THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH

by Alfred Edersheim

Alfred Edersheim's comprehensive historical and theological work exploring Jesus Christ's life within its Jewish and Roman context, drawing on extensive knowledge of rabbinic literature and ancient customs.

128 Chapters

Table of Contents

0. The Life And Times Of Jesus The Messiah
1. PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.
2. PREFACE TO THE SECOND AND THIRD EDITIONS.
3. LIST OF AUTHORITIES
4. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN REFERENCE TO RABBINIC WRITINGS QUOTED IN THIS WORK...
5. Book I INTRODUCTORY. THE PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL: THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAY...
6. CHAPTER I. THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST - THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE...
7. CHAPTER II. THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE WEST - THE HELLENISTS - ORIGIN OF HELLE...
8. CHAPTER III. THE OLD FAITH PREPARING FOR THE NEW - DEVELOPMENT OF HELLENIST THEO...
9. CHAPTER IV. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA, THE RABBIS, AND THE GOSPELS - THE FINAL DEVELOP...
10. CHAPTER V. ALEXANDRIA AND ROME - THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN THE CAPITALS OF WESTE...
11. CHAPTER VI. POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE WEST - ...
12. CHAPTER VII. IN PALESTINE - JEWS AND GENTILES IN THE LAND' - THEIR MUTUAL RELATI...
13. CHAPTER VIII. TRADITIONALISM, ITS ORIGIN, CHARACTER, AND LITERATURE - THE MISHNA...
14. Book II FROM THE MANGER IN BETHLEHEM TO THE BAPTISM IN JORDAN.
15. CHAPTER I. IN JERUSALEM WHEN HEROD REIGNED
16. CHAPTER II. THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF HEROD - THE TWO WORLDS IN JERUSALEM.
17. CHAPTER III. THE ANNUNCIATION OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST
18. CHAPTER IV. THE ANNUNCIATION OF JESUS THE MESSIAH, AND THE BIRTH OF HIS FORERUNN...
19. CHAPTER V. WHAT MESSIAH DID THE JEWS EXPECT?
20. CHAPTER VI. THE NATIVITY OF JESUS THE MESSIAH.
21. CHAPTER VII. THE PURIFICATION OF THE VIRGIN AND THE PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE
22. CHAPTER VIII. THE VISIT AND HOMAGE OF THE MAGI, AND THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT
23. CHAPTER IX. THE CHILD-LIFE IN NAZARETH
24. CHAPTER X. IN THE HOUSE OF HIS HEAVENLY, AND IN THE HOME OF HIS EARTHLY FATHER -...

25. CHAPTER XI. IN THE FIFTEENTH YEAR OF TIBERIUS CÆSAR AND UNDER THE PONTIFIC...
26. CHAPTER XII. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS: ITS HIGHER MEANING.
27. Book III. THE ASCENT: FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION.
28. CHAPTER I. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS
29. CHAPTER II. THE DEPUTATION FROM JERUSALEM - THE THREE SECTS OF THE PHARISEES, SA...
30. CHAPTER III. THE TWOFOLD TESTIMONY OF JOHN - THE FIRST SABBATH OF JESUS'S MINIST...
31. CHAPTER IV. THE MARRIAGE FEAST IN CANA OF GALILEE - THE MIRACLE THAT IS A SIGN.'
32. CHAPTER V. THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE - THE SIGN,' WHICH IS NOT A SIGN.
33. CHAPTER VI. THE TEACHER COME FROM GOD AND THE TEACHER FROM JERUSALEM - JESUS AND...
34. CHAPTER VII. IN JUDÆA AND THROUGH SAMARIA - A SKETCH OF SAMARITAN HISTORY ...
35. CHAPTER VIII. JESUS AT THE WELL OF SYCHAR
36. CHAPTER IX. THE SECOND VISIT TO CANA - CURE OF THE NOBLEMAN'S' SON AT CAPERNAUM.
37. CHAPTER X. THE SYNAGOGUE AT NAZARETH - SYNAGOGUE-WORSHIP AND ARRANGEMENTS.
38. CHAPTER XI. THE FIRST GALILEAN MINISTRY.
39. CHAPTER XII. AT THE UNKNOWN' FEAST IN JERUSALEM, AND BY THE POOL OF BETHESDA.
40. CHAPTER XIII. BY THE SEA OF GALILEE - THE FINAL CALL OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES, AND...
41. CHAPTER XIV. A SABBATH IN CAPERNAUM
42. CHAPTER XV. SECOND JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE - THE HEALING OF THE LEPER.
43. CHAPTER XVI. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM - CONCERNING THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS - THE ...
44. CHAPTER XVII. THE CALL OF MATTHEW - THE SAVIOUR'S WELCOME TO SINNERS - RABBINIC ...
45. CHAPTER XVIII. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT - THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST AND RABBINIC TEAC...
46. CHAPTER XIX. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM - HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.
47. CHAPTER XX. THE RAISING OF THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN - THE MEETING OF LIFE AND DEATH...
48. CHAPTER XXI. THE WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER
49. CHAPTER XXII. THE MINISTRY OF LOVE, THE BLASPHEMY OF HATRED, AND THE MISTAKES OF...

50. CHAPTER XXIII. NEW TEACHING IN PARABLES' - THE PARABLES TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LAK...
51. CHAPTER XXIV. CHRIST STILLS THE STORM ON THE LAKE OF GALILEE.
52. CHAPTER XXV. AT GERASA - THE HEALING OF THE DEMONISED.
53. CHAPTER XXVI. THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN - CHRIST'S PERSONAL APPEARANCE - THE RAIS...
54. CHAPTER XXVII. SECOND VISIT TO NAZARETH - THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE.
55. CHAPTER XXVIII. THE STORY OF THE BAPTIST, FROM HIS LAST TESTIMONY TO JESUS TO HI...
56. CHAPTER XXIX. THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND
57. CHAPTER XXX. THE NIGHT OF MIRACLES ON THE LAKE OF GENNESARET
58. CHAPTER XXXI. THE CAVILS OF THE PHARISEES CONCERNING PURIFICATION, AND THE TEACH...
59. CHAPTER XXXII. THE GREAT CRISIS IN POPULAR FEELING - THE LAST DISCOURSES IN THE ...
60. CHAPTER XXXIII. JESUS AND THE SYRO-PHOENICIAN WOMAN
61. CHAPTER XXXIV. A GROUP OF MIRACLES AMONG A SEMI-HEATHEN POPULATION
62. CHAPTER XXXV. THE TWO SABBATH-CONTROVERSIES - THE PLUCKING OF THE EARS OF CORN B...
63. CHAPTER XXXVI. THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND - TO DALMANUTHA - THE SIGN FROM ...
64. CHAPTER XXXVII. THE GREAT CONFESSION - THE GREAT COMMISSION - THE GREAT INSTRUCT...
65. Book IV. THE DESCENT: FROM THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION INTO THE VALLEY OF HUMIL...
66. CHAPTER I. THE TRANSFIGURATION.
67. CHAPTER II. ON THE MORROW OF THE TRANSFIGURATION
68. CHAPTER III. THE LAST EVENTS IN GALILEE - THE TRIBUTE-MONEY, THE DISPUTE BY THE ...
69. CHAPTER IV. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM - CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE LAST PAR...
70. CHAPTER V. FURTHER INCIDENTS OF THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM - THE MISSION AND RETUR...
71. CHAPTER VI. AT THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES - FIRST DISCOURSE IN THE TEMPLE
72. CHAPTER VII. IN THE LAST, THE GREAT DAY OF THE FEAST'
73. CHAPTER VIII. TEACHING IN THE TEMPLE ON THE OCTAVE OF THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.
74. CHAPTER IX. THE HEALING OF THE MAN BORN BLIND.
75. CHAPTER X. THE GOOD SHEPHERD' AND HIS ONE FLOCK' - LAST DISCOURSE AT THE FEAST O...
76. CHAPTER XI. THE FIRST PERÆAN DISCOURSES - TO THE PHARISEES CONCERNING THE ...

77. CHAPTER XII. THE MORNING-MEAL IN THE PHARISEE'S HOUSE - MEALS AND FEASTS AMONG T...
78. CHAPTER XIII. TO THE DISCIPLES - TWO EVENTS AND THEIR MORAL.
79. CHAPTER XIV. AT THE FEAST OF THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE.
80. CHAPTER XV. THE SECOND SERIES OF PARABLES - THE TWO PARABLES OF HIM WHO IS NEIGH...
81. CHAPTER XVI. THE THREE PARABLES OF WARNING: TO THE INDIVIDUAL, TO THE NATION, AN...
82. CHAPTER XVII. THE THREE PARABLES OF THE GOSPEL: OF THE RECOVERY OF THE LOST - OF...
83. CHAPTER XVIII. THE UNJUST STEWARD - DIVES AND LAZARUS - JEWISH AGRICULTURAL NOTE...
84. CHAPTER XIX. THE THREE LAST PARABLES OF THE PERÆAN SERIES: THE UNRIGHTEOUS...
85. CHAPTER XX. CHRIST'S DISCOURSES IN PERÆA - CLOSE OF THE PERÆAN MINIS...
86. CHAPTER XXI. THE DEATH AND THE RAISING OF LAZARUS - THE QUESTION OF MIRACLES AND...
87. CHAPTER XXII. ON THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM - DEPARTURE FROM EPHRAIM BY WAY OF SAM...
88. CHAPTER XXIII. THE LAST INCIDENTS IN PERÆA - THE YOUNG RULER WHO WENT AWAY...
89. CHAPTER XXIV. IN JERICHO AND AT BETHANY - JERICHO - A GUEST WITH ZACCHÆUS ...
90. Book V. THE CROSS AND THE CROWN.
91. CHAPTER I. THE FIRST DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - PALM-SUNDAY - THE ROYAL ENTRY INTO JE...
92. CHAPTER II. THE SECOND DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - THE BARREN FIG-TREE - THE CLEANSING...
93. CHAPTER III. THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - THE EVENTS OF THAT DAY - THE QUESTI...
94. CHAPTER IV. THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - THE LAST CONTROVERSIES AND DISCOURSE...
95. CHAPTER V. THE THIRD DAY IN PASION-WEEK - THE LAST SERIES OF PARABLES: TO THE PH...
96. CHAPTER VI. THE EVENING OF THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVE...
97. CHAPTER VII. EVENING OF THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK-ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES-LAS...
98. CHAPTER VIII. THE FOURTH DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - JESUS IN HIS LAST SABBATIC REST B...
99. CHAPTER IX. THE FIFTH DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - MAKE READY THE PASSOVER!'

100. CHAPTER X. THE PASCHAL SUPPER - THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.
101. CHAPTER XI. THE LAST DISCOURSES OF CHRIST - THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION.
102. CHAPTER XII. GETHSEMANE
103. CHAPTER XIII. THURSDAY NIGHT - BEFORE ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS - PETER AND JESUS.
104. CHAPTER XIV. THE MORNING OF GOOD FRIDAY.
105. CHAPTER XV. CRUCIFIED, DEAD, AND BURIED.'
106. CHAPTER XVI. ON THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST FROM THE DEAD.
107. CHAPTER XVII. ON THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD; HE ASCENDED INTO HEA...
108. APPENDIX I. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC WRITINGS
109. APPENDIX II. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA AND RABBINIC THEOLOGY.
110. APPENDIX III. RABBINIC VIEWS AS TO THE LAWFULNESS OF IMAGES, PICTORIAL REPRESENT...
111. APPENDIX IV. AN ABSTRACT OF JEWISH HISTORY FROM THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT...
112. APPENDIX V. RABBINIC THEOLOGY AND LITERATURE
113. APPENDIX VI. List of the Maccabees, of the Family of Herod, of the High-Priests,...
114. APPENDIX VII. ON THE DATE OF THE NATIVITY OF OUR LORD
115. APPENDIX VIII. RABBINIC TRADITIONS ABOUT ELIJAH, THE FORERUNNER OF THE MESSIAH
116. APPENDIX IX. LIST OF OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED IN ANCIENT RAB...
117. APPENDIX X. ON THE SUPPOSED TEMPLE-SYNAGOGUE.
118. APPENDIX XI. ON THE PROPHECY, IS. XL. 3
119. APPENDIX XII. THE BAPTISM OF PROSELYTES
120. APPENDIX XIV. THE LAW IN MESSIANIC TIMES.
121. APPENDIX XV. THE LOCATION OF SYCHAR, AND THE DATE OF OUR LORD'S VISIT TO SAMARIA...
122. APPENDIX XVI. ON THE JEWISH VIEWS ABOUT DEMONS' AND THE DEMONISED,' TOGETHER WIT...
123. APPENDIX XVII. THE ORDINANCES AND LAW OF THE SABBATH AS LAID DOWN IN THE MISHNAH...
124. APPENDIX XVIII. HAGGADAH ABOUT SIMEON KEPHA (LEGEND OF SIMON PETER.)
125. APPENDIX XIX. ON ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, ACCORDING TO THE RABBIS AND THE NEW TESTAME...
126. INDEX I. OF SUBJECTS
127. INDEX II. of passages from the four gospels referred to in these volumes.

Chapter 0

The Life And Times Of Jesus The Messiah

Chapter 1

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

In presenting these volumes to the reader, I must offer an explanation, - though I would fain hope that such may not be absolutely necessary. The title of this book must not be understood as implying any pretence on my part to write a Life of Christ' in the strict sense. To take the lowest view, the materials for it do not exist. Evidently the Evangelists did not intend to give a full record of even the outward events in that History; far less could they have thought of compassing the sphere or sounding the depths of the Life of Him, Whom they present to us as the God-Man and the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father. Rather must the Gospels be regarded as four different aspects in which the Evangelists viewed the historical Jesus of Nazareth as the fulfilment of the Divine promise of old, the Messiah of Israel and the Saviour of man, and presented Him to the Jewish and Gentile world for their acknowledgment as the Sent of God, Who revealed the Father, and was Himself the Way to Him, the Truth, and the Life. And this view of the Gospel-narratives underlies the figurative representation of the Evangelist in Christian Symbolism. [1] In thus guarding my meaning in the choice of the title, I have already indicated my own standpoint in this book. But in another respect I wish to disclaim having taken any predetermined dogmatic standpoint at the outset of my investigations. I wished to write, not for a definite purpose, be it even that of the defence of the faith, - but rather to let that purpose grow out of the book, as would be pointed out by the course of independent study, in which arguments on both sides should be impartially weighed and facts ascertained. In this manner I hoped best to attain what must be the first object in all research, but especially in such as the present: to ascertain, as far as we can, the truth, irrespective of consequences. And thus also I hoped to help others, by going, as it were, before them, in the path which their enquires must take, and removing the difficulties and entanglements which beset it. So might I honestly, confidently, and, in such a matter, earnestly, ask them to follow me, pointing to the height to which such enquires must lead up. I know, indeed, that there is something beyond and apart from this; even the restful sense on that height, and the happy outlook from it. But this is not within the province of one man to give to another, nor yet does it come in the way of study, however earnest and careful; it depends upon, and implies the existence of a subjective state which comes only by the direction given to our enquires by the true degz (St John xvi.13). This statement of the general object in view will explain the course pursued in these enquiries. First and foremost, this book was to be study of the Life of Jesus the Messiah, retaining the general designation, as best conveying to others the subject to be treated. But, secondly, since Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew, spoke to, and moved among Jews, in Palestine, and at a definite period of its history, it was absolutely necessary to view that Life and Teaching in all its surroundings of place, society, popular life, and intellectual or religious development. This would form not only the frame in which to set the picture of the Christ, but the very background of the picture itself. It is, indeed, most true that Christ spoke not only to the Jews, to Palestine, and to that time, but - of which history has given the evidence - to all men and to all times. Still He spoke first and directly to the Jews, and His words must have been intelligible to them, His teaching have reached upwards from their intellectual and religious standpoint, even although it infinitely extended the horizon so as, in its full application, to make it wide as the bounds of earth and time.

Nay, to explain the bearing of the religious leaders of Israel, from the first, towards Jesus, it seemed also necessary to trace the historical development of thought and religious belief, till it issued in that system of Traditionalism, which, by an internal necessity, was irreconcilably antagonistic to the Christ of the Gospels. On other grounds also, such a full portraiture of Jewish life, society, and thinking seemed requisite. It furnishes alike a vindication and an illustration of the Gospel-narratives. A vindication - because in measure as we transport ourselves into that time, we feel that the Gospels present to us a real, historical scene; that the men and the circumstances to which we are introduced are real - not a fancy picture, but just such as we know and now recognize them, and would expect them to have spoken, or to have been. Again, we shall thus vividly realise another and most important aspect of the words of Christ. We shall perceive that their form is wholly of the times, their cast Jewish - while by the side of this similarity of form there is not only essential difference but absolute contrariety of substance and spirit. Jesus spoke as truly a Jew to the Jews, but He spoke not as they - no, not as their highest and best Teachers would have spoken. And this contrariety of spirit with manifest similarity of form is, to my mind, one of the strongest evidences of the claims of Christ, since it raises the all-important question, whence the Teacher of Nazareth - or, shall we say, the humble Child of the Carpenter-home in a far-off little place of Galilee - had drawn His inspiration? And clearly to set this forth has been the first object of the detailed Rabbinic quotations in this book. But their further object, besides this vindication, has been the illustration of the Gospel-narratives. Even the general reader must be aware that some knowledge of Jewish life and society at the time is requisite for the understanding of the Gospel-history. Those who have consulted the works of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Meuschen, Wetstein and Wünsche, or even the extracts from them presented in Commentaries, know that the help derived from their Jewish references is very great. And yet, despite the immense learning and industry of these writers, there are serious drawbacks to their use. Sometimes the references are critically not quite accurate; sometimes they are derived from works that should not have been adduced in evidence; occasionally, either the rendering, or the application of what is separated from its context, is not reliable. A still more serious objection is, that these quotations are not unfrequently one sided; but chiefly this - perhaps, as the necessary consequence of being merely illustrative notes to certain verses in the Gospels - that they do not present a full and connected picture. And yet it is this which so often gives the most varied and welcome illustration of the Gospel-narratives. In truth, we know not only the leading personages in Church and State in Palestine at that time, their views, teaching, pursuits, and aims; the state of parties; the character of popular opinion; the proverbs, the customs, the daily life of the country - but we can, in imagination, enter their dwellings, associate with them in familiar intercourse, or follow them to the Temple, the Synagogue, the Academy, or to the market-place and the workshop. We know what clothes they wore, what dishes they ate, what wines they drank, what they produced and what they imported: nay, the cost of every article of their dress or food, the price of houses and of living; in short, every detail that can give vividness to a picture of life. All this is so important for the understanding of the Gospel-history as, I hope, to justify the fulness of archæological detail in this book. And yet I have used only a portion of the materials which I had collected for the purpose. And here I must frankly own, as another reason for this fulness of detail, that many erroneous and misleading statements on this subject, and these even on elementary points, have of late been made. Supported by references to the labours of truly learned German writers, they have been sometimes set forth with such confidence as to impose the laborious and unwelcome duty of

carefully examining and testing them. But to this only the briefest possible reference has been made, and chiefly in the beginning of these volumes. Another explanation seems more necessary in this connection. In describing the Traditionalism of the time of Christ, I must have said what, I fear, may, most unwillingly on my part, wound the feelings of some who still cling, if not to the faith of, yet to what now represents the ancient Synagogue. But let me appeal to their fairness. I must needs state what I believe to be the facts; and I could neither keep them back nor soften them, since it was of the very essence of my argument to present Christ as both in contact and in contrast with Jewish Traditionalism. No educated Western Jew would, in these days, confess himself as occupying the exact standpoint of Rabbinic Traditionalism. Some will select parts of the system; others will allegorise, explain, or modify it; very many will, in heart - often also openly - repudiate the whole. And here it is surely not necessary for me to rebut or disown those vile falsehoods about the Jews which ignorance, cupidity, and bigoted hatred have of late again so strangely raised. But I would go further, and assert that, in reference to Jesus of Nazareth, no educated Israelite of to-day would identify himself with the religious leaders of the people eighteen centuries ago. Yet is not this disclaimer of that Traditionalism which not only explains the rejection of Jesus, but is the sole logical raison d'être of the Synagogue, also its condemnation? I know, indeed, that from this negative there is a vast step in advance to the positive in the reception of the Gospel, and that many continue in the Synagogue, because they are not so convinced of the other as truthfully to profess it. And perhaps the means we have taken to present it have not always been the wisest. The mere appeal to the literal fulfilment of certain prophetic passages in the Old Testament not only leads chiefly to critical discussions, but rests the case on what is, after all, a secondary line of argumentation. In the New Testament prophecies are not made to point to facts, but facts to point back to prophecies. The New Testament presents the fulfilment of all prophecy rather than of prophecies, and individual predictions serve as fingerposts to great outstanding facts, which mark where the roads meet and part. And here, as it seems to me, we are at one with the ancient Synagogue. In proof, I would call special attention to Appendix IX., which gives a list of all the Old Testament passages Messianically applied in Jewish writings. We, as well as they, appeal to all Scripture, to all prophecy, as that of which the reality is in the Messiah. But we also appeal to the whole tendency and new direction which the Gospel presents in opposition to that of Traditionalism; to the new revelation of the Father, to the new brotherhood of man, and to the satisfaction of the deepest wants of the heart, which Christ has brought - in short, to the Scriptural, the moral, and the spiritual elements; and we would ask whether all this could have been only the outcome of a Carpenter's Son at Nazareth at the time, and amidst the surroundings which we so well know. In seeking to reproduce in detail the life, opinions, and teaching of the contemporaries of Christ, we have also in great measure addressed ourselves to what was the third special object in view in this History. This was to clear the path of difficulties - in other words, to meet such objections as might be raised to the Gospel-narratives. And this, as regards principle - not details and minor questions, which will cause little uneasiness to the thoughtful and calm reader; quite irrespective also of any theory of inspiration which may be proposed, and hence of any harmonistic or kindred attempts which may be made. Broadly speaking, the attacks on the Gospel-narratives may be grouped under these three particulars: they may be represented as intentional fraud by the writers, and imposition on the readers; or, secondly, a rationalistic explanation may be sought of them, showing how what originally had been quite simple and natural was misunderstood by ignorance, or perverted by superstition; or, thirdly, they may be

represented as the outcome of ideas and expectations at the time, which gathered around the beloved Teacher of Nazareth, and, so to speak, found body in legends that clustered around the Person and Life of Him Who was regarded as the Messiah. . . . And this is supposed to account for the preaching of the Apostles, for their life-witness, for their martyr-death, for the Church, for the course which history has taken, as well as for the dearest hopes and experiences of Christian life! Of the three modes of criticism just indicated, importance attaches only to the third, which has been broadly designated as the mythical theory. The fraud-theory seems - as even Strauss admits - psychologically so incompatible with admitted facts as regards the early Disciples and the Church, and it does such violence to the first requirements of historical enquiry, as to make it - at least to me - difficult to understand how any thoughtful student could be swayed by objections which too often are merely an appeal to the vulgar, intellectually and morally, in us. For - to take the historical view of the question - even if every concession were made to negative criticism, sufficient would still be left in the Christian documents to establish a consensus of the earliest belief as to all the great facts of the Gospel-History, on which both the preaching of the Apostles and the primitive Church have been historically based. And with this consensus at least, and its practical outcome, historical enquiry has to reckon. And here I may take leave to point out the infinite importance, as regards the very foundation of our faith, attaching to the historical Church - truly in this also the kklesa theo zntos, stlos ka draoma [columna et fulcrum] ts letheas (the Church of the Living God, the pillar and stay [support] of the truth). As regards the second class of interpretation - the rationalistic - it is altogether so superficial, shadowy and unreal that it can at most be only regarded as a passing phase of light-minded attempts to set aside felt difficulties.But the third mode of explanation, commonly, though perhaps not always quite fairly, designated as the mythical, deserves and demands, at least in its sober presentation, the serious consideration of the historical student. Happily it is also that which, in the nature of it, is most capable of being subjected to the test of historical examination. For, as previously stated, we possess ample materials for ascertaining the state of thought, belief, and expectancy in the time of Christ, and of His Apostles. And to this aspect of objections to the Gospels the main line of argumentation in this book has been addressed. For, if the historical analysis here attempted has any logical force, it leads up to this conclusion, that Jesus Christ was, alike in the fundamental direction of His teaching and work, and in its details, antithetic to the Synagogue in its doctrine, practice, and expectancies.But even so, one difficulty - we all feel it - remaineth. It is that connected with miracles, or rather with the miraculous, since the designation, and the difficulty to which it points, must not be limited to outward and tangible phenomena. But herein, I venture to say, lies also its solution, at least so far as such is possible - since the difficulty itself, the miraculous, is of the very essence of our thinking about the Divine, and, therefore one of the conditions of it: at least, in all religions of which the origin is not from within us, subjective, but from without us, objective, or, if I may so say, in all that claim to be universal religions (catholic thinking). But, to my mind, the evidential value of miracles (as frequently set forth in these volumes) lies not in what, without intending offence, I may call their barely super-naturalistic aspect, but in this, that they are the manifestations of the miraculous, in the widest sense, as the essential element in revealed religion. Miracles are of chief evidential value, not in themselves, but as instances and proof of the direct communication between Heaven and earth. And such direct communication is, at least, the postulate and first position in all religions. They all present to the worshipper some medium of personal communication from Heaven to earth - some prophet or other channel of the Divine - and

some medium for our communication with Heaven. And this is the fundamental principle of the miraculous as the essential postulate in all religion that purposes again to bind man to God. It proceeds on the twofold principle that communication must first come to man from Heaven, and then that it does so come. Rather, perhaps, let us say, that all religion turns on these two great factors of our inner experience: man's felt need and (as implied in it, if we are God's creatures) his felt expectancy. And in the Christian Church this is not merely matter of the past - it has attained its fullest reality, and is a constant present in the indwelling of the Paraclete.Yet another part of the task in writing this book remains to be mentioned. In the nature of it, such a book must necessarily have been more or less of a Commentary on the Gospels. But I have sought to follow the text of the Gospels throughout, and separately to consider every passage in them, so that, I hope, I may truthfully designate it also a Commentary on the Four Gospels - though an informal one. And here I may be allowed to state that throughout I have had the general reader in view, reserving for the foot-notes and Appendices what may be of special interest to students. While thankfully availing myself of all critical help within my reach - and here I may perhaps take the liberty of specially singling out Professor Westcott's Commentary on St. John - I have thought it right to make the sacred text the subject of fresh and independent study. The conclusions at which I arrived I would present with the more deference, that, from my isolated position, I had not, in writing these volumes, the inestimable advantage of personal contact, on these subjects, with other students of the sacred text.It only remains to add a few sentences in regard to other matters - perhaps of more interest to myself than to the reader. For many years I had wished and planned writing such a book, and all my previous studies were really in preparation for this. But the task was actually undertaken at the request of the Publishers, of whose kindness and patience I must here make public acknowledgment. For, the original term fixed for writing it was two or three years. It has taken me seven years of continual and earnest labour - and, even so, I feel as if I would fain, and ought to, spend other seven years upon what could, at most, be touching the fringe of this great subject. What these seven years have been to me I could not attempt to tell. In a remote country parish, entirely isolated from all social intercourse, and amidst not a few trials, parochial duty has been diversified and relieved by many hours of daily work and of study - delightful in and for itself. If any point seemed not clear to my own mind, or required protracted investigation, I could give days of undisturbed work to what to others might perhaps seem secondary, but was all-important to me. And so these seven years passed - with no other companion in study than my daughter, to whom I am indebted, not only for the Index Rerum, but for much else, especially for a renewed revision, in the proof-sheets, of the references made throughout these volumes. What labour and patience this required every reader will perceive - although even so I cannot hope that no misprint or slip of the pen has escaped our detection. And now I part from this book with thankfulness to Almighty God for sparing me to complete it, with lingering regret that the task is ended, but also with unfeigned diffidence. I have, indeed, sought to give my best and most earnest labour to it, and to write what I believed to be true, irrespective of party or received opinions. This, in such a book, was only sacred duty. But where study necessarily extended to so many, and sometimes new, departments, I cannot hope always to carry the reader with me, or, which is far more serious - to have escaped all error. My deepest and most earnest prayer is that He, in Whose Service I have desired to write this book, would graciously accept the humble service - forgive what is mistaken and bless what is true. And if anything personal may intrude into these concluding lines, I would fain also designate what I have written as Apologia pro vita mea (alike in its fundamental direction

and even ecclesiastically) - if, indeed, that may be called an Apologia which is the confession of this inmost conviction of mind and heart: Lord, to Whom shall we go? The words of eternal life hast Thou! And we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God.'ALFRED EDERSHEIM8 BRADMORE ROAD, OXFORD:September 1883

Chapter 2

PREFACE TO THE SECOND AND THIRD EDITIONS.

IN issuing a new edition of this book I wish, in the first place, again to record, as the expression of permanent convictions and feelings, some remarks with which I had prefaced the Second Edition, although happily they are not at present so urgently called for. With the feelings of sincere thankfulness for the kindness with which this book was received by all branches of the Church, only one element of pain mingled. Although I am well convinced that a careful or impartial reader could not arrive at any such conclusion, yet it was suggested that a perverse ingenuity might abuse certain statements and quotations for what in modern parlance are termed Anti-Semitic' purposes. That any such thoughts could possibly attach to a book concerning Him, Who was Himself a Jew; Who in the love of His compassion wept tears of bitter anguish over the Jerusalem that was about to crucify Him, and Whose first utterance and prayer when nailed to the Cross was: Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' - would seem terribly incongruous and painful. Nor can it surely be necessary to point out that the love of Christ, or the understanding of His Work and Mission, must call forth feelings far different from those to which reference has been made. To me, indeed, it is difficult to associate the so-called Anti-Semitic movement with any but the lowest causes: envy, jealousy, and cupidity on the one hand; or, on the other, ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, and hatred of race. But as these are times when it is necessary to speak unmistakably, I avail myself of the present opportunity to point out the reasons why any Talmudic quotations, even if fair, can have no application for Anti-Semitic' purposes. First: It is a mistake to regard everything in Talmudic writings about the Gentiles' as presently applying to Christians. Those spoken of are characterised as the worshippers of idols,' of stars and planets,' and by similar designations. That the heathens' of those days and lands should have been suspected of almost any abomination, deemed capable of any treachery or cruelty towards Israel, - no student of history can deem strange, especially when the experience of so many terrible wrongs (would they had been confined to the heathen and to those times!) would naturally lead to morbidly excited suspicions and apprehensions. Secondly: We must remember the times, the education, and the general standpoint of that period as compared with our own. No one would measure the belief of Christians by certain statements in the Fathers, nor judge the moral principles of Roman Catholics by prurient quotations from the Casuists; nor yet estimate the Lutherans by the utterances and deeds of the early successors of Luther, nor Calvinists by the burning of Servetus. In all such cases the general standpoint of the times has to be first taken into account. And no educated Jew would share the follies and superstitions, nor yet sympathise with the suspicions or feelings towards even the most hostile and depraved heathens, that may be quoted from the Talmud. Thirdly: Absolutely the contrary of all this has been again and again set forth by modern Jewish writers. Even their attempts to explain away certain quotations from the Talmud - unsuccessful though, in my view, some of them are - afford evidence of their present repudiation of all such sentiments. I would here specially refer to such work as Dr. Grünebaum's Ethics of Judaism' (Sittenlehre d. Judenthums') - a book deeply interesting also as setting forth the modern Jewish view of Christ and His Teaching, and accordant (though on different grounds) with some of the conclusions expressed in this book, as regards certain incidents in the History of Christ. The

principles expressed by Dr. Grünebaum, and other writers, are such as for ever to give the lie to Anti-Semitic charges. And although he and others, with quite proper loyalty, labour to explain certain Talmudic citations, yet it ultimately comes to the admission that Talmudic sayings are not the criterion and rule of present duty, even as regards the heathen - still less Christians, to whom they do not apply. What has just been stated, while it fully disposes of all Anti-Semitism,' only the more clearly sets forth the argument which forms the main proposition of this book. Here also we have the highest example. None loved Israel so intensely, even unto death, as Jesus of Nazareth; none made such withering denunciations as He of Jewish Traditionalism, in all its branches, and of its Representatives. It is with Traditionalism, not the Jews, that our controversy lies. And here we cannot speak too plainly nor decidedly. It might, indeed, be argued, apart from any proposed different applications, that on one or another point opinions of a different kind may also be adduced from other Rabbis. Nor is it intended to convey unanimity of opinion on every subject. For, indeed, such scarcely existed on any one point - not on matters of fact, nor even often on Halakhic questions. And this also is characteristic of Rabbinism. But it must be remembered that we are here dealing with the very text-book of that sacred and Divine Traditionalism, the basis and substance of Rabbinism, for which such unlimited authority and absolute submission are claimed; and hence, that any statement admitted into its pages, even though a different view were also to be adduced, possesses an authoritative and a representative character. And this further appears from the fact that the same statements are often repeated in other documents, besides that in which they were originally made, and that they are also supported by other statements, kindred and parallel in spirit. In truth, it has throughout been my aim to present, not one nor another isolated statement or aspect of Rabbinism, but its general teaching and tendency. In so doing I have, however, purposely left aside certain passages which, while they might have most fully brought out the sad and strange extravagances to which Rabbinism could go, would have involved the unnecessary quotation of what is not only very painful in itself, but might have furnished an occasion to enemies of Israel. Alike the one and the other it was my most earnest desire to avoid. And by the side of these extravagances there is so much in Jewish writings and life - the outcome of Old Testament training - that is noblest and most touching, especially as regards the social virtues, such as purity, kindness, and charity, and the acknowledgment of God in sufferings, as well as their patient endurance. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that even the vehement assertions of partisans on the other side, supported by isolated sayings, sometimes torn from their context, or by such coincidences as are historically to be expected, will persuade those who keep in view either the words of Christ or His history and that of the Apostles, that the relation between Christianity in its origin, as the fulfilment of the Old Testament, and Traditionalism, as the externalised development of its letter, is other than that of which these volumes furnish both the explanation and the evidence. In point of fact, the attentive student of history will observe that a similar protest against the bare letter underlies Alexandrianism and Philo - although there from the side of reason and apologetically, in the New Testament from the aspect of spiritual life and for its full presentation. Thus much - somewhat reluctantly written, because approaching controversy - seemed necessary by way of explanation. The brief interval between the First and Second Editions rendered only a superficial revision possible, as then indicated. For the present edition the whole work has once more been revised, chiefly with the view of removing from the numerous marginal Talmudic references such misprints as were observed. In the text and notes, also, a few errata have been corrected, or else the meaning rendered more clear. In one or two places fresh

notes have been made; some references have been struck out, and others added. These notes will furnish evidence that the literature of the subject, since the first appearance of these volumes, has not been neglected, although it seemed unnecessary to swell the List of Authorities' by the names of all the books since published or perused. Life is too busy and too short to be always going back on one's traces. Nor, indeed, would this be profitable. The further results of reading and study will best be embodied in further labours, please God, in continuation of those now completed. Opportunity may then also occur for the discussion of some questions which had certainly not been overlooked, although this seemed not the proper place for them: such as that of the composition of the Apostolic writings. And so, with great thankfulness for what service this book has been already allowed to perform, I would now send it forth on its new journey, with this as my most earnest hope and desire: that, in however humble a manner, it may be helpful for the fuller and clearer setting forth of the Life of Him Who is the Life of all our life. A. E. OXFORD: March 1886.

Chapter 3

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

CHIEFLY USED IN WRITING THIS BOOK. Alford: Greek Testament. Von der Alm: Heidn. u. jüd. Urtheile über Jesu u. die alten Christen. Altingius: Dissertationes et Orationes. Apocrypha: S.P.C.K. Commentary on. The Apocryphal Gospels. Auerbach: Berith Abraham. Bacher: Die Agada der Babylon. Amoräer. Bäck: Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes u.seiner Literatur. Baedeker: Syrien u. Palästina. Bähr: Gesetz über Falsche Zeugen nach Bible u. Talmud. Barclay: City of the Great King. Beer: Leben Abraham's.Beer: Leben Mosis.Beer, P.: Geschichte d. relig. Sekten d. Juden.Bengel: Gnomon Novi Testamenti.Bengel: Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe.Bergel: Naturwissenschaftliche Kenntnisse d. Talmudisten.Bergel: Der Himmel u. seine Wunder.Bergel: Die Eheverhältnisse der alten Juden.Berliner, Dr. A.: Targum Onkelos.Bertholdt: Christologie Judæorum. Testaments.Beyschlag: Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments.Beyschlag: Zur Johanneischen Frage.Bickell: Die Entstehung der Liturgie aus der Einsetzungsfeier.Bleek: Einleitung in dasa Neue Testament. ed. Mangold.Bleek: Synoptische Erklärung d. drei Evangelien.Bloch: Studien z. Gesch. der Sammlung d althebr. Literatur.Bloch: Das Mosaisch-talmud. Polizeirecht.Bloch: Civilprocess-Ordnung nach Mos. rabb. Rechte.Bochartus: Hierozoicon.Bodek: Marcus Aurelius u. R. Jehudah.Bodenschatz: Kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden.Böhl: Forschungen nach einer Volks bibel zur Zeit Jesu.Böhl: Alttestamentliche Citate im N. T.Bonar: The Land of Promise.Braun: Die Söhne des Herodes.Braunius: De Vestitu Hebræorum.Brecher: DasTranscendentale im Talmud.Bredow: Rabbinische Mythen, &c.Brückner: Die Versuchungsgeschichte unseres Herrn Jesu Christi.Brück: Rabbinische Ceremonialgebräuche.Brüll: Fremdsprachliche Redensarten im Talmud.Brüll: Trachten der Juden.Buber: Pesikta.Bucher: Des Apostels Johannes Lehre vom Logos.Burgon: The Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark.Buxtorf: Exercitationes.Buxtorf: Synagoga Judaica.Buxtorf; Lexicon Talmud.Calvin: Comment. (passim).Cahen: Repertorium Talmudioum.Carpzov: Chuppa Hebræorium.Caspari: Einleitung in das Leben Jesu Christi.Cassel: Das Buch Kusari.Cassel: Lehrbuch der Jud. Gesch, u. Literatur.Castelli: Commento di Sabbatai Donnolo sul libro della Creazione.Castelli: Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei.Cavedoni: Biblische Numismatik.Charteris: Canonicity.Chasronoth Hashas.Cheyne: Prophecies of Isaiah.Chijs: De Herode Magno.Cohen: Les Déicides.Commentaries, Speaker's, on the Gospels; Camb. Bible on the Gospels.Conder: Tent Work in Palestine.Conder: Handbook to the Bible.Conforte: Liber Kore ha-Dorot.Cook: The Rev. Version of the Gospels.Creizenach: Shulcan Aruch.Cremer: New Testament Dictionary.Cureton: Syriac Gospels.Dähne: Jüdisch-Alex. Religionsphilos.Davidson: Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.Davidson: The Last Things.Dachs: Codex Succa Talmudis Babylonici.Danko: Historia Revelationis Divinae N. T.Danko: De Sacra Scriptura ejusque interpretatione Commentarius.Delaunay: Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité Judéo-Grecque.Delitzsch: Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu.Delitzsch: Geschichte der jüd. Poesie.Delitzsch: Durch Krankheit zur Genesung.Delitzsch: Ein Tag in Capernaum.Delitzsch: Untersuchungen üb. die Entsteh. u. Anlage d. Matth-Evang.Delitzsch; Talmudische Studien.Delitzsch: Jesus und Hillel.Derenbourg: Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine.Deutsch: Literary Remains.Deylingius: Observationes Sacræ.Dillmann: Das Buch

Henoch.Döllinger: Heidenthum und Judenthum.Drummond: The Jewish Messiah.Dukes: Zur Rabbinischen Sprachkunde.Dukes: Rabbinische Blumenlese.Duschak: Zur Botanik des Talmud.Duschak: Die Moral der Evangelien und des Talmud.Duschak: Jüdischer Cultus.Duschak: Schulgesetzgebung.Ebrard: Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangel. Geschichte.Edersheim: History of the Jewish Nation.Edersheim: The Temple, its Ministry and its Services.Edersheim: Sketches of Jewish Social Life.Ehrmann: Geschichte der Schulen u. der Cultur unter den Juden.Eisenmenger: Entdecktes Judenthum.Eisler: Beiträge zur Rabb. Sprach- u. Alterthums-kunde.Ellicott: New Testament Commentary: Gospels.Ellicott: Lectures on the Life of our Lord.Encyclopaedia Britannica (passim).Etheridge: The Targums on the Pentateuch.Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History.Ewald: Abodah Sarah.Ewald: Geschichte des Volkes Israel.Ewald: Bibl. Jahrb. (passim).Fabricius: Codex Pseudepigraphus V.T.Farrar: Life of Christ.Farrar: Eternal Hope.Fassel: Das Mos. rabb. Civilrecht.Fassel: Gerichts-Verf.Field: Otium Norvicense.Filipowski: Liber Juchassin.Fisher: Beginnings of Christianity.Frankel: Targum der Proph.Frankel: Ueb. d. Einfl. d. palast. Exegese auf die Alexandr. Hermeneutik.Frankel: Monatschrift fur das Judenthum (passim).Frankel: Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta.Frankel: Einleitung in d. Jerusalem Talmud.Franck: d. Kabbala.Freudenthal: Hellenistische Studien.Friedenthal: Jessode haddat weikere Haemuna.Friedlaender: Sittengeschichte Roms.Friedlaender: Ben Dosa u. seine Zeit.Friedlaender: Patristische u. Talmudische Studien.Friedlieb: Oracula Subyllina.Friedlieb: Archäologie der Leidensge schichte.Friedmann: Siphré debe Rab.Fritzsche u. Grimm: Handbuch zu den Apokryphen.Fritzsche u. Grimm: Libri V. T. Pseudepigraphi Selecti.Fuller: Harmony of the Four Gospels.Fürst: Der Kanon des A. T.Fürst: Kultur u. Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien.Fürst: Biblioth. Jüd. (passim).Fürstenthal: Menorath Hammaor.Fürstenthal: Jessode haddat.Geier: De Ebraeorum Luctu Lugentiumque Ritibus.Geiger: Das Judenthum u. seine Geschichte. Geiger: Beiträge z. Jüd. Literatur-Gesch.Geiger: Zeitschrift fur Jud. Theol. (passim).Geiger: Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen der Bibel.Geikie: Life and Words of Christ.Gelpke: Die Jugendgesch. des Herrn.Gerlach: Die Röm. Statthälter in Syrien u Judäa.Gfrörer: Philo.Gfrörer: Jahrh. d. Heils.Ginsburg: Ben Chajim's Introd.Ginsburg: Massoreth Ha-Massoreth.Ginsburg: The Essenes.Ginsburg: The Kabbalah.Godet: Commentar.Godet: Bibl. Studies.Goebel: Die Parabeln Jesu.Goldberg: The Language of Christ.Graetz: Geschichte der Juden.Green: Handbk. to the Grammar of the Grk. Test.Grimm: Die Samariter.Grimm: Clavis N. T.Gronemann: Die Jonathansche Pentateuch-Uebersetzung.Grünebaum: Sittenlehre des Judenthums.Guérin: Description de la Palestine et Samarie.Guillemard: Hebraisms in the Greek Testament.Günzburg: Beleuchtung des alten Judenthums.Hamburger: Real Encyklopädie f. Bibel u. Talmud.Hamelsveia: Dissertatio de aedibus vet. Hebr.Haneberg: Die relig. Alterth. der Bibel.Harnoch: De Philonis Judaei Log. Inquisitio.Hartmann: Die Hebräerin am Putztische u. als Braut.Hartmann: Die enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem Neuen.Hase: Leben Jesu.Haupt: Die A. T. Citate in den 4 Evangelien.Hausrath: Neutestamentliche zeitgeschichte.Herzfeld: Geschichte Israels.Herzfeld: Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Alterthums.Herzog: Real-Encyklopädie (passim).Hildesheimer: Der Herod. Tempel n. d. Talmud u. Josephus.Hilgenfeld: Jüdische Apokalyptik.Hirschfeld: Halach. u. Hagad. Exegese.Hirschfeld: Tractatus Macot. Hitzig: Geschichte des Volkes Israel.Hoffmann: Leben Jesu.Hofmann: Schriftbeweis.Hofmann: Weissagung u. Erfullung.Hoffmann: Abhandlungen üb. die Pentat. Gesetze.Holdheim: d. Cerem. Ges.Hottinger: Juris Hebr. Leges.Huschke: Ueb. d. Census u. die Steuerverf. d. früh. Röm. Kaiserzeit.Huschke: Ueb. d. z. Zeit d. Geb. Jesu Christi gehaltenen Census.Havercamp: Flavius

Josephus.Ideler: Chronologie.Ikenius: Antiquitates Hebraicæ.Ikenius: Dissertationes Philologico-theologicæ.Jellinek: Beth ha-Midrash.Joel: Blick in d. Religionsgesch. d.2ten Christlichen Jahrh.Joel: Religionsphilos. des Sohar.Jost: Gesch. d. Judenth. u. seiner Sekten.Jowett: Epistles of St. Paul, Romans, Galatians, Thessalonians.Josephus Gorionides: ed. Breithaupt.Juynboll: Comment. in Hist. Gentis Samaritanæ.Keil: Einl. in. d. Kanon. u. Apokryph. Schriften des A. T.Keim: Geschichte Jesu von Nazara.Kennedy: Resurrection of Jesus Christ.Kirchheim: Septem Libri Talmudici parvi Hierosol.Kirchner: Jud. Passahf.Kitto: Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature (passim).Kobut: Jüdische Angelologie u. Daemonologie.König: Die Menschwerdung Gottes.Köster: Nachw. d. Spur. einer Trinitätslehre vor Christo.Krafft: Jüdische Sagen u. Dichtungen.Krauss: Die Grosse Synode.Krebs: Decreta Athen in honor Hyrcani P. M. Judæorum.Krebs: Decreta Roman. pro Judæis.Krebs: Observationes in Nov. Test.Kuhn: Städt. u. bürgerl. Verfass d. Röm. Reichs.Landau: Arukh.Lange: Bibelwerk (on Gospels).Langen: Judenthum in Palästina z. Zeit Christi.Lange: Leben Jesu.Langfelder: Symbolik des Judenthums.Lattes: Saggio di Giunte e Correzzioni al Lessico Talmudico.Lavadeur: Krit. Beleucht. d. jüd Kalenderwesens.Lenormant: Chaldean Magic.Levi: Historia Religionis Judæorum.Levy: Neuhebr. u. Chaldäisch. Wörterbuch.Levy: Chaldäisch. Wörterb. über die Targumim.Levy: Gesch. der Jüdisch. Münzen.Levyssohn: Disputatio de Jud. sub. Cæs. Conditione.Lewin: Fasti Sacri.Lewin: Siege of Jerusalem.Lewyssohn: Zoologie des Talmuds.Lightfoot: Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in 4 Evangel.Lightfoot: Commentary on Galatians.Lightfoot: Commentary on Colossians.Lisco: Die Wunder Jesu Christi.Low: Beiträge z. jüd Alterthumskunde.Low: Lebensalter in d. jüd. Literatur.Löwe: Schulchan Aruch.Lowy: Biggoreth ha Talmud.Lucius: Essenismus in sein Verhältn z. Judenth.Lücke: Johannes (Gospel).Lundius: Jüdische Heiligthumer.Luthardt: Johann. Evangelium.Luthardt: Die modern. Darstell. d. Lebens Jesu.Lutterbeck: Neutestamentliche Lehrbegriffe.McLellan: New Testament (Gospels).Madden: Coins of the Jews.Maimonides: Yad haChazzakah.Marcus: Pädagogik des Talmud.Marquardt: Röm, Staatsverwaltung.Martinus: Fidei Pugio.Maybaum: Die Anthropomorph. u. Anthropopath. bei Onkelos.Megillath Taanith.Meier: Judaica.Meuschen: Nov. Test ex Talmude et Joseph.Meyer: Seder Olam Rabba et Suta.Meyer: Buch Jezira.Meyer: Kommentar. (on Gospels).Meyer: Arbeit u. Handwerk. im Talmud.Midrash Rabboth.Midrashim. (See List in Rabb. Abbrev.)Mill: On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels.Mishnah.Molitor: Philosophie der Geschichte.Moscovitor: Het N. T. en de Talmud.Müller: Mess. Erwart. d. Jud. Philo.Müller: Zur Johann Frage.Müller, J.: Massech. Sopher.Münter: Stern der WeisenNanz: Die Besessenen im N. T.Neander: Life of Christ.Nebe: Leidensgesch. unser. Herrn Jesu Christi.Nebe: Auferstehungsgesch. unser. Herrn Jesu Christi.Neubauer: La Géographie du Talmud.Neubauer and Driver: Jewish Interpreters of Isaiah. liii.Neumann: Messian. Erschein. bei d. Juden.Neumann: Gesch. d. Mess. Weissag. im A. T.New Testament. Ed. Scrivener. Ed. Westcott and Hort. Ed. Gebhardt. Nicolai: De Sepulchris Hebræorum.Nizzachon Vetus. et Toledoth Jeshu.Nicholson: The Gospel accord. to the Hebrews.Norris: New Testament (Gospels).Nork: Rabbinische Quellen u. Parallelen.Nutt: Samaritan History.Otho: Lexicon Rabbin. Philolog.Outram: De Sacrificiis Judæor et Christi.Othijoth de R. Akiba.Oxlee: Doc. of Trinity on Princips. of Judaism.Pagninus: Thesaurus Linguæ Sanctæ.Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements (passim).Perles: Liechenfeierlichk. im Nachbibl, Judenth.Philippson: Haben wirklich die Jud. Jesum gekreuzigt?Philippson: Israelit. Religionslehre.Philo Judæus: Opera.Pictorial Palestine (passim).Picturesque Palestine.Pinner: Berachoth.Pinner: Compend. des Hieros. u. Babyl. Thalm.Pirké de R. Elieser.Plumptre: Comment.

on the Gospels.Plumptre: Bible Educator (passim).Pocock: Porta Mosis.Prayer-books, Jewish: i. Arnheim. ii. Mannheimer. iii. Polak (Frankfort ed.). iv. Friedländer. v. F. A. Euchel. vi. Jacobson. vii. Pesach Haggadah. viii. Rodelheim ed.Pressensé: Jesus Christ: His Time, Life, and Works.Prideaux: Connec. of O. and N.T.Pusey: What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?Rabbinowicz: Einleit. in d. Gesetzgeb. u. Medicin d. Talm.Ravuis: Dissertat. de. aedib. vet. Hebr.Redslob: Die Kanonisch. Evangelien.Reland: Antiquit. Sacr. veter. Hebr.Reland: Palæstina.Remond: Ausbreit. d. Judenthums.Renan: L'Antéchrist.Renan: Vie de Jésus.Renan: Marc-Auréle.Rhenferd et Vitringa: De Decem Otiosis Synagogæ.Riehm: Handwörterb. d. bibl. Alterth. (passim).Riehm: Lehrbegriff d. Hebraerbriefs.Riess: Geburtsjahr Christi.Ritter: Philo u. die Halacha.Roberts: Discussion on the Gospels.Robinson: Biblical Researches in Palestine.Roeth: Epistoia ad Hebraeos.Rohr: Palästina z. Zeit Christi.Rönsch: Buch Jubiläen.Roos: Lehre u. Lebensgesch. Jesu Christi.Rösch: Jesus-Mythen d. Talmudist.Rosenmüller: Biblisch. Geographie.Rossi, Azarjah de: Meor Enajim.Rossi, Giambernardo de: Della Lingua Propria di Christo.Sachs: Beiträge z. Sprach u. Alterthumskunde.Saalschütz: Musik bei d. Hebraern.Saalschütz: Mos. Recht.Salvador: Römerherrschaft in Judæa.Salvador: Gesch. d. Jud. Volkes.Sammter: Baba Mezia.Schenkel: Bibel-Lexicon (passim).Schleusner: Lexicon Gr. Lat. in N.T.Schmer: De Chuppa Hebræorum.Schmilg: Der Siegeskalender Megill Taanith.Schneckenburger: Neutestament. Zeitgeschichte.Schoettgen: Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ.Schreiber: Principien des Judenthums.Schroederus: Comment. de Vestitu Mulier. Hebr.Schürer: Neutestam. Zeitgesch.Schürer: Gemeindeverfass. d. Juden in Rom in d. Kaiserzeit.Schwab: Le Talmud de Jérusalem.Schwarz: D. Heilige Land.Schwarz: Tosifta Shabbath.Scrivener: Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.Seder Hadoroth.Selden: De Synedriis Ebr.Selden: De Jure Naturali et Gent. Hebr.Selden: Uxor Ebraica.Sepp: Leben Jesu.Sevin: Chronologie des Lebens Jesu.Sheringham: Joma.Siegfried: Philo von Alexandria.Singer: Onkelos u. seine Verhältn. z. Halacha.Sion Ledorosh.Smith: Dictionary of the Bible (passim).Smith and Wace: Dictionary of Christian Biography (passim).Sohar.Tikkuné haSohar.Saloweyczyk: Bibel, Talmud, u. Evangelium.Sommer: Mispar haSohar.Spencer: De Legib. Hebr. Ritual.Spiess: Das Jerusalem des Josephus.Spitzer: Das Mahl bei den Hebräern.Stanley: Sinai and Palestine.Steinmeyer: Geburt des Herrn u. seinerste Schritte im Leben.Steinmeyer: Die Parabeln des HerrnStein: Schrift des Lebens.Stern: Die Frau im Talmud.Stern: Gesch. des Judenthums.Stier: Reden des Herrn Jesu.Strack: Pirké Aboth.Strack: Proleg. Crit. in V.T. Hebr.Strauss: Leben Jesu.Supernatural Religion.Surenhusius: Biblos Katallages.Surenhusius: Mishnah.Talmud, Babylon and Jerusalem.Targum, the Targumim in the Mikraoth gedoloth.Taylor: Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirqé Ab., &c.), with critical and illutrative Notes.Taylor: Great Exemplar.Tauchuma: Midrash.Thein: Der Talmud.Theologische Studien u. Kritiken (passim).Tholuck: Bergpredigt Christi.Tholuck: Das Alt. Test. im Neu. Test.Tischendorf: When were our Gospels written?Toetterman: R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus.Traill: Josephus.Trench: Notes on the MiraclesTrench: Notes on the Parables.Tristram: Natural History of the Bible.Tristram: Land of Israel.Tristram: Land of Moab. d. alt. Hebr.Trusen: Sitten, Gebräuche u. Krankheiten.Ugolinus: Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum (passim).Unruh: Das alte Jerusalem u. seine Bauwerke.Vernes: Histoire des Idées Messianiques.Vitringa: De Synagoga Vetere.Volkmar: Einleitung in die Apokryphen.Volkmar: Marcus.Volkmar: Mose Prophetie u. Himmel fahrt.Vorstius: De Hebraisms Nov. Test.Wace: The Gospel and its Witnesses.Wagenseil: Sota. Wahl: Clavis Nov. Test. Philologica.Warneck: Pontius Pilatus.Watkins: Gospel of St. John.Weber: Johannes der

Täufer u. die Parteien seiner Zeit.Weber: System der altsynagog. paläst. Theologie. B.Weiss: Lehrb. d. bibl. Theol. des N.T.Weiss: Mechilta.Weiss: Siphra B.Weiss: Matthäusevangelium. B.Weiss: Leben Jesu.Weiss: Geschichte. der jüd. Tradition.Weizsäcker: Untersuch. üb. die evangel. Geschichte.Wellhausen: Die Pharisäer u. die Sadducäer. Westcott: Introduction to the Study of the Gospels.Westcott: On the Canon of the New Testament.Westcott: Gospel of St. John.Wetstein: Novum Testamentum Graecum (Gospels).Wichelhaus: Kommentar zur Leidensgeschichte.Wieseler: Beiträge zu den Evange. u. der Evangel. Gesch.Wieseler: Chronol. Synopse der 4 Evangelien.Wiesner: d. Bann in s. Gesch. Entwickelung.Winer: Biblisches Realwörterbuch (passim).Winer: De Onkeloso.Wilson: Recovery of Jerusalem.Wittichen: Die Idee des Reiches Gottes.Wittichen: Leben Jesu.Wolfius: Bibliotheca Hebræa (passim).Wordsworth: Commentary (Gospels).Wunderbar: Bibl. talmud. Medecin.Wünsche: Die Leiden des Messias.Wünsche: Neue Beiträge z. Erlaut. der Evangel.Wünsche: Der Jerusalemische Talmud.Wünsche: Bibliotheca Rabbinica.Yalkut Shimeoni.Yalkut Rubeni.Young: Christology of the Targums.Zahn: Forsch. zur Gesch. d. N.T. Kanous.Zeller: Philosophie der Griechen.Zemach David.Zimmermann: Karten u. Pläne z. Topographie des alten Jerusalems.Zockler: Handb. d. Theol. Wissenschaften.Zumpt: Geburtsjahr Christi.Zunz: Zur Geschichte u. Literatur.Zunz: Die Gottesdienstl. Vortr. d. JudenZunz: Synagogale Poesie.Zunz: Ritus d. Synagogalen-Gottesdienst.Zuckermandel: Tosephta.

Chapter 4

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN REFERENCE TO RABBINIC WRITINGS QUOTED IN THIS WORK.

THE Mishnah is always quoted according to Tractate, Chapter (Pereq) and Paragraph (Mishnah), the Chapter being marked in Roman, the paragraph in ordinary Numerals. Thus Ber. ii.4 means the Mishnic Tractate Berakhoth, second Chapter, fourth Paragraph. The Jerusalem Talmud is distinguished by the abbreviation Jer. before the name of the Tractate. Thus, Jer. Ber. is the Jer. Gemara, or Talmud, of the Tractate Berakhoth. The edition, from which quotations are made, is that commonly used, Krotoschin, 1866, 1 vol. fol. The quotations are made either by Chapter and Paragraph (Jer. Ber. ii.4), or, in these volumes mostly, by page and column. It ought to be noted that in Rabbinic writings each page is really a double one, distinguished respectively as a and b: a being the page to the left hand of the reader, and b the reverse one (on turning over the page) to the right hand of the reader. But in the Jerusalem Gemara (and in Yalkut [see below], as in all works where the page and column (col.) are mentioned) the quotation is often - in these volumes, mostly - made by page and column (two columns being on each side of a page). Thus, while Jer. Ber. ii.4 would be Chapter II. Par.4, the corresponding quotation by page and column would in that instance be, Jer. Ber.4 d; d marking that it is the fourth column in b (or the off-side) of page 4. The Babyl. Talmud is, in all its editions, equally paged, so that a quotation made applies to all editions. It is double-paged, and quoted with the name of the Tractate, the number of the page, and a or b according as one or another side of the page is referred to. The quotations are distinguished from those of the Mishnah by this, that in the Mihnah Roman and ordinary numerals are employed (to mark Chapters and Paragraphs), while in the Babylon Talmud the name of the Tractate is followed by an ordinary numeral, indicating the page, together with a or b, to mark which side of the page is referred to. Thus Ber.4 a means: Tractate Berachoth, p.4, first or left-hand side of the page. I have used the Vienna edition, but this, as already explained, is not a point of any importance. To facilitate the verification of passages quoted I have in very many instances quoted also the lines, either from top or bottom. The abbreviation Tos. (Tosephta, additamentum) before the name of a Tractate refers to the additions made to the Mishnah after its redaction. This redaction dates from the third century of our era. The Tos. extends only over 52 of the Mishnic Tractates. They are inserted in the Talmud at the end of each Tractate, and are printed on the double pages in double columns (col. a and b on p. a, col. e and d on p. b). They are generally quoted by Pereq and Mishnah: thus, Tos. Gitt. i.1, or (more rarely) by page and column, Tos. Gitt. p.150 a. The ed. Zuckermandel is, when quoted, specially indicated. Besides, the Tractate Aboth de Rabbi Nathan (Ab. de. R. Math.), and the smaller Tractates, Sopherim (Sopher), Semachoth (Semach.), Kallah (Kall. or Chall), [2] Derekh Erets (Der Er.), Derekh Erets Zuta (commonly Der Er. S.), and Pereq Shalom (Per. Shal.) are inserted at the close of vol. ix. of the Talmud. They are printed in four columns (on double pages), and quoted by Pereq and Mishnah. The so-called Septem Libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani are published separately (ed. Raphael Kirchheim, Fref 1851). They are the Massecheth Sepher Torah (Mass. Seph. Tor.), Mass. Mezuzah (Mass. Mesus.), Mass. Tephillin (Mass. Tephill.), Mass. Tsitsith (Mass. Ziz.), Mass. Abhadim (Mass. Abad.), Mass.

Kuthim (Mass. Cuth.), and Mass. Gerim (Mass. Ger.). They are printed and quoted according to double pages (a and b). To these must be added the so-called Chesronoth haShas, a collection of passages expurgated in the ordinary editions from the various Tractates of the Talmud. Here we must close, what might else assume undue proportions, by an alphabeticallist of the abbreviations, although only of the principal books referred to: - Ab. Zar. [3] The Talmudic Tractate Abhodah Zorah, on Idolatry. Ab. The Talmudic Tractate Pirquey Abohoth, Savings of the Fathers. Ab. de R Nath. The Tractate Abhoth de Rabbi Nathan at the close of vol. ix. in the Bab. Talm. Arakh. The Talmudic Tractate Arakhin, on the redemption of persons or things consecrated to the Sanctuary.Bab. K. The Talmudic Tractate Babha Qamma (First Gate'), the first,Bab. Mets. [or Mez.] Talmudic Tractate Babha Metsia (Middle Gate'), the second,Bab. B. The Talmudic Tractate Babha Bathra (Last Gate'), the third of the great Tractates on Common Law.Bechor. The Talmudic Tractate Bekhoroth, on the consecration to the Sanctuary of the First-born.Bemid R. The Midrash (or Commentary) Bemidbar Rabba, on Numbers.Ber. The Talmudic Tractate Berakhoth, on Prayers and Benedictions.Ber. R. The Midrash (or Commentary) Bereshith Rabba, on Genesis.Bets. [or Bez.] The Talmudic Tractate Betsah, laws about an egg laid on Sabbath and Fast-days, and on similar points connected with the sanctifying of such seasons.Biccur. The Talmudic Tractate Bikkurim, on First-fruits.Chag. The Talmudic Tractate Chagigah, on the festive offerings at the three Great Feasts.Chall. The Talmudic Tractate Challah, on the first of the dough (Numb. xv.17).Chull. The Talmudic Tractate Chullin, the rubric as to the mode of killing meat and kindred subjects.Debar R. The Midrash Debharim Rabba, on Deuteronomy.Dem. The Talmudic Tractate Demai, regarding Produce, the tithing of which is not certain.Ech. R. The Midrash Ekhah Rabbathi, on Lamentations (also quoted as Mid. on Lament).Eduy. The Talmudic Tractate Eduyoth (Testimonies), the legal determinations enacted or confirmed on a certain occasion, decisive in Jewish History.Erub. The Talmudic Tractate Erubhin, on the conjunction of Sabbath boundaries. (See Appendix XVII.)Midr. Esth. The Midrash on Esther.Gitt. The Talmudic Tractate Gittin, on Divorce.Horay. The Taldmudic Tractate Horayoth Decisions' on certain unintentional transgressions.Jad. [or Yad.] The Taldmudic Tractate Yadayim, on the Washing of Hands.Jebam. [or Yebam.] The Taldmudic Tractate Yebhamoth, on the Levirate.Jom. [mostly Yom.] The Taldmudic Tractate Yoma, on the Day of Atonement.Kel. The Taldmudic Tractate Kelim, on the purification of furniture and vessels.Kerith. The Taldmudic Tractate Kerithuth, on the punishment of cutting off.'Kethub. The Taldmudic Tractate Kethubhoth, on marriage-contracts.Kidd. The Taldmudic Tractate Qiddushin, on Betrothal.Kil. The Taldmudic Tractate Kilayim, on the unlawful commixtures (Lev. xix.19; Deut. xxii.9-11).Kinn. The Taldmudic Tractate Qinnim, on the offering of doves (Lev. v.1-10; xii.8).Midr. Kohel. The Midrash on Qoheleth or Eccles.Maas. The Talmudic Tractate Maaseroth, on Levitical Tithes.Maas Sh. The Talmudic Tractate Maaser Sheni, on second Tithes (Deut. xiv.22, &c.).Machsh. The Talmudic Tractate Makhshirin, on fluids that may render products defiled,' or that leave them undefiled (Lev. xi.34, 38).Makk. [or Macc.] The Talmudic Tractate Makkoth, on the punishment of Stripes.Mechil. The Talmudic Tractate Mekhilta, a Commentary on part of Exodus, dating at the latest from the first half of the second century.Megill. The Talmudic Tractate Megillah, referring to the reading of the (roll') Book of Esther and on the Feast of Esther.Meil. The Talmudic Tractate Meilah, on the defilement of things consecrated.Menach. The Talmudic Tractate Menachoth, on Meat-offerings.Midd. The Talmudic Tractate Middoth, on the Temple-measurements and arrangements.Mikv. The Talmudic Tractate Miqvaoth, on ablutions and immersions.Moed K. The Talmudic Tractate Moed Qatan, on

Half-holidaysNaz. The Talmudic Tractate Nazir, on the Nasirate.Ned. The Talmudic Tractate Nedarim, on Vowing.Neg. The Talmudic Tractate Negaim, on Leprosy.Nidd. The Talmudic Tractate Niddah, on female levitical impurity (menstrua).Ohol. The Talmudic Tractate Oholoth, on the defilement of tents and houses, specially by death.Orl. The Talmudic Tractate Orlah, on the ordinances connected with Lev. xix.23.Par. The Talmudic Tractate Parah, on the Red Heifer and purification by its ashes.Peah The Talmudic Tractate Peah, on the corner to be left for the poor in harvesting. Pes. The Talmudic Tractate Pesachim, on the Paschal Feast.Pesiqta The Book Pesiqta, an exceedingly interesting series of Meditations or brief discussions and Lectures on certain portions of the Lectionary for the principal Sabbaths and Feast Days.Pirqé de R. Eliez. The Haggadic Pirqé de Rabbi Eliezer, in 54 chapters, a discursive Tractate on the History of Israel from the creation to the time of Moses, with the insertion of three chapters (xlix.-li.) on the history of Haman and the future Messianic deliverance.Rosh haSh. The Talmudic Tractate Rosh haShanah, on the Feast of New YearSab. The Talmudic Tractate Zabhim, on certain levitically defiling issues.Sanh. The Talmudic Tractate Sanhedrin, on the Sanhedrim and Criminal Jurisprudence.Sebach. The Talmudic Tractate Zebhachim, on Sacrifices.Shabb. The Talmudic Tractate Shabbath, on Sabbath-observance.Shebh. The Talmudic Tractate Shebhiith, on the Sabbatic Year.Shebu. The Talmudic Tractate Shebhuoth, on Oaths, &c.Sheqal. The Talmudic Tractate Sheqalim, on the Temple-Tribute, &c.Shem R. The Midrash Shemoth Rabba on Exodus.Shir haSh R. The Midrash Shir haShirim Rabba, on the Song of Solomon.Siphra The ancient Commentary on Leviticus, dating from the second century.Siphré The still somewhat older Commentary on Numb. and Deuter.Sot. The Talmudic Tractate Sotah, on the Woman accused of Adultery.Sukk. The Talmudic Tractate Sukkah, on the Feast of Tabernacles.Taan. The Talmudic Tractate Taanith, on Fasting and Fast-Days.Tam. The Talmudic Tractate Tamid, on the daily Service and Sacrifice in the Temple.Teb. Yom. The Talmudic Tractate Tebhul Yom (bathed of the day'), on impurities, where there is immersion on the evening of the same day.Tem. The Talmudic Tractate Temurah, on substitution for things consecrated (Lev. xxvii.10).Ter. The Talmudic Tractate Terumoth, on the priestly dues in produce.Tohar. The Talmudic Tractate Toharoth, on minor kinds of defilement.Tanch. The Midrashic Commentary Tanchuma (or Yelamdenu), on the Pentateuch.Ukz. The Talmudic Tractate Uqtsin, on the defilement of fruits through their envelopes, stalks, &c.Vayyik R. The Midrash Vayyikra Rabba, on Leviticus.Yalk. The great collectaneum: Yalkut Shimeoni, which is a catena on the whole Old Testament, containing also quotations from works lost to us. [4]

Chapter 5

Book I INTRODUCTORY. THE PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL: THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST

{hebrew} All the prophets prophesied not but of the days of the Messiah.'-Sanh.99 a {hebrew} The world was not created but only for the Messiah.'-Sanh.98 b

CHAPTER I. 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 centralisation and localisation 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 Monothsiem 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 civilisation 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 [5] ,' 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 centre of Israel's unity. Nor could the depressed state of the nation alter their views or shake their confidence. What mattered it, that the Idumæan, Herod, had usurped the throne of David, expect 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. [6] 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. [7] Yet far away in the mountains of Ephraim [8] 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 [9] had purified the Temple, and restored its altar on the very same day [10] on which the abomination of desolation' [11] 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, [12] since absence from Palestine was now entirely voluntary. But all the more that it referred not to outward suffering, [13] did its continued use indicate a deep feeling of religious sorrow, of social isolation, and of political strangership [14] in the midst of a heathen world. For although, as Josephus reminded his countrymen, [15] 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,' [16] yet they had nowhere found a real home. A century and a half before our era comes to us from Egypt [17] - where the Jews possessed exceptional privileges - professedly from the heathen, but really from the Jewish [18] Sibyl, this lament of Israel - Crowding with thy numbers every ocean and country - Yet an offense to all around thy presence and customs! [19] 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. [20] 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.' [21] 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. [22] Yet its heart beat in Jerasulem, 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, [23] the division of the dispersion' into two grand sections - the Eastern or Trans-Euphratic, and the Western or Hellenist - seems clearly marked. [24] In this arrangement the former would include the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia,' Judæa 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,' [25] and of Hellenists' or Grecians.' [26] On the other hand, the Trans-Euphratic Jews, who inhabited Babylon and many of the other satrapies,' [27] 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.' [28] 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. [29] 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. [30] Every other country was considered outside the land,' as Palestine was called, witht the exception of Babylonia, which was reckoned as part of it. [31] 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. [32] 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. [33] Nor was their inferiority confined to numbers. The wealthiest and most influential of the Jews remained behind. According to Josephus, [34] 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 [35]), 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. [36] 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, [37] favoured by the successors of Alexander. When in turn the Macedono-Syrian rule gave place to the Parthian Empire, [38] 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. [39] At the same time it must not be thought that, even in these favoured 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. [40] 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 Seleucidæ) - 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, [41] even as they afterwards despatched messengers into Syria for the same purpose. [42] 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, [43] 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. [44] 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. [45] 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. [46] 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 [47] 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 labour 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 [48] in that respect, and from the stress which Josephus lays on this point. [49] 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! [50]Nor was it merely purity of descent of which the Eastern dispersion could boast. In truth, Palestine owed everything to Ezra, the Babylonian, [51] 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, [52] 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. [53] [54] The language spoken by the Jews was no longer Hebrew, but Aramæan, both in Palestine and in Babylonia; [55] 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, [56] and the addresses 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?' [57] 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, [58] 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 [59] (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, [60] 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 scarely 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, [61] that the Babylonians were stupid, proud, and poor (they ate bread upon bread'), [62] 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.' [63]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. [64] 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, [65] 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; [66] 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. [67]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 Deut. xxx.13: Wisdom is not "beyond the sea" - that is, it will not be found among traders or merchants,' [68] 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 [69] - 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 harbours, 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 [70] - 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 labour, which preceded his re-appearance in Jerusalem, when from the burning longing to labour 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. [71] And it was among the same community that Peter wrote and laboured, [72] 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. [73] 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. [74] 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. [75] Josephus [76] 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. [77] [78] Another Jewish tradition [79] 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 [80] 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. [81] As regards the ten tribes there is this truth underlying the strange hypothesis, that, as their persistent apostasy 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, [82] and latterly with almost convincing evidence (so far as such is possible) to the Afghans, as descended from the lost tribes. [83] 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. [84] Besides, there is reason to believe that part of them, at least, had coalesced with their brethren of the later exile; [85] while we know that individuals who had settled in Palestine and, presumably, elsewhere, were able to trace descent from them. [86] Still the great mass of the ten tribes was in the days of Christ, as in our own, lost to the Hebrew nation.

CHAPTER II. 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 llenzein, to conform to the language and manners of the Greeks. [87] Whatever their religious and social isolation, it was, in the nature of thing, impossible that the Jewish communities in the West should remains 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; [88] 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 favourable 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, writtem and oral, which characterised the East, was to the, 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 practised 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. [89] 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. [90] How different were the rites which he practised, 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, [91] Agrippa, [92] and Josephus, [93] speak as a regular institution, but whose antiquity and general prevalence is attested in Jewish writings, [94] 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.' [95] 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. [96] 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 realise their living connection with it, or bound it more closely, was precious. Letters out of Judæa,' 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 pedlar 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 onesided

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; idealise 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 recognise 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 civilisation 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 Rabbinism. 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 Josh. i.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.' [97] 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 Aramæan, 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. [98] It may be so, that the expression Siphrey Homeros' (Homeric writings), which occur not only in the Talmud [99] but even in the Mishnah [100] referred pre-eminently, if not exclusively, to the religious or semi-religious Jewish Hellenistic literature, outside even the Apocrypha. [101] 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 Judæa 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 Judæa. 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 labour and care bestowed on them, Hebrew

manuscripts of the Bible were enormously dear, as we infer from a curious Talmudical notice, [102] where a common wollen 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 19l. 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. [103] 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.' [104] 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. [105] 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 favour 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. [106] 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 Aristeas to his brother Philocrates, [107] in which we are told how, by the advice of his librarian (?), Demetrius Phalereus, Ptolemy II. had sent by him (Aristeas) 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 Phalareus, in the reign and under the patronage - if not by direction - of Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus). [108] With this the Jewish accounts

agree, which describe the translation of the Pentateuch under Ptolemy - the Jerusalem Talmud [109] in a simpler narrative, the Babylonian [110] with additions apparently derived from the Alexandrian legends; the former expressly noting thirteen, the latter marking fifteen, variations from the original text. [111]The Pentateuch once translated, whether by one, or more likely by several persons, [112] 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 Aristeas' account - only that in that case it should have been seventy-two; or from the approval of the Alexandrian Sannedrin [113] - 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. [114] 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. [115] 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. [116] 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 tex into the Law, the Prophets, [117] 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. [118] 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. [119] In the great majority of the lesser variations our Hebrew must be regarded as the correct text. [120]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 licence, 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. [121] 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, [122] 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. [123] But there is this vital difference between Palestinianism 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 [124] a thing is written only to break it to the ear' - to adapt it to our human modes of speaking and understanding; and again, [125] 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, [126] though afterwards forgotten, till restored and re-introduced. [127] 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 [128] 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, [129] and that the ordinary daily prayers might be said in Greek. [130] 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. Deut. xxxii.8, xxxiii.2), we specially mark that is preserved the Messianic interpretation of Gen. xlix.10, and Numb. xxiv.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, [131] and that is completion had been followed by the terrible omen of an eclipse, that lasted three days. [132] 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. [133] 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. [134]

CHAPTER III. THE OLD FAITH PREPARING FOR THE NEW - DEVELOPMENT OF HELLENIST THEOLOGY: THE APOCRYPHA, ARISTEAS, ARISTOBULUS, AND THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC 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. [135] 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. [136] 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,' [137] 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, [138] 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. [139] 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. [140] This, then, was an unassailable position to take: contempt poured on heathenism as such, [141] and a rational 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. [142] On the other hand, that sublime work, the Wisdom of Solomon,' contains Platonic and Stoic elements [143] - chiefly perhaps the latter - the two occurring side by side. Thus [144] Wisdom,' which is so concretely presented as to be almost hypostatised, [145] is first described in the language of Stoicism, [146] and afterwards set forth, in that of Platonism, [147] 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 [148] 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, [149] and of earth and matter pressing it down. [150] 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. [151] 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. [152] 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. [153] 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, &c., it became easy to prove almost anything, or to extract from these philosophical truths ethical principles, and even the later results of natural science. [154] 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 [155] 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.' [156] 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. [157] 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. [158] 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. [159] 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, [160] or searches out of the subleties 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,' [161] and did not this imply a twofold meaning; nay, could not the Torah be explained by many different methods? [162] 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.' [163] 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, [164] 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 [165]). 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 Aristole be found in the Bible. But how was this to be accounted for? Of course, the Bible had not learned from Aristole, but he and all the other philosphers 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, [166] 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-Grecia 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 [167] 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' [168] [169] of the Advent of the Messiah. Viewed in this light, they embody the ardent aspirataions and the inmost hopes [170] 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. [171] 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. [172] 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 Patriacrch, 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 characteristic. 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 mould. 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 Judaising 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 era. 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 lacunæ. It was probably written about the time of Christ - and this gives it a special interest - by a Palestinian, and in Hebrew, or rather Aramæan. But, like the rest of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic literature which comes from Palestine, or was originally written in Hebrew, we posses 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 IV. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA, THE RABBIS, AND THE GOSPELS - THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT OF HELLENISM IN ITS RELATION TO RABBINISM AND THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

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. [173] 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, [174] as the head of an embassy to entreat the Emperior 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; [175] he names not fewer than sixty-four Greek writers; [176] 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 Numb. xxiii.19 we read God is not a man,' and in Deut. i.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 occassionally 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. [177] 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. [178] 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, [179] any repetition of what had been already stated would point to something new. These were comparatively sober rules of exegesis. Not so the licence which he claimed of freely altering the punctuation [180] 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 versâ, 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. [181] We repeat, that these allegorical canons of Philo are essentially the same as those of Jewish traditionalism in the Haggadah, [182] only the latter were not rationalising, and far more brilliant in their application. [183] 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, [184] 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.) [185] Similarly, it is noted that Scripture uses euphemistic language, so as to preserve the greatest delicacy. [186] 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 colours, 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. [187] 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. [188] 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 (poios), and even without any name (etos) ; hence, wholly uncognisable by man (katleptos). Thus, changing the punctuation and the accents, the LXX. of Gen. iii.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, Ex. iii.14, and vi.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 uncognisable appeared from Ex. xx.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' (es ka t pn). 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 Saviour' from the Egypt' of passion. Two things follow. With Philo's ideas of the sepration between God and matter, it was impossible always to account for miracles or interpositions. Accordingly, these are sometimes allegorised, 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 (dunmeis, lgoi). 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. [189] Its existence is presupposed, and its leading ideas are sketched in the Mishnah. [190] 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 [191] designates God as Maqom - the place' - the tpos, the all-comprehending, what the Kabbalists called the EnSoph, the boundless,' that God, without any quality, Who becomes cognisable only by His manifestations. [192] 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, [193] or emanations from God, through which this contact was ultimately brought about, and of which the EnSoph, 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' (dunmeis), Words' (lgoi),

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 colouring, did not Eastern Judaism also teach that there was a distinction between the Unapproachable God, and God manifest? [194] Another remark will show the parallelism between Philo and Rabbinism. [195] As the latter speaks of the two qualities (Middoth) of Mercy and Judgment in the Divine Being, [196] 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 (theos lgos), Goodness (gathotes), as the Creative Potency (poietik dnamis), and Power (xousia), as the Ruling Potency (basilik dnamis), proving this by a curious etymological derivation of the words for God' and Lord' (Thes and krios) - apparently unconscious that the LXX., in direct contradiction, translated Jehovah by Lord (krios), and Elohim by God (Thes)! 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 reveled Himself. [197] 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' (hypostatising it). More than this, in Talmudical writings, we find mention not only of the Shem, or Name,' [198] but also of the Shekhinah,' God as manifest and present, which is sometimes also presented as the Ruach ha Qodesh, of Holy Spirit. [199] But in the Targumim we get yet another expression, which, strange to say, never occurs in the Talmud. [200] It is that of the Memra, Logos, or Word.' Not that the term is exclusively applied to the Divine Logos. [201] 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. [202] But what does this imply? The distinction between God and the Memra of Jehovah is marked in many passages. [203] Similarly, the Memra of Jehovah is distinguished from the Shekhinah. [204] Nor is the term used instead of the sacred word Jehovah; [205] nor for the well-known Old Testament expression the Angel of the Lord;' [206] nor yet for the Metatron of the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and of the Talmud. [207] Does it then represent an older tradition underlying all these? [208] 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, [209] 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. [210] 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. [211]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' (ekn) upon which man was made, [212] 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 (rganon) 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 (rmenes ka prophtes); 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, Melchisedek, the priest of the most high God, the king of righteousness (basiles dkaios), and the king of Salem (basiles ernes), Who brings righteousness and peace to the soul. [213] 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. [214] The Logos of Philo is shadowy, unreal, not a Person; [215] 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. [216] Such speculations must have been current among the Jews long before, to judge by certain warning given by the Son of Sirach. [217] [218] And Stoic views of the origin of the world seem implied even in the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon (i.7; vii.24; viii.1; xii.1). [219] The mystics in the Talmud arrived at similar conclusions, not through Greek, but through Persian teaching. Their speculations [220] boldly entered on the dangerous ground, [221] forbidden to the many, scarcely allowed to the few, [222] 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. [223] But so far did isolated teachers become intoxicated [224] by the new wine of these strange speculations, that they whispered it to one another that water was the original element of the world, [225] which had successively been hardened into snow and then into earth. [226] [227] 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. i.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. [228] Traces also occur of the doctrine of the pre-existence of things, in a sense similar to that of Plato. [229]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 (asthesis); and heavenwards, as Reason (nos). The sensuous part of the soul was connected with the body. It had no heavenly past, and would have no future. But Reason' (nos) was that breath of true life which God had breathed into man (pnema) 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 (dæmons, demiourgo). To the latter is due our earthly part. God breathed on the formation, and the earthly Reason' became intelligent' spiritual' soul (psuch noer). Our earthly part alone is the seat of sin. [230]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, [231] finds absolutely no parallel in Jewish writings. [232] 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 helplesss 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. [233] But the Talmud expressly teaches, [234] that God originally created man with two propensities, [235] one to good and one to evil (Yetser tobh, and Yetser hara [236]). The evil impulse began immediately after birth. [237] [238] But it was within the power of man to vanquish sin, and to attain perfect righteousness; in fact, this stage had actually been attained. [239]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 mould. 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 Hellenises, 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. [240] But from this state the soul must pass to one of devotion to reason. [241] 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 [242] and joy. [243] Here we must for the present pause. [244] 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, [245] 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, [246] 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 i.2, regard the narrative of St. Mark as the grand representative of that authentic narration' (digesis), though not by Apostles, [247] which was in circulation, and the Gospel by St. Matthew as representing the tradition' handed down (the pardosis), by the Apostolic eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, [248] 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 realisation 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, [249] applies to Jesus, is that of the pas 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, [250] 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. [251] And these three ideas, with their sequences, are presented in the third Gospel as centring 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. [252] And so the fourth Gospel became, not the supplement, but the complement, of the other three. [253] 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, [254] 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. [255] 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, [256] and in His presentation as the Light, the Life, the Wellspring of the world. [257] But these forms are filled in the fourth Gospel with quite other substance. God is not afar off, uncognisable 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. [258] 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. [259] 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 V. ALEXANDRIA AND ROME - THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN THE CAPITALS OF WESTERN CIVILISATION.

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 centred 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 civilised' 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 wierd 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 gorgeousness dazzling the imagination. [260] 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 [261] - 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 civilisation; 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 harbour - or rather with five harbours. 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 [262] with more eagerness than that of any modern ocean-steamer. [263] The commerce of India was in the hands of the Alexandrian shippers. [264] Since the days of the Ptolemies the Indian trade alone had increased sixfold. [265] Nor was the native industry inconsiderable. Linen goods, to suit the tastes or costumes of all countries; woolen 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 favourite 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 harbours; 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 theatre and singers; what scenes on that long canal to Canobus, lined with luxurious inns, where barks full of pleasure-seekers revelled 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 Therapeutæ, [266] 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, [267] 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, favoured them. Originally a special quarter had been assigned to the Jews in the city - the Delta' by the eastern harbour and the Canobus canal -

probably alike to keep the community separate, and from its convenience for commercial purposes. The priveleges which the Ptolemies had accorded to the Jews were confirmed, and even enlarged, by Julius Cæsar. The export trade in grain was now in their hands, and the harbour 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. [268] 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. [269] At first the Egyptian Jews were very proud of their new sanctuary, and professed to see in it the fulfilment of the prediction, [270] 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, [271] while the priests at Leontopolis, before marrying, always consulted the official archives in Jerusalem to ascertain the purity of descent of their intended wives. [272] 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. [273] 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. [274] 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. [275] Other inscriptions prove, [276] 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. [277] 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. [278] In Alexandria, the Jews were under the rule of a Jewish Ethnarch, [279] whose authority was similar to that of the Archon' of independent cities. [280] But his authority [281] was transferred, by Augustus, to the whole eldership.' [282] 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. [283] 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. [284] Its chief was entrusted with the management of the affairs of Antonia, the much respected sister-in-law of the Emperor Tiberius. [285] It was a small thing for such a man to lend King Agrippa, when his fortunes were very low, a sum of about 7,000l. with which to resort to Italy, [286] 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. [287] 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, [288] 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, [289] 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 characterised 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. [290] 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. [291] There can be little doubt, that the popular favour 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. Every year, so he told them, it was the practice of 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 entrials, 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 battened 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 Cæsars, why did they not erect statues, and pay Divine honor to them? [292] 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, [293] 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 - Idæi = Judæi), 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. [294] 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 organisation, 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 unvaquished, 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 distrubance, 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, [295] 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 Cæsars, 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;' [296] 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 theatre would resound with laughter as his religion was lampooned, no matter how absurd the stories, or how poor the punning. [297] 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. [298] 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. [299] 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' [300] (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 Cæsars 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. [301] How far they would carry their passive resistance, appears from a story told by Josephus, [302] 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. [303] 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 included all ranks - merchants, bankers, literati, even actors. [304] 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. [305] 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, [306] glass, old clothes and second-hand wares. The Jewish burying-ground in that quarter [307] 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 [308] 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. [309] The Synagoge Elaias' may have been so called from bearing on its front the device of an olive-tree, a favourite, 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. [310] 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 civilisation 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 Cæsars, 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, [311] 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. [312] In Rome itself the Jewish community was organized as in other places. [313] 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 centre 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 Ægina, in Patræ, 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. [314] 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. [315] 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, [316] 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 favourites who were Jews, like the actor of whom Josephus speaks; [317] among those who were inclined towards Judaism, like Poppæa, the dissolute wife of Nero, whose coffin as that of a Jewess was laid among the urns of the emperors; [318] or among real proselytes, like those of all ranks who, from superstition or conviction, had identified themselves with the Synagogue. [319] In truth, there was no law to prevent the spread of Judaism. Excepting the brief period when Tiberius [320] 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 Cæsar and of Augustus we have quite a series of edicts, which secured the full exercise of their religion and their communal rights. [321] 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), [322] 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, [323] an equivalent in money. [324] 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 Cæsar [325] 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. [326] 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 favour shown to them.

CHAPTER VI. 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. [327] 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, [328] 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. [329] 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. [330] 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, [331] 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.' [332] In Syria also, where, according to Josephus, the largest number of Jews lived, [333] they experienced special favour. In Antioch their rights and immunities were recorded on tables of brass. [334] But, indeed, the capital of Syria was one of their favourite 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 Rabbinists 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. [335] 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.' [336] 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.' [337] 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, it 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 Cæsars. 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 centre, and a common hope. Wherever the Jew sojourned, or however he might differ from his brethern, 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, [338] which enclosed the folded parchment that, on twenty-two lines, bore the words from Deut. iv.4-9 and xi.13-21, or to call attention by their breadth to the Tephillin, [339] or phylacteries on his left arm and forehead, or even to make observable the Tsitsith, [340] or fringes on the borders of his garments. [341] Perhaps, indeed, all these observances may at that time not have been deemed incumbent on every Jew. [342] 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, [343] one, and, if possible, more Synagogues. [344] Where there was no Synagogue there was at least a Proseuche, [345] [346] open sky, after the form of a theatre, 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 sympathisers among Judaising Gentiles. [347] They even watched to see, how the Sabbath lamp was kindled, and the solemn prayers spoken which marked the beginning of the Sabbath. [348] 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 centre; 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 realised 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, of 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. [349] 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, [350] 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. [351] 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. [352] 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. [353] 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.' [354] 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.' [355] That prayer included in its generality also the lost ten tribes. So, for example, the prophecy [356] 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. [357] [358] And thus even these wanderers, so long lost, were to be reckoned in the field of the Good Shepherd. [359] 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; [360] 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.' [361] It was a beautiful idea to liken Israel to the olive-tree, which is never stripped of its leaves. [362] 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 honour would the nations bring them back. The patriarchs and all the just would rise to share in the joys Patræ 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. [363] 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?' [364] 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. [365] 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, [366] and the restoration of the dispersed, [367] when all nations would bring their wealth to the House of God. [368] [369] 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.' [370] And no wonder, since they are the days when the King, the Son of David,' [371] having purged Jerusalem [372] and destroyed the heathen by the word of His mouth, [373] would gather together a holy people which He would rule with justice, and judge the tribes of His people, [374] dividing them over the land according to tribes;' when no stranger would any longer dwell among them.' [375] 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.' [376] 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, [377] 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. [378] 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. [379] 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. [380] [381]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 Baruch, 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; [382] the other, in

the letter to the nine and a half tribes, far beyond the Euphrates, [383] 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. [384]The writings to which we have referred have all a decidedly Hellenistic tinge of thought. [385] 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, [386] 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. [387] 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. [388] 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 12

CHAPTER VII. 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; [389] did not Israel possess the merits of the fathers,' [390] 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? [391] More than that, God had created the world on account of Israel, [392] 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. [393] 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, [394] 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. [395] And how could it well be otherwise, since the studies, which engaged His chosen children on earth, equally occupied their Almighty Father in heaven? [396] 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 realise 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; [397] 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. [398] 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 Cæsarea) 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 [about three hours north of Acre] and unto the river [Euphrates], 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, &c. 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. [399] 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, [400] and where the first Gentile Church was formed, [401] 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, [402]

concentrated their first efforts on that Syria 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 endeavour 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 Peræa, was really Syrian, and formed part of Syria Decapolis; [403] 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 Judæa proper, to which Galilee, Samaria and Peræa 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 adminstration as they required devolved on Scribes' (the so-called komogrammates or topogrammates). Thus Jerusalem was really, as well as nominally, the capital of the whole land. Judæa 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 - centred 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 centre of the country; Cæsarea in the west, commanding the sea-coast; Gaba in Galilee, close to the great plain of Esdraelon; and Esbonitis in Peræa. [404] Similarly, Philip the Tetrarch built Cæsarea Philippi and Julias (Bethsaida-Julias, on the western shore of the lake); and Herod Antipas another Julias, and Tiberias. [405] 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 honour of Augustus at Sebaste and Cæsarea, so those cities were really intended to form centres 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. [406] 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. [407] On the other hand, Herod and his successors encouraged the worship of the Emperor and of Rome, which, characteristically, was chiefly practised in the East. [408] Thus, in the temple which Herod built to Augustus in Cæsarea, there were statues of the Emperor as Olympian Zeus, and of Rome as Hera. [409] 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 Cæsarea, but even in Jerusalem, he built a theatre and amphitheatre, where at great expense games were held every four years in honour of Augustus. [410] 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, [411] 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 theatres and amphitheatres - 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. [412] 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 [413] absolutely forbade any representation of things in heaven, on earth, or in the waters. But the Mishnah [414] seems to relax these prohibitions by subtle distinctions, which are still further carried out in the Talmud. [415] 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. [416] 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,' [417] as well as the colossal statues at Cæsarea, and those of the three daughters of Agrippa, which after his death [418] were so shamefully abused by the soldiery at Sebaste and Cæsarea. [419] 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 Judæa 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. [420] Rome, which was the fourth beast of Daniel, [421] would in the age to come, [422] when Jerusalem would be the metropolis of all lands, [423] be the first to excuse herself on false though vain pleas for her wrongs to Israel. [424] But on wordly grounds also, Rome was contemptible, having derived her language and writing from the Greeks, and not possessing even a hereditary

succession in her empire. [425] If such was the estimate of dreaded Rome, it may be imagined in what contempt other nations were held. Well might the earth tremble,' [426] 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 [427] 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! [428] To begin with, every Gentile child, so soon as born, was to be regarded as unclean. Those who actually worshipped mountains, hills, bushes, &c. - 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 summarised: 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 [429] as to forbid aid to a mother in the hour of her need, or nourishment to her babe, in order not to bring up a child for idolatry! [430] 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.' [431] 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, [432] since it was deemed, that he who had to do with heretics was imminent peril of becoming one himself, [433] 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. [434] 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, [435] bread and oil prepared by them, were unlawful. Their wine was wholly interdicted [436] - 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 VIII. 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 ({hebrew}, grammates, literatus). He seems ubiquitous; we meet him in Jerusalem, in Judæa, and even in Galilee. [437] Indeed, he is indispensable, not only in Babylon, which may have been the birthplace of his order, but among the dispersion' also. [438] 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 recognised authority. He has been solemnly ordained by the laying on of hands; and is the Rabbi, [439] my great one,' Master, amplitudo. He puts questions; he urges objections; he expects full explanations and respectful demeanour. 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,' [440] the well-plastered pit,' [441] filled with the water of knowledge out of which not a drop can escape,' [442] in opposition to the weeds of untilled soil' {hebrew} of ignorance. [443] 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,' [444] the teacher of the Law,' [445] and along with the chief priests' and elders' a judge in the eccesiastical tribunals, whether of the capital or in the provinces. [446] 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. [447] In short, he is the Talmid or learned student, the Chakham or sage, whose honour is to be great in the future world. Each Scribe outweighed all the common people, who must accordingly pay him every honour. Nay, they were honoured 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. [448] 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 versâ. [449] 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 [450] 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,' [451] this might indicate to his successors, the Sopherim (Scribes), the threefold direction which their studies afterwards took: the Midrash, the Halakhah, and the Haggadah, [452] [453] 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. [454] 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, [455] either who composed this assembly, or of how many members it consisted. [456] 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 organised. [457] 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 [458] 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, [459] 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. [460] [461] 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. [462] 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.' [463] 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 [464] (as Ab-beth-din), and his superior in learning and judgment, Jehudah ben Tabbai (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 Seleucidæ, 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 Zeqenim, Elders,' whose task was purely ecclesiastical - the preservation of their religion, such as the dogmatic labours 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 sympathised 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, [465] 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. [466] [467] 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, [468] 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 Hycanus, the fourth from Judas Maccabee, and the Pharisaical party, [469] which is equally recorded by Josephus [470] and the Talmud, [471] with only variations of names and details. The dispute apparently arose from the desire of the Pharisees, that Hycanus 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.' [472] 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,' [473] which under the earlier Maccabees was called the tribunal of the Asmoneans.' [474] [475] now passed into the Sanhedrin. [476] [477] Thus we place the origin of this institution about the time of Hyrcanus. With this Jewish tradition fully agrees. [478] 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. [479] 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 forseen 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 title 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. [480] 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. [481] 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 rigour, 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. [482] In describing the historical growth of the Halakhah, [483] 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 intosixteen 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 primaeval times, even as legend had it, that Adam was born circumcised, [484] 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 Ex. xx.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. [485] 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. [486] But traditionalism went further, and placed the oral actually above the written Law. The expression, [487] 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. [488] 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. [489] [490]

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. [491] And, before his death, Moses had summoned any one to come forward, if he had forgotten aught of what he had heard and learned. [492] 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. [493] 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). [494] Nor were these open to discussion. The second class formed the oral law,' [495] or the traditional teaching' [496] 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. [497] 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' [498] or of the Rabbis' [499] [500] - 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: [501] 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).' [502] 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' [503] - 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. [504] 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, &c. 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. [505] The oldest of these is ascribed to R. Akiba, in the time of the Emperor Hadrian. [506] [507] 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. [508] 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. [509] But all connected with social intercourse, or ordinary life (such as contracts), is written, not in Hebrew, but in Aramæan, 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. [510] 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. [511] 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. [512] 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 Aramæan; 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. ix. 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. [513] Next follow six minor tractates. These are respectively entitled Sopherim (Scribes), [514] detailing the ordinances about copying the Scriptures, the ritual of the Lectionary, and festive prayers; Ebhel Rabbathi or Semakhoth, [515] containing Halakhah and Haggadah about funeral and mourning observances; Kallah, [516] on the married relationship; Derekh Erets, [517] embodying moral directions and the rules and customs of social intercourse; Derekh Erets Zuta, [518] treating of similar subjects, but as regards learned students; and, lastly, the Pereq ha Shalom, [519] which is a eulogy on peace. All these tractates date, at least in their present form, later than the Talmudic period. [520] 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 emphasise 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 defil the man.' [521] 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 colouring 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. [522] The miraculous merges into the ridiculous, and even the revolting. Miraculous cures, miraculous supplies, miraculous help, all for the glory of great Rabbis, [523] 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 recognise 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, [524] that he who busies himself with Scripture only (i.e. without either the Mishnah or Gemara) has merit, and yet no merit. [525] Even the comparative paucity of references to the Bible in the Mishnah [526] 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. [527]

Chapter 14

Book II FROM THE MANGER IN BETHLEHEM TO THE BAPTISM IN JORDAN.

_____ Fortitudo infirmatur, Parva fit immensitas; Liberator alligatur, Nascitur æternitas. O quam mira perpetrasti Jesu propter hominem! Tam ardenter quem amasti Paradiso exulem.' - Ancient Latin Hymn

CHAPTER I. 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 recognised 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; [528] Solomon and Herod, each, built the Temple. But with the son of David began, and with the Idumæan 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, [529] the deep clefts by which it was surrounded, the Mount of Olives rising in the 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 recognisable. The ancient Jebusite fort, the City of David, Mount Zion, [530] 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, [531] he built a wall right through the middle of the city,' so as to shut out the foe. [532] 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 isolatc its garrison. It was at last taken by Simon, the brother and successor of Jonathan, and levelled with the ground. [533] Fort Baris, which was constructed by his successor Hyrcanus I., [534] 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, [535] 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, [536] 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. [537] 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 unenclosed 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, [538] which, from a small building, little larger than an ordinary church, in the time of Solomon, [539] 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. [540] 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; Judæans and Jerusalemites; white-robed Priests and Levites; Temple officials; broad-phylacteried, 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 despised them as cursed, ignorant country people, little better than heathens, or, for that matter, than brute beasts. Here also there lay about a crowd 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-poised 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. [541] 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. [542] 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 coloured 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 jeweller; the various articles de luxe, that adorned the houses of the rich; the work of the designer, the moulder, 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 jewelled cups, rings and other workmanship of precious metals; glass, silks, fine linen, woollen 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 36l. on a cloak; [543] silk would be paid by its weight in gold; purple wool at 3l.5s. 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, [544] and a tolerable outfit for yourself from 3l. to 6l. For the same sum you might purchase an ass, [545] an ox, [546] or a cow, [547] and, for little more, a horse. A calf might be had for less than fifteen shillings, a goat for five or six. [548] 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 labour 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. [549] A day labourer was paid about 7½d. a day, though skilled labour would fetch a good deal more. Indeed, the great Hillel was popularly supposed to have supported his family on less than twopence a day, [550] while property to the amount of about 6l., or trade with 2l. or 3l. 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. [551] To these many like details might be added. [552] Sufficient has been said to show the two ends of society: the exceeding dearness of luxuries, and the corresponding cheapness of necessaries. Such extremes would meet especially at Jerusalem. Its population, computed at from 200,000 to 250,000, [553] was enormously swelled by travellers, and by pilgrims during the great festivals. [554] 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 harbour of Joppa; and thence, as from the industrial centres of busy Galilee, would the pedlar 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 [555] 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, [556] tried the soundness of food or drink, [557] and occasionally fixed or lowered the market-prices, enforcing their decision, [558] if need were, even with the stick. [559] [560] Not only was there an upper and a lower market in Jerusalem, [561] but we read of at least seven special markets: those for cattle, [562] wool, iron-ware, [563] clothes, wood, [564] bread, and fruit and vegetables. The original market-days were Monday and Tuesday, afterwards Friday. [565] The large fairs (Yeridin) were naturally confined to the centres of import and export - the borders of Egypt (Gaza), the ancient Phoenician maritime towns (Tyre and Acco),

and the Emporium across the Jordan (Botnah). [566] Besides, every caravansary, or khan (qatlis, atlis, katlusis), was a sort of mart, where goods were unloaded, and especially cattle set out [567] 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), [568] 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. [569] 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 Judæan or Galilean wine, Idumæan vinegar, or foreign beer. If from these busy scenes we turn to the more aristocratic quarters of the Upper City, [570] 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.' [571] 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. [572] 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 Idumæan. 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. [573] It was probably this which Herod afterwards enlarged and beautified, and turned into a threatre. No expense was spared on the great games held there. The threatre 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. [574] Besides this theatre, Herod also built an immense amphitheatre, which we must locate somewhere in the north-west, and outside the second city wall. [575] 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, [576] 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 Cæsar, 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 harbour of Cæsarea 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 Peræa, Alexandreion, Herodeion, Hyrcania, and Masada in Judæa - proclaimed his name and sway. But in Jerusalem it seemed as if he had gathered up all his strength. The theatre and amphitheatre 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, [577] or else thereby to expiate the slaughter of so many Rabbis. [578] [579] Probably a desire to gain popularity, and supersition, may alike have contributed, as also the wish to gratify his love for splendour 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 Idumæan. Whatever his origin, he was a true king of the Jews - as great, nay greater, than Solomon himself. Certainly, neither labour 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.' [580] And yet Israel despised 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 Judæa, an Alexandrian. And yet the power of that Idumæan was but of yesterday, and of mushroom growth!

CHAPTER II. THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF HEROD - THE TWO WORLDS IN JERUSALEM.

It is an intensely painful history, [581] 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 Seleucidæ). 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 Ecclus.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 smouldering 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 Saviour to look for. The period even of promise was more brief than might have been expected. The fervour 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 [582] 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 vigour, 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 [583] 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 Idumæa had been conquered by the Maccabean King Hyrcanus I., and its inhabitants forced to adopt Judaism. By this Idumæa 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 Judæa, and below Samaria. [584] After it became Judæan, 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 Maccabæus, 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 Cæsar, the prospects of Antipater and Hycanus seemed dark. But they quickly changed sides; and timely help given to Cæsar in Egypt brought to Antipater the title of Procurator of Judæa, while Hycanus 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 guerilla 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 Cæsar had named him Governor of Coelesyria. On the murder of Cæsar, and the possession of Syria by Cassius, Antipater and Herod again changed sides. But they rendered such substantial service as to secure favour, and Herod was continued in the position conferred on him by Cæsar. 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 Idumæans knew how to gain the new ruler, and Phasaelus and Herod were named Tetrarchs of Judæa. 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, [585] 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 Judæa. 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. [586] 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 abscure Babylonian to the High-Priesthood. This awakened the active hostility of Alexandra, the mother of Marimme, 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 [587] 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 trail. 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 Idumæa, 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 Peræa. 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 Plaestine, 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 Idumæan; they detested his semi-heathen reign; they abhorred his deeds of cruelty. the King had surrounded himself with foreign councillors, and was protected by foreign mercenaries from Thracia, Germany, and Gaul. [588] So long as he lived, no woman's honour 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. [589] 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, [590] 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 [591] - supposed to represent those great figures in Jewish tradition, Abtalion and Shemajah. [592] [593] 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 Judæa practically independent, or rather under Rabbinc rule.It was also under the government of Herod, that Hillel and Shammai lived and taught in Jerusalem: [594] the two, whom tradition designates as the fathers of old.' [595] 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. [596] 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. [597] 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 labourer, 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, [598]

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. [599] [600] 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 theatre and amphitheatre; 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 renumeration. [601] [602] 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. [603] It seems strange, that this could ever have been doubted. [604] 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 Aramæan - 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? [605] 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. [606] 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, [607] quicker, shorter, lighter' (Lishna Qalila). [608] 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 jewellery, 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. [609] Nor might even women look in the glass on the Sabbath. [610] 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; [611] nor to such as hung on the wall. [612] 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, [613] in a kind of post-bag. Nay, there seem to have been some sort of receiving-offices in towns, [614] and even something resembling our parcel-post. [615] 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. [616]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 [617] gives of Is. iii.16-24, in regard to the manners and modes of attraction practised 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, [618] and the notices of the indecent dress worn not only by women, [619] but even by corrupt High-Priestly youths. Nor do the exaggerated descriptions of what the Midrash on Lamentations [620] 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. [621] The City of the Prophets, also, since each of them whose birthplace had not been mentioned, must be regarded as having sprung from it. [622] 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 III. THE ANNUNCIATION OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

(St. Luke i.5-25.) It was the time of the Morning Sacrifice. [623] 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 Tyropoeon, 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. [624] 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 cockcrowing, or a little earlier or later, [625] 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. [626] 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, [627] 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 symbolised Israel's accepted prayers. Again was the lot (the third) cast to indicate him, who was to be honoured with this highest mediatorial act. Only once in a lifetime might any one enjoy that privilege. [628] Henceforth he was called rich,' [629] 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 [630] on the part of the assembled priests. It was the first week in October 748 a.u.c., [631] that is, in the sixth year before our present era, when the course of Abia' [632] - 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. [633] But never during these many years had he been honoured 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-centres - the Ophel-quarter in Jerusalem, nor in Jericho [634] - 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 honour. [635] That he was surrounded by relatives and friends, and that he was well known and respected throughout his district, appears incidentally from the narrative. [636] 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 monopolise. And in this instance Zacharias and Elisabeth, his wife, were truly righteous,' [637] 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. [638] 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 ofttimes 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; [639] 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, [640] spoke in most pathetic language of the wrong of parting from the wife of youth, [641] and there were those to whom the bare fact of childlessness rendered separation a religious duty. [642] 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 centred 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 neighbourhood 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, [643] 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 odours' that rose from the golden altar in the Holy Place. [644] Zacharias waited, until he saw the incense kindling. Then he also would have bowed down in worship,' and reverently withdrawn, [645] 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 recognise as an Angelic form. [646] 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 [647] [648] - 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. [649] 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. [650] 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 spseak, 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 realisation. 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, [651] 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, [652] 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 [653] - that is, in the words of prophecy, [654] 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.' [655] 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 realised 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, [656] or of Manoah and his wife, [657] 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, [658] 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 stoke 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 Rabbinists, a model priest. They would have described him as an idiot,' [659] or common, and as an Amha-arets, a rustic' priest, and treated him with benevolent contempt. [660] 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, [661] 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 [662] 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 [663] and Michael, [664] 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. [665] 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. [666] 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. [667] Sometimes, indeed, he is blamed, as for the closing words in his prayer about the turning of the heart of the people, [668] and even his sacrifice on Carmel was only excused on the ground of express command. [669] 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. [670] [671] But nowhere is he prominently designated as intended to make ready for the Lord a people prepared.' [672]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 IV. THE ANNUNCIATION OF JESUS THE MESSIAH, AND THE BIRTH OF HIS FORERUNNER.

(St. Matt. i.; St. Luke i.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, [673] 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 realise, 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, [674] 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 Gailee 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 amphitheatre, 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. [675] [676] Climbing this steep hill, fragrant with aromatic plants, and bright with rich-coloured 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 centre 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, centres 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 Cæsarea 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. [677] 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 courses,' 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-centres, [678] 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. [679] We may take it, that the people of Nazareth were like those of other little towns similarly circumstanced: [680] with all the peculiarities of the impulsive, straight-spoken, hot-blooded, brave, intensely national Galileans; [681] 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, [682] Judæa - 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 Judæa, nor its sacred secrecy interfered with by an Argus-eyed legislation. [683] The purity of betrothal in Galilee was less likely to be sullied, [684] and weddings were more simple than in Judæa - without the dubious institution of groomsmen, [685] [686] or friends of the bridegroom' [687] whose office must not unfrequently have degenerated into utter coarseness. The bride was chosen, not as in Judæa, 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, [688] or, which seems the more likely, [689] as those of Joseph only, marking his natural and his legal descent [690] from David, or vice versâ [691] - there can be no question, that both Joseph and Mary were of the royal lineage of David. [692] Most probably the two were nearly related, [693] 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. [694] [695] 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. [696] 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. [697] Accordingly,

their betrothal must have been of the simplest, and the dowry settled the smallest possible. [698] Whichever of the two modes of betrothal [699] 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. [700] 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' [701] 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. [702] But this designation of highly favored' [703] 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 favour' 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, [704] and its never-ending, boundless Kingdom. [705] 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, [706] 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!' [707] But as for the deeper meaning of the name Jesus, [708] 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. [709] 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 favoured;' words which, even to her understanding, must have carried yet further thoughts of Divine favour, 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, [710] 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. [711] And of this twofold manifestation of miraculous favour' - 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. [712]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, [713] she recognised 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, [714] but their music of the new; the keynote being that of favour,' grace,' struck by the Angel in his first salutation: favour' to the Virgin; [715] favour,' eternal favour' to all His humble and poor ones; [716] and favour' to Israel, stretching in golden line from the calling of Abraham to the glorious future that now opened. [717] 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. [718] 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. [719]Three months had passed since the Virgin-Mother entered the home of her kinswoman. And now she must return to Nazareth. Soon Elisabeth's neighbours 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.' [720] 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 [721] of the charge. He would follow, all unconscious of it, the truer manly feeling of R. Eliezar, [722] R. Jochanan, and R. Zera, [723] 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; [724] the symbolism of such a name was deeply rooted in Jewish belief; [725] 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, [726] 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 [727] popularly regarded as marks of God's favour; 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 [728] [729]). 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. [730]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' [731] in fulfilment [732] of what had been prefigured. [733] The promise of a Virginborn 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 [734] - 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. [735] 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 [736] might indicate this. It was, so tradition has it, as if the father had acted sacrificially as High-Priest, [737] offering his child to God in gratitude and love; [738] and it symbolised this deeper moral truth, that man must by his own act complete what God had first instituted. [739] 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, [740] was probably in circulation at the time. [741] 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, [742] 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. [743] Let his father rejoice in the issue of his loins, and his mother in the fruit of her womb, as it is written in Prov. xxiii.25, and as it is said in Ezek. xvi.6, and again in Ps. cv.8, and Gen. xxi.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 marriagebaldachino, and good works.' [744] Of all this Zacharias was, though a deeply interested, yet a deaf and dumb [745] 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, spiritualises 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 realisation. 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 incesing, 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 [746] 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. [747]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 unbeliving 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 Judæa, 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!' [748]

CHAPTER V. 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 recognised, 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; [749] 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.' [750] 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, crystallised 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. [751] 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.' [752] 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 summarised 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.' [753] 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, [754] 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 onesided 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 excommentation 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,' [755] and The world was created only for the Messiah.' [756] 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. [757] 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. [758] 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-Saviour, 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 realise, 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 [759] 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 liii. and other passages - and in one most remarkable comment [760] 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. [761] 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. [762] The fall of Adam is ascribed to the envy of the Angels [763] - 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. [764] The instrument employed was the serpent, of whose original condition the strangest legends are told, probably to make the Biblical narrative appear more rational. [765] 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. [766] Six things Adam is said to have lost by his sin; but even these are to be restored to man by the Messiah. [767] [768] 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. [769] But although the fate which overtook Adam was to rest on all the world, [770] and death came not only on our first father but on his descendants, and all creation lost its perfectness, [771] 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, [772] 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. [773] 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, [774] but they had refused to submit to it. [775] But when Israel took on themselves the Law at Mount Sinai, the description in Psalm 1xxxii.6 applied literally to them. They would not have died, and were the sons of God.' [776] 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. [777]

Thus there were two divergent opinions - the one ascribing death to personal, the other tracing it to Adam's guilt. [778] 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; [779] the first working in him from the beginning, the latter coming gradually in the course of time. [780] Yet, so far from guilt attaching to the Yetser ha-ra, its existence is absolutely necessary, if the world is to continue. [781] In fact, as the Talmud expressly teaches, [782] the evil desire or impulse was created by God Himself; while it is also asserted [783] 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. [784] On the other hand, as it is in the power of each wholly to overcome sin, and to gain life by study and works; [785] as Israel at Mount Sinai had actually got rid of the Yetser ha-ra; and as there had been those, who were entirely righteous [786] - 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. [787] [788]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 [789] - national sin; the idolatry of former times; [790] the prevalence of crimes and vices; the dereliction of God's ordinances; [791] the neglect of instruction, of study, and of proper practice of His Law; and, in later days, the love of money and party strife. [792] But the seventy years' captivity had ceased, why not the present dispersion? Because hypocrisy had been added to all other sins; [793] because there had not been proper repentance; [794] because of the half-heartedness of the Jewish proselytes; because of improper marriages, and other evil customs; [795] and because of the gross dissoluteness of certain cities. [796] 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. [797] As significantly summed up, Israel was without Priesthood, without law, without God. [798] Nay, the world itself suffered in consequence of the destruction of the Temple. In a very remarkable passage, [799] where it is explained, that the seventy bullocks offered during the Feast of Tabernacles were for the nations of the world, R. Jochanan deplores 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. [800] Indeed, but for the intercession of the Angels the world would now be destroyed. [801] 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, [802] [803] and the very Angelic hosts had since been diminished. [804] 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. [805] It is a touching legend, which represents the Shekhinah as still lingering over the western wall of the Temple [806] - the only one supposed to be still standing. [807] 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. [808] He weeps over His

children and their desolateness, [809] and displays in the heavens tokens of mourning, corresponding to those which an earthly monarch would show. [810]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, reft the canopy of cloud. The first capitivity passed, why not the second? This is the painful question ever and again discussed by the Rabbis. [811] 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, [812] we are told, that Israel will not repent till Elijah comes. [813] Besides, bold as the language is, there is truth in the expostulation, which the Midrash [814] 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 Zechar. i.3, yet, when Israel reiterates the words, Turn Thou us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned,' supporting them by Ps lxxxv.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 realisation. Among the most touching of these is a beautiful passage (almost reminding us of Heb. xi.), in which Israel's future deliverance is described as the reward of faith. [815] Similarly beautiful is the thought, [816] that, when God redeems Israel, it will be amidst their weeping. [817] 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 [818] [819] 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 [820] 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! [821]In these circumstances, any attempt at determining the date of Messiah's coming would be even more hypothetical than such calculations generally are. [822] Guesses on the subject could only be grounded on imaginary symbolisms. Of such we have examples in the Talmud. [823] 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;

[824] others again expected it at the beginning, or end, of the eighty-fifth Jubilee - with this proviso, that it 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, [825] and the Messiah come, after a terrible war between Rome and Ishmael (the West and the East). [826] But as the rule of these monarchies was to last altogether one day (= 1000 years), less two-thirds of an hour (1 hour = 83 ½ years); [827] it would follow, that their domination would last 944 4/9 years. [828] 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. [829]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; [830] [831] or when all the souls, predestined to inhabit bodies, had been on earth. [832] 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, [833] 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. [834] 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. [835] [836] 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 Rabinic literature, and, so far as we can gather from the Gospel-narratives, from those 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, overstepped, 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 utterance: We prophesy in part' [837] (k mrous propheteomen). [838] 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 (Ezek. xxxvii.), 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 Genesis xlix.10, and especially of Numbers xxiv.7, 17, we gather, that the Kingdom of the Messiah [839] was higher than any that is earthly, and destined to subdue them all. But the rendering of Psalm lxxii.5, 7; Psalm cx.3; and especially of Isaiah ix., carries us much farther. They convey the idea, that the existence of this Messiah was regarded as

premundane (before the moon, [840] before the morning-star [841]), and eternal, [842] and His Person and dignity as superior to that of men and Angels: the Angel of the Great Council,' [843] [844] probably the Angel of the Face' - a view fully confirmed by the rendering of the Targum. [845] 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. [846] 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, [847] dates from more than a century and a half before Christ - presents a picture of Messianic times, [848] 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 splendour of fire.' [849] Similarly, the vision of Messianic times opens with a reference to the King Whom God will send from the sun.' [850] [851] That a superhuman Kingdom of eternal duration, such as this vision paints, [852] should have a superhuman King, seems almost a necessary corollary. [853]Even more distinct are the statements in the so-called Book of Enoch.' Critics are substantially agreed, that the oldest part of it [854] dates from between 150 and 130 b.c. [855] 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, [856] 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,' [857] the Son of Man,' [858] 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'). [859] 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 [now changed] white bulls,' the great Animal among them, having great and black horns on His head' [860] - 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 [861] is followed by a full description of its need and its blessings, [862] to which the concluding Psalm [863] forms an apt epilogue. The King Who reigns is of the house of David. [864] He is the Son of David, Who comes at the time known to God only, to reign over Israel. [865] He is a righteous King, taught of God. [866] He is Christ the Lord. (Christs Krios, [867] exactly as in the LXX. translations of Lamentations iv.20). He is pure from sin,' which qualifies Him for ruling His people, and banishing sinners by His word. [868] 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 blessingof the Lord being upon Him, He does not fail. [869] This is the beauty of the King of Israel, Whom God hath chosen, to set Him over the house of Israel to rule it.' [870] 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. [871] 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. [872] 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. [873] This estimate of the Messiah may be gathered from IV Esdras, [874] [875] with which the kindred picture of the Messiah and His reign in the Apocalypse of Baruch [876] 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 Is. ix.6, and in that on Micah v.2. But the Midrash on Prov. viii.9 [877] expressly mentions the Messiah among the seven things created before the world. [878] 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. [879] [880] [881] [882] 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 [883] 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. [884] In general, the idea of the Messiah's appearance and concealment is familiar to Jewish tradition. [885] [886] But the Rabbis go much farther back, and declare that from the time of Judah's marriage, [887] God busied Himself with creating the light of the Messiah,' it being significantly added that, before the first oppressor [Pharaoh] was born, the final deliverer [Messiah, the son of David] was already born.' [888] In another passage the Messiah is expresily identified with Anani, [889] [890] and therefore represented as pre-existent long before his actual manifestation. [891] The same inference may be drawn from His emphatic designation as the First. [892] Lastly, in Yalkut on Is. lx., the words In Thy light shall we see light' (Ps. xxxvi.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 [893] Whatever else may be inferred from it, this passage clearly implies not only the pre-existence, but the premundane existence of the Messiah. [894]But, indeed, it carries us much farther. For, a Messiah, preexistent, 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. [895] Like Moses He comes, withdraws, and comes again. [896] 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 [897] - 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. [898] 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 (Is. xxvii.13). [899] 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. [900] 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; [901] as the first Deliverer had made a spring of water to rise, so would the second. [902] But even this is not all. That the Messiah had, without any instruction, attained to knowledge of God; [903] and that He had received, directly from Him, all wisdom, knowledge, counsel, and grace, [904] 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. [905] The Messiah would be greater than the Patriarchs,' higher than Moses, [906] and even loftier than the ministering Angels. [907] In view of this we can understand, how the Midrash on Psalm xxi.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 honour 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.' [908] 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 honour and glory,' at creation; [909] the second of majesty,' at the Red Sea; [910] the third of strength,' at the giving of the Law; [911] the fourth white,' when He blotteth out the sins of Israel; [912] the fifth of zeal,' when He avengeth them of their enemies; [913] the sixth of righteousness,' at the time when the Messiah should be revealed; [914] and the seventh red,' when He would take vengeance on Edom (Rome). [915] But,' continues the commentary, the garment with which in the future He will clothe the Messiah, its splendour will extend from one end of the world to the other, as it is written: [916] "As a bridegroom priestly in headgear." 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 odour, and His supplication holiness and purity. Happy Israel, what is reserved for you! Thus it is written: [917] "How manifold is Thy goodness, which Thou hast reserved to them that fear Thee.'" [918] Such a King Messiah might well be represented as sitting at the Right Hand of God, while Abraham was only at His left; [919] nay, as throwing forth His Right Hand, while God stood up to war for Him. [920]It is not without hesitation, that we make reference to Jewish allusions to the miraculous birth of the Saviour. 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 [had regard, looked forward] to that Seed which is to come from another place. And who is this? This is Messiah the King.' [921] The second appears in the narrative of the crime of Lot's daughters: [922] 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.' [923] [924]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.' [925] [926] Whether this implies some activity of the Messiah in connection with creation, [927] 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. [928] [929] The whole of this passage, beginning at p.147 b, is very curious and deeply interesting. It would lead too far to quote 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. [930]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 nation - 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. [931]

CHAPTER VI. THE NATIVITY OF JESUS THE MESSIAH.

(St. Matthew i.25; St. Luke ii.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 of 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 realised - 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 Judæa, 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 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, [932] 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 [933] - 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. [934] If the account of the circumstances, which brought Joseph and Mary to 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. [935] 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; [936] secondly, whatever rendering of St. Luke ii.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 favour of St. Luke's statement is strengthened by the consideration, that such an event as the taxing of Judæa 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 [really] carried out when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria,' some years after Herod's death and when Judæa had become a Roman province. [937] We are now prepared to follow the course of the Gospel-narrative. In consequence of the decree of Cæsar 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. [938] According to the Jewish mode of registration, the people would have been enrolled according to tribes {hebrew}, families or clans {hebrew}, and the house of their fathers {hebrew}. But as the ten tribes had not returned to Palestine, this could only take place to a very limited extent, [939] 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. [940] In these circumstances, Mary, now the wife' of Joseph, though standing to him only in the actual relationship of betrothed,' [941] 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, [942] as the two travellers from Nazareth,

bringing with them the few necessaries 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. [943] 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 amphitheatre, 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' [944] - 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. [945] With a sense of relief the travellers would turn from this, to mark the undulating outlines of the highland wilderness of Judæa, 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. [946] 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.' [947] The Christian heart and imagination, indeed, long to be able to localise 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. [948] 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 characterised 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, [949] was a settled conviction. Equally so was the belief, that He was to be revealed from Migdal Eder, the tower of the flock.' [950] 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 [951] leads to the conclusion, that the flocks, which pastured there, were destined for Temple-sacrifices, [952] and, accordingly, that the shepherds, who watched over them, were not ordinary shepherds. The latter were under the ban of Rabbinism, [953] 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. [954] 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, [955] 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 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. [956] 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 Saviour, 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; [957] so, when the Herald-Angel had spoken, a multitude of heaven's host [958] 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! [959]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, [960] 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.' [961] 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 [962] - 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. [963]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 Judæa, but within the wider circle that embraced Behtlehem 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!' [964]

CHAPTER VII. THE PURIFICATION OF THE VIRGIN AND THE PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE

(St. Luke ii.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 form 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, so far as she had trodden it; while upon that on which she was to move, was such dazzling brightness, that she could scare 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 wisdon and in favour 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 favoured' 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. [965] An illustrative instance will prove this better than argument. We read, in a commentary on the opening words of Gen. xv.18, [966] 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.' [967] 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, [968] 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 siginificance 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 eight 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. [969] 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); [970] neither father nor mother [971] 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,' [972] 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. [973] The Rabbinic law fixed this at forty-one days after the birth of a son, and eighty-one after that of a daughter, [974] so as to make the Biblical terms quite complete. [975] 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. [976] 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. [977] But mothers who were within convenient distance of the Temple, and especially the more earnest among them, would naturally attend personally in the Temple; [978] 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. [979] 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. [980] 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 [981] 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. [982] 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 a young pigeon. [983] The ribric 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, [984] below the red line, [985] 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. [986] 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, [987] 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. [988] 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. [989] 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.' [990] 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. [991] As we infer, [992] 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. [993] 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,' [994] 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 symbolised in the drink-offering, and the hymn of praise whose Tris-Hagion filled the Temple. From where they stood they could see it all, [995] 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, [996] 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-Saviour 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; [997] fear of God,' [998] 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.' [999] The Holy Spirit was upon him; and by that same Spirit [1000] 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' [1001] - release him [1002] in blessed comfort from work and watch - since he had actually seen that salvation, [1003] 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 Judiac - quite the contrary: only what was of the Old Testament - in what he first said. [1004] 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, [1005] 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 [1006] 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 [1007] 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. [1008] 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. [1009]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, [1010] 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' promised, 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 Judæa, 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 promised 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 VIII. THE VISIT AND HOMAGE OF THE MAGI, AND THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT

(St. Matt. ii.1-8.) With the Presentation of the Infant Saviour 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. [1011] On the other hand, the Prologue to the first Gospel, while omitting these, records other incidents of the infancy of the Saviour. 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 Saviour 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 [1012] - in the former case as implying the practice of magical arts; [1013] 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. [1014] 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, [1015] and the presence in those lands of a large Jewish diaspora, through which they might, and probably would, gain knowleded of the great hope of Israel, [1016] is sufficiently attested by Jewish history. The oldest opinion traces the Magi - though partially on insufficient grounds [1017] - 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. [1018] 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 Saviour in the Temple, certain Magi from the East arrived in Jerusalem with strange tidings. They had seen at its rising' [1019] a sidereal appearance, [1020] 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 [1021] to Him, probably not because they imagined He must be born in the Jewish capital [1022] 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. [1023] 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. [1024] 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. [1025] Herod took immediate measures, characterised by his usual cunning. He called together all the High-Priests - past and present - and all the learned Rabbis, [1026] and, without committing himself as to whether the Messiah was already born, or only expected, [1027] simply propounded to them the question of His birthplace. This would show him where Jewish expectancy looked for the appearance of his rival, and thus enable him to watch alike that place and the people generally, while it might possibly bring to light the feelings of the leaders of Israel. At the same time he took care diligently to inquire the precise time, when the sidereal appearance had first attracted the attention of the Magi. [1028] 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 synchronise 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 [1029] 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 Micah v.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, [1030] 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, [1031] 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, [1032] but generally to the quotations from the Old Testament in the New. [1033] 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 [1034] for the goal of their pilgrimage, to their surprise and joy, the star,' which had attracted their attention at its rising,' [1035] 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 auhoritatively 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, [1036] 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;' [1037] and there the Magi found the Infant-Saviour 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.' [1038] 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. [1039] 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 synchronised in a remarkable manner with great events in human history.' [1040] On the other hand, if the 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 orgin 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, [1041] 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. [1042] Nor can it be represented as intended to fulfil the prophecy of Isaiah, [1043] [1044] 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 literalised, [1045] what would become of the other part of that prophecy, [1046] 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. [1047] 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 [1048] - and the emphatic statement, that he who learned even one thing from a Mage deserved death, show what views were authoritatively held. [1049] [1050] Of course, the Jews (or many of them), like most ancients, believed in the influence of the planets upon the destiny of man. [1051] But it was a principle strongly expressed, and frequently illustrated in the Talmud, that such planetary influence did not extend to Israel. [1052] 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. [1053] It was

supposed, that some persons had a star of their own, [1054] 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). [1055] One Rabbi even had it, that success, wisdom, the duration of life, and a posterity, depended upon the constellation. [1056] Such views were carried out till they merged in a kind of fatalism, [1057] or else in the idea of a natal affinity,' by which persons born under the same constellation were thought to stand in sympathetic rapport. [1058] The further statement, that conjunctions of the planets [1059] affected the products of the earth [1060] 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 Münter's well known tractate on the Star of the Magi, [1061] writers have endeavoured to show, that Jewish expectancy of a Messiah was connected with a peculiar sidereal conjunction, such as that which occurred two years before the birth of our Lord, [1062] and this on the ground of a quotation from the well-known Jewish commentator Abarbanel (or rather Abrabanel). [1063] 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, [1064] 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. [1065] 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' [1066] - 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. [1067] 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 Pices, 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 [1068] - belongs to the great Kepler, [1069] 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 [1070] - 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. [1071] Such, impartially stated, are the facts of the case - and here the subject must, in the present state of our information, be left. [1072]Only two things are recorded of this visit of the Magi to Bethlehem: their humblest Eastern homage, and their offerings. [1073] 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 athe 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. [1074]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-Saviour 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. [1075] 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 martydom' (flores martyrum,' as Prudentius calls them). The slaughter was entirely in accordance with the character and former measures of Herod. [1076] Nor do we wonder, that it remained unrecorded by Josephus, since on other occasions also he has omitted events which to us seem important. [1077] 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 [1078] - 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.' [1079] In the murder of the Innocents,' he sees the fulfilment of Rachel's lament [1080] (who died and was buried in Ramah) [1081] over her children, the men of Benjamin, when the exiles to Babylon met in Ramah, [1082] 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 Saviour from Egypt. [1083] 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 realisation 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 IX. THE CHILD-LIFE IN NAZARETH

(St. Matt. ii.19-23; St. Luke ii.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. [1084] 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, [1085] 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 theatre 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 Judæa 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. [1086] 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. [1087] Henceforth this was to be a Yom Tobh (feast-day), on which mourning was interdicted. [1088] 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. [1089] 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. [1090] 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 Peræa; and Philip (the son of Cleopatra, of Jerusalem [1091]), tetrarch of the territory east of the Jordan. [1092] These testaments reflected the varying phases of suspicion and family-hatred through which Herod had passed. Although the Emperor seems to have authorised him to appoint his successor, [1093] Herod wisely made his disposition dependent on the approval of Augustus. [1094] 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. [1095] But the people of Jerusalem were not easily satisfied. At first liberal promises of amnesty and reforms had assuaged the populace. [1096] 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. [1097] 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 clamouring 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. [1098] [1099] At the same time, a Jewish deputation of fifty, from Palestine, accompanied by eight thousand Roman Jews, clamoured for the deposition of the entire Herodian race, on account of their crimes, [1100] 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 Judæa, Idumæa, and Samaria, with a

revenue of 600 talents [1101] (about 230,000l. to 240,000l). 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. [1102] 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, [1103] 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-Saviour from the dominions of Archelaus. But it needed Divine direction to determine his return to Nazareth. [1104] 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;' [1105] 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 favour 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, [1106] 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 Saviour, not a biography of Jesus of Nazareth. St. Matthew, indeed, summarises 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, [1107] by the distinctive designation: of Nazareth,' {hebrew} (Notsri), Nazoraos, 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 Saviour 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 [1108] 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.' [1109] 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 Isaiah xi,1, which was likewise applied to the Messiah. [1110] Thus, starting from Isaiah xi.1, Netser being equivalent to Tsemach, Jesus would, as Notsri or Ben Netser, [1111] [1112] bear in popular parlance, and that on the ground of prophetic Scriptures, the exact equivalent of the best-known designation of the Messiah. [1113] 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' (symbolised by His Divinely-appointed early residence), small and despised 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 Judæans, 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 Judæa, accordingly, flocked, from ploughshare and workshop, whoever wished to become learned in the Law.' The very neighbourhood of the Gentile world, the contact with the great commercial centres 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 Judæa its innermost Sanctuary. The natural disposition of the people, even the soil and climate of Galilee, were not favourable to the all-engrossing passion for Rabbinic study. In Judæa all seemed to invite to retrospection and introspection; to favour 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 centres 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, practised 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. [1114] Reason, duty, and precept, alike bound him to reverence them, as he reverenced 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 Judæa 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 favour solitary thought and religious abstraction.It was quite otherwise in Galilee. The smiling landscape of Lower Galilee invited the easy labour of the agriculturist. Even the highlands of Upper Galilee [1115] were not, like those of Judæa, 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 Judæa. 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 Judæa. 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 centres 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, [1116] but admits that they cared more for honour than for money. The great ideal teacher of Palestinian schools was Akiba, and one of his most outspoken opponents a Galilean, Rabbi José. [1117] 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. [1118] The Talmud mentions several points in which the practice of the Galileans differed from that of Judæa - all either in the direction of more practical earnestness, [1119] or of alleviation of Rabbinic rigorism. [1120] 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. [1121] There was a general contempt in Rabbinic circles for all that was Galilean. Although the Judæan or Jerusalem dialect was far from pure, [1122] the people of Galilee were especially blamed for neglecting the study of their language, charged with error in grammar, and especially with absurd malpronunciation, sometimes leading to ridiculous mistakes. [1123] Galilean - Fool!' was so common an expression, that a learned lady turned with it upon so great a man as R. José, the Galilean, because he had used two needless words in asking her the road to Lydda. [1124] [1125] Indeed, this R. José had considerable prejudices to overcome, before his remarkable talents and learning were fully acknowledged. [1126] 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,' favour,' 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 Saviour 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, initialled by the brief but emphatic summaries of the third Gospel.In regard to the Child-Life, [1127] we read: And the Child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, [1128] being filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him.' [1129] 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, 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; [1130] no description more terribly realistic than that of the vengeance which overtakes such sin. [1131]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, [1132] 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 honour father and mother, pious works, peacemaking between man and man, and the study of the Law, which is equivalent to them all.' [1133] 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. [1134] 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. [1135] 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 (Ecclus. iii. [1136]), but from the Jewish women of the New Testament. [1137] 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 [1138] was reverently touched by each who came or went, and then the fingers kissed that had come in contact with the Holy Name. [1139] 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 Euice 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.' [1140] 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. [1141] 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 [1142] known the Holy Scriptures,' and that in their life-moulding influence. [1143] It was, indeed, no idle boast that the Jews were from their swaddling-clothes...trained to recognise 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;' [1144] that from their earliest consciousness they learned the laws, so as to have them, as it were, engraven upon the soul;' [1145] 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.' [1146]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.' [1147] 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. [1148] Every other engagement, even the necessary meal, should give place to this paramount duty; [1149] nor should it be forgotten that, while here real labour was necessary, it would never prove fruitless. [1150] 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. [1151] Directly the child learned to speak, his religious instruction was to begin [1152] - no doubt, with such verses of Holy Scripture as composed that part of the Jewish liturgy, which answers to our Creed. [1153] 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. [1154] 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. [1155] The earliest hymns taught would be the Psalms for the days of the week, or festive Psalms, such as the Hallel, [1156] 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. [1157] 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 labours, were among the last victims of Herod's cruelty. [1158] 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. [1159] 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. [1160] [1161] 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. [1162] It was even deemed unlawful to live in a place where there was no school. [1163] Such a city deserved to be either destroyed or excommunicated. [1164] 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; [1165] 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, [1166] 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.' [1167] 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. [1168] 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 [1169] - 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; toshow 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. [1170] 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. [1171] 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. [1172] 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, [1173] 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. [1174] 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; Lev. i.-ix.; and Numb. i.-x.35, are specially mentioned. [1175]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, [1176] 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-Saviour 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. [1177] He would attend the services of the Synagogue, where Moses and the prophets were read, and, as afterwards by Himself, [1178] occasional addresses delivered. [1179] 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 [1180] and St. Luke, [1181] 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. [1182] Indeed, as the Pharisees and Sadducees 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 X. IN THE HOUSE OF HIS HEAVENLY, AND IN THE HOME OF HIS EARTHLY FATHER - THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM - THE RETIREMENT AT NAZARETH.

(St. Luke ii.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. [1183] 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. [1184] 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.' [1185] But, as a matter of fact, the legal age was in this respect anticipated by two years, or at least by one. [1186] It was in accordance with this custom, that, [1187] 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 [1188] to go up to the Temple; and we mark that, although women were not bound to make such personal appearance, [1189] 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, [1190] when, in consequence of the charges against him, he was banished to Gaul. Judæa, Samaria and Idumæa 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 Cæsarea. It will be remembered, that the Jews themselves had desired some such arrangement, in te 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; [1191] 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, [1192] 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. [1193] The popular excitement which this called forth was due, probably, not so much to opposition on principle, [1194] as to this, that the census was regarded as the badge of servitude, and incompatible with the Theocratic character of Israel. [1195] Had a census been considered absolutely contrary to the Law, the leading Rabbis would never have submitted to it; [1196] 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. [1197] 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; [1198] positively, that God alone was to lead as absolute Lord. [1199] 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 [1200] was composed: Mi Camochah Baelim Jehovah, Who like Thee among the gods, Jehovah?' [1201] 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 (zelotai) or by the Hebrew equivalent Qannaim (Cananæans, not Canaanites,' as in A.V.) The real home of that party was not Judæa 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, [1202] 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 organised by guerilla 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 Esekias. What followed is told in substantially the same manner, though with difference of form [1203] and, sometimes, nomenclature, by Josephus, [1204] and in the Talmud. [1205] 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 Zech. xi.1, was popularly regarded as betokening its speedy destruction. [1206] [1207] 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. [1208] 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. [1209] 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.' [1210] A far deeper feeling, and intense, though misguided earnestness pervaded the School of Shammai. It was in the minority, but it sympathised 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, [1211] even the most distinguished (such as Akylas or Onkelos); [1212] 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; [1213] 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 Judæa, 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 colour, 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 sytematically. 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. [1214] The four families [1215] 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 theHigh-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 characterised 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. [1216] Joazar took the popular part against Archelaus, on his accession. For this he was deprived of his dignity in favour 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 Sië, an otherwise unknown individual. At the time of the taxing of Quirinius we find Joazar again in office, [1217] 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 favoured national aspirations. [1218] 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 favour he had hoped to gain. It will be remembered, that the Nationalist party - or Zealots,' as they were afterwards called - first appeared in those guerilla-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 sympathised, 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. [1219] How the Hillelites looked upon this movement, we gather even from the slighting allusion of Gamaliel. [1220] 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. [1221] 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, [1222] while a fouth 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. [1223] 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, [1224] Annius Rufus, [1225] and Valerius Gratus, [1226] 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 Cæsars. 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 synchronised. His first visit to the Temple followed upon the Roman possession of Judæa, 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 philosphical 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, [1227] the festive company from Nazareth, soon swelled by other festive bands, went up to Jerusalem, chanting by the way those Psalms of Ascent' [1228] to the accompaniment of the flute, they might implicitly yeild 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 [1229] - 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, [1230] 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; [1231] the two so-called Huldah' (probably, weasel') gates, which led by tunnels [1232] 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, [1233] 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, [1234] 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. [1235] [1236] 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. [1237] But the most splendid gate was that to the east, termed the Beautiful.' [1238] 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. [1239]In some part of this Temple, sitting in the midst of the Doctors, [1240] 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 [1241] - 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,' [1242] cannot necessarily imply that Joseph and the Mother of Jesus had remained in Jerusalem during the whole Paschal week. [1243] 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. [1244] 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, [1245] 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. [1246] 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' [1247] and discerning answers.' [1248] 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. [1249] Many other questions might arise on the subject of the Passover. Or did the Child Jesus - as afterwards, in connection with the Messianic teaching [1250] - 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, [1251] if the direct road north, through Samaria, [1252] was taken (or, according to the Mishnah, at Akrabah [1253]) - have so anxiously sought Him by the way, [1254] 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, [1255] 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 realised 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.' [1256] 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 [1257] 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 everpresent impression of all those matters,' [1258] of which she was the most cognisant. 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. [1259] 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. [1260] 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. [1261] 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. [1262] 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. [1263]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. [1264] If we might venture on a general characterisation, we would infer from the Epistle of St. James, that his religious views had originally been cast in the mould of Shammai. Certainly, there is nothing of the Hillelite direction about it, but all to remind us of the earnestness, directness, vigour, and rigour of Shammai. Of Simon we know that he had belonged to the Nationalist party, since he is expressly so designated (Zelotes, [1265] Cananæan). [1266] 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. [1267] 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 [1268] - 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. Mark vi.3, we may infer with great probability, though not with absolute certainty, [1269] that He had adopted the trade of Joseph. Among the Jews the contempt for manual labour, which was one of the painful [1270] 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. [1271] 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. [1272] 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 labour, 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 recognised the good and the hopeful, even in those who seemed most lost. He quenched not the dimly burning flax, nor brake the bruised 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 ontwardly 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

realising 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. [1273] 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. [1274] 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 favour with God and Man.'

Chapter 25

CHAPTER XI. IN THE FIFTEENTH YEAR OF TIBERIUS CÆSAR AND UNDER THE PONTIFICATE OF ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS - A VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

(St. Matthew iii.1-12; St. Mark i.2-8; St. Luke iii.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 Judæa, 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. [1275] 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 Cæsar), 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 theatre 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 favourable. 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 centre 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. [1276] 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. [1277] 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 unsavoury to describe how far the worship of indecency 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, [1278] 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 practised, 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 labour, 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 [1279] of John in his character as Forerunner of the Messiah. Only his outward and inward development, and his being in the deserts,' [1280] are briefly indicated. [1281] The latter, assuredly, not in order to learn from the Essenes, [1282] 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 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 [1283] - was absolute and undisputed master of Judæa; 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 [1284] 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, Judæa 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. [1285] 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 Peræa - 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 misgrave, 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 neighbourhood (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 splendour. The city, which was peopled chiefly by adventurers, was mainly Grecian, and adorned with an amphitheatre, 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 Cæsarea 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 favourably 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. [1286] 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. [1287]It was far other when Tiberius succeeded to the Empire, and Judæa was a province. Merciless harshness characterised 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. [1288] 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 Judæa, 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 characterised 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. [1289] 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, [1290] in Galilee, [1291] and even in Samaria, [1292] until the Emperor himself interposed. [1293]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. [1294] 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 [1295] in terrible language. And although there is no evidence that the house of Annas' [1296] was guilty of the same gross self-indulgence, violence, [1297] luxury, and even public indecency, [1298] as some of their successors, they are included in the woes pronounced on the corrupt leaders of the priesthood, whom the Santuary is represented as bidding depart from the sacred precincts, which their presence defiled. [1299] 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 [1300] to private

influence on the judges in their administration of justice, whereby morals were corrupted, judgment perverted and the Shekhinah withdrawn from Israel.' [1301] In illustration of this, we recall the terrorism which prevented Sanhedrists from taking the part of Jesus, [1302] and especially the violence which seems to have determined the final action of the Sanhedrin, [1303] 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, and even the principal members of their families, [1304] [1305] there could, of course, be only one actual High-Priest. The conjunction of the two names of Annas and Caiaphas [1306] 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 Acts iv.6, where Annas appears as the actual President, and by the terms in which Caiaphas is spoken of, as merely one of them,' [1307] but by the part which Annas took in the final condemnation of Jesus. [1308]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 Cæsar - reckoning, as provincials would do, [1309] from his co-regency with Augustus (which commenced two years before his sole reign), in the year 26 a.d. [1310] According to our former computation, Jesus would then be in His thirtieth year. [1311] The scene of John's first public appearance was in the wilderness of Judæa,' that is, the wild, desolate district around the mouth of the Jordan. We know not whether John baptized in this place, [1312] nor yet how long he continued there; but we are expressly told, that his stay was not confined to that locality. [1313] Soon afterwards we find him at Bethabara, [1314] which is farther up the stream. The outward appearance and the habits of the Messenger corresponded to the character and object of his Mission. Neither his dress nor his food was that of the Essenes; [1315] and the former, at least, like that of Elijah, [1316] [1317] 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, individualised. 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, [1318] we may here say, that it is the whole Old Testament sublimated, and the whole New Testament realised. 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 realisation. [1319] 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; [1320] the underlying idea of all its institutions. [1321] 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, [1322] [1323] the glorious vision beheld by Daniel. [1324] [1325] 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 realisation, 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.' [1326]According to the Rabbinic views of the time, the terms Kingdom,' Kingdom of heaven,' [1327] and Kingdom of God' (in the Targum on Micah iv.7 Kingdom of Jehovah'), were equivalent. In fact, the word heaven' was very often used instead of God,' so as to avoid unduly familiarising the ear with the Sacred Name. [1328] This, probably, accounts for the exclusive use of the expression Kingdom of Heaven' in the Gospel by St. Matthew. [1329] 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. [1330]This Kingdom of Heaven,' or of God,' must, however, be distinguished from such terms as the Kingdom of the Messiah' (Malkhutha dimeshicha [1331]), the future age (world) of the Messiah' (Alma deathey dimeshicha [1332]), the days of the Messiah,' the age to come' (soeculum futurum, the Athid labho [1333] - both this and the previous expression [1334]), the end of days,' [1335] and the end of the extremity of days' Soph Eqebh Yomaya [1336]). 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. [1337] 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.' [1338] 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. [1339] Accordingly, the Mishnah [1340] gives this as the reason why, in the collection of Scripture passages which forms the prayer called Shema,' [1341] the confession, Deut. vi.4 &c., precedes the admonition, Deut. xi.13 &c., 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.' [1342] 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. [1343] To give other instances: Israel is said to have taken up the yoke of the Kingdom of God at Mount Sinai; [1344] the children of Jacob at their last interview with their father; [1345] and Isaiah on his call to the prophetic office, [1346] 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. [1347] 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 Isaiah xl.9, the words Behold your God!' are paraphrased: The Kingdom of your God is revealed.' Similarly, [1348] 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.'" [1349] [1350] 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 Hos. iii.5. [1351] 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. [1352]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). [1353] 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 realisation, of which the invisible Church is the true counterpart. When Christ says, [1354] 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 [1355] seems to be that, except a man be born of water (profession, with baptism [1356] 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; [1357] which was manifested in and through Christ; [1358] is apparent in the Church;' [1359] gradually develops amidst hindrances; [1360] is triumphant at the second coming of Christ [1361] (the end'); and, finally, perfected in the

world to come. [1362] 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. [1363] 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. [1364] 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, [1365] 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, [1366] while they, as Abraham's children, were sure of escape - in the words of the Talmud, that the night' (Is. xxi.12) was only to the nations of the world, but the morning to Israel?' [1367]For, no principle was more fully established in the popular conviction, than that all Israel had part in the world to come (Sanh. x.1), and this, specifically, because of their connection with Abraham. This appears not only from the New Testament, [1368] 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. [1369] Abraham was represented as sitting at the gate of Gehenna, to deliver any Israelite [1370] who otherwise might have been consigned to its terrors. [1371] In fact, by their descent from Abraham, all the children of Israel were nobles, [1372] infinitely higher than any proselytes. What,' exclaims the Talmud, shall the born Israelite stand upon the earth, and the proselyte be in heaven?' [1373] In fact, the ships on the sea were preserved through the merit of Abraham; the rain descended on account of it. [1374] 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; [1375] his righteousness had on many occasions been the support of Israel's cause; [1376] Daniel had been heard for the sake of Abraham; [1377] nay, his merit availed even for the wicked. [1378] [1379] In its extravagance the Midrash thus apostrophises Abraham: If thy children were even (morally) dead bodies, without blood vessels or bones, thy merit would avail for them!' [1380]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; [1381] [1382] 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; [1383] 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.' [1384] 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. [1385] His Baptism would not be of preparatory repentance and with water, but the Divine Baptism in [1386] the Holy Spirit and fire [1387] - in the Spirit Who sanctified, and the Divine Light which purified, [1388] 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. [1389] 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 symbolised 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, [1390] 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. [1391] 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 [1392] and their garments, [1393] 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? [1394] 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. [1395]

CHAPTER XII. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS: ITS HIGHER MEANING.

(St. Matt. iii.13-17; St. Mark i.7-11; St. Luke iii.21-23; St. John i.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, [1396] 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, [1397] 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.' [1398] 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 Judæa, 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. [1399] 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, [1400] bound with many-coloured 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. [1401] 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 earnestess, 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. [1402] And still the voice, everywhere proclaiming the same message, travelled upward, along the winding Jordon 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. [1403] 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, [1404] 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 Peræa. [1405] Here he baptized. [1406] 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. [1407] 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 recognise the Messiah. [1408] [1409] 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. [1410] 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 honour 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. [1411] To these and similar views must be added the latest conceit of Renan, [1412] 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 favour 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. Matt. xxi.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 [1413] 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,' [1414] 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. [1415] The one bears reference to the record,' the other to the deeper and absolutely necessary fact which underly 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. [1416] 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.' [1417] One prayer, the only one which He taught His disciples, recurs to our minds. [1418] We must here individualise and emphasise 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 sufferigs' 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 [1419] Jesus, remaining on him. It was as if, symbolically, in the words of St.

Peter, [1420] 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 ii. [1421] 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.' [1422]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, à 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, [1423] 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, [1424] and, so to speak, had taken, their place. [1425] 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 [1426] (Toseph. Sanh. xi.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. [1427] 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 (Lücke, Evang. Joh. i. 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. [1428] It is dwelt upon with much confidence by Gfrörer [1429] and others, as evidence of the mythical origin

of the Gospels; [1430] it is repeated by Wünsche, 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 Cant. ii.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, [1431] which is generally thus quoted: The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters, like a dove.' [1432] 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 Gen. i.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. [1433] But, if any doubt could still exist, it would be removed by the fact that in a parallel passage, [1434] 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. [1435] 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?' [1436]

Chapter 27

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

_____ {hebrew} 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 [Deut. x.17, followed by verse 18], repeated in the Prophets [Is. lvii.15], and reiterated in the Hagiographa [Ps. lxviii.4, followed by verse 5].' - Megill 31 a.

CHAPTER I. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

(St. Matt. iv.1-11; St. Mark i.12, 13; St. Luke iv.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 foresakeness, 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 [1437] 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 endeavour of Satan to take away the soul of Moses. [1438] 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.' [1439] 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. [1440]

So far from any idea obtaining that Satan was to assault the Messiah, in a well-known passage, which has been previously quoted, [1441] the Arch-enemy is represented as overwhelmed and falling on his face at sight of Him, and owning his complete defeat. [1442] On another point in this history we find the same inversion of thought current in Jewish legend. In the Commentary just referred to, [1443] 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 . . . . . Is. lx.1. . . . . upon you only . . . . Is. lx.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 ..... Is. lx.3. . . . . And they shall come and lick the dust from under the feet of the King Messiah, as it is written, Is. xlix.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, [1444] as it is written, Zech. viii.23.' One more quotation from the same Commentary: [1445] In that hour, the Holy One, blessed be His Name, exalts the Messiah to the heaven of heavens, and spreads over Him of the splendour 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; [1446] 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.' [1447] [1448] 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. [1449] 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. [1450] And the reality of such a kingdom of evil no earnest mind would call in question, nor would it pronounce à priori against the personality of its king. Reasoning à 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. [1451] On the other hand it must be admitted that the narrative, if naturally

interpreted, suggests an outward and real event, not an inward transaction; [1452] 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), [1453] 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 impossiblity 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. [1454] [1455] 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 Judæa 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 uot 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 assualt 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. [1456] On the other hand, temptation without the inward correspondence of existent sin is not only unthinkable, so far as man is concerned, [1457] but temptation without the possibility of sin seems unreal - a kind of Docetism. [1458] 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, [1459] not only in the sense that Christ actually did not sin, nor merely in this, that our concupiscence' [1460] 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. [1461] 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 premisses - 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. [1462] 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. [1463] 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 summarises, 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, [1464] 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, [1465] 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. [1466] 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. [1467] 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, [1468] 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 male-factor; 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 realised at that moment, in the almost utter cessation of every other mental faculty: [1469] 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 sympathising 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 [1470] - 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 individual, 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. [1471] [1472] 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 succmb: 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, [1473] presumably that on which every day a Priest was stationed to watch, as the pale morning light passed over the hills of Judæa far off to Hebron, to announce it as the signal for offering the morning sacrifice. [1474] 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. [1475] 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 realisation 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, [1476] 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 or 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 [1477] 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; [1478] 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 Santanic, 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!' [1479]

CHAPTER II. THE DEPUTATION FROM JERUSALEM - THE THREE SECTS OF THE PHARISEES, SADDUCEES, AND ESSENES - EXAMINATION OF THEIR DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES.

(St. John i.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 realisation. 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 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 trust-worthy deputation. In the account of this by St. John certain points seem clearly implied; [1481] on others only suggestions can be ventured. That the interview referred to occurred after the Baptism of Jesus, appears from the whole context. [1482] 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. John vii.15), yet it refers to the people in their corporate capacity, that is, as represented by their constituted religious authorities. [1483] On the other hand, although the term scribes and elders' does not occur in the Gospel of St. John, [1484] 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 recognised 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; [1485] 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. [1486] 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,' [1487] which consisted of the fourteen chief officers of the Temple. 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. [1488] It would be too much to suppose, 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 [1489] 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. [1490] They mark, not sects, but mental directions, such as in their principles are natural and universal, and, indeed, appear in connection with all metaphysical [1491] 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 Sadducess 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. [1492] 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 [1493] as the most trustworthy authority on the matter. The inferences which we derive from the statements of Josephus, [1494] though always to be qualified by our general estimate of his animus, [1495] 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 coloured 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, [1496] 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. [1497] 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, [1498] 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. [1499] 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. [1500] The family of a Chabher belonged, as a matter of course, to the community; [1501] but this ordinance was afterwards altered. [1502] 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. [1503] 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 recognised by the Rabbis generally as of primary importance. [1504] 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); [1505] and that in regard to Levitical purity (the special vow of the Chabher). [1506] 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.' [1507] 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.' [1508] 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. [1509] It is as a tradition among the pharisees [1510] 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,' [1511] 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, [1512] 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. [1513] 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, [1514] while the Sadducees represented the civil and political element. The Pharisees represented only the prevailing system of, not 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. [1515] [1516] 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. [1517] Lastly, there were certain traditional ordinances on which both parties were at one. [1518] Thus it seems Sadduceeism was in a sense rather a speculative 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 recognised 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. [1519] A careful examination of the statements of Josephus on this subject will show that they convey no more than this. [1520] 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. [1521] 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 rigour,' [1522] [1523] imposed on themselves the necessity of much self-denial, especially in regard to food, [1524] 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 [1525] must refer to the honours 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.' [1526] [1527] The second doctrinal difference between Pharisees and Sadducees concerned the after death.' According to the New Testament, [1528] the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, while Josephus, going further, imputes to them denial of reward or punishment after death, [1529] and even the doctrine that the soul perishes with the body. [1530] 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, [1531] 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 [1532] 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 [1533] 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. [1534] 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 endeavoured 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. [1535] Connected with this was the equally Rationalistic

opposition to belief in Angels and Spirits. It is only mentioned in the New Testament, [1536] 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' (emarmne) [1537] 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 [1538]

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 [1539] 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, [1540] 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 foreordered. There might be seven years of pestilence in the land, and yet no one died before his time. [1541] Even if a man inflicted a cut on his finger, he might be sure that this also had been preordered. [1542] Nay, wheresoever a man was destined to die, thither would his feet carry him.' [1543] 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, [1544] 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. [1545] 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. [1546] It was, indeed, true that God had created the evil impulse in us; but He had also given the remedy in the Law. [1547] 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). [1548] Or, to put it in the language of the great Akiba: [1549] Everything is foreseen; free determination is accorded to man; and the world is judged in goodness.' With this simple juxtaphysition 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. [1550] Two other similar instances are mentioned. [1551] 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. [1552] 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. [1553] 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. [1554] What seem the original ordinances, [1555] 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 rigour 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. [1556] [1557] 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. [1558]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 Lev. xxiii.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 Pentacost always on a Sunday; [1559] while the Pharisees understood the term Sabbath' of the festive Paschal day. [1560] [1561] 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. [1562]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. [1563] [1564] 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. [1565] 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. [1566] 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; [1567] 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, [1568] 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 [1569] againstfalse 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. [1570] 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. [1571] Lastly, the Sadducees argued that if, according to Exodus xxi.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 recognise any responsibility on the latter score. [1572] [1573] For the sake of completeness it has been necessary to enter into details, which may not posses 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, [1574] and especially the female world, [1575] 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. [1576] But to conclude from this, [1577] 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, [1578] 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, [1579] 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 expressely told that they were of the Pharisees.' [1580]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 dispite. According to a Jewish legend of about the seventh century of our era, [1581] the name was derived from one Tsadoq (Zadok), [1582] 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. [1583] But the objections to this are insuperable. Not to speak of the linguistic difficulty of deriving Tsadduqim (Zaddukim, Sadducees) from Tsadoq (Zadok), [1584] 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 honoured 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. [1585] [1586] From 1 Macc. ii.42; vii.13; 2 Macc. xiv.6, it appears that originally they had taken the sacred name of Chasidim, or the pious.' [1587] This, no doubt, on the ground that they were truly those who, according to the directions of Ezra, [1588] had separated themselves (become nibhdalim) from the filthiness of the heathen' (all heathen defilement) by carrying out the traditional ordinances. [1589] In fact, Ezra marked the beginning of the later,' in contradistinction to the earlier,' or Scripture-Chasidim. [1590] 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, [1591] 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. [1592] Some wit might have suggested: Read not Tsaddiqim, the righteous,' but Tsadduqim (from Tsadu, {hebrew}), desolation,' destruction.' Whether or not this suggestion approve itself to critics, the derivation of Sadducees from Tsaddiqim is certainly that which offers most probability. [1593] 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 (Esseno or 'Essaoi - 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. [1594] 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 know of their views, would account for the scanty notices about them. Josephus and Philo, [1595] 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. [1596] Still, the secrecy of their doctrines renders us dependent on writers, of whom at least one (Josephus) lies open to the suspicion of colouring 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 emphasise, the teaching of Christianity was in a direction opposite from that of Essenism. [1597]We posses 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., [1598] and that we meet the first Essence in the reign of Aristobulus I. [1599]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. [1600] Even its outward organisation 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 chaunt of prayer or memento mori;' no penances, 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 centres of immorality, [1601] they chose for their settlements chiefly villages, one of their largest colonies being by the shore of the Dead Sea. [1602] At the same time they had also houses' inmost, if not all the cities of Palestine, [1603] notably in Jerusalem, [1604] where, indeed, one of the gates was named after them. [1605] In these houses' they lived in common, [1606] under officials of their own. The affairs of the order' were administered by a tribunal of at least a hundred members, [1607] 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. [1608] 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. [1609] 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. [1610] 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. [1611] The sacraficial meal was again concluded by prayer, when they put off their sacred dress, and returned to their labour. 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, [1612] 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, [1613] 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; [1614] 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. [1615] 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. [1616] 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 labour 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. [1617] 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 cognisant 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; [1618] the same mystic writings revealed the secret remedies of plants and stones for the healing of the body, [1619] 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, [1620] we know what development the doctrine of Angels received both in the Book of Enoch (alike in its earlier and in its later portion [1621]) and in the Book of Jubilees, [1622] 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. [1623] Here we would only specially notice that in the Book of Jubilees [1624] Angels are represented as teaching Noah all herbal remedies' for diseases, [1625] while in the later Pirqé de R. Eliezer [1626] this instruction is said to have been given to Moses. These two points (relaion 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.' [1627] 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, [1628] the other to Persian sources, [1629] 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, [1630] 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. [1631] [1632]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 moulding 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 ('Esseno, 'Essaoi) seems the Greek equivalent for Chitsonim ({hebrew}), the outsiders.' Even the circumstance that the axe, or rather spade (xinrion), 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 ({hebrew}) and Asidaioi ('Asidaoi). For, in rendering Hebrew into Greek, the ch ({hebrew}) 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.' [1633] Instances of a change of the Hebrew i into the Greek e are frequent, and of the Hebrew o into the Greek _ 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 ({hebrew}) for the Greek (egens) Eugen_s (well-born'). [1634] 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 Rabbinic 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, &c.), 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 seem to identify them with the sect of the Essenes. Thus, in one passage [1635] 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 coloured, 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. [1636] 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. [1637] 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, [1638] 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 [1639] to Essene practices, similar to that which has already been noticed. [1640] For, immediatley 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' [1641] (materialists), the same punishment is assigned to those who read externe writings' (Sepharim haChitsonim) and who whispered' (a magical formula) over a wound.' [1642] Both the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmud [1643] 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. [1644] 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 [1645] 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 cognisance 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 30

CHAPTER III. THE TWOFOLD TESTIMONY OF JOHN - THE FIRST SABBATH OF JESUS'S MINISTRY - THE FIRST SUNDAY - THE FIRST DISCIPLES.

(St. John i.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-quickening, of unfolding understanding, and of ripened decision. We see it in his more emphasised 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 realise 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. [1646] 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. [1647] 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, [1648] in Whom the institution and sacramental meaning of the Priesthood, and of Sacrifices, found their fulfilment. [1649] 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' [1650] [1651] - 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. Matt. xi.14), proves that he claimed it not; [1652] 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 fictitious 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, [1653] 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 [1654] 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. [1655] 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. Luke iii.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 [1656] 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 recognised, [1657] 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, [1658] 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 Saviour said of him, Elias is indeed come,' but they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed.' [1659] 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.' [1660] 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

Deut. xviii.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 [1661] 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.' [1662] Even the various opinions broached in the Mishnah, [1663] 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 [1664] 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. [1665] 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.' [1666] 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,' [1667] as set forth in Is. liii. 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, [1668] and the halo of His glory shone around the well-remembered prophecy. It must always have been Messianically understood; [1669] it formed the groundwork of Messianic thought to the New Testament writers [1670] - 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. [1671] 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,' [1672] 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 liii. was but the complete realisation 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. [1673] Without further following this remarkable Rabbinic commentation, [1674] 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 Micah vii.19, they suppress [in the A.V. subdue'] our iniquities (the Hebrew word Kabhash meaning he who suppresseth).' [1675] Still more strong is the statement of the school of Hillel, to the effect that the sacrifical lambs were termed Kebhasim (from kabhas, to wash'), because they wash away the sins of Israel.' [1676] 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 Saviourship, which only long afterwards, and reluctantly, came to the followers of the Lamb. [1677] 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 triump in that great contest indicated in Gen. iii.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 scène 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. [1678] 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, [1679] that Jesus returned to Galilee, [1680] calling others by the way. And the third day' after it [1681] - that is, on the Wednesday - was the marriage in Cana. [1682]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 (v.40); the other, unnamed one, could have been no other than John himself, the beloved disciple. [1683] 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. [1684] 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 [1685] 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 honoured 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;' [1686] their unspoken, but half-conscious longing by what the invitation implied (according to the most probable reading, Come and ye shall see' [1687] It was but early morning - ten o'clock. [1688] 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: [1689] He (Andrew) first findeth his own brother.' [1690] 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.' [1691] 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 [1692] of the Saviour now read in Peter's inmost character his future call and work: Thou art Simon, the son of John [1693] - thou shalt be called [1694] Cephas, which is interpreted (Grecianised) Peter.' [1695]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. [1696]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-townsman 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 Saviour 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' [1697] - looking back on what changed the name of Jacob into Israel - and the evident reference to the full realisation of Jacob's vision in

Bethel, [1698] 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 Jer. xxx.11, of Israel's final restoration. [1699] Nathanael (Theodore, the gift of God,') had, as we often read of Rabbis, [1700] rested for prayer, meditation, or study, in the shadow of that wide-spreading tree so common in Palestine, the fig-tree. [1701] 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;' [1702] all the more, perhaps, from the painful contrast in the present. Such a verse as that with which, in a well-known Rabbinic work, [1703] the meditation for the New Moon of Nisan, the Passover month, closes: Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help,' [1704] would recur, and so lead back the mind to the suggestive symbol of Jacob's vision, and its realisation in the age to come.' [1705] These 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 wth 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, [1706] 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 neighbourhood, 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, [1707] yet with full view of the final triumph (thou shalt see greater things than these'), and of the true realisation in it of that glorious symbol of Jacob's vision. [1708]And so Nathanael, the God-given' - or, as we know him in after-history, Bartholomew, the son of Telamyon' [1709] - 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 fertilised the barrenness of the far-off lands of the Gentiles.

CHAPTER IV. THE MARRIAGE FEAST IN CANA OF GALILEE - THE MIRACLE THAT IS A SIGN.'

(St. John ii.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.' [1710] [1711] 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 realisation of its ideal destiny as created in the likeness of God. It should never be forgotton, 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,' [1712] 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. [1713] 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. [1714] [1715] 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 symbolised the union of God with Israel. [1716] 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 insistance 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, [1717] or the sadness of burial. To use the bold allegory of the times, God Himself had spoken the words of blessing over the cup at the union of our first parents, when Michael and Gabriel acted as groomsmen, [1718] and the Angelic choir sang the wedding hymn. [1719] 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). [1720] 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, [1721] 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. [1722] 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.' [1723] 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. [1724] 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. [1725] 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 Shitré Erusin) fixed the dowry which each brought, the mutual obligations, and all other legal points. [1726] 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,' [1727] would be spoken, and the bride and bridegroom crowned with garlands. [1728] Then a formal legal instrument, called the Kethubah, was signed, [1729] which set forth that the bridegroom undertook to work for her, to honour, keep, and care for her, [1730] as is the manner of the men of Israel; that he promised to give his maiden-wife at least two hundred Zuz [1731] (or more it might be), [1732] 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. [1733] 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, [1734] sometimes wisely, to the general enjoyment, [1735] 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 Judæa, that at the marriage of Cana no friend of the bridegroom,' or groomsman' (Shoshebheyna), is mentioned, while he is referred to in St. John iii.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, [1736] did not obtain, [1737] though all the invited guests bore the general name of children of the bridechamber' (bené Chuppah). [1738] 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. [1739] But if we adopt the most probable indentification of it with the modern pleasant village of Kefr Kenna, [1740] 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

honoured 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 [1741] 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. [1742] 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 [1743] 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. [1744] 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). [1745] 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, [1746] 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,' [1747] 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. [1748] The common Palestinian bath' was equal to the Roman amphora, containing about 5 ¼ gallons, while the Sepphoris bath' corresponded to the Attic metretes, and would contain about 8 ½ gallons. In the former case, therefore, each of these pots might have held from 10 ½ to 15 ¾ gallons; in the latter, from 17 to 25 ½. 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, [1749] it seems to have been the practiceto 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, [1750] 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, [1751] 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, [1752] 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.' [1753] 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. [1754]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. [1755] 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 every-day 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, [1756] 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; [1757] 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. [1758] 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. [1759] 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, [1760] or remembers that, when commending her to John on the Cross, He used the same mode of expression, [1761] 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!' [1762]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, [1763] 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, [1764] of the first of His miracles as a sign,' [1765] pointing to the deeper and higher that was to be revealed, and of the first forth-manifesting of His glory.' [1766] 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 colours, 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, [1767] for which there assuredly exists no legendary basis, either in Old Testament history, or in contemporary Jewish expectation; [1768] which cannot be sublimated into nineteenth-century idealism; [1769] least of all can be conceived as an after-thought of His disciples, invented by an Ephesian writer of the second century. [1770] 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, [1771] and will ever remain; not, indeed, magic, [1772] nor arbitrary power, but power with a moral purpose, and that the highest. [1773] 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 V. THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE - THE SIGN,' WHICH IS NOT A SIGN.

(St. John ii.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,' [1774] 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. [1775] 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. [1776] 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 Hûm 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. [1777] We know it from New Testament history, and from the writings of Josephus. [1778] A rancorous notice and certain vile insinuations [1779] of the Rabbis, [1780] 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. [1781] 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; [1782] the fertility of the country - notably of the plain of Gennesaret close by; and the merry babble, and fertilising 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. [1783] 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 realise 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, scarce one stone left on the other: the good Centurion's house, that of Matthew the publican, [1784] that of Simon Peter, [1785] the temporary home which first sheltered the Master and His loved ones. All are unrecognisable - 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 [1786] - 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. [1787] 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, [1788] [1789] then this Passover must have taken place in the spring (about April) of the same year. [1790] 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 sepulchres 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' [1791] - 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 authorised. 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.2d. of our money. From this tax many of the priests - to the chagrin of the Rabbis - claimed exemption, on the ingenious plea that in Lev. vi.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 Lev. vi.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, [1792] 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 1½d. to 2d. [1793] (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 75,000l., the bankers' profits may have amounted to from 8,000l. to 9,000l., an immense sum in the circumstances of the country. [1794] 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 authorised 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 realise 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 realise 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 [1795] 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. [1796] 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. [1797] [1798] 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 labour 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. [1799] Now, as we are informed that a certain mumcheh of firstlings had been authorised to charge for his inspection from four to six Isar (1¼d. to about 2d.), according to the animal inspected, [1800] 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. [1801] 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, [1802] 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.3d.), 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 2d. 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 controvesial 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. [1803] [1804] 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 [1805] 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, [1806] 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, [1807] and this, as expressly stated, on account of the sinful greed which characterised 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.' [1808] 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. [1809] 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.' [1810] 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!' [1811] 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. [1812] [1813] 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 Mis 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 (Mal. iii.1-3). Scarce had He entered the Temple-porch, and trod the Court of the Gentiles, than He drove thence what profanely defiled it. [1814] There was not a hand lifted, not a word spoken to arrest Him, as He made the scourage 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. [1815] 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. [1816]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. [1817] 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. [1818] 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, [1819] 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. [1820] 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, [1821] 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 stil 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 despiser behold, and wonder, and perish,' for He worketh a work in their days, a work which they shall in no wise believe.' [1822]

CHAPTER VI. THE TEACHER COME FROM GOD AND THE TEACHER FROM JERUSALEM - JESUS AND NICODEMUS

(St. John iii.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-forgetful, God-dedicated Servant of Jehovah, as His figure stood out against the Old Testament sky, realising 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.' [1823] Thus, even in those days of their early learning, Jesus purging the Temple in view of a hostile rulership was the full realisation 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' [1824] 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. [1825] 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 thank offering, 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. [1826] 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, [1827] or the repulsive, and in part blasphemous, account of a series of prodigies in testimony of the subleties of some great Rabbi [1828] - 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), [1829] one of the Pharisees and a member of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. And, as we gather from his mode of expression, [1830] 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 vigour of bold confession. [1831] 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, althogether rash to speak of the manner of his first approach to Christ as most commentators have done. We can scarcely realise 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. [1832] 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. John iii.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. [1833] If from St. John xix.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 realising 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, [1834] [1835] 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,' [1836] so connected with that Teacher come from God, that Nicodemus would inquire. And yet, though 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, [1837] 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 [1838] - was likened to a child just born. [1839] 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. [1840] 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, [1841] 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 premiss: 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. [1842] 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, [1843] 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? [1844] 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, [1845] 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, [1846] 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.' [1847] 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 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 [1848] 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. [1849] 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 34

CHAPTER VII. IN JUDÆA AND THROUGH SAMARIA - A SKETCH OF SAMARITAN HISTORY AND THEOLOGY - JEWS AND SAMARITANS.

(St. John iv.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 [1850] 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 Judæa. There He taught and His disciples baptized. [1851] [1852] 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: [1853] Jesus maketh and baptizeth more disciples than John.' [1854] 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, [1855] 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 occassion, a discussion arose on the part of John's disciples with a Jew,' [1856] on the subject of purification. [1857] 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 [1858] 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 honour 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 honour 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 unsurped 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, [1859] 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. [1860] 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 Judæa, while John baptized at Ænon (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 favour, that it locates the scene of John's last public work close to the seat of Hearod Antipas, into whose power the Baptist was so soon to be delivered. [1861] 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, [1862] 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. [1863] 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, [1864] who attributes the imprisonment and death of the Baptist simply to Herod's suspicious fear of John's unbounded influence with the people. [1865] 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, [1866] 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 [1867] reads rather like a brief summary; [1868] 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; [1869] and he alone tells of that early Judæan ministry and the journey through Samaria, which preceded the Galilean work. The shorter road from Judæa to Galilee led through Samaria; [1870] and this, if we may credit Josephus, [1871] was generally taken by the Galileans on their way to the capital. On the other hand, the Judæans seem chiefly to have made a détour through Peræa, 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, [1872] and the expression, He must needs go through Samaria,' [1873] can only refer to the advisability in the circumstances of taking the most direct road, [1874] or else to the wish of avoiding Peræa as the seat of Herod's government. [1875] Such prejudices in regard to Samaria, as those which affected the ordinary Judæan devotee, 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. [1876] The Biblical history of that part of Palestine which bore the name of Samaria need not here be repeated. [1877] Before the final deportation of Israel by Shalmaneser, or rather Sargon, [1878] 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. [1879] 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, [1880] 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. [1881] 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. [1882] 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, [1883] to mark that they were of foreign race, [1884] [1885] 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. [1886] 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. [1887] 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. [1888] The first foreign colonists of Samaria brought their peculiar forms of idolatry with them. [1889] 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. [1890] 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 [1891]) the Samaritans built a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, and Manasseh, [1892] 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, [1893] Gerizim was declared the rightful centre of worship, and the doctrines and rites of the Samaritans exhibited a curious imitation and adaptation of those prevalent in Judæa. 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, [1894] the origin and meaning of many of them have been forgotten. [1895] 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, [1896] 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 Deut. xxvii.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, [1897] 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 [1898] it again became Syrian (Antigonus). Only three years afterwards, [1899] 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, out in 298 it was once more ravaged by the son of Antigonus. 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), [1900] permanently under Syrian dominion. In the troublous times of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, [1901] the Samaritans escaped the fate of the Jews by repudiating all connection with Israel, and dedicating their temple to Jupiter. [1902] 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, [1903] which was never rebuilt. The city of Samaria was taken several years afterwards [1904] [1905] by the sons of Hyrcanus (Antigonus 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, [1906] and greatly enlarged and beautified by Herod, who called it Sebaste in honour of Augustus, to whom he reared a magnificent temple. [1907] Under Roman rule the city enjoyed great privileges - had even a Senate of its own. [1908] 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 honour of the Imperial family of Rome, ultimately obtained the name of Flavia Neapolis, 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. [1909]Although not only in the New Testament, but in 1 Macc. x.30, and in the writings of Josephus, [1910] Western Palestine is divided into the provinces of Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee, the Rabbis, whose ideas were shaped by the observances of Judaism, ignore this division. For them Palestine consisted only of Judæa, Peræa, and Galilee. [1911] Samaria appears merely as a strip intervening between Judæa and Galilee, being the land of the Cuthæans.' [1912] Nevertheless, it was not regarded like heathen lands, but pronounced clean. Both the Mishnah [1913] and Josephus [1914] mark Anuath ({hebrew}) as the southern boundary of Samaria (towards Judæa). Northward it extended to Ginæa (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 Judæa. 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 Judæa, 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 jealously. 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. [1915] 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. [1916] We also read that they tried to desecrate the Temple on the eve of the Passover; [1917] and that they waylaid

and killed pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem. [1918] 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 candour 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 [1919]) has, to avoid the censorship of the press, been often purposely substituted for Sadducees,' or heretics,' i.e. Christians. [1920] Thus, when [1921] 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' ({hebrew}) for stranger' ({hebrew}), the latter, and not strictly Samaritan descent being meant. [1922] The popular interchange of these terms casts light on the designation of the Samaritan as a stranger' by our Lord in St. Luke xvii.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 characterised the Samaritans as the foolish people' which his heart abhorred.' [1923] 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. [1924] 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, [1925] since they were neither in practice nor in theory regarded as co-religionists. [1926] [1927] Yet they were not treated as heathens, and their land, their springs, baths, houses, and roads were declared clean. [1928]The question was discussed, whether or not they were to be considered lion-proselytes' (from fear of the lions), or as genuine converts; [1929] and, again, whether or not they were to be regarded as heathens. [1930] 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, [1931] 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; [1932] whilst later authority (Rabbi Jehuda the Holy) would have them considered and treated as heathens. Again, it is expressly stated in the Babylon Talmud, [1933] 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. [1934] 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 a dove, [1935] 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 [1936] 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,' [1937] finds its exact counterpart [1938] in this: May I never set eyes on a Samaritan;' or else, May I never be thrown into company with him!' A Rabbi in Cæsarea 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. [1939] Matters proceeded so far, that they were entirely excluded from fellowship. [1940] The extreme limit of this direction, [1941] if, indeed, the statement applies to the Samaritans, [1942] 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, [1943] 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. [1944] 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 [1945] 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; [1946] their bread [1947] 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. [1948] 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. [1949] Nevertheless, Samaritan sages' are referred to. [1950] 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, [1951] from whom the Fathers have copied the charge. [1952] Certainly, they hold that doctrine at present. They strongly believed in the Unity of God; they held the doctrine of Angels and devils; [1953] they received the Pentateuch as of sole Divine authority; [1954] 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. [1955] [1956] 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 VIII. JESUS AT THE WELL OF SYCHAR

(St. John iv.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, [1957] which Jacob had brought from the people of the land, the patriarch had, at great labour 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. [1958] 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. [1959] At the Well of Jacob' which, for our present purpose, may be regarded as the centre 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 Farâh, which debouches into the Jordan. We can trace it as it crosses the waters of that Wady, and we infer, that its immediate neighbourhood must have been the scene where Jesus had taught, and His disciples baptized. It is still in Judæa, and yet sufficiently removed from Jerusalem; and the Wady is so full of springs that one spot near it actually bears the name of 'Ainûn, springs,' like the ancient Ænon. 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 neighbouring Sychar. And it was, as we judge, the evening of a day in early summer, [1960] when Jesus, accompanied by the small band which formed His disciples, [1961] 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. [1962] More than any other, perhaps, in the Fourth Gospel, it bears the mark, not only of Judæan, 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, [1963] which in the fourth century at least had so entirely ceased to be Samaritan, that it had become the home of some celebrated Rabbis; [1964] 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 unintendingly (for He had not even entered Sychar) beginning to teach, and that, what He could not yet teach in Judæa, scarcely even to His own disciples; then the complete change in the woman, and the misapprehension [1965] and non-reception [1966] 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 [1967] 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, [1968] 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 Judæan Gospel, characterised 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, [1969] when the travel-stained pilgrims reached that parcel of ground' which, according to ancient Jewish tradition, Jacob had given to his son Joseph. [1970] 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, [1971] that the glory of His Divine Personality suddenly shines through it. This time it was a poor, ignorant Samaritan woman, [1972] 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 Judæa. 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. [1973] Even if He had not spoken, the Samaritaness would have recognised the Jew by His appearance [1974] and dress, if, as seems likely, He wore the fringes on the border of His garment. [1975] His speech would, by its pronunciation, place His nationality beyond doubt. [1976] 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,' [1977] 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 Saviour 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 colouring, He ever sees the supernatural, even as the light lies in varying hues on the mountain, or glows in changeful colouring 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 materialised 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 labour, 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, [1978] in significant contrast to water accumulated in a cistern. [1979] 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, [1980] 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,' [1981] 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 Ecclus. xxiv.21): They that drink me shall yet be thirsty.' [1982] More closely related to the words of Christ is it, when we read [1983] of a fountain of wisdom;' while, in the Targum on Cant. iv.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. [1984] But the saying of our Lord to the Samaritaness referred 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. [1985] 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 civilising 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 [1986] a touch of irony,' while, on the other hand, it seems an exaggeration to regard them simply as the cry of realised 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 Saviour'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 [1987] and her after-reference to it [1988] 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 Judæa 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 Saviour 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. [1989] 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 recognised 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. [1990] 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 Saviour 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. [1991] 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, [1992] 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 [1993] 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. [1994] 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 centre. 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, [1995] 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, realising 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.' [1996] 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' [1997] - for, of the Jews, as concerning the flesh,' was Christ to come. [1998] 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' [1999] - and only worship in spirit and in truth could be acceptable to such a God. Higher or more Christlike 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. [2000] 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 Judæa, 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 Judæan notions of a Rabbi, [2001] 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 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. [2002] Under this impression they went out of the City, and came on their way towards Him.' [2003] [2004]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. [2005]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 [2006]) 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, [2007] 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 then 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, [2008] that Christ returned from Judæa 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' [2009] 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 [2010] 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 labour. 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 [what she said] 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 [2011] do we believe. For we ourselves have heard, and know, that this is truly the Saviour of the world.' [2012]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 Saviour of the world.

CHAPTER IX. THE SECOND VISIT TO CANA - CURE OF THE NOBLEMAN'S' SON AT CAPERNAUM.

(St. Matt. iv.12; St. Mark i.14; St. Luke iv.14, 15; St. John iv.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.' [2013] 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. [2014] Accordingly, this circumstance is specially marked by St. Matthew, [2015] and by St. Mark, [2016] 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. [2017] 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, [2018] 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. [2019] But here also - as Eusebius had already noted [2020] - 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 Judæa, he joins this departure from Judæa 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. [2021] We therefore follow his guidance, simply noting that the various stages of this Galilean residence should be grouped as follows: Cana, [2022] Nazareth, [2023] and Capernaum, with general itineration from that centre. [2024] 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.' [2025] 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 [2026] only took place after the unnamed feast;' that, indeed, they had probably returned to their homes and ordinary occupations when Jesus went to Nazareth, [2027] 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, [2028] and also that He made a longer stay in Capernaum. [2029] When Jesus returned to Galilee, it was in circumstances entirely different from those under which He had left it. As He Himself said, [2030] there had, perhaps naturally, been prejudices connected with the

humbleness of His upbringing, and the familiarity engendered by knowledge [2031] 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, [2032] 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 gladsome 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 [2033] It appears that the son of one of Herod Antipas' officers, either civil or military, [2034] 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. [2035] 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 coloured 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 favours; while he (the failing Rabbi) was like a lord before the King,' who would not be accorded mere favours, 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 [2036] 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 Saviour 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. [2037] 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,' [2038] presently to find his faith both crowned and perfected. [2039] 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. [2040] 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. [2041] Critics have noticed marked divergences in almost every detail of the two narratives, [2042] which some - both orthodox and negative interpreters - have so strangely represented as only different presentations of one and the same event. [2043] 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 Saviour in the one instance reprove as the requirement of sight, which by itself could only produce a transitory faith, that which in the other He marvelled 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, [2044] 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 Saviour 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 [2045] 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. [2046] 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. [2047] 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;' [2048] [2049] and, lastly, that when the court-official' applied to Jesus. The two latter events were evidently contemporaneous. [2050] 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 unsurmountable difficulties. [2051] 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. [2052] 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, [2053] 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, [2054] and thence to absolute faith in Him, [2055] 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 X. THE SYNAGOGUE AT NAZARETH - SYNAGOGUE-WORSHIP AND ARRANGEMENTS.

(St. Luke iv.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. [2056] Once more it sounded through the still summer-air, to tell all, that work must be laid aside. [2057] 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 honoured, 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, [2058] 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, [2059] and the Rabbinic attempts to trace them even to

patriarchal times [2060] 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' (Battey 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. [2061] 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 utilised to afford the country-people, who lived far from the Synagogues, opportunities for worship; [2062] 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 [2063] 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. [2064] 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. [2065] 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. [2066] 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, [2067] 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 neighbours, or on private munificence. If this failed, they might meet for worship in a private dwelling, a sort of Synagogue in the house.' [2068] 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 [2069] passage in the Talmud, [2070] this seems to have been the case in Persia, while a later notice [2071] appeals in support of it to Prov. viii.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. [2072] Hence, the inference, that the Galilean Synagogues lately excavated cannot date from an early period, because they are not in prominent positions, is erroneous. [2073] 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, [2074] or men of leisure, who could devote their time to the Synagogue worship and administration. [2075] This was proved by the consideration, that common worship implied a congregation, which, according to Jewish Law, must consist of at least ten men. [2076] 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 Ezek. viii.16. [2077] 2ndly. The prevailing direction in Palestine was towards the west, as in the Temple. Thus, we read [2078] 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, [2079] 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. [2080] The so-called Ark' would be at the south end; the seats for the elders and honourable in front of it, facing the people, and with their back to the Ark. [2081] Here two pillars are wanting in the Synagogue at Capernaum. The lectern of the reader would be in the centre, 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 Therapeutæ; [2082] but there is no indication that the practice prevailed in the Synagogues, or in Palestine. figure 3 Figure 3a.We can now, with the help given by recent excavations, from 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 mouldings 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 9½ feet. [2083] 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; [2084] 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. [2085] 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), [2086] but chiefly the Tebhah, Ark. [2087] It was made movable, so that it might be carried out, as on public fasts. [2088] Steps generally led up to it (the Darga 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. [2089] Right before the Ark, and facing the people, are the seats of honour, for the rulers of the Synagogue and the honourable. [2090] 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. [2091] In the middle of the Synagogue (so generally) is the Bima, [2092] or elevation, on which there is the Luach, or desk, [2093] from which the Law is read. This is also called the Kurseya, chair, or throne, [2094] or Kissé, 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. [2095] 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. [2096] However, the Synagogue must not be made a thoroughfare. We must not behave lightly in it. [2097] 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. [2098] 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, &c. 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. [2099]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. [2100] 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; [2101] 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, [2102] 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 (Zeqenim), or rulers (rchontes), whose chief is the Archisynagogos, or Rosh ha-Keneseth. These are the rulers (Parnasim) or shepherds (poimnes). There can be no question (from the inscriptions on the Jewish tombstones in Rome), [2103] that the Archisynagogos [2104] 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. [2105] 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. [2106] Sometimes the office was held by regular teachers. [2107]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, [2108] 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, [2109] the person who read in the Synagogue the portion from the Prophets, was also expected to conduct the devotions, at least in greater part. [2110] 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, [2111] so arranged, as the Mishnah notes, [2112] 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 Saviour, and the Saviour 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 Saviour to their children's children, for His own Name's sake, in love. O King, Helper, Saviour, 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 fulfillest 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 [2113] 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. [2114] 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. [2115] But gradually, and especially after the insertion of the well-known prayer against the heretics or rather Christian converts (Eulogy XI. [2116]), the present order of the eighteen Eulogies (Amidah) seems to have been established. Both the Jerusalem [2117] and the Babylon Talmud [2118] contain much on this subject which is of very great interest. [2119]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 Shekhinah 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 [2120] (in the Temple above the head). This was called the lifting up of hands. [2121] In the Synagogue the priestly blessing was spoken in three sections, the people each time responding by an Amen. [2122] Lastly, in the Synagogue, the word Adonai' was substituted for Jehovah. [2123] [2124] If no descendants of Aaron were present, the leader of the devotions repeated the usual priestly benediction. [2125] 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, [2126] 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. [2127] It is a curious statement, that priests from certain cities in Galilee were not allowed to speak the words of blessing, because their pronunciation of the gutturals was misleading. [2128] According to the Jerusalem Talmud, [2129] 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. [2130] On the other hand, strict sobriety was insisted on 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 (têq, 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. [2131] No doubt, there was even in ancient times a lectionary, though certainly not that presently in use, which occupies exactly a year. [2132] On the contrary, the Palestinian lectionary occupied three [2133] or, according to some, three and a half years, [2134] 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. [2135] [2136] According to the Talmud, [2137] a descendant of Aaron was always called up first to the reading; [2138] then followed a Levite, and afterwards five ordinary Israelites. As this practice, as well as that of priestly benediction, [2139] 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, [2140] the so-called Haphtarah. [2141] 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, [2142] 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, [2143] and translated into the Aramæan verse by verse, and in the section from the Prophets, or Haphtarah, after every three verses. [2144] 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. [2145] 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. [2146] 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 Aramæan, 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.' [2147]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, [2148] 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. [2149] 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. [2150] The Targum Jonathan assumes the practice in the time of the Judges; [2151] the men of the Great Synagogue are, of course, credited with it, and Shemayah and Abhtalyon are expressly designated as preachers.' [2152] 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 [2153] and Philo. [2154] 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, [2155] 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 Christianisation 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 neighbouring Synagogue to hear the declamations of some shallow popular Haggadist. [2156] 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. [2157] 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. [2158] For, was it not to carry out the spirit of Hos. vi.3; xi.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.' [2159] However, more unworthy motives sometimes influenced some of the audience, and a Talmudic passage [2160] 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, [2161] 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. [2162] [2163] 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. [2164] 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. [2165] But this, or the full discussion of a single text [2166] ({hebrew}, 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, [2167] but in illustration of Scripture. [2168] 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. [2169]If such licence 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. [2170] 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 favourite 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 honour 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 depreciatory and caustic remarks, which not unfrequently occur, as to the manners, tone, vanity, self-conceit, and silliness of the Amora [2171] [2172] who, as he stood beside the Rabbi, thought far more of attracting attention and applause to himself, then of benefitting his hearers. Hence some Rabbis would only employ special and trusted interpreters of their own, who were above fifty years of age. [2173] 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 XI. THE FIRST GALILEAN MINISTRY.

(St. Matt. iv.13-17; St. Mark i.14, 15; St. Luke iv.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, [2174] 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.' [2175] It is difficult to understand how, either on historical grounds, or after study of the character of Christ, the idea could have arisen [2176] 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. Realising 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 realise - 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, [2177] and that it included the passage [2178] quoted by the Evangelist as read by the Lord Jesus. [2179] We know that the rolls' on which the Law was written were distinct from those of the Prophets; [2180] 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, [2181] 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, [2182] the Haphtarah ordinarily consisted of not less than twenty-one verses, [2183] 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 (Is. lxi.1), together with a clause from Is. lviii.6, [2184] and the first clause of Is. lxi.2. 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 [2185]) from the rendering of the LXX. But, on investigation, it appears that one clause is omitted from Is. lxi.1, [2186] and that between the close of Is. lxi.1 and the clause of verse 2, which is added, a clause is inserted from the LXX. of Is. lviii.6. [2187] 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 favourite mode of teaching - the Charaz - or stringing, like pearls, passage to passage, illustrative of each other. [2188] 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 Is. lxi.1, and the insertion of another adapted from Is. lviii.6, were evidently intentional. It might be presumptuous to attempt stating the reasons which may have influenced the Saviour 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 Is. lxi.1, 2, as one of the three passages, [2189] in which mention of the Holy Ghost was connected with the promised redemption. [2190] 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 bruised; 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 unrealised, 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 listed to, [2191] 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 neighbour. 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.' [2192] 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; [2193] 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 favoured in the ministry of Elijah and of Elisha. [2194] 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. [2195] This, with the unspoken intention of crowding Him over the cliff, [2196] which there rises abruptly about forty feet out of the valley beneath. [2197] If we are correct in indicating the locality, the road here bifurcates, [2198] 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. [2199] 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. [2200] Cast out of His own city, Jesus pursued His solitary way towards Capernaum. [2201] 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. [2202] Here He would, on the Sabbath-days, preach in that Synagogue, of which the good centurion was the builder, [2203] and Jairus the chief ruler. [2204] 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 neighbourhood, 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, [2205] it would seem that, after the return of Jesus from Judæa 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 neighbourhood.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. [2206] 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, [2207] 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.' [2208] Others [2209] 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, [2210] 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: [2211] To them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up.'

CHAPTER XII. AT THE UNKNOWN' FEAST IN JERUSALEM, AND BY THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

(St. John v.) The shorter days of early autumn had come, [2212] 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. [2213] 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 centre 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. [2214] [2215] Others [2216] have come to the same conclusion from the meagreness 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. [2217] 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.' [2218] 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. [2219] In that case, most probability would attach to the identification of the Pool Bethesda with a pool somewhat north of the so-called Birket Israîl. 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 Aramæan - 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 ({hebrew}, Delitzsch), House of Porches,' and Beth Zeytha (Westcott) House of the Olive' - seem all unsatisfactory. More probability attaches to the rendering Beth Asutha (Wünsche), 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 Aramaised. Here two different derivations suggest themselves. The root-word of Esda might either express to become well' - Beth sthai - or something akin to the Rabbinic Zit [2220] ({hebrew}=zthi). 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 Aramaised form derived from the Greek word zo, to boil' or bubble up' (subst. zsis); 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, [2221] 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. [2222] But the words in verse 4 of our Authorised Version, and perhaps, also, the last clause of verse 3, are admittedly an interpolation. [2223] In another part of this book it is explained at length, [2224] how Jewish belief at the time attached such agency to Angels, and how it localised (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' (plthos tn sthenonton), 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. Matt. viii.17 and St. Mark vi.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. [2225] 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, [2226] 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. [2227] 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? [2228] 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! [2229] 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, [2230] 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. [2231] 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? [2232] 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. [2233] 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 labour on a Sabbath, such as what infringed its sacred rest or what constituted a burden, multitudes of them who laboured 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 laboured 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. [2234]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, [2235] 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.' [2236]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 neighbouring 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 Saviour of the world. And so the miracles, as we mistakingly 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 Saviour 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 [2237] 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, [2238] and not merely in the sense which the Jews attached to it [2239] - 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. [2240] 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 Saviour 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 vigour, gathered, himself up and rolled together his coverlet to hasten after Him, Jesus had already withdrawn. [2241] [2242] 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 Saviour. For he believed Him, [2243] and therefore trusted in Him, that He must be right; and so, trusting without questioning, be 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 labour of moving the sick into the waters of Bethesda would have been unlawful, unless there had been present danger to life, [2244] 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,' [2245] 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 realised 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. [2246] And in this He also taught, what the Jews had never understood, the true meaning of the Sabbath-Law, by emphasising 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 40

CHAPTER XIII. BY THE SEA OF GALILEE - THE FINAL CALL OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES, AND THE MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISHES

(St. Matt. iv.18-22; St. Mark i.16-20; St. Luke v.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, sophistical, 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, [2247] 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. Mark i.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, [2248] and they stood by the shore, or in the boats drawn up on the beach, casting in their nets to wash' them [2249] 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. [2250] And as fish was among the favourite 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; [2251] a kind of relish' or sauce was made of them, and the roe also prepared. [2252] or twine, [2253] 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 flavour 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. [2254] [2255] It is one of their usual exaggerations, when we read of 300 different kinds of fish at a dinner given to a great Rabbi, [2256] although the common proverb had it, to denote what was abundant, that it was like bringing fish to Acco.' [2257] Besides, fish was also largely imported from abroad. [2258] It indicates the importance of this traffic, that one of the gates of Jerusalem was called the fish-gate.' [2259] Indeed, there is a legend [2260] to the effect, that not less than 600,000 casks of sardines

were every week supplied for the fig-dressers of King Jannæus. 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. [2261] 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 ({hebrew}, 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. Mark i.16, it was Christ's first walk by the Lake on the morning after His return from Judæa. 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. [2262] 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. [2263] 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, [2264] 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. [2265] 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 [2266] 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 laboured 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 Saviour, 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.' [2267]

CHAPTER XIV. A SABBATH IN CAPERNAUM

(St. Matt. viii 14-17; St. Mark i.21-34; St. Luke iv.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, [2268] 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. [2269] 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. [2270] And when we find the same word to describe the impression of the Sermon on the Mount,' [2271] 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, [2272] 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 demonised.' [2273] Similarly, it seems a strange inaccuracy on the part of commentators to exclude from the Gospel, of St. John all notice of the demonised.' That the Fourth Gospel, although not reporting any healing of the demonised, shares the fundamental view of the Synoptists, appears not only from St. John vii.20, viii.48, 52, but especially from viii.49 and x.20, 21. [2274] 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 demonised,' 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 demonised?' 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 demonised 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,' [2275] and that, when the disciples afterwards reported their success in this, Christ actually made it a matter of thanksgiving to God. [2276] The same view underlies His reproof to the disciples, when failing in this part of their work; [2277] while in St. Luke xi.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 demonised.' [2278] Our next inquiry must be as to the character of the phenomenon thus designated. In view of the fact that in St. Mark ix.21, the demonised 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 paralysed would not have been described as demonised,' 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 demonised 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 demonised, but the demoniser, just as in certain mesmeric states the consciousness of the mesmerised 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. [2279] 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. [2280] or in the Apocrypha, [2281] nor, for that matter in the Mishnah, [2282] 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. [2283] The references in heathen or in Christian writings posterior to those of the New Testament lie beyond our present inquiry. [2284] 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. [2285] 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, &c.); 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 demonished 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 demonised.' 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 demonised 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 demonised, 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 demonised' 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 demonised might have shaken themselves free from the overshadowing power, or sought release from it. Thus the demonised state involved personal responsibility, although that of a diseased and disturbed consciousness. In one respect those who were demonised' 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 demonised, though one which could scarcely have been anticipated. For, there is authority for inserting the word straightway' [2286] 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? [2287] Thou art come to destroy us! [2288] 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 demonised, at least in so far that there is no longer confusion between him and his tormenter, and the latter speaks in his own name. One stronger than the demon had affected the higher part in the demonised. 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 [2289] 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. [2290] Each turned to his neighbour with the inquiry: What is this? A new doctrine with authority! And He commandeth the unclean spirits, and they obey Him.' [2291] 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 coloured 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 Saviour, 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,' [2292] 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 ({hebrew} 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 Exod. iii.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. [2293] 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 [2294] 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 [2295] 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 neighbour 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. [2296] 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 neighbourhood 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, solemnised, 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 Restoror 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.' [2297] 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 Saviour 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. [2298] 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 XV. SECOND JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE - THE HEALING OF THE LEPER.

(St. Matt. iv.23; viii.2-4; St. Mark i.35-45; St. Luke iv.42-44; v.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. [2299] 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, [2300] and bade His Apostles look for higher and better things than power over all diseases or even over evil spirits. [2301] [2302] 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,' [2303] Jesus rose up, and went into a solitary place to pray. The use of the same expression [2304] in St. Mark xiii.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 [2305] - 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 realise 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, [2306] 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 accordantly 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. [2307] 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, [2308] 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,' [2309] 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 dishevelled, [2310] and the lower part of his face and his upper lip covered, [2311] 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, [2312] and forebade their entering not only the Temple or Jerusalem, but any walled city, [2313] 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. [2314] 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, [2315] since, evidently, infection would have been most likely to spread in such circumstances. [2316] It has already been stated, that Rabbinism confessed itself powerless in presence of this living death. Although, as Michaelis rightly suggests, [2317] 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. [2318] 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. [2319] 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 [2320] - that the poor sufferer only asked of Jesus to declare, not to make, him clean. [2321] 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, [2322] 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 Saviour. 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 Is. liii.4. [2323] [2324] We need not here enumerate the various symptoms, by which the Rabbinic law teaches us to recognise true leprosy. [2325] Any one capable of it might make the medical inspection, although only a descendant of Aaron could formally pronounce clean or unclean. [2326] Once declared leprous, the sufferer was soon made to feel the utter heartlessness of Rabbinism. To banish him outside walled towns [2327] may have been a necessity, which, perhaps, required to be enforced by the threatened penalty of forty stripes save one. [2328] 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. [2329] For, from the symbolism and connection between the physical and the psychical, [2330] 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, [2331] 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' ({hebrew}). 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. [2332] 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 provisions 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, [2333] and everything in it, to the beams of the roof. [2334] 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;' [2335] the sick is not healed, till all his sins are forgiven him.' [2336] 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.' [2337] [2338] But their real unspirituality appears most clearly, when we remember how special diseases were traced to particular sins. Thus, [2339] 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. [2340] And even such sentiments in regard to sufferings [2341] are immediately followed by such cynical declarations on the part of Rabbis so afflicted, as that they loved neither the chastisement, nor its reward. [2342] 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 Prov. xix.29. [2343] [2344] Eleven sins are mentioned [2345] which bring leprosy, among them pre-eminently those of which the tongue is the organ. [2346] 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. [2347] No one was even to salute him; his bed was to be low, inclining towards the ground. [2348] 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. [2349] [2350] 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. [2351] 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 Saviour had made upon the people. He would have fled from a Rabbi; he came in lowliest 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, [2352] have

sent the healed man away - as the term bears, cast him out.' [2353] 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 Saviour'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. [2354] 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 recognised miracle, to which He might afterwards appeal. Not to speak of the un-Christlikeness 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 quiet 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. [2355] 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. [2356] 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, [2357] and by inciting against Him even the prejudices and doubts of the half-enlightened followers of His own Forerunner. [2358] 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 XVI. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM - CONCERNING THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS - THE HEALING OF THE PARALYSED

(St. Matt. ix.1-8; St. Mark ii.1-12; St. Luke v.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, [2359] 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 [2360] 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 v., which is unconfirmed by any of the Synoptists, we strengthen not only the evidence in favour 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, [2361] that in forgiving sins Jesus blasphemed by making Himself equal with God, has its exact counterpart in the similar charge against Him in St. John v.18, which kindled in them the wish to kill Jesus. Secondly, as in that case the final reply of Jesus pointed to the authority' (xousa) which the Father had given Him for Divine administration on earth, [2362] so the healing of the paralytic was to show the Scribes that He had authority' (xousa) [2363] 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,' [2364] are to the very letter the same [2365] which are recorded [2366] 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. [2367] 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. [2368] 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, [2369] 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 Saviour, as to fill its limited space to over flowing, 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 Judæa, 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 realise the scene. We can picture to ourselves the Saviour 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, [2370] we feel it difficult to be sure of the exact place which the Saviour occupied on this occasion. Meetings for religious study and discussion were certainly held in the Aliyah or upper chamber. [2371] But, on many grounds, such a locale seems utterly unsuited to the requirements of the narrative. [2372] Similar objections attach to the idea, that it was the front room of one of those low houses occupied by the poor. [2373] 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 honoured 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. [2374] 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 [2375] 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, [2376] while that of a large house is computed at about 91. a year, [2377] and that of a courtyard at about 14s. a year. [2378] 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 paralysed 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,' [2379] 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 paralysed - 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 Saviour spake to him were: Be of good cheer.' [2380] 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,' [2381] alike in connection with the salt which rendered the sacrifices meet for the altar, [2382] and sufferings, [2383] which did the like for the soul by cleansing away sin. [2384] We can readily believe, as the recorded experience of the Rabbis shows, [2385] 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. [2386] 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.' [2387] 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, [2388] which was open and known to Him Who readeth all thoughts, [2389] 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 honoured of God's servants? Man, indeed; but the Son of Man' [2390] 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 XVII. THE CALL OF MATTHEW - THE SAVIOUR'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. Matt. ix.9-13; St. Mark ii.13-17; St. Luke v.27-32; St. Matt. x.2-4;St. Mark iii.13-19; St. Luke vi.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. Matthew ix.13, and St. Mark ii.17, [2391] 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. [2392] 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;' [2393] 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.' [2394] On this ground the punishment of infidelity or apostasy in the next world was endless, while that of actual transgressions was limited in duration. [2395] [2396] 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. [2397] 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. [2398] 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 [2399] of the saying which conjoined the Law and repentance, and represented them as preceding the Creation. [2400] Another would seem derived from a kind of Manichaean view of sin. According to it, God Himself was really the author of the Yetser haRa, or evil impulse [2401] (the law in our members'), for which, indeed, there was an absolute necessity, if the world was to continue. [2402] [2403] 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. [2404] Thus it came, that the true penitent really occupied a higher place, stood where the perfectly righteous could not stand.' [2405] 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,' [2406] 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, [2407] and, again, if all Israel repented for only one day; [2408] or, to put it otherwise - if Israel were all saints, or all sinners. [2409] 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. [2410] 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; [2411] 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 ({hebrew}), return;' while, in the New Testament, it is change of mind' (metanoia). It would not be fair here to argue, that the common expression for repenting was

to do penitence' ({hebrew}), since by its side we frequently meet that other: to return in penitence' ({hebrew}). Indeed, other terms for repentance also occur. Thus Tohu ({hebrew}) 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' ({hebrew}) 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 realised, 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. [2412] 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, [2413] death, [2414] or the Day of Atonement. [2415] Besides these, there were always the merits of the fathers;' [2416] or, perhaps, some one good work done; [2417] or, at any rate, the brief period of purgatorial pain, which might open the gate of mercy. These are the so-called advocates' (Peraqlitin, {hebrew}) of the penitent sinner. In a classical passage on the subject, [2418] repentance is viewed in its bearing on four different spiritual [2419] conditions, which are supposed to be respectively referred to in Jer. iii.22; Lev. xvi.30; Is. xxii.14; and Ps. lxxxix.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. [2420] But the nature of repentance has yet to be more fully explained. Its gate is sorrow and shame. [2421] In that sense repentance may be the work of a moment, as in the twinkling of an eye,' [2422] and a life's sins may obtain mercy by the tears and prayers of a few minutes' repentance. [2423] [2424] 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.' [2425] By the side of what may be called contrition, Jewish theology places confession (Viddui, {hebrew}). This was deemed so integral a part of repentance, that those about to be executed, [2426] or to die, [2427] were admonished to it. Achan of old had thus obtained pardon. [2428] 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 this Psalm, [2429] It is a good thing to confess

[2430] unto the Lord.' [2431] [2432] Manasseh, when in trouble, called upon God and was heard, [2433] 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. [2434] Similarly, even Pharaoh, who, according to Jewish tradition, made in the Red Sea confession of God, [2435] 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. [2436] But, after all, inward repentance only arrested the decrees of justice. [2437] 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, [2438] as an offering to God, similar to, but better than the fat of sacrifices on the altar, [2439] and as preventing further sins by chastening and keeping under the body. [2440] A similar view must be taken of self-inflicted penances. [2441] [2442] 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.' [2443] [2444] Nay, it must be of even more than was due in strict law. [2445] 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, [2446] but aim at doing all the more in the opposite direction, or of overcoming sin in the same circumstances of temptation. [2447] Beyond all this were the really good works, whether occupation with the Law [2448] or outward deeds, which constituted perfect repentance. Thus we read, [2449] 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 [2450] 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. [2451] 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. [2452] 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. [2453] 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 favoured district, when Jesus went forth again by the seaside.' And with this, as we shall see, best agrees the succession of afterevents.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. [2454] 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, [2455] and of several Rabbis. [2456] It is perhaps of more interest, that the Talmud [2457] names five as the disciples of Jesus, and among them these two whom we can clearly identify: Matthew [2458] and Thaddæus. [2459]Sitting before [2460] 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 neighbourhood, but also for those who would then strike the great road of Eastern commerce, which led from Damascus to the harbours of the West. Touching the Lake in that very neighbourhood, 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 Judæa 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 Cæsar, 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 antinationalism. 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 defense 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 witness-bearing, because they exacted more than was due.' [2461] Hence also it was said, that repentance was specially difficult for tax-gatherers and custom-house officers. [2462] [2463]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. [2464] 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, harbour-dues, town-dues, &c. 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 licences, 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 2½ to 5, and on articles of luxury to even 12½ 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 favour, and exacting from those who were not their favourites. They were a criminal race, to which Lev. xx.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 favour 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. [2465] That there was ground for such rigour, appears from such an occurrence, [2466] 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, [2467] or a person pass his slave as his son. [2468]The Mokhes was called great' [2469] if he employed substitutes, and small' if he stood himself at the receipt of custom. Till the time of Cæsar 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 Cæsar, the taxes of Judæa were no longer farmed, but levied by publicans in Judæa, and paid directly to the Government, the officials being appointed by the provincials themselves. [2470] [2471] 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 [2472] even the changing of money from the guilt-laden chest of a Mokhes, or douanier, the Gemara [2473] 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. [2474] On heathen feast days toll was remitted to those who came to the festival. [2475] Sometimes this was also done from kindness. [2476] 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 honour 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. [2477]What has been described in such detail, will cast a peculiar light on the call of Matthew by the Saviour 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.' [2478] 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 shipowners 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,' [2479] 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 Rabbinists 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, [2480] 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 [2481] 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!' [2482] 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 [2483] - 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

[2484] to His own mode of viewing and treating the Sabbath-question. [2485] 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.' [2486] 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 [2487] 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. [2488] 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, [2489] 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 Alphæus or Clopas. [2490] [2491] 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, Thaddæus - 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.' [2492] In that case both Lebbæus and Thaddæus 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. [2493] Thus his real name would have been Judas Lebbæus, and his surname Thaddæus. Closely connected with these two we have in all the Gospels, Simon, surnamed Zelotes or Cananæan (not Canaanite), both terms indicating his original connection with the Galilean Zealot party, the Zealots for the Law.' [2494] His position in the Apostolic Catalogue, and the testimony of Hegesippus, [2495] seem to point him out as the son of Clopas, and brother of James, and of Judas Lebbæus. 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. [2496] Lastly,

we have Judas Iscariot, or Ish Kerioth, a man of Kerioth,' a town in Judah. [2497] Thus the betrayer alone would be of Judæan 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.' [2498]

CHAPTER XVIII. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT - THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST AND RABBINIC TEACHING.

(St. Matt. v.-vii.) 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. [2500] [2501] 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, [2502] 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. Luke vi.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 unrealised 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 Judæa, comes to us in Palistinian 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 [2503] 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. [2504] On the other hand, even in accordance with the traditional characterisation of St. Matthew's narrative, we expect in it the fullest account of our Lord's Discourses, [2505] while we also notice that His Galilean Ministry forms the main subject of the First Gospel. [2506] 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 characterise 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, &c. 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, [2507] 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 labour 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. [2508] 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, [2509] 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 [2510] 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 realisation of that Law which, by the Spirit, is written on the fleshly tables of the heart. [2511] These Ten Commandments in the Old Covenant were preceded by a Prologue. [2512] The ten Beatitudes have, characteristically, not a Prologue but an Epilogue, [2513] 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. [2514] 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 Exod. xxi. and xxii.This closes the first part of the Sermon on the Mount.' The second part is contained in St. Matt. vi. 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. [2515] 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 realise 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. [2516] It is, moreover, absolute and undivided

self-dedication to God. [2517] 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. [2518] 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. [2519] Secondly, it cannot be extended, as you would do it, by external means, [2520] but cometh to us from God, [2521] and is entered by personal determination and separation. [2522] Thirdly, it is not preached, as too often is attempted, when thoughts of it are merely of the external. [2523] 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. [2524] 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. [2525]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. [2526] 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 [2527] 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 [2528] on the part of Rabbi Joshua, who compares the reward ({hebrew}) formerly given to him who brought one or another offering to the Temple with that of him who is of a lowly mind ({hebrew}), to whom it is reckoned as if he had brought all the sacrifices. To this the saying of the great Hillel [2529] seems exactly parallel: My humility is my greatness, and my greatness my humility,' which, be it observed, is elicited by a Rabbinic accommodation of Ps. cxiii., 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, summarise the opening pages of the Talmudic tractate on Idolatry. [2530] 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. xix.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 Ps.1xxvi.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, &c. 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 Ps. ii.3. And it is in this manner that Rabbinism looked for the fulfilment of those words in Ps. ii.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 apostatise in the war of Gog and Magog, when again Ps. ii.4 would be realised: 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. [2531] 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. [2532] Similarly, Rabbinism speaks of the perfectly righteous ({hebrew}) 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 ({hebrew}) my sons may live, and that I may merit the world to come, behold, this is the perfectly righteous.' [2533] 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, [2534] 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, [2535] but to atone for sins. [2536] [2537] 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. [2538] 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. [2539] 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: [2540] 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, [2541] 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. iv.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. [2542] 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. Luke vi.38 should here be kept in view, as also what may be regarded as the explanatory additions in St. Matt. v.42-48.The second instance, to which it seems desirable to advert, is the supposed similarity between petitions in the Lord's Prayer [2543] 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, [2544] 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. [2545] Most painful, for example, is it [2546] to find this interpretation of Hezekiah's prayer, [2547] 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 [2548] 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 [2549] 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. [2550] Further details would lead beyond our present scope. It must suffice to indicate that such sayings as St. Matt. v.6, 15, 17, 25, 29, 31, 46, 47; vi.8, 12, 18, 22, 24, 32; vii.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 [2551] 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. [2552] 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 [2553] 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. Matt. v.17: I have come not to diminish from the Law of Moses, nor yet have I come to add to the Law of Moses.' [2554] [2555] 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, [2556] adding, that if all men in the world were gathered together to abolish the least letter in the Law, they would not succeed. [2557] Not a letter could be removed from the Law [2558] - 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). [2559] Similarly, [2560] the guilt of changing those little hooks (titles') which make the distinction between such Hebrew letters as {hebrew} and {hebrew}, {hebrew} and {hebrew}, {hebrew} and {hebrew}, is declared so great, that, if such were done, the world would be destroyed. [2561] 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,' [2562] quite corresponds to the Rabbinic appeal to those that had preceded, the Zeqenim or Rishonim. In regard to St. Matt. v.22, we remember that the term brother' applied only to Jews, while the Rabbis used to designate the ignorant [2563] - 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, [2564] 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; [2565] 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. [2566] 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."' [2567] 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' ({hebrew}). Lastly, as regards our Lord's admonition, it is mentioned [2568] as characteristic of the pious, that their yea is yea,' and their nay nay.'Passing to St. Matt. vi., 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. [2569] 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,' [2570] were genuine, it would correspond to the common Jewish ascription, from which, in all probability, it has been derived. In regard to verses 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: [2571] 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, [2572] 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 vii., 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, [2573] 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: [2574] 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, [2575] we conclude that this also was a proverbial expression. The same may be said of gathering grapes of thorns.' [2576] Similarly, the designation of pearls' (verse 6) for the valuable sayings of sages is common. To verse 11 there is a realistic parallel, [2577] 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 [2578] 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! [2579] 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, [2580] 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 sill more close parallel is that [2581] 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. Matt. vii.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.' [2582]

CHAPTER XIX. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM - HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

(St. Matt. viii.1, 5-15; St. Mark iii.20, 21; St. Luke vii.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 neighbouring Tiberias, which Herod Antipas [2583] 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. [2584] But as yet Capernaum was still exalted up to heaven.' Here was the home of that believing Court-official, whose child Jesus had healed. [2585] 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. [2586] 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, [2587] with reiterated, growing, and perhaps Orientally exaggerating details, they hastened out of their house in a neighbouring street [2588] 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' [2589] seems rather opposed to the supposition. Still less does the objection deserve serious refutation, [2590] 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 characterised 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 harmonise 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. [2591] But we may as well note, that the circumstance, that the event is passed over by St. Mark, militates against the favourite modern theory of the Gospels being derived from an original tradition (what is called the original Mark,' Ur-Marcus). [2592] 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, [2593] 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. [2594] And Rabbinic parallelism there was none. For, although a sudden cure, and at a distance, is related in connection with a Rabbi, [2595] 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 Cæsarea. [2596] 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. [2597] 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, [2598] 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 Cæsarea; 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. [2599] The circumstances, the times, the place, the very position of the man, make such suppositions rational, event 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, [2600] 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 bluffness 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 reverenced Jesus, would these scruples, from his own standpoint, increase. As the houses of Gentiles were unclean,' [2601] 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 we are led to infer that the house of the Centurion was not in Capernaum itself, but in its immediate neighbourhood, probably on the road to Tiberias. And so in St. Matt. viii.7, we read the words of our Saviour 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. [2602] 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. [2603] 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. [2604] 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 Authorised 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) [xosa, Pondus habens, ejusdem ponderis cum aliqo, pretio aequans] 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' (kans): 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. [2605] 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 realises, 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 - these blessings are 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 Is. xxv.6, had perhaps yet another and deeper meaning. As each weekly Sabbath was to be honoured 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, [2606] 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 Ps. xxiii.5.

[2607] 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, [2608] was in the valley of Hinnom, between two palm trees - lay beyond the mountains of darkness.' [2609] It was a place of darkness, [2610] to which in the day of the Lord, [2611] the Gentiles would be consigned. [2612] On the other hand, the merit of circumcision would in the day of the Messiah deliver Jewish sinners from Gehinnom. [2613] It seems a moot question, whether the expression outer darkness' [2614] [2615] 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 [2616] and the gnashing of teeth.' In Rabbinic thought the former was connected with sorrow, [2617] the latter almost always anger [2618] - 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,' [2619] or, in strictly Rabbinic language, royal children,' [2620] children of God,' of heaven,' [2621] children of the upper chamber' (the Aliyah) [2622] and of the world to come.' [2623] In fact, in their view, God had first sat down on His throne as King, when the hymn of deliverance (Ex. xv.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. [2624]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 XX. THE RAISING OF THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN - THE MEETING OF LIFE AND DEATH.

(St. Luke vii.11-17.) THAT early spring-tide in Galilee was surely the truest realisation 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. [2625] 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,' [2626] 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; [2627] 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. [2628] 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. [2629] 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. [2630] 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,' [2631] which the Rabbis regarded as fulfilling that part of the promise to Issachar: he saw the land that it was pleasant.' [2632] 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. [2633] [2634] 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, [2635] that from Talmudic and even earlier sources, [2636] 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; [2637] and then the desolate thoughts connected in the Jewish mind with childlessness. We can realise it all: how Jewish ingenuity and wisdom would resort to remedies real or magical; how the neighbours would come in with reverent step, feeling as if the very Shekhinah were unseen at the head of the pallet in that humble home; [2638] how they would whisper sayings about submission, which, when realisation 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. [2639] 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. [2640] In passionate grief the mother has rent her upper garment. [2641] The last sad offices have been rendered to the dead. The body has been laid on the ground; hair and nails have been cut, [2642] 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), [2643] 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. [2644] And now the mother was left Oneneth (moaning, lamenting) - a term which distinguished the mourning before from that after burial. [2645] 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 neighbour, or in another room, or at least with her back to the dead. [2646] Pious friends would render neighbourly 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, [2647] 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 chaunt in weird strains the lament: Alas, the lion! alas. the hero!' or similar words, [2648] while great Rabbis were wont to bespeak for themselves a warm funeral oration' (Hesped, or Hespeda). [2649] For, from the funeral oration a man's fate in the other world might be inferred; [2650] and, indeed, the honour of a sage was in his funeral oration.'

[2651] and in this sense the Talmud answers the question, whether a funeral oration is intended to honour the survivors or the dead. [2652] 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. [2653] Immediately before the dead came the women, this being peculiar to Galilee, [2654] the Midrash giving this reason of it, that woman had introduced death into the world. [2655] The body was not, as afterwards in preference, [2656] carried in an ordinary coffin of wood (Aron), if possible, cedarwood - on one occassion, at least, made with holes beneath; [2657] 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. [2658] 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. [2659] Commonly, though not in later practice, the face of the dead body was uncovered. [2660] 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. [2661] In exceptional cases we read of the use of incense, [2662] and even of a kind of libation. [2663] 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). [2664] Nor can we doubt that the ends of handles were borne by friends and neighbours, 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. [2665] 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 sympathising 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 Prov. xvii.5 was applied. [2666] 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. [2667] 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 chaunts of mourning women, [2668] accompanied by flutes and the melancholy tinkle of cymbals, perhaps by trumpets, [2669] [2670] 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 recognised her as she went before the bier, leading him to the grave whom she had brought into life. He recognised her, but she recognised 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 [2671] 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!' [2672] It was not so that Jesus spoke to those around, nor to her, but characteristically: Be not weeping.' [2673] 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, [2674] which Rabbinism, 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 [2675] 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 coloured the scene, even from the intense agitation which characterised 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? [2676] 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, [2677] that the differences between this history and the raising of the dead by Elijajh 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 [2678] - 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. [2679] 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, [2680] but to expose them to the charge of cunningly devising fables. [2681] 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 [2682] (sunkura) 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 [2683] of the felt Divine Presence, and over their souls swept the hymn of Divine praise: fear, because [2684] God had visited [2685] His people. And further and wider spread the wave - over Judæa, 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? [2686]

CHAPTER XXI. THE WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER

(St. Luke vii.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. [2687] But other indications determine our inference. The embassy of the Baptist's disciples (which will be described in another connection) [2688] 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 [2689] 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, [2690] 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, [2691] the full development of which, as already stated, prompted the Mission of the Seventy. Yet, even so, the impression left upon us by St. Matt. xi.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 labouring, [2692] 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 labours 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' [2693] to a heavy burden, and made the Will of God to them labour, weary and unaccomplishable. But, whether or not spoken at that special time, we cannot fail to recognise their special suitableness to the forgiven sinner' in the Pharisee's house, [2694] 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. [2695] 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, [2696] 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: [2697] 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 Saviour 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. [2698] 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' [2699] - 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, [2700] 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. [2701] 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? [2702] It little matters - as little as whether she had been,' or was' up to that day, a sinner,' [2703] 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 realise 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 labour 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. [2704] 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, [2705] and of the iris plant, but chiefly the mixture known in antiquity as foliatum, were largely manufactured and used in Palestine. [2706] A flask with this perfume was worn by women round the neck, and hung down below the breast (the Tselochith shel Palyeton). [2707] So common was its use as to be allowed even on the Sabbath. [2708] 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 woman. [2709] 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' [2710] His Feet. As if surprised, or else afraid to awaken His attention, or defile Him by her tears, she quickly [2711] wiped them away with the long tresses of her hair that had fallen down and touched Him, [2712] 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 [2713] 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,' [2714] given to Christ in his spoken thoughts, or the manner in which afterwards he replied to the Saviour's question by a supercilious I suppose,' or presume,' [2715] 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,' [2716] 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. [2717] But, He was more than a prophet - the Saviour 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, [2718] who would best love the creditor [2719] who had freely [2720] forgiven them? [2721] 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, [2722] were not, indeed, necessary attentions at a feast. All the more did they indicate special care, affection, and respect. [2723] 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, [2724] the Saviour 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' [2725] - 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.' [2726]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 any 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' [2727] - 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.' [2728] Our logical dogmatics would have had it: go in peace;' more truly He, into peace.' [2729] 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 XXII. THE MINISTRY OF LOVE, THE BLASPHEMY OF HATRED, AND THE MISTAKES OF EARTHLY AFFECTION - THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM - HEALING OF THE DEMONISED DUMB - PHARISAIC CHARGE AGAINST CHRIST - THE VISIT OF CHRIST'S MOTHER AND BRETHREN

(St. Luke viii.1-3; St. Matt. ix.32-35; St. Mark iii.22, &c.; St. Matt. xii.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 as 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 [2730] 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. [2731] Her designation as Magdalene was probably derived from her native city, Magdala, [2732] just as several Rabbis are spoken of in the Talmud as Magdalene' (Magdelaah, or Magdelaya [2733]). Magdala, which was a Sabbath-day's journey from Tiberias, [2734] was celebrated for its dyeworks, [2735] and its manufactories of fine woolen textures, of which eighty are mentioned. [2736] Indeed, all that district seems to have been engaged in this industry. [2737] 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. [2738] 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. [2739] But its moral corruption was also great, and to this the Rabbis attributed its final destruction. [2740] Magdala had a Synagogue. [2741] [2742] 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, [2743] 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 defence, 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. [2744] Moreover, only twenty minutes to the north of Magdala descended the so-called Valley of Doves' (the Wady Hamâm), 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 Mejdel. 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, [2745] might supply some of the dye. [2746] Such details may help us more clearly to realise 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, [2747] and then sat over against the new tomb of Joseph in which His Body was laid. [2748] And the terrible time which followed she spent with her like-minded friends, who in Galilee had ministered to Christ, [2749] in preparing those spices and ointments' [2750] which the Risen Saviour 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, [2751] 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 [2752]) must have been even more trying. She was the wife of Chuza, Herod's Steward [2753] - possibly, though not likely, the Court-official whose son Jesus had healed by the word spoken in Cana. [2754] 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 [2755] the designation ({hebrew}) [2756] seems rather used as a by-name (little pitcher') for a small, insignificant person, than as a proper name. [2757] 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. [2758] It was then, also, that the healing of the demonised dumb took place, which is recorded in St. Matt. ix.32-35, and alluded to in St. Mark iii.22-30. This narrative must, of course, not be confounded with the somewhat similar event told in St. Matt. xii.22-32, and in St. Luke xi.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, [2759] 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, [2760] to have been spoken at that later period. [2761] 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 our of the demon. Even these circumstances show that a new stage in the Messianic course had begun. It is characterised 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 it first actively 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, [2762] 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 Judæa. [2763] No doubt they reached the leaders at Jerusalem. There seems just sufficient time between this and the healing of the demonised dumb on the return-journey to Capernaum, to account for the presence there of those Pharisees, [2764] who are expressly described by St. Mark [2765] 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. [2766] Thus, in their view, it was really Satan who acted in and through Him; and Jesus, instead of being recognised 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. [2767] 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. [2768] 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.' [2769] [2770] 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. [2771] Even this circumstance shows its decisive importance. It forms a parallel to the former attempts of the Pharisees to influence the disciples of Jesus, [2772] and then to stir up the hostility of the disciples of John, [2773] 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. [2774] [2775] 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, [2776] 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. [2777] And this is ever the right relationship in the Kingdom of Heaven!THE ASCENT: FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION

CHAPTER XXIII. NEW TEACHING IN PARABLES' - THE PARABLES TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LAKE OF GALILEE, AND THOSE TO THE DISCIPLES IN CAPERNAUM

(St. Matt. xiii.1-52; St. Mark iv.1-34; St. Luke viii.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 vigour of youth. The imagery of the Sermon on the Mount' indicates that winter's rain and storms were just past. [2778] 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 [2779] deck with wondrous richness the grass of the fields - alas! so soon to wither [2780] - while all trees put forth their fragrant promise of fruit. [2781] 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 [2782] 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, [2783] [2784] 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, [2785] 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 [2786] 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, [2787] 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, [2788] 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. [2789] 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 bing primary, and the judicial only secondary. This order is reversed in the third series, consisting of eight Parables. [2790] Here the controversial has not only the ascendency 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 [2791]) 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.' [2792] 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. [2793] 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 [2794] as that by Parables. Only in their case, they were almost entirely illustrations of what had been said or taught; [2795] 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, [2796] which there is an almost literal Jewish parallel. [2797] 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 Saviour 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. [2798] 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' ({hebrew}) To what is the thing like? To one,' &c. 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. [2799] 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. [2800] 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, [2801] and even proverbial sayings, such as Physician, heal thyself,' [2802] or that about the blind leading the blind, [2803] are designated Parables. Again, the term Parable,' although used in our Authorised 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. [2804] 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, [2805] 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, [2806] about the blind leading the blind, [2807] about the forth-putting of leaves on the fig-tree; [2808] or in the parabolic proverb, Physician, heal thyself;' [2809] or in such parabolic narratives of St. John, as about the Good Shepherd, [2810] or the Vine, [2811] 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, [2812] the leaven in the meal, [2813] and the pearl of great price, [2814] 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, [2815] 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 [2816] 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 (tpos), not in the ordinary sense of that term, but in that not unfrequent in Scripture: as example - whether for imitation, [2817] or in warning. [2818] 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, [2819] the fact that Jesus spake to the people in Parables, [2820] and only in Parables, [2821] is strongly marked. It appears, therefore, to have been the first time that this mode of popular teaching was adopted by him. [2822] Accordingly, the disciples not only expressed their astonishment, but inquired the reason of this novel method. [2823] 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. [2824] 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. [2825] 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, [2826] consisted of a cumulation of Parables, without any hint as to their meaning or interpretation. [2827] 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. [2828]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 premisses, 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. [2829]Thus much in general explanation. The record of the first series of Parables [2830] 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, [2831] 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. [2832] 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 Saviour 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 [2833] 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 ({hebrew}) or by means of cattle ({hebrew} [2834]). 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, [2835] 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, [2836] 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 premisses 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. [2837] 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' [2838]), 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, [2839] 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 [2840] [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 [2841] 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, [2842] but only a degenerate kind of wheat. [2843] 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. [2844] 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 undistinguishable 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 realise 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 [2845] 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 [2846] in (upon) the midst [2847] 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.' [2848] 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, [2849] 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 Æon-completion.' [2850] 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 Æon-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.' [2851]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, [2852] 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, despised, 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 recognise 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. [2853] In fact, the expression, small as a mustard-seed,' had become proverbial, and was used, not only by our Lord, [2854] but frequently by the Rabbis, to indicate the smallest amount, such as the least drop of blood, [2855] the least defilement, [2856] or the smallest remnant of sun-glow in the sky. [2857] 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,' [2858] 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. [2859] 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' [2860] - there, or else under the shadow of it, [2861] 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, [2862] 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. [2863] Indeed, it is specifically used as an illustration of the Messianic Kingdom. [2864] 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, [2865] 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, [2866] while the Jerusalem ephah was one-fifth, and the Sepphoris (or Galilean) ephah two-fifths, or, according to another authority, one-half larger. [2867] To mix three measures' of meal was common in Biblical, as well as in later times. [2868] 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 characterisation of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Saviour 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. [2869] 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. [2870] 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. [2871] 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 [2872] 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. [2873] [2874] 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. [2875] 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 XXIV. CHRIST STILLS THE STORM ON THE LAKE OF GALILEE.

(St. Matt. viii.18, 23-27; St. Mark iv.35-41; St. Luke viii.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' [2876] - 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 [2877] 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.' [2878] 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, [2879] the miracle on its proclamations of the special Divine Manifestations in the sea; [2880] 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, [2881] or with those of impatience, perhaps uttered by Peter himself? [2882] 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, [2883] or the converse? [2884] 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, [2885] 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 [2886] 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, characterised the bearing of the Virgin-Mother. And it equally characterised 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' [2887] by the voice of His disciples, He rebuked the wind and the sea,' as Jehovah had of old [2888] - just as He had rebuked' the fever, [2889] and the paroxysm of the demonised. [2890] 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?' [2891] but Who, then, is this?' [2892] 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 [2893] 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, [2894] 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, Weiszäcker, 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 Saviour'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 recognise, not only the fullest refutation of the Pharisaic misrepresentation of the Person of Christ, but the realisation in the Ideal Man of the ideal of man as heaven-destined, [2895] and the initial fulfilment of the promise which

this destination implied. Creation' has, indeed, been made subject to vanity;' [2896] 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.' [2897] 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. [2898] And as we enter on this field of contemplation, many views open to us. The true Humanity of the Saviour, 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.THE ASCENT: FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION

CHAPTER XXV. AT GERASA - THE HEALING OF THE DEMONISED.

(St. Matt. viii.28-34; St. Mark v.1-20; St. Luke viii.26-39.) THAT day of wonders was not yet ended. Most writers have, indeed, suggested, that the healing of the demonised 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. [2899] 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.' [2900] 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 Saviour 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 demonised 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. [2901] This is the correct reading in St. Mark's, and probably in St. Luke's, perhaps also in St. Matthew's Gospel. [2902] 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 demonised. Altogether the scene forms a fitting background to the narrative. From these tombs the demonised, who is specially singled out by St. Mark and St. Luke, as well as his less prominent companion, [2903] 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. [2904] We must here remember what has previously been explained as to the confusion in the consciousness of the demonised between their own notions and the ideas imposed on them by the demons. It is quite in accordance with the Jewish notions of the demonised, 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 demonised, 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 demonised 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 demonised 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 demonised, 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 demonised 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 demonised 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 demonised 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 demonised, 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, [2905] the absence of self-control, [2906] his homicidal, [2907] and almost suicidal, [2908] frenzy, are all depicted. Evidently, it was the object to set forth the extreme degree of the demonised 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 characterised 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 demonised was drawn to Jesus, as He touched the shore at Gerasa. As always, the first effect of the contact was a fresh paroxysm, [2909] 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, [2910] 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 demonised 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 demonised, 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, who 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.' [2911] For, as immediately on the homage and protestation of the demonised: 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 demonised 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.' [2912] 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. [2913] For, it was a common Jewish idea, that, under certain circumstances, a legion of hurtful spirits' [2914] (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?' [2915] This identification of the demons with the demonised, 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 realise 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 demonised. 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 demonised, 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 Authorised Version, [2916] 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. [2917] 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 demonised, 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 demonised, and then the issue in the destruction of the herd. From the first, as they saw the demonised, 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 demonised, 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. [2918] 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 demonised - 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 realised 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 demonised humbly, earnestly entreated, that he might go with his Saviour. 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 demonised had prepared the way for Him. [2919]

CHAPTER XXVI. THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN - CHRIST'S PERSONAL APPEARANCE - THE RAISING OF JAIRUS' DAUGHTER

(St. Matt. ix.18-26; St. Mark v.21-43; St. Luke viii.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 demonised 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 unlikeliness 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 Saviour 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, [2920] 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' [2921] - and when they [2922] 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, [2923] was apparently not a common one. [2924] But these are comparatively small difficulties in the way of the mythical interpretation. Jairus, one of the Synagogue-rulers [2925] of Capernaum, had an only daughter, [2926] who at the time of this narrative had just passed childhood, and reached the period when Jewish Law declared a woman of age. [2927] 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). [2928] 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 tenour 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 neighbourhood - 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 [2929] 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. [2930] 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 [2931] 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. [2932] 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; [2933] to wear dirty clothes deserved death; [2934] for the glory of God was man, and the glory of man was his dress.' [2935] 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. [2936] [2937] 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. [2938] 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' [2939] 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. [2940] Perhaps a distinctive garment, most likely a head-gear, was worn, even by rulers' (the elder,'{hebrew}), at their ordination. [2941] The Palestinian Nasi, or President of the Sanhedrin, also had a distinctive dress, [2942] and the head of the Jewish community in Babylon a distinctive girdle. [2943] [2944] 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. [2945] 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 [2946] 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 Chaluq or under-dress, and the Aphqarsin or innermost covering. [2947] As regarded shoes, a man should sell his very roof-tree for them, [2948] although he might have to part with them for food if he were in a weak condition through blood-letting. [2949] But it was not the practice to provide more than one pair of shoes, [2950] and to this may have referred the injunction [2951] 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 far summer use. [2952] 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. [2953] 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' [2954] by with uncovered head' [2955] The ordinary covering of the head was the so-called Sudar (or Sudarimn), 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). [2956] The Sudar was twisted by Rabbis in a peculiar manner to distinguish them from others. [2957] We read besides of a sort of cap or hood attached to garments. Three, or else four articles commonly constituted the dress of the body. First came the under-grment, commonly the Chaluq of the Kittuna [2958] (The Biblical Kethoneth), from which latter some have derived the word cotton.' The Chaluq might be of linen or of wool. [2959] The sages wore it down to the feet. It was covered by the upper garment or Tallith to within about a handbreadth. [2960] The Chaluq 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 posses only one such coat' or inner garment was a mark of poverty. [2961] Hence, when the Apostles were sent on their temporary mission, they were directed not to take two coats.' [2962] 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' (chitn) corresponds. As the garment which our Lord wore, [2963] [2964] and those of which He spoke to His Apostles are designated by that name, we conclude that it represents the well-know 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, [2965] by a girdle. One kind of the latter, the Pundah or Aphundah, [2966] was provided with pockets or other receptacles, [2967] and hence might not be worn outside by those who went into the Temple, [2968] 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. [2969] [2970] 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, [2971] and that, when worn by females, it was regarded as a mark of wealth, [2972] 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 Bardesin - the modern Burnoose - upwards. The Gelima was a cloak of which the border,' or hem,' is specially mentioned ({hebrew}). [2973] The Gunda was a peculiarly Pharisaic garb. [2974] But the upper garment which Jesus wore would be either the so-called Goltha, or, most likely, the Tallith. Both the Goltha [2975] and the Tallith [2976] 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, Numb. xv.38-41; Deut. xxii.12. At first, this observance seems to have been comparatively simple. The question as to the number of filaments on these frings' 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. [2977] The Mishnah leaves it still a comparatively open question, whether these filaments were to be blue or white. [2978] But the Targum makes a strong point of it as between Moses and Korah, that there was to be a filament of hyacinth colour among four of white. [2979] It seems even to imply the peculiar symbolical mode of knotting them at present in use. [2980] Further symbolic details were, of course, added in the course of time. [2981] 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 favour 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, [2982] 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. [2983] As we know, it was without seam, woven from the top throughout;' [2984] and this closely accords with the texture of these garments. Round the middle it would be fastened with a girdle. [2985] 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. [2986] 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. [2987] There was certainly no warrant for them in Holy Scripture, and only Pharisee externalism could represent their use as fulfilling the import of Exod. xiii.9, 16; Deut. vi.8; xi.18. The admission that neither the officiating priests, nor the representatives of the people, wore them in the Temple, [2988] 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. [2989] 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 [2990] 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. [2991] 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 Saviour. 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 [2992] 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 vigour 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 realise 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.' [2993] 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. [2994]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 [2995] (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 unwilled 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' [2996] 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,' [2997] 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 Saviour, 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, [2998] 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 [2999] 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 [3000] it, as they whispered to the Ruler not to trouble the Rabbi any further, [3001] 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, [3002] 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. [3003]Within, the tumult' and weeping, the wail of the mourners, real or hired, and the melancholy sound of the mourning flutes [3004] - 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 {hebrew}, or {hebrew}, when the sleep is overpowering and oppressive), instead of to die.' It may well have been that Jesus made use of this word of double meaning in some such manner as this: Talyetha dimkhath, 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 apprised 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.' [3005] 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] ({hebrew} [3006]), 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.' [3007]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 straitly 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 Saviour, 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 realised 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 [3008] propounded by Strauss, and by him often derived from the ancient armoury 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 tenour 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. [3009]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! [3010] 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. [3011] 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 Saviour of the world, Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.' [3012] 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 XXVII. SECOND VISIT TO NAZARETH - THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE.

(St. Matt. xiii.54-58; x.1, 5-42; xi.1; St. Mark vi.1-13; St. Luke ix.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 [3013] 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, [3014] 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. [3015] [3016] 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 Judæa, 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 favour 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; [3017] that Joseph had died; and that the mother and brethren' of Jesus had left Nazareth, [3018] while His sisters' apparently continued there, being probably married to Nazarenes. [3019] 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 that 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 rumour 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 honour 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?' [3020] 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 moulded 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 noways 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 labourers. For, although, in all likelihood, the words, from which quotation has just been made, [3021] were spoken at a later time, [3022] 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. [3023] Truly those to whom the Twelve were sent forth were troubled' [3024] 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, [3025] 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 xiii. and in St. Luke xii. and xxi. 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 [3026] applies entirely to this first Mission of the Twelve, although the closing words point forward to the judgment.' [3027] Accordingly it has its parallels, although in briefer form, in the other two Gospels. [3028]1. The Twelve were to go forth two and two, [3029] furnished with authority [3030] - 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. [3031] 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 [3032] for their journey, beyond the absolute immediate present. [3033] They were but labourers, 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. [3034] [3035]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 labourers 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 honour' 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.' [3036] 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, [3037] while the houses, springs, roads, and certain food of the Samaritans were declared clean. [3038] At the same time, religiously and as regarded fellowship, the Samaritans were placed on the same footing with Gentiles. [3039] 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. [3040] 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 Deut. iv.5. [3041] [3042] 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 [3043] (mark, not sandals), and a money-girdle. [3044] The symbolic [3045] 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?' [3046] 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. [3047] 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. [3048] [3049] In this sense, anything that clave to a person was metaphorically called the dust,' as for example, the dust of an evil tongue,' [3050] the dust of usury,' as, on the other hand, to dust to idolatry' meant to cleave to it. [3051] 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 [3052] returned to the place where his tent had been at the beginning.' [3053] [3054]These remarks show how closely the Lord followed, in this first part of His charge to the disciples, [3055] Jewish forms of thinking and modes of expression. It is not otherwise in the second, [3056] 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, [3057] 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.' [3058] 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, [3059] 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 [3060] 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, [3061] 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, [3062] and visited with such punishments as these tribunals had power to inflict. [3063] More than this, they would be brought before governors and kings - primarily, the Roman governors and the Herodian princes. [3064] 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. [3065] 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 defence, 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 Dan. vii.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, [3066] 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. Mark xiii.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, [3067] 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. [3068] 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 Æon 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. [3069] 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, [3070] 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. [3071] 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, [3072] 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. [3073] Even the direction to flee from persecution is repeated by the Rabbis in similar circumstances and established by the example of Jacob, [3074] of Moses, [3075] and of David. [3076]In the next section of this Discourse of our Lord, as reported by St. Matthew, [3077] 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: [3078] It is enough for a servant to be as his lord' ({hebrew}). 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, [3079] 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, ({hebrew}) means in Rabbinic language, not any ordinary dwelling, but specifically the Temple, [3080] [3081] and Beel-Zebul would be the Master of the Temple.' On the other hand, Zibbul ({hebrew}) means [3082] sacrificing to idols; [3083] and hence Beel-zebul would, in that sense, be equivalent to lord' or chief of idolatrous sacrificing' [3084] - 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! [3085] 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. [3086] [3087] 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, [3088] 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. [3089] 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. [3090] 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 ({hebrew}), about the third of a penny. [3091] 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 Amos iii.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' ({hebrew}), he came forth. [3092] Nor could even the additional promise of Christ: But of you even the hairs of the head are all numbered,' [3093] 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. [3094] And in later Rabbinic writings [3095] 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. [3096] 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 [3097] 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. [3098] 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. [3099]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. [3100] [3101] 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 [3102] 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.' [3103]Nor could the disciples be in doubt as to the meaning of the last part of Christ's address. [3104] 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. [3105] The very expression in the name of' a prophet, or a righteous man, is strictly Jewish ({hebrew}), 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 [3106] had become the prophet of that name, because he had provided for the hundred prophets. [3107] 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' ({hebrew}) 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 [3108] does God not cause His Shekhinah to rest.' [3109] 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 fervour 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.' [3110]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 XXVIII. THE STORY OF THE BAPTIST, FROM HIS LAST TESTIMONY TO JESUS TO HIS BEHEADING IN PRISON

(1. St. John iii.25-30.2. St. Matt. ix.14-17; St. Mark ii.18-22; St. Luke v.33-39.3. St. Matt. xi.2-14; St. Luke vii.18-35.4. St. Matt. xiv.1-12; St. Mark vi.14-29; St. Luke ix.7-9.) WHILE the Apostles went forth by two and two on their first Mission, [3111] Jesus Himself taught and preached in the towns around Capernaum. [3112] This period of undisturbed activity seems, however, to have been of brief duration. [3113] That it was eminently successful, we infer not only from direct notices, [3114] 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 Paraean dominions (east of the Jordan), either at Julias or at Machærus, in which latter fortress the Baptist was beheaded. We infer, that the labours 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 labours 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. [3115] 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, [3116] and after that into the borders of Tyre and Sidon.' [3117] 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 [3118] in the late spring, or rather early summer of the year 27 of our era, that John was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim. In the neighbourhood, Jesus and His disciples were similarly engaged. [3119] The Presence and activity of Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover [3120] 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. [3121] 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 favour 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 Shoshebheyna'), with all that popular association or higher Jewish allegory connected with that relationship. [3122] 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. John iii.31 to 36 [3123]) as formerly those of the conversation with Nicodemus. [3124] 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: Peræa, east of the Jordan. To realise 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. [3125] By a narrow strip northwards, Peræa just slipped in between the Decapolis and Samaria. It is impossible with certainty to localise the Ænon, 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 Judæa, 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 Peræa 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 Peræa. There can be no doubt but that the Baptist must either have crossed into, or else that Ænon, near Salim, was actually within the dominions of Herod. [3126] It was on that occasion that Herod seized on his person, [3127] 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. [3128] For, although Galilee belonged to Herod Antipas, it was sufficiently far from the present residence of the Tetrarch in Peræa. Tiberias, his Galilean residence, with its splendid royal palace, had only been built a year or two before; [3129] and it is impossible to suppose, that Herod would not have sooner heard of the fame of Jesus, [3130] if his court had been in Tiberias, in the immediate neighbourhood 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 Peræa. Here he had two palaces, one at Julias, or Livias, the other at Machærus. The latter will be immediately described as the

place of the Baptist's imprisonment and martyrdom. The Julias, or Livias, of Peræa 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 Peræa represented the ancient Beth Haram in the tribe of Gad, [3131] a name for which Josephus gives [3132] Betharamphtha, and the Rabbis Beth Ramthah. [3133] [3134] It still survives in the modern Beit-harân. 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.' [3135] Supposing Antipas to have been at the Peræan Julias, he would have been in the closest proximity to the scene of the Baptist's last recorded labours 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, [3136] 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, [3137] 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, [3138] 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.' [3139] 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, [3140] 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. [3141] 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 neighbourhood of Ænon, 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 Machærus. [3142] [3143] 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, Machærus is straight south of it, about two and a half hours north-west of the ancient Kiriathaim (the modern Kurêiyât), the site of Chedorlaomer's victory. [3144] Machærus(the modern M'Khaur) marked the extreme point south, as Pella that north, in Peræa. 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 Jannæus, but destroyed by Gabinius in the wars of Pompey. [3145] It was not only restored, but greatly enlarged, by Herod the Great, who surrounded it with the best defences 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 inclosure of the castle Herod had built a magnificent palace. A large number of cisterns, storehouses, and arsenals, containing every weapon of attack or defence, 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 Machærus. This was evidently the weak point of the situation. [3146] A late and very trustworthy traveller [3147] has pronounced the description of Josephus [3148] 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 Machærus. Ruins covering quite a square mile, on a group of undulating hills, mark the site of the ancient town of Machærus. 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 defences - 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 realising 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 Judæa, 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 labours, from the home of his childhood in the hill-country of Judæa, 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 Machærus 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. [3149] 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 Machærus, 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, [3150] 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. [3151] 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. [3152]Even apart from such extravagances, [3153] 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) [3154] 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, [3155] 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 minutiæ 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. [3156] [3157] It may well have been, that it was on one of those 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. [3158] [3159] 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 Judaising 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 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.' [3160] 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. [3161] Even in the Day of Atonement a bride was allowed to relax one of the ordinances of that strictest fast. [3162] 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 [3163] 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' ({hebrew}), 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.' [3164] [3165] And, as the institution of friends of the bridegroom' prevailed in Judæa, but not in Galilee, this marked distinction of the friends of the bridegroom,' [3166] 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-Judæan (Ephesian) authorship of the Fourth Gospel, the minute archæological touches, and the general fitting of the words of the Baptist [3167] 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. [3168] 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. [3169] 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 [3170] - 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. [3171] 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 wrap 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 Machærus; 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. [3172] [3173] 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 attempt to lift himself the axe which seemed to have slip 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 honoured 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 crystallisation, 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 imposter, 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 Æon. [3174] 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. [3175] [3176] 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, [3177] are evangelised.' 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 scandalised 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? [3178] 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. [3179] 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 honour 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, [3180] [3181] did not imply that spiritual reception which was due to his Mission. [3182] 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. [3183] 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. [3184] Even by Jewish admission, [3185] the Law and all the prophets prophesied only of the days of Messiah.' [3186] 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 [3187] 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 [3188] by all her children. [3189] 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.' [3190]6. The scene once more changes, and we are again at Machærus. [3191] 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 expect 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. [3192] 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 Asmonæan 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 Asmonæan princess Mariamme (I.), she had been married to her half-uncle, Herod Philip, [3193] the son of Herod the Great and of Mariamme (II.), the daughter of the High-Priest (Boëthos). 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 Machærus, 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 favours from the Emperor, and her faithfulness to her husband in his fallen fortunes, are the only redeeming points in her history. [3194] 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, [3195] 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. [3196] 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. [3197] 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 aprobation 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 XXIX. THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

(St. Matt. xiv.13-21; St. Mark vi.30-44; St. Luke ix.10-17; St. John vi.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,' [3198] as we might call it), on the eastern border of Galilee, [3199] just within the territory of the Tetrarch Philip. Originally a small village, Philip had converted it into a town, and named it Julias, after Cæsar's daughter. It lay on the eastern bank of Jordan, just before that stream enters the Lake of Galilee. [3200] It must, however, not be confounded with the other Fisher-town,' or Bethsaida, on the western shore of the Lake, [3201] which the Fourth Gospel, evidencing by this local knowledge its Judæan, or rather Galilean, authorship, distinguishes from the eastern as Bethsaida of Galilee.' [3202] [3203] 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,' [3204] which is referred to in the Fourth Gospel; [3205] 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, [3206] that the Passover was nigh,' [3207] is confirmed by the independent notice of St. Mark, [3208] that those whom the Lord miraculously led 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 their 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, [3209] 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 neighbouring villages, [3210] as those from Capernaum passed through them, perhaps, also, as they recognised on the Lake the now well-known sail, [3211] 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. John vi.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. [3212] 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 Peræa, 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. [3213] 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 throughly 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. [3214] Presently, as He saw the great multitudes gathering, He was moved with compassion towards them.' [3215] [3216] 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 Saviour'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,' [3217] 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.' [3218] 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 Saviour, 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 Saviour was moving among them - beginning to teach them many things,' [3219] and healing them that had need of healing.' [3220] Yet, as He so moved and thought of it all, from the first, He Himself knew what He was about to do.' [3221] 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. [3222] 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. [3223] 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. [3224] 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. [3225] 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. [3226] 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. [3227] 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?' [3228] 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.' [3229] The other minute trait in St. John's Gospel consists in the use of a peculiar word for fish' (psrion), 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 ({hebrew}) derived from the same Greek word (pson), of which that used by St. John is the diminutive, means a savoury dish,' while Aphyan ({hebrew}) or Aphits ({hebrew}), 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 savoury by salting, [3230] and names certain kinds, specially designated as small fishes,' [3231] which might be eaten without being cooked. Small fishes were recommended for health; [3232] and a kind of pickle or savoury 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 ({hebrew}). [3233] Now the diminutive used by St. John (psrion) 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 savoury' 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' (chthon meglon). 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.' [3234] Thus, in infinite humility, the meal at which the Risen Saviour 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.' [3235] green,' and fresh, [3236] much grass;' [3237] then the people in their companies' [3238] of fifties and hundreds, reclining, [3239] and looking in their regular divisions, and with their bright many-coloured dresses, like garden-beds' [3240] [3241] 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' [3242] or, as St. John puts it, gave thanks,' [3243] and brake' it. The expression recalls that connected with the Holy Eucharist, and leaves little doubt on the mind that, in the Discourse delivered in the Synagogue of Capernaum, [3244] there is also reference to the Lord's Supper. As of comparatively secondary importance, yet helping us better to realise 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. [3245] We can scarcely be mistaken as to the words which Jesus spake when He gave thanks.' The Jewish Law [3246] 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 ({hebrew}). [3247] Similarly, we have very distinct information as regards a case like the present. We gather, that the use of savoury' 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 thanksgiving' should be said for one or the other. In any case only one benediction was to be used. [3248] 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 Aramæan, Greek, or Hebrew, were those so well known: Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the world, Who causes to come forth ({hebrew}) 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 realised 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' (kphinoi), known in

Jewish writings by a similar name (Kephiphah), made of wicker or willows [3249] ({hebrew}) were in common use, but considered of the poorest kind. [3250] 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, {hebrew}) into the world.' And so the Baptist's last inquiry, Art Thou the Coming One?' [3251] was fully and publicly answered, and that by the Jews themselves.THE ASCENT: FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION

CHAPTER XXX. THE NIGHT OF MIRACLES ON THE LAKE OF GENNESARET

(St. Matt. xiv.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, [3252] 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.' [3253] 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 solemnised, to their homes, by telling them that He withdrew to pray. And He did pray till far on, when the (second) evening had come,' [3254] 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 Cæsar.' 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. [3255] In any case it would be what might be termed the morning-watch, [3256] 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. [3257] 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 honour, made him to have dominion over the works of His Hands, and all things were put under his feet. [3258] Indeed, this dominion over the sea' seems to exhibit the Divinely human rather than the humanly Divine aspect of His Person, [3259] 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 recognising 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,' [3260] (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, [3261] but that he felt to the full the difficulties of what he so firmly believed, [3262] and made the foundation of all his preaching. [3263] Indeed, the elaborate exposition of the historical grounds, on which he had arrived at the conviction of reality, [3264] 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. [3265] [3266] 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,' [3267] 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. [3268] And possibly such had been his intention, till He saw their difficulty, if not danger, from the contrary wind. [3269] 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 labouring so far on the Lake, [3270] 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 realising 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 Saviour after prayer looking across to where the boatmen vainly labour 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 Saviour 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 labour 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. [3271] 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, [3272] 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,' [3273] 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, [3274] 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, [3275] to transform his doubt, but left him, unassured from without, to his own feelings as he saw the wind, [3276] 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, [3277] the wind ceased, and immediately the ship was at the land. But they that were in the boat' - apparently in contradistinction to the disciples, [3278] 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.THE END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.EXPLANATORY NOTES AND CORRECTIONS FOR THE FIRST VOLUMEPage 7, note 1: i.e. the mind of the one was settled like men, that of the others unsettled as women.Page 12, note 2: Diety' = Shekhinah.'Page 35, note 3: See Zunz, Gottesd. Vortr. p.323, note b.Page 97, note 1. This, of course, is and inference from the whole history and relation there indicated.Page 174, note 1a, line 7, read: Hath He said, and shall He not do it?' being the quotation from Numb. xxiii.19, which is intended as an answer to the pretension. The rendering of the passage by the learned Dr. Schwab is untenable.Page 268, note 3: the quotation is taken from the unmutilated and sublime citation as given in R. Martini Pugio Fidei, ed. Carpzov. p.782. Page 271(k). This is the view of Beer, Leben Abr. p.88.Page 292: for temptations' read temptation.' The ten temptations of Abraham are referred to in Ab. P.3, and enumerated in Ab. de R. N.33 and Pirque de R. El.26. Page 312h . Of course, this is the expression of a later Rabbi, but it refers to Pharisaic interpretations.Page 358c. So Lightfoot infers from the passage; but as the Rabbi who speaks is etymologising and almost punning, the inference should perhaps not be pressed.Page 384, note 1: In Vayy. R.30, the expression refers to the different condition of Israel after the time described in Hos. iii.4, or in that of Hezekiah, or at the deliverance of Mordecai. In Bemid. R.11, the expression is connected with their ingathering of proselytes in fulfilment of Gen. xii.2.Page 387, lines 17 and 18. On this subject, however, other opinions are also entertained. Comp. Sukk.5 a.Page 443, as to priest guilty of open sin, the details, which I refrained from giving, are mentioned in Duschak, Jud. Kultus, p.270.Page 444, note 3. This, of course, in regard to an unlearned priest. See discussion in Duschak, u.s. p.255.Page 447(c). Ber.6 b. Probably this was to many the only ground for reward, since the discourse was the Pirqa, or on the Halakah. Ib.(e) Taan.16 a: though the remark refers to the leader ot the devotions on fast-days, it is also applied to the preacher by Duschak, p.285.Page 505, note 3, see correction of p.174, note (u.s.).Page 514, note 2: in Taan.20 a the story of the miracle is cold which gave him the name Nicodemus.Page 536(g). I refer to the thanksgiving of Nechunyah. See also the prayer put into the mouth of Moses, Ber.32 a. And although such prayers as Ber.16 b, 17 a, are sublime, they are, in my view, not to be compared with that of Christ in its fulness and breadth.Page 539(c). sanh.100 b is, of course, not verbatim worded. This would

be in the second sentence: Possibly on the morrow he will not be, and have been found caring for a world which is not his.'Page 557b, read in text: the common formula at funerals in Palestine was, Weep with him,' &c.Page 597, note, line 9 from bottom: for our' their' and for us' read them.'Page 620, line 4 from bottom, The dress of the wife,' &c., read The clothing,' the meaning being that in the alternative between saving the life of the ignorant and clothing the wife of the learned (if she had no clothes), the latter is of more importance. Page 622, margin, delete the second' in .Book III -- -- -- -- THE ASCENT:FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OFTRANSFIGURATION - continued

CHAPTER XXXI. THE CAVILS OF THE PHARISEES CONCERNING PURIFICATION, AND THE TEACHING OF THE LORD CONCERNING PURITY - THE TRADITIONS CONCERNING HAND-WASHING' AND VOWS.'

(St. Matt. xv.1-20; St. Mark vii.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.' [3279] According to St. Mark, [3280] the Master had directed the disciples to make for the other Bethsaida, or Fisherton,' on the western shore of the Lake. [3281] Remembering how common the corresponding name is in our own country, [3282] 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.' [3283] 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 [3284] names Bethsaida, and St. John [3285] 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 harbour have been discovered at Tell Hûm, the site of Capernaum. [3286] Further, it would explain, how Peter and Andrew, who, according to St. John, [3287] were of Bethsaida, are described by St. Mark [3288] 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-townsman. 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 - the names were interchangeable, or rather, that Bethsaida was the Fisherton' of Capernaum. [3289] 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 neighbourhood 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,' [3290] [3291] enables us not only to localise 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, [3292] 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 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, [3293] 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 [3294] and the Rabbis [3295] describe in such glowing language. To this day it bears marks of having been the most favoured spot in this favoured region. Travelling 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 an amphitheatric 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 Khân Minyeh. The latter has, in accordance with tradition, been regarded by some as representing Bethsaida, [3296] 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. [3297] [3298] 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, [3299] 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.' [3300] As this could only have been done either on a Sabbath or Feast-Day (in this instance, the Passover [3301]), 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). [3302] 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 Judæa, all labour, including, of course, that of a journey across the Lake, was intermitted on the Eve of the Passover. [3303] 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,' [3304] 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, [3305] or the Reproof of the Pharisees. [3306] 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 offence' of the Pharisees, and apparently the withdrawal of some in the outer circle of discipleship, [3307] 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. [3308] 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 neighbouring 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 neighbouring 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; [3309] next would follow the remark of the disciples and the reply of the Lord, spoken, probably, when they were again on the way; [3310] and, lastly, the final explanation of Christ, after they had entered the house at Capernaum. [3311]

In all probability a part of what is recorded in St. John vi.24, &c. 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 offence. 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.' [3312] 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 realised 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.' [3313] 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,' [3314] 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 [3315] 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.' [3316] 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, [3317] or, at least, to poverty. [3318] Bread eaten with unwashen hands was as if it had been filth. [3319] Indeed, a Rabbi who had held this command in contempt was actually buried in excommunication. [3320] 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 recognising a Jew. [3321] [3322]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. [3323] Presently, Scriptural support was sought for it. Some based it on the original ordinance of purification in Lev. xv.11; [3324] while others saw in the words [3325] 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.' [3326] 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. [3327] [3328] 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. [3329] 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' (sheniyim), or the other,' later,' or afterwaters' (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, [3330] literally, the lifting of the hands; while for the washing before meat the term Meshi or Mesha [3331] 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 prescribed. [3332] The latter was really an affusion. As the 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 discolour or defile it, large vessels or jars were generally kept for the purpose. These might be of any material, although stone is specially mentioned. [3333] It was the practice to draw water out of these with what was called a natla, antila, or antelaya, [3334] very often of glass, which must hold (at least) a quarter of a log [3335] - 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, &c. 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 [3336] ({hebrew}, or {hebrew} - lappereq, or ad happereq). If the water remained short of the wrist (chuts lappereq), the hands were not clean. [3337] Accordingly, the words of St. Mark [3338] can only mean that the Pharisees eat not except they wash their hands to the wrist.' [3339] 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. [3340] [3341] To increase this precaution, it was next laid down as a principle, that all that renders the Terumah unfit, also defiles the hands. [3342] 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 favour of these books: all the holy writings defile the hands; the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes defile the hands.' [3343] 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 [3344] 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. [3345] [3346]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. [3347] 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, [3348] in acknowledgment of which the voice from heaven' (Bath-Qol) had been heard to utter Prov. xxiii.15, and xxvii.11. But the earliest trace of this custom occurs in a portion of the Sibylline Books, which dates from about 160 b.c., [3349] where we find an allusion to the practice of continually washing the hands, in connection with prayer and thanksgiving. [3350] 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, [3351] and hence emphatically a tradition of the Elders,' since these two teachers bear, in Rabbinic writings, each the designation of the Elder.' [3352] 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 [3353] and in the Babylon Talmud, [3354] 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' {hebrew} 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, [3355] 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. [3356] But, besides these eighteen decrees, the two Schools on that day [3357] agreed in solemnly re-enacting the decrees about the Book (the copy of the Law), and the hands' ({hebrew}). The Babylon Talmud [3358] 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. [3359] For, it was an express Rabbinic principle [3360] that, if an ordinance had been only recently re-enacted ({hebrew}), it might not be called in question or invalidated ({hebrew}).' [3361] 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 minutiæ 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 bought of Gentiles, they were (as the case might be) to be immersed, put into boiling water, purged with fire, or at least polished. [3362]Let us now try to realise 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 apologised 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, [3363] [3364] and of more binding importance than those of Holy Scripture itself. [3365] 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; [3366] 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. [3367] 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, [3368] 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. xiii.17. [3369] Nay, Jer. xxv.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. [3370] 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. [3371]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. [3372] 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 Is. lvi.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. [3373] It is even more terrible to read of God wearing the Tallith, [3374] or that He puts on the Phylacteries, which is deduced from Is. lxii.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: Exod. xiii.1-10; 10-16; Deut. vi.4-10; xi.13-22. In the Divine Phylacteries they were: 1 Chron. xvii.21; Deut. iv.7-8; xxxiii.29; iv.34; xxvi.19. [3375] 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. [3376] This is deduced from Lev. xvi.16. Similarly, He immersed in a bath of fire, [3377] 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, [3378] and that no Halakhah (traditional law) might contradict Scripture. [3379] 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, [3380] 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 absurdity [3381] - than that of honour 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.' [3382] 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.' [3383] 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 demoralising 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.' [3384] 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 [3385] (the latter also a Phoenician 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, [3386] 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. [3387]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 [3388] 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' [3389] - 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 [3390] - 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;' [3391] while that of the oath was a simple affirmation or negation, [3392] I

shall not eat.' [3393] 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. [3394] 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 [3395] to open a door for repentance. [3396] Absolutions from a vow might be obtained before a sage,' or, in his absence, before three laymen, [3397] when all obligations became null and void. At the same time the Mishnah [3398] admits, that this power of absolving from vows was a tradition hanging, as it were, in the air, [3399] since it received little (or, as Maimonides puts it, no) support from Scripture. [3400]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. [3401] It cannot be denied that such vows, in regard to parents, would be binding, and that they were actually made. [3402] Indeed, the question is discussed in the Mishnah in so many words, whether honour of father and mother' [3403] constituted a ground for invalidating a vow, and decided in the negative against a solitary dissenting voice. [3404] And if doubt should still exist, a case is related in the Mishnah, [3405] in which a father was thus shut out by the vow of his son from anything by which he might be profited by him ({hebrew}). [3406] 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,' [3407] is not only explained but vindicated by the common usage of the Rabbis, [3408] 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 ({hebrew}). [3409]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 fulfilment: This people honoureth 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.'

[3410] 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 fulness and fulfilling it. There is nothing from without the [3411] man, that, entering into him, can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man, those are they that defile the man.' [3412] 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.' [3413] 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 sympathised 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, [3414] 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, [3415] 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. [3416] But never before could they have realised, 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.' [3417] [3418]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.' [3419] Not only the spirit of legalism, but the very terms common' (in reference to the unwashen 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 unwashen 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. [3420] 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 unwashen hands, forgetful that He has made all meats clean to him who is inwardly and spiritually cleansed.

CHAPTER XXXII. 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. John vi.22-71.) [3421] 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 neutralised, 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. [3422] 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.' [3423] 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 vi.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 [3424]) was spoken in Synagogue, as He taught in Capernaum.' [3425] It has been well observed, that there are evident breaks after verse 40 and verse 51.' [3426] Probably the succession of events may have been that part of what is here recorded by St. John [3427] had taken place when those from across the Lake had first met Jesus; [3428] part on the way to, and entering, the Synagogue; [3429] and part as what He spoke in His Discourse, [3430] and then after the defection of some of His former disciples. [3431] 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 centre 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.' [3432] 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: [3433] 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 rumour 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.' [3434] 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 literalised, 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; [3435] the grain was to stand like palm trees, and to be reaped and winnowed without labour. [3436] 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 ({hebrew}) being, as was significantly pointed out, respectively the first, the middle, and the last letters of the alphabet. [3437] 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 [3438] 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. [3439] 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' [3440] - miraculous food, of all manner of taste, and suited to every age, according to the wish or condition of him who see ate it, [3441] 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. [3442] 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. [3443] 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 Saviour 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 [3444] 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,' [3445] it indicated that the manna and the miraculous water-supply were the sequence of Israel's receiving the Law and the Commandments [3446] - for the real bread from heaven was the Law. [3447] [3448] 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 [3449] 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, [3450] 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. [3451] 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. [3452] Indeed, one of the names given to the Messiah - that of Yinnon, according to Ps. lxxii.17 [3453] - has by some been derived from this very expectancy. [3454] 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, pn) which the Father giveth Me shall come unto Me (shall reach Me [3455]), 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 (ps) who intently looketh [3456] 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.' [3457]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 [3458] 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 [3459] 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. [3460] [3461] Only, his was the misunderstanding of ignorance, theirs of wilful 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.' [3462] 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 (Is. liv.13; Jer. xxxi.34) to the teaching by God in the Messianic Age. [3463] [3464] 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 [3465] 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.' [3466] 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, [3467] 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, [3468] 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 benefitted 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, [3469] 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,' [3470]), nay, or martyrdom, which His words seemed to indicate, My Flesh is the true [3471] meat, and My Blood is the true

drink;' [3472] and what even this fellowship secured, consisted only in abiding in Him and He in them; [3473] 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 offence 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 [3474] the far more mysterious and un-Jewish facts of the Messiah's Crucifixion and Ascension! [3475] Truly, not outward following, but only inward and spiritual life-quickening 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. [3476]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. [3477] 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.' [3478] 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.' [3479] [3480] 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. [3481] 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.THE ASCENT:FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION.

CHAPTER XXXIII. JESUS AND THE SYRO-PHOENICIAN WOMAN

(St. Matt. xv.21-28; St. Mark vii.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 neighbourhood, 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, [3482] 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 [3483] tells us, He withdrew' [3484] 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 Saviour 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 [3485] 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 neighbouring district of Tyre and Sidon, and reached the mother of the demonised 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.' [3486] As the Saviour apparently received the woman in the house, [3487] 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 [3488] 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. [3489] 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.'" [3490] 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. [3491] 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 Saviour. 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 agonised 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 - house-dogs, [3492] 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. [3493] [3494] 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.' [3495] Only, who were they within and who they without? What made a child,' whose was the bread - and what characterised 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.' [3496] And her daughter was healed from that hour.' [3497] 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 recognising 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 XXXIV. A GROUP OF MIRACLES AMONG A SEMI-HEATHEN POPULATION

(St. Matt. xv.29-31; St. Mark vii 31-37; St. Mark viii.22-26; St. Matt. xi.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, [3498] were passed. Making a long circuit through the territory of Sidon, [3499] 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,' [3500] 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. [3501] 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 [3502] 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. [3503] 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 unfrequently - 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. [3504] [3505] 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.' [3506] Peculiar, also, is the thrusting' [3507] 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, [3508] 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 [3509] 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, [3510] whom the Saviour 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; [3511] [3512] 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 Saviour 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 Saviour's lips parted to speak the word of command: Be opened' [3513] - and straightway the gladsome sound would pass into his hearing,' [3514] 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, [3515] as wrought by Jesus in these parts, and, as we infer, on a heathen. [3516] 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 Saviour 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. [3517] 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. [3518] 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. [3519] 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, [3520] but the consequence of disease, and that silence was enjoined after the healing. [3521] 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. [3522] 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. [3523] 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, [3524] seem to imply that He was not on the ordinary scene of His labours 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 fulfilment of what to David had only been promises. [3525] 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 [3526] 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. [3527] 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 realising 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 [3528]), 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. [3529] 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, [3530] whether they were to praise or blame, who, despite the Saviour'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 XXXV. 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. Matt. xii.1-21; St. Mark ii.23-iii.6; St. Luke vi.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 Saviour 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 prevailingly 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 labour, 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. [3531] 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 [3532] - such were some of the means by which the day was to be honoured 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: [3533] 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,' [3534] when it stood before the Mount. Even the tortures of Gehenna were intermitted on that holy, happy day. [3535] 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. [3536] The Jewish Law, as there summarised, 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. [3537] 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. [3538] 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, [3539] 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, &c., 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 ({hebrew}). 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. [3540] 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. [3541] 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,' [3542] which, as shown in another place, [3543] 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 [3544] our Lord, with such of His disciples as had then gathered to Him, tarried for some time - no doubt for several weeks - in Judæa. [3545] The wheat was ripe for harvesting, when he passed through Samaria. [3546] 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. [3547] Chronologically, therefore, there is no room for this event between the first Passover and Pentecost. [3548] 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. [3549] If, therefore, we have to place the plucking of the ears of corn after the Feast recorded in St. John v., 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, [3550] 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, [3551] 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 [3552] - probably by a field-path - through cornfields, when His disciples, being hungry, [3553] as they went, [3554] plucked ears of corn and ate them, having rubbed off the husks in their hands. [3555] On any ordinary day this would have been lawful, [3556] but on the Sabbath it involved, according to Rabbinic statutes, at least two sins. For, according to the Talmud, what was really one labour, would, if made up of several acts, each of them forbidden, amount to several acts of labour, each involving sin, punishment, and a sin-offering. [3557] [3558] This so-called division' of labour applied only to infringement of the Sabbath-rest - not of that of feast-days. [3559] 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.' [3560] 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 labour, 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! [3561] And yet it was forbidden to stop with a little wax the hole in a cask by which the fluid was running out, [3562] 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, [3563] and indeed all other obligations. [3564] 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 Lev. xviii.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. [3565] 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.' [3566] 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, [3567] although, by the letter of the Levitical Law, [3568] 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, [3569] 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. [3570] 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 Lev. xxii.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. [3571] 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-labour 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.' [3572] 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. [3573]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, [3574] according to some throat-disease, [3575] while, according to others, such a disease as angina, [3576] 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 [3577] although here also there was a way of evading the Law. [3578] A person suffering from toothache might not gargle his mouth with vinegar, but he might use an ordinary toothbrush and dip it in vinegar. [3579] 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. [3580] External lesions also might be attended to, if they involved danger to life. [3581] 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. [3582]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. [3583] On the other hand, St. Matthew, while alluding to this terribly telling challenge, [3584] 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. [3585] But even the Talmud discusses cases in which it was lawful to lift an animal out of a pit on a Sabbath. [3586] 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, [3587] 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 Saviour'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 Saviour's Eye and Word, he slowly stretched it forth. And as He stretched it forth, his hand was restored. [3588] The Saviour 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.' [3589] 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 fulfilment: 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 XXXVI. THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND - TO DALMANUTHA - THE SIGN FROM HEAVEN' - JOURNEY TO CÆSAREA PHILIPPI - WHAT IS THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES?

(St. Matt. xv.32-xvi.12; St. Mark viii.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. [3590] 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 neighbourhood. 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. [3591] 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 mould 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. [3592] 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 Saviour 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. [3593] 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 necessaries 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, [3594] 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. [3595] 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,' [3596] 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.' [3597] 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, [3598] 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, [3599] 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, [3600] 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 Saviour'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 realise it, till after His Resurrection they understood, and worshipped Him as God Incarnate. And it is only realising 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 Saviour'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.' [3601] 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. [3602] 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,' [3603] [3604] 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 [3605] 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' [3606] - a word which implies, that they resided elsewhere,' [3607] though, of course, in the neighbourhood. 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 ({hebrew}, {hebrew}, {hebrew} = limn), 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 Tarichæa, the modern Kerak, so terribly famous for a sea-fight, or rather a horrible butchery of poor fugitives, when Tarichæa 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, [3608] the fortress of Tarichæa 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. [3609] 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 Deut. xiii., 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,' [3610] 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 Pamias were turned into blood. [3611] [3612] 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?' [3613] 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. [3614] 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, [3615] 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 Cæsar;' 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. [3616] 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.' [3617] 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,' [3618] was the warning cry of judgment and the loving call to repentance. [3619]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 Cæsarea 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, [3620] 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 dulness 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, [3621] 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 XXXVII. THE GREAT CONFESSION - THE GREAT COMMISSION - THE GREAT INSTRUCTION - THE GREAT TEMPTATION - THE GREAT DECISION.

(St. Matt. xvi.13-28; St. Mark viii.27, ix.1; St. Luke ix.18-27.) If we are right in identifying the little bay - Dalmanutha - with the neighbourhood of Tarichæa, yet another link of strange coincidence connects the prophetic warning spoken there with its fulfilment. From Dalmanutha our Lord passed across the Lake to Cæsarea Philippi. From Cæsarea Philippi did Vespasian pass through Tiberias to Tarichæa, 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 Tarichæa, 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. [3622] [3623] 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, Cæsarea 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. [3624] 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'), [3625] 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. [3626] 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, [3627] 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 Cæsarea 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, [3628] 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 Cæsarea Philippi. The situation of the ancient Cæsarea 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.' [3629] 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 honour. 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 honour of the Emperor, Cæsarea 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 bevelled 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 Cæsarea, when we recall the importance of the events enacted there, or in the immediate neighbourhood. 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.' [3630] In Cæsarea, or its immediate neighbourhood, [3631] 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; [3632] 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 Judæa, 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 Tarichæa, 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 disfavour, is evident from the later challenge of His own relatives to go and meet the Pharisees at headquarters in Judæa, and to show openly, if He could, by His works, that He was the Messiah. [3633] 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. [3634] Undoubtedly this had already tried their faith, as appears from the question of Christ: Will ye also go away?' [3635] 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 [3636] - 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, [3637] 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. [3638] 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, [3639] 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 emphasised by the use of the article (in the original): Who do the men say that I am?' [3640] 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.' [3641] 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.' [3642] 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 premisses. 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. [3643] 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,' [3644] 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.' [3645] [3646] 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 [3647] - we can scarcely doubt, for that very revelation by the Father, which He afterwards joyously recognised in the words of Peter.The reply of the Saviour 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 [3648] 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, [3649] and in the letters of St. Paul, [3650] 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 ({hebrew}).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]' [3651] - the Aramaic word Kepha ({hebrew}, or {hebrew}) 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). [3652] 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 ({hebrew}). This seems the more likely, since, as we have previously seen, it was the practice in Galilee to have two names, [3653] especially when the strictly Jewish name, such as Simon, had no equivalent among the Gentiles. [3654] 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, {hebrew}). 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, {hebrew}) to build on it, and to found the world,' whence also Abraham is called a Rock (Tsur, {hebrew}) as it is said: [3655] Look unto the Rock whence ye are hewn.' [3656] [3657] 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. [3658] [3659] To complete this sketch, in the curious Jewish legend about the Apostle Peter, which is outlined in an Appendix to this volume, [3660] Peter is always designated as Simon Kepha (spelt {hebrew}), 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 ({hebrew}) which is the name for stone, because he sat there upon a stone till his death' ({hebrew}). [3661] But to return. Believing, that Jesus spoke to Peter in the Aramic, 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. [3662] 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 (kklesa), as the equivalent of the Hebrew Qahal, convocation,' the called,' [3663] occurs in the LXX. rendering of the Old Testament, and in the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach' [3664] and was apparently in familiar use at the time. [3665] 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' [3666] shall not prevail against it.Viewing the Church' as a building founded upon the Petrine,' [3667] 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, [3668] and at his bidding first be baptized. [3669]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 ({hebrew}), which means to bind,' in the sense of prohibiting, and Hittir ({hebrew}, from {hebrew}) which means to loose,' in the sense of permitting. For the latter the term Shera or Sheri ({hebrew}, or {hebrew}) 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.' [3670] 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. [3671]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 [3672] - 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. [3673] He was so constantly in the habit of using symbolic language, and had only lately reproved them for taking that about the leaven' 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 [3674] - God forbid it, God be merciful to Thee:' [3675] 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, [3676] 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. [3677]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,' [3678] till in those judgments they would see that the Son of Man had come in His Kingdom. [3679] Then - only then - at the 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 nigh-march of events under His direction. God is content to wait, because He reigneth; man must be content to wait, because he believeth.

Chapter 65

Book IV. THE DESCENT: FROM THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION INTO THE VALLEY OF HUMILIATION AND DEATH.

But God forbede but men shulde leve Wel mor thing then men han seen with eye Men shall not wenen euery thing a lye But yf him-selfe yt seeth or elles dooth For god wot thing is neuer the lasse sooth Thogh euery wight ne may it nat y-see.' Chaucer: Prologue to the Legend of Good Women.

CHAPTER I. THE TRANSFIGURATION.

(St Matt. xvii.1-8; St. Mark ix.2-8; St. Luke ix.28-36.) THE great confession of Peter, as the representative Apostle, had laid the foundations of the Church as such. In contradistinction to the varying opinions of even those best disposed towards Christ, it openly declared that Jesus was the Very Christ of God, the fulfilment of all Old Testament prophecy, the heir of Old Testament promise, the realisation of the Old Testament hope for Israel, and, in Israel, for all mankind. Without this confession, Christians might have been a Jewish sect, a religious party, or a school of thought, and Jesus a Teacher, Rabbi, Reformer, or Leader of men. But the confession which marked Jesus as the Christ, also constituted His followers the Church. It separated them, as it separated Him, from all around; it gathered them into one, even Christ; and it marked out the foundation on which the building made without hands was to rise. Never was illustrative answer so exact as this: On this Rock' - bold, outstanding, well-defined, immovable - will I build My Church.' Without doubt this confession also marked the high-point of the Apostles' faith. Never afterwards, till His Resurrection, did it reach so high. Nay, what followed seems rather a retrogression from it: beginning with their unwillingness to receive the announcement of His decease, and ending with their unreadiness to share His sufferings or to believe in His Resurrection. And if we realise the circumstances, we shall understand at least, their initial difficulties. Their highest faith had been followed by the most crushing disappointment; the confession that He was the Christ, by the announcement of His approaching Sufferings and Death at Jerusalem. The proclamation that He was the Divine Messiah had not been met by promises of the near glory of the Messianic Kingdom, but by announcements of certain, public rejection and seeming terrible defeat. Such possibilities had never seriously entered into their thoughts of the Messiah; and the declaration of the very worst, and that in the near future, made at such a moment, must have been a staggering blow to all their hopes. It was as if they had reached the topmost height, only to be cast thence into the lowest depth. On the other hand, it was necessary that at this stage in the History of the Christ, and immediately after His proclamation, the sufferings and the rejection of the Messiah should be prominently brought forward. It was needful for the Apostles, as the remonstrance of Peter showed; and, with reverence be it added, it was needful for the Lord Himself, as even His words to Peter seem to imply: Get thee behind Me; thou art a stumbling-block unto me.' For - as we have said - was not the remonstrance of the disciple in measure a re-enactment of the great initial Temptation by Satan after the forty days' fast in the wilderness? And, in view of all this, and of what immediately afterwards followed, we venture to say, it was fitting that an interval of six' days should intervene, or, as St. Luke puts it, including the day of Peter's confession and the night of Christ's Transfiguration, about eight days.' The Chronicle of these days is significantly left blank in the Gospels, but we cannot doubt, that it was filled up with thoughts and teaching concerning that Decease, leading up to the revelation on the Mount of Transfiguration. There are other blanks in the narrative besides that just referred to. We shall try to fill them up, as best we can. Perhaps it was the Sabbath when Peter's great confession was made; and the six days' of St. Matthew and St. Mark become the about eight days' of St. Luke, when we reckon from that Sabbath to the close of another, and suppose that at even the Saviour ascended the Mount of Transfiguration with the

three Apostles: Peter, James, and John. There can scarcely be a reasonable doubt that Christ and His disciples had not left the neighborhood of Cæsarea, [3680] and hence, that the mountain' must have been one of the slopes of gigantic, snowy Hermon. In that quiet semi-Gentile retreat of Cæsarea Philippi could He best teach them, and they best learn, without interruption or temptation from Pharisees and Scribes, that terrible mystery of His Suffering. And on that gigantic mountain barrier which divided Jewish and Gentile lands, and while surveying, as Moses of old, the land to be occupied in all its extent, amidst the solemn solitude and majestic grandeur of Hermon, did it seem most fitting that, both by anticipatory fact and declamatory word, the Divine attestation should be given to the proclamation that He was the Messiah, and to this also, that, in a world that is in the power of sin and Satan, God's Elect must suffer, in order that, by ransoming, He may conquer it to God. But what a background, here, for the Transfiguration; what surroundings for the Vision, what echoes for the Voice from heaven! It was evening, [3681] and, as we have suggested, the evening after the Sabbath, when the Master and those three of His disciples, who were most closely linked to Him in heart and thought, climbed the path that led up to one of the heights of Hermon. In all the most solemn transactions of earth's history, there has been this selection and separation of the few to witness God's great doings. Alone with his son, as the destined sacrifice, did Abraham climb Moriah; alone did Moses behold, amid the awful loneliness of the wilderness, the burning bush, and alone on Sinai's height did he commune with God; alone was Elijah at Horeb, and with no other companion to view it than Elisha did he ascend into heaven. But Jesus, the Saviour of His people, could not be quite alone, save in those innermost transactions of His soul: in the great contest of His first Temptation, and in the solitary communings of His heart with God. These are mysteries which the outspread wings of Angels, as reverently they hide their faces, conceal from earth's, and even heaven's vision. But otherwise, in the most solemn turning-points of this history, Jesus could not be alone, and yet was alone with those three chosen ones, most receptive of Him, and most representative of the Church. It was so in the house of Jairus, on the Mount of Transfiguration, and in the Garden of Gethsemane. As St. Luke alone informs us, it was to pray' that Jesus took them apart up into that mountain. To pray,' no doubt in connection with those sayings;' since their reception required quite as much the direct teaching of the Heavenly Father, as had the previous confession of Peter, of which it was, indeed, the complement, the other aspect, the twin height. And the Transfiguration, with its attendant glorified Ministry and Voice from heaven, was God's answer to that prayer. What has already been stated, has convinced us that it could not have been to one of the highest peaks of Hermon, as most modern writers suppose, that Jesus led His companions. There are three such peaks: those north and south, of about equal height (9,400 feet above the sea, and nearly 11,000 above the Jordan valley), are only 500 paces distant from each other, while the third, to the west (about 100 feet lower), is separated from the others by a narrow valley. Now, to climb the top of Hermon is, even from the nearest point, an Alpine ascent, trying and fatiguing, which would occupy a whole day (six hours in the ascent and four in the descent), and require provisions of food and water; while, from the keenness of the air, it would be impossible to spend the night on the top. [3682] To all this there is no allusion in the text, nor slightest hint of either difficulties or preparations, such as otherwise would have been required. Indeed, a contrary impression is left on the mind. Up into an high mountain apart,' to pray.' The Sabbath-sun had set, and a delicious cool hung in the summer air, as Jesus an the three commenced their ascent. From all parts of the land, far as Jerusalem or Tyre, the one great object in view must always have been snow-clad Hermon. And now it stood

out before them - as, to the memory of the traveller in the West, Monte Rosa or Mont Blanc [3683] - in all the wondrous glory of a sunset: first rose-colored, then deepening red, next the death-like pallor, and the darkness relieved by the snow, in quick succession.' [3684] From high up there, as one describes it, [3685] a deep ruby flush came over all the scene, and warm purple shadows crept slowly on. The sea of Galilee was lit up with a delicate greenish-yellow hue, between its dim walls of hill. The flush died out in a few minutes, and a pale, steel-coloured shade succeeded. . . . A long pyramidal shadow slid down to the eastern foot of Hermon, and crept across the great plain; Damascus was swallowed up by it; and finally the pointed end of the shadow stood out distinctly against the sky - a dusky cone of dull colour against the flush of the afterglow. It was the shadow of the mountain itself, stretching away for seventy miles across the plain - the most marvellous shadow perhaps to be seen anywhere. The sun underwent strange changes of shape in the thick vapours - now almost square, now like a domed Temple - until at length it slid into the sea, and went out like a blue spark.' And overhead shone out in the blue summer-sky, one by one, the stars in Eastern brilliancy. We know not the exact direction which the climbers took, nor how far their journey went. But there is only one road that leads from Cæsarea Philippi to Hermon, and we cannot be mistaken in following it. First, among vine-clad hills stocked with mulberry, apricot and fig-trees; then, through corn-fields where the pear tree supplants the fig; next, through oak coppice, and up rocky ravines to where the soil is dotted with dwarf shrubs. And if we pursue the ascent, it still becomes steeper, till the first ridge of snow is crossed, after which turfy banks, gravelly slopes, and broad snow-patches alternate. The top of Hermon in summer - and it can only be ascended in summer or autumn - is free from snow, but broad patches run down the sides expanding as they descend. To the very summit it is well earthed; to 500 feet below it, studded with countless plants, higher up with dwarf clumps. [3686] As they ascend in the cool of that Sabbath evening, the keen mountain air must have breathed strength into the climbers, and the scent of snow - for which the parched tongue would long in summer's heat [3687] - have refreshed them. We know not what part may have been open to them of the glorious panorama from Hermon embracing as it does a great part of Syria from the sea to Damascus, from the Lebanon and the gorge of the Litany to the mountains of Moab; or down the Jordan valley to the Dead Sea; or over Galilee, Samaria, and on to Jerusalem and beyond it. But such darkness as that of a summer's night would creep on. And now the moon shone out in dazzling splendour, cast long shadows over the mountain, and lit up the broad patches of snow, reflecting their brilliancy on the objects around. On that mountain-top He prayed.' Although the text does not expressly state it, we can scarcely doubt, that He prayed with them, and still less, that He prayed for them, as did the Prophet for his servant, when the city was surrounded by Syrian horsemen: that his eyes might be opened to behold heaven's host - the far more that are with us than they that are with them.' [3688] And, with deep reverence be it said, for Himself also did Jesus pray. For, as the pale moonlight shone on the fields of snow in the deep passes of Hermon, so did the light of the coming night shine on the cold glitter of Death in the near future. He needed prayer, that in it His Soul might lie calm and still - perfect, in the unruffled quiet of His Self-surrender, the absolute rest of His Faith, and the victory of His Sacrificial Obedience. And He needed prayer also, as the introduction to, and preparation for, His Transfiguration. Truly, He stood on Hermon. It was the highest ascent, the widest prospect into the past, present, and future, in His Earthly Life. Yet was it but Hermon at night. And this is the human, or rather the Theanthropic view of this prayer, and of its consequence. As we understand it, the prayer with them had ceased, or it had merged into silent prayer of each, or Jesus now

prayed alone and apart, when what gives this scene such a truly human and truthful aspect ensued. It was but natural for these men of simple habits, at night, and after the long ascent, and in the strong mountain-air, to be heavy with sleep. And we also know it as a psychological fact, that, in quick reaction after the overpowering influence of the strongest emotions, drowsiness would creep over their limbs and senses. They were heavy - weighted - with sleep,' as afterwards at Gethsemane their eyes were weighted. [3689] [3690] Yet they struggled with it, and it is quite consistent with experience, that they should continue in that state of semi-stupor, during what passed between Moses and Elijah and Christ, and also be fully awake,' [3691] to see His Glory, and the two men who stood with Him.' In any case this descriptive trait, so far from being (as negative critics would have it), a later embellishment,' could only have formed part of a primitive account, since it is impossible to conceive any rational motive for its later addition. [3692]What they saw was their Master, while praying, transformed.' [3693] The form of God' shone through the form of a servant;' the appearance of His Face became other,' [3694] [3695] it did shine as the sun.' [3696] [3697] Nay, the whole Figure seemed bathed in light, the very garments whiter far than the snow on which the moon shone [3698] - so as no fuller on earth can white them,' [3699] glittering,' [3700] white as the light.' And more than this they saw and heard. They saw with Him two men,' [3701] whom, in their heightened sensitiveness to spiritual phenomena, they could have no difficulty in recognising, by such of their conversation as they heard, as Moses and Elijah. [3702] The column was now complete: the base in the Law; the shaft in that Prophetism of which Elijah was the great Representative - in his first Mission, as fulfilling the primary object of the Prophets: to call Israel back to God; and, in his second Mission, this other aspect of the Prophets' work, to prepare the way for the Kingdom of God; and the apex in Christ Himself - a unity completely fitting together in all its parts. And they heard also, that they spake of His Exodus - outgoing - which He was about to fulfil at Jerusalem.' [3703] Although the term Exodus,' outgoing,' occurs otherwise for death,' [3704] we must bear in mind its meaning as contrasted with that in which the same Evangelic writer designates the Birth of Christ, as His incoming.' [3705] In truth, it implies not only His Decease, but its manner, and even His Resurrection and Ascension. In that sense we can understand the better, as on the lips of Moses and Elijah, this about His fulfilling that Exodus: accomplishing it in all its fulness, and so completing Law and Prophecy, type and prediction.And still that night of glory had not ended. A strange peculiarity has been noticed about Hermon in the extreme rapidity of the formation of cloud on the summit. In a few minutes a thick cap forms over the top of the mountain, and as quickly disperses and entirely disappears.' [3706] It almost seems as if this, like the natural position of Hermon itself, was, if not to be connected with, yet, so to speak, to form the background to what was to be enacted. Suddenly a cloud passed over the clear brow of the mountain - not an ordinary, but a luminous cloud,' a cloud uplit, filled with light. As it laid itself between Jesus and the two Old Testament Representatives, it parted, and presently enwrapped them. Most significant is it, suggestive of the Presence of God, revealing, yet concealing - a cloud, yet luminous. And this cloud overshadowed the disciples: the shadow of its light fell upon them. A nameless terror seized them. Fain would they have held what seemed for ever to escape their grasp. Such vision had never before been vouchsafed to mortal man as had fallen on their sight; they had already heard Heaven's converse; they had tasted Angels' Food, the Bread of His Presence. Could the vision not be perpetuated - at least prolonged? In the confusion of their terror they knew not how otherwise to word it, than by an expression of ecstatic longing for the continuance of what they had, of their earnest readiness to

do their little best, if they could but secure it - make booths for the heavenly Visitants [3707] - and themselves wait in humble service and reverent attention on what their dull heaviness had prevented their enjoying and profiting by, to the full. They knew and felt it: Lord' - Rabbi' - Master' - it is good for us to be here' - and they longed to have it; yet how to secure it, their terror could not suggest, save in the language of ignorance and semi-conscious confusion. They wist not what they said.' In presence of the luminous cloud that enwrapt those glorified Saints, they spake from out that darkness which compassed them about.And now the light-cloud was spreading; presently its fringe fell upon them. [3708] Heaven's awe was upon them: for the touch of the heavenly strains, almost to breaking, the bond betwixt body and soul. And a Voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is My Beloved [3709] Son: hear Him.' It had needed only One other Testimony to seal it all; One other Voice, to give both meaning and music to what had been the subject of Moses' and Elijah's speaking. That Voice had now come - not in testimony to any fact, but to a Person - that of Jesus as His Beloved Son,' [3710] and in gracious direction to them. They heard it, falling on their faces in awestruck worship. How long the silence had lasted, and the last rays of the cloud had passed, we know not. Presently, it was a gentle touch that roused them. It was the Hand of Jesus, as with words of comfort He reassured them: Arise, and be not afraid.' And as, startled, [3711] they looked round about them, they saw no man save Jesus only. The Heavenly Visitants had gone, the last glow of the light-cloud had faded away, the echoes of Heaven's Voice had died out. It was night, and they were on the Mount with Jesus, and with Jesus only.Is it truth or falsehood; was it reality or vision, or part of both, this Transfiguration-scene on Hermon? One thing, at least, must be evident: if it be a true narrative, it cannot possibly describe a merely subjective vision without objective reality. But, in that case, it would be not only difficult, but impossible, to separate one part of the narrative - the appearance of Moses and Elijah - from the other, the Transfiguration of the Lord, and to assign to the latter objective reality, [3712] while regarding the former as merely a vision. But is the account true? It certainly represents primitive tradition, since it is not only told by all the three Evangelists, but referred to in 2 Peter i.16-18, [3713] and evidently implied in the words of St. John, both in his Gospel, [3714] and in the opening of his First Epistle. Few, if any would be so bold as to assert that the whole of this history had been invented by the three Apostles, who professed to have been its witnesses. Nor can any adequate motive be imagined for its invention. It could not have been intended to prepare the Jews for the Crucifixion of the Messiah, since it was to be kept a secret till after His Resurrection; and, after the event, it could not have been necessary for the assurance of those who believed in the Resurrection, while to others it would carry no weight. Again, the special traits of this history are inconsistent with the theory of its invention. In a legend, the witnesses of such an event would not have been represented as scarcely awake, and not knowing what they said. Manifestly, the object would have been to convey the opposite impression. Lastly, it cannot be too often repeated, that, in view of the manifold witness of the Evangelists, amply confirmed in all essentials by the Epistles - preached, lived, and bloodsealed by the primitive Church, and handed down as primitive tradition - the most untenable theory seems that which imputes intentional fraud to their narratives, or, to put it otherwise, non-belief on the part of the narrators of what they related.But can we suppose, if not fraud, yet mistake on the part of these witnesses, so that an event, otherwise naturally explicable, may, through their ignorance or imaginativeness, have assumed the proportions of this narrative? The investigation will be the more easy, that, as regards all the main features of the narrative, the three Evangelists are entirely agreed. Instead of examining in detail the various

rationalistic attempts made to explain this history on natural grounds, it seems sufficient for refutation to ask the intelligent reader to attempt imagining any natural event, which by any possibility could have been mistaken for what the eyewitnesses related, and the Evangelists recorded.There still remains the mythical theory of explanation, which, if it could be supported, would be the most attractive among those of a negative character. But we cannot imagine a legend without some historical motive or basis for its origination. The legend must be in character - that is, congruous to the ideas and expectancies entertained. Such a history as that of the Transfiguration could not have been a pure invention; but if such or similar expectancies had existed about the Messiah, then such a legend might, without intentional fraud, have, by gradual accretion, gathered around the Person of Him Who was regarded as the Christ. And this is the rationale of the so-called mythical theory. But all such ideas vanish at the touch of history. There was absolutely no Jewish expectancy that could have bodied itself forth in a narrative like that of the Transfiguration. To begin with the accessories, the idea, that the coming of Moses was to be connected with that of the Messiah, rests not only on an exaggeration, but on a dubious and difficult passage in the Jerusalem Targum. [3715] [3716] It is quite true, that the face of Moses shone when he came down from the Mount; but, if this is to be regarded as the basis of the Transfiguration of Jesus, the presence of Elijah would not be in point. On the other hand - to pass over other inconsistencies - anything more un-Jewish could scarcely be imagined than a Messiah crucified, or that Moses and Elijah should appear to converse with Him on such a Death! If it be suggested, that the purpose was to represent the Law and the Prophets as bearing testimony to the Dying of the Messiah, we fully admit it. Certainly, this is the New Testament and the true idea concerning the Christ; but equally certainly, it was not and is not, that of the Jews concerning the Messiah. [3717] If it is impossible to regard this narrative as a fraud; hopeless, to attempt explaining it as a natural event; and utterly unaccountable, when viewed in connection with contemporary thought or expectancy - in short, if all negative theories fail, let us see whether, and how on the supposition of its reality, it will fit into the general narrative. To begin with: if our previous investigations have rightly led us up to this result, that Jesus was the Very Christ of God, then this event can scarcely be described as miraculous - at least in such a history. If we would not expect it, it is certainly that which might have been expected. For, first, it was (and at that particular period) a necessary stage in the Lord's History, viewed in the light in which the Gospels present Him. Secondly, it was needful for His own strengthening, even as the Ministry of the Angels after the Temptation. Thirdly, it was good' for these three disciples to be there: not only for future witness, but for present help, and also with special reference to Peter's remonstrance against Christ's death-message. Lastly, the Voice from heaven, in hearing of His disciples, was of the deepest importance. Coming after the announcement of His Death and Passion, it sealed that testimony, and, in view of it, proclaimed Him as the Prophet to Whom Moses had bidden Israel hearken, [3718] while it repeated the heavenly utterance concerning Him made at His Baptism. [3719]But, for us all, the interest of this history lies not only in the past; it is in the present also, and in the future. To all ages it is like the vision of the bush burning, in which was the Presence of God. And it points us forward to that transformation, of which that of Christ was the pledge, when this corruptible shall put on incorruption.' As of old the beacon-fires, lighted from hill to hill, announced to them far away from Jerusalem the advent of solemn feast, so does the glory kindled on the Mount of Transfiguration shine through the darkness of the world, and tell of the Resurrection-Day.On Hermon the Lord and His disciples had reached the highest point in this

history. Henceforth it is a descent into the Valley of Humiliation and Death!

CHAPTER II. ON THE MORROW OF THE TRANSFIGURATION

(St. Matt. xvii.9-21; St. Mark ix.9-29: St. Luke ix.37-43.) IT was the early dawn of another summer's day when the Master and His disciples turned their steps once more towards the plain. They had seen His Glory; they had had the most solemn witness which, as Jews, the could have; and they had gained a new knowledge of the Old Testament. It all bore reference to the Christ, and it spake of His Decease. Perhaps on that morning better than in the previous night did they realise the vision, and feel its calm happiness. It was to their souls like the morning-air which they breathed on that mountain. It would be only natural, that their thoughts should also wander to the companions and fellow-disciples whom, on the previous evening, they had left in the valley beneath. How much they had to tell them, and how glad they would be of the tidings they would hear! That one night had for ever answered so many questions about that most hard of all His sayings: concerning His Rejection and violent Death at Jerusalem; it had shed heavenly light into that terrible gloom! They - at least these three - had formerly simply submitted to the saying of Christ because it was His, without understanding it; but now they had learned to see it in quite another light. How they must have longed to impart it to those whose difficulties were at least as great, perhaps greater, who perhaps had not yet recovered from the rude shock which their Messianic thoughts and hopes had so lately received. We think here especially of those, whom, so far as individuality of thinking is concerned, we may designate as the representative three, and the counterpart of the three chosen Apostles: Philip, who ever sought firm standing-ground for faith; Thomas, who wanted evidence for believing; and Judas, whose burning Jewish zeal for a Jewish Messiah had already begun to consume his own soul, as the wind had driven back upon himself the flame that had been kindled. Every question of a Philip, every doubt of a Thomas, every despairing wild outburst of a Judas, would be met by what they had now to tell. But it was not to be so. Evidently, it was not an event to be made generally known, either to the people or even to the great body of the disciples. They could not have understood its real meaning; they would have misunderstood, and in their ignorance misapplied to carnal Jewish purposes, its heavenly lessons. But even the rest of the Apostles must not know of it: that they were not qualified to witness it, proved that they were not prepared to hear of it. We cannot for a moment imagine, that there was favouritism in the selection of certain Apostles to share in what the others might not witness. It was not because these were better loved, but because they were better prepared [3720] - more fully receptive, more readily acquiescing, more entirely self-surrendering. Too often we commit in our estimate the error of thinking of them exclusively as Apostles, not as disciples; as our teachers, not as His learners, with all the failings of men, the prejudices of Jews, and the unbelief natural to us all, but assuming in each individual special forms, and appearing as characteristic weaknesses. And so it was that, when the silence of that morning-descent was broken, the Master laid on them the command to tell no man of this vision, till after the Son of Man were risen from the dead. This mysterious injunction of silence affords another presumptive evidence against the invention, or the rationalistic explanations, or the mythical origin of this narrative. It also teaches two further lessons. The silence thus enjoined was the first step into the Valley of Humiliation. It was also a test, whether they had understood the spiritual teaching of the vision. And their strict obedience,

not questioning even the grounds of the injunction, proved that they had learned it. So entire, indeed, was their submission, that they dared not even ask the Master about a new and seemingly greater mystery than they had yet heard: the meaning of the Son of Man rising from the Dead. [3721] Did it refer to the general Resurrection; was the Messiah to be the first to rise from the dead, and to waken the other sleepers - or was it only a figurative expression for His triumph and vindication? Evidently, they knew as yet nothing of Christ's Personal Resurrection as separate from that of others, and on the third day after His Death. And yet it was so near! So ignorant were they, and so unprepared! And they dared not ask the Master of it. This much they had already learned: not to question the mysteries of the future, but simply to receive them. But in their inmost hearts they kept that saying - as the Virgin-Mother had kept many a like saying - carrying it about with them' as a precious living germ that would presently spring up and bear fruit, or as that which would kindle into light and chase all darkness. But among themselves, then and many times afterwards, in secret converse, they questioned what the rising again from the dead should mean. [3722] There was another question, and it they might ask of Jesus, since it concerned not the mysteries of the future, but the lessons of the past. Thinking of that vision, of the appearance of Elijah and of his speaking of the Death of the Messiah, why did the Scribes say that Elijah should first come - and, as was the universal teaching, for the purpose of restoring all things? If, as they had seen, Elijah had come, but only for a brief season, not to abide, along with Moses, as they had fondly wished when they proposed to rear them booths; if he had come not to the people but to Christ, in view of only them three - and they were not even to tell of it; and, if it had been, not to prepare for a spiritual restoration, but to speak of what implied the opposite: the Rejection and violent Death of the Messiah - then, were the Scribes right in their teaching, and what was its real meaning? The question afforded the opportunity of presenting to the disciples not only a solution of their difficulties, but another insight into the necessity of His Rejection and Death. They had failed to distinguish between the coming of Elijah and its alternative sequence. Truly Elias cometh first' - and Elijah had come already' in the person of John the Baptist. The Divinely intended object of Elijah's coming was to restore all things.' This, of course, implied a moral element in the submission of the people to God, and their willingness to receive his message. Otherwise there was this Divine alternative in the prophecy of Malachi: Lest I come to smite the land with the ban' (Cherem). Elijah had come; if the people had received his message, there would have been the promised restoration of all things. As the Lord had said on a previous occasion [3723] : If ye are willing to receive him, [3724] this is Elijah, which is to come.' Similarly, if Israel had received the Christ, He would have gathered them as a hen her chickens for protection; He would not only have been, but have visibly appeared as, their King. But Israel did not know their Elijah, and did unto him whatsoever they listed; and so, in logical sequence, would the Son of Man also suffer of them. And thus has the other part of Malachi's prophecy been fulfilled: and the land of Israel been smitten with the ban. [3725] Amidst such conversation the descent from the mountain was accomplished. Presently they found themselves in view of a scene, which only too clearly showed that unfitness of the disciples for the heavenly vision of the preceding night, to which reference has been made. For, amidst the divergence of details between the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and, so far as it goes, that of St. Luke, the one point in which they almost literally and emphatically accord is, when the Lord speaks of them, in language of bitter disappointment and sorrow, as a generation with whose want of faith, notwithstanding all that they had seen and learned, He had still to bear, expressly attributing [3726] their failure in restoring the lunatick, to

their unbelief.' [3727] It was, indeed, a terrible contrast between the scene below and that vision of Moses and Elijah, when they had spoken of the Exodus of the Christ, and the Divine Voice had attested the Christ from out the luminous cloud. A concourse of excited people - among them once more Scribes,' who had tracked the Lord and come upon His weakest disciples in the hour of their greatest weakness - is gathered about a man who had in vain brought his lunatick son for healing. He is eagerly questioned by the multitude, and moodily answers; or, as it might almost seem from St. Matthew, [3728] he is leaving the crowd and those from whom he had vainly sought help. This was the hour of triumph for these Scribes. The Master had refused the challenge in Dalmanutha, and the disciples, accepting it, had signally failed. There they were, questioning with them' noisily, discussing this and all similar phenomena, but chiefly the power, authority, and reality of the Master. It reminds us of Israel's temptation in the wilderness, and we should scarcely wonder, if they had even questioned the return of Jesus, as they of old did that of Moses. At that very moment, Jesus appeared with the three. We cannot wonder that, when they saw Him, they were greatly amazed, [3729] and running to Him saluted Him.' [3730] He came - as always, and to us also - unexpectedly, most opportunely, and for the real decision of the question in hand. [3731] There was immediate calm, preceding victory. Before the Master's inquiry about the cause of this violent discussion could be answered, the man who had been its occasion came forward. With lowliest gesture (kneeling to Him' [3732]) he addressed Jesus. At last he had found Him, Whom he had come to seek; and, if possibility of help there were, oh! let it be granted. Describing the symptoms of his son's distemper, which were those of epilepsy and mania - although both the father and Jesus rightly attributed the disease to demoniac influence - he told, how he had come in search of the Master, but only found the nine disciples, and how they had presumptuously attempted, and signally failed in the attempted cure. Why had they failed? For the same reason, that they had not been taken into the Mount of Transfiguration - because they were faithless,' because of their unbelief.' They had that outward faith of the probatum est' (it is proved'); they believed because, and what, they had seen; and they were drawn closer to Christ - at least almost all of them, though in varying measure - as to Him Who, and Who alone, spake the words of eternal life,' which, with wondrous power, had swayed their souls, or laid them to heaven's rest. But that deeper, truer faith, which consisted in the spiritual view of that which was the unseen in Christ, and that higher power, which flows from such apprehension, they had not. In such faith as they had, they spake, repeated forms of exorcism, tried to imitate their Master. But they signally failed, as did those seven Jewish Priest-sons at Ephesus. And it was intended that they should fail, that so to them and to us the higher meaning of faith as contrasted with power, the inward as contrasted with the merely outward qualification, might appear. In that hour of crisis, in the presence of questioning Scribes and a wondering populace, and in the absence of the Christ, only one power could prevail, that of spiritual faith; and that kind' could not come out but by prayer.' [3733] It is this lesson, viewed also in organic connection with all that had happened since the great temptation at Dalmanutha, which furnishes the explanation of the whole history. For one moment we have a glimpse into the Saviour's soul: the poignant sorrow of His disappointment at the unbelief of the faithless and perverse generation,' [3734] with which He had so long borne; the infinite patience and condescension, the Divine need be' of His having thus to bear even with His own, together with the deep humiliation and keen pang which it involved; and the almost home-longing, as one has called it, [3735] of His soul. These are mysteries to adore. The next moment Jesus turns Him to the father. At His command the lunatick is brought to Him. In the

Presence of Jesus, and in view of the coming contest between Light and Darkness, one of those paroxysms of demoniac operation ensues, such as we have witnessed on all similar occasions. This was allowed to pass in view of all. But both this, and the question as to the length of time the lunatick had been afflicted, together with the answer, and the description of the dangers involved, which it elicited, were evidently intended to point the lesson of the need of a higher faith. To the father, however, who knew not the mode of treatment by the Heavenly Physician, they seemed like the questions of an earthly healer who must consider the symptoms before he could attempt to cure. If Thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us.' It was but natural - and yet it was the turning-point in this whole history, alike as regarded the healing of the lunatick, the better leading of his father, the teaching of the disciples, and that of the multitude and the Scribes. There is all the calm majesty of Divine self-consciousness, yet without trace of self-assertion, when Jesus, utterly ignoring the if Thou canst,' turns to the man and tells him that, while with the Divine Helper there is the possibility of all help, it is conditioned by a possibility in ourselves, by man's receptiveness, by his faith. Not, if the Christ can do anything or even everything, but, If thou canst believe, [3736] all things are possible to him that believeth.' [3737] The question is not, it can never be, as the man had put it; it must not even be answered, but ignored. It must ever be, not what He can, but what we can. When the infinite fulness is poured forth, as it ever is in Christ, it is not the oil that is stayed, but the vessels which fail. He giveth richly, inexhaustibly, but not mechanically; there is only one condition, the moral one of the presence of absolute faith - our receptiveness. And so these words have to all time remained the teaching to every individual striver in the battle of the higher life, and to the Church as a whole - the in hoc signo vinces' [3738] over the Cross, the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.It was a lesson, of which the reality was attested by the hold which it took on the man's whole nature. While by one great outgoing of his soul he overleapt all, to lay hold on the one fact set before him, he felt all the more the dark chasm of unbelief behind him, but he also clung to that Christ, Whose teaching of faith had shown him, together with the possibility, the source of faith. Thus through the felt unbelief of faith he attained true faith by laying hold on the Divine Saviour, when he cried out and said: [3739] Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief.' [3740] These words have remained historic, marking all true faith, which, even as faith, is conscious of, nay implies, unbelief, but brings it to Christ for help. The most bold leap of faith and the timid resting at His Feet, the first beginning and the last ending of faith, have alike this as their watchword.Such cry could not be, and never is, unheard. It was real demoniac influence which, continuing with this man from childhood onwards, had well-nigh crushed all moral individuality in him. In his many lucid intervals these many years, since he had grown from a child into a youth, he had never sought to shake off the yoke and regain his moral individuality, nor would he even now have come, if his father had not brought him. If any, this narrative shows the view which the Gospels and Jesus took of what are described as the demonised.' It was a reality, and not accommodation to Jewish views, when, as He saw the multitude running together, He rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to him: Dumb and deaf spirit, I command thee, come out of him, and no more come into him.'Another and a more violent paroxysm, so that the bystanders almost thought him dead. But the unclean spirit had come out of him. And with strong gentle Hand the Saviour lifted him, and with loving gesture delivered him to his father.All things had been possible to faith; not to that external belief of the disciples, which failed to reach that kind,' [3741] and ever fails to reach such kind, but to true spiritual faith in Him. And so it is to each of us individually, and to the Church, to all time. That kind' - whether it be of

sin, of lust, of the world, or of science falsely so called, of temptation, or of materialism - cometh not out by any of our ready-made formulas or dead dogmas. Not so are the flesh and the Devil vanquished; not so is the world overcome. It cometh out by nothing but by prayer: Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief.' Then, although our faith were only what in popular language was described as the smallest' - like a grain of mustard-seed' - and the result to be achieved the greatest, most difficult, seemingly transcending human ability to compass it - what in popular language was designated as removing mountains' [3742] - nothing shall be impossible' unto us. And these eighteen centuries of suffering in Christ, and deliverance through Christ, and work for Christ, have proved it. For all things are ours, if Christ is ours.

CHAPTER III. THE LAST EVENTS IN GALILEE - THE TRIBUTE-MONEY, THE DISPUTE BY THE WAY, THE FORBIDDING OF HIM WHO COULD NOT FOLLOW WITH THE DISCIPLES, AND THE CONSEQUENT TEACHING OF CHRIST.

(St. Matt. xvii.22, xviii.22; St. Mark ix.30-50; St. Luke ix.43-50.) Now that the Lord's retreat in the utmost borders of the land, at Cæsarea Philippi, was known to the Scribes, and that He was again surrounded and followed by the multitude, there could be no further object in His retirement. Indeed, the time was coming that He should meet that for which He had been, and was still, preparing the minds of His disciples - His Decease at Jerusalem. Accordingly, we find Him once more with His disciples in Galilee - not to abide there, [3743] nor to traverse it as formerly for Missionary purposes, but preparatory to His journey to the Feast of Tabernacles. The few events of this brief stay, and the teaching connected with it, may be summed up as follows. 1. Prominently, perhaps, as the summary of all, we have now the clear and emphatic repetition of the prediction of His Death and Resurrection. While He would keep His present stay in Galilee as private as possible, [3744] He would fain so emphasize this teaching to His disciples, that it should sink down into their ears and memories. For it was, indeed, the most needful for them in view of the immediate future. Yet the announcement only filled their loving hearts with exceeding sorrow; they comprehend it not; nay, they were - perhaps not unnaturally - afraid to ask Him about it. We remember, that even the three who had been with Jesus on the Mount, understood not what the rising from the dead should mean, and that, by direction of the Master, they kept the whole Vision from their fellow-disciples; and, thinking of it all, we scarcely wonder that, from their standpoint, it was hid from them, so that they might not perceive it. 2. It is to the depression caused by His insistence on this terrible future, to the constant apprehension of near danger, and the consequent desire not to offend,' and so provoke those at whose hands, Christ had told them, He was to suffer, that we trace the incident about the tribute-money. We can scarcely believe, that Peter would have answered as he did, without previous permission of his Master, had it not been for such thoughts and fears. It was another mode of saying, That be far from Thee' - or, rather, trying to keep it as far as he could from Christ. Indeed, we can scarcely repress the feeling, that there was a certain amount of secretiveness on the part of Peter, as if he had apprehended that Jesus would not have wished him to act as he did, and would fain have kept the whole transaction from the knowledge of his Master. It is well known that, on the ground of the injunction in Exod. xxx.13 &c., every male in Israel, from twenty years upwards, was expected annually to contribute to the Temple-Treasury the sum of one half-shekel [3745] of the Sanctuary, [3746] that is, one common shekel, or two Attic drachms, [3747] equivalent to about 1s.2d. or 1s.3d. of our money. Whether or not the original Biblical ordinance had been intended to institute a regular annual contribution, the Jews of the Dispersion would probably regard it in the light of a patriotic as well as religious act. To the particulars previously given on this subject a few others may be added. The family of the Chief of the Sanhedrin (Gamaliel) seems to have enjoyed the curious distinction of bringing their

contributions to the Temple-Treasury, not like others, but to have thrown them down before him who opened the Temple-Chest, [3748] when they were immediately placed in the box from which, without delay, sacrifices were provided. [3749] Again, the commentators explain a certain passage in the Mishnah [3750] and the Talmud [3751] as implying that, although the Jews in Palestine had to pay the tribute-money before the Passover, those from neighbouring lands might bring it before the Feast of Weeks, and those from such remote countries as Babylonia and Media as late as the Feast of Tabernacles. [3752] Lastly, although the Mishnah lays it down, that the goods of those might be distrained, who had not paid the Temple-tribute by the 25th Adar, it is scarcely credible that this obtained at the time of Christ, [3753] at any rate in Galilee. Indeed, this seems implied in the statement of the Mishnah [3754] and the Talmud, [3755] that one of the thirteen trumpets' in the Temple, into which contributions were cast, was destined for the shekels of the current, and another for those of the preceding, year. Finally, these Temple-contributions were in the first place devoted to the purchase of all public sacrifices, that is, those which were offered in the name of the whole congregation of Israel, such as the morning and evening sacrifices. It will be remembered, that this was one of the points in fierce dispute between the Pharisees and Sadducees, and that the former perpetuated their triumph by marking its anniversary as a festive day in their calendar. It seems a terrible irony of judgment [3756] when Vespasian ordered, after the destruction of the Temple, that this tribute should henceforth be paid for the rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. [3757] It will be remembered that, shortly before the previous Passover, Jesus with His disciples had left Capernaum, [3758] That they returned to the latter city only for the Sabbath, and that, as we have suggested, they passed the first Paschal days on the borders of Tyre. We have, indeed, no means of knowing where the Master had tarried during the ten days between the 15th and the 25th Adar, supposing the Mishnic arrangements to have been in force in Capernaum. He was certainly not at Capernaum, and it must also have been known, that He had not gone up to Jerusalem for the Passover. Accordingly, when it was told in Capernaum, that the Rabbi of Nazareth had once more come to what seems to have been His Galilean home, it was only natural, that they who collected the Temple-tribute [3759] should have applied for its payment. It is quite possible, that their application may have been, if not prompted, yet quickened, by the wish to involve Him in a breach of so well-known an obligation, or else by a hostile curiosity. Would He, Who took so strangely different views of Jewish observances, and Who made such extraordinary claims, own the duty of paying the Temple-tribute? Had it been owing to His absence, or from principle, that He had not paid it last Passover-season? The question which they put to Peter implies, at least, their doubt. We have already seen what motives prompted the hasty reply of Peter. He might, indeed, also otherwise, in his rashness, have given an affirmative answer to the inquiry, without first consulting the Master. For there seems little doubt, that Jesus had on former occasions complied with the Jewish custom. But matters were now wholly changed. Since the first Passover, which had marked His first public appearance in the Temple at Jerusalem, He had stated - and quite lately in most explicit terms - that He was the Christ, the Son of God. To have now paid the Temple-tribute, without explanation, might have involved a very serious misapprehension. In view of all this, the history before us seems alike simple and natural. There is no pretext for the artificial construction put upon it by commentators, any more than for the suggestion, that such was the poverty of the Master and His disciples, that the small sum requisite for the Temple-tribute had to be miraculously supplied. We picture it to ourselves on this wise. Those who received the Tribute-money had come to Peter, and perhaps met him in the court or

corridor, and asked him: Your Teacher (Rabbi), does He not pay the didrachma?' While Peter hastily responded in the affirmative, and then entered into the house to procure the coin, or else to report what has passed, Jesus, Who had been in another part of the house, but was cognisant of all, anticipated him.' [3760] Addressing him in kindly language as Simon,' He pointed out the real state of matters by an illustration which must, of course, not be too literally pressed, and of which the meaning was: Whom does a King intend to tax for the maintenance of his palace and officers? Surely not his own family, but others. The inference from this, as regarded the Temple-tribute, was obvious. As in all similar Jewish parabolic teaching, it was only indicated in general principle: Then are the children free.' But even so, be it as Peter had wished, although not from the same motive. Let no needless offence be given; for, assuredly, they would not have understood the principle on which Christ would have refused the Tribute money, [3761] and all misunderstanding on the part of Peter was now impossible. Yet Christ would still further vindicate His royal title. He will pay for Peter also, and pay, as heaven's King, with a Stater, or four-drachm piece, miraculously provided. Thus viewed, there is, we submit, a moral purpose and spiritual instruction in the provision of the Stater out of the fish's mouth. The rationalistic explanation of it need not be seriously considered; for any mythical interpretation there is not the shadow of support in Biblical precedent or Jewish expectancy. But the narrative in its literality has a true and high meaning. And if we wished to mark the difference between its sober simplicity and the extravagances of legend, we would remind ourselves, not only of the well-known story of the Ring of Polycrates, but of two somewhat kindred Jewish Haggadahs. They are both intended to glorify the Jewish mode of Sabbath observance. One of them bears that one Joseph, known as the honourer' of the Sabbath, had a wealthy heathen neighbour, to whom the Chaldæans had prophesied that all his riches would come to Joseph. To render this impossible, the wealthy man converted all his property into one magnificent gem, which he carefully concealed within his head-gear. Then he took ship, so as for ever to avoid the dangerous vicinity of the Jew. But the wind blew his head-gear into the sea, and the gem was swallowed by a fish. And lo! it was the holy season, and they brought to the market a splendid fish. Who would purchase it but Joseph, for none as he would prepare to honour the day by the best which he could provide. But when they opened the fish, the gem was found in it - the moral being: He that borroweth for the Sabbath, the Sabbath will repay him.' [3762] The other legend is similar. It was in Rome (in the Christian world) that a poor tailor went to market to buy a fish for a festive meal. [3763] Only one was on sale, and for it there was keen competition between the servant of a Prince and the Jew, the latter at last buying it for not less than twelve dinars. At the banquet, the Prince inquired of his servants why no fish had been provided. When he ascertained the cause, he sent for the Jew with the threatening inquiry, how a poor tailor could afford to pay twelve dinars for a fish? My Lord,' replied the Jew, there is a day on which all our sins are remitted us, and should we not honour it?' The answer satisfied the Prince. But God rewarded the Jew, for, when the fish was opened, a precious gem was found in it, which he sold, and ever afterwards lived of the proceeds. [3764] The reader can scarcely fail to mark the absolute difference between even the most beautiful Jewish legends and any trait in the Evangelic history.3. The event next recorded in the Gospels took place partly on the way from the Mount of Transfiguration to Capernaum, and partly in Capernaum itself, immediately after the scene connected with the Tribute-money. It is recorded by the three Evangelists, and it led to explanations and admonitions, which are told by St. Mark and St. Luke, but chiefly by St. Matthew. This circumstance seems to indicate, that the latter was the chief actor in that which occasioned this special teaching and warning of Christ, and

that it must have sunk very deeply into his heart.As we look at it, in the light of the then mental and spiritual state of the Apostles, not in that in which, perhaps naturally, we regard them, what happened seems not difficult to understand. As St. Mark puts it, [3765] by the way they had disputed among themselves which of them would be the greatest - as St. Matthew explains, [3766] in the Messianic Kingdom of Heaven. They might now the more confidently expect its near Advent from the mysterious announcement of the Resurrection on the third day, [3767] which they would probably connect with the commencement of the last Judgment, following upon the violent Death of the Messiah. Of a dispute, serious and even violent, among the disciples, we have evidence in the exhortation of the Master, as reported by St. Mark, [3768] in the direction of the Lord how to deal with an offending brother, and in the answering inquiry of Peter. [3769] Nor can we be at a loss to perceive its occasion. The distinction just bestowed on the three, in being taken up the Mount, may have roused feelings of jealousy in the others perhaps of self-exaltation in the three. Alike the spirit which John displayed in his harsh prohibition of the man that did not follow with the disciples, [3770] and the self-righteous bargaining of Peter about forgiving the supposed or real offences of a brother, [3771] give evidence of anything but the frame of mind which we would have expected after the Vision on the Mount.In truth, most incongruous as it may appear to us, looking back on it in the light of the Resurrection, day, nay, almost incredible - evidently, the Apostles were still greatly under the influence of the old spirit. It was the common Jewish view, that there would be distinctions of rank in the Kingdom of Heaven. It can scarcely be necessary to prove this by Rabbinic quotations, since the whole system of Rabbinism and Pharisaism, with its separation from the vulgar and ignorant, rests upon it. But even within the charmed circle of Rabbinism, there would be distinctions, due to learning, merit, and even to favouritism. In this world there were His special favourites, who could command anything at His hand, to use the Rabbinic illustration, like a spoilt child from its father. [3772] [3773] And in the Messianic age God would assign booths to each according to his rank. [3774] On the other hand, many passages could be quoted bearingon the duty of humility and self-abasement. But the stress laid on the merit attaching to this shows too clearly, that it was the pride that apes humility. One instance, [3775] previously referred to, will suffice by way of illustration. When the child of the great Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai was dangerously ill, he was restored through the prayer of one Chanina ben Dosa. On this the father of the child remarked to his wife: If the son of Zakkai had all day long put his head between his knees, no heed would have been given to him.' How is that?' asked his wife; is Chanina greater than thou?' No,' was the reply, he is like a servant before the King, while I am like a prince before the King' (he is always there, and has thus opportunities which I, as a lord, do not enjoy).How deep-rooted were such thoughts and feelings, appears not only from the dispute of the disciples by the way, but from the request proffered by the mother of Zebedee's children and her sons at a later period, in terrible contrast to the near Passion of our Lord. [3776] It does, indeed come upon us as a most painful surprise, and as sadly incongruous, this constant self-obtrusion, self-assertion, and low, carnal self-seeking; this Judaistic trifling in face of the utter self-abnegation and self-sacrifice of the Son of Man. Surely, the contrast between Christ and His disciples seems at times almost as great as between Him and the other Jews. If we would measure His Stature, or comprehend the infinite distance between His aims and teaching and those of His contemporaries, let it be by comparison with even the best of His disciples. It must have been part of His humiliation and self-examination to bear with them. And is it not, in a sense, still so as regards us all?We have already seen, that there was quite sufficient occasion and material for such a dispute on the way

from the Mount of Transfiguration to Capernaum. We suppose Peter to have been only at the first with the others. To judge by the later question, how often he was to forgive the brother who had sinned against him, he may have been so deeply hurt, that he left the other disciples, and hastened on with the Master, Who would, at any rate, sojourn in his house. For, neither he nor Christ seem to have been present when John and the others forbade the man, who would not follow with them, to cast out demons in Christ's name. Again, the other disciples only came into Capernaum, and entered the house, just as Peter had gone for the Stater, with which to pay the Temple-tribute for the Master and himself. And, if speculation be permissible, we would suggest that the brother, whose offences Peter found it so difficult to forgive, may have been none other than Judas. In such a dispute by the way, he, with his Judaistic views, would be specially interested; perhaps he may have been its chief instigator; certainly, he, whose natural character, amidst its sharp contrasts to that of Peter, presented so many points of resemblance to it, would, on many grounds, be specially jealous of, and antagonistic to him. Quite natural in view of this dispute by the way is another incident of the journey, which is afterwards related. [3777] As we judge, John seems to have been the principal actor in it; perhaps, in the absence of Peter, he claimed the leadership. They had met one who was casting out demons in the Name of Christ - whether successfully or not, we need scarcely inquire. So widely had faith in the power of Jesus extended; so real was the belief in the subjection of the demons to Him; so reverent was the acknowledgment of Him. A man, who, thus forsaking the methods of Jewish exorcists, owned Jesus in the face of the Jewish world, could not be far from the Kingdom of Heaven; at any rate, he could not quickly speak evil of Him. John had, in name of the disciples, forbidden him, because he had not cast in his lot wholly with them. It was quite in the spirit of their ideas about the Messianic Kingdom, and of their dispute, which of His close followers would be greatest there. And yet, they might deceive themselves as to the motives of their conduct. If it were not almost impertinence to use such terms, we would have said that there was infinite wisdom and kindness in the answer which the Saviour gave, when referred to on the subject. To forbid a man, in such circumstances, would be either prompted by the spirit of the dispute by the way - or else must be grounded on evidence that the motive was, or the effect would ultimately be (as in the case of the sons of Sceva) to lead men to speak evil' of Christ, or to hinder the work of His disciples. Assuredly, such could not have been the case with a man, who invoked His Name, and perhaps experienced its efficacy. More than this - and here is an eternal principle: He that is not against us is for us;' he that opposeth not the disciples, really is for them - a saying still more clear, when we adopt the better reading in St. Luke, [3778] He that is not against you is for you.' [3779]There was reproof in this, as well as instruction, deeply consistent with that other, though seemingly different, saying: [3780] He that is not with Me is against Me.' The distinction between them is twofold. In the one case it is not against,' in the other it is not with;' but chiefly it lies in this: in the one case it is not against the disciples in their work, while in the other it is - not with Christ. A man who did what he could with such knowledge of Christ as he possessed, even although he did not absolutely follow with them, was not against' them. Such an one should be regarded as thus far with them; at least be let alone, left to Him Who knew all things. Such a man would not lightly speak evil of Christ - and that was all the disciples should care for, unless, indeed, they sought their own. Quite other was it as regarded the relation of a person to the Christ Himself. There neutrality was impossible - and that which was not with Christ, by this very fact was against Him. The lesson is of the most deep-reaching character, and the distinction, alas! still overlooked - perhaps, because ours is too

often the spirit of those who journeyed to Capernaum. Not, that it is unimportant to follow with the disciples, but that it is not ours to forbid any work done, however imperfectly, in His Name, and that only one question is really vital - whether or not a man is decidedly with Christ.Such were the incidents by the way. And now, while withholding from Christ their dispute, and, indeed, anything that might seem personal in the question, the disciples, on entering the house where He was in Capernaum, addressed to Him this inquiry (which should be inserted from the opening words of St. Matthew's narrative): Who, then, is greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?' It was a general question - but Jesus perceived the thought of their hearts; [3781] He knew about what they had disputed by the way, [3782] and now asked them concerning it. The account of St. Mark is most graphic. We almost see the scene. Conscience-stricken they held their peace.' As we read the further words: [3783] And He sat down,' it seems as if the Master had a first gone to welcome the disciples on their arrival, and they, full of their dispute,' had, without delay, addressed their inquiry to him in the court or antechamber, where they met Him, when, reading their thoughts, He had first put the searching counter-question, what had been the subject of their dispute. Then, leading the way into the house, He sat down,' not only to answer their inquiry, which was not a real inquiry, but to teach them what so much they needed to learn. He called a little child - perhaps Peter's little son - and put him in the midst of them. Not to strive who was to be greatest, but to be utterly without self-consciousness, like a child - thus, to become turned and entirely changed in mind: converted,' was the condition for entering into the Kingdom of Heaven. Then, as to the question of greatness there, it was really one of greatness of service - and that was greatest service which implied most self-denial. Suiting the action to the teaching, the Blessed Saviour took the happy child in His Arms. Not, to teach, to preach, to work miracles, nor to do great things, but to do the humblest service for Christ's sake - lovingly, earnestly, wholly, self-forgetfully, simply for Christ, was to receive Christ - nay, to receive the Father. And the smallest service, as it might seem - even the giving a cup of cold water in such spirit, would not lose its reward. Blessed teaching this to the disciples and to us; blessed lesson, which, these many centuries of scorching heat, has been of unspeakable refreshing, alike to the giver and the receiver of the cup of water in the Name of Christ, in the love of Christ, and for the sake of Christ. [3784] These words about receiving Christ, and receiving in the Name of Christ,' had stirred the memory and conscience of John, and made him half wonder, half fear, whether what they had done by the way, in forbidding the man to do what he could in the name of Christ, had been right. And so he told it, and received the further and higher teaching on the subject. And, more than this, St. Mark and, more fully, St. Matthew, record some further instruction in connection with it, to which St. Luke refers, in a slightly different form, at a somewhat later period. [3785] But it seems so congruous to the present occasion, that we conclude it was then spoken, although, like other sayings, [3786] it may have been afterwards repeated under similar circumstances. [3787] Certainly, no more effective continuation, and application to Jewish minds, of the teaching of our Lord could be conceived than that which follows. For, the love of Christ goes deeper than the condescension of receiving a child, utterly un-Pharisaic and un-Rabbinic as this is. [3788] To have regard to the weaknesses of such a child - to its mental and moral ignorance and folly, to adapt ourselves to it, to restrain our fuller knowledge and forego our felt liberty, so as not to offend' - not to give occasion for stumbling to one of these little ones,' that so through our knowledge the weak brother for whom Christ died should not perish: this is a lesson which reaches even deeper than the question, what is the condition of entrance into the Kingdom, or what service constitutes real greatness in it. A man may enter into

the Kingdom and do service - yet, if in so doing he disregard the law of love to the little ones, far better his work should be abruptly cut short; better, one of those large millstones, turned by an ass, were hung about his neck and he cast into the sea! We pause to note, once more, the Judaic, and, therefore, evidential, setting of the Evangelic narrative. The Talmud also speaks of two kinds of millstones - the one turned by hand ({hebrew}), [3789] referred to in St. Luke xvii.35; the other turned by an ass (mlos nils), just as the Talmud also speaks of the ass of the millstone' ({hebrew}). [3790] Similarly, the figure about a millstone hung round the neck occurs also in the Talmud - although there as figurative of almost insuperable difficulties. [3791] Again, the expression, it were better for him,' is a well-known Rabbinic expression (Mutabh hayah lo). [3792] Lastly, according to St. Jerome, the punishment which seems alluded to in the words of Christ, and which we know to have been inflicted by Augustus, was actually practised by the Romans in Galilee on some of the leaders of the insurrection under Judas of Galilee.And yet greater guilt would only too surely be incurred! Woe unto the world! [3793] Occasions of stumbling and offence will surely come, but woe to the man through whom such havoc was wrought. What then is the alternative? If it be a question as between offence and some part of ourselves, a limb or member, however useful - the hand, the foot, the eye - then let it rather be severed from the body, however painful, or however seemingly great the loss. It cannot be so great as that of the whole being in the eternal fire of Gehenna, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. [3794] it hand, foot, or eye - practice, pursuit, or research - which consciously leads us to occasions of stumbling, it must be resolutely put aside in view of the incomparably greater loss of eternal remorse and anguish.Here St. Mark abruptly breaks off with a saying in which the Saviour makes general application, although the narrative is further continued by St. Matthew. The words reported by St. Mark are so remarkable, so brief, we had almost said truncated, as to require special consideration. [3795] It seems to us that, turning from this thought that even members which are intended for useful service may, in certain circumstances, have to be cut off to avoid the greatest loss, the Lord gave to His disciples this as the final summary and explanation of all: For every one shall be salted for the fire' [3796] - or, as a very early gloss, which has strangely crept into the text, [3797] paraphrased and explained it, Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.' [3798] No one is fit for the sacrificial fire, no one can himself be, nor offer anything as a sacrifice, unless it have been first, according to the Levitical Law, covered with salt, symbolic of the incorruptible. Salt is good; but if the salt,' with which the spiritual sacrifice is to be salted for the fire, have lost its savour, wherewith will ye season it?' Hence, have salt in yourselves,' but do not let that salt be corrupted by making it an occasion of offence to others, or among yourselves, as in the dispute by the way, or in the disposition of mind that led to it, or in forbidding others to work who follow not with you, but be at peace among yourselves.'To this explanation of the words of Christ it may, perhaps, be added that, from their form, they must have conveyed a special meaning to the disciples. It is well-known law, that every sacrifice burned on the Altar must be salted with salt. [3799] Indeed, according to the Talmud, not only every such offering, but even the wood with which the sacrificial fire was kindled, was sprinkled with salt. [3800] Salt symbolised to the Jews of that time the incorruptible and the higher. Thus, the soul was compared to the salt, and it was said concerning the dead: Shake off the salt, and throw the flesh to the dogs.' [3801] The Bible was compared to salt; so was acuteness of intellect. [3802] Lastly, the question: If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith will ye season it?' seems to have been proverbial, and occurs in exactly the same words in the Talmud, apparently to denote a thing that is impossible. [3803] [3804] Most thoroughly anti-Pharisaic and

anti-Rabbinic as all this was, what St. Matthew further reports leads still farther in the same direction. We seem to see Jesus still holding this child, and, with evident reference to the Jewish contempt for that which is small, point to him and apply, in quite other manner than they had ever heard, the Rabbinic teaching about the Angels. In the Jewish view, [3805] only the chiefest of the Angels were before the Face of God within the curtained Veil, or Pargod, while the others, ranged in different classes, stood outside and awaited his behest. [3806] The distinction which the former enjoyed was always to behold His Face, and to hear and know directly the Divine counsels and commands. This distinction was, therefore, one of knowledge; Christ taught that it was one of love. Not the more exalted in knowledge, and merit, or worth, but the simpler, the more unconscious of self, the more receptive and clinging - the nearer to God. Look up from earth to heaven; those representative, it may be, guardian, Angels nearest to God, are not those of deepest knowledge of God's counsel and commands, but those of simple, humble grace and faith - and so learn, not only not to despise one of these little ones, but who is truly greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven!Viewed in this light, there is nothing incongruous in the transition: For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost.' [3807] This, His greatest condescension when He became the Babe of Bethlehem, is also His greatest exaltation. He Who is nearest the Father, and, in the most special and unique sense, always beholds His Face, is He that became a Child, and, as the Son of Man, stoops lowest, to save that which was lost. The words are, indeed, regarded as spurious by most critics, because certain leading manuscripts omit them, and they are supposed to have been imported from St. Luke xix.10. But such a transference from a context wholly unconnected with this section [3808] seems unaccountable, while, on the other hand, the verse in question forms, not only an apt, but almost necessary, transition to the Parable of the Lost Sheep. It seems, therefore, difficult to eliminate it without also striking out that Parable; and yet it fits most beautifully into the whole context. Suffice it for the present to note this. The Parable itself is more fully repeated in another connection, [3809] in which it will be more convenient to consider it.Yet a further depth of Christian love remained to be shown, which, all self-forgetful, sought not its own, but the things of others. This also bore on the circumstances of the time, and the dispute between the disciples, but went far beyond it, and set forth eternal principles. Hitherto it had been a question of not seeking self, nor minding great things, but Christ-like and God-like, to condescend to the little ones. What if actual wrong had been done, and just offence given by a brother'? [3810] In such case, also, the principle of the Kingdom - which, negatively, is that of self-forgetfulness, positively, that of service of love - would first seek the good of the offending brother. We mark, here, the contrast to Rabbinism, which directs that the first overtures must be made by the offender, not the offended; [3811] and even prescribes this to be done in the presence of numerous witnesses, and, if needful, repeated three times. [3812] As regards the duty of showing to a brother his fault, and the delicate tenderness of doing this in private, so as not to put him to shame, Rabbinism speaks the same as the Master of Nazareth. [3813] In fact, according to Jewish criminal law, punishment could not be inflicted unless the offender (even the woman suspected of adultery) had previously been warned before witnesses. Yet, in practice, matters were very different: and neither could those be found who would take reproof, nor yet such as were worthy to administer it. [3814]Quite other was it in the Kingdom of Christ, where the theory was left undefined, but the practice clearly marked. Here, by loving dealing, to convince of his wrong, him who had done it, was not humiliation nor loss of dignity or of right, but real gain: the gain of our brother to us, and eventually to Christ Himself. But even if this should fail, the offended must not

desist from his service of love, but conjoin in it others with himself so as to give weight and authority to his remonstrances, as not being the outcome of personal feeling or prejudice - perhaps, also, to be witnesses before the Divine tribunal. If this failed, a final appeal should be made on the part of the Church as a whole, which, of course, could only be done through her representatives and rulers, to whom Divine authority had been committed. And if that were rejected, the offer of love would, as always in the Gospel, pass into danger of judgment. Not, indeed, that such was to be executed by man, but that such an offender, after the first and second admonition, was to be rejected. [3815] He was to be treated as was the custom in regard to a heathen or a publican - not persecuted, despised, or avoided, but not received in Church-fellowship (a heathen), nor admitted to close familiar intercourse (a publican). And this, as we understand it, marks out the mode of what is called Church discipline in general, and specifically as regards wrongs done to a brother. Discipline so exercised (which may God restore to us) has the highest Divine sanction, and the most earnest reality attaches to it. For, in virtue of the authority which Christ has committed to the Church in the persons of her rulers and representatives, [3816] what they bound or loosed - declared obligatory or non-obligatory - was ratified in heaven. Nor was this to be wondered at. The incarnation of Christ was the link which bound earth to heaven: through it whatever was agreed upon in the fellowship of Christ, as that which was to be asked, would be done for them of his Father Which was in heaven. [3817] Thus, the power of the Church reached up to heaven through the power of prayer in His Name Who made God our Father. And so, beyond the exercise of discipline and authority, there was the omnipotence of prayer - if two of you shall agree . . . as touching anything . . . it shall be done for them' - and, with it, also the infinite possibility of a higher service of love. For, in the smallest gathering in the Name of Christ, His Presence would be, [3818] and with it the certainty of nearness to, and acceptance with, God. [3819] It is bitterly disappointing that, after such teaching, even a Peter could - either immediately afterwards, or perhaps after he had had time to think it over, and apply it - come to the Master with the question, how often he was to forgive an offending brother, imagining that he had more than satisfied the new requirements, if he extended it to seven times. [3820] Such traits show better than elaborate discussions the need of the mission and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. And yet there is something touching in the simplicity and honesty with which Peter goes to the Master with such a misapprehension of His teaching, as if he had fully entered into its spirit. Surely, the new wine was bursting the old bottles. It was a principle of Rabbinism that, even if the wrongdoer had made full restoration, he would not obtain forgiveness till he had asked it of him whom he had wronged, but that it was cruelty in such circumstances to refuse pardon. [3821] The Jerusalem Talmud [3822] adds the beautiful remark: Let this be a token in thine hand - each time that thou showest mercy, God will show mercy on thee; and if thou showest not mercy, neither will God show mercy on thee.' And yet it was a settled rule, that forgiveness should not be extended more than three times. [3823] Even so, the practice was terribly different. The Talmud relates, without blame, the conduct of a Rabbi, who would not forgive a very small slight of his dignity, though asked by the offender for thirteen successive years, and that on the Day of Atonement - the reason being, that the offended Rabbi had learned by a dream that his offending brother would attain the highest dignity, whereupon he feigned himself irreconcilable, to force the other to migrate from Palestine to Babylon, where, unenvied by him, he might occupy the chief place! [3824]And so it must have seemed to Peter, in his ignorance, quite a stretch of charity to extend forgiveness to seven, instead of three offences. It did not occur to him,

that the very act of numbering offences marked an externalism which had never entered into, nor comprehended the spirit of Christ. Until seven times? Nay, until seventy times seven! [3825] The evident purport of these words was to efface all such landmarks. Peter had yet to learn, what we, alas! too often forget: that as Christ's forgiveness, so that of the Christian, must not be computed by numbers. It is qualitative, not quantitative: Christ forgives sin, not sins - and he who has experienced it, follows in His footsteps. [3826]

CHAPTER IV. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM - CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE LAST PART OF THE GOSPEL-NARRATIVES - FIRST INCIDENTS BY THE WAY.

(St. John vii.1-16; St. Luke ix.1-56; 57-62; St. Matthew viii.19-22.) THE part in the Evangelic History which we have now reached has this peculiarity and difficulty, that the events are now recorded by only one of the Evangelists. The section in St. Luke's Gospel from chapter ix.51 to chapter xviii.14 stands absolutely alone. From the circumstance that St. Luke omits throughout his narrative all notation of time or place, the difficulty of arranging here the chronological succession of events is so great, that we can only suggest what seems most probable, without feeling certain of the details. Happily, the period embraced is a short one, while at the same time the narrative of St. Luke remarkably fits into that of St. John. St. John mentions three appearances of Christ in Jerusalem at that period: at the Feast of Tabernacles, [3827] at that of the Dedication, [3828] and His final entry, which is referred to by all the other Evangelists. [3829] But, while the narrative of St. John confines itself exclusively to what happened in Jerusalem or its immediate neighborhood. it also either mentions or gives sufficient indication that on two out of these three occasions Jesus left Jerusalem for the country east of the Jordan (St. John x.19-21; St. John x.39-43, where the words in ver.39, they sought again to take Him,' point to a previous similar attempt and flight). Besides these, St. John also records a journey to Bethany - though not to Jerusalem - for the raising of Lazarus, [3830] and after that a council against Christ in Jerusalem, in consequence of which He withdrew out of Judæan territory into a district near the wilderness' [3831] - as we infer, that in the north, where John had been baptizing and Christ been tempted, and whither He had afterwards withdrawn. [3832] We regard this wilderness' as on the western bank of the Jordan, and extending northward towards the eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee. [3833] If St. John relates three appearances of Jesus at this time in Jerusalem, St. Luke records three journeys to Jerusalem, [3834] the last of which agrees, in regard to its starting point, with the notices of the other Evangelists, [3835] always supposing that we have correctly indicated the locality of the wilderness' whither, according to St. John xi.54, Christ retired previous to His last journey to Jerusalem. In this respect, although it is impossible with our present information to localise the City of Ephraim,' [3836] the statement that it was near the wilderness,' affords us sufficient general notice of its situation. For, the New Testament speaks of only two wilderness,' that of Judæa in the far South, and that in the far North of Peræa, or perhaps in the Decapolis, to which St. Luke refers as the scene of the Baptist's labours, where Jesus was tempted, and whither He afterwards withdrew. We can, therefore, have little doubt that St. John refers [3837] to this district. And this entirely accords with the notices by the other Evangelists of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem, as through the borders of Galilee and Samaria, and then across the Jordan, and by Bethany to Jerusalem. It follows (as previously stated) that St. Luke's account of the three journeys to Jerusalem fits into the narrative of Christ's three appearances in Jerusalem as described by St. John. And the unique section in St. Luke [3838] supplies the record of what took place before, during, and after those journeys, of which the upshot is told by St. John. This much seems certain;

the exact chronological succession must be, in part, matter of suggestion. But we have now some insight into the plan of St. Luke's Gospel, as compared with that of the others. We see that St. Luke forms a kind of transition, is a sort of connecting link between the other two Synoptists [3839] and St. John. This is admitted even by negative critics. [3840] The Gospel by St. Matthew has for its main object the Discourses or teaching of the Lord, around which the History groups itself. It is intended as a demonstration, primarily addressed to the Jews, and in a form peculiarly suited to them, that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of the Living God. The Gospel by St. Mark is a rapid survey of the History of the Christ as such. It deals mainly with the Galilean Ministry. The Gospel by St. John, which gives the highest, the reflective, view of the Eternal Son as the Word, deals almost exclusively with the Jerusalem Ministry. [3841] And the Gospel by St. Luke complements the narratives in the other two Gospels (St. Matthew and St. Mark), and it supplements them by tracing, what is not done otherwise: the Ministry in Peroea. Thus, it also forms a transition to the Fourth Gospel of the Judæan Ministry. If we may venture a step further: The Gospel by St. Mark gives the general view of the Christ; that by St. Matthew the Jewish, that by St. Luke the Gentile, and that by St. John the Church's view. Imagination might, indeed, go still further, and see the impress of the number five - that of the Pentateuch and the Book of Psalms - in the First Gospel; the numeral four (that of the world) in the Second Gospel (4x4=16 chapters); that of three in the Third (8x3=24 chapters); and that of seven, the sacred Church number, in the Fourth Gospel (7x3=21 chapters). And perhaps we might even succeed in arranging the Gospels into corresponding sections. But this would lead, not only beyond our present task, but from solid history and exegesis into the regions of speculation. [3842] The subject, then, primarily before us, is the journeying of Jesus to Jerusalem. In that wider view which St. Luke takes of this whole history, he presents what really were three separate journeys as one - that towards the great end. In its conscious aim and object, all - from the moment of His finally quitting Galilee to His final Entry into Jerusalem - formed, in the highest sense, only one journey And this St. Luke designates in a peculiar manner. Just as [3843] he had spoken, not of Christ's Death but of His Exodus,' or outgoing, which included His Resurrection and Ascension, so he now tells us that, when the days of His uptaking' - including and pointing to His Ascension [3844] - were being fulfilled, He also [3845] steadfastly set [3846] His Face to go to Jerusalem.' St. John, indeed, goes farther back, and speaks of the circumstances which preceded His journey to Jerusalem. There is an interval, or, as we might term it, a blank, of more than half a year between the last narrative in the Fourth Gospel and this. For, the events chronicled in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel took place immediately before the Passover, [3847] which was on the fifteenth day of the first ecclesiastical month (Nisan), while the Feast of Tabernacle [3848] began on the same day of the seventh ecclesiastical month (Tishri). But, except in regard to the commencement of Christ's Ministry, that sixth chapter is the only one in the Gospel of St. John which refers to the Galilean Ministry of Christ. We would suggest, that what it records is partly intended [3849] to exhibit, by the side of Christ's fully developed teaching, the fully developed enmity of the Jerusalem Scribes, which led even to the defection of many former disciples. Thus, chapter vi. would be a connecting-link (both as regards the teaching of Christ and the opposition to Him) between chapter v., which tells of His visit at the Unknown Feast,' and chapter vii., which records that at the Feast of Tabernacles. The six or seven months between the Feast of Passover [3850] and that of Tabernacles, [3851] and all that passed within them, are covered by this brief remark: After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for He would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews [the leaders of the people [3852]]

sought to kill Him.' But now the Feast of Tabernacles was at hand. The pilgrims would probably arrive in Jerusalem before the opening day of the Festival. For, besides the needful preparations - which would require time, especially on this Feast, when booths had to be constructed in which to live during the festive week - it was (as we remember) the common practice to offer such sacrifices as might have previously become due at any of the great Feasts to which the people might go up. [3853] Remembering that five months had elapsed since the last great Feast (that of Weeks), many such sacrifices must have been due. Accordingly, the ordinary festive companies of pilgrims, which would travel slowly, must have started from Galilee some time before the beginning of the Feast. These circumstances fully explain the details of the narrative. They also afford another most painful illustration of the loneliness of Christ in His Work. His disciples had failed to understand, they misapprehended His teaching. In the near prospect of His Death they either displayed gross ignorance, or else disputed about their future rank. And His own brethren' did not believe in Him. The whole course of late events, especially the unmet challenge of the Scribes for a sign from heaven,' had deeply shaken them. What was the purpose of works,' if done in the privacy of the circle of Christ's Apostles, in a house, a remote district, or even before an ignorant multitude? If, claiming to be the Messiah, He wished to be openly [3854] known as such, He must use other means. If He really did these things, let Him manifest Himself before the world - in Jerusalem, the capital of their world, and before those who could test the reality of His Works. Let Him come forward, at one of Israel's great Feasts, in the Temple, and especially at this Feast which pointed to the Messianic ingathering of all nations. Let Him now go up with them in the festive company into Judæa, that so His disciples - not the Galileans only - but all, might have the opportunity of gazing' [3855] on His Works. [3856] As the challenge was not new, [3857] so, from the worldly point of view, it can scarcely be called unreasonable. It is, in fact, the same in principle as that to which the world would now submit the claims of Christianity to men's acceptance. It has only this one fault, that it ignores the world's enmity to the Christ. Discipleship is not the result of any outward manifestation by evidences' or demonstration. It requires the conversion of a child-like spirit. To manifest Himself! This truly would He do, though not in their way. For this the season' [3858] had not yet come, though it would soon arrive. Their season' - that for such Messianic manifestations as they contemplated - was always ready.' And this naturally, for the world' could not hate' them; they and their demonstrations were quite in accordance with the world and its views. But towards Him the world cherished personal hatred, because of their contrariety of principle, because Christ was manifested, not to restore an earthly kingdom to Israel, but to bring the Heavenly Kingdom upon earth - to destroy the works of the Devil.' Hence, He must provoke the enmity of that world which lay in the Wicked One. Another manifestation than that which they sought would He make, when His season was fulfilled;' soon, beginning at this very Feast, continued at the next, and completed at the last Passover; such manifestation of Himself as the Christ, as could alone be made in view of the essential enmity of the world. And so He let them go up in the festive company, while Himself tarried. When the noise and publicity (which He wished to avoid) were no longer to be apprehended, He also went up, but privately, [3859] not publicly, as they had suggested. Here St. Luke's account begins. It almost reads like a commentary on what the Lord had just said to His brethren, about the enmity of the world, and His mode of manifestation - who would not, and who would receive Him, and why. 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 . . . which were born . . . of God.' The first purpose of Christ seems to have been to

take the more direct road to Jerusalem, through Samaria, and not to follow that of the festive pilgrim-bands, which travelled to Jerusalem through Peræa, in order to avoid the band of their hated rivals. But His intention was soon frustrated. In the very first Samaritan village to which the Christ had sent beforehand to prepare for Himself and His company, [3860] His messengers were told that the Rabbi could not be received; that neither hospitality nor friendly treatment could be extended to One Who was going up to the Feast at Jerusalem. The messengers who brought back this strangely un-Oriental answer met the Master and His followers on the road. It was not only an outrage on common manners, but an act of open hostility to Israel, as well as to Christ, and the Sons of Thunder,' whose feelings for their Master were, perhaps, the more deeply stirred as opposition to Him grew more fierce, proposed to vindicate the cause, alike of Israel and its Messiah-King, by the open and Divine judgment of fire called down from heaven to destroy that village. Did they in this connection think of the vision of Elijah, ministering to Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration - and was this their application of it? Truly, they knew not of what Spirit they were to be the children and messengers. He Who had come, not to destroy, but to save, turned and rebuked them, and passed from Samaritan into Jewish territory to pursue His journey. [3861] Perhaps, indeed, He had only passed into Samaria to teach His disciples this needful lesson. The view of this event just presented seems confirmed by the circumstance, that St. Matthew lays the scene immediately following on the other side' - that is, in the Decapolis. [3862] It was a journey of deepest interest and importance. For, it was decisive not only as regarded the Master, but those who followed Him. Henceforth it must not be, as in former times, but wholly and exclusively, as into suffering and death. It is thus that we view the next three incidents of the way. Two of them find, also, a place in the Gospel by St. Matthew, [3863] although in a different connection, in accordance with the plan of that Gospel, which groups together the Teaching of Christ, with but secondary attention to chronological succession. It seems that, as, after the rebuff of these Samaritans, they were going' towards another, and a Jewish village, one' [3864] of the company, and, as we learn from St. Matthew, a Scribe,' in the generous enthusiasm of the moment - perhaps, stimulated by the wrong of the Samaritans, perhaps, touched by the love which would rebuke the zeal of the disciples, but had no word of blame for the unkindness of others - broke into a spontaneous declaration of readiness to follow Him absolutely and everywhere. Like the benediction of the woman who heard Him, [3865] it was one of these outbursts of an enthusiasm which His Presence awakened in every susceptible heart. But there was one eventuality which that Scribe, and all of like enthusiasm, reckoned not with - the utter homelessness of the Christ in this world - and this, not from accidental circumstances, but because He was the Son of Man.' [3866] And there is here also material for still deeper thought in the fact that this man was a Scribe,' and yet had not gone up to the Feast, but tarried near Christ - was one' of those that followed Him now, and was capable of such feelings! [3867] How many whom we regard as Scribes, may be in analogous relation to the Christ, and yet how much of fair promise has failed to ripen into reality in view of the homelessness of Christ and Christianity in this world - the stranger ship of suffering which it involves to those who would follow, not somewhere, but absolutely, and everywhere?The intenseness of the self-denial involved in following Christ, and its contrariety to all that was commonly received among men, was, purposely, immediately further brought out. This Scribe had proffered to follow Jesus. Another of his disciples He asked to follow Him, and that in circumstances of peculiar trail and difficulty. [3868] The expression to follow' a Teacher would, in those days be universally understood as implying discipleship. Again, no other duty would be

regarded as more sacred than that they, on whom the obligation naturally devolved, should bury the dead. To this everything must give way - even prayer, and the study of the Law. [3869] Lastly, we feel morally certain, that, when Christ called this disciple to follow Him, He was fully aware that at that very moment his father lay dead. Thus, He called him not only to homelessness - for this he might have been prepared - but to set aside what alike natural feeling and the Jewish Law seemed to impose on him as the most sacred duty. In the seemingly strange reply, which Christ made to the request to be allowed first to bury his father, we pass over the consideration that, according to Jewish law, the burial and mourning for a dead father, and the subsequent purifications, would have occupied many days, so that it might have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to overtake Christ. We would rather abide by the simple words of Christ. They teach us this very solemn and searching lesson, that there are higher duties than either those of the Jewish Law, or even of natural reverence, and a higher call than that of man. No doubt Christ had here in view the near call to the Seventy - of whom this disciple was to be one - to go and preach the Kingdom of God.' When the direct call of Christ to any work comes - that is, if we are sure of it from His own words, and not (as, alas! too often we do) only infer it by our own reasoning on His words - then every other call must give way. For, duties can never be in conflict - and this duty about the living and life must take precedence of that about death and the dead. Nor must we hesitate, because we know not in what form this work for Christ may come. There are critical moments in our inner history, when to postpone the immediate call, is really to reject it; when to go and bury the dead - even though it were a dead father - were to die ourselves!Yet another hindrance to following Christ was to be faced. Another in the company that followed Christ would go with Him, but he asked permission first to go and bid farewell to those whom he had left in his home. It almost seems as if this request had been one of those tempting' questions, addressed to Christ. But, even if otherwise, the farewell proposed was not like that of Elisha, nor like the supper of Levi-Matthew. It was rather like the year which Jephtha's daughter would have with her companions, ere fulfilling the vow. It shows, that to follow Christ was regarded as a duty, and to leave those in the earthly home as a trial; and it betokens, not merely a divided heart, but one not fit for the Kingdom of God. For, how can he draw a straight furrow in which to cast the seed, who, as he puts his hand to the plough, looks around or behind him?Thus, these are the three vital conditions of following Christ: absolute self-denial and homelessness in the world; immediate and entire self-surrender to Christ and His Work, and a heart and affections simple, undivided, and set on Christ and His Work, to which there is no other trial of parting like that which would involve parting from Him, no other or higher joy than that of following Him. In such spirit let them now go after Christ in His last journey - and to such work as He will appoint them!

CHAPTER V. FURTHER INCIDENTS OF THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM - THE MISSION AND RETURN OF THE SEVENTY - THE HOME AT BETHANY - MARTHA AND MARY

(St. Luke x.1-16; Matt. ix.36-38; xi.20-24; St. Luke x.17-24; St. Matt. xi.25-30 ; xiii.16 ; St. Luke x.25 ; 38-42.) ALTHOUGH, for the reasons explained in the previous chapter, the exact succession of events cannot be absolutely determined, it seems most likely, that it was on His progress southwards at this time that Jesus designated' [3870] those seventy' [3871] others,' who were to herald His arrival in every town and village. Even the circumstance, that the instructions to them are so similar to, and yet distinct from, those formerly given to the Twelve, seems to point to them as those from whom the Seventy are to be distinguished as other.' We judge, that they were sent forth at this time, first, from the Gospel of St. Luke, where this whole section appears as a distinct and separate record, presumably, chronologically arranged; secondly, from the fitness of such a mission at that particular period, when Jesus made His last Missionary progress towards Jerusalem; and, thirdly, from the unlikelihood, if not impossibility, of taking such a public step after the persecution which broke out after His appearance at Jerusalem on the Feast of Tabernacles. At any rate, it could not have taken place later than in the period between the Feast of Tabernacles and that of the Dedication of the Temple, since, after that, Jesus walked no more openly among the Jews.' [3872] With all their similarity, there are notable differences between the Mission of the Twelve and this of the other Seventy.' Let it be noted, that the former is recorded by the three Evangelists, so that there could have been no confusion on the part of St. Luke. [3873] But the mission of the Twelve was on their appointment to the Apostolate; it was evangelistic and missionary; and it was in confirmation and manifestation of the power and authority' given to them. We regard it, therefore, as symbolical of the Apostolate just instituted, with its work and authority. On the other hand, no power or authority was formally conferred on the Seventy, their mission being only temporary, and, indeed, for one definite purpose; its primary object was to prepare for the coming of the Master in the places to which they were sent; and their selection was from the wider circle of disciples, the number being now Seventy instead of Twelve. Even these two numbers, as well as the difference in the functions of the two classes of messengers, seem to indicate that the Twelve symbolised the princes of the tribes of Israel, while the Seventy were the symbolical representatives of these tribes, like the seventy elders appointed to assist Moses. [3874] [3875] This symbolical meaning of the number Seventy continued among the Jews. We can trace it in the LXX. (supposed) translators of the Bible into Greek, and in the seventy members of the Sanhedrin, or supreme court. [3876] There was something very significant in this appearance of Christ's messengers, by two and two, in every place He was about to visit. As John the Baptist had, at the first, heralded the Coming of Christ, so now two heralds appeared to solemnly announce His Advent at the close of His Ministry; as John had sought, as the representative of the Old Testament Church, to prepare His Way, so they, as the representatives of the New Testament Church. In both cases the preparation sought was a moral one. It was the national summons to open the gates to the rightful King, and accept His rule. Only, the need was now the greater for the

failure of John's mission, through the misunderstanding and disbelief of the nation. [3877] This conjunction with John the Baptist and the failure of his mission, as regarded national results, accounts for the insertion in St. Matthew's Gospel of part of the address delivered on the Mission of the Seventy, immediately after the record of Christ's rebuke of the national rejection of the Baptist. [3878] For St. Matthew, who (as well as St. Mark) records not the Mission of the Seventy - simply because (as before explained) the whole section, of which it forms part, is peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel - reports the Discourses' connected with it in other, and to them congruous, connections. We mark, that, what may be termed the Preface' to the Mission of the Seventy, is given by St. Matthew (in a somewhat fuller form) as that to the appointment and mission of the Twelve Apostles; [3879] and it may have been, that kindred words had preceded both. Partially, indeed, the expressions reported in St. Luke x.2 had been employed long before. [3880] Those multitudes' throughout Israel - nay, those also which are not of that flock' - appeared to His view like sheep without a true shepherd's care, distressed and prostrate,' [3881] and their mute misery and only partly conscious longing appealed, and not in vain, to His Divine compassion. This constituted the ultimate ground of the Mission of the Apostles, and now of the Seventy, into a harvest that was truly great. Compared with the extent of the field, and the urgency of the work, how few were the labourers! Yet, as the field was God's, so also could He alone thrust forth labourers' willing and able to do His work, while it must be ours to pray that He would be pleased to do so. On these introductory words, [3882] which ever since have formed the bidding prayer' of the Church in her work for Christ, followed the commission and special directions to the thirty-five pairs of disciples who went on this embassy. In almost every particular they are the same as those formerly given to the Twelve. [3883] We mark, however, that both the introductory and the concluding words addressed to the Apostles are wanting in what was said to the Seventy. It was not necessary to warn them against going to the Samaritans, since the direction of the Seventy was to those cities of Peræa and Judæa, on the road to Jerusalem, through which Christ was about to pass. Nor were they armed with precisely the same supernatural powers as the Twelve. [3884] Naturally, the personal directions as to their conduct were in both cases substantially the same. We mark only three peculiarities in those addressed to the Seventy. The direction to salute no man by the way' was suitable to a temporary and rapid mission, which might have been sadly interrupted by making or renewing acquaintances. Both the Mishnah [3885] and the Talmud [3886] lay it down, that prayer was not to be interrupted to salute even a king, nay, to uncoil a serpent that had wound round the foot. [3887] On the other hand, the Rabbis discussed the question, whether the reading of the Shema and of the portion of the Psalms called the Hallel might be interrupted at the close of a paragraph, from respect for a person, or interrupted in the middle, from motives of fear. [3888] All agreed, that immediately before prayer no one should be saluted, to prevent distraction, and it was advised rather to summarise or to cut short than to break into prayer, though the latter might be admissible in case of absolute necessity. [3889] None of these provisions, however, seems to have been in the mind of Christ. If any parallel is to be sought, it would be found in the similar direction of Elisha to Gehazi, when sent to lay the prophet's staff on the dead child of the Shunammite. The other two peculiarities in the address to the Seventy seem verbal rather than real. The expression, [3890] if the Son of Peace be there,' is a Hebraism, equivalent to if the house be worthy,' [3891] and refers to the character of the head of the house and the tone of the household. [3892] Lastly, the direction to eat and drink such things as were set before them [3893] is only a further explanation of the command to abide in the house which had received

them, without seeking for better entertainment. [3894] On the other hand, the whole most important close of the address to the Twelve - which, indeed, forms by far the largest part of it [3895] - is wanting in the commission to the Seventy, thus clearly marking its merely temporary character. In St. Luke's Gospel, the address to the Seventy is followed by a denunciation of Chorazin and Bethsaida. [3896] This is evidently in its right place there, after the Ministry of Christ in Galilee had been completed and finally rejected. In St. Matthew's Gospel, it stands (for a reason already indicated) immediately after the Lord's rebuke of the popular rejection of the Baptist's message. [3897] The woe' pronounced on those cities, in which most of His mighty works were done,' is in proportion to the greatness of their privileges. The denunciation of Chorazin and Bethsaida is the more remarkable, that Chorazin is not otherwise mentioned in the Gospels, nor yet any miracles recorded as having taken place in (the western) Bethsaida. From this two inferences seem inevitable. First, this history must be real. If the whole were legendary, Jesus would not be represented as selecting the names of places, which the writer had not connected with the legend. Again, apparently no record has been preserved in the Gospels of most of Christ's miracles - only those being narrated which were necessary in order to present Jesus as the Christ, in accordance with the respective plans on which each of the Gospels was constructed. [3898] As already stated, the denunciations were in proportion to the privileges, and hence to the guilt, of the unbelieving cities. Chorazin and Bethsaida are compared with Tyre and Sidon, which under similar admonitions would have repented, [3899] while Capernaum, which, as for so long the home of Jesus, had truly been exalted to heaven,' [3900] is compared with Sodom. And such guilt involved greater punishment. The very site of Bethsaida and Chorazin cannot be fixed with certainty. The former probably represents the Fisherton' of Capernaum, [3901] the latter seems to have almost disappeared from the shore of the Lake. St. Jerome places it two miles from Capernaum. If so, it may be represented by the modern Kerâzeh, somewhat to the north-west of Capernaum. The site would correspond with the name. For Kerâzeh is at present a spring with an insignificant ruin above it,' [3902] and the name Chorazin may well be derived from Keroz ({hebrew}) a water-jar - Cherozin, or Chorazin,' the water-jars. If so, we can readily understand that the Fisherton' on the south side of Capernaum, and the well-known springs, Chorazin,' on the other side of it, may have been the frequent scene of Christ's miracles. This explains also, in part, why the miracles there wrought had not been told as well as those done in Capernaum itself. In the Talmud a Chorazin, or rather Chorzim, is mentioned as celebrated for its wheat. [3903] But as for Capernaum itself - standing on that vast field of ruins and upturned stones which marks the site of the modern Tell Hûm, we feel that no description of it could be more pictorially true than that in which Christ prophetically likened the city in its downfall to the desolateness of death and Hades.' Whether or not the Seventy actually returned to Jesus before the Feast of Tabernacles, [3904] it is convenient to consider in this connection the result of their Mission. It had filled them with the joy' of assurance; nay, the result had exceeded their expectations, just as their faith had gone beyond the mere letter unto the spirit of His Words. As they reported it to Him, even the demons had been subject to them through His Name. In this they had exceeded the letter of Christ's commission; but as they made experiment of it, their faith had grown, and they had applied His command to heal the sick' to the worst of all sufferers, those grievously vexed by demons. And, as always, their faith was not disappointed. Nor could it be otherwise. The great contest had been long decided; it only remained for the faith of the Church to gather the fruits of that victory. The Prince of Light and Life had vanquished the Prince of Darkness and Death. The Prince of this world must be cast out.

[3905] In spirit, Christ gazed on Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.' As one has aptly paraphrased it: [3906] While you cast out his subjects, I saw the prince himself fall.' It has been asked, whether the words of Christ referred to any particular event, such as His Victory in the Temptation. [3907] But any such limitation would imply grievous misunderstanding of the whole. So to speak, the fall of Satan is to the bottomless pit; ever going on to the final triumph of Christ. As the Lord beholds him, he is fallen from heaven - from the seat of power and of worship; for, his mastery is broken by the Stronger than he. And he is fallen like lightning, in its rapidity, dazzling splendour, and destructiveness. [3908] Yet as we perceive it, it is only demons cast out in His Name. For still is this fight and sight continued, and to all ages of the present dispensation. Each time the faith of the Church casts out demons - whether as formerly, or as they presently vex men, whether in the lighter combat about possession of the body, or in the sorer fight about possession of the soul - as Christ beholds it, it is ever Satan fallen. For, he sees of the travail of His soul, and is satisfied. And so also is there joy in heaven over every sinner that repenteth. The authority and power over the demons,' attained by faith, was not to pass away with the occasion that had called it forth. The Seventy were the representatives of the Church in her work of preparing for the Advent of Christ. As already indicated, the sight of Satan fallen from heaven is the continuous history of the Church. What the faith of the Seventy had attained was now to be made permanent to the Church, whose representatives they were. For, the words in which Christ now gave authority and power to tread on [3909] serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the Enemy, and the promise that nothing should hurt them, could not have been addressed to the Seventy for a Mission which had now come to an end, except in so far as they represented the Church Universal. It is almost needless to add, that those serpents and scorpions' are not to be literally but symbolically understood. [3910] [3911] Yet it is not this power or authority which is to be the main joy either of the Church or the individual, but [3912] the fact that our names are written in heaven. [3913] And so Christ brings us back to His great teaching about the need of becoming children, and wherein lies the secret of true greatness in the Kingdom. It is beautifully in the spirit of all this, when we read that the joy of the disciples was met by that of the Master, and that His teaching presently merged into a prayer of thanksgiving. Throughout the occurrences since the Transfiguration, we have noticed an increasing antithesis to the teaching of the Rabbis. But it almost reached its climax in the thanksgiving, that the Father in heaven had hid these things from the wise and the understanding, and revealed them unto babes. As we view it in the light of those times, we know that the wise and understanding' - the Rabbi and the Scribe - could not, from their standpoint, have perceived them; nay, that it is matter of never-ending thanks that, not what they, but what the babes,' understood, was - as alone it could be - the subject of the Heavenly Father's revelation. We even tremble to think how it would have fared with the babes,' if the wise and understanding' had had part with them in the knowledge revealed. And so it must ever be, not only the Law of the kingdom and the fundamental principle of Divine Revelation, but matter for thanksgiving, that, not as wise and understanding,' but only as babes' - as converted,' like children' - we can share in that knowledge which maketh wise unto salvation. And this truly is the Gospel, and the Father's good pleasure. [3914]The words, [3915] with which Christ turned from this Address to the Seventy and thanksgiving to God, seem almost like the Father's answer to the prayer of the Son. They refer to, and explain, the authority which Jesus had bestowed on His Church: All things were delivered [3916] to Me of My Father;' and they afford the highest rationale for the fact, that these things had been hid from the wise and revealed unto babes. For, as no

man, only the Father, could have full knowledge of the Son, and, conversely, no man, only the Son, had true knowledge of the Father, it followed, that this knowledge came to us, not of Wisdom or learning, but only through the Revelation of Christ: No one knoweth Who the Son is, save the Father; and Who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.'St. Matthew, who also records this - although in a different connection, immediately after the denunciation of the unbelief of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum - concludes this section by words which have ever since been the grand text of those who following in the wake of the Seventy, have been ambassadors for Christ. [3917] On the other hand, St. Luke concludes this part of his narrative by adducing words equally congruous to the occasion, [3918] which, indeed, are not new in the mouth of the Lord. [3919] From their suitableness to what had preceded, we can have little doubt that both that which St. Matthew, and that which St. Luke, reports was spoken on this occasion. Because knowledge of the Father came only through the Son, and because these things were hidden from the wise and revealed to babes,' did the gracious Lord open His Arms so wide, and bid all [3920] that laboured and were heavy laden come to HIM. These were the sheep, distressed and prostrate, whom to gather, that He might give them rest, He had sent forth the Seventy on a work, for which He had prayed the Father to thrust forth labourers, and which He has since entrusted to the faith and service of love of the Church. And the true wisdom, which qualified for the Kingdom, was to take up His yoke, which would be found easy, and a lightsome burden, not like that unbearable yoke of Rabbinic conditions; [3921] and the true understanding to be sought, was by learning of Him. In that wisdom of entering the Kingdom by taking up its yoke, and in that knowledge which came by learning of Him, Christ was Himself alike the true lesson and the best Teacher for those babes.' For He is meek and lowly in heart. He had done what He taught, and He taught what He had done; and so, by coming unto Him, would true rest be found for the soul.These words, as recorded by St. Matthew - the Evangelist of the Jews - must have sunk the deeper into the hearts of Christ's Jewish hearers, that they came in their own old familiar form of speech, yet with such contrast of spirit. One of the most common figurative expressions of the time was that of the yoke' ({hebrew}), to indicate submission to an occupation or obligation. Thus, we read not only of the yoke of the Law,' but of that to earthly governments,' and ordinary civil obligations.' [3922] Very instructive for the understanding of the figure is this paraphrase of Cant. i.10: How beautiful is their neck for bearing the yoke of Thy statues; and it shall be upon them like the yoke on the neck of the ox that plougheth in the field, and provideth food for himself and his master.' [3923] [3924] This yoke might be cast off,' as the ten tribes had cast off that of God,' and thus brought on themselves their exile. [3925] On the other hand, to take upon oneself the yoke' ({hebrew}) meant to submit to it of free choice and deliberate resolution. Thus, in the allegorism of the Midrash, in the inscription, Prov. xxx.1, concerning Agur, the son of Jakeh' - which is viewed as a symbolical designation of Solomon - the word Massa,' rendered in the Authorized Version prophecy,' is thus explained in reference to Solomon: Massa, because he lifted on himself (Nasa) the yoke of the Holy One, blessed be He.' [3926] And of Isaiah it was said, that he had been privileged to prophesy of so many blessings, because he had taken upon himself the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven with joy.' [3927] [3928] And, as previously stated, it was set forth that in the Shema,' or Creed - which was repeated every day - the words, Deut. vi.4-9, were recited before those in xi.13-21, so as first generally to take upon ourselves the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven, and only afterwards that of the commandments.' [3929] [3930] And this yoke all Israel had taken upon itself, thereby gaining the merit ever afterwards imputed to them. Yet,

practically, the yoke of the Kingdom' was none other than that of the Law' and of the commandments;' one of laborious performances and of impossible self-righteousness. It was unbearable,' not the easy' and lightsome yoke of Christ, in which the Kingdom of God was of faith, not of works. And, as if themselves to bear witness to this, we have this saying of theirs, terribly significant in this connection: Not like those formerly (the first), who made for themselves the yoke of the Law easy and light; but like those after them (those afterwards), who made the yoke of the Law upon them heavy!' [3931] And, indeed, this voluntary making of the yoke as heavy as possible, the taking on themselves as many obligations as possible, was the ideal of Rabbinic piety. There was, therefore, peculiar teaching and comfort in the words of Christ; and well might He add, as St. Luke reports, [3932] that blessed were they who saw and heard these things. [3933] For, that Messianic Kingdom, which had been the object of rapt vision and earnest longing to prophets and kings of old had now become reality. [3934]Abounding as this history is in contrasts, it seems not unlikely, that the scene next recorded by St. Luke [3935] stands in its right place. Such an inquiry on the part of a certain lawyer,' as to what he should do to inherit eternal life, together with Christ's Parabolic teaching about the Good Samaritan, is evidently congruous to the previous teaching of Christ about entering into the Kingdom of Heaven. Possibly, this Scribe may have understood the words of the Master about these things being hid from the wise, and the need of taking up the yoke of the Kingdom, as enforcing the views of those Rabbinic teachers, who laid more stress upon good works than upon study. Perhaps himself belonged to that minority, although his question was intended to tempt - to try whether the Master would stand the Rabbinic test, alike morally and dialectically. And, without at present entering on the Parable which gives Christ's final answer (and which will best be considered together with the others belonging to that period), it will be seen how peculiarly suited it was to the state of mind just supposed.From this interruption, which, but for the teaching of Christ connected with it, would have formed a terrible discord in the heavenly harmony of this journey, we turn to a far other scene. It follows in the course of St. Luke's narrative, and we have no reason to consider it out of its proper place. If so, it must mark the close of Christ's journey to the Feast of Tabernacles, since the home of Martha and Mary, to which it introduces us, was in Bethany, close to Jerusalem, almost one of its suburbs. Other indications, confirmatory of this note of time, are not wanting. Thus, the history which follows that of the home of Bethany, when one of His disciples asks Him to teach them to pray, as the Baptist had similarly taught his followers, seems to indicate, that they were then on the scene of John's former labours - north-east of Bethany; and, hence, that it occurred on Christ's return from Jerusalem. Again, from the narrative of Christ's reception in the house of Martha, we gather that Jesus had arrived in Bethany with His disciples, but that He alone was the guest of the two sisters. [3936] We infer that Christ had dismissed His disciples to go into the neighbouring City for the Feast, while Himself tarried in Bethany. Lastly, with all this agrees the notice in St. John vii.14, that it was not at the beginning, but about the midst of the feast,' that Jesus went up into the Temple.' Although travelling on the two first festive days was not actually unlawful, yet we can scarcely conceive that Jesus would have done so - especially on the Feast of Tabernacles; and the inference is obvious, that Jesus had tarried in the immediate neighbourhood, as we know He did at Bethany in the house of Martha and Mary. [3937]Other things, also, do so explain themselves - notably, the absence of the brother of Martha and Mary, who probably spent the festive days in the City itself. It was the beginning of the Feast of Tabernacles, and the scene recorded by St. Luke [3938] would take place in the open leafy booth which served as the sitting

apartment during the festive week. For, according to law, it was duty during the festive week to eat, sleep, pray, study - in short, to live - in these booths, which were to be constructed of the boughs of living trees. [3939] And, although this was not absolutely obligatory on women, [3940] yet, the rule which bade all make the booth the principal, and the house only the secondary dwelling,' [3941] would induce them to make this leafy tent at least the sitting apartment alike for men and women. And, indeed, those autumn days were just the season when it would be joy to sit in these delightful cool retreats - the memorials of Israel's pilgrim-days! They were high enough, and yet not too high; chiefly open in front; close enough to be shady, and yet not so close as to exclude sunlight and air. Such would be the apartment in which what is recorded passed; and, if we add that this booth stood probably in the court, we can picture to ourselves Martha moving forwards and backwards on her busy errands, and seeing, as she passed again and again, Mary still sitting a rapt listener, not heeding what passed around; and, lastly, how the elder sister could, as the language of verse 40 implies, enter so suddenly the Master's Presence, bringing her complaint. To understand this history, we must dismiss from our minds preconceived, though, perhaps, attractive thoughts. There is no evidence that the household of Bethany had previously belonged to the circle of Christ's professed disciples. It was, as the whole history shows, a wealthy home. It consisted of two sisters - the elder, Martha (a not uncommon Jewish name, [3942] being the feminine of Mar, [3943] and equivalent to our word mistress'); the younger, Mary; and their brother Lazarus, or, Laazar. [3944] Although we know not how it came, yet, evidently, the house was Martha's, and into it she received Jesus on His arrival in Bethany. It would have been no uncommon occurrence in Israel for a pious, wealthy lady to receive a great Rabbi into her house. But the present was not an ordinary case. Martha must have heard of Him, even if she had not seen Him. But, indeed, the whole narrative implies, [3945] that Jesus had come to Bethany with the view of accepting the hospitality of Martha, which probably had been proffered when some of those Seventy,' sojourning in the worthiest house at Bethany, had announced the near arrival of the Master. Still, her bearing affords only indication of being drawn towards Christ - at most, of a sincere desire to learn the good news, not of actual discipleship.And so Jesus came - and, with Him and in Him, Heaven's own Light and Peace. He was to lodge in one of the booths, the sisters in the house, and the great booth in the middle of the courtyard would be the common living apartment of all. It could not have been long after His arrival - it must have been almost immediately, that the sisters felt they had received more than an Angel unawares. How best to do Him honour, was equally the thought of both. To Martha it seemed, as if she could not do enough in showing Him all hospitality. And, indeed, this festive season was a busy time for the mistress of a wealthy household, especially in the near neighbourhood of Jerusalem, whence her brother might, after the first two festive days, bring with him, any time that week, honoured guests from the City. To these cares was now added that of doing sufficient honour to such a Guest - for she, also, deeply felt His greatness. And so she hurried to and fro through the courtyard, literally, distracted [3946] about much serving.'Her younger sister, also, would do Him all highest honour; but, not as Martha. Her homage consisted in forgetting all else but Him, Who spake as none had ever done. As truest courtesy or affection consists, nor in its demonstrations, but in being so absorbed in the object of it as to forget its demonstration, so with Mary in the Presence of Christ. And then a new Light, another Day had risen upon her; a fresh life had sprung up within her soul: She sat at the Lord's Feet, [3947] and heard his Word.' We dare not inquire, and yet we well know, of what it would be. And so, time after time - perhaps, hour after hour - as Martha passed on her busy way,

she still sat listening and living. At last, the sister who, in her impatience, could not think that a woman could, in such manner, fulfill her duty, or show forth her religious profiting, broke in with what sounds like a querulous complaint: Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone?' Mary had served with her, but she had now left her to do the work alone. Would the Master bid her resume her neglected work? But, with tone of gentle reproof and admonition, the affectionateness of which appeared even in the repetition of her name, Martha, Martha - as, similarly, on a later occasion, Simon, Simon - did He teach her in words which, however simple in their primary meaning, are so full, that they have ever since borne the most many-sided application: Thou art careful and anxious about many things; but one thing is needful; [3948] and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.'It was, as we imagine, perhaps the first day of, or else the preparation for, the Feast. More than that one day did Jesus tarry in the home of Bethany. Whether Lazarus came then to see Him - and, still more, what both Martha and Mary learned, either then, or afterwards, we reverently forbear to search into. Suffice it, that though the natural disposition of the sisters remained what it had been, yet henceforth, Jesus loved Martha and her sister.'

CHAPTER VI. AT THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES - FIRST DISCOURSE IN THE TEMPLE

(St. John vii.11-36.) IT was Chol ha Moed - as the non-sacred part of the festive week, the half-holy days were called. [3949] Jerusalem, the City of Solemnities, the City of Palaces, the City of beauty and glory, wore quite another than its usual aspect; other, even, than when its streets were thronged by festive pilgrims during the Passover-week, or at Pentecost. For this was pre-eminently the Feast for foreign pilgrims, coming from the farthest distance, whose Temple-contributions were then received and counted. [3950] Despite the strange costumes of Media, Arabia, Persia, or India, and even further; or the Western speech and bearing of the pilgrims from Italy, Spain, the modern Crimea, and the banks of the Danube, if not from yet more strange and barbarous lands, it would not be difficult to recognise the lineaments of the Jew, nor to perceive that to change one's clime was not to change one's mind. As the Jerusalemite would look with proud self-consciousness, not unmingled with kindly patronage, on the swarthy strangers, yet fellow-countrymen, or the eager-eyed Galilean curiously stare after them, the pilgrims would, in turn, gaze with mingled awe and wonderment on the novel scene. Here was the realisation of their fondest dreams ever since childhood, the home and spring of their holiest thoughts and best hopes - that which gave inward victory to the vanquished, and converted persecution into anticipated triumph. They could come at this season of the year - not during the winter for the Passover, nor yet quite so readily in summer's heat for Pentecost. But now, in the delicious cool of early autumn, when all harvest-operations, the gathering in of luscious fruit and the vintage were past, and the first streaks of gold were tinting the foliage, strangers from afar off, and countrymen from Judæa, Peræa, and Galilee, would mingle in the streets of Jerusalem, under the ever-present shadow of that glorious Sanctuary of marble, cedarwood, and gold, up there on high Moriah, symbol of the infinitely more glorious overshadowing Presence of Him, Who was the Holy One in the midst of Israel. How all day long, even till the stars lit up the deep blue canopy over head, the smoke of the burning, smouldering sacrifices rose in slowly-widening column, and hung between the Mount of Olives and Zion; how the chant of Levites, and the solemn responses of the Hallel were borne on the breeze, or the clear blast of the Priests silver trumpets seemed to waken the echoes far away! And then, at night, how all these vast Temple-buildings stood out, illuminated by the great Candelabras that burned in the Court of the Women, and by the glare of torches, when strange sound of mystic hymns and dances came floating over the intervening darkness! Truly, well might Israel designate the Feast of Tabernacles as the Feast' (haChag), and the Jewish historian describe it as the holiest and greatest.' [3951] [3952] Early on the 14th Tishri (corresponding to our September or early October), all the festive pilgrims had arrived. Then it was, indeed, a scene of bustle and activity. Hospitality had to be sought and found; guests to be welcomed and entertained; all things required for the feast to be got ready. Above all, booths must be erected everywhere - in court and on housetop, in street and square, for the lodgment and entertainment of that vast multitude; leafy dwellings everywhere, to remind of the wilderness-journey, and now of the goodly land. Only that fierce castle, Antonia, which frowned

above the Temple, was undecked by the festive spring into which the land had burst. To the Jew it must have been a hateful sight, that castle, which guarded and dominated his own City and Temple - hateful sight and sounds, that Roman garrison, with its foreign, heathen, ribald speech and manners. Yet, for all this, Israel could not read on the lowering sky the signs of the times, nor yet knew the day of their merciful visitation. And this, although of all festivals, that of Tabernacles should have most clearly pointed them to the future. Indeed, the whole symbolism of the Feast, beginning with the completed harvest, for which it was a thanksgiving, pointed to the future. The Rabbis themselves admitted this. The strange number of sacrificial bullocks - seventy in all - they regarded as referring to the seventy nations' of heathendom. [3953] The ceremony of the outpouring of water, which was considered of such vital importance as to give to the whole festival the name of House of Outpouring,' [3954] was symbolical of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. [3955] As the brief night of the great Temple-illumination closed, there was solemn testimony made before Jehovah against heathenism. It must have been a stirring scene, when from out of the mass of Levites, with their musical instruments, who crowded the fifteen steps that led from the Court of Israel to that of the Women, stepped two priests with their silver trumpets. As the first cockcrowing intimated the dawn of morn, they blew a threefold blast; another on the tenth step, and yet another threefold blast as they entered the Court of the Women. And still sounding their trumpets, they marched through the Court of the Women to the Beautiful Gate. Here, turning round and facing westwards to the Holy Place, they repeated: Our fathers, who were in this place, they turned their backs on the Sanctuary of Jehovah, and their faces eastward, for they worshipped eastward, the sun; but we, our eyes are towards Jehovah.' We are Jehovah's - our eyes are towards Jehovah.' [3956] [3957] Nay, the whole of this night- and morning-scene was symbolical: the Temple-illumination, of the light which was to shine from out the Temple into the dark night of heathendom; then, at the first dawn of morn the blast of the priests' silver trumpets, of the army of God, as it advanced, with festive trumpet-sound and call, to awaken the sleepers, marching on to quite the utmost bounds of the Sanctuary, to the Beautiful Gate, which opened upon the Court of the Gentiles - and, then again, facing round to utter solemn protest against heathenism, and make solemn confession of Jehovah! But Jesus did not appear in the Temple during the first two festive days. The pilgrims from all parts of the country - perhaps, they from abroad also - had expected Him there, for everyone would now speak of Him - not openly,' in Jerusalem, for they were afraid of their rulers. It was hardly safe to speak of Him without reserve. But they sought Him, and inquired after Him - and they did speak of Him, though there was only a murmuring - a low, confused discussion of the pro and con, in this great controversy among the multitudes,' [3958] or festive bands from various parts. Some said: He is a good man, while others declared that He only led astray the common, ignorant populace. And now, all at once, in Chol ha Moed, [3959] Jesus Himself appeared in the Temple, and taught. We know that, on a later occasion, [3960] He walked and taught in Solomon's Porch,' and, from the circumstance that the early disciples made this their common meeting-place, [3961] we may draw the inference that it was here the people now found Him. Although neither Josephus nor the Mishnah mention this Porch' by name, [3962] we have every reason for believing that it was the eastern colonnade, which abutted against the Mount of Olives and faced the Beautiful Gate,' that formed the principal entrance into the Court of the Women,' and so into the Sanctuary. For, all along the inside of the great wall which formed the Temple-enclosure ran a double colonnade - each column a monolith of white marble, 25 cubits high, covered with cedar-beams. That on the south side (leading from the western entrance to

Solomon's Porch), known as the Royal Porch,' was a threefold colonnade, consisting of four rows of columns, each 27 cubits high, and surmounted by Corinthian capitals. We infer that the eastern was Solomon's Porch,' from the circumstance that it was the only relic left of Solomon's Temple. [3963] These colonnades, which, from their ample space, formed alike places for quiet walk and for larger gatherings, had benches in them - and, from the liberty of speaking and teaching in Israel, Jesus might here address the people in the very face of His enemies. We know not what was the subject of Christ's teaching on this occasion. But the effect on the people was one of general astonishment. They knew what common unlettered Galilean tradesmen were - but this, whence came it? [3964] How does this one know literature (letters, learning), [3965] never having learned?' To the Jews there was only one kind of learning - that of Theology; and only one road to it - the Schools of the Rabbis. Their major was true, but their minor false - and Jesus hastened to correct it. He had, indeed, learned,' but in a School quite other than those which alone they recognised. Yet, on their own showing, it claimed the most absolute submission. Among the Jews a Rabbi's teaching derived authority from the fact of its accordance with tradition - that it accurately represented what had been received from a previous great teacher, and so on upwards to Moses, and to God Himself. On this ground Christ claimed the highest authority. His doctrine was not His own invention - it was the teaching of Him that sent Him. The doctrine was God-received, and Christ was sent direct from God to bring it. He was God's messenger of it to them. [3966] Of this twofold claim there was also twofold evidence. Did He assert that what He taught was God-received? Let trial be made of it. Everyone who in his soul felt drawn towards God; each one who really willeth to do His Will,' would know concerning this teaching, whether it is of God,' or whether it was of man. [3967] It was this felt, though unrealised influence which had drawn all men after Him, so that they hung on His lips. It was this which, in the hour of greatest temptation and mental difficulty, had led Peter, in name of the others, to end the sore inner contest by laying hold on this fact: To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life - and we have believed and know, that Thou art the Holy One of God.' [3968] Marking, as we pass, that this inward connection between that teaching and learning and the present occasion, may be the deeper reason why, in the Gospel by St. John, the one narrative is immediately followed by the other, we pause to say, how real it hath proved in all ages and to all stages of Christian learning - that the heart makes the truly God-taught (pectus facit Theologum'), and that inward, true aspiration after the Divine prepares the eye to behold the Divine Reality in the Christ. But, if it be so is there not evidence here, that He is the God-sent - that He is a real, true Ambassador of God? If Jesus' teaching meets and satisfies our moral nature, if it leads up to God, is He not the Christ? And this brings us to the second claim which Christ made, that of being sent by God. There is yet another logical link in His reasoning. He had said: He shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from Myself.' From Myself? Why, there is this other test of it: Who speaketh from himself, seeketh his own glory' - there can be no doubt or question of this, but do I seek My own glory? - But He Who seeketh the glory of Him Who sent Him, He is true (a faithful messenger), and unrighteousness is not in Him.' [3969] Thus did Christ appeal and prove it: My doctrine is of God, and I am sent of God! Sent of God, no unrighteousness in Him! And yet at that very moment there hung over Him the charge of defiance of the Law of Moses, nay, of that of God, in an open breach of the Sabbath-commandment - there, in that very City, the last time He had been in Jerusalem; for which, as well as for His Divine claims, the Jews were even then seeking to kill Him.' [3970] And this forms the transition to what may be called the second part of Christ's address. If, in the

first part, the Jewish form of ratiocination was already apparent, it seems almost impossible for any one acquainted with those forms to understand how it can be overlooked in what follows. [3971] It is exactly the mode in which a Jew would argue with Jews, only the substance of the reasoning is to all times and people. Christ is defending Himself against a charge which naturally came up, when He claimed that His Teaching was of God and Himself God's real and faithful Messenger. In His reply the two threads of the former argument are taken up. Doing is the condition of knowledge - and a messenger had been sent from God! Admittedly, Moses was such, and yet every one of them was breaking the Law which he had given them; for, were they not seeking to kill Him without right or justice? This, put in the form of a double question, [3972] represents a peculiarly Jewish mode of argumentation, behind which lay the terrible truth, that those, whose hearts were so little longing to do the Will of God, not only must remain ignorant of His Teaching as that of God, but had also rejected that of Moses. A general disclaimer, a cry Thou hast a demon' (art possessed), who seeks to kill Thee?' here broke in upon the Speaker. But He would not be interrupted, and continued: One work I did, and all you wonder on account of it' [3973] - referring to His healing on the Sabbath, and their utter inability to understand His conduct. Well, then, Moses was a messenger of God, and I am sent of God. Moses gave the law of circumcision - not, indeed, that it was of his authority, but had long before been God-given - and, to observe this law, no one hesitated to break the Sabbath, [3974] since, according to Rabbinic principle, a positive ordinance superseded a negative. And yet, when Christ, as sent from God, made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath (made a whole man sound') they were angry with Him! [3975] Every argument which might have been urged in favour of the postponement of Christ's healing to a week-day, would equally apply to that of circumcision; while every reason that could be urged in favour of Sabbath-circumcision, would tell an hundredfold in favour of the act of Christ. Oh, then, let them not judge after the mere outward appearance, but judge the right judgment.' And, indeed, had it not been to convince them of the externalism of their views, that Jesus had on that Sabbath opened the great controversy between the letter that killeth and the spirit that maketh alive, when He directed the impotent man to carry home the bed on which he had lain? If any doubt could obtain, how truly Jesus had gauged the existing state of things, when He contrasted heart-willingness to do the Will of God, as the necessary preparation for the reception of His God-sent Teaching, with their murderous designs, springing from blind literalism and ignorance of the spirit of their Law, the reported remarks of some Jerusalemites in the crowd would suffice to convince us. [3976] The fact that He, Whom they sought to kill, was suffered to speak openly, seemed to them incomprehensible. Could it be that the authorities were shaken in their former idea about Him, and now regarded Him as the Messiah? But it could not be. [3977] It was a settled popular belief, and, in a sense, not quite unfounded, that the appearance of the Messiah would be sudden and unexpected. He might be there, and not be known; or He might come, and be again hidden for a time. [3978] [3979] As they put it, when Messiah came, no one would know whence He was; but they all knew whence this One' was. And with this rough and ready argument of a coarse realism, they, like so many among us, settled off-hand and once for all the great question. But Jesus could not, even for the sake of His poor weak disciples, let it rest there. Therefore' He lifted up His voice, [3980] that it reached the dispersing, receding multitude. Yes, they thought they knew both Him and whence He came. It would have been so had He come from Himself. But He had been sent, and He that sent Him was real;' [3981] it was a real Mission, and Him, who had thus sent the Christ, they knew not. And so, with a reaffirmation of His twofold claim, His Discourse

closed. [3982] But they had understood His allusions, and in their anger would fain have laid hands on Him, but His hour had not come. Yet others were deeply stirred to faith. As they parted they spoke of it among themselves, and the sum of it all was: The Christ, when He cometh, will He do more miracles (signs) than this One did?' So ended the first teaching of that day in the Temple. And as the people dispersed, the leaders of the Pharisees - who, no doubt aware of the presence of Christ in the Temple, yet unwilling to be in the number of His hearers, had watched the effect of His Teaching - overheard the low, furtive, half-outspoken remarks (the murmuring') of the people about Him. Presently they conferred with the heads of the priesthood and the chief Temple-officials. [3983] Although there was neither meeting, nor decree of the Sanhedrin about it, nor, indeed, could be, [3984] orders were given to the Temple-guard on the first possible occasion to seize Him. Jesus was aware of it, and as, either on this or another day, He was moving in the Temple, watched by the spies of the rulers and followed by a mingled crowd of disciples and enemies, deep sadness in view of the end filled His heart. Jesus therefore said' - no doubt to His disciples, though in the hearing of all - yet a little while am I with you, then I go away [3985] to Him that sent Me. Ye shall seek Me, and not find Me; and where I am, thither ye cannot come.' [3986] Mournful words, these, which were only too soon to become true. But those who heard them naturally failed to comprehend their meaning. Was He about to leave Palestine, and go to the Diaspora of the Greeks, among the dispersed who lived in heathen lands, to teach the Greeks? Or what could be His meaning? But we, who hear it across these centuries, feel as if their question, like the suggestion of the High-Priest at a later period, nay like so many suggestions of men, had been, all unconsciously, prophetic of the future.

CHAPTER VII. IN THE LAST, THE GREAT DAY OF THE FEAST'

(St. John vii.37 - viii.11.) IT was the last, the great day of the Feast,' and Jesus was once more in the Temple. We can scarcely doubt that it was the concluding day of the Feast, and not, as most modern writers suppose, its Octave, which, in Rabbinic language, was regarded as a festival by itself.' [3987] [3988] But such solemn interest attaches to the Feast, and this occurrence on its last day, that we must try to realise the scene. We have here the only Old Testament type yet unfilfilled; the only Jewish festival which has no counterpart in the cycle of the Christian year, [3989] just because it points forward to that great, yet unfulfilled hope of the Church: the ingathering of Earth's nations to the Christ. The celebration of the Feast corresponded to its great meaning. Not only did all the priestly families minister during that week, but it has been calculated that not fewer than 446 Priests, with, of course, a corresponding number of Levites, were required for its sacrificial worship. In general, the services were the same every day, except that the number of bullocks offered decreased daily from thirteen on the first, to seven on the seventh day. Only during the first two, and on the last festive day (as also on the Octave of the Feast), was strict Sabbatic rest enjoined. On the intervening half-holidays (Chol haMoed), although no new labour was to be undertaken, unless in the public service, the ordinary and necessary avocations of the home and of life were carried on, and especially all done that was required for the festive season. But the last, the Great Day of the Feast,' was marked by special observances. Let us suppose ourselves in the number of worshippers, who on the last, the Great Day of the Feast,' are leaving their booths' at daybreak to take part in the service. The pilgrims are all in festive array. In his right hand each carries what is called the Lulabh, [3990] which, although properly meaning a branch,' or palm-branch,' consisted of a myrtle and willow-branch tied together with a palm-branch between them. This was supposed to be in fulfilment of the command, Lev. xxiii.40. The fruit (A.V. boughs') of the goodly trees,' mentioned in the same verse of Scripture, was supposed to be the Ethrog, the so-called Paradise-apple (according to Ber. R.15, the fruit of the forbidden tree), a species of citron. [3991] This Ethrog each worshipper carries in his left hand. It is scarcely necessary to add, that this interpretation of Lev. xxiii.40 was given by the Rabbis; [3992] perhaps more interesting to know, that this was one of the points in controversy between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Thus armed with Lulabh in their right, and Ethrog in their left hands, the festive multitude would divide into three bands. Some would remain in the Temple to attend the preparation of the Morning Sacrifice. Another band would go in procession below Jerusalem' [3993] to a place called Moza, the Kolonia' of the Jerusalem Talmud, [3994] which some have sought to identify with the Emmaus of the Resurrection-Evening. [3995] At Moza they cut down willow-branches, with which, amidst the blasts of the Priests' trumpets, they adorned the altar, forming a leafy canopy about it. Yet a third company were taking part in a still more interesting service. To the sound of music a procession started from the Temple. It followed a Priest who bore a golden pitcher, capable of holding three log. [3996] Onwards it passed, probably, through Ophel, which recent investigations have shown to have been covered with buildings to the very verge of Siloam, down the edge of the Tyropoeon Valley, where it merges into that of the Kedron. To this day terraces mark where the gardens, watered by the living spring, extended from the King's Gardens by the spring Rogel down

to the entrance into the Tyropoeon. Here was the so-called Fountain-Gate,' and still within the City-wall the Pool of Siloam,' the overflow of which fed a lower pool. As already stated it was at the merging of the Tyropoeon into the Kedron Valley, in the south-eastern angle of Jerusalem. The Pool of Siloam was fed by the living spring farther up in the narrowest part of the Kedron Valley, which presently bears the name of the Virgin's Fountain,' but represents the ancient En-Rogel and Gihon. Indeed, the very canal which led from the one to the other, with the inscription of the workmen upon it, has lately been excavated. [3997] Though chiefly of historical interest, a sentence may be added. The Pool of Siloam is the same as the King's Pool' of Neh. ii.14. [3998] It was made by King Hezekiah, in order both to divert from a besieging army the spring of Gihon, which could not be brought within the City-wall, and yet to bring its waters within the City. [3999] This explains the origin of the name Siloam, sent' - a conduit [4000] - or Siloah,' as Josephus calls it. Lastly, we remember that it was down in the valley at Gihon (or En-Rogel), that Solomon was proclaimed, [4001] while the opposite faction held revel, and would have made Adonijah king, on the cliff Zoheleth (the modern Zahweileh) right over against it, not a hundred yards distant, [4002] where they must, of course, have distinctly heard the sound of the trumpets and the shouts of the people as Solomon was proclaimed king. [4003] But to return. When the Temple-procession had reached the Pool of Siloam, the Priest filled his golden pitcher from its waters. [4004] Then they went back to the Temple, so timing it, that they should arrive just as they were laying the pieces of the sacrifice on the great Altar of Burnt-offering, [4005] towards the close of the ordinary Morning-Sacrifice service. A threefold blast of the Priests' trumpets welcomed the arrival of the Priest, as he entered through the Water-gate,' [4006] which obtained its name from this ceremony, and passed straight into the Court of the Priests. Here he was joined by another Priest, who carried the wine for the drink-offering. The two Priests ascended the rise' of the altar, and turned to the left. There were two silver funnels here, with narrow openings, leading down to the base of the altar. Into that at the east, which was somewhat wider, the wine was poured, and, at the same time, the water into the western and narrower opening, the people shouting to the Priest to raise his hand, so as to make sure that he poured the water into the funnel. For, although it was held, that the water-pouring was an ordinance instituted by Moses, a Halakhah of Moses from Sinai,' [4007] this was another of the points disputed by the Sadducees. [4008] And, indeed, to give practical effect to their views, the High-Priest Alexander Jannæus had on one occasion poured the water on the ground, when he was nearly murdered, and in the riot, that ensued, six thousand persons were killed in the Temple. [4009] Immediately after the pouring of water,' the great Hallel,' consisting of Psalms cxiii. to cxviii. (inclusive), was chanted antiphonally, or rather, with responses, to the accompaniment of the flute. As the Levites intoned the first line of each Psalm, the people repeated it; while to each of the other lines they responded by Hallelu Yah (Praise ye the Lord'). But in Psalm cxviii. the people not only repeated the first line, O give thanks to the Lord,' but also these, O then, work now salvation, Jehovah,' [4010] O Lord, send now prosperity;' [4011] and again, at the close of the Psalm, O give thanks to the Lord.' As they repeated these lines, they shook towards the altar the Lulabh which they held in their hands - as if with this token of the past to express the reality and cause of their praise, and to remind God of His promises. It is this moment which should be chiefly kept in view. The festive morning-service was followed by the offering of the special sacrifices for the day, with their drink-offerings, and by the Psalm for the day, which, on the last, the Great Day of the Feast,' was Psalm lxxxii. from verse 5. [4012] [4013] The Psalm was, of course, chanted, as always, to instrumental accompaniment, and at the end of

each of its three sections the Priests blew a threefold blast, while the people bowed down in worship. In further symbolism of this Feast, as pointing to the ingathering of the heathen nations, the public services closed with a procession round the Altar by the Priests, who chanted O then, work now salvation, Jehovah! O Jehovah, send now prosperity.' [4014] But on the last, the Great Day of the Feast,' this procession of Priests made the circuit of the altar, not only once, but seven times, as if they were again compassing, but now with prayer, the Gentile Jericho which barred their possession of the promised land. Hence the seventh or last day of the Feast was also called that of the Great Hosannah.' As the people left the Temple, they saluted the altar with words of thanks, [4015] and on the last day of the Feast they shook off the leaves on the willow-branches round the altar, and beat their palm-branches to pieces. [4016] On the same afternoon the booths' were dismantled, and the Feast ended. [4017] We can have little difficulty in determining at what part of the services of the last, the Great Day of the Feast,' Jesus stood and cried, If any one thirst, let Him come unto Me and drink!' It must have been with special reference to the ceremony of the outpouring of the water, which, as we have seen, was considered the central part of the service. [4018] Moreover, all would understand that His words must refer to the Holy Spirit, since the rite was universally regarded as symbolical of His outpouring. The forthpouring of the water was immediately followed by the chanting of the Hallel. But after that there must have been a short pause to prepare for the festive sacrifices (the Musaph). It was then, immediately after the symbolic rite of water-pouring, immediately after the people had responded by repeating those lines from Psalm cxviii. - given thanks, and prayed that Jehovah would send salvation and prosperity, and had shaken their Lulabh towards the altar, thus praising with heart, and mouth, and hands,' and then silence had fallen upon them - that there rose, so loud as to be heard throughout the Temple, the Voice of Jesus. He interrupted not the services, for they had for the moment ceased: He interpreted, and He fulfilled them. Whether we realise it in connection with the deeply-stirring rites just concluded, and the song of praise that had scarcely died out of the air; or think of it as a vast step in advance in the history of Christ's Manifestation, the scene is equally wondrous. But yesterday they had been divided about Him, and the authorities had given directions to take Him; to-day He is not only in the Temple, but, at the close of the most solemn rites of the Feast, asserting, within the hearing of all, His claim to be regarded as the fulfilment of all, and the true Messiah! And yet there is neither harshness of command nor violence of threat in His proclamation. It is the King, meek, gentle, and loving; the Messiah, Who will not break the bruised reed, Who will not lift up His Voice in tone of anger, but speak in accents of loving, condescending compassion, Who now bids, whosoever thirsteth, come unto Him and drink. And so the words have to all time remained the call of Christ to all that thirst, whence- or what-soever their need and longing of soul may be. But, as we listen to these words as originally spoken, we feel how they mark that Christ's hour was indeed coming: the preparation past; the manifestation in the present, unmistakable, urgent, and loving; and the final conflict at hand. Of those who had heard Him, none but must have understood that, if the invitation were indeed real, and Christ the fulfilment of all, then the promise also had its deepest meaning, that he who believed on Him would not only receive the promised fulness of the Spirit, but give it forth to the fertilising of the barren waste around. It was, truly, the fulfilment of the Scripture-promise, not of one but of all: that in Messianic times the Nabhi, prophet,' literally the weller forth, viz., of the Divine, should not be one or another select individual, but that He would pour out on all His handmaidens and servants of His Holy Spirit, and thus the moral wilderness of this world be changed into a fruitful garden.

Indeed, this is expressly stated in the Targum which thus paraphrases Is. xliv.3: Behold, as the waters are poured on arid ground and spread over the dry soil, so will I give the Spirit of My Holiness on they sons, and My blessing on thy children's children.' What was new to them was, that all this was treasured up in the Christ, that out of His fulness men might receive, and grace for grace. And yet even this was not quite new. For, was it not the fulfilment of that old prophetic cry: The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon Me: therefore has He Messiahed (anointed) Me to preach good tidings unto the poor'? So then, it was nothing new, only the happy fulfilment of the old, when He thus spake of the Holy Spirit, which they who believed on Him should receive,' not then, but upon His Messianic exaltation. And so we scarcely wonder that many, on hearing Him, said, though not with that heart-conviction which would have led to self-surrender, that He was the Prophet promised of old, even the Christ, while others, by their side, regarding Him as a Galilean, the Son of Joseph, raised the ignorant objection that He could not be the Messiah, since the latter must be of the seed of David and come from Bethlehm. Nay, such was the anger of some against what they regarded a dangerous seducer of the poor people, that they would fain have laid violent hands on Him. But amidst all this, the strongest testimony to His Person and Mission remains to be told. It came, as so often, from a quarter whence it could least have been expected. Those Temple-officers, whom the authorities had commissioned to watch an opportunity for seizing Jesus, came back without having done their behest, and that, when, manifestly, the scene in the Temple might have offered the desired ground for His imprisonment. To the question of the Pharisees, they could only give this reply, which has ever since remained unquestionable fact of history, admitted alike by friend and foe: Never man so spake as this man.' [4019] For, as all spiritual longing and all upward tending, not only of men but even of systems, consciously or unconsciously tends towards Christ, [4020] so can we measure and judge all systems by this, which no sober student of history will gainsay, that no man or system ever so spake.It was not this which the Pharisees now gainsaid, but rather the obvious, and, we may add, logical, inference from it. The scene which followed is so thoroughly Jewish, that it alone would suffice to prove the Jewish, and hence Johannine, authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The harsh sneer: Are ye also led astray?' is succeeded by pointing to the authority of the learned and great, who with one accord were rejecting Jesus. But this people' - the country-people (Am ha-arez), the ignorant, unlettered rabble - are cursed.' Sufficient has been shown in previous parts of this book to explain alike the Pharisaic claim of authority and their almost unutterable contempt of the unlettered. So far did the latter go, that it would refuse, not only all family connection and friendly intercourse, [4021] but even the bread of charity, to the unlettered; [4022] nay, that, in theory at least, it would have regarded their murder as no sin, [4023] and even cut them off from the hope of the Resurrection. [4024] [4025] But is it not true, that, even in our days, this double sneer, rather than argument, of the Pharisees is the main reason of the disbelief of so many: Which of the learned believe on Him? but the ignorant multitude are led by superstition to ruin.There was one standing among the Temple-authorities, whom an uneasy conscience would not allow to remain quite silent. It was the Sanhedrist Nicodemus, still a night-disciple, even in brightest noon-tide. He could not hold his peace, and yet he dared not speak for Christ. So he made compromise of both by taking the part of, and speaking as, a righteous, rigid Sanhedrist. Does our Law judge (pronounce sentence upon) a man, except it first hear from himself and know what he doeth?' From the Rabbinic point of view, no sounder judicial saying could have been uttered. Yet such common-places impose not on any one, nor even serve any good purpose. It helped not the cause of Jesus, and it disguised not

the advocacy of Nicodemus. We know what was thought of Galilee in the Rabbinic world. Art thou also of Galilee? Search and see, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.'And so ended this incident, which, to all concerned, might have been so fruitful of good. Once more Nicodemus was left alone, as every one who had dared and yet not dared for Christ is after all such bootless compromises; alone - with sore heart, stricken conscience, and a great longing. [4026]

CHAPTER VIII. TEACHING IN THE TEMPLE ON THE OCTAVE OF THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

(St. John viii.12-59.) The startling teaching on the last, the Great Day of the Feast' was not the only one delivered at that season. The impression left on the mind is, that after silencing, as they thought, Nicodemus, the leaders of the Pharisees had dispersed. [4027] The addresses of Jesus which followed must, therefore, have been delivered, either later on that day, or, what on every account seems more likely, chiefly, or all, on the next day, [4028] which was the Octave of the Feast, when the Temple would be once more thronged by worshippers. On this occasion we find Christ, first in The Treasury,' [4029] and then [4030] in some unnamed part of the sacred building, in all probabilities one of the Porches,' Greater freedom could be here enjoyed, since these Porches,' which enclosed the Court of the Gentiles, did not form part of the Sanctuary in the stricter sense. Discussions might take place, in which not, as in the Treasury,' only the Pharisees,' [4031] but the people generally, might propound questions, answer, or assent. Again, as regards the requirements of the present narrative, since the Porches opened upon the Court, the Jews might there pick up stones to cast at Him (which would have been impossible in any part of the Sanctuary itself), while lastly, Jesus might easily pass out of the Temple in the crowd that moved through the Porches to the outer gates. [4032] But the narrative first transports us into the Treasury,' where the Pharisees' - or leaders - would alone venture to speak. It ought to be specially marked, that if they laid not hands on Jesus when He dared to teach in this sacred locality, and that such unwelcome doctrine, His immunity must be ascribed to the higher appointment of God: because His hour had not yet come.' [4033] An archæological question may here be raised as to the exact localisation of the Treasury,' whether it was the colonnade around the Court of the Women,' in which the receptacles for charitable contributions - the so-called Shopharoth, or trumpets' - were placed, [4034] or one of the two chambers' in which, respectively, secret gifts [4035] and votive offerings [4036] were deposited. [4037] [4038] The former seems the most likely. In any case, it would be within the Court of the Women,' the common meeting-place of the worshippers, and, as we may say, the most generally attended part of the Sanctuary. [4039] Here, in the hearing of the leaders of the people, took place the first Dialogue between Christ and the Pharisees. It opened with what probably was an allusion alike to one of the great ceremonies of the Feast of Tabernacles, to its symbolic meaning, and to an express Messianic expectation of the Rabbis. As the Mishnah states: On the first, [4040] or, as the Talmud would have it, [4041] on every night [4042] of the festive week, the Court of the Women' was brilliantly illuminated, and the night spent in the demonstrations already described. This was called the joy of the feast.' This festive joy,' of which the origin is obscure, was no doubt connected with the hope of earth's great harvest-joy in the conversion of the heathen world, and so pointed to the days of the Messiah.' In connection with this we mark, that the term light' was specially applied to the Messiah. In a very interesting passage of the Midrash [4043] we are told, that, while commonly windows were made wide within and narrow without, it was the opposite in the Temple of Solomon, because the light issuing from the Sanctuary was to lighten that which was without. This reminds us of the language

of devout old Simeon in regard to the Messiah, [4044] as a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of His people Israel.' The Midrash further explains, that, if the light in the Sanctuary was to be always burning before Jehovah, the reason was, not that He needed such light, but that He honoured Israel with this as a symbolic command. In Messianic times God would, in fulfilment of the prophetic meaning of this rite, kindle for them the Great Light,' and the nations of the world would point to them, who had lit the light for Him Who lightened the whole world. But even this is not all. The Rabbis speak of the original light in which God had wrapped Himself as in a garment, [4045] and which could not shine by day, because it would have dimmed the light of the sun. From this light that of the sun, moon, and stars had been kindled. [4046] It was now reserved under the throne of God for the Messiah, [4047] in Whose days it would shine forth once more. Lastly, we ought to refer to a passage in another Midrash, [4048] where, after a remarkable discussion on such names of the Messiah as the Lord our Righteousness,' the Branch,' the Comforter,' Shiloh,' Compassion,' His Birth is connected with the destruction, and His return with the restoration of the Temple. [4049] But in that very passage the Messiah is also specially designated as the Enlightener,' the words: [4050] the light dwelleth with Him,' being applied to Him. What has just been stated shows, that the Messianic hope of the aged Simeon [4051] most truly expressed the Messianic thoughts of the time. It also proves, that the Pharisees could not have mistaken the Messianic meaning in the words of Jesus, in their reference to the past festivity: I am the Light of the world.' This circumstance is itself evidential as regards this Discourse of Christ, the truth of this narrative, and even the Jewish authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But, indeed, the whole Address, the argumentation with the Pharisees which follows, as well as the subsequent Discourse to, and argumentation with, the Jews, are peculiarly Jewish in their form of reasoning. Substantially, these Discourses are a continuation of those previously delivered at this Feast. But they carry the argument one important step both backwards and forwards. The situation had now become quite clear, and neither party cared to conceal it. What Jesus had gradually communicated to the disciples, who were so unwilling to receive it, had now become an acknowledged fact. It was no longer a secret that the leaders of Israel and Jerusalem were compassing the Death of Jesus. This underlies all His Words. And He sought to turn them from their purpose, not by appealing to their pity nor to any lower motive, but by claiming as His right that, for which they would condemn Him. He was the Sent of God, the Messiah; although, to know Him and His Mission, it needed moral kinship with Him that had sent Him. But this led to the very root of the matter. It needed moral kinship with God: did Israel, as such, possess it? They did not; nay, no man possessed it, till given him of God. This was not exactly new in these Discourses of Christ, but it was now far more clearly stated and developed, and in that sense new. We also are too apt to overlook this teaching of Christ - perhaps have overlooked it. It is concerning the corruption of our whole nature by sin, and hence the need of God-teaching, if we are to receive the Christ, or understand His doctrine. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit; wherefore, marvel not that I said, Ye must be born again.' That had been Christ's initial teaching to Nicodemus, and it became, with growing emphasis, His final teaching to the teachers of Israel. It is not St. Paul who first sets forth the doctrine of our entire moral ruin: he had learned it from the Christ. It forms the very basis of Christianity; it is the ultimate reason of the need of a Redeemer, and the rationale of the work which Christ came to do. The Priesthood and the Sacrificial Work of Christ, as well as the higher aspect of His Prophetic Office, and the true meaning of His Kingship, as not of this world, are based upon it. Very markedly, it constitutes the starting-point in the fundamental divergence

between the leaders of the Synagogue and Christ - we might say, to all time between Christians and non-Christians. The teachers of Israel knew not, nor believed in the total corruption of man - Jew as well as Gentile - and, therefore, felt not the need of a Saviour. They could not understand it - how Except a man' - at least a Jew - were born again,' and, from above,' he could not enter, nor even see, the Kingdom of God. They understood not their own Bible: the story of the Fall - not Moses and the Prophets; and how could they understand Christ? they believed not them, and how could they believe Him? And yet, from this point of view, but only from this, does all seem clear: the Incarnation, the History of the Temptation and Victory in the Wilderness, and even the Cross. Only he who has, in some measure, himself felt the agony of the first garden, can understand that of the second garden. Had they understood, by that personal experience which we must all have of it, the Proto-Evangel of the great contest, and of the great conquest by suffering, they would have followed its lines to their final goal in the Christ as the fulfilment of all. And so, here also, were the words of Christ true, that it needed heavenly teaching, and kinship to the Divine, to understand His doctrine. This underlies, and is the main object of these Discourses of Christ. As a corollary He would teach, that Satan was not a merely malicious, impish being, working outward destruction, but that there was a moral power of evil which held us all - not the Gentile world only, but even the most favoured, learned, and exalted among the Jews. Of this power Satan was the concentration and impersonation; the prince of the power of darkness.' This opens up the reasoning of Christ, alike as expressed and implied. He presented Himself to them as the Messiah, and hence as the Light of the World. It resulted, that only in following Him would a man not walk in the darkness,' [4052] but have the light - and that, be it marked, not the light of knowledge, but of life. [4053] On the other hand, it also followed, that all, who were not within this light, were in darkness and in death. It was an appeal to the moral in His hearers. The Pharisees sought to turn it aside by an appeal to the external and visible. They asked for some witness, or palpable evidence, of what they called His testimony about Himself, [4054] well knowing that such could only be through some external, visible, miraculous manifestation, just as they had formerly asked for a sign from heaven. The Bible, and especially the Evangelic history, is full of what men ordinarily, and often thoughtlessly, call the miraculous. But, in this case, the miraculous would have become the magical, which it never is. If Christ had yielded to their appeal, and transferred the question from the moral to the coarsely external sphere, He would have ceased to be the Messiah of the Incarnation, Temptation, and Cross, the Messiah-Saviour. It would have been to un-Messiah the Messiah of the Gospel, for it was only, in another form, a repetition of the Temptation. A miracle or sign would at that moment have been a moral anachronism - as much as any miracle would be in our days, [4055] when the Christ makes His appeal to the moral, and is met by a demand for the external and material evidence of His Witness. The interruption of the Pharisees [4056] was thoroughly Jewish, and so was their objection. It had to be met, and that in the Jewish form [4057] in which it had been raised, while the Christ must at the same time continue His former teaching to them concerning God and their own distance from Him. Their objection had proceeded on this fundamental judicial principle - A person is not accredited about himself.' [4058] Harsh and unjust as this principle sometimes was, [4059] it evidently applied only in judicial cases, and hence implied that these Pharisees sat in judgment on Him as one suspected, and charged with guilt. The reply of Jesus was plain. Even if His testimony about Himself were unsupported, it would still be true, and He was competent to bear it, for He knew, as a matter of fact, whence He came and whither He went - His own part in this Mission, and its goal, as well as God's - whereas they knew

[4060] not either. [4061] But, more than this: their demand for a witness had proceeded on the assumption of their being the judges, and He the panel - a relation which only arose from their judging after the flesh. Spiritual judgment upon that which was within belonged only to Him, that searcheth all secrets. Christ, while on earth, judged no man; and, even if He did so, it must be remembered that He did it not alone, but with, and as the Representative of, the Father. Hence, such judgment would be true. [4062] But, as for their main charge, was it either true, or good in law? In accordance with the Law of God, there were two witnesses to the fact of His Mission: His own, and the frequently-shown attestation of His Father. And, if it were objected that a man could not bear witness in his own cause, the same Rabbinic canon laid it down, that this only applied if his testimony stood alone. But if it were corroborated (even in a matter of greatest delicacy), [4063] although by only one male or female slave - who ordinarily were unfit for testimony - it would be credited. The reasoning of Christ, without for a moment quitting the higher ground of His teaching, was quite unanswerable from the Jewish standpoint. The Pharisees felt it, and, though well knowing to Whom He referred, tried to evade it by the sneer - where (not Who) His Father was? This gave occasion for Christ to return to the main subject of His Address, that the reason of their ignorance of Him was, that they knew not the Father, and, in turn, that only acknowledgment of Him would bring true knowledge of the Father. [4064] Such words would only ripen in the hearts of such men the murderous resolve against Jesus. Yet, not till His, not their, hour had come! Presently, we find Him again, now in one of the Porches - probably that of Solomon - teaching, this time, the Jews.' We imagine they were chiefly, if not all, Judæans - perhaps Jerusalemites, aware of the murderous intent of their leaders - not His own Galileans, whom He addressed. It was in continuation of what had gone before - alike of what He had said to them and of what they felt towards Him. The words are intensely sad - Christ's farewell to His rebellious people, His tear-words over lost Israel; abrupt also, as if they were torn sentences, or, else, headings for special discourses: I go My way' - Ye shall seek Me, and in your sin [4065] shall ye die' - Whither I go, ye cannot come!' And is it not all most true? These many centuries has Israel sought its Christ, and perished in its great sin of rejecting Him; and whither Christ and His kingdom tended, the Synagogue and Judaism never came. They thought that He spoke of His dying, and not, as He did, of that which came after it. But, how could His dying establish such separation between them? This was the next question which rose in their minds. [4066] Would there be anything so peculiar about His dying, or, did His expression about going indicate a purpose of taking away His Own life? [4067]It was this misunderstanding which Jesus briefly but emphatically corrected by telling them, that the ground of their separation was the difference of their nature: they were from beneath, He from above; they of this world, He not of this world. Hence they could not come where He would be, since they must die in their sin, as He had told them - if ye believe not that I am.' [4068]The words were intentionally mysteriously spoken, as to a Jewish audience. Believe not that Thou art! But Who art Thou?' Whether or not the words were spoken in scorn, their question condemned themselves. In His broken sentence, Jesus had tried them - to see how they would complete it. Then it was so! All this time they had not yet learned Who He was; had not even a conviction on that point, either for or against Him, but were ready to be swayed by their leaders! Who I am?' - am I not telling you it even from the beginning; has My testimony by word or deed ever swerved on this point? I am what all along, from the beginning, I tell you. [4069] Then, putting aside this interruption, He resumed His argument. [4070] Many other things had He to say and to judge concerning them, besides the bitter truth of their perishing if they believed not that it was He

- but He that had sent Him was true, and He must ever speak into the world the message which He had received. When Christ referred to it as that which He heard from Him,' [4071] He evidently wished thereby to emphasise the fact of His Mission from God, as constituting His claim on their obedience of faith. But it was this very point which, even at that moment, they were not understanding. [4072] And they would only learn it, not by His Words, but by the event, when they had lifted Him up,' as they thought, to the Cross, but really on the way to His Glory. [4073] [4074] Then would they perceive the meaning of the designation He had given of Himself, and the claim founded on it: [4075] Then shall ye perceive that I am.' Meantime: And of Myself do I nothing, but as the [4076] Father taught Me, these things do I speak. And He that sent Me is with Me. He [4077] hath not left Me alone, because what pleases Him I do always.'If the Jews failed to understand the expression lifting up,' which might mean His Exaltation, though it did mean, in the first place, His Cross, there was that in His Appeal to His Words and Deeds as bearing witness to His Mission and to the Divine Help and Presence in it, which by its sincerity, earnestness, and reality, found its way to the hearts of many. Instinctively they felt and believed that His Mission must be Divine. Whether or not this found articulate expression, Jesus now addressed Himself to those who thus far - at least for the moment - believed on Him. They were at the crisis of their spiritual history, and He must press home on them what He had sought to teach at the first. By nature far from Him, they were bondsmen. Only if they abode in His Word would they know the truth, and the truth would make them free. The result of this knowledge would be moral, and hence that knowledge consisted not in merely believing on Him, but in making His Word and teaching their dwelling - abiding in it. [4078] But it was this very moral application which they resisted. In this also Jesus had used their own forms of thinking and teaching, only in a much higher sense. For their own tradition had it, that he only was free who laboured in the study of the Law. [4079] Yet the liberty of which He spoke came not through study of the Law, [4080] but from abiding in the Word of Jesus. But it was this very thing which they resisted. And so they ignored the spiritual, and fell back upon the national, application of the words of Christ. As this is once more evidential of the Jewish authorship of this Gospel, so also the characteristically Jewish boast, that as the children of Abraham they had never been, and never could be, in real servitude. It would take too long to enumerate all the benefits supposed to be derived from descent from Abraham. Suffice here the almost fundamental principle: All Israel are the children of Kings,' [4081] and its application even to common life, that as the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, not even Solomon's feast could be too good for them.' [4082] Not so, however, would the Lord allow them to pass it by. He pointed them to another servitude which they knew not, that of sin, [4083] and, entering at the same time also on their own ideas, He told them that continuance in this servitude would also lead to national bondage and rejection: For the servant abideth not in the house for ever.' [4084] On the other hand, the Son abode there for ever; whom He made free by adoption into His family, they would be free in reality and essentially. [4085] [4086] Then for their very dulness, He would turn to their favourite conceit of being Abraham's seed. There was, indeed, an obvious sense in which, by their natural descent, they were such. But there was a moral descent - and that alone was of real value. Another, and to them wholly new, and heavenly teaching this, which our Lord presently applied in a manner they could neither misunderstand nor gainsay, while He at the same time connected it with the general drift of His teaching. Abraham's seed? But they entertained purposes of murder, and that, because the Word of Christ had not free course, made not way in them. [4087] His Word was what He had seen with (before) the Father, [4088] not heard - for His presence was there

Eternal. Their deeds were what they had heard from their father [4089] - the word seen' in our common text depending on a wrong reading. And thus He showed them - in answer to their interpellation - that their father could not have been Abraham, so far as spiritual descent was concerned. [4090] They had now a glimpse of His meaning, but only to misapply it, according to their Jewish prejudice. Their spiritual descent, they urged, must be of God, since their descent from Abraham was legitimate. [4091] But the Lord dispelled even this conceit by showing, that if theirs were spiritual descent from God, then would they not reject His Message, nor seek to kill Him, but recognise and love him. [4092]But whence this misunderstanding of His speech? [4093] [4094] Because they are morally incapable of hearing it - and this because of the sinfulness of their nature: an element which Judaism had never taken into account. And so, with infinite Wisdom, Christ once more brought back His Discourse to what He would teach them concerning man's need, whether he be Jew or Gentile, of a Saviour and of renewing by the Holy Ghost. If the Jews were morally unable to hear His Word and cherished murderous designs, it was because, morally speaking, their descent was of the Devil. Very differently from Jewish ideas [4095] did He speak concerning the moral evilof Satan, as both a murderer and a liar - a murderer from the beginning of the history of our race, and one who stood not in the truth, because truth is not in him.' Hence whenever he speaketh a lie' - whether to our first parents, or now concerning the Christ - he speaketh from out his own (things), for he (Satan) is a liar, and the father of such an one (who telleth or believeth lies).' [4096] Which of them could convict Him of sin? If therefore He spake truth, [4097] and they believed Him not, it was because they were not of God, but, as He had shown them, of their father, the Devil.The argument was unanswerable, and there seemed only one way to turn it aside - a Jewish Tu quoque, an adaptation of the Physician, heal thyself:' Do we not say rightly, that Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon?' It is strange that the first clause of this reproach should have been so misunderstood and yet its direct explanation lies on the surface. We have only to translate it into the language which the Jews had used. By no strain of ingenuity is it possible to account for the designation Samaritan,' as given by the Jews to Jesus, if it is regarded as referring to nationality. Even at the very Feast they had made it an objection to His Messianic claims, that He was (as they supposed) a Galilean. [4098] Nor had He come to Jerusalem from Samaria; [4099] nor could He be so called (as Commentators suggest) because He was a foe' to Israel, or a breaker of the Law,' or unfit to bear witness' [4100] - for neither of these circumstances would have led the Jews to designate Him by the term Samaritan.' But, in the language which they spoke, what is rendered into Greek by Samaritan,' would have been either Kuthi ({hebrew}), which, while literally meaning a Samaritan, [4101] is almost as often used in the sense of heretic,' or else Shomroni ({hebrew}). The latter word deserves special attention. [4102] Literally, it also means, Samaritan;' but, the name Shomron (perhaps from its connection with Samaria), is also sometimes used as the equivalent of Ashmedai, the Prince of the demons. [4103] [4104] According to the Kabbalists, Shomron was the father of Ashmedai, and hence the same as Sammael, or Satan. That this was a wide-spread Jewish belief, appears from the circumstance that in the Koran (which, in such matters, would reproduce popular Jewish tradition), Israel is said to have been seduced into idolatry by Shomron, [4105] while, in Jewish tradition, this is attributed to Sammael. [4106] If, therefore, the term applied by the Jews to Jesus was Shomroni - and not Kuthi, heretic' - it would literally mean, Child of the Devil.' [4107] This would also explain why Christ only replied to the charge of having a demon, since the two charges meant substantially the same: Thou art a child of the devil and hast a demon.' In wondrous patience and

mercy He almost passed it by, dwelling rather, for their teaching, on the fact that, while they dishonoured Him, He honoured His Father. He heeded not their charges. His concern was the glory of His Father; the vindication of His own honour would be brought about by the Father - though, alas! in judgment on those who were casting such dishonour on the Sent of God. [4108] Then, as if lingering in deep compassion on the terrible issue, He once more pressed home the great subject of His Discourse, that only if a man keep' - both have regard to, and observe - His Word,' he shall not gaze at death [intently behold it] [4109] unto eternity' - for ever shall he not come within close and terrible gaze of what is really death, of what became such to Adam in the hour of his Fall.It was, as repeatedly observed, this death as the consequence of the Fall, of which the Jews knew nothing. And so they once more misunderstood it as of physical death, [4110] and, since Abraham and the prophets had died, regarded Christ as setting up a claim higher than theirs. [4111] The Discourse had contained all that He had wished to bring before them, and their objections were degenerating into wrangling. It was time to break it off by a general application. The question, He added, was not of what He said, but of what God said of Him - that God, Whom they claimed as theirs, and yet knew not, but Whom He knew, and Whose Word He kept.' [4112] But, as for Abraham - he had exulted' in the thought of the coming day of the Christ, and, seeing its glory, he was glad. Even Jewish tradition could scarcely gainsay this, since there were two parties in the Synagogue, of which one believed that, when that horror of great darkness fell on him, [4113] Abraham had, in vision, been shown not only this, but the coming world - and not only all events in the present age,' but also those in Messianic times. [4114] [4115] And now, theirs was not misunderstanding, but wilful misinterpretation. He had spoken of Abraham seeing His day; they took it of His seeing Abraham's day, and challenged its possibility. Whether or not they intended thus to elicit an avowal of His claim to eternal duration, and hence to Divinity, it was not time any longer to forbear the full statement, and, with Divine emphasis, He spake the words which could not be mistaken: Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I AM.'It was as if they had only waited for this. Furiously they rushed from the Porch into the Court of the Gentiles - with symbolic significance, even in this - to pick up stones, and to cast them at Him. But, once more, His hour had not yet come, and their fury proved impotent. Hiding Himself for the moment, as might so easily be done, in one of the many chambers, passages, or gateways of the Temple, He presently passed out.It had been the first plain disclosure and avowal of His Divinity, and it was in the midst of His enemies,' and when most contempt was cast upon Him. Presently would that avowal be renewed both in Word and by Deed; for the end' of mercy and judgment had not yet come, but was drawing terribly nigh.

CHAPTER IX. THE HEALING OF THE MAN BORN BLIND.

(St. John ix.) After the scene in the Temple described in the last chapter, and Christ's consequent withdrawal from His enemies, we can scarcely suppose any other great event to have taken place on that day within or near the precincts of the Sanctuary. And yet, from the close connection of the narratives, we are led to infer that no long interval of time can have elapsed before the healing of the man born blind. [4116] Probably it happened the day after the events just recorded. We know that it was a Sabbath, [4117] and this fresh mark of time, as well as the multiplicity of things done, and the whole style of the narrative, confirm our belief that it was not on the evening of the day when He had spoken to them first in the Treasury,' and then in the Porch. On two other points there is strong presumption, though we cannot offer actual proof. Remembering, that the entrance to the Temple or its Courts was then - as that of churches is on the Continent - the chosen spot for those who, as objects of pity, solicited charity; [4118] remembering, also, how rapidly the healing of the blind man became known, and how soon both his parents and the healed man himself appeared before the Pharisees - presumably, in the Temple; lastly, how readily the Saviour knew where again to find him [4119] - we can scarcely doubt that the miracle took place at the entering to the Temple, or on the Temple-Mount. Secondly, both the Work, and especially the Words of Christ, seem in such close connection with what had preceded, that we can scarcely be mistaken in regarding them as intended to form a continuation of it. It is not difficult to realise the scene, nor to understand the remarks of all who had part in it. It was the Sabbath - the day after the Octave of the Feast, and Christ with His disciples was passing - presumably when going into the Temple, where this blind beggar was wont to sit, probably soliciting alms, perhaps in some such terms as these, which were common at the time: Gain merit by me;' or, O tenderhearted, by me gain merit, to thine own benefit.' But on the Sabbath he would, of course, neither ask nor receive alms, though his presence in the wonted place would secure wider notice and perhaps lead to many private gifts. Indeed, the blind were regarded as specially entitled to charity; [4120] and the Jerusalem Talmud [4121] relates some touching instances of the delicacy displayed towards them. As the Master and His disciples passed the blind beggar, Jesus saw' him, with that look which they who followed Him knew to be full of meaning. Yet, so thoroughly Judaised were they by their late contact with the Pharisees, that no thought of possible mercy came to them, only a truly and characteristically Jewish question, addressed to Him expressly, and as Rabbi:' [4122] through whose guilt this blindness had befallen him - through his own, or that of his parents. For, thoroughly Jewish the question was. Many instances could be adduced, in which one or another sin is said to have been punished by some immediate stroke, disease, or even by death; and we constantly find Rabbis, when meeting such unfortunate persons, asking them, how or by what sin this had come to them. But, as this man was blind from his birth,' the possibility of some actual sin before birth would suggest itself, at least as a speculative question, since the evil impulse' (Yetser haRa), might even then be called into activity. [4123] At the same time, both the Talmud and the later charge of the Pharisees, In sins wast thou born altogether,' imply that in such cases the alternative explanation would be considered, that the blindness might be caused by the sin of his parents. [4124] It was a common Jewish view, that the merits or demerits of the parents would

appear in the children. In fact, up to thirteen years of age a child was considered, as it were, part of his father, and as suffering for his guilt. [4125] More than that, the thoughts of a mother might affect the moral state of her unborn offspring, and the terrible apostasy of one of the greatest Rabbis had, in popular belief, been caused by the sinful delight his mother had taken when passing through an idol-grove. [4126] Lastly, certain special sins in the parents would result in specific diseases in their offspring, and one is mentioned [4127] as causing blindness in the children. [4128] But the impression left on our minds is, that the disciples felt not sure as to either of these solutions of the difficulty. It seemed a mystery, inexplicable on the supposition of God's infinite goodness, and to which they sought to apply the common Jewish solution. Many similar mysteries meet us in the administration of God's Providence - questions, which seem unanswerable, but to which we try to give answers, perhaps, not much wiser than the explanations suggested by disciples. But why seek to answer them at all, since we possess not all, perhaps very few of, the data requisite for it? There is one aspect, however, of adversity, and of a strange dispensation of evil, on which the light of Christ's Words here shines with the brightness of a new morning. There is a physical, natural reason for them. God has not specially sent them, in the sense of His interference or primary causation, although He has sent them in the sense of His knowledge, will, and reign. They have come in the ordinary course of things, and are traceable to causes which, if we only knew them, would appear to us the sequence of the laws which God has imposed on His creation, and which are necessary for its orderly continuance. And, further, all such evil consequences, from the operation of God's laws, are in the last instance to be traced back to the curse which sin has brought upon man and on earth. With these His Laws, and with their evil sequences to us through the curse of sin, God does not interfere in the ordinary course of His Providence; although he would be daring, who would negative the possibility of what may seem, though it is not, interference, since the natural causes which lead to these evil consequences may so easily, naturally, and rationally be affected. But there is another and a higher aspect of it, since Christ has come, and is really the Healer of all disease and evil by being the Remover of its ultimate moral cause. This is indicated in His words, when, putting aside the clumsy alternative suggested by the disciples, He told them that it was so in order that the works of God might be made manifest in him.' They wanted to know the why,' He told them the in order to,' of the man's calamity; they wished to understand its reason as regarded its origin, He told them its reasonableness in regard to the purpose which it, and all similar suffering, should serve, since Christ has come, the Healer of evil - because the Saviour from sin. Thus He transferred the question from intellectual ground to that of the moral purpose which suffering might serve. And this not in itself, nor by any destiny or appointment, but because the Coming and Work of the Christ has made it possible to us all. Sin and its sequences are still the same, for the world is established that it cannot move.' But over it all has risen the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His wings; and, if we but open ourselves to His influence, these evils may serve this purpose, and so have this for their reason, not as, regards their genesis, but their continuance, that the works of God may be made manifest.' To make this the reality to us, was the work of Him' Who sent, and for which He sent, the Christ. And rapidly now must He work it, for perpetual example, during the few hours still left of His brief working-day. [4129] This figure was not unfamiliar to the Jews, [4130] though it may well be that, by thus emphasising the briefness of the time, He may also have anticipated any objection to His healing on the Sabbath. But it is of even more importance to notice, how the two leading thoughts of the previous day's Discourse were now again taken up

and set forth in the miracle that followed. These were, that He did the Work which God had sent Him to do, [4131] and that He was the Light of the world. [4132] As its Light He could not but shine so long as He was in it. And this He presently symbolised (and is not every miracle a symbol?) in the healing of the blind. Once more we notice, how in His Deeds, as in His Words, the Lord adopted the forms known and used by His contemporaries, while He filled them with quite other substance. It has already been stated, [4133] that saliva was commonly regarded as a remedy for diseases of the eye, although, of course, not for the removal of blindness. With this He made clay, which He now used, adding to it the direction to go and wash in the Pool of Siloam, a term which literally meant sent.' [4134] A symbolism, this, of Him Who was the Sent of the Father. For, all is here symbolical: the cure and its means. If we ask ourselves why means were used in this instance, we can only suggest, that it was partly for the sake of him who was to be healed, partly for theirs who afterwards heard of it. For, the blind man seems to have been ignorant of the character of his Healer, [4135] and it needed the use of some means to make him, so to speak, receptive. On the other hand, not only the use of means, but their inadequacy to the object, must have impressed all. Symbolical, also, were these means. Sight was restored by clay, made out of the ground with the spittle of Him, Whose breath had at the first breathed life into clay; and this was then washed away in the Pool of Siloam, from whose waters had been drawn on the Feast of Tabernacles that which symbolised the forthpouring of the new life by the Spirit. Lastly, if it be asked why such miracle should have been wrought on one who had not previous faith, who does not even seem to have known about the Christ, we can only repeat, that the man himself was intended to be a symbol, that the works of God should be made manifest in him.' And so, what the Pharisees had sought in vain, was freely vouch-safed when there was need for it. With inimitable simplicity, itself evidence that no legend is told, the man's obedience and healing are recorded. We judge, that his first impulse when healed must have been to seek for Jesus, naturally, where he had first met Him. On his way, probably past his own house to tell his parents, and again on the spot where he had so long sat begging, all who had known him must have noticed the great change that had passed over him. So marvellous, indeed, did it appear, that, while part of the crowd that gathered would, of course, acknowledge his identity, others would say: No, but he is like him;' in their suspiciousness looking for some imposture. For there can be little doubt, that on his way he must have learned more about Jesus than merely His Name, [4136] and in turn have communicated to his informants the story of his healing. Similarly, the formal question now put to him by the Jews was as much, if not more, a preparatory inquisition than the outcome of a wish to learn the circumstances of his healing. And so we notice in his answer the cautious desire not to say anything that could incriminate his Benefactor. He tells the facts truthfully, plainly; he accentuates by what means he had recovered,' [4137] not received, sight; but otherwise gives no clue by which either to discover or to incriminate Jesus. [4138] Presently they bring him to the Pharisees, not to take notice of his healing, but to found on it a charge against Christ. Such must have been their motive, since it was universally known that the leaders of the people had, of course informally, agreed to take the strictest measures, not only against the Christ, but against any one who professed to be His disciple. [4139] The ground on which the present charge against Jesus would rest was plain: the healing involved a manifold breach of the Sabbath-Law. The first of these was that He had made clay. [4140] Next, it would be a question whether any remedy might be applied on the holy day. Such could only be done in diseases of the internal organs (from the throat downwards), except when danger to life or the loss of an organ was involved. [4141] It

was, indeed, declared lawful to apply, for example, wine to the outside of the eyelid, on the ground that this might be treated as washing; but it was sinful to apply it to the inside of the eye. And as regards saliva, its application to the eye is expressly forbidden, on the ground that it was evidently intended as a remedy. [4142] There was, therefore, abundant legal ground for a criminal charge. And, although on the Sabbath the Sanhedrin would not hold any formal meeting, and, even had there been such, the testimony of one man would not have sufficed, yet the Pharisees' set the inquiry regularly on foot. First, as if not satisfied with the report of those who had brought the man, they made him repeat it. [4143] The simplicity of the man's language left no room for evasion or subterfuge. Rabbinism was on its great trial. The wondrous fact could neither be denied nor explained, and the only ground for resisting the legitimate inference as to the character of Him Who had done it, was its inconsistence with their traditional law. The alternative was: whether their traditional law of Sabbath-observance, or else He Who had done such miracles, was Divine? Was Christ not of God, because He did not keep the Sabbath in their way? But, then; could an open transgressor of God's Law do such miracles? In this dilemma they turned to the simple man before them. Seeing that He opened' his eyes, what did he say of Him? what was the impression left on his mind, who had the best opportunity for judging? [4144] There is something very peculiar, and, in one sense, most instructive, as to the general opinion entertained even by the best-disposed, who had not yet been taught the higher truth, in his reply, so simple and solemn, so comprehensive in its sequences, and yet so utterly inadequate by itself: He is a Prophet.' One possibility still remained. After all, the man might not have been really blind; and they might, by cross-examining the parents, elicit that about his original condition which would explain the pretended cure. But on this most important point, the parents, with all their fear of the anger of the Pharisees, remained unshaken. He had been born blind; but as to the manner of his cure, they declined to offer any opinion. Thus, as so often, the machinations of the enemies of Christ led to results the opposite of those wished for. For, the evidential value of their attestation of their son's blindness was manifestly proportional to their fear of committing themselves to any testimony for Christ, well knowing what it would entail.For to persons so wretchedly poor as to allow their son to live by begging, [4145] the consequence of being un-Synagogued,' or put outside the congregation [4146] - which was to be the punishment of any who confessed Jesus as the Messiah - would have been dreadful. Talmudic writings speak of two, or rather, we should say, of three, kinds of excommunication,' of which the two first were chiefly disciplinary, while the third was the real casting out,' un-Synagoguing,' cutting off from the congregation.' [4147] The general designation [4148] for excommunication' was Shammatta, although, according to its literal meaning, the term would only apply to the severest form of it. [4149] The first and lightest degree was the so-called Neziphah or Neziphutha; properly, a rebuke,' an inveighing. Ordinarily, its duration extended over seven days; but, if pronounced by the Nasi, or Head of the Sanhedrin, it lasted for thirty days. In later times, however, it only rested for one day on the guilty person. [4150] Perhaps St. Paul referred to this rebuke' in the expression which he used about an offending Elder. [4151] He certainly adopted the practice in Palestine, [4152] when he would not have an Elder rebuked' although he went far beyond it when he would have such entreated.' In Palestine it was ordered, that an offending Rabbi should be scourged instead of being excommunicated. [4153] Yet another direction of St. Paul's is evidently derived from these arrangements of the Synagogue, although applied in a far different spirit. When the Apostle wrote: An heretic after the first and second admonition reject;' there must have been in his mind the second degree of Jewish

excommunication, the so-called Niddui (from the verb to thrust, thrust out, cast out). This lasted for thirty days at the least, although among the Babylonians only for seven days. [4154] At the end of that term there was a second admonition,' which lasted other thirty days. If still unrepentant, the third, or real excommunication, was pronounced, which was called the Cherem, or ban, and of which the duration was indefinite. Any three persons, or even one duly authorised, could pronounce the lowest sentence. The greater excommunication (Niddui) - which, happily, could only be pronounced in an assembly of ten - must have been terrible, being accompanied by curses, [4155] [4156] and, at a later period, sometimes proclaimed with the blast of the horn. [4157] [4158] If the person so visited occupied an honourable position, it was the custom to intimate his sentence in a euphemistic manner, such as: It seems to me that thy companions are separating themselves from thee.' He who was so, or similarly addressed, would only too well understand its meaning. Henceforth he would sit on the ground, and bear himself like one in deep mourning. He would allow his beard and hair to grow wild and shaggy; he would not bathe, nor anoint himself; he would not be admitted into an assembly of ten men, neither to public prayer, nor to the Academy; though he might either teach, or be taught by, single individuals. Nay, as if he were a leper, people would keep at a distance of four cubits from him. If he died, stones were cast on his coffin, nor was he allowed the honour of the ordinary funeral, nor were they to mourn for him. Still more terrible was the final excommunication, or Cherem, when a ban of indefinite duration was laid on a man. Henceforth he was like one dead. He was not allowed to study with others, no intercourse was to be held with him, he was not even to be shown the road. He might, indeed, buy the necessaries of life, but it was forbidden to eat or drink with such an one. [4159]We can understand, how everyone would dread such an anathema. But when we remember, what it would involve to persons in the rank of life, and so miserably poor as the parents of that blind man, we no longer wonder at their evasion of the question put by the Sanhedrin. And if we ask ourselves, on what ground so terrible a punishment could be inflicted to all time and in every place - for the ban once pronounced applied everywhere - simply for the confession of Jesus as the Christ, the answer is not difficult. The Rabbinists enumerate twenty-four grounds for excommunication, of which more than one might serve the purpose of the Pharisees. But in general, to resist the authority of the Scribes, or any of their decrees, or to lead others either away from the commandments,' or to what was regarded as profanation of the Divine Name, was sufficient to incur the ban, while it must be borne in mind that excommunication by the President of the Sanhedrin extended to all places and persons. [4160] As nothing could be elicited from his parents, the man who had been blind was once more summoned before the Pharisees. It was no longer to inquire into the reality of his alleged blindness, nor to ask about the cure, but simply to demand of him recantation, though this was put in the most specious manner. Thou hast been healed: own that it was only by God's Hand miraculously stretched forth, [4161] and that this man' had nothing to do with it, save that the coincidence may have been allowed to try the faith of Israel. It could not have been Jesus Who had done it, for they knew Him to be a sinner.' Of the two alternatives they had chosen that of the absolute rightness of their own Sabbath-traditions as against the evidence of His Miracles. Virtually, then, this was the condemnation of Christ and the apotheosis of traditionalism. And yet, false as their conclusion was, there was this truth in their premisses, that they judged of miracles by the moral evidence in regard to Him, Who was represented as working them.But he who had been healed of his blindness was not to be so betrayed into a denunciation of his great Physician. The simplicity and earnestness of his

convictions enabled him to gain even a logical victory. It was his turn now to bring back the question to the issue which they had originally raised; and we admire it all the more, as we remember the consequences to this poor man of thus daring the Pharisees. As against their opinion about Jesus, as to the correctness of which neither he nor others could have direct knowledge, [4162] there was the unquestionable fact of his healing of which he had personal knowledge. The renewed inquiry now by the Pharisees, as to the manner in which Jesus had healed him, [4163] might have had for its object to betray the man into a positive confession, or to elicit something demoniacal in the mode of the cure. The blind man had now fully the advantage. He had already told them; why the renewed inquiry? As he put it half ironically: Was it because they felt the wrongness of their own position, and that they should become His disciples? It stung them to the quick; they lost all self-possession, and with this their moral defeat became complete. Thou art the disciple of that man, but we (according to the favourite phrase) are the disciples of Moses.' Of the Divine Mission of Moses they knew, but of the Mission of Jesus they knew nothing. [4164] The unlettered man had now the full advantage in the controversy. In this, indeed,' there was the marvellous,' that the leaders of Israel should confess themselves ignorant of the authority of One, Who had power to open the eyes of the blind - a marvel which had never before been witnessed. If He had that power, whence had He obtained it, and why? It could only have been from God. They said, He was a sinner' - and yet there was no principle more frequently repeated by the Rabbis, [4165] than that answers to prayer depended on a man being devout' and doing the Will of God. There could therefore by only one inference: If Jesus had not Divine Authority, He could not have had Divine Power.The argument was unanswerable, and in its unanswerableness shows us, not indeed the purpose, but the evidential force of Christ's Miracles. In one sense they had no purpose, or rather were purpose to themselves, being the forthbursting of His Power and the manifestation of His Being and Mission, of which latter, as applied to things physical, they were part. But the truthful reasoning of that untutored man, which confounded the acuteness of the sages, shows the effect of these manifestations on all whose hearts were open to the truth. The Pharisees had nothing to answer, and, as not unfrequently in analogous cases, could only, in their fury, cast him out with bitter reproaches. Would he teach them - he, whose very disease showed him to have been a child conceived and born in sin, and who, ever since his birth, had been among ignorant, Law-neglecting sinners'?But there was Another, Who watched and knew him: He Whom, so far as he knew, he had dared to confess, and for Whom he was content to suffer. Let him now have the reward of his faith, even its completion; and so shall it become manifest to all time, how, as we follow and cherish the better light, it riseth upon us in all its brightness, and that faithfulness in little bringeth the greater stewardship. Tenderly did Jesus seek him out, wherever it may have been: [4166] and, as He found him, this one question did He ask, whether the conviction of his experience was not growing into the higher faith of the yet unseen: Dost thou believe on the Son of God?' [4167] He had had personal experience of Him - was not that such as to lead up to the higher faith? And is it not always so, that the higher faith is based on the conviction of personal experience - that we believe on Him as the Son of God, because we have experience of Him as the God-sent, Who has Divine Power, and has opened the eyes of the blind-born - and Who has done to us what had never been done by any other in the world? Thus is faith always the child of experience, and yet its father also; faith not without experience, and yet beyond experience; faith not superseded by experience, but made reasonable by it. To such a soul it needed only the directing Word of Christ. And Who is He, Lord, that I may believe on Him?' [4168] It seems as if

the question of Jesus had kindled in him the conviction of what was the right answer. We almost see how, like a well of living water, the words sprang gladsome from his inmost heart, and how he looked up expectant on Jesus. To such readiness of faith there could be only one answer. In language more plain than He had ever before used, Jesus answered, and with immediate confession of implicit faith the man lowly worshipped. [4169] And so it was, that the first time he saw his Deliverer, it was to worship Him. It was the highest stage yet attained. What contrast this faith and worship of the poor unlettered man, once blind, now in every sense seeing, to the blindness of judgment which had fallen on those who were the leaders of Israel! [4170] The cause alike of the one and the other was the Person of the Christ. For our relationship to Him determines sight or blindness, as we either receive the evidence of what He is from what He indubitably does, or reject it, because we hold by our own false conceptions of God, and of what His Will to us is. And so is Christ also for judgment.'There were those who still followed Him - not convinced by, nor as yet decided against Him - Pharisees, who well understood the application of His Words. Formally, it had been a contest between traditionalism and the Work of Christ. They also were traditionalists - were they also blind? But, nay, they had misunderstood Him by leaving out the moral element, thus showing themselves blind indeed. It was not the calamity of blindness; but it was a blindness in which they were guilty, and for which they were responsible, [4171] which indeed was the result of their deliberate choice: therefore their sin - not their blindness only - remained!

CHAPTER X. THE GOOD SHEPHERD' AND HIS ONE FLOCK' - LAST DISCOURSE AT THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

(St. John x.1-21.) The closing words which Jesus had spoken to those Pharisees who followed HIm breathe the sadness of expected near judgment, rather than the hopefulness of expostulation. And the Discourse which followed, ere He once more left Jerusalem, is of the same character. It seems, as if Jesus could not part from the City in holy anger, but ever, and only, with tears. All the topics of the former Discourses are now resumed and applied. They are not in any way softened or modified, but uttered in accents of loving sadness rather than of reproving monition. This connection with the past proves, that the Discourse was spoken immediately after, and in connection with, the events recorded in the previous chapters. At the same time, the tone adopted by Christ prepares us for His Peræan Ministry, which may be described as that of the last and fullest outgoing of His most intense pity. This, in contrast to what was exhibited by the rulers of Israel, and which would so soon bring terrible judgment on them. For, if such things were done in the green tree' of Israel's Messiah-King, what would the end be in the dry wood of Israel's commonwealth and institutions? It was in accordance with the character of the Discourse presently under consideration, that Jesus spake it, not, indeed, in Parables in the strict sense (for none such are recorded in the Fourth Gospel), but in an allegory [4172] in the Parabolic form, [4173] hiding the higher truths from those who, having eyes, had not seen, but revealing them to such whose eyes had been opened. If the scenes of the last few days had made anything plain, it was the utter unfitness of the teachers of Israel for their professed work of feeding the flock of God. The Rabbinists also called their spiritual leaders feeders,' Parnasin ({hebrew}) - a term by which the Targum renders some of the references to the Shepherds' in Ezek. xxxiv. and Zech xi. [4174] The term comprised the two ideas of leading' and feeding,' which are separately insisted on in the Lord's allegory. As we think of it, no better illustration, nor more apt, could be found for those to whom the flock of God' was entrusted. It needed not therefore that a sheepfold should have been in view, [4175] to explain the form of Christ's address. [4176] It only required to recall the Old Testament language about the shepherding of God, and that of evil shepherds, to make the application to what had so lately happened. They were, surely, not shepherds, who had cast out the healed blind man, or who so judged of the Christ, and would cast out all His disciples. They had entered into God's Sheepfold, but not by the door by which the owner, God, had brought His flock into the fold. To it the entrance had been His free love, His gracious provision, His thoughts of pardoning, His purpose of saving mercy. That was God's Old Testament-door into His Sheepfold. Not by that door, as had so lately fully appeared, had Israel's rulers come in. They had climbed up to their place in the fold some other way - with the same right, or by the same wrong, as a thief or a robber. They had wrongfully taken what did not belong to them - cunningly and undetected, like a thief; they had allotted it to themselves, and usurped it by violence, like a robber. What more accurate description could be given of the means by which the Pharisees and Sadducees had attained the rule over God's flock, and claimed it for themselves? And what was true of them holds equally so of all, who, like them, enter by some other way.' How different He,

Who comes in and leads us through God's door of covenant-mercy and Gospel-promise - the door by which God had brought, and ever brings, His flock into His fold! This was the true Shepherd. The allegory must, of course, not be too closely pressed; but, as we remember how in the East the flocks are at night driven into a large fold, and charge of them is given to an under shepherd, we can understand how, when the shepherd comes in the morning, the doorkeeper' [4177] or guardian' opens to him. In interpreting the allegory, stress must be laid not so much on any single phrase, be it the porter,' the door,' or the opening,' as on their combination. If the shepherd comes to the door, the porter hastens to open it to him from within, that he may obtain access to the flock; and when a true spiritual Shepherd comes to the true spiritual door, it is opened to him by the guardian from within, that is, he finds ready and immediate access. Equally pictorial is the progress of the allegory. Having thus gained access to His flock, it has not been to steal or rob, but the Shepherd knows and calls them, each by his name, and leads them out. We mark that in the expression: when He has put forth all His own' [4178] - the word is a strong one. For they have to go each singly, and perhaps they are not willing to go out each by himself, or even to leave that fold, and so he puts' or thrusts them forth, and He does so to all His own.' Then the Eastern shepherd places himself at the head of his flock, and goes before them, guiding them, making sure of their following simply by his voice, which they know. So would His flock follow Christ, for they know His Voice, and in vain would strangers seek to lead them away, as the Pharisees had tried. It was not the known Voice of their own Shepherd, and they would only flee from it. [4179] We can scarcely wonder, that they who heard it did not understand the allegory, for they were not of His flock and knew not His Voice. But His own knew it then, and would know it for ever. Therefore,' [4180] both for the sake of the one and the other, He continued, now dividing for greater clearness the two leading ideas of His allegory, and applying each separately for better comfort. These two ideas were: entrance by the door, and the characteristics of the good Shepherd - thus affording a twofold test by which to recognise the true, and distinguish it from the false. I. The door - Christ was the Door. [4181] The entrance into God's fold and to God's flock was only through that, of which Christ was the reality. And it had ever been so. All the Old Testament institutions, prophecies, and promises, so far as they referred to access into God's fold, meant Christ. And all those who went before Him, [4182] pretending to be the door - whether Pharisees, Sadducees, or Nationalists - were only thieves and robbers: that was not the door into the Kingdom of God. And the sheep, God's flock, did not hear them; for, although they might pretend to lead the flock, the voice was that of strangers. The transition now to another application of the allegorical idea of the door' was natural and almost necessary, though it appears somewhat abrupt. Even in this it is peculiarly Jewish. We must understand this transition as follows: I am the Door; those who professed otherwise to gain access to the fold have climbed in some other way. But if I am the only, I am also truly the Door. And, dropping the figure, if any man enters by Me, he shall be saved, securely go out and in (where the language is not to be closely pressed), in the sense of having liberty and finding pasture. II. This forms also the transition to the second leading idea of the allegory: the True and Good Shepherd. Here we mark a fourfold progression of thought, which reminds us of the poetry of the Book of Psalms. There the thought expressed in one line or one couplet is carried forward and developed in the next, forming what are called the Psalms of Ascent (of Degrees'). And in the Discourse of Christ also the final thought of each couplet of verses is carried forward, or rather leads upward in the next. Thus we have here a Psalm of Degrees concerning the Good Shepherd and His Flock, and, at the same time, a New Testament version of

Psalm xxiii. Accordingly its analysis might be formulated as follows: - 1. Christ, the Good Shepherd, in contrast to others who falsely claimed to be the shepherds. [4183] Their object had been self, and they had pursued it even at the cost of the sheep, of their life and safety. He came' [4184] for them, to give, not to take, that they may have life and have abundance.' [4185] Life,' nay, that they may have it, I lay down' [4186] Mine: so does it appear that I am the Good [4187] Shepherd.' [4188] 2. The Good Shepherd Who layeth down His life for His Sheep! What a contrast to a mere hireling, whose are not the sheep, and who fleeth at sight of the wolf (danger), and the wolf seizeth them, and scattereth (viz., the flock): (he fleeth) because he is a hireling, and careth not for the sheep.' The simile of the wolf must not be too closely pressed, but taken in a general sense, to point the contrast to Him Who layeth down His Life for His sheep.' [4189] Truly He is - is seen to be - the fair Shepherder,' [4190] Whose are the sheep, and as such, I know Mine, and Mine know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father. And I lay down My Life for the sheep.' 3. For the sheep that are Mine, whom I know, and for whom I lay down My Life! But those sheep, they are not only of this fold,' not all of the Jewish fold,' but also scattered sheep of the Gentiles. They have all the characteristics of the flock: they are His; and they hear His Voice; but as yet they are outside the fold. Them also the Good Shepherd must lead,' and, in evidence that they are His, as He calls them and goes before them, they shall hear His Voice, and so, O most glorious consummation, they shall become one flock [4191] and one Shepherd.'And thus is the great goal of the Old Testament reached, and the good tidings of great joy' which issue from Israel are unto all people.' The Kingdom of David, which is the Kingdom of God, is set up upon earth, and opened to all believers. We cannot help noticing - though it almost seems to detract from it - how different from the Jewish ideas of it is this Kingdom with its Shepherd-King, Who knows and Who lays down His Life for the sheep, and Who leads the Gentiles not to subjection nor to inferiority, but to equality of faith and privileges, taking the Jews out of their special fold and leading up the Gentiles, and so making of both one flock.' Whence did Jesus of Nazareth obtain these thoughts and views, towering so far aloft of all around?But, on the other hand, they are utterly un-Gentile also - if by the term Gentile' we mean the Gentile Churches,' in antagonism to the Jewish Christians, as a certain school of critics would represent them, which traces the origin of this Gospel to this separation. A Gospel written in that spirit would never have spoken on this wise of the mutual relation of Jews and Gentiles towards Christ and in the Church. The sublime words of Jesus are only compatible with one supposition: that He was indeed the Christ of God. Nay, although men have studied or cavilled at these words for eighteen and a half centuries, they have not yet reached unto this: They shall become one flock, one Shepherd.'4. In the final Step of Ascent' [4192] the leading thoughts of the whole Discourse are taken up and carried to the last and highest thought. The Good Shepherd that brings together the One Flock! Yes - by laying down His Life, but also by taking it up again. Both are necessary for the work of the Good Shepherd - nay, the life is laid down in the surrender of sacrifice, in order that it may be taken up again, and much more fully, in the Resurrection-Power. And, therefore, His Father loveth Him as the Messiah-Shepherd, Who so fully does the work committed to Him, and so entirely surrenders Himself to it.His Death, His Resurrection, let no one imagine that it comes from without! It is His own act. He has power' in regard to both, and both are His own, voluntary, Sovereign, and Divine acts.And this, all this, in order to be the Shepherd-Saviour - to die, and rise for His Sheep, and thus to gather them all, Jews and Gentiles, into one flock, and to be their Shepherd. This, neither more nor less, was the Mission which God had given Him; this, the commandment' which He had

received of His Father - that which God had given Him to do. [4193]It was a noble close of the series of those Discourses in the Temple, which had it for their object to show, that He was truly sent of God.And, in a measure, they attained that object. To some, indeed, it all seemed unintelligible, incoherent, madness; and they fell back on the favourite explanation of all this strange drama - He hath a demon! But others there were - let us hope, many, not yet His disciples - to whose hearts these words went straight. And how could they resist the impression? These utterances are not of a demonised' - and, then, it came back to them: Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?'And so, once again, the Light of His Words and His Person fell upon His Works, and, as ever, revealed their character, and made them clear.Note. - It seems right here, in a kind of Postscript-Note,' to call attention to what could not have been inserted in the text without breaking up its unity, and yet seems too important to be relegated to an ordinary foot-note. In Yoma 66 b, lines 18 to 24 from top, we have a series of questions addressed to Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanos, designed - as it seems to me - to test his views about Jesus and his relation to the new doctrine. Rabbi Eliezer, one of the greatest Rabbis, was the brother-in-law of Gamaliel II., the son of that Gamaliel at whose feet Paul sat. He may, therefore, have been acquainted with the Apostle. And we have indubitable evidence that he had intercourse with Jewish Christians, and took pleasure in their teaching; and, further, that he was accused of favouring Christianity. Under these circumstances, the series of covered, enigmatic questions, reported as addressed to him, gains a new interest. I can only repeat, that I regard them as referring to the Person and the Words of Christ. One of these questions is to this effect: Is it [right, proper, duty] for the Shepherd to save a lamb from the lion?' To this the Rabbi gives (as always in this series of questions) an evasive answer, as follows: You have only asked me about the lamb.' On this the following question is next put, I presume by way of forcing an express reply: Is it [right, proper, duty] to save the Shepherd from the lion?' and to this the Rabbi once more evasively replies: You have only asked me about the Shepherd.' Thus, as the words of Christ to which covert reference is made have only meaning when the two ideas of the Sheep and the Shepherd are combined, the Rabbi, by dividing them, cleverly evaded giving an answer to his questioners. But these inferences come to us, all of deepest importance: 1. I regard the questions above quoted as containing a distinct reference to the words of Christ in St. John x.11. Indeed, the whole string of questions, of which the above form part, refers to Christ and His Words.2. It casts a peculiar light, not only upon the personal history of this great Rabbi, the brother-in-law of the Patriarch Gamaliel II., but a side-light also, on the history of Nicodemus. Of course, such evasive answers are utterly unworthy of a disciple of Christ, and quite incompatible with the boldness of confession which must characterise them. But the question arises - now often seriously discussed by Jewish writers: how far many Rabbis and laymen may have gone in their belief of Christ, and yet - at least in too many instances - fallen short of discipleship; and, lastly, as to the relation between the early Church and the Jews, on which not a few things of deep interest have to be said, though it may not be on the present occasion.3. Critically also, the quotation is of the deepest importance. For, does it not furnish a reference - and that on the lips of Jews - to the Fourth Gospel, and that from the close of the first century? There is here something which the opponents of its genuineness and authenticity will have to meet and answer. Another series of similar allegorical questions in connection with R. Joshua b.Chananyah is recorded in Bekhor.8 a and b, but answered by the Rabbi in an anti-Christian sense. See Mandelstamm, Talmud. Stud. i. But Mandelstamm goes too far in his view of the purely allegorical meaning, especially of the introductory part.

CHAPTER XI. THE FIRST PERÆAN DISCOURSES - TO THE PHARISEES CONCERNING THE TWO KINGDOMS - THEIR CONTEST - WHAT QUALIFIES A DISCIPLE FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND HOW ISRAEL WAS BECOMING SUBJECT TO THAT OF EVIL.

(St. Matt. xii.22-45; St. Luke xi.14-36.) It was well that Jesus should, for the present, have parted from Jerusalem with words like these. They would cling about His hearers like the odour of incense that had ascended. Even the schism' that had come among them [4194] concerning His Person made it possible not only to continue His Teaching, but to return to the City once more ere His final entrance. For, His Peræan Ministry, which extended from after the Feast of Tabernacles to the week preceding the last Passover, was, so to speak, cut in half by the brief visit of Jesus to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedication. [4195] Thus, each part of the Peræan Ministry would last about three months; the first, from about the end of September to the month of December; [4196] the second, from that period to the beginning of April. [4197] Of these six months we have (with the solitary exception of St. Matthew xii.22-45), [4198] no other account than that furnished by St. Luke, [4199] [4200] although, as usually, the Jerusalem and Judæan incidents of it are described by St. John. [4201] After that we have the account of His journey to the last Passover, recorded, with more or less detail, in the three Synoptic Gospels. It will be noticed that this section is peculiarly lacking in incident. It consists almost exclusively of Discourses and Parables, with but few narrative portions interspersed. And this, not only because the season of the year must have made itinerancy difficult, and thus have hindered the introduction to new scenes and of new persons, but chiefly from the character of His Ministry in Peræa. We remember that, similarly, the beginning of Christ's Galilean Ministry had been chiefly marked by Discourses and Parables. Besides, after what had passed, and must now have been so well known, illustrative Deeds could scarcely have been so requisite in Peræa. In fact, His Peræan was, substantially, a resumption of His early Galilean Ministry, only modified and influenced by the much fuller knowledge of the people concerning Christ, and the greatly developed enmity of their leaders. This accounts for the recurrence, although in fuller, or else in modified, form, of many things recorded in the earlier part of this History. Thus, to begin with, we can understand how He would, at this initial stage of His Peræan, as in that of His Galilean Ministry, repeat, when asked for instruction concerning prayer, those sacred words ever since known as the Lord's Prayer. The variations are so slight as to be easily accounted for by the individuality of the reporter. [4202] They afford, however, the occasion for remarking on the two principal differences. In St. Luke the prayer is for the forgiveness of sins,' while St. Matthew uses the Hebraic term debts,' which has passed even into the Jewish Liturgy, denoting our guilt as indebtedness ({hebrew}). Again, the day by day' of St. Luke, which further explains the petition for daily bread,' common both to St. Matthew and St. Luke, may be illustrated by the beautiful Rabbinic teaching, that the Manna fell only for each day, in order that thought of their daily dependence might call forth constant faith in our Father Which is in heaven.' [4203] [4204] Another Rabbinic saying places [4205] our nourishment on the same level with our

redemption, as regards the thanks due to God and the fact that both are day by day. [4206] Yet a third Rabbinic saying [4207] notes the peculiar manner in which both nourishment and redemption are always mentioned in Scripture (by reduplicated expressions), and how, while redemption took place by an Angel, [4208] nourishment is attributed directly to God. [4209] But to return. From the introductory expression: When (or whenever) ye pray, say' - we venture to infer, that this prayer was intended, not only as the model, but as furnishing the words for the future use of the Church. Yet another suggestion may be made. The request, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples,' [4210] seems to indicate what was the certain place,' which, now consecreated by our Lord's prayer, became the school for ours. It seems at least likely, that the allusion of the disciples to the Baptist may have been prompted by the circumstance, that the locality was that which had been the scene of John's labours - of course, in Peræa. Such a note of place is the more interesting, that St. Luke so rarely indicates localities. In fact, he leaves us in ignorance of what was the central place in Christ's Peræan Ministry, although there must have been such. In the main, the events are, indeed, most likely narrated in their chronological order. But, as Discourses, Parables, and incidents are so closely mixed up, it will be better, in a work like the present, for clearness' and briefness' sake, to separate and group them, so far as possible. Accordingly, this chapter will be devoted to the briefest summary of the Lord's Discourses in Peræa, previous to His return to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple. The first of these was on the occasion of His casting out a demon, [4211] and restoring speech to the demonised; or if, as seems likely, the cure is the same as that recorded in St. Matt. xii.22, both sight and speech, which had probably been paralysed. This is one of the cases in which it is difficult to determine whether narratives in different Gospels, with slightly varying details, represent different events or only differing modes of narration. It needs no argument to prove, that substantially the same event, such as the healing of a blind or dumb demonised person, may, and probably would, have taken place on more than one occasion, and that, when it occurred, it would elicit substantially the same remarks by the people, and the same charge against Christ of superior demoniac agency which the Pharisees had now distinctly formulated. [4212] Again, when recording similar events, the Evangelists would naturally come to tell them in much the same manner. Hence, it does not follow that two similar narratives in different Gospels always represent the same event. But in this instance, it seems likely. The earlier place which it occupies in the Gospel by St. Matthew may be explained by its position in a group denunciatory of the Pharisees; and the notice there of their blasphemous charge of His being the instrument of Satan probably indicates the outcome of their council,' how they might destroy Him. [4213] [4214] It is this charge of the Pharisees which forms the main subject of Christ's address, His language being now much more explicit than formerly, [4215] even as the opposition of the Pharisees had more fully ripened. In regard to the slight difference in the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke, we mark that, as always, the Words of the Lord are more fully reported by the former, while the latter supplies some vivid pictorial touches. [4216] The following are the leading features of Christ's reply to the Pharisaic charge: First, It was utterly unreasonable, [4217] and inconsistent with their own premisses, [4218] showing that their ascription of Satanic agency to what Christ did was only prompted by hostility to His Person. This mode of turning the argument against the arguer was peculiarly Hebraic, and it does not imply any assertion on the part of Christ, as to whether or not the disciples of the Pharisees really cast out demons. Mentally, we must supply - according to your own professions, your disciples cast out demons. If so, by whom are they doing it? But, secondly, beneath this logical argumentation lies

deep and spiritual instruction, closely connected with the late teaching during the festive days in Jerusalem. It is directed against the flimsy, superstitious, and unspiritual views entertained by Israel, alike of the Kingdom of evil and of that of God. For, if we ignore the moral aspect of Satan and his kingdom, all degenerates into the absurdities and superstitions of the Jewish view concerning demons and Satan, which are fully described in another place. [4219] On the other hand, introduce the ideas of moral evil, of the concentration of its power in a kingdom of which Satan is the representative and ruler, and of our own inherent sinfulness, which makes us his subjects - and all becomes clear. Then, truly, can Satan not cast out Satan - else how could his kingdom stand; then, also, is the casting out of Satan only by God's Spirit,' or Finger:' and this is the Kingdom of God. [4220] Nay, by their own admission, the casting out of Satan was part of the work of Messiah. [4221] [4222] Then had the Kingdom of God, indeed, come to them - for in this was the Kingdom of God; and He was the God-sent Messiah, come not for the glory of Israel, nor for anything outward or intellectual, but to engage in mortal conflict with moral evil, and with Satan as its representative. In that contest Christ, as the Stronger, bindeth the strong one,' spoils his house (divideth his spoil), and takes from him the armour in which his strength lay (he trusted') by taking away the power of sin. [4223] This is the work of the Messiah - and, therefore also, no one can be indifferent towards Him, because all, being by nature in a certain relation towards Satan, must, since the Messiah had commenced His Work, occupy a definite relationship towards the Christ Who combats Satan. [4224] [4225] It follows, that the work of the Christ is a moral contest waged through the Spirit of God, in which, from their position, all must take a part. But it is conceivable that a man may not only try to be passively, but even be actively on the enemy's side, and this not by merely speaking against the Christ, which might be the outcome of ignorance or unbelief, but by representing that as Satanic which was the object of His Coming. [4226] Such perversion of all that is highest and holiest, such opposition to, and denunciation of, the Holy Spirit as if He were the manifestation of Satan, represents sin in its absolute completeness, and for which there can be no pardon, since the state of mind of which it is the outcome admits not the possibility of repentance, because its essence lies in this, to call that Satanic which is the very object of repentance. It were unduly to press the Words of Christ, to draw from them such inferences as, whether sins unforgiven in this world might or might not be forgiven in the next, since, manifestly, it was not the intention of Christ to teach on this subject. On the other hand, His Words seem to imply that, at least as regards this sin, there is no room for forgiveness in the other world. For, the expression is not the age to come' ({hebrew}), but, the world to come' ({hebrew}, or, {hebrew}), which, as we know, does not strictly refer to Messianic times. but to the future and eternal, as distinguished both from this world ({hebrew}), and from the days of the Messiah' ({hebrew}). [4227] 3. But this recognition of the spiritual, which was the opposite of the sin against the Holy Ghost, was, as Christ had so lately explained in Jerusalem, only to be attained by spiritual kinship with it. [4228] The tree must be made good, if the fruit were to be good; tree and fruit would correspond to each other. How, then, could these Pharisees speak good things,' since the state of the heart determined speech and action? Hence, a man would have to give an account even of every idle word, since, however trifling it might appear to others or to oneself, it was really the outcome of the heart,' and showed the inner state. And thus, in reality. would a man's future in judgment be determined by his words; a conclusion the more solemn, when we remember its bearing on what His disciples on the one side, and the Pharisees on the other, said concerning Christ and the Spirit of God. 4. Both logically and morally the Words of Christ were unanswerable;

and the Pharisees fell back on the old device of challenging proof of His Divine Mission by some visible sign. [4229] But this was to avoid the appeal to the moral element which the Lord had made; it was an attempt to shift the argument from the moral to the physical. It was the moral that was at fault, or rather, wanting in them; and no amount of physical evidence or demonstration could have supplied that. All the signs from heaven would not have supplied the deep sense of sin and of the need for a mighty spiritual deliverance, [4230] which alone would lead to the reception of the Saviour Christ. Hence, as under previous similar circumstances, [4231] He would offer them only one sign, that of Jonas the prophet. But whereas on the former occasion Christ chiefly referred to Jonas' preaching (of repentance), on this He rather pointed to the allegorical history of Jonas as the Divine attestation of his Mission. As he appeared in Nineveh, he was himself a sign unto the Ninevites;' [4232] the fact that he had been three days and nights in the whale's belly, and that thence he had, so to speak, been sent forth alive to preach in Nineveh, was evidence to them that he had been sent of God. And so would it be again. After three days and three nights in the heart of the earth' - which is a Hebraism for in the earth' [4233] - would His Resurrection Divinely attest to this generation His Mission. The Ninevites did not question, but received this attestation of Jonas; nay, an authentic report of the wisdom of Solomon had been sufficient to bring the Queen of Sheba from so far; in the one case it was, because they felt their sin; in the other, because she felt need and longing for better wisdom than she possessed. But these were the very elements wanting in the men of this generation; and so both Nineveh and the Queen of Sheba would stand up, not only as mute witnesses against, but to condemn, them. For, the great Reality of which the preaching of Jonas had been only the type, and for which the wisdom of Solomon had been only the preparation, had been presented to them in Christ. [4234] 5. And so, having put aside this cavil, Jesus returned to His former teaching [4235] concerning the Kingdom of Satan and the power of evil; only now with application, not, as before, to the individual, but, as prompted by a view of the unbelieving resistance of Israel, to the Jewish commonwealth as a whole. Here, also, it must be remembered, that, as the words used by our Lord were allegorical and illustrative, they must not be too closely pressed. As compared with the other nations of the world, Israel was like a house from which the demon of idolatry had gone out with all his attendants, really the Beel-Zibbul' whom they dreaded. And then the house had been swept of all the foulness and uncleanness of idolatry, and garnished with all manner of Pharisaic adornments. Yet all this while the house was left really empty; God was not there; the Stronger One, Who alone could have resisted the Strong One, held not rule in it. And so the demon returned to it again, to find the house whence he had come out, swept and garnished indeed, but also empty and defenceless. The folly of Israel lay in this, that they thought of only one demon - him of idolatry - Beel-Zibbul, with all his foulness. That was all very repulsive, and they had carefully removed it. But they knew that demons were only manifestations of demoniac power, and that there was a Kingdom of evil. So this house, swept of the foulness of heathenism and adorned with all the self-righteousness of Pharisaism, but empty of God, would only become a more suitable and more secure habitation of Satan; because, from its cleanness and beauty, his presence and rule there as an evil spirit would not be suspected. So, to continue the illustrative language of Christ, he came back with seven other spirits more wicked than himself' - pride, self-righteousness, unbelief, and the like, the number seven being general - and thus the last state - Israel without the foulness of gross idolatry and garnished with all the adornments of Pharisaic devotion to the study and practice of the Law - was really worse than had been the first with all its open repulsiveness. 6. Once more was the Discourse interrupted, this

time by a truly Jewish incident. A woman in the crowd burst into exclamations about the blessedness of the Mother who had borne and nurtured such a Son. [4236] The phraseology seems to have been not uncommon, since it is equally applied by the Rabbis to Moses, [4237] and even to a great Rabbi. [4238] More striking, perhaps, is another Rabbinic passage (previously quoted), in which Israel is described as breaking forth into these words on beholding the Messiah: Blessed the hour in which Messiah was created; blessed the womb whence He issued; blessed the generation that sees Him; blessed the eye that is worthy to behold Him.' [4239] [4240]And yet such praise must have been peculiarly unwelcome to Christ, as being the exaltation of only His Human Personal excellence, intellectual or moral. It quite looked away from that which He would present: His Work and Mission as the Saviour. Hence it was, although from the opposite direction, as great a misunderstanding as the Personal depreciation of the Pharisees. Or, to use another illustration, this praise of the Christ through His Virgin-Mother was as unacceptable and unsuitable as the depreciation of the Christ, which really, though unconsciously, underlay the loving care of the Virgin-Mother when she would have arrested Him in His Work, [4241] and which (perhaps for this very reason) St. Matthew relates in the same connection. [4242] Accordingly, the answer in both cases is substantially the same: to point away from His merely Human Personality to His Work and Mission - in the one case: Whosoever shall do the Will of My Father Which is in heaven, the same is My brother, and sister, and mother;' in the other: Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it.' [4243]7. And now the Discourse draws to a close [4244] by a fresh application of what, in some other form or connection, Christ had taught at the outset of His public Ministry in the Sermon on the Mount.' [4245] Rightly to understand its present connection, we must pass over the various interruptions of Christ's Discourse, and join this as the conclusion to the previous part, which contained the main subject. This was, that spiritual knowledge presupposed spiritual kinship. [4246] Here, as becomes the close of a Discourse, the same truth is practically applied in a more popular and plain, one might almost say realistic, manner. As here put, it is, that spiritual receptiveness is ever the condition of spiritual reception. What was the object of lighting a lamp? Surely, that it may give light. But if so, no one would put it into a vault, nor under the bushel, but on the stand. Should we then expect that God would light the spiritual lamp, if it be put in a dark vault? Or, to take an illustration of it from the eye, which, as regards the body, serves the same purpose as the lamp in a house. Does it not depend on the state of the eye whether or not we have the sensation, enjoyment, and benefit of the light? Let us, therefore, take care, lest, by placing, as it were, the lamp in a vault, the light in us be really only darkness. [4247] On the other hand, if by means of a good eye the light is transmitted through the whole system - if it is not turned into darkness, like a lamp that is put into a vault or under a bushel, instead of being set up to spread light through the house - then shall we be wholly full of light. And this, finally, explains the reception or rejection of Christ: how, in the words of an Apostle, the same Gospel would be both a savour of life unto life, and of death unto death.It was a blessed lesson with which to close His Discourse, and one full of light, if only they had not put it into the vault of their darkened hearts. Yet presently would it shine forth again, and give light to those whose eyes were opened to receive it; for, according to the Divine rule and spiritual order, to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that he hath.

CHAPTER XII. THE MORNING-MEAL IN THE PHARISEE'S HOUSE - MEALS AND FEASTS AMONG THE JEWS - CHRIST'S LAST PERÆAN WARNING TO PHARISAISM

(St. Luke xi.37-54.) BITTER as was the enmity of the Pharisaic party against Jesus, it had not yet so far spread, nor become so avowed, as in every place to supersede the ordinary rules of courtesy. It is thus that we explain that invitation of a Pharisee to the morning-meal, which furnished the occasion for the second recorded Peræan Discourse of Christ. Alike in substance and tone, it is a continuation of His former address to the Pharisees. And it is probably here inserted in order to mark the further development of Christ's anti-Pharisaic teaching. It is the last address to the Pharisees, recorded in the Gospel of St. Luke. [4248] A similar last appeal is recorded in a much later portion of St. Matthew's Gospel, [4249] only that St. Luke reports that spoken in Peræa, St. Matthew that made in Jerusalem. This may also partly account for the similarity of language in the two Discourses. Not only were the circumstances parallel, but the language held at the end [4250] may naturally have recurred to the writer, when reporting the last controversial Discourse in Peræa. Thus it may well have been, that Christ said substantially the same things on both occasions, and yet that, in the report of them, some of the later modes of expression may have been transferred to the earlier occasion. And because the later both represents and presents the fullest anti-Pharisaic Discourse of the Saviour, it will be better to postpone our analysis till we reach that period of His Life. [4251] Some distinctive points, however, must here be noted. The remarks already made will explain, how some time may have elapsed between this and the former Discourse, and that the expression And as He spake' [4252] must not be pressed as a mark of time (referring to the immediately preceding Discourse), but rather be regarded as indicating the circumstances under which a Pharisee had bidden Him to the meal. [4253] Indeed, we can scarcely imagine that, immediately after such a charge by the Pharisees as that Jesus acted as the representative of Beelzebul, and such a reply on the part of Jesus, a Pharisee would have invited Him to a friendly meal, or that Lawyers,' or, to use a modern term, Canonists,' would have been present at it. How different their feelings were after they had heard His denunciations, appears from the bitterness with which they afterwards sought to provoke Him into saying what might serve as ground for a criminal charge. [4254] And there is absolutely no evidence that, as commentators suggest, the invitation of the Pharisee had been hypocritically given, for the purpose of getting up an accusation against Christ. More than this, it seems entirely inconsistent with the unexpressed astonishment of the Pharisee, when he saw Jesus sitting down to food without having first washed hands. Up to that moment, then, it would seem that he had only regarded Him as a celebrated Rabbi, though perhaps one who taught strange things. But what makes it almost certain, that some time must have elapsed between this and the previous Discourse (or rather that, as we believe, the two events happened in different places), is, that the invitation of the Pharisee was to the morning-meal.' [4255] We know that this took place early immediately after the return from morning prayers in the Synagogue. [4256] It is, therefore, scarcely conceivable, that all that is recorded in connection with the first Discourse should have

occurred before this first meal. On the other hand, it may well have been, that what passed at the Pharisee's table may have some connection with something that had occurred just before in the Synagogue, for we conjecture that it was the Sabbath-day. We infer this from the circumstance that the invitation was not to the principal meal, which on a Sabbath the Lawyers' (and, indeed, all householders) would, at least ordinarily, have in their own homes. [4257] We can picture to ourselves the scene. The week-day family-meal was simple enough, whether breakfast or dinner - the latter towards evening, although sometimes also in the middle of the day, but always before actual darkness, in order, as it was expressed, that the sight of the dishes by daylight might excite the appetite. [4258] The Babylonian Jews were content to make a meal without meat; not so the Palestinians. [4259] With the latter the favorite food was young meat: goats, lambs, calves. Beef was not so often used, and still more rarely fowls. Bread was regarded as the mainstay of life, [4260] without which no entertainment was considered as a meal. Indeed, in a sense it constituted the meal. For the blessing was spoken over the bread, and this was supposed to cover all the rest of the food that followed, such as the meat, fish or vegetables - in short, all that made up the dinner, but not the dessert. Similarly, the blessing spoken over the wine included all other kinds of drink. [4261] Otherwise it would have been necessary to pronounce a separate benediction over each different article eaten or drunk. He who neglected the prescribed benedictions was regarded as if he had eaten of things dedicated to God, [4262] since it was written: The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.' [4263] [4264] Beautiful as this principle is, it degenerated into tedious questions of casuistry. Thus, if one kind of food was eaten as an addition to another, it was settled that the blessing should be spoken only over the principal kind. Again, there are elaborate disputations as to what should be regarded as fruit, and have the corresponding blessing, and how, for example, one blessing should be spoken over the leaves and blossom, and another over the berries of the caper. [4265] Indeed, that bush gave rise to a serious controversy between the Schools of Hillel and Shammai. Another series of elaborate discussions arose, as to what blessing should be used when a dish consisted of various ingredients, some the product of the earth, others, like honey, derived from the animal world. Such and similar disquisitions, giving rise to endless argument and controversy, busied the minds of the Pharisees and Scribes. Let us suppose the guests assembled. To such a morning-meal they would not be summoned by slaves, nor be received in such solemn state as at feasts. First, each would observe, as a religious rite, the washing of hands.' Next, the head of the house would cut a piece from the whole loaf - on the Sabbath there were two loaves - and speak the blessing. [4266] But this, only if the company reclined at table, as at dinner. If they sat, as probably always at the early meal, each would speak the benediction for himself. [4267] The same rule applied in regard to the wine. Jewish casuistry had it, that one blessing sufficed for the wine intended as part of the meal. If other wine were brought in during the meal, then each one would have to say the blessing anew over it; if after the meal (as was done on Sabbaths and feast-days, to prolong the feast by drinking), one of the company spoke the benediction for all. At the entertainment of this Pharisee, as indeed generally, our Lord omitted the prescribed washing of hands' before the meal. But as this rite was in itself indifferent, He must have had some definite object, which will be explained in the sequel. The externalism of all these practices will best appear from the following account which the Talmud gives of a feast.' [4268] As the guests enter, they sit down on chairs, and water is brought to them, with which they wash one hand. After this the cup is taken, when each speaks the blessing over the wine partaken of before dinner. Presently they all lie down at table. Water is again brought

them, with which they now wash both hands, preparatory to the meal, when the blessing is spoken over the bread, and then over the cup, by the chief person at the feast, or else by one selected by way of distinction. The company responded by Amen, always supposing the benediction to have been spoken by an Israelite, not a heathen, slave, nor law-breaker. Nor was it lawful to say it with an unlettered man, although it might be said with a Cuthæan [4269] (heretic, or else Samaritan), who was learned. After dinner the crumbs, if any, are carefully gathered - hands are again washed, and he who first had done so leads in the prayer of thanksgiving. The formula in which he is to call on the rest to join him, by repeating the prayers after him, is prescribed, and differs according to the number of those present. The blessing and the thanksgiving are allowed to be said not only in Hebrew, but in any other language. [4270] In regard to the position of the guests, we know that the uppermost seats were occupied by the Rabbis. The Talmud formulates it [4271] in this manner: That the worthiest lies down first, on his left side, with his feet stretching back. If there are two cushions' (divans), the next worthiest reclines above him, at his left hand; if there are three cushions, the third worthiest lies below him who had lain down first (at his right), so that the chief person is in the middle (between the worthiest guest at his left and the less worthy one at his right hand). The water before eating is first handed to the worthiest, and so in regard to the washing after meat. But if a very large number are present, you begin after dinner with the least worthy, till you come to the last five, when the worthiest in the company washes his hands, and the other four after him. [4272] The guests being thus arranged, the head of the house, or the chief person at table, speaks the blessing, [4273] and then cuts the bread. By some it was not deemed etiquette to begin eating till after he who had said the prayer had done so, but this does not seem to have been the rule among the Palestinian Jews. Then, generally, the bread was dipped into salt, or something salted, etiquette demanding that where there were two they should wait one for the other, but not where there were three or more. This is not the place to furnish what may be termed a list of menus at Jewish tables. In earlier times the meal was, no doubt, very simple. It became otherwise when intercourse with Rome, Greece, and the East made the people familiar with foreign luxury, while commerce supplied its requirements. Indeed, it would scarcely be possible to enumerate the various articles which seem to have been imported from different, and even distant, countries. To begin with: the wine was mixed with water, and, indeed, some thought that the benediction should not be pronounced till the water had been added to the wine. [4274] According to one statement, two parts, [4275] according to another, three parts, of water were to be added to the wine. [4276] Various vintages are mentioned: among them a red wine of Saron, and a black wine. Spiced wine was made with honey and pepper. Another mixture, chiefly used for invalids, consisted of old wine, water, and balsam; yet another was wine of myrrh;' [4277] we also read of a wine in which capers had been soaked. To these we should add wine spiced, either with pepper, or with absinthe; and what is described as vinegar, a cooling drink made either of grapes that had not ripened, or of the lees. Besides these, palm-wine was also in use. Of foreign drinks, we read of wine from Ammon, and from the province Asia, the latter a kind of must' boiled down. Wine in ice came from the Lebanon; a certain kind of vinegar from Idumaea; beer from Media and Babylon; a barley-wine (zythos) from Egypt. Finally, we ought to mention Palestinian apple-cider, [4278] and the juice of other fruits. If we adopt the rendering of some, even liqueurs were known and used. Long as this catalogue is, that of the various articles of food, whether native or imported, would occupy a much larger space. Suffice it that, as regarded the various kinds of grain, meat, fish, and fruits. either in their natural state or preserved, it embraced almost everything known to

the ancient world. At feasts there was an introductory course, consisting of appetising salted meat, or of some light dish. This was followed by the dinner itself, which finished with dessert (Aphiqomon or terugima) consisting of pickled olives, radishes and lettuce, and fruits, among which even preserved ginger from India is mentioned. [4279] The most diverse and even strange statements are made as to the healthiness, or the reverse, of certain articles of diet, especially vegetables. Fish was a favorite dish, and never wanting at a Sabbath-meal. It was a saying, that both salt and water should be used at every meal, if health was to be preserved. Condiments, such as mustard or pepper, were to be sparingly used. Very different were the meals of the poor. Locusts - fried in flour or honey, or preserved - required, according to the Talmud, no blessing, since the animal was really among the curses of the land. Eggs were a common article of food, and sold in the shops. Then there was a milk-dish into which people dipped their bread. Others, who were better off, had a soup made of vegetables, especially onions, and meat, while the very poor would satisfy the cravings of hunger with bread and cheese, or bread and fruit, or some vegetables, such as cucumbers, lentils, beans, peas, or onions. At meals the rules of etiquette were strictly observed, especially as regarded the sages. Indeed, two tractates are added to the Talmud, of which the one describes the general etiquette, the other that of sages,' and the title of which may be translated by The Way of the World' (Derekh Erets), being a sort of code of good manners. According to some, it was not good breeding to speak while eating. The learned and most honored occupied not only the chief places, but were sometimes distinguished by a double portion. According to Jewish etiquette, a guest should conform in everything to his host, even though it were unpleasant. Although hospitality was the greatest and most prized social virtue, which, to use a Rabbinic expression, might make every home a sanctuary and every table an altar, an unbidden guest, or a guest who brought another guest, was proverbially an unwelcome apparition. Sometimes, by way of self-righteousness, the poor were brought in, and the best part of the meal ostentatiously given to them. At ordinary entertainments, people were to help themselves. It was not considered good manners to drink as soon as you were asked, but you ought to hold the cup for a little in your hand. But it would be the height of rudeness, either to wipe the plates, to scrape together the bread, as though you had not had enough to eat, or to drop it, to the inconvenience of your neighbour. If a piece were taken out of a dish, it must of course not be put back; still less must you offer from your cup or plate to your neighbour. From the almost religious value attaching to bread, we scarcely wonder that these rules were laid down: not to steady a cup or plate upon bread, nor to throw away bread, and that after dinner the bread was to be carefully swept together. Otherwise, it was thought, demons would sit upon it. The Way of the World' for Sages, [4280] lays down these as the marks of a Rabbi: that he does not eat standing; that he does not lick his fingers; that he sits down only beside his equals - in fact, many regarded it as wrong to eat with the unlearned; that he begins cutting the bread where it is best baked, nor ever breaks off a bit with his hand; and that, when drinking, he turns away his face from the company. Another saying was that the sage was known by four things: at his cups, in money matters, when angry, and in his jokes. [4281] After dinner, the formalities concerning handwashing and prayer, already described, were gone through, and then frequently aromatic spices burnt, over which a special benediction was pronounced. We have only to add, that on Sabbaths it was deemed a religious duty to have three meals, and to procure the best that money could obtain, even though one were to save and fast for it all the week. Lastly, it was regarded as a special obligation and honor to entertain sages. We have no difficulty now in understanding what passed

at the table of the Pharisee. When the water for purification was presented to Him, Jesus would either refuse it; or if, as seems more likely at a morning-meal, each guest repaired by himself for the prescribed purification, He would omit to do so, and sit down to meat without this formality. No one, who knows the stress which Pharisaism laid on this rite would argue that Jesus might have conformed to the practice. [4282] Indeed, the controversy was long and bitter between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel, on such a point as whether the hands were to be washed before the cup was filled with wine, or after that, and where the towel was to be deposited. With such things the most serious ritual inferences were connected on both sides. [4283] A religion which spent its energy on such trivialities must have lowered the moral tone. All the more that Jesus insisted so earnestly, as the substance of His Teaching, on that corruption of our nature which Judaism ignored, and on that spiritual purification which was needful for the reception of His doctrine, would He publicly and openly set aside ordinances of man which diverted thoughts of purity into questions of the most childish character. On the other hand, we can also understand what bitter thoughts must have filled the mind of the Pharisee, whose guest Jesus was, when he observed His neglect of the cherished rite. It was an insult to himself, a defiance of Jewish Law, a revolt against the most cherished tradltions of the Synagogue. Remembering that a Pharisee ought not to sit down to a meal with such, he might feel that he should not have asked Jesus to his table. All this, as well as the terrible contrast between the punctiliousness of Pharisaism in outward purifications, and the inward defilement which it never sought to remove, must have lain open before Him Who read the inmost secrets of the heart, and kindled His holy wrath. Probably taking occasion (as previously suggested) from something that had passed before, He spoke with the point and emphasis which a last appeal to Pharisaism demanded.What our Lord said on this occasion will be considered in detail in another place. [4284] Suffice it hear to mark, that He first exposed the mere externalism of the Pharisaic law of purification, to the utter ignoring of the higher need of inward purity, which lay at the foundation of all. [4285] If the primary origin of the ordinance was to prevent the eating of sacred offerings in defilement, [4286] were these outward offerings not a symbol of the inward sacrifice, and was there not an inward defilement as well as the outward? [4287] To consecrate what we had to God in His poor, instead of selfishly enjoying it, would not, indeed, be a purification of them (for such was not needed), but it would, in the truest sense, be to eat God's offerings in cleanness. [4288] We mark here a progress and a development, as compared with the former occasion when Jesus had publicly spoken on the same subject. [4289] Formerly, He had treated the ordinance of the Elders as a matter not binding; now, He showed how this externalism militated against thoughts of the internal and spiritual. Formerly, He had shown how traditionalism came into conflict with the written Law of God: now, how it superseded the first principles which underlay that Law. Formerly, He had laid down the principle that defilement came not from without inwards, but from within outwards; [4290] now, He unfolded this highest principle that higher consecration imparted purity.The same principle, indeed, would apply to other things, such as to the Rabbinic law of tithing. At the same time it may have been, as already suggested, that something which had previously taken place, or was the subject of conversation at table, had given occasion for the further remarks of Christ. [4291] Thus, the Pharisee may have wished to convey his rebuke of Christ by referring to the subject of tithing. And such covert mode of rebuking was very common among the Jews. It was regarded as utterly defiling to eat of that which had not been tithed. Indeed, the three distinctions of a Pharisee were: [4292] not to make use nor to partake of anything that had not been tithed; to observe the laws of

purification; and, as a consequence of these two, to abstain from familiar intercourse with all non-Pharisees. This separation formed the ground of their claim to distinction. [4293] It will be noticed that it is exactly to these three things our Lord adverts: so that these sayings of His are not, as might seem, unconnected, but in the strictest internal relationship. Our Lord shows how Pharisaism, as regarded the outer, was connected with the opposite tendency as regarded the inner man: outward purification with ignorance of the need of that inward purity, which consisted in God-consecration, and with the neglect of it; strictness of outward tithing with ignorance and neglect of the principle which underlay it, viz., the acknowledgment of God's right over mind and heart (judgment and the love of God); while, lastly, the Pharisaic pretence of separation, and consequent claim to distinction, issued only in pride and self-assertion. Thus, tried by its own tests, Pharisaism [4294] terribly failed. It was hypocrisy, although that word was not mentioned till afterwards; [4295] [4296] and that both negatively and positively: the concealment of what it was, and the pretension to what it was not. And the Pharisaism which pretended to the highest purity, was, really, the greatest impurity - the defilement of graves, only covered up, not to be seen of men! It was at this point that one of the Scribes' at table broke in. Remembering in what contempt some of the learned held the ignorant bigotry of the Pharisees, [4297] we can understand that he might have listened with secret enjoyment to denunciations of their folly.' As the common saying had it, the silly pietist,' a woman Pharisee,' and the (self-inflicted) blows of Pharisaism,' were among the plagues of life. [4298] And we cannot help feeling, that there is sometimes a touch of quiet humour in the accounts which the Rabbis give of the encounters between the Pharisees and their opponents. [4299] But, as the Scribe rightly remarked, by attacking, not merely their practice, but their principles, the whole system of traditionalism, which they represented, was condemned. [4300] And so the Lord assuredly meant it. The Scribes' were the exponents of the traditional law; those who bound and loosed in Israel. They did bind on heavy burdens, but they never loosed one; all those grievous burdens of traditionalism they laid on the poor people, but not the slightest effort did they make to remove any of them. [4301] Tradition, yes! the very profession of it bore witness against them. Tradition, the ordinances that had come down - they would not reform nor put aside anything, but claim and proclaim all that had come down from the fathers as a sacred inheritance to which they clung. So be it! let them be judged by their own words. The fathers had murdered the prophets, and they built their sepulchres; that, also, was a tradition - that of guilt which would be avenged. Tradition, learning, exclusiveness - alas! it was only taking away from the poor the key of knowledge; and while they themselves entered not by the door' into the Kingdom, they hindered those who would have gone in. And truly so did they prove that theirs was the inheritance, the tradition,' of guilt in hindering and banishing the Divine teaching of old, and murdering its Divine messengers. [4302]There was a terrible truth and solemnity in what Jesus spake, and in the Woe which He denounced on them. The history of the next few months would bear witness how truly they had taken upon them this tradition of guilt; and all the after-history of Israel shows how fully this Woe' has come upon them. But, after such denunciations, the entertainment in the Pharisee's house must have been broken up. The Christ was too terribly in earnest - too mournfully so over those whom they hindered from entering the Kingdom, to bear with the awful guilt of their trivialities. With what feelings they parted from Him, appears from the sequel.And when He was come out from thence, the Scribes and the Pharisees began to press upon Him vehemently, and to provoke Him to speak of many things; laying wait for Him, to catch something out of His Mouth.' [4303]

CHAPTER XIII. TO THE DISCIPLES - TWO EVENTS AND THEIR MORAL.

(St. Luke xii.1 - xiii.17.) The record of Christ's last warning to the Pharisees, and of the feelings of murderous hate which it called forth, is followed by a summary of Christ's teaching to His disciples. The tone is still that of warning, but entirely different from that to the Pharisees. It is a warning of sin that threatened, not of judgment that awaited; it was for prevention, not in denunciation. That such warnings were most seasonable, requires scarcely proof. They were prompted by circumstances around. The same teaching, because prompted by the same causes, had been mostly delivered, also, on other occasions. Yet there are notable, though seemingly slight, divergences, accounted for by the difference of the writers or of the circumstances, and which mark the independence of the narratives. 1. The first of these Discourses [4304] naturally connects itself with what had passed at the Pharisee's table, an account of which must soon have spread. Although the Lord is reported as having addressed the same language chiefly to the Twelve when sending them on their first Mission, [4305] [4306] we shall presently mark several characteristic variations. The address - or so much of it as is reported, probably only its summary - is introduced by the following notice of the circumstances: In the mean time, when the many thousands of the people were gathered together, so that they trode upon each other, He began to say to His disciples: "First [above all, {hebrew}], [4307] beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.'" There is no need to point out the connection between this warning and the denunciation of Pharisaism and traditionalism at the Pharisee's table. Although the word hypocrisy' had not been spoken there, it was the sum and substance of His contention, that Pharisaism, while pretending to what it was not, concealed what it was. And it was this which, like leaven,' pervaded the whole system of Pharisaism. Not that as individuals they were all hypocrites, but that the system was hypocrisy. And here it is characteristic of Pharisaism, that Rabbinic Hebrew has not even a word equivalent to the term hypocrisy.' The only expression used refers either to flattery of, or pretence before men, [4308] not to that unconscious hypocrisy towards God which our Lord so truly describes as the leaven' that pervaded all the Pharisees said and did. It is against this that He warned His disciples - and in this, rather than conscious deception, pretence, or flattery, lies the danger of the Church. Our common term, unreality,' but partially describes it. Its full meaning can only be gathered from Christ's teaching. But what precise term He may have used, it is impossible to suggest. [4309] After all, hypocrisy was only self-deception. [4310] But, [4311] there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed.' Hence, what they had said in the darkness would be revealed, and what they had spoken about in the store-rooms [4312] would be proclaimed on the housetops. Nor should fear influence them. [4313] Fear of whom? Man could only kill the body, but God held body and soul. And, as fear was foolish, so was it needless in view of that wondrous Providence which watched over even the meanest of God's creatures. [4314] Rather let them, in the impending struggle with the powers of this world, rise to consciousness of its full import - how earth's voices would find their echo in heaven. And then this contest, what was it! Not only opposition to Christ, but, in it inmost essence, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Therefore, to

succumb in that contest, implied the deepest spiritual danger. [4315] Nay, but let them not be apprehensive; their acknowledgment would be not only in the future; even now, in the hour of their danger, would the Holy Ghost help them, and give them an answer before their accusers and judges, whoever they might be - Jews or Gentiles. Thus, if they fell victims, it would be with the knowledge - not by neglect - of their Father; here, there, everywhere, in their own hearts, before the Angels, before men, would He give testimony for those who were His witnesses. [4316] Before proceeding, we briefly mark the differences between this and the previous kindred address of Christ, when sending the Apostles on their Mission. [4317] There (after certain personal directions), the Discourse began [4318] with what it here closes. There it was in the form of warning prediction, here in that of comforting reassurance; there it was near the beginning, here near the close, of His Ministry. Again, as addressed to the Twelve on their Mission, it was followed by personal directions and consolations, [4319] and then, transition was made to the admonition to dismiss fear, and to speak out publicly what had been told them privately. On the other hand, when addressing His Peræan disciples, while the same admonition is given, and partly on the same grounds, yet, as spoken to disciples rather than to preachers, the reference to the similarity of their fate with that of Christ is omitted, while, to show the real character of the struggle, an admonition is added, which in His Galilean Ministry was given in another connection. [4320] Lastly, whereas the Twelve were admonished not to fear, and, therefore, to speak openly what they had learned privately, the Peræan disciples are forewarned that, although what they had spoken together in secret would be dragged into the light of greatest publicity, yet they were not to be afraid of the possible consequences to themselves. 2. The second Discourse recorded in this connection was occasioned by a request for judicial interposition on the part of Christ. This He answered by a Parable, [4321] [4322] which will be explained in conjunction with the other Parables of that period. The outcome of this Parable, as to the utter uncertainty of this life, and the consequent folly of being so careful for this world while neglectful of God, led Him to make warning application to His Peræan disciples. [4323] Only here the negative injunction that preceded the Parable, beware of covetousness,' is, when addressed to the disciples,' carried back to its positive underlying principle: to dismiss all anxiety, even for the necessaries of life, learning from the birds and the flowers to have absolute faith and trust in God, and to labour for only one thing, the Kingdom of God. But, even in this, they were not to be careful, but to have absolute faith and trust in their Father, Who was well pleased to give' them the Kingdom.' [4324] With but slight variations the Lord had used the same language, even as the same admonition had been needed, at the beginning of His Galilean Ministry, in the Sermon on the Mount. [4325] Perhaps we may here, also, regard the allusion to the springing flowers as a mark of time. Only, whereas in Galilee this would mark the beginning of spring, it would, in the more favoured climate of certain parts of Peræa, indicate the beginning of December, about the time of the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple. More important, perhaps, is it to note, that the expression [4326] rendered in the Authorised and Revised Versions, neither be ye of doubtful mind,' really means, neither be ye uplifted,' in the sense of not aiming, or seeking after great things. [4327] This rendering the Greek word (meteorzein) is in accordance with its uniform use in the LXX., [4328] and in the Apocrypha; while, on the other hand, it occurs in Josephus and Philo, in the sense of being of a doubtful mind.' But the context here shows, that the term must refer to the disciples coveting great things, since only to this the remark could apply, that the Gentile world sought such things, but that our Father knew what was really needful for us. Of deepest importance is the final consolation, to dismiss all

care and anxiety, since the Father was pleased to give to this little flock' the Kingdom. The expression flood' carries us back to the language which Jesus had held ere parting from Jerusalem. [4329] Henceforth this designation would mark His people. Even its occurrence fixes this Discourse as not a repetition of that which St. Matthew had formerly reported, but as spoken after the Jerusalem visit. It designates Christ's people in distinction to their ecclesiastical (or outward) organisation in a fold,' and marks alike their individuality and their conjunction, their need and dependence, and their relation to Him as the Good Shepherd.' Small and despised though it be in the eyes of men, the little flock' is unspeakably noble, and rich in the gift of the Father. These admonitions, alike as against covetousness, and as to absolute trust and a self-surrender to God, which would count all loss for the Kingdom, are finally set forth, alike in their present application and their ultimate and permanent principle, in what we regard as the concluding part of this Discourse. [4330] Its first sentence:'Sell that ye have, and give alms,' which is only recorded by St. Luke, indicates not a general principle, but its application to that particular period, when the faithful disciple required to follow the Lord, unencumbered by worldly cares or possessions. [4331] The general principle underlying it is that expressed by St. Paul, [4332] and finally resolves itself into this: that the Christian should have as not holding, and use what he has not for self nor sin, but for necessity. This conclusion of Christ's Discourse, also, confirms the inference that it was delivered near the terrible time of the end. Most seasonable would be here the repetition - though in slightly different language - of an admonition, given in the beginning of Christ's Galilean Ministry, [4333] to provide treasure in heaven, which could neither fail nor be taken away, for, assuredly, where the treasure was, there also would the heart be. 3. Closely connected with, and yet quite distinct from, the previous Discourse is that about the waiting attitude of the disciples in regard to their Master. Wholly detached from the things of the world, their hearts set on the Kingdom, only one thing should seem worthy their whole attention, and engage all their thoughts and energies: their Master! He was away at some joyous feast, and the uncertainty of the hour of His return must not lead the servants to indulge in surfeiting, nor to lie down in idleness, but to be faithful to their trust, and eagerly expectant of their Master. The Discourse itself consists of three parts and a practical application. itself consists of three parts and a practical application. 1. The Disciples as Servants in the absence of their Master: [4334] their duty and their reward. [4335] This part, containing what would be so needful to these Peræan disciples, is peculiar to St. Luke. The Master is supposed to be absent, at a wedding, a figure which must not be closely pressed, not being one of the essentials in the Parable. At most, it points to a joyous occasion, and its mention may chiefly indicate that such a feast might be protracted, so that the exact time of the Master's return could not be known to the servants who waited at home. In these circumstances, they should hold themselves in readiness, that, whatever hour it might be, they should be able to open the door at the first knocking. Such eagerness and devotion of service would naturally meet its reward, and the Master would, in turn, consult the comfort of those who had not allowed themselves their evening-meal, nor lain down, but watched for His return. Hungry and weary as they were from their zeal for Him, He would now, in turn, minister to their personal comfort. And this applied to servants who so watched - it mattered not how long, whether into the second or the third of the watches into which the night was divided. [4336] The Parable' now passes into another aspect of the case, which is again referred to in the last Discourses of Christ. [4337] Conversely - suppose the other case, of people sleeping: the house might be broken into. Of course, if one had known the hour when the thief would come, sleep would not have been indulged in; but it is just this uncertainty

and suddenness - and the Coming of the Christ into His Kingdom would be equally sudden - which should keep the people in the house ever on their watch till Christ came. [4338]It was at this particular point that a question of Peter interrupted the Discourse of Christ. To whom did this Parable' apply about the good man' and the servants' who were to watch: to the Apostles, or also to all? From the implied - for it is not an express - answer of the Lord, we infer, that Peter expected some difference between the Apostles and the rest of the disciples, whether as regarded the attitude of the servants that waited, or the reward. From the words of Christ the former seems the more likely. We can understand how Peter might entertain the Jewish notion, that the Apostles would come with the Master from the marriage-supper, rather than wait for His return, and work while waiting. It is to this that the reply of Christ refers. If the Apostles or others are rulers, it is as stewards, and their reward of faithful and wise stewardship will be advance to higher administration. But as stewards they are servants - servants of Christ, and ministering servants in regard to the other and general servants. What becomes them in this twofold capacity is faithfulness to the absent, yet ever near, Lord, and to their work, avoiding, on the one hand, the masterfulness of pride and of harshness, and, on the other, the self-degradation of conformity to evil manners, either of which would entail sudden and condign punishment in the sudden and righteous reckoning at His appearing. The Parable,' therefore, alike as to the waiting and the reckoning, applied to work for Christ, as well as to personal relationship towards Him.Thus far this solemn warning would naturally be afterwards repeated in Christ's Last Discourses in Judæa, as equally needful, in view of His near departure. [4339] But in this Peræan Discourse, as reported by St. Luke, there now follows what must be regarded, not, indeed, as a further answer to Peter's inquiry, but as specifically referring to the general question of the relation between special work and general discipleship which had been raised. For, in one sense, all disciples are servants, not only to wait, but to work. As regarded those who, like the professed stewards or labourers, knew their work, but neither made ready,' [4340] nor did according to His Will, their punishment and loss (where the illustrative figure of many' and few stripes' must not be too closely pressed) would naturally be greater than that of them who knew not, though this also involves guilt, that their Lord had any will towards them, that is, any work for them. This, according to a well-understood principle, universally, almost instinctively, acted upon among men. [4341]2. In the absence of their master! A period this of work, as well as of waiting; a period of trial also. [4342] Here, also,the two opening verses, in their evident connection with the subject-matter under the first head of this Discourse, [4343] but especially with the closing sentences about work for the Master, are peculiar to St. Luke's narrative, and fit only into it. The Church had a work to do in His absence - the work for which He had come. He came to cast fire on earth,' - that fire which was kindled when the Risen Saviour sent the Holy Ghost, and of which the tongues of fire were the symbol. [4344] Oh, how He longed, [4345] that it were already kindled! But between Him and it lay the cold flood of His Passion, the terrible Passion in which He was to be baptized. Oh, how He felt the burden of that coming Agony! [4346] That fire must they spread: this was the work in which, as disciples, each one must take part. Again, in that Baptismal Agony of His they also must be prepared to share. It was fire: burning up, as well as purifying and giving light. And here it was in place to repeat to His Peræan disciples the prediction already addressed to the Twelve when going on their Mission, [4347] as to the certain and necessary trials connected with carrying the fire' which Christ had cast on earth, even to the burning up of the closest bonds of association and kinship. [4348]3. Thus far to the disciples. And now for its application to the multitudes' [4349] - although here also He could

only repeat what on a former occasion He had said to the Pharisees. [4350] Let them not think that all this only concerned the disciples. No; it was a question between Israel and their Messiah, and the struggle would involve the widest consequences, alike to the people and the Sanctuary. Were they so blinded as not to know how to interpret the time'? [4351] Could they not read its signs - they who had no difficulty in interpreting it when a cloud rose from the sea, or the sirocco blew from the south? [4352] Why then - and here St. Luke is again alone in his report [4353] - did they not, in the circumstances, of themselves judge what was right and fitting and necessary, in view of the gathering tempest? What was it? Even that he had told them before in Galilee, [4354] for the circumstances were the same. What common sense and common prudence would dictate to every one whom his accuser or creditor hauled before the magistrate: to come to an agreement with him before it was too late, before sentence had been pronounced and executed. [4355] Although the illustration must not be pressed as to details, its general meaning would be the more readily understood that there was a similar Rabbinic proverb, [4356] although with very different practical application.4. Besides these Discourses, two events are recorded before Christ's departure to the Feast of the Dedication.' Each of these led to a brief Discourse, ending in a Parable.The first records two circumstances not mentioned by the Jewish historian Josephus, [4357] nor in any other historical notice of the time, either by Rabbinic or other writers. This shows, on the one hand, how terribly common such events must have been, when they could be so generally omitted from the long catalogue of Pilate's misdeeds towards the Jews. On the other hand it also evidences that the narrative of St. Luke was derived from independent, authentic sources - in other words, the historical character of his narrative - when he could refer as well known to facts, which are not mentioned in any other record of the times; and, lastly, that we are not warranted in rejecting a notice, simply because we find no other mention of it than on the pages of the Third Gospel.It appears that, just then, or quite soon afterwards, some persons told Christ about a number of His own Galileans, whom Pilate had ordered to be cut down, as we infer, in the Temple, while engaged in offering their sacrifices, [4358] so that, in the pictorial language of the East, their blood had mingled with that of their sacrifices. Clearly, their narration of this event must be connected with the preceding Discourse of Jesus. He had asked them, whether they could not discern the signs of the terrible national storm that was nearing. And it was in reference to this, as we judge, that they repeated this story. To understand their object, we must attend to the answer of Christ. It is intended to refute the idea, that these Galileans had in this been visited by a special punishment of some special sin against God. Two questions here arise. Since between Christ's visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles and that at the Dedication of the Temple no Festival took place, it is most probable that this event had happened before Christ's visit to Jerusalem. But in that case it seems most likely - almost certain - that Christ had heard of it before. If so, or, at any rate, if it was not quite a recent event, why did these men tell Him of it then and there? Again, it seems strange that, although the Jews connected special sins with special punishments, they should have regarded it as the Divine punishment of a special sin to have been martyred by a Pilate in the Temple, while engaged in offering sacrifices.All this becomes quite plain, if we regard these men as trying to turn the edge of Jesus' warning by a kind of Tu quoque' argument. Very probably these Galileans were thus ruthlessly murdered, because of their real or suspected connection with the Nationalist movement, of which Galilee was the focus. It is as if these Jews had said to Jesus: Yes, signs of the times and of the coming storm! These Galileans of yours, your own countrymen, involved in a kind of Pseudo-Messianic movement, a kind of signs of

the times' rising, something like that towards which you want us to look - was not their death a condign punishment? This latter inference they did not express in words, but implied in their narration of the fact. But the Lord read their thoughts and refuted their reasoning. For this purpose He adduced another instance, [4359] when a tower at the Siloam-Pool had fallen on eighteen persons and killed them, perhaps in connection with that construction of an aqueduct into Jerusalem by Pilate, which called forth, on the part of the Jews, the violent opposition, which the Roman so terribly avenged. As good Jews, they would probably think that the fall of the tower, which had buried in its ruins these eighteen persons, who were perhaps engaged in the building of that cursed structure, was a just judgment of God! For Pilate had used for it the sacred money which had been devoted to Temple-purposes (the Qorban), [4360] and many there were who perished in the tumult caused by the Jewish resistance to this act of profanation. But Christ argued, that it was as wrong to infer that Divine-judgment had overtaken His Galilean countrymen, as it would be to judge that the Tower of Siloam had fallen to punish these Jerusalemites. Not one party only, nor another; not the supposed Messianic tendency (in the shape of a national rising), nor, on the other hand, the opposite direction of absolute submission to Roman domination, was in fault. The whole nation was guilty; and the coming storm, to the signs of which He had pointed, would destroy all unless there were spiritual repentance on the part of the nation. And yet wider than this, and applying to all time, is the underlying principle, that, when a calamity befalls a district or an aggregation of individuals, we ought not to take to ourselves judgment as to its special causation, but to think spiritually of its general application - not so much seek to trace what is the character of its connection with a district or individuals, as to learn its lessons and to regard them as a call addressed to all. And conversely, also, this holds true in regard to deliverances. Having thus answered the implied objection, the Lord next showed, in the Parable of the Fig-tree, [4361] the need and urgency of national repentance. [4362]The second event recorded by St. Luke in this connection [4363] recalls the incidents of the early Judæan [4364] and of the Galilean Ministry. [4365] We observe the same narrow views and externalism as before in regard to the Sabbath on the part of the Jewish authorities, and, on the part of Christ, the same wide principles and spiritual application. If we were in search of evidence of the Divine Mission of Jesus, we would find it in this contrariety on so fundamental a point, since no teacher in Israel nor Reformer of that time - not the most advanced Sadducee - would have defended, far less originated, the views as to the Sabbath which Christ now propounded. [4366] Again, if we were in quest of evidence of the historical truthfulness of the Gospel-narratives, we would find it in a comparison of the narratives of the three Sabbath-controversies: in Jerusalem, in Galilee, and in Peræa. In all the spirit was the same. And, although the differences between them may seem slight, they are characteristic, and mark, as if they pointed to it with the finger, the locality and circumstances in which each took place. In Jerusalem there is neither reasoning nor rebuke on the part of the Jews, but absolute persecution. There also the Lord enters on the higher exposition of His action, motives, and Mission. [4367] In Galilee there is questioning, and cunning intrigue against Him on the part of the Judæans who dogged His steps. But while no violence can be attempted against Him, the people do not venture openly to take His part. [4368] But in Peræa we are confronted by the clumsy zeal of a country-Archisynagogos (Chief Ruler of a Synagogue), who is very angry, but not very wise; who admits Christ's healing power, and does not dare to attack Him directly, but, instead, rebukes, not Christ, not even the woman who had been healed, but the people who witnessed it, at the same time telling them to come for healing on other days, not perceiving, in his narrow-minded bigotry,

what this admission implied. This rustic Ruler had not the cunning, nor even the courage, of the Judæan Pharisees in Galilee, whom the Lord had formerly convicted and silenced. Enough, to show this obscure Peræan partisan of Pharisaism and the like of him their utter folly, and that by their own admissions. [4369] And presently, not only were His adversaries ashamed, while in Galilee they went out and held a council against Him, [4370] but the people were not afraid, as the Galileans had been in presence of their rulers, and openly rejoiced in the glorious working of the Christ.Little more requires to be added about this incident in one of the Synagogues' of Peræa. Let us only briefly recall the scene. Among those present in this Synagogue had been a poor woman, who for eighteen years had been a sufferer, as we learn, through demoniac agency. It is quite true that most, if not all, such diseases were connected with moral distemper, since demoniac possession was not permanent, and resistance might have been made in the lucid intervals, if there had been moral soundness. But it is ungrounded to distinguish between the spirit of infirmity' as the moral and psychical, and her being bent,' as indicating the physical disease, [4371] or even to describe the latter as a permanent curvature of the spine.' [4372] The Greek word here rendered infirmity' has passed into Rabbinic language (Isteniseyah, {hebrew}), and there means, not any particular disease, but sickliness, sometimes weakliness. In fact, she was, both physically and morally, not sick, but sickly, and most truly was hers a spirit of infirmity,' so that she was bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up.' For, we mark that hers was not demoniac possession at all - and yet, though she had not yielded, she had not effectually resisted, and so she was bound' by a spirit of infirmity,' both in body and soul.We recognise the same spirit of infirmity' in the circumstances of her healing. When Christ, seeing her - probably a fit symbol of the Peræans in that Synagogue - called her, she came; when He said unto her, Woman, thou hast been loosed [4373] from thy sickliness,' she was unbound, and yet in her weakliness she answered not, nor straightened herself, till Jesus laid His Hands on her,' and so strengthened her in body and soul, and then she was immediately made straight, and glorified God.'As for the Archisynagogos, we have, as already hinted, such characteristic portraiture of him that we can almost see him: confused, irresolute, perplexed, and very angry, bustling forward and scolding the people who had done nothing, yet not venturing to silence the woman, now no longer infirm - far less, to reprove the great Rabbi, Who had just done such a glorious thing,' but speaking at Him through those who had been the astounded eye-witnesses. He was easily and effectually silenced, and all who sympathised with him put to shame. Hypocrites!' spake the Lord - on your own admisions your practice and your Law condemn your speech. Every one on the Sabbath looseth his ox or ass, and leads him to the watering. The Rabbinic law expressly allowed this, [4374] and even to draw the water, provided the vessel were not carried to the animal. [4375] If, as you admit, I have the power of loosing' from the bonds of Satan, and she has been so bound these eighteen years, should she - a daughter of Abraham - not have that done for her which you do for your beasts of burden? The retort was unanswerable and irresistible; it did what was intended: it covered the adversaries with shame. And the Peræans in that Synagogue felt also, at least for the time, the blessed freedom which had come to that woman. They took up the echoes of her hymn of praise, and rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by Him.' And He answered their joy by rightly directing it - by setting before them the Kingdom,' which He had come both to preach and to bring, in all its freeness, reality, power, and all-pervading energy, as exhibited in the two Parables of the Mustard-seed' and the Leaven,' spoken before in Galilee. These were now repeated, as specially suited to the circumstances: first, to the Miracle they had witnessed; then, to

the contention that had passed; and, lastly, to their own state of feeling. And the practical application of these Parables must have been obvious to all.

CHAPTER XIV. AT THE FEAST OF THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE.

(St. Luke xiii.22; St. John x.22-42.) ABOUT two months had passed since Jesus had left Jerusalem after the Feast of Tabernacles. Although we must not commit ourselves to such calculations, we may here mention the computation which identifies the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles of that year [4376] with Thursday the 23rd September; the last, the Great Day of the Feast,' with Wednesday the 29th; the Octave of the Feast with the 30th September; and the Sabbath when the man born blind was healed with the 2nd of October. [4377] In that case, the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple,' which commenced on the 25th day of Chislev, and lasted eight days, would have begun on Wednesday the 1st, and closed on Wednesday the 8th December. But, possibly, it may have been a week or two later. At that Feast, or about two months after He had quitted the City, we find Christ once more in Jerusalem and in the Temple. His journey thither seems indicated in the Third Gospel (St. Luke xiii.22), and is at least implied in the opening words with which St. John prefaces his narrative of what happened on that occasion. [4378] [4379] As we think of it, there seems special fitness - presently to be pointed out - in Christ's spending what we regard as the last anniversary season of His Birth [4380] in the Temple at that Feast. It was not of Biblical origin, but had been instituted by Judas Maccabaeus in 164 b.c., when the Temple, which had been desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes, was once more purified, and re-dedicated to the Service of Jehovah. [4381] Accordingly, it was designated as the Dedication of the Altar.' [4382] Josephus [4383] calls it The Lights,'from one of the principal observances at the Feast, though he speaks in hesitating language of the origin of the festival as connected with this observance, probably because, while he knew, he was ashamed to avow, and yet afraid to deny his belief in the Jewish legend connected with it. The Jews called it Chanukkah, dedication' or consecration,' and, in much the same sense, Enkainia in the Greek of the LXX., [4384] [4385] and in the New Testament. During the eight days of the Feast the series of Psalms known as at the Hallel [4386] was chanted in the Temple, the people responding as at the Feast of Tabernacles. [4387] Other rites resembled those of the latter Feast. Thus, originally, the people appeared with palm-branches. [4388] This, however, does not seem to have been after-wards observed, while another rite, not mentioned in the Book of Maccabees - that of illuminating the Temple and private houses - became characteristic of the Feast. Thus, the two festivals, which indeed are put in juxtaposition in 2 Macc. x.6, seem to have been both externally and internally connected. The Feast of the Dedication,' or of Lights,' derived from that of Tabernacles its duration of eight days, the chanting of the Hallel, and the practice of carrying palm-branches. On the other hand, the rite of the Temple-illumination may have passed from the Feast of the Dedication' into the observances of that of Tabernacles.' Tradition had it, that, when the Temple-Services were restored by Judas Maccabaeus, the oil found to have been desecrated. Only one flagon was discovered of that which was pure, sealed with the very signet of the High-Priest. The supply proved just sufficient to feed for one day the Sacred Candlestick, but by a miracle the flagon was continually replenished during eight days, till a fresh supply could be brought from Thekoah. In

memory of this, it was ordered the following year, that the Temple be illuminated for eight days on the anniversary of its Dedication.' [4389] The Schools of Hillel and Shammai differed in regard to this, as on most other observances. The former would have begun the first night with the smallest number of lights, and increased it every night till on the eighth it was eight times as large as on the first. The School of Shammai, on the other hand, would have begun with the largest number, and diminished, till on the last night it amounted to an eighth of the first. Each party had its own - not very satisfactory - reasons for its distinctive practice, and its own adherents. [4390] But the Lights' in honour of the Feast were lit not only in the Temple, but in every home. One would have sufficed for the whole household on the first evening, but pious householders lit a light for every inmate of the home, so that, if ten burned on the first, there would be eighty on the last night of the Festival. According to the Talmud, the light might be placed at the entrance to the house or room, or, according to circumstances, in the window, or even on the table. According to modern practice the light is placed at the left on entering a room (the Mezuzah is on the right). Certain benedictions are spoken on lighting these lights, all work is stayed, and the festive time spent in merriment. The first night is specially kept in memory of Judith, who is supposed then to have slain Holofernes, and cheese is freely partaken of as the food of which, according to legend, [4391] she gave him so largely, to incite him to thirst and drunkenness. [4392] Lastly, during this Festival, all fasting and public mourning were prohibited, though some minor acts of private mourning were allowed. [4393] More interesting, perhaps, than this description of the outward observances is the meaning of this Festival and its connection with the Feast of Tabernacles, to both of which reference has already been made. Like the Feast of Tabernacles, it commemorated a Divine Victory, which again gave to Israel their good land, after they had once more undergone sorrows like those of the wilderness; it was another harvest-feast, and pointed forward to yet another ingathering. As the once extinguished light was relit in the Temple, and, according to Scriptural imagery, might that not mean the Light of Israel, the Lamp of David? - it grew day by day in brightness, till it shone quite out into the heathen darkness, that once had threatened to quench it. That He Who purified the Temple, was its True Light, and brought the Great Deliverance, should (as hinted) have spent the last anniversary season of His Birth at that Feast in the Sanctuary, shining into their darkness, seems most fitting, especially as we remember the Jewish legend, according to which the making of the Tabernacle had been completed on the 25th Chislev, although it was not set up till the 1st of Nisan (the Paschal month). [4394] Thoughts of the meaning of this Feast, and of what was associated with it, will be helpful as we listen to the words which Jesus spake to the people in Solomon's Porch.' There is a pictorialness in the description of the circumstances, which marks the eyewitness. It is winter, and Christ is walking in the covered Porch, [4395] in front of the Beautiful Gate,' which formed the principal entrance into the Court of the Women.' As he walks up and down, the people are literally barring His Way - came round about' Him. From the whole circumstances we cannot doubt, that the question which they put: How long holdest Thou us in suspense?' had not in it an element of truthfulness or genuine inquiry. Their desire, that He should tell them plainly' if He were the Christ, had no other motive than that of grounding on it an accusation. [4396] The more clearly we perceive this, the more wonderful appears the forbearance of Christ and the wisdom of His answer. Briefly he puts aside their hypocrisy. What need is there of fresh speech? He told them before, and they believe [4397] not.' From words He appeals to the mute but indisputable witness of deeds: the works which He wrought in His Father's Name. Their non-belief in presence of these facts was due to their not being of His Sheep. As he had said unto

them before, [4398] it was characteristic of His Sheep (as generally of every flock in regard to its own shepherd) to hear - recognise, listen to - His Voice and follow Him. We mark in the words of Christ, a triplet of double parallelisms concerning the Sheep and the Shepherd, in ascending climax, [4399] as follows: - [4400] My sheep hear My Voice, And I know them, And they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life: And they shall never perish. And no one shall snatch them out of My Hand. A similar fourfold parallelism with descending and ascending climax, but of an antithetic character, has been noticed [4401] in Christ's former Discourse in the Temple (St. John x.13-15) - The hireling

I Is an hireling, Am the good Shepherd, Careth not for the sheep. Know the sheep,Fleeth

Lay down My Life.Richer or more comforting assurance than that recorded above could not have been given. But something special has here to be marked. The two first parallelisms always link the promise of Christ to the attitude of the sheep; not, perhaps, conditionally, for the relation is such as not to admit conditionalness, either in the form of because - therefore,' or even of if - then,' but as a matter of sequence and of fact. But in the third parallelism there is no reference to anything on the part of the sheep; it is all promise, and the second clause only explains and intensifies what is expressed in the first. If it indicates attack of the fiercest kind and by the strongest and most cunning of enemies, be they men or devils, it also marks the watchfulness and absolute superiority of Him Who hath them, as it were, in His Hand - perhaps a Hebraism for power' - and hence their absolute safety. And, as if to carry twofold assurance of it, He reminds His hearers that His Work being the Father's Commandment,' it is really the Father's Work, given to Christ to do, and no one could snatch them out of the Father's Hand. It is a poor cavil, to try to limit these assurances by seeking to grasp and to comprehend them in the hollow of our human logic. Do they convey what is commonly called the doctrine of perseverance'? Nay! but they teach us, not about our faith but about His faithfulness, and convey to us assurance concerning Him rather than ourselves; and this is the only aspect in which the doctrine of perseverance' is either safe, true, or Scriptural.But one logical sequence is unavoidable. Rightly understood, it is not only the last and highest announcement, but it contains and implies everything else. If the Work of Christ is really that of the Father, and His Working also that of the Father, then it follows that He and the Father are One' (one' is in the neuter). This identity of work (and purpose) implies the identity of Nature (Essence); that of working, the identity of power. [4402] And so, evidently, the Jews understood it, when they again took up stones with the intention of stoning Him - no doubt, because He expressed, in yet more plain terms, what they regarded as His blasphemy. Once more the Lord appealed from His Words, which were doubted, to His Works, which were indubitable. And so He does to all time. His Divine Mission is evidence of His Divinity. And if His Divine Mission be doubted, He appeals to the many excellent works' (kal rga) which He hath showed from the Father,' any one of which might, and, in the case of not a few, had, served as evidence of His Mission. And when the Jews ignored, as so many in our days, this line of evidence, and insisted that He had been guilty of blasphemy, since, being a man, He had made Himself God, the Lord replied in a manner that calls for our special attention. From the peculiarly Hebraistic mode of designating a quotation from the Psalms [4403] as written in the Law,' [4404] we gather that we have here a literal transcript of the very words of our Lord. [4405] But what we specially wish, is, emphatically, to disclaim any interpretation of them, which would seem to imply that Christ had wished to evade their inference: that He claimed to be One with the Father - and to

convey to them, that nothing more had been meant than what might lawfully be applied to an ordinary man. Such certainly is not the case. He had claimed to be One with the Father in work and working: from which, of course, the necessary inference was, that He was also One with Him in Nature and Power. Let us see whether the claim was strange. In Ps. lxxxii.6 the titles God' (Elohim) and Sons of the Highest' (Beney Elyon) had been given to Judges as the Representatives and Vicegerents of God, wielding His delegated authority, since to them had come His Word of authorisation. But here was authority not transmitted by the word,' but personal and direct consecration, and personal and direct Mission on the part of God. The comparison made was not with prophets, because they only told the word and message from God, but with Judges, who, as such, did the very act of God. If those who, in so acting, had received an indirect commission, were gods,' the very representatives of God, [4406] could it be blasphemy when He claimed to be the Son of God, Who had received, not authority through a word transmitted through long centuries, but direct personal command to do the Father's Work; had been directly and personally consecrated to it by the Father, and directly and personally sent by Him, not to say, but to do, the work of the Father? Was it not rather the true and necessary inference from these premisses?All would, of course, depend on this, whether Christ really did the works of the Father. [4407] That was the test; and, as we instinctively perceive, both rationally and truly. But if He did the works of His Father, then let them believe, if not the words yet the works, and thus would they arrive at the knowledge, and understand' [4408] - distinguishing here the act from the state [4409] - that in Me is the Father, and I in the Father.' In other words, recognizing the Work as that of the Father, they would come to understand that the father worked in Him, and that the root of His Work was in the Father. The stones, that had been taken up, were not thrown, for the words of Christ rendered impossible the charge of explicit blasphemy which alone would, according to Rabbinic law, have warranted such summary vengeance. But they sought again to seize Him,' so as to drag Him before their tribunal. His time, however, had not yet come, and He went forth out of their hand' - how, we know not.Once more the Jordan rolled between Him and His bitter persecutors. Far north, over against Galilee, in the place of John's early labours, probably close to where Jesus Himself had been baptized, was the scene of His last labours. And those, who so well remembered both the Baptist and the testimony which he had there borne to the Christ, recalled it all as they listened to His Words and saw His Works. As they crowded around Him, both the difference and the accord between John and Jesus carried conviction to their minds. The Baptist had done no sign,' [4410] such as those which Jesus wrought: but all things which John had spoken of Him, they felt it, were true. And, undisturbed by the cavils of Pharisees and Scribes, many of these simple-minded, true-hearted men, far away from Jerusalem, believed on Him. To adapt a saying of Bengel: they were the posthumous children of the Baptist. Thus did he, being dead, yet speak. And so will all that is sown for Christ, though it lie buried and forgotten of men, spring up and ripen, as in one day, to the deep, grateful, and external joy of them who had laboured in faith and gone to rest in hope.

CHAPTER XV. THE SECOND SERIES OF PARABLES - THE TWO PARABLES OF HIM WHO IS NEIGHBOUR TO US: THE FIRST, CONCERNING THE LOVE THAT, UNASKED, GIVES IN OUR NEED; THE SECOND, CONCERNING THE LOVE WHICH IS ELICITED BY OUR ASKING IN OUR NEED.

(St. Luke x.25-37; xi.5-13.) THE period between Christ's return from the Feast of the Dedication' and His last entry into Jerusalem, may be arranged into two parts, divided by the brief visit to Bethany for the purpose of raising Lazarus from the dead. Even if it were possible, with any certainty, chronologically to arrange the events of each of these periods, the variety and briefness of what is recorded would prevent our closely following them in this narrative. Accordingly, we prefer grouping them together as the Parables of that period, its Discourses, and its Events. And the record of the raising of Lazarus may serve as a landmark between our Summary of the Parables and that of the Discourses and Events which preceded the Lord's final appearance in Jerusalem. These last words help us to understand the necessary difference between the Parables of this and of the preceding and the following periods. The Parables of this period look back upon the past, and forward into the future. Those spoken by the Lake of Galilee were purely symbolical. They presented unseen heavenly realities under emblems which required to be translated into earthly language. It was quite easy to do so, if you possessed the key to the heavenly mysteries; otherwise, they were dark and mysterious. So to speak, they were easily read from above downwards. Viewed from below upwards, only most dim and strangely intertwining outlines could be perceived. It is quite otherwise with the second series of Parables. They could, as they were intended, be understood by all. They required no translation. They were not symbolical but typical, using the word type,' not in the sense of involving a predictive element, [4411] but as indicating an example, or, perhaps, more correctly, an exemplification. [4412] Accordingly, the Parables of this series are also intensely practical. Lastly, their prevailing character is not descriptive, but hortatory; and they bring the Gospel, in the sense of glad tidings to the lost, most closely and touchingly to the hearts of all who hear them. They are signs in words, as the miracles are signs in works, of what Christ has come to do and to teach. Most of them bear this character openly; and even those which do not, but seem more like warning, have still an undertone of love, as if Divine compassion lingered in tender pity over that which threatened, but might yet be averted. Of the Parables of the third series it will for the present suffice to say, that they are neither symbolical nor typical, but their prevailing characteristic is prophetic. As befits their historical place in the teaching of Christ, they point to the near future. They are the fast falling, lengthening shadows cast by the events which are near at hand, The Parables of the second (or Peræan) series, which are typical and hortatory, and Evangelical' in character, are thirteen in number, and, with the exception of the last, are either peculiar to, or else most fully recorded in, the Gospel by St. Luke. 1. The Parable of the Good Samaritan. [4413] - This Parable is connected with a question, addressed to Jesus by a lawyer' - not one of the Jerusalem Scribes or Teachers,

but probably an expert in Jewish Canon Law, [4414] who possibly made it more or less a profession in that district, though perhaps not for gain. Accordingly, there is a marked absence of that rancour and malice which characterised his colleagues of Judæa. In a previous chapter it has been shown, that this narrative probably stands in its proper place in the Gospel of St. Luke. [4415] We have also suggested, that the words of this lawyer referred, or else that himself belonged, to that small party among the Rabbinists who, at least in theory, attached greater value to good works than to study. At any rate, there is no occasion to impute directly evil motives to him. Knowing the habits of his class, we do not wonder that he put his question to tempt' - test, try - the great Rabbi of Nazareth. There are many similar instances in Rabbinic writings of meetings between great Teachers, when each tried to involve the other in dialectic difficulties and subtle disputations. Indeed, this was part of Rabbinism, and led to that painful and fatal trifling with truth, when everything became matter of dialectic subtlety, and nothing was really sacred. What we require to keep in view is, that to this lawyer the question which he propounded was only one of theoretic, not of practical interest, nor matter of deep personal concern, as it was to the rich young ruler, who, not long afterwards, addressed a similar inquiry to the Lord. [4416] We seem to witness the opening of a regular Rabbinic contest, as we listen to this speculative problem: Teacher, what having done shall I inherit eternal life?' At the foundation lay the notion, that eternal life was the reward of merit, of works: the only question was, what these works were to be. The idea of guilt had not entered his mind; he had no conception of sin within. It was the old Judaism of self-righteousness speaking without disguise: that which was the ultimate ground of the rejecting and crucifying of the Christ. There certainly was a way in which a man might inherit eternal life, not indeed as having absolute claim to it, but (as the Schoolmen might have said: de congruo) in consequence of God's Covenant on Sinai. And so our Lord, using the common Rabbinic expression what readest thou?' ({hebrew}), pointed him to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The reply of the lawyer' is remarkable, not only on its own account, but as substantially, and even literally, that given on two other occasions by the Lord Himself. [4417] The question therefore naturally arises, whence did this lawyer, who certainly had not spiritual insight, derive his reply? As regarded the duty of absolute love to God, indicated by the quotation of Deut. vi.5, there could, of course, be no hesitation in the mind of a Jew. The primary obligation of this is frequently referred to, and, indeed, taken for granted, in Rabbinic teaching. The repetition of this command, which in the Talmud receives the most elaborate and strange interpretation, [4418] formed part of the daily prayers. When Jesus referred the lawyer to the Scriptures, he could scarcely fail to quote this first paramount obligation. Similarly, he spoke as a Rabbinic lawyer, when he referred in the next place to love to our neighbour, as enjoined in Lev. xix.18. Rabbinism is never weary of quoting as one of the characteristic sayings of its greatest teacher, Hillel (who, of course, lived before this time), that he had summed up the Law, in briefest compass, in these words: What is hateful to thee, that do not to another. This is the whole Law; the rest is only its explanation.' [4419] Similarly, Rabbi Akiba taught, that Lev. xix.18 was the principal rule, we might almost say, the chief summary of the Law ({hebrew}). [4420] Still, the two principles just mentioned are not enunciated in conjunction by Rabbinism, nor seriously propounded as either containing the whole Law or as securing heaven. They are also, as we shall presently see, subjected to grave modifications. One of these, as regards the negative form in which Hillel put it, while Christ put it positively, [4421] [4422] has been previously noticed. The existence of such Rabbinic modifications, and the circumstance, already mentioned, that on two other occasions the answer of Christ Himself to a similar inquiry was

precisely that of this lawyer, suggests the inference, that this question may have been occasioned by some teaching of Christ, to which they had just listened, and that the reply of the lawyer may have been prompted by what Jesus had preached concerning the Law. If it be asked, why Christ seemed to give His assent to the lawyer's answer, as if it really pointed to the right solution of the great question, we reply: No other answer could have been given him. On the ground of works - if that had been tenable - this was the way to heaven. To understand any other answer, would have required a sense of sin; and this could not be imparted by reasoning: it must be experienced. It is the preaching of the Law which awakens in the mind a sense of sin. [4423] Besides, if not morally, yet mentally, the difficulty of this way' would soon suggest itself to a Jew. Such, at least, is one aspect of the counter-question with which the lawyer' now sought to retort on Jesus. Whatever complexity of motives there may have been - for we know nothing of the circumstances, and there may have been that in the conduct or heart of the lawyer which was specially touched by what had just passed - there can be no doubt as to the maiu object of his question: But who is my neighbour?' He wished to justify himself,' in the sense of vindicating his original question, and showing that it was not quite so easily settled as the answer of Jesus seemed to imply. And here it was that Christ could in a Parable' show how far orthodox Judaism was from even a true understanding, much more from such perfect observance of this Law as would gain heaven. Thus might He bring even this man to feel his shortcomings and sins, and awaken in him a sense of his great need. This, of course, would be the negative aspect of this Parable; the positive is to all time and to all men. That question: Who is my neighbour?' has ever been at the same time the outcome of Judaism (as distinguished from the religion of the Old Testament), and also its curse. On this point it is duty to speak plainly, even in face of the wicked persecutions to which the Jews have been exposed on account of it. Whatever modern Judaism may say to the contrary, there is a foundation of truth in the ancient heathen charge against the Jews of odium generis humani (hatred of mankind). God had separated Israel unto Himself by purification and renovation - and this is the original meaning of the word holy' and sanctify' in the Hebrew ({hebrew}). They separated themselves in self-righteousness and pride - and that is the original meaning of the word Pharisee' and Pharisaism' ({hebrew}). In so saying no blame is cast on individuals; it is the system which is at fault. This question: Who is my neighbour?' frequently engages Rabbinism. The answer to it is only too clear. If a hypercriticism were to interpret away the passage [4424] which directs that idolators are not to be delivered when in imminent danger, while heretics and apostates are even to be led into it, the painful discussion on the meaning of Exod. xxiii.5 [4425] would place it beyond question. The sum of it is, that, except to avert hostility, a burden is only to be unloaded, if the beast that lieth under it belongeth to an Israelite, not if it belong to a Gentile; and so the expression, [4426] the ass of him that hateth thee,' must be understood of a Jewish, and not of a Gentile enemy ({hebrew}). [4427] It is needless to follow the subject further. But more complete rebuke of Judaistic narrowness, as well as more full, generous, and spiritual world-teaching than that of Christ's Parable could not be imagined. The scenery and colouring are purely local. And here we should remember, that, while admitting the lawfulness of the widest application of details for homiletical purposes, we must take care not to press them in a strictly exegetical interpretation. [4428]Some one coming from the Holy City, the Metropolis of Judaism, is pursuing the solitary desert-road, those twenty-one miles to Jericho, a district notoriously insecure, when he fell among robbers, who, having both stripped and inflicted on him strokes, went away leaving him just as he was, [4429] half dead.' This is the first scene. The second opens with an

expression which, theologically, as well as exegetically, is of the greatest interest. The word rendered by chance' (sunkura) occurs only in this place, [4430] for Scripture commonly views matters in relation to agents rather than to results. As already noted, [4431] the real meaning of the word is concurrence,' much like the corresponding Hebrew term ({hebrew}). And better definition could not be given, not, indeed, of Providence,' which is a heathen abstraction for which the Bible has no equivalent, but for the concrete reality of God's providing. He provides through a concurrence of circumstances, all in themselves natural and in the succession of ordinary causation (and this distinguishes it from the miracle), but the concurring of which is directed and overruled by Him. And this helps us to put aside those coarse tests of the reality of prayer and of the direct rule of God, which men sometimes propose. Such stately ships ride not in such shallow waters.It was by such a concurrence,' that, first a priest, then a Levite came down that road, when each, successively, when he saw him, passed by over against (him).' It was the principle of questioning, Who is my neighbour?' which led both priest and Levite to such heartless conduct. Who knew what this wounded man was, and how he came to lie there: and were they called upon, in ignorance of this, to take all the trouble, perhaps incur the risk of life, which care of him would involve? Thus Judaism (in the persons of its chief representatives) had, by its exclusive attention to the letter, come to destroy the spirit of the Law. Happily, there came yet another that way, not only a stranger, but one despised, a semi-heathen Samaritan. [4432] He asked not who the man was, but what was his need. Whatever the wounded Jew might have felt towards him, the Samaritan proved a true neighbour.' He came towards him, and beholding him, he was moved with compassion.' His resolution was soon taken. He first bound up his wounds, and then, taking from his travelling provision wine and oil, made of them, what was regarded as the common dressing for wounds. [4433] Next, having set' (lifted) him on his own beast, he walked by his side, and brought him to one of those houses of rest and entertainment, whose designation (pandocheon) has passed into Rabbinic language ({hebrew}). These khans, or hostelries, by the side of unfrequented roads, afforded free lodgment to the traveller. But generally they also offered entertainment, in which case, of course, the host, commonly a non-Israelite, charged for the victuals supplied to man or beast, or for the care taken. In the present instance the Samaritan seems himself to have tended the wounded man all that evening. But even thus his care did not end. The next morning, before continuing his journey, he gave to the host two dinars - about one shilling and threepence of our money, the amount of a labourer's wages for two days, [4434] - as it were, two days' wages for his care of him, with this provision, that if any further expense were incurred, either because the wounded man was not sufficiently recovered to travel, or else because something more had been supplied to him, the Good Samaritan would pay it when he next came that way.So far the Parable: its lesson the lawyer' is made himself to enunciate. Which of these three seems to thee to have become neighbour of him that fell among the robbers?' Though unwilling to take the hated name of Samaritan on his lips, especially as the meaning of the Parable and its anti-Rabbinic bearing were so evident, the lawyer' was obliged to reply, He that showed mercy on him,' when the Saviour finally answered, Go, and do thou likewise.'Some further lessons may be drawn. The Parable implies not a mere enlargement of the Jewish ideas, but a complete change of them. It is truly a Gospel-Parable, for the whole old relationship of mere duty is changed into one of love. Thus, matters are placed on an entirely different basis from that of Judaism. The question now is not Who is my neighbour?' but Whose neighbour am I?' The Gospel answers the question of duty by pointing us to love. Wouldst thou know who is thy neighbour?

Become a neighbour to all by the utmost service thou canst do them in their need. And so the Gospel would not only abolish man's enmity, but bridge over man's separation. Thus is the Parable truly Christian, and, more than this, points up to Him Who, in our great need, became Neighbour to us, even at the cost of all He had. And from Him, as well as by His Word, are we to learn our lesson of love. 2. The Parable which follows in St. Luke's narrative [4435] seems closely connected with that just commented upon. It is also a story of a good neighbour who gives in our need, but presents another aspect of the truth to which the Parable of the Good Samaritan had pointed. Love bends to our need: this is the objective manifestation of the Gospel. Need looks up to love, and by its cry elicits the boon which it seeks. And this is the subjective experience of the Gospel. The one underlies the story of the first Parable, the other that of the second.Some such internal connection between the two Parables seems, indeed, indicated even by the loose manner in which this second Parable is strung to the request of some disciples to be taught what to pray. [4436] Like the Parable of the Good Samaritan,' it is typical, and its application would be the more felt, that it not only points to an exemplification, but appeals to every man's consciousness of what himself would do in certain given circumstances. The latter are as follows. A man has a friend who, long after nightfall, unexpectedly comes to him from a journey. He has nothing in the house, yet he must provide for his need, for hospitality demands it. Accordingly, though it be so late, he goes to his friend and neighbour to ask him for three loaves, stating the case. On the other hand, the friend so asked refuses, since, at that late hour, he has retired to bed with his children, and to grant his request would imply not only inconvenience to himself, but the disturbing of the whole household. The main circumstances therefore are: Sudden, unthought-of sense of imperative need, obliging to make what seems an unseasonable and unreasonable request, which, on the face of it, offers difficulties and has no claim upon compliance. It is, therefore, not ordinary but, so to speak, extraordinary prayer, which is here alluded to.To return to the Parable: the question (abruptly broken off from the beginning of the Parable in ver.5), is what each of us would do in the circumstances just detailed. The answer is implied in what follows. [4437] It points to continued importunity, which would at last obtain what it needs. I tell you, even if he will not give him, rising up, because he is his friend, yet at least [4438] on account of his importunity, he will rise up and give him as many as he needeth.' This literal rendering will, it is hoped, remove some of the seeming difficulties of the Parable. It is a gross misunderstanding to describe it as presenting a mechanical view of prayer: as if it implied, either that God was unwilling to answer; or else, that prayer, otherwise unheard, would be answered merely for its importunity. It must be remembered, that he who is within is a friend, and that, under circumstances, he would at once have complied with the request. But, in this case, there were special difficulties, which are represented as very great; it is midnight; he has retired to bed, and with his children; the door is locked. And the lesson is, that where, for some reasons, there are, or seem, special difficulties to an answer to our prayers (it is very late, the door is no longer open, the children have already been gathered in), the importunity arising from the sense of our absolute need, and the knowledge that He is our Friend, and that He has bread, will ultimately prevail. The difficulty is not as to the giving, but as the giving then - rising up,' and this is overcome by perseverance, so that (to return to the Parable), if he will not rise up because he is his friend, yet at least he will rise because of his importunity, and not only give him three' loaves, but, in general, as many as he needeth.'So important is the teaching of this Parable, that Christ makes detailed application of it. In the circumstances described a man would persevere with his friend, and in the end succeed. And, similarly, the Lord bids us ask,' and that

earnestly and believingly; seek,' and that energetically and instantly; knock,' and that intently and loudly. Ask - He is a Friend, and we shall receive;' seek,' it is there, and we shall find;' knock,' - our need is absolute, and it shall be opened to us. But the emphasis of the Parable and its lesson are in the word every one' (ps). Not only this or that, but every one,' shall so experience it. The word points to the special difficulties that may be in the way of answer to prayer - the difficulties of the rising up,' which have been previously indicated in the Parable. These are met by perseverance which indicates the reality of our need (ask'), the reality of our belief that the supply is there (seek'), and the intensity and energy of our spiritual longing (knock'). Such importunity applies to every one,' whoever he be, and whatever the circumstances which would seem to render his prayer specially difficult of answer. Though he feel that he has not and needs, he ask;' though he have lost - time, opportunities, mercies - he seek;' though the door seem shut, he knocks.' Thus the Lord is helper to every one;' but, as for us, let us learn the lesson from what we ourselves would do in analogous circumstances. Nay, more than this, God will not decieve by the appearance of what is not reality. He will even give the greatest gift. The Parabolic relation is now not that of friends, but of father and son. If the son asks for bread, will the father give what seems such, but is only a stone? If he asks for a fish, will he tender him what looks such, but is a serpent? If he seek an egg, will he hand to him what breeds a scorpion? The need, the hunger, of the child will not, in answer to its prayer, receive at the Father's Hands, that which seems, but gives not the reality of satisfaction - rather is poison. Let us draw the inference. Such is our conduct - how much more shall our heavenly Father give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him. That gift will not disappoint by the appearance of what is not reality; it will not deceive either by the promise of what it does not give, or by giving what would prove fatal. As we follow Christ's teaching, we ask for the Holy Spirit; and the Holy Spirit, in leading us to Him, leads us into all truth, to all life, and to what satisfies all need.

CHAPTER XVI. THE THREE PARABLES OF WARNING: TO THE INDIVIDUAL, TO THE NATION, AND TO THE THEOCRACY - THE FOOLISH RICH MAN - THE BARREN FIG-TREE - THE GREAT SUPPER.

(St. Luke xii.13-21; xiii.6-9; xiv.16-24.) The three Parables, which successively follow in St. Luke's Gospel, may generally be designated as those of warning.' This holds specially true of the last two of them, which refer to the civil and the ecclesiastical polity of Israel. Each of the three Parables is set in an historical frame, having been spoken under circumstances which gave occasion for such illustration. 1. The Parable of the foolish rich man. [4439] It appears, that some one among them that listened to Jesus conceived the idea, that the authority of the Great Rabbi of Nazareth might be used for his own selfish purposes. This was all he had profited, that it seemed to open possibilities of gain - stirred thoughts of covetousness. But other inferences also come to us. Evidently, Christ must have attracted and deeply moved multitudes, or His interposition would not have been sought; and, equally evidently, what He preached had made upon this man the impression, that he might possibly enlist Him as his champion. The presumptive evidence which it affords as regards the effect and the subject-matter of Christ's preaching is exceedingly interesting. On the other hand, Christ had not only no legal authority for interfering, but the Jewish law of inheritance was so clearly defined, and, we may add, so just, that if this person had any just or good cause, there could have been no need for appealing to Jesus. Hence it must have been covetousness,' in the strictest sense, which prompted it - perhaps, a wish to have, besides his own share as a younger brother, half of that additional portion which, by law, came to the eldest son of the family. [4440] [4441] Such an attempt for covetous purposes to make use of the pure unselfish preaching of love, and to derive profit from His spiritual influence, accounts for the severity with which Christ rejected the demand, although, as we judge, He would, under any circumstances, have refused to interfere in purely civil disputes, with which the established tribunals were sufficient to deal. All this accounts for the immediate reference of our Lord to covetousness, the folly of which He showed by this almost self-evident principle, too often forgotten - that not in the superabounding to any one [not in that wherein he has more than enough] consisteth his life, from the things which he possesseth.' [4442] In other words, that part of the things which a man possesseth by which his life is sustained, consists not in what is superabundant; his life is sustained by that which he needs and uses; the rest, the super-abundance, forms no part of his life, and may, perhaps, never be of use to him. Why, then, be covetous, or long for more than we need? And this folly also involves danger. For, the love of these things will engross mind and heart, and care about them will drive out higher thoughts and aims. The moral as regarded the Kingdom of God, and the warning not to lose it for thought of what perisheth with the using,' are obvious. The Parable itself bears on all these points. It consists of two parts, of which the first shows the folly, the second the sin and danger, of that care for what is beyond our present need, which is the characteristic of covetousness. The rich man is surveying his land, which is bearing

plentifully - evidently beyond its former yield, since the old provision for storing the corn appears no longer sufficient. It seems implied - or, we may at least conjecture - that this was not only due to the labour and care of the master, but that he had devoted to it his whole thought and energy. More than this, it seems as if, in the calculations which he now made, he looked into the future, and saw there progressive increase and riches. As yet, the harvest was not reaped; but he was already considering what to do, reckoning upon the riches that would come to him. And so he resolved to pull down the old, and build larger barns, where he would store his future possessions. From one aspect there would have been nothing wrong in an act of almost necessary foresight - only great folly in thinking, and speaking, and making plans, as if that were already absolutely his which might never come to him at all, which, was still unreaped, and might be garnered long after he was dead. His life was not sustained by that part of his possessions which were the superabounding.' But to this folly was also added sin. For, God was not in all his thoughts. In all his plans for the future - and it was his folly to make such absolutely - he thought not of God. His whole heart was set on the acquisition of earthly riches - not on the service of God. He remembered not his responsibility; all that he had, was for himself, and absolutely his own to batten upon; Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry.' He did not even remember, that there was a God Who might cut short his years. So had he spoken in his heart - proud, selfish, self-indulgent, God-forgetting - as he looked forth upon what was not yet, even in an inferior sense, his own, but which he already treated as such, and that in the most absolute sense. And now comes the quick, sharp, contrast, which is purposely introduced quite abruptly. But God said unto Him' - not by revelation nor through inward presentiment, but, with awful suddenness, in those unspoken words of fact which cannot be gainsaid or answered: Thou fool! this very night' - which follows on thy plans and purposings - thy soul is required of thee. But, the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be?' Here, with the obvious evidence of the folly of such state of mind, the Parable breaks off. Its sinfulness - nay, and beyond this negative aspect of it, the wisdom of righteousness in laying up the good treasure which cannot be taken from us, appears in this concluding remark of Christ - So is he who layeth up treasure (treasureth) for himself, and is not rich towards God.' It was a barbed arrow, we might say, out of the Jewish quiver, but directed by the Hand of the Lord. For, we read in the Talmud [4443] that a Rabbi told his disciples, Repent the day before thy death;' and when his disciples asked him: Does a man know the day of his death?' he replied, that on that very ground he should repent to-day, lest he should die to-morrow. And so would all his days be days of repentance. Again, the son of Sirach wrote: [4444] There is that waxeth rich by his wariness and pinching, and this is the portion of his reward; whereas he saith, I have found rest, and now will eat continually of my goods; and yet he knoweth not what time shall come upon him, and that he must leave those things to others, and die.' But we sadly miss in all this the spiritual application which Christ made. Similarly, the Talmud, [4445] by a play on the last word ({hebrew}), in the first verse of Psalm xlix., compares man to the weasel, which laboriously gathers and deposits, not knowing for whom, while the Midrash [4446] tells a story, how, when a Rabbi returned from a feast where the Host had made plans of storing his wine for a future occasion, the Angel of Death appeared to him, grieved for man, since you say, thus and thus shall we do in the future, while no one knoweth how soon he shall be called to die,' as would be the case with the host of that evening, who would die after the lapse of thirty days. But once more we ask, where is the spiritual application, such as was made by Christ? So far from it, the Midrash adds, that when the Rabbi challenged the Angel to

show him the time of his own death, he received this reply, that he had not dominion over the like of him, since God took pleasure in their good works, and added to their days! 2. The special warning intended to be conveyed by the Parable of the Barren Fig-tree [4447] sufficiently appears from the context. As explained in a previous chapter, [4448] the Lord had not only corrected the erroneous interpretation which the Jews were giving to certain recent national occurences, but pointed them to this higher moral of all such events, that, unless speedy national repentance followed, the whole people would perish. This Parable offers not merely an exemplification of this general prediction of Christ, but sets before us what underlies it: Israel in its relation to God; the need of repentance; Israel's danger; the nature of repentance, and its urgency; the relation of Christ to Israel; the Gospel; and the final judgment on impenitence. As regards the details of this Parable, we mark that the fig-tree had been specially planted by the owner in his vineyard, which was the choicest situation. This, we know, was not unusual. Fig-trees, as well as palm and olive-trees, were regarded as so valuable, that to cut them down if they yielded even a small measure of fruit, was popularly deemed to deserve death at the Hand of God. [4449] Ancient Jewish writings supply interesting particulars of this tree and its culture. According to Josephus, in favoured localities the ripe fruit hung on the tree for ten months of the year, [4450] the two barren months being probably April and May, before the first of the three crops which it bore had ripened. The first figs [4451] ripened towards the end of June, sometimes earlier. The second, which are those now dried and exported, ripened in August; the third, which were small and of comparatively little value, in September, and often hung all winter on the trees. A species (the Benoth Shuach) is mentioned, of which the fruit required three years for ripening. [4452] The fig-tree was regarded as the most fruitful of all trees. [4453] On account of its repeated crops, it was declared not subject to the ordinance which enjoined that fruit should be left in the corners for the poor. [4454] Its artificial inoculation was known. [4455] The practice mentioned in the Parable, of digging about the tree ({hebrew}), and dunging it ({hebrew}), is frequently mentioned in Rabbinic writings, and by the same designations. Curiously, Maimonides mentions three years as the utmost limit within which a tree should bear fruit in the land of Israel. [4456] Lastly, as trees were regarded as by their roots undermining and deteriorating the land, [4457] a barren tree would be of threefold disadvantage: it would yield no fruit; it would fill valuable space, which a fruit-bearer might occupy; and it would needlessly deteriorate the land. Accordingly, while it was forbidden to destroy fruit-bearing trees, [4458] it would, on the grounds above stated, be duty to cut down a barren' or empty' tree (Ilan seraq [4459]). These particulars will enable us more fully to understand the details of the Parable. Allegorically, the fig-tree served in the Old Testament as emblem of the Jewish nation [4460] - in the Talmud, rather as that of Israel's lore, and hence of the leaders and the pious of the people. [4461] The vineyard is in the New Testament the symbol of the Kingdom of God, as distinct from the nation of Israel. [4462] Thus far, then, the Parable may be thus translated: God called Israel as a nation, and planted it in the most favoured spot: as a fig-tree in the vineyard of His own Kingdom. And He came seeking,' as He had every right to do, fruit thereon, and found none.' It was the third year [4463] that He had vainly looked for fruit, when He turned to His Vinedresser - the Messiah, to Whom the vineyard is committed as its King - with this direction: Cut it down - why doth it also deteriorate the soil?' It is barren, though in the best position; as a fig-tree it ought to bear figs, and here the best; it fills the place which a good tree might occupy; and besides, it deteriorates [4464] the soil (literally: {hebrew}). And its three years' barrenness has established (as before explained) its utterly hopeless character. Then it is that the Divine Vinedresser, in His infinite compassion,

pleads, and with far deeper reality than either Abraham or Moses could have entreated, for the fig-tree which Himself had planted and tended, that it should be spared this year also,' until then that I shall dig about it, and dung it,' - till He labour otherwise than before, even by His Own Presence and Words, nay, by laying to its roots His most precious Blood. And if then it bear fruit' - here the text abruptly breaks off, as implying that in such case it would, of course, be allowed to remain; but if not, then against [4465] the future (coming) year shalt thou cut it down.' The Parable needs no further commentation. [4466] In the words of a recent writer: [4467] Between the tree and the axe nothing intervenes but the intercession of the Gardener, Who would make a last effort, and even His petition applies only to a short and definite period, and, in case it pass without result, this petition itself merges in the proposal, "But if not, then cut it down."' How speedily and terribly the warning came true, not only students of history, but all men and in all ages have been made to know. Of the lawfulness of a further application of this Parable to all kindred circumstances of nation, community, family, nay, even of individuals, it is not necessary to speak. 3. The third Parable of warning - that of the Great Supper [4468] - refers not to the political state of Israel, but to their ecclesiastical status, and their continuance as the possessors and representatives of the Kingdom of God. It was spoken after the return of Jesus from the Feast of the Dedication, and therefore carries us beyond the point in this history which we have reached. Accordingly, the attendant circumstances will be explained in the sequel. In regard to these we only note, how appropriately such a warning of Israel's spiritual danger, in consequence of their hardness of heart, misrepresentation, and perversion of God's truth, would come at a Sabbath-meal of the Pharisees, when they lay in wait against Him, and He first challenged their externalising of God's Day and Law to the subversion of its real meaning, and then rebuked the self-assertion, pride, and utter want of all real love on the part of these leaders of Israel. What led up to the Parable of the Great Supper' happened after these things: after His healing of the man with the dropsy in sight of them all on the Sabbath, after His twofold rebuke of their perversion of the Sabbath-Law, and of those marked characteristics of Pharisaism, which showed how far they were from bringing forth fruit worthy of the Kingdom, and how, instead of representing, they represented the Kingdom, and were utterly unfit ever to do otherwise. [4469] The Lord had spoken of making a feast, not for one's kindred, nor for the rich - whether such outwardly, or mentally and spirtually from the standpoint of the Pharisees - but for the poor and afflicted. This would imply true spirituality, because that fellowship of giving, which descends to others in order to raise them as brethren, not condescends, in order to be raised by them as their Master and Superior. [4470] And He had concluded with these words: And thou shalt be blessed - because they have not to render back again to thee, for it shall be rendered back to thee again in the Resurrection of the Just.' [4471]It was this last clause - but separated, in true Pharisaic spirit, from that which had preceded, and indicated the motive - on which one of those present now commented, probably with a covert, perhaps a provocative, reference to what formed the subject of Christ's constant teaching: Blessed whoso shall eat bread in the Kingdom of Heaven.' An expression this, which to the Pharisee meant the common Jewish expectancy of a great feast [4472] at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom. So far he had rightly understood, and yet he had entirely misunderstood, the words of Christ. Jesus had, indeed, referred to the future retribution of (not, for) deeds of love, among which He had named as an instance, suggested by the circumstances, a feast for, or rather brotherly love and fellowship towards, the poor and suffering. But although the Pharisee referred to the Messianic Day, his words show that he did not own Jesus as the Messiah. Whether or not it was

the object of his exclamation, as sometimes religious commonplaces or platitudes are in our days, to interrupt the course of Christ's rebukes, or, as before hinted, to provoke Him to unguarded speech, must be left undetermined. What is chiefly apparent is, that this Pharisee separated what Christ said about the blessings of the first Resurrection from that with which He had connected them - we do not say as their condition, but as logically their moral antecedent: viz., love, in opposition to self-assertion and self-seeking. The Pharisee's words imply that, like his class, he, at any rate, fully expected to share in these blessings, as a matter of course, and because he was a Pharisee. Thus to leave out Christ's anteceding words was not only to set them aside, but to pervert His saying, and to place the blessedness of the future on the very opposite basis from that on which Christ had rested it. Accordingly, it was to this man personally [4473] that the Parable was addressed.There can be no difficulty in understanding the main ideas underlying the Parable. The man who made the Great Supper' [4474] was He Who had, in the Old Testament, prepared a feast of fat things.' [4475] The bidding many' preceded the actual announcement of the day and hour of the feast. We understand by it a preliminary intimation of the feast then preparing, and a general invitation of the guests, who were the chief people in the city; for, as we shall presently see, the scene is laid in a city. This general announcement was made in the Old Testament institutions and prophecies, and the guests bidden were those in the city, the chief men - not the ignorant and those out of the way, but the men who knew, and read, and expounded these prophecies. At last the preparations were ended, and the Master sent out His Servant, not necessarily to be understood of any one individual in particular - such as John the Baptist - but referring to whomsoever He would employ in His Service for that purpose. It was to intimate to the persons formerly bidden, that everything was now ready. Then it was that, however differing in their special grounds for it, or expressing it with more or less courtesy, they were all at one in declining to come. The feast, to which they had been bidden some time before, and to which they had apparently agreed to come (at least, this was implied), was, when actually announced as ready, not what they had expected, at any rate not what they regarded as more desirable than what they had, and must give up in order to come to it. For - and this seems one of the principal points in the Parable - to come to that feast, to enter into the Kingdom, implies the giving up of something that seems if not necessary yet most desirable, and the enjoyment of which appears only reasonable. Be it possession, business, and pleasure (Stier), or the priesthood, the magistracy, and the people generally (St. Augustine), or the priesthood, the Pharisees, and the Scribes, or the Pharisees, the Scribes, and the self-righteously virtuous, with reference to whom we are specially to think of the threefold excuse, the main point lies in this, that, when the time came, they all refused to enter in, each having some valid and reasonable excuse. But the ultimate ground of their refusal was, that they felt no real desire, and saw nothing attractive in such a feast; had no real reverence for the host; in short, that to them it was not a feast at all, but something much less to be desired than what they had, and would have been obliged to give up, if they had complied with the invitation. Then let the feast - for it was prepared by the goodness and liberality of the Host - be for those who were in need of it, and to whom it would be a feast: the poor and those afflicted - the maimed, and blind, and lame, on whom those great citizens who had been first bidden would look down. This, with reference to, and in higher spiritual explanation of, what Christ had previously said about bidding such to our feast of fellowship and love. [4476] Accordingly, the Servant is now directed to go out quickly into the (larger) streets and the (narrow) lanes of the City,' - a trait which shows that the scene is laid in the City,' the professed habitation of God. The

importance of this circumstance is evident. It not only explains who the first bidden chief citizens were, but also that these poor were the despised ignorant, and the maimed, lame, and blind - such as the publicans and sinners. These are they in the streets' and lanes;' and the Servant is directed, not only to invite, but to bring them in,' as otherwise they might naturally shrink from coming to such a feast. But even so, there is yet room;' for the great Lord of the house has, in His great liberality, prepared a very great feast for very many. And so the Servant is once more sent, so that the Master's house may be filled.' But now he is bidden to go out,' outside the City, outside the Theocracy, into the highways and hedges,' to those who travel along the world's great highway, or who have fallen down weary, and rest by its hedges; into the busy, or else weary, heathen world. This reference to the heathen world is the more apparent that, according to the Talmud, [4477] there were commonly no hedges round the fields of the Jews. And this time the direction to the Servant is not, as in regard to those naturally bashful outcasts of the City - who would scarcely venture to the great house - to bring them in,' but constrain' [without a pronoun] to come in,' Not certainly as indicating their resistance and implying force, [4478] but as the moral constraint of earnest, pressing invitation, coupled with assurance both of the reality of the feast and of their welcome to it. For, these wanderers on the world's highway had, before the Servant came to them, not known anything of the Master of the house, and all was quite new and unexpected. Their being invited by a Lord Whom they had not known, perhaps never heard of before, to a City in which they were strangers, and to a feast for which - as wayfarers, or as resting by the hedges, or else as working within their enclosure - they were wholly unprepared, required special urgency, a constraining,' to make them either believe in it, or come to it from where the messengers found them, and that without preparing for it by dress or otherwise. And so the house would be filled!Here the Parable abruptly breaks off. What follows are the words of our Lord in explanation and application of it to the company then present: For I say unto you, that none of those men which were bidden shall taste of My supper.' And this was the final answer to this Pharisee and to those with him at that table, and to all such perversion of Christ's Words and misapplication of God's Promises as he and they were guilty of.

CHAPTER XVII. THE THREE PARABLES OF THE GOSPEL: OF THE RECOVERY OF THE LOST - OF THE LOST SHEEP, THE LOST DRACHM, THE LOST SON.

(St. Luke xv.) A SIMPLE perusal of the three Parables, grouped together in the fifteenth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, will convince us of their connection. Although they treat of repentance,' we can scarcely call them The Parables of Repentance;' for, except in the last of them, the aspect of repentance is subordinate to that of restoration, which is the moral effect of repentance. They are rather peculiarly Gospel-Parables of the recovery of the lost:' in the first instance, through the unwearied labour; in the second, through the anxious care, of the owner; and in the third Parable, through the never-ceasing love of the Father. Properly to understand these Parables, the circumstance which elicited them must be kept in view. As Jesus preached the Gospel of God's call, not to those who had, as they imagined, prepared themselves for the Kingdom by study and good works, but as that to a door open, and a welcome free to all, all the publicans and sinners were [constantly] drawing near to Him.' It has formerly been shown, [4479] that the Jewish teaching concerning repentance was quite other than, nay, contrary to, that of Christ. Theirs was not a Gospel to the lost: they had nothing to say to sinners. They called upon them to do penitence,' and then Divine Mercy, or rather Justice, would have its reward for the penitent. Christ's Gospel was to the lost as such. It told them of forgiveness, of what the Saviour was doing, and the Father purposed and felt for them; and that, not in the future and as reward of their penitence, but now in the immediate present. From what we know of the Pharisees, we can scarcely wonder that they were murmuring at Him, saying, This man receiveth "sinners," and eateth with them.' Whether or not Christ had on this, as on other occasions, [4480] joined at a meal with such persons - which, of course, in the eyes of the Pharisees would have been a great aggravation to His offence - their charge was so far true, that this One,' in contrariety to the principles and practice of Rabbinism, received sinners' as such, and consorted with them. Nay, there was even more than they charged Him with: He not only received them when they sought Him, but He sought them, so as to bring them to Him; not, indeed, that they might remain sinners,' but that, by seeking and finding them, they might be restored to the Kingdom, and there might be joy in heaven over them. And so these are truly Gospel-Parables, although presenting only some aspects of it. Besides their subject-matter, these three Parables have some other points in common. Two things are here of chief interest. They all proceed on the view that the work of the Father and of Christ, as regards the Kingdom,' is the same; that Christ was doing the work of the Father, and that they who know Christ know the Father also. That work was the restoration of the lost; Christ had come to do it, and it was the longing of the Father to welcome the lost home again. Further, and this is only second in importance, the lost was still God's property; and he who had wandered farthest was a child of the Father, and considered as such. And, although this may, in a wider sense, imply the general propriety of Christ in all men, and the universal Fatherhood of God, yet, remembering that this Parable was spoken to Jews, we, to whom these Parables now come, can scarcely be wrong in thinking, as we read them, with special thankfulness of our Christian

privileges, as by Baptism numbered among the sheep of His Flock, the treasure of His Possession, and the children of His Home. [4481] In other particulars there are, however, differences, all the more marked that they are so finely shaded. These concern the lost, their restoration, and its results. 1. The Parable of the Lost Sheep. - At the outset we remark that this Parable and the next, that of the Lost Drachm, are intended as an answer to the Pharisees. Hence they are addressed to them: What man of you?' [4482] or what woman?' [4483] just as His late rebuke to them on the subject of their Sabbath-cavils had been couched: Which of you shall have a son or an ox fallen into a well?' [4484] Not so the last Parable, of the Lost Son, in which He passed from defence, or rather explanation, of His conduct, to its higher reason, showing that He was doing the work of the Father. Hence, while the element of comparison (with that which had not been lost) appears in most detailed form in the first Parable, it is generalised in the second, and wholly omitted in the third. Other differences have to be marked in the Parables themselves. In the first Parable (that of the Lost Sheep) the main interest centres in the lost; in the second (that of the Lost Drachm), in the search; in the third, in the restoration. And although in the third Parable the Pharisees are not addressed, there is the highest personal application to them in the words which the Father speaks to the elder son - an application, not so much of warning, as of loving correction and entreaty, and which seems to imply, what otherwise these Parables convey, that at least these Pharisees had murmured,' not so much from bitter hostility to Christ, as from spiritual ignorance and misunderstanding. Again, these Parables, and especially that of the Lost Sheep, are evidently connected with the preceding series, that of warnings.' The last of these showed how the poor, the blind, lame, and maimed, nay, even the wanderers on the world's highway, were to be the guests at the heavenly Feast. And this, not only in the future, and after long and laborious preparation, but now, through the agency of the Saviour. As previously stated, Rabbinism placed acceptance at the end of repentance, and made it its wages. And this, because it knew not, nor felt the power of sin, nor yet the free grace of God. The Gospel places acceptance at the beginning of repentance, and as the free gift of God's love. And this, because it not only knows the power of sin, but points to a Saviour, provided of God. The Lost Sheep is only one among a hundred: not a very great loss. Yet which among us would not, even from the common motives of ownership, leave the ninety-and-nine, and go after it, all the more that it has strayed into the wilderness? And, to take these Pharisees on their own ground, [4485] should not the Christ have done likewise to the straying and almost lost sheep of His own flock? Nay, quite generally and to all time, is this not the very work of the Good Shepherd,' and may we not, each of us, thus draw from it precious comfort? As we think of it, we remember that it is natural for the foolish sheep so to wander and stray. And we think not only of those sheep which Jewish pride and superciliousness had left to go astray, but of our own natural tendency to wander. And we recall the saying of St. Peter, which, no doubt, looked back upon this Parable: Ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.' [4486] It is not difficult in imagination to follow the Parabolic picture: how in its folly and ignorance the sheep strayed further and further, and at last was lost in solitude and among stony places; how the shepherd followed and found it, weary and footsore; and then with tender care lifted it on his shoulder, and carried it home, gladsome that he had found the lost. And not only this, but when, after long absence, he returned home with his found sheep, that now nestled close to its Saviour, he called together his friends, and bade them rejoice with him over the erst lost and now found treasure. It needs not, and would only diminish the pathos of this exquisite Parable, were we to attempt interpreting its details. They apply wherever and to

whatever they can be applied. Of these three things we think: of the lost sheep; of the Good Shepherd, seeking, finding, bearing, rejoicing; and of the sympathy of all who are truly friends - like-minded with Him. These, then, are the emblems of heavenly things. In heaven - oh, how different the feeling from that of Pharisaism! View the flock' as do the Pharisees, and divide them into those who need and who need not repentance, the sinners' and the righteous,' as regards man's application of the Law - does not this Parable teach us that in heaven there shall be joy over the sinner that repenteth' more than over the ninety-and-nine' righteous,' which have not need of repentance'? And to mark the terrible contrast between the teaching of Christ and that of the Pharisees; to mark also, how directly from heaven must have been the message of Jesus, and how poor sinners must have felt it such, we put down in all its nakedness the message which Pharisaism brought to the lost. Christ said to them: There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' Pharisaism said - and we quote here literally - There is joy before God when those who provoke Him perish from the world.' [4487] 2. In proceeding to the second Parable, that of the Lost Drachm, we must keep in mind that in the first the danger of being lost arose from the natural tendency of the sheep to wander. [4488] In the second Parable it is no longer our natural tendency to which our loss is attributable. The drachm (about 7 ½d. of our money) has been lost, as the woman, its owner, was using or counting her money. The loss is the more sensible, as it is one out of only ten, which constitute the owner's property. But it is still in the house - not like the sheep that had gone astray - only covered by the dust that is continually accumulating from the work and accidents around. And so it is more and more likely to be buried under it, or swept into chinks and corners, and less and less likely to be found as time passes. But the woman lights a lamp, sweeps the house, and seeks diligently, till she has found it. And then she calleth together those around, and bids them rejoice with her over the finding of the lost part of her possessions. And so there is joy in the presence of the Angels over one sinner that repenteth. The comparison with others that need not such is now dropped, because, whereas formerly the sheep had strayed - though from the frowardness of its nature - here the money had simply been lost, fallen among the dust that accumulates - practically, was no longer money, or of use; became covered, hidden, and was in danger of being for ever out of sight, not serviceable, as it was intended to be and might have been. We repeat, the interest of this Parable centres in the search, and the loss is caused, not by natural tendency, but by surrounding circumstances, which cover up the bright silver, hide it, and render it useless as regards its purpose, and lost to its owner.3. If it has already appeared that the two first Parables are not merely a repetition, in different form, of the same thought, but represent two different aspects and causes of the being lost' - the essential difference between them appears even more clearly in the third Parable, that of the Lost Son. Before indicating it in detail, we may mark the similarity in form, and the contrast in spirit, of analogous Rabbinic Parables. The thoughtful reader will have noted this even in the Jewish parallel to the first Parable, [4489] where the reason of the man following the straying animal is Pharisaic fear and distrust, lest the Jewish wine which it carried should become mingled with that of the Gentiles. Perhaps, however, this is a more apt parallel, when the Midrash [4490] relates how, when Moses fed the sheep of Jethro in the wilderness, and a kid had gone astray, he went after it, and found it drinking at a spring. As he thought it might be weary, he laid it on his shoulder and brought it back, when God said that, because he had shown pity on the sheep of a man, He would give him His own sheep, Israel, to feed. [4491] As a parallel to the second Parable, this may be quoted as similar in form, though very different in spirit, when a Rabbi notes, [4492] that, if a man had lost a Sela (drachm) or

anything else of value in his house, he would light ever so many lights ({hebrew}) till he had found what provides for only one hour in this world. How much more, then, should he search, as for hidden treasures, for the words of the Law, on which depends the life of this and of the world to come! [4493] And in regard to the high place which Christ assigned to the repenting sinner, we may note that, according to the leading Rabbis, the penitents would stand nearer to God than the perfectly righteous' ({hebrew}), since, in Is. lvii.19, peace was first bidden to those who had been afar off, and then only to those near. This opinion was, however, not shared by all, and one Rabbi maintained, [4494] that, while all the prophets had only prophesied with reference to penitents (this had been the sole object of their mission), yet, as regarded the perfectly righteous,' eye hath not seen' O God, beside Thee, what He hath prepared' for them. [4495] Lastly, it may, perhaps, be noted, that the expression there is joy before Him' ({hebrew}) is not uncommon in Jewish writings with reference to events which take place on earth.To complete these notes, it may be added that, besides illustrations, to which reference will be made in the sequel, Rabbinic tradition supplies a parallel to at least part of the third Parable, that of the Lost Son. It tells us that, while prayer may sometimes find the gate of access closed, it is never shut against repentance, and it introduces a Parable in which a king sends a tutor after his son, who, in his wickedness, had left the palace, with this message: Return, my son!' to which the latter replied: With what face can I return? I am ashamed!' On which the father sends this message: My son, is there a son who is ashamed to return to his father - and shalt thou not return to thy father? Thou shalt return.' So, continues the Midrash, had God sent Jeremiah after Israel in the hour of their sin with the call to return, [4496] and the comforting reminder that it was to their Father. [4497]In the Parable of the Lost Son,' the main interest centres in his restoration. It is not now to the innate tendency of his nature, nor yet to the work and dust in the house that the loss is attributable, but to the personal, free choice of the individual. He does not stray; he does not fall aside - he wilfully departs, and under aggravated circumstances. It is the younger of two sons of a father, who is equally loving to both, and kind even to his hired servants, whose home, moreover, is one not only of sufficiency, but of superabundance and wealth. The demand which he makes for the portion of property falling' to him is founded on the Jewish Law of Inheritance. [4498] Presumably, the father had only these two sons. The eldest would receive two portions, the younger the third of all movable property. The father could not have disinherited the younger son, although, if there had been several younger sons, he might have divided the property falling to them as he wished, provided he expressed only his disposition, and did not add that such or such of the children were to have a less share or none at all. On the other hand, a man might, during his lifetime, dispose of all his property by gift, as he chose, to the disadvantage, or even the total loss, of the first-born, or of any other children; nay, he might give all to strangers. [4499] In such cases, as, indeed, in regard to all such dispositions, greater latitude was allowed if the donor was regarded as dangerously ill, than if he was in good health. In the latter case a legal formality of actual seizure required to be gone through. With reference to the two eventualities just mentioned - that of diminishing or taking away the portion of younger children, and the right of gift - the Talmud speaks of Testaments, [4500] which bear the name Diyatiqi, as in the New Testament. [4501] These dispositions might be made either in writing or orally. But if the share of younger children was to be diminished or taken away, the disposition must be made by a person presumably near death (Shekhibh mera). But no one in good health (Bari) could diminish (except by gift) the legal portion of a younger son. [4502] It thus appears that the younger son was, by law, fully entitled to his share of the possessions, although, of course, he

had no right to claim it during the lifetime of his father. That he did so, might have been due to the feeling that, after all, he must make his own way in the world; to dislike of the order and discipline of his home; to estrangement from his elder brother; or, most likely, to a desire for liberty and enjoyment, with the latent belief that he would succeed well enough if left to himself. At any rate, his conduct, whatever his motives, was most heartless as regarded his father, and sinful as before God. Such a disposition could not prosper. The father had yielded to his demand, and, to be as free as possible from control and restraint, the younger son had gone into a far country. There the natural sequences soon appeared, and his property was wasted in riotous living. Regarding the demand for his inheritance as only a secondary trait in the Parable, designed, on the one hand, more forcibly to bring out the guilt of the son, and, on the other, the goodness, and afterwards the forgiveness, of the Father, we can scarcely doubt that by the younger son we are to understand those publicans and sinners' against whose reception by, and fellowship with, Christ the Pharisees had murmured.The next scene in the history is misunderstood when the objection is raised, that the young man's misery is there represented as the result of Providential circumstances rather than of his own misdoing. To begin with, he would not have been driven to such straits in the famine, if he had not wasted his substance with riotous living. Again, the main object is to show, that absolute liberty and indulgence of sinful desires and passions ended in anything but happiness. The Providence of God had an important part in this. Far more frequently are folly and sin punished in the ordinary course of Providence than by special judgments. Indeed, it is contrary to the teaching of Christ, [4503] and it would lead to an unmoral view of life, to regard such direct interpositions as necessary, or to substitute them for the ordinary government of God. Similarly, for our awakening also we are frequently indebted to what is called the Providence, but what is really the manifold working together of the grace, of God. And so we find special meaning in the occurrence of this famine. That, in his want, he clave [4504] (kollthe) to one of the citizens of that country,' seems to indicate that the man had been unwilling to engage the dissipated young stranger, and only yielded to his desperate importunity. This also explains how he employed him in the lowest menial service, that of feeding swine. To a Jew, there was more than degradation in this, since the keeping of swine (although perhaps the ownership rather than the feeding) was prohibited to Israelites under a curse. [4505] [4506] And even in this demeaning service he was so evil entreated, that for very hunger he would fain have filled his belly with the carob-pods that the swine did eat.' But here the same harshness, which had sent him to such employment, met him on the part of all the people of that country: and no man gave unto him,' even sufficient of such food. What perhaps gives additional meaning to this description is the Jewish saying: When Israel is reduced to the carob-tree, they become repentant.' [4507] [4508]It was this pressure of extreme want which first showed to the younger son the contrast between the country and the circumstances to which his sin had brought him, and the plentiful provision of the home he had left, and the kindness which provided bread enough and to spare for even the hired servants. There was only a step between what he said, having come into himself,' and his resolve to return, though its felt difficulty seems implied in the expression: I will arise.' Nor would he go back with the hope of being reinstated in his position as son, seeing he had already received, and wasted in sin, his portion of the patrimony. All he sought was to be made as one of the hired servants. And, alike from true feeling, and to show that this was all his pretence, he would preface his request by the confession, that he had sinned against heaven' - a frequent Hebraism for against God' [4509] - and in the sight of his father, and hence could no longer lay claim to the name of son. The

provision of the son he had, as stated, already spent, the name he no longer deserved. This favour only would he seek, to be as a hired servant in his father's house, instead of in that terrible, strange land of famine and harshness.But the result was far other than he could have expected. When we read that, while he was yet afar off, his father saw him,' we must evidently understand it in the sense, that his father had been always on the outlook for him, an impression which is strengthened by the later command to the servants to bring the calf, the fatted one,' [4510] as if it had been specially fattened against his return. As he now saw him, he was moved with compassion, and he ran, and he fell on his neck, and covered him with kisses.' [4511] Such a reception rendered the purposed request, to be made as one of the hired servants, impossible - and its spurious insertion in the text of some important manuscripts [4512] affords sad evidence of the want of spiritual tact and insight of early copyists. The father's love had anticipated his confession, and rendered its self-spoken sentence of condemnation impossible. Perfect love casteth out fear,' and the hard thoughts concerning himself and his deserts on the part of the returning sinner were banished by the love of the father. And so he only made confession of his sin and wrong - not now as preface to the request to be taken in as a servant, but as the outgoing of a humbled, grateful, truly penitent heart. Him whom want had humbled, thought had brought to himself, and mingled need and hope led a suppliant servant - the love of a father, which anticipated his confession, and did not even speak the words of pardon, conquered, and so morally begat him a second time as his son. Here it deserves special notice, as marking the absolute contrast between the teaching of Christ and Rabbinism, that we have in one of the oldest Rabbinic works [4513] a Parable exactly the reverse of this, when the son of a friend is redeemed from bondage, not as a son, but to be a slave, that so obedience might be demanded of him. The inference drawn is, that the obedience of the redeemed is not that of filial love of pardoned, but the enforcement of the claim of a master. How otherwise in the Parable and teaching of Christ! But even so the story of love has not come to an end. They have reached the house. And now the father would not only restore the son, but convey to him the evidence of it, and he would do so before, and by the servants. The three tokens of wealth and position are to be furnished him. Quickly' the servants are to bring forth the stola,' the upper garment of the higher classes, and that the first' - the best, and this instead of the tattered, coarse raiment of the foreign swineherd. Similarly, the finger-ring for his hand, and the sandals for his unshod feet, would indicate the son of the house. And to mark this still further, the servants were not only to bring these articles, but themselves to put them on' the son, so as thereby to own his mastership. And yet further, the calf, the fatted one' for this very occasion, was to be killed, and there was to be a joyous feast, for this' his son was dead, and is come to life again; was lost, and is found.' [4514]Thus far for the reception of publicans and sinners,' and all in every time whom it may concern. Now for the other aspect of the history. While this was going on, so continues the Parable, the elder brother was still in the field. On his return home, he inquired of a servant the reason of the festivities which he heard within the house. Informed that his younger brother had come, and the calf long prepared against a feast had been killed, because his father had recovered him safe and sound,' he was angry, would not go in, and even refused the request to that effect of the father, who had come out for the purpose. The harsh words of reproach with which he set forth his own apparent wrongs could have only one meaning: his father had never rewarded him for his services. On the other hand, as soon as this' his son' - whom he will not even call his brother - had come back, notwithstanding all his disservice, he had made a feast of joy!But in this very thing lay the error of

the elder son, and - to apply it - the fatal mistake of Pharisaism. The elder son regarded all as of merit and reward, as work and return. But it is not so. We mark, first, that the same tenderness which had welcomed the returning son, now met the elder brother. He spoke to the angry man, not in the language of merited reproof, but addressed him lovingly as son,' and reasoned with him. And then, when he had shown him his wrong, he would fain recall him to better feeling by telling him of the other as his brother.' [4515] But the main point is this. There can be here no question of desert. So long as the son is in His Father's house He gives in His great goodness to His child all that is the Father's. But this poor lost one - still a son and a brother - he has not got any reward, only been taken back again by a Father's love, when he had come back to Him in the deep misery of his felt need. This son, or rather, as the other should view him, this brother,' had been dead, and was come to life again; lost, and was found. And over this it was meet to make merry and be glad,' not to murmur. Such murmuring came from thoughts of work and pay - wrong in themselves, and foreign to the proper idea of Father and son; such joy, from a Father's heart. The elder brother's were the thoughts of a servant: [4516] of service and return; the younger brother's was the welcome of a son in the mercy and everlasting love of a Father. And this to us, and to all time!

Chapter 83

CHAPTER XVIII. THE UNJUST STEWARD - DIVES AND LAZARUS - JEWISH AGRICULTURAL NOTES - PRICES OF PRODUCE - WRITING AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS - PURPLE AND FINE LINEN - JEWISH NOTIONS OF HADES.

(St. Luke xvi.) Although widely differing in their object and teaching, the last group of Parables spoken during this part of Christ's Ministry are, at least outwardly, connected by a leading thought. The word by which we would string them together is Righteousness. There are three Parables of the Unrighteous: the Unrighteous Steward, the Unrighteous Owner, and the Unrighteous Dispenser, or Judge. And these are followed by two other Parables of the Self-righteous: Self-righteousness in its Ignorance, and its dangers as regards oneself; and Self-righteousness in its Harshness, and its dangers as regards others. But when this outward connection has been marked, we have gone the utmost length. Much more close is the internal connection between some of them. We note it, first and chiefly, between the two first Parables. Recorded in the same chapter, [4517] and in the same connection, they were addressed to the same audience. True, the Parable of the Unjust Steward was primarily spoken to His disciples,' [4518] that of Dives and Lazarus to the Pharisees. [4519] But then the audience of Christ at that time consisted of disciples and Pharisees. And these two classes in the audience stood in peculiar relation to each other, which is exactly met in these two Parables, so that the one may be said to have sprung out of the other. For, the disciples,' to whom the first Parable was addressed, were not primarily the Apostles, but those publicans and sinners' whom Jesus had received, to the great displeasure of the Pharisees. [4520] Them He would teach concerning the Mamon of unrighteousness. And, when the Pharisees sneered at this teaching, He would turn it against them, and show that, beneath the self-justification, [4521] which made them forget that now the Kingdom of God was opened to all, [4522] and imagine that they were the sole vindicators of a Law [4523] which in their everyday practice they notoriously broke, [4524] there lay as deep sin and as great alienation from God as that of the sinners whom they despised. Theirs might not be the Mamon of, yet it might be that for unrighteousness; and, while they sneered at the idea of such men making of their Mamon friends that would receive them into everlasting tabernacles, themselves would experience that in the end a terrible readjustment before God would follow on their neglect of using for God, and their employment only for self of such Mamon as was theirs, coupled as it was with harsh and proud neglect of what they regarded as wretched, sore-covered Lazarus, who lay forsaken and starving at their very doors. It will have been observed, that we lay once more special stress on the historical connection and the primary meaning of the Parables. We would read them in the light of the circumstances in which they were spoken - as addressed to a certain class of hearers, and as referring to what had just passed. The historical application once ascertained, the general lessons may afterwards be applied to the widest range. This historical view will help us to understand the introduction, connection, and meaning, of the two Parables which have been described as the most difficult: those of the Unjust Steward, [4525] and of Dives and Lazarus. At the outset we must

recall, that they were addressed to two different classes in the same audience. In both the subject is Unrighteousness. In the first, which is addressed to the recently converted publicans and sinners, it is the Unrighteous Steward, making unrighteous use of what had been committed to his administration by his Master; in the second Parable, which is addressed to the self-justifying, sneering Pharisees, it is the Unrighteous Possessor, who uses only for himself and for time what he has, while he leaves Lazarus, who, in his view, is wretched and sore-covered, to starve or perish, unheeded, at his very door. In agreement with its object, and as suited to the part of the audience addressed, the first Parable points a lesson, while the second furnishes a warning. In the first Parable we are told, what the sinner when converted should learn from his previous life of sin; in the second, what the self-deceiving, proud Pharisee should learn as regarded the life which to him seemed so fair, but was in reality so empty of God and of love. It follows - and this is of greatest importance, especially in the interpretation of the first Parable - that we must not expect to find spiritual equivalents for each of the persons or incidents introduced. In each case, the Parable itself forms only an illustration of the lessons, spoken or implied, which Christ would convey to the one and the other class in His audience. I. The Parable of the Unjust Steward. - In accordance with the canon of interpretation just laid down, we distinguish - 1. The illustrative Parable. [4526] 2. Its moral. [4527] 3. Its application in the combination of the moral with some of the features of the Parable. [4528] 1. The illustrative Parable. [4529] This may be said to converge to the point brought out in the concluding verse: [4530] the prudence which characterises the dealings of the children of this world in regard to their own generation, or, to translate the Jewish forms of expression into our own phraseology, the wisdom with which those who care not for the world to come choose the means most effectual for attaining their worldly objects. It is this prudence by which their aims are so effectually secured, and it alone, which is set before the children of light,' as that by which to learn. And the lesson is the more practical, that those primarily addressed had hitherto been among these men of the world. Let them learn from the serpent its wisdom, and from the dove its harmlessness; from the children of this world, their prudence as regarded their generation, while, as children of the new light, they must remember the higher aim for which that prudence was to be employed. Thus would that Mamon which is of unrighteousness,' and which certainly faileth,' become to us treasure in the world to come - welcome us there, and, so far from failing,' prove permanent - welcome us in everlasting tabernacles. Thus, also, shall we have made friends of the Mamon of unrighteousness,' and that, which from its nature must fail, become eternal gain - or, to translate it into Talmudic phraseology, it will be of the things of which a man enjoys the interest in this world, while the capital remains for the world to come. It cannot now be difficult to understand the Parable. Its object is simply to show, in the most striking manner, the prudence of a worldly man, who is unrestrained by any other consideration than that of attaining his end. At the same time, with singular wisdom, the illustration is so chosen as that its matter (materia), the Mamon of unrighteousness,' may serve to point a life-lesson to those newly converted publicans and sinners, who had formerly sacrificed all for the sake, or in the enjoyment of, that Mamon. All else, such as the question, who is the master and who the steward, and such like, we dismiss, since the Parable is only intended as an illustration of the lesson to be afterwards taught. The connection between this Parable and what the Lord had previously said concerning returning sinners, to which our remarks have already pointed, is further evidenced by the use of the term wasting' (diaskorpzon), in the charge against the steward, just as the prodigal son had wasted' (dieskrpise) his substance. [4531] Only, in the present instance, the property had been

entrusted to his administration. As regards the owner, his designation as rich' seems intended to mark how large was the property committed to the steward. The steward' was not, as in St. Luke xii.42-46, a slave, but one employed for the administration cf the rich man's affairs, subject to notice of dismissal. [4532] He was accused - the term implying malevolence, but not necessarily a false charge - not of fraud, but of wasting, probably by riotous living and carelessness, his master's goods. And his master seems to have convinced himself that the charge was true, since he at once gives him notice of dismissal. The latter is absolute, and not made dependent on the account of his stewardship,' which is only asked as, of course, necessary, when he gives up his office. Nor does the steward either deny the charge or plead any extenuation. His great concern rather is, during the time still left of his stewardship, before he gives up his accounts, to provide for his future support. The only alternative before him in the future is that of manual labour or mendicancy. But for the former he has not strength; from the latter he is restrained by shame. Then it is that his prudence' suggests a device by which, after his dismissal, he may, without begging, be received into the houses of those whom he has made friends. [4533] It must be borne in mind, that he is still steward, and, as such, has full power of disposing of his master's affairs. When, therefore, he sends for one after another of his master's debtors, and tells each to alter the sum in the bond, he does not suggest to them forgery or fraud, but, in remitting part of the debt - whether it had been incurred as rent in kind, or as the price of produce purchased - he acts, although unrighteously, yet strictly within his rights. Thus, neither the steward nor the debtors could be charged with criminality, and the master must have been struck with the cleverness of a man who had thus secured a future provision by making friends, so long as he had the means of so doing (ere his Mamon of unrighteousness failed). A few archæological notices may help the interpretation of details. From the context it seems more likely, that the bonds,' or rather writings,' of these debtors were written acknowledgements of debt, than, as some have supposed that they were, leases of farms. The debts over which the steward variously disposed, according as he wished to gain more or less favour, were considerable. In the first case they are stated at a hundred Bath of oil,' in the second as a hundred Cor of wheat.' In regard to these quantities we have the preliminary difficulty, that three kinds of measurement were in use in Palestine - that of the Wilderness,' or, the original Mosaic; that of Jerusalem,' which was more than a fifth larger; and that of Sepphoris, probably the common Galilean measurement, which, in turn, was more than a fifth larger than the Jerusalem measure. [4534] To be more precise, one Galilean was equal to 3/2 Wilderness' measures. Assuming the measurement to have been the Galilean, one Bath [4535] would have been equal to an Attic Metrêtês, or about 39 litres. On the other hand, the so-called Wilderness measurement' would correspond with the Roman measures, and, in that case, the Bath' would be the same as the Amphora, or amount to a little less than 26 litres. [4536] The latter is the measurement adopted by Josephus. [4537] [4538] In the Parable, the first debtor was owing 100 of these Bath,' or, according to the Galilean measurement, about 3,900 litres of oil. As regards the value of a Bath of oil, little information can be derived from the statements of Josephus, since he only mentions prices under exceptional circumstances, either in particularly plentiful years, [4539] or else at a time of war and siege. [4540] In the former, an Amphora, or 26 litres, of oil seems to have fetched about 9d.; but it must be added, that, even in such a year, this represents a rare stroke of business, since the oil was immediately afterwards re-sold for eight times the amount, and this - 3s. for half an Amphora of about 13 litres - would probably represent an exceptionally high war-price. The fair price for it would probably have been 9d. For the Mishnah informs us, that the

ordinary earthenware casks' (the Gerabh) held each 2 Seah, or 48 Log, or about 26 litres. [4541] Again, according to a notice in the Talmud, [4542] 100 such casks,' or, 200 Seah, were sold for 10 (presumably gold) dinars, or 250 silver dinars, equal to about 7l.10s. of our money. And as the Bath (= 3 Seah) held a third more than one of those casks,' or Gerabhin, the value of the 100 Bath of oil would probably amount to about 10l. of our money, and the remission of the steward, of course, to 5l. The second debtor owed a hundred Cor of wheat' - that is, in dry measure, ten times the amount of the oil of the first debtor, since the Cor was ten Ephah or Bath, the Ephah three Seah, the Seah six Qabh, and the Qabh four Log. This must be borne in mind, since the dry and the fluid measures were precisely the same; and here, also, their threefold computation (the Wilderness,' the Jerusalem,' and the Galilean') obtained. As regards the value of wheat, we learn [4543] that, on an average, four Seah of seed were expected to produce one Cor - that is, seven and a half times their amount; and that a field 1,500 cubits long and 50 wide was expected to grow a Cor. The average price of a Cor of wheat, bought uncut, amounted to about 25 dinars, or 15s. Striking an average between the lowest prices mentioned [4544] and the highest, [4545] we infer that the price of 3 Seah or an Ephah would be from two shillings to half-a-crown, and accordingly of a Cor (or 10 Ephah) from 20 to 25 shillings (probably this is rather more than it would cost). On this computation the hundred Cor would represent a debt of from 100l. to 125l., and the remission of the steward (of 20 Cor), a sum of from 20l. to 25l. Comparatively small as these sums may seem, they are in reality large, remembering the value of money in Palestine, which, on a low computation, would be five times as great as in our own country. [4546] These two debtors are only mentioned as instances, and so the unjust steward would easily secure for himself friends by the Mamon of unrighteousness,' the term Mamon, [4547] we may note, being derived from the Syriac and Rabbinic word of the same kind ({hebrew}, from {hebrew}={hebrew}, {hebrew}, to apportion). [4548]Another point on which acquaintance with the history and habits of those times throws light is, how the debtors could so easily alter the sum mentioned in their respective bonds. For, the text implies that this, and not the writing of a new bond, is intended; since in that case the old one would have been destroyed, and not given back for alteration. It would be impossible, within the present limits, to enter fully on the interesting subject of writing, writing-materials, and written documents among the ancient Jews. [4549] Suffice it to give here the briefest notices.The materials on which the Jews wrote were of the most divers kind: leaves, as of olives, palms, the carob, &c.; the rind of the pomegranate, the shell of walnuts, &c.; the prepared skins of animals (leather and parchment); and the product of the papyrus, used long before the time of Alexander the Great for the manufacture of paper, and known in Talmudic writings by the same name, as Papir [4550] or Apipeir, [4551] but more frequently by that of Nayyar - probably from the stripes (Nirin) of the plant of which it was made. [4552] But what interests us more, as we remember the tablet' (pinakdion) on which Zacharias wrote the name of the future Baptist, [4553] is the circumstance that it bears not only the same name, Pinaqes or Pinqesa, but that it seems to have been of such common use in Palestine. [4554] . It consisted of thin pieces of wood (the Luach) fastened or strung together. The Mishnah [4555] enumerates three kinds of them: those where the wood was covered with papyrus, [4556] those where it was covered with wax, and those where the wood was left plain to be written on with ink. The latter was of different kinds. Black ink was prepared of soot (the Deyo), or of vegetable or mineral substances. [4557] Gum Arabic and Egyptian (Qumos and Quma) and vitriol (Qanqanthos) seem also to have been used [4558] in writing. It is curious to read of writing in colours and with red ink or Siqra, [4559] and even of a kind

of sympathetic ink, made from the bark of the ash, and brought out by a mixture of vitriol and gum. [4560] We also read of a gold-ink, as that in which the copy of the Law was written which, according to the legend, the High-Priest had sent to Ptolemy Philadelphus for the purpose of being translated into Greek by the LXX. [4561] But the Talmud prohibits copies of the Law in gold letters, [4562] or more probably such in which the Divine Name was written in gold letters. [4563] [4564] In writing, a pen, Qolemos, made of reed (Qaneh [4565]) was used, and the reference in an Apostolic Epistle [4566] to writing with ink and pen' (di mlanos ka kalmou) finds even its verbal counterpart in the Midrash, which speaks of Milanin and Qolemin (ink and pens). Indeed, the public writer' - a trade very common in the East [4567] - went about with a Qolemos, or reed-pen, behind his ear, as a badge of his employment. [4568] [4569] With the reed-pen we ought to mention its necessary accompaniments: the penknife, [4570] the inkstand (which, when double, for black and red ink, was sometimes made of earthenware, Qalamarim [4571]), and the ruler [4572] - it being regarded by the stricter set as unlawful to write any words of Holy Writ on any unlined material, no doubt to ensure correct writing and reading. [4573] [4574]In all this we have not referred to the practice of writing on leather specially prepared with salt and flour, [4575] nor to the Qelaph, or parchment in the stricter sense. [4576] For we are here chiefly interested in the common mode of writing, that on the Pinaqes, or tablet,' and especially on that covered with wax. Indeed, a little vessel holding wax was generally attached to it (Pinaqes sheyesh bo beth Qibbul shaavah [4577]). On such a tablet they wrote, of course, not with a reed-pen, but with a stylus, generally of iron. This instrument consisted of two parts, which might be detached from each other: the hard pointed writer' (Kothebh), and the blotter' (Mocheq) which was flat and thick for smoothing out letters and words which had been written or rather graven in the wax. [4578] There can be no question that acknowledgments of debt, and other transactions, were ordinarily written down on such wax-covered tablets; for not only is direct reference made to it, [4579] but there are special provisions in regard to documents where there are such erasures, or rather effacements: such as, that they require to be noted in the document, [4580] under what conditions and how the witnesses are in such cases to affix their signatures, [4581] just as there are particular injunctions how witnesses who could not write are to affix their mark. But although we have thus ascertained that the bonds' in the Parable must have been written on wax - or else, possibly, on parchment - where the Mocheq, or blotter, could easily efface the numbers, we have also evidence that they were not, as so often, written on tablets' (the Pinaques). For, the Greek term, by which these bonds' or writings' are designated in the Parable (grmmata [4582]), is the same as is sometimes used in Rabbinic writings (Gerammation) for an acknowledgment of debt; [4583] [4584] the Hebraised Greek word corresponding to the more commonly used (Syriac) term Shitre (Shetar), which also primarily denotes writings,' and is used specifically for such acknowledgments. [4585] [4586] Of these there were two kinds. The most formal Shetar was not signed by the debtor at all, but only by the witnesses, who were to write their names (or marks) immediately (not more than two lines) below the text of the document, to prevent fraud. Otherwise, the document would not possess legal validity. Generally, it was further attested by the Sanhedrin [4587] of three, who signed in such manner as not to leave even one line vacant. [4588] Such a document contained the names of creditor and debtor, the amount owing, and the date, together with a clause attaching the property of the debtor. In fact, it was a kind of mortgage; all sale of property being, as with us, subject to such a mortgage, [4589] which bore the name Acharayuth (probably, guarantee' [4590]) When the debt was paid, the legal obligation was simply returned to the debtor; if paid in part,

either a new bond was written, or a receipt given, which was called Shobher [4591] or Tebhara, because it broke' the debt.But in many respects different were those bonds which were acknowledgements of debt for purchases made, such as we suppose those to have been which are mentioned in the Parable. In such cases it was not uncommon to dispense altogether with witnesses, and the document was signed by the debtor himself. In bonds of this kind, the creditor had not the benefit of a mortgage in case of sale. We have expressed our belief that the Parable refers to such documents, and we are confirmed in this by the circumstance that they not only bear a different name from the more formal bonds (the Shitre), but one which is perhaps the most exact rendering of the Greek term ({hebrew}, [4592] a writing of hand,' note of hand' [4593]). For completeness' sake we add, in regard to the farming of land, that two kinds of leases were in use. Under the first, called Shetar Arisuth, the lessee (Aris = oros [4594]) received a certain portion of the produce. He might be a lessee for life, for a specified number of years, or even a hereditary tiller of the ground; or he might sub-let it to another person. [4595] Under the second kind of lease, the farmer - or Meqabbel - entered into a contract for payment either in kind, when he undertook to pay a stipulated and unvarying amount of produce, in which case he was called a Chokher (Chakhur or Chakhira [4596]), or else a certain annual rental in money, when he was called a Sokher. [4597]2. From this somewhat lengthened digression, we return to notice the moral of the Parable. [4598] It is put in these words: Make to yourselves friends out of [by means of] the Mamon of unrighteousness, that, when it shall fail, [4599] they may receive you into everlasting tabernacles.' From what has been previously stated, the meaning of these words offers little serious difficulty. We must again recall the circumstances, that they were primarily addressed to converted publicans and sinners, to whom the expression Mamon of unrighteousness' - of which there are close analogies, and even an exact transcript [4600] in the Targum - would have an obvious meaning. Among us, also, there are not a few who may feel its aptness as they look back on the past, while to all it carries a much needed warning. Again, the addition of the definite article leaves no doubt, that the everlasting tabernacles' mean the well-known heavenly home; in which sense the term tabernacle' is, indeed, already used in the Old Testament. [4601] [4602] But as a whole we regard it (as previously hinted) as an adaptation to the Parable of the well-known Rabbinic saying, that there were certain graces of which a man enjoyed the benefit here, while the capital, so to speak, remained for the next world. And if a more literal interpretation were demanded, we cannot but feel the duty incumbent on those converted publicans, nay, in a sense, on us all, to seek to make for ourselves of the Mamon - be it of money, of knowledge, of strength, or opportunities, which to many has, and to all may so easily, become that of unrighteousness' - such lasting and spiritual application: gain such friends by means of it, that, when it fails,' as fail it must when we die, all may not be lost, but rather meet us in heaven. Thus would each deed done for God with this Mamon become a friend to greet us as we enter the eternal world.3. The suitableness both of the Parable and of its application to the audience of Christ appears from its similarity to what occurs in Jewish writings. Thus, the reasoning that the Law could not have been given to the nations of the world, since they have not observed the seven Noachic commandments (which Rabbinism supposes to have been given to the Gentiles), is illustrated by a Parable in which a king is represented as having employed two administrators (Apiterophin); one over the gold and silver, and the other over the straw. The latter rendered himself suspected, and - continues the Parable - when he complained that he had not been set over the gold and silver, they said unto him: Thou fool, if thou hast rendered thyself suspected in regard to the straw, shall

they commit to thee the treasure of gold and silver? [4603] And we almost seem to hear the very words of Christ: He that is faithful [4604] in that which is least, is faithful also in much,' in this of the Midrash: The Holy One, blessed be His Name, does not give great things to a man until he has been tried in a small matter;' which is illustrated by the history of Moses and of David, who were both called to rule from the faithful guiding of sheep. [4605] Considering that the Jewish mind would be familiar with such modes of illustration, there could have been no misunderstanding of the words of Christ. These converted publicans might think - and so may some of us - that theirs was a very narrow sphere of service, one of little importance; or else, like the Pharisees, and like so many others among us, that faithful administration of the things of this world (the Mamon of unrighteousness') had no bearing on the possession of the true riches in the next world. In answer to the first difficulty, Christ points out that the principle of service is the same, whether applied to much or to little; that the one was, indeed, meet preparation for, and, in truth, the test of the other. [4606] He that is faithful' - or, to paraphrase the word (pists), he that has proved himself, is accredited (answering to {hebrew}) - in the least, is also faithful [accredited] in much; and who in the least is unjust is also in much unjust.' Therefore, if a man failed in faithful service of God in his worldly matters - in the language of the Parable, if he were not faithful in the Mamon of unrighteousness - could he look for the true Mamon, or riches of the world to come? Would not his unfaithfulness in the lower stewardship imply unfitness for the higher? And - still in the language of the Parable - if they had not proved faithful in mere stewardship, in that which was another's,' could it be expected that they would be exalted from stewardship to proprietorship? And the ultimate application of all was this, that dividedness was impossible in the service of God. [4607] It is impossible for the disciple to make separation between spiritual matters and worldly, and to attempt serving God in the one and Mamon in the other. There is absolutely no such distinction to the disciple, and our common usage of the words secular and spiritual is derived from a terrible misunderstanding and mistake. To the secular, nothing is spiritual; and to the spiritual, nothing is secular: No servant can serve two Masters; ye cannot serve God and Mamon.II. The Parable of Dives and Lazarus. [4608] - Although primarily spoken to the Pharisees, and not to the disciples, yet, as will presently appear, it was spoken for the disciples. The words of Christ had touched more than one sore spot in the hearts of the Pharisees. This consecration of all to God as the necessary condition of high spiritual service, and then of higher spiritual standing - as it were ownership' - such as they claimed, was a very hard saying. It touched their covetousness. They would have been quite ready to hear, nay, they believed that the true' treasure had been committed to their trust. But that its condition was, that they should prove themselves God-devoted in the unrighteous Mamon,' faithful in the employment of it in that for which it was entrusted to their stewardship, this was not to be borne. Nor yet, that such prospects should be held out to publicans and sinners, while they were withheld from those who were the custodians of the Law and of the Prophets. But were they faithful to the Law? And as to their claim of being the owners,' the Parable of the Rich Owner and of his bearing would exhibit how unfaithful they were in much' as well as in little,' in what they claimed as owners as well as in their stewardship - and this, on their own showing of their relations to publicans and sinners: the Lazarus who lay at their doors.Thus viewed, the verses which introduce the second Parable (that of Dives and Lazarus) will appear, not detached sayings,' as some commentators would have us believe, but most closely connected with the Parable to which they form the Preface. Only, here especially, must we remember, that we have only Notes of Christ's Discourse, made years before by one who had heard it, and

containing the barest outline - as it were, the stepping-stones - of the argument as it proceeded. Let us try to follow it. As the Pharisees heard what Christ said, their covetousness was touched. It is said, moreover, that they derided Him - literally, turned up their noses at Him.' [4609] The mocking gestures, with which they pointed to His publican-disciples, would be accompanied by mocking words in which they would extol and favourably compare their own claims and standing with that of those new disciples of Christ. Not only to refute but to confute, to convict, and, if possible, to convince them, was the object of Christ's Discourse and Parable. One by one their pleas were taken up and shown to be utterly untenable. They were persons who by outward righteousness and pretences sought to appear just before men, but God knew their hearts; and that which was exalted among men, their Pharisaic standing and standing aloof, was abomination before Him. [4610] These two points form the main subject of the Parable. Its first object was to show the great difference between the before men' and the before God;' between Dives as he appears to men in this world, and as he is before God and will be in the next world. Again, the second main object of the Parable was to illustrate that their Pharisaic standing and standing aloof - the bearing of Dives in reference to a Lazarus - which was the glory of Pharisaism before men, was an abomination before God. Yet a third object of the Parable was in reference to their covetousness, the selfish use which they made of their possessions - their Mamon. But a selfish was an unrighteous use; and, as such, would meet with sorer retribution than in the case of an unfaithful steward. But we leave for the prseent the comparative analysis of the Parable to return to the introductory words of Christ. Having shown that the claims of the Pharisees and their standing aloof from poor sinners were an abomination before God, Christ combats these grounds of their bearing, that they were the custodians and observers of the Law and of the Prophets, while those poor sinners had no claims upon the Kingdom of God. Yes - but the Law and the Prophets had their terminus ad quem in John the Baptist, who brought the good tidings of the Kingdom of God.' Since then every one' had to enter it by personal resolution and force.' [4611] Yes - it was true that the Law could not fail in one tittle of it. [4612] But, notoriously and in everyday life, the Pharisees, who thus spoke of the Law and appealed to it, were the constant and open breakers of it. Witness here their teaching and practice concerning divorce, which really involved a breach of the seventh commandment. [4613]Thus, when bearing in mind that, as previously stated, we have here only the heads,' or rather the stepping stones,' of Christ's argument - from notes by a hearer at the time, which were afterwards given to St. Luke - we clearly perceive, how closely connected are the seemingly disjointed sentences which preface the Parable, and how aptly they introduce it. The Parable itself is strictly of the Pharisees and their relation to the publicans and sinners' whom they despised, and to whose stewardship they opposed thoughts of their own proprietorship. With infinite wisdom and depth the Parable tells in two directions: in regard to their selfish use of the literal riches - their covetousness - and in regard to their selfish use of the figurative riches: their Pharisaic righteousness, which left poor Lazarus at their door to the dogs and to famine, not bestowing on him aught from their supposed rich festive banquets.On the other hand, it will be necessary in the interpretation of this Parable to keep in mind, that its Parabolic details must not be exploited, nor doctrines of any kind derived from them, either as to the character of the other world, the question of the duration of future punishments, or the possible moral improvement of those in Gehinnom. All such things are foreign to the Parable, which is only intended as a type, or exemplification and illustration, of what is intended to be taught. And, if proof were required, it would surely be enough to remind ourselves, that this Parable is addressed to the Pharisees, to

whom Christ would scarcely have communicated details about the other world, on which He was so reticent in His teaching to the disciples. The Parable naturally falls into three parts.1. Dives and Lazarus before and after death, [4614] or the contrast between before men' and before God;' the unrighteous use of riches - literal and figurative; and the relations of the Pharisaic Dives to the publican Lazarus, as before men and as before God: the exalted among men' an abomination before God.' And the application of the Parable is here the more telling, that alms were so highly esteemed among the Pharisees, and that the typical Pharisee is thus set before them as, on their own showing, the typical sinner.The Parable opens by presenting to us a rich man' clothed in purple and byssus, joyously faring every day in splendor.' All here is in character. His dress is described as the finest and most costly, for byssus and purple were the most expensive materials, only inferior to silk, which, if genuine and unmixed - for at least three kinds of silk are mentioned in ancient Jewish writings - was worth its weight in gold. Both byssus - of which it is not yet quite certain, whether it was of hemp or cotton - and purple were indeed manufactured in Palestine, but the best byssus (at least at that time [4615]) came from Egypt and India. The white garments of the High-Priest on the Day of Atonement were made of it. [4616] To pass over exaggerated accounts of its costliness, [4617] the High-Priest's dress of Pelusian linen for the morning service of the Day of Atonement was said to have cost about 36l.; that of Indian linen for the evening of the same day about 24l. Of course, this stuff would, if of home-manufacture, whether made in Galilee or in Judæa, [4618] be much cheaper. As regarded purple, which was obtained from the coasts of Tyre, [4619] wool of violet-purple was sold about that period by weight [4620] at the rate of about 3l. the Roman pound, though it would, of course, considerably vary in price.Quite in accordance with this luxuriousness - unfortunately not uncommon among the very high-placed Jews, since the Talmud (though, no doubt, exaggeratedly) speaks of the dress of a corrupt High-Priest as having cost upwards of 300l. [4621] - was the feasting every day, the description of which conveys the impression of company, merriment, and splendour. All this is, of course, intended to set forth the selfish use which this man made of his wealth, and to point the contrast of his bearing towards Lazarus. Here also every detail is meant to mark the pitiableness of the case, as it stood out before Dives. The very name - not often mentioned in any other real, and never in any other Parabolic story - tells it: Lazarus, Laazar, a common abbreviation of Elazar, as it were, God help him!' Then we read that he was cast' [4622] (bbleto) at his gateway, as if to mark that the bearers were glad to throw down their unwelcome burden. [4623] Laid there, he was in full view of the Pharisee as he went out or came in, or sat in his courtyard. And as he looked at him, he was covered with a loathsome disease; as he heard him, he uttered a piteous request to be filled with what fell from the rich man's table. Yet nothing was done to help his bodily misery, and, as the word desiring' (pithumn) implies, his longing for the crumbs' remained unsatisfied. So selfish in the use of his wealth was Dives, so wretched Lazarus in his view; so self-satisfied and unpitying was the Pharisee, so miserable in his sight and so needy the publican and sinner. Yea, even the dogs came and licked his sores' - for it is not to be understood as an alleviation, but as an aggravation of his ills, that he was left to the dogs, which in Scripture are always represented as unclean animals. So it was before men. But how was it before God? There the relation was reversed. The beggar died - no more of him here. But the Angels carried him away into Abraham's bosom.' Leaving aside for the present [4624] the Jewish teaching concerning the after death,' we are struck with the sublime simplicity of the figurative language used by Christ, as compared with the wild and sensuous fancies of later Rabbinic teaching on the subject. It is, indeed, true, that we must not

look in this Parabolic language for Christ's teaching about the after death.' On the other hand, while He would say nothing that was essentially divergent from, at least, the purest views entertained on the subject at that time - since otherwise the object of the Parabolic illustration would have been lost - yet, whatever He did say must, when stripped of its Parabolic details, be consonant with fact. Thus, the carrying up of the soul of the righteous by Angels is certainly in accordance with Jewish teaching, though stripped of all legendary details, such as about the number and the greetings of the Angels. [4625] But it is also fully in accordance with Christian thought of the ministry of Angels. Again, as regards the expression Abraham's bosom,' it occurs, although not frequently, in Jewish writings. [4626] [4627] On the other hand, the appeal to Abraham as our father is so frequent, his presence and merits are so constantly invoked; notably, he is so expressly designated as he who receives ({hebrew}) the penitent into Paradise, [4628] that we can see how congruous especially to the higher Jewish teaching, which dealt not in coarsely sensuous descriptions of Gan Eden, or Paradise, the phrase Abraham's bosom' must have been. Nor surely can it be necessary to vindicate the accord with Christian thinking of a figurative expression, that likens us to children lying lovingly in the bosom of Abraham as our spiritual father.2. Dives and Lazarus after death: [4629] The great contrast' fully realised, and how to enter into the Kingdom. - Here also the main interest centres in Dives. He also has died and been buried. Thus ends all his exaltedness before men. The next scene is in Hades or Sheol, the place of the disembodied spirits before the final Judgment. It consists of two divisions: the one of consolation, with all the faithful gathered unto Abraham as their father; the other of fiery torment. Thus far in accordance with the general teaching of the New Testament. As regards the details, they evidently represent the views current at the time among the Jews. According to them, the Garden of Eden and the Tree of Life were the abode of the blessed. [4630] Nay, in common belief, the words of Gen. ii.10: a river went out of Eden to water the garden,' indicated that this Eden was distinct from, and superior to, the garden in which Adam had been originally placed. [4631] With reference to it, we read that the righteous in Gan Eden see the wicked in Gehinnom, and rejoice; [4632] and, similarly, that the wicked in Gehinnom see the righteous sitting beautified in Gan Eden, and their souls are troubled. [4633] Still more marked is the parallelism in a legend told [4634] about two wicked companions, of whom one had died impenitent, while the other on seeing it had repented. After death, the impenitent in Gehinnom saw the happiness of his former companion, and murmured. When told that the difference of their fate was due to the other's penitence, he wished to have space assigned for it, but was informed that this life (the eve of the Sabbath) was the time for making provision for the next (the Sabbath). Again, it is consonant with what were the views of the Jews, that conversations could be held between dead persons, of which several legendary instances are given in the Talmud. [4635] [4636] The torment, especially of thirst, of the wicked, is repeatedly mentioned in Jewish writings. Thus, in one place, [4637] the fable of Tantalus is apparently repeated. The righteous is seen beside delicious springs, and the wicked with his tongue parched at the brink of a river, the waves of which are constantly receding from him. [4638] But there is this very marked and characteristic contrast, that in the Jewish legend the beatified is a Pharisee, while the sinner tormented with thirst is a Publican! Above all, and as marking the vast difference between Jewish ideas and Christ's teaching, we notice that there is no analogy in Rabbinic writings to the statement in the Parable, that there is a wide and impassable gulf between Paradise and Gehenna.To return to the Parable. When we read that Dives in torments lifted up his eyes,' it was, no doubt, for help, or, at least, alleviation. Then he first

perceived and recognised the reversed relationship. The text emphatically repeats here: And he,' - literally, this one (ka atos), as if now, for the first time, he realised, but only to misunderstand and misapply it, how easily superabundance might minister relief to extreme need - calling (viz., upon = invoking) said: "Father Abraham, have mercy upon me, and send Lazarus.'" The invocation of Abraham, as having the power, and of Abraham as Father,' was natural on the part of a Jew. And our Lord does not here express what really was, but only introduces Jews as speaking in accordance with the popular notions. Accordingly, it does not necessarily imply on the part of Dives either glorification of carnal descent (gloriatio carnis, as Bengel has it), nor a latent idea that he might still dispose of Lazarus. A Jew would have appealed to Father Abraham' under such or like circumstances, and many analogous statements might be quoted in proof. But all the more telling is it, that the rich Pharisee should behold in the bosom of Abraham, whose child he specially claimed to be, what, in his sight, had been poor Lazarus, covered with moral sores, and, religiously speaking, thrown down outside his gate - not only not admitted to the fellowship of his religious banquet, but not even to be fed by the crumbs that fell from his table, and to be left to the dogs. And it was the climax of the contrast that he should now have to invoke, and that in vain, his ministry, seeking it at the hands of Abraham. And here we also recall the previous Parable about making, ere it fail, friends by means of the Mamon of unrighteousness, that they may welcome us in the everlasting tabernacles. It should be remembered that Dives now limits his request to the humblest dimensions, asking only that Lazarus might be sent to dip the tip of his finger in the cooling liquid, and thus give him even the smallest relief. To this Abraham replies, though in a tone of pity: Child,' yet decidedly - showing him, first, the rightness of the present position of things; and, secondly, the impossibility of any alteration, such as he had asked. Dives had, in his lifetime, received his good things; that had been his things, he had chosen them as his part, and used them for self, without communicating of them. And Lazarus had received evil things. Now Lazarus was comforted, and Dives in torment. It was the right order - not that Lazarus was comforted because in this world he had suffered, nor yet that Dives was in torment because in this world he had had riches. But Lazarus received there the comfort which had been refused to him on earth, and the man who had made this world his good, and obtained there his portion, of which he had refused even the crumbs to the most needy, now received the meet reward of his unpitying, unloving, selfish life. But, besides all this, which in itself was right and proper, Dives had asked what was impossible: no intercourse could be held between Paradise and Gehenna, and on this account [4639] a great and impassable chasm existed between the two, so that, even if they would, they could not, pass from heaven to hell, nor yet from hell to those in bliss. And, although doctrinal statements should not be drawn from Parabolic illustrations, we would suggest that, at least so far as this Parable goes, it seems to preclude the hope of a gradual change or transition after a life lost in the service of sin and self.3. Application of the Parable, [4640] showing how the Law and the Prophets cannot fail, and how we must now press into the Kingdom. It seems a strange misconception on the part of some commentators, that the next request of Dives indicates a commencing change of mind on his part. To begin with, this part of the Parable is only intended to illustrate the need, and the sole means of conversion to God - the appeal to the Law and the Prophets being the more apt that the Pharisees made their boast of them, and the refusal of any special miraculous interposition the more emphatic, that the Pharisees had been asking for a sign from heaven.' Besides, it would require more than ordinary charity to discover a moral change in the desire that his brothers might - not be converted, but not come to that place of

torment!Dismissing, therefore, this idea, we now find Dives pleading that Lazarus might be sent to his five brothers, who, as we infer, were of the same disposition and life as himself had been, to testify unto them' - the word implying more than ordinary, even earnest, testimony. Presumably, what he so earnestly asked to be attested was, that he, Dives, was in torment; and the expected effect, not of the testimony but of the mission of Lazarus, [4641] whom they are supposed to have known, was, that these, his brothers, might not come to the same place. At the same time, the request seems to imply an attempt at self-justification, as if, during his life, he had not had sufficient warning. Accordingly, the reply of Abraham is no longer couched in a tone of pity, but implies stern rebuke of Dives. They need no witness-bearer: they have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them. If testimony be needed, their has been given, and it is sufficient - a reply this, which would specially appeal to the Pharisees. And when Dives, now, perhaps, as much bent on self-justification as on the message to his brothers, remonstrates that, although they had not received such testimony, yet if one come to them from the dead,' they would repent, the final, and, as, alas! history has shown since the Resurrection of Christ, the true answer is, that if they hear not [give not hearing to] Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be influenced [4642] [moved: their intellects to believe, their wills to repent], if one rose from the dead.'And here the Parable, and the warning to the Pharisees, abruptly break off. When next we hear the Master's voice, [4643] it is in loving application to the disciples of some of the lessons which were implied in what He had spoken to the Pharisees.

CHAPTER XIX. THE THREE LAST PARABLES OF THE PERÆAN SERIES: THE UNRIGHTEOUS JUDGE - THE SELF-RIGHTEOUS PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN - THE UNMERCIFUL SERVANT

(St. Luke xviii.1-14; St. Matt. xviii.23-35.) If we were to seek confirmation of the suggestion, that these last and the two preceding Parables are grouped together under a common viewpoint, such as that of Righteousness, the character and position of the Parables now to be examined would supply it. For, while the Parable of the Unjust Judge evidently bears close affinity to those that had preceded - especially to that of him who persisted in his request for bread [4644] - it evidently refers not, as the other, to man's present need, but to the Second Coming of Christ. The prayer, the perseverance, the delay, and the ultimate answer of which it speaks, are all connected with it. [4645] Indeed, it follows on what had passed on this subject immediately before - first, between the Pharisees and Christ, [4646] and then between Christ and the disciples. [4647] Again, we must bear in mind that between the Parable of Dives and Lazarus and that of the Unjust Judge, not indeed, a great interval of time, but most momentous events, had intervened. These were: the visit of Jesus to Bethany, the raising of Lazarus, the Jerusalem council against Christ, the flight to Ephraim, [4648] a brief stay and preaching there, and the commencement of His last journey to Jerusalem. [4649] During this last slow journey from the borders of Galilee to Jerusalem, we suppose the Discourses [4650] and the Parable about the Coming of the Son of Man to have been spoken. And although such utterances will be best considered in connection with Christ's later and full Discourses about The Last Things,' we readily perceive, even at this stage, how, when He set His Face towards Jerusalem, there to be offered up, thoughts and words concerning the End' may have entered into all His teaching, and so have given occasion for the questions of the Pharisees and disciples, and for the answers of Christ, alike by Discourse and in Parable. The most common and specious, but also the most serious mistake take in reference to the Parable of the Unjust Judge,' is to regard it as implying that, just as the poor widow insisted in her petition and was righted because of her insistence, so the disciples should persist in prayer and would be heard because of their insistence. But this is an entirely false interpretation. When treating of the Parable of the Unrighteous Steward, we disclaimed all merely mechanical ideas of prayer, as if God heard us for our many repetitions. This error must here also be carefully avoided. The inference from the Parable is not, that the Church will be ultimately vindicated because she perseveres in prayer, but that she so perseveres, because God will surely right her cause: it is not, that insistence in prayer is the cause of its answer, but that the certainty of that which is asked for should lead to continuance in prayer, even when all around seems to forbid the hope of answer. This is the lesson to be learned from a comparison of the Unjust Judge with the Just and Holy God in His dealings with His own. If the widow persevered, knowing that, although no other consideration, human or Divine, would influence the Unjust Judge, yet her insistence would secure its object, how much more should we not faint,' but continue in prayer, who are appealing to God, Who has His

people and His cause at heart, even though He delay, remembering also that even this is for their sakes who pray. And this is fully expressed in the introductory words. He spake also a Parable to them with reference [4651] to the need be (prs t den) of their [4652] always praying and not fainting.' [4653] The remarks just made will remove what otherwise might seem another serious difficulty. If it be asked, how the conduct of the Unjust Judge could serve as illustration of what might be expected from God, we answer, that the lesson in the Parable is not from the similarity but from the contrast between the Unrighteous human and the Righteous Divine Judge. Hear what the Unrighteous Judge saith. But God [mark the emphatic position of the word], shall He not indeed [o m] vindicate [the injuries of, do judgment for] His elect . . .?' In truth, this mode of argument is perhaps the most common in Jewish Parables, and occurs on almost every page of ancient Rabbinic commentaries. It is called the Qal vaChomer, light and heavy,' and answers to our reasoning a fortiori or de minore ad majus (from the less to the greater). [4654] According to the Rabbis, ten instances of such reasoning occur in the Old Testament [4655] itself. [4656] Generally, such reasoning is introduced by the words Qal vaChomer; often it is prefaced by, Al achath Kammah veKammah, against one how much and how much,' that is, how much more.' Thus, it is argued that, if a King of flesh and blood' did so and so, shall not the King of Kings, &c.; or, if the sinner received such and such, shall not the righteous, &c.? In the present Parable the reasoning would be: If the Judge of Unrighteousness' said that he would vindicate, shall not the Judge of all Righteousness do judgment on behalf of His Elect? In fact, we have an exact Rabbinic parallel to the thought underlying, and the lesson derived from, this Parable. When describing, how at the preaching of Jonah Nineveh repented and cried to God, His answer to the loud persistent cry of the people is thus explained: The bold (he who is unabashed) conquers even a wicked person [to grant him his request], how much more the All-Good of the world!' [4657] The Parable opens by laying down as a general principle the necessity and duty of the Disciples always to pray - the precise meaning being defined by the opposite, or limited clause: not to faint,' that is, not to become weary.' [4658] The word always' must not be understood in respect of time, as if it meant continuously, but at all times, in the sense of under all circumstances, however apparently adverse, when it might seem as if an answer could not come, and we would therefore be in danger of fainting' or becoming weary. This rule applies here primarily to that weariness' which might lead to the cessation of prayer for the Coming of the Lord, or of expectancy of it, during the long period when it seems as if He delayed His return, nay, as if increasingly there were no likelihood of it. But it may also be applied to all similar circumstances, when prayer seems so long unanswered that weariness in praying threatens to overtake us. Thus, it is argued, even in Jewish writings, that a man should never be deterred from, nor cease praying, the illustration by Qal vaChomer being from the case of Moses, who knew that it was decreed he should not enter the land, and yet continued praying about it. [4659] The Parable introduces to us a Judge in a city, and a widow. Except where a case was voluntarily submitted for arbitration rather than judgment, or judicial advice was sought of a sage, one man could not have formed a Jewish tribunal. Besides, his mode of speaking and acting is inconsistent with such a hypothesis. He must therefore have been one of the Judges, or municipal authorities, appointed by Herod or the Romans, perhaps a Jew, but not a Jewish Judge. Possibly, he may have been a police-magistrate, or one who had some function of that kind delegated to him. We know that, at least in Jerusalem, there were two stipendiary magistrates (Dayyaney Gezeroth [4660] whose duty it was to see to the observance of all police-regulations and the prevention of crime. Unlike the regular Judges, who

attended only on certain days and hours, [4661] and were unpaid, these magistrates were, so to speak, always on duty, and hence unable to engage in any other occupation. It was probably for this reason that they were paid out of the Temple-Treasury, [4662] and received so large a salary as 225l., or, if needful, even more. [4663] On account of this, perhaps also for their unjust exactions, Jewish wit designated them, by a play on the words, as Dayyaney Gezeloth - Robber-Judges, instead of their real title of Dayyaney Gezeroth (Judges of Prohibitions, or else of Punishments). [4664] It may have been that there were such Jewish magistrates in other places also. Josephus speaks of local magistracies. [4665] [4666] At any rate there were in every locality police-officials, who watched over order and law. [4667] The Talmud speaks in very depreciatory terms of these village-Judges' (Dayyaney deMegista), in opposition to the town tribunals (Bey Davar), and accuses them of ignorance, arbitrariness, and covetousness, so that for a dish of meat they would pervert justice. [4668] Frequent instances are also mentioned of gross injustice and bribery in regard to the non-Jewish Judges in Palestine. It is to such a Judge that the Parable refers - one who was consciously, openly, and avowedly [4669] inaccessible to the highest motive, the fear of God, and not even restrained by the lower consideration of regard for public opinion. It is an extreme case, intended to illustrate the exceeding unlikelihood of justice being done. For the same purpose, the party seeking justice at his hands is described as a poor, unprotected widow. But we must also bear in mind, in the interpretation of this Parable, that the Church, whom she represents, is also widowed in the absence of her Lord. To return - this widow came' to the Unjust Judge (the imperfect tense in the original indicating repeated, even continuous coming), with the urgent demand to be vindicated of her adversary, that is, that the Judge should make legal inquiry, and by a decision set her right as against him at whose hands she was suffering wrong. For reasons of his own he would not; and this continued for a while. At last, not from any higher principle, nor even from regard for public opinion - both of which, indeed, as he avowed to himself, had no weight with him - he complied with her request, as the text (literally translated) has it: Yet at any rate [4670] because this widow troubleth me, I will do justice for her, lest, in the end, coming she bruise me,' [4671] - do personal violence to me, attack me bodily. Then follows the grand inference from it: If the Judge of Unrighteousness' speak thus, shall not the Judge of all Righteousness - God - do judgment, vindicate [by His Coming to judgment and so setting right the wrong done to His Church] His Elect, which cry to Him day and night, although He suffer long on account of them' - delay His final interposition of judgment and mercy, and that, not as the Unjust Judge, but for their own sakes, in order that the number of the Elect may all be gathered in, and they fully prepared? Difficult as the rendering of this last clause admittedly is, our interpretation of it seems confirmed by the final application of this Parable. [4672] Taking the previous verse along with it, we wouldhave this double Parallelism: But God, shall He not vindicate [do judgment on behalf of] His Elect?' [4673] I tell you, that He will do judgment on behalf of them shortly' - this word being chosen rather than speedily' (as in the A. and R.V.), because the latter might convey the idea of a sudden interposition, such as is not implied in the expression. This would be the first Parallelism; the second this: Although He suffer long [delay His final interposition] on account of them' (verse 7), to which the second clause of verse 8 would correspond, as offering the explanation and vindication: But the Son of Man, when He have come, shall He find the faith upon the earth?' It is a terribly sad question, as put by Him Who is the Christ: After all this long-suffering delay, shall He find the faith upon the earth - intellectual belief on the part of one class, and on the part of the Church the faith of the heart which trusts in, longs, and prays, because it expects and

looks for His Coming, all undisturbed by the prevailing unbelief around, only quickened by it to more intensity of prayer! Shall He find it? Let the history of the Church, nay, each man's heart, make answer! 2. The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, which follows, [4674] is only internally connected with that of the Unjust Judge.' It is not unrighteousness, but of self-righteousness - and this, both in its positive and negative aspects: as trust in one's own state, and as contempt of others. Again, it has also this connection with the previous Parable, that, whereas that of the Unrighteous Judge pointed to continuance, this to humility in prayer. The introductory clause shows that it has no connection in point of time with what had preceded, although the interval between the two may, of course, have been very short. Probably, something had taken place, which is not recorded, to occasion this Parable, which, if not directly addressed to the Pharisees, [4675] is to such as are of Pharisaic spirit. It brings before us two men going up to the Temple - whether at the hour of prayer,' or otherwise, is not stated. Remembering that, with the exception of the Psalms for the day and the interval for a certain prescribed prayer, the service in the Temple was entirely sacrificial, we are thankful for such glimpses, which show that, both in the time of public service, and still more at other times, the Temple was made the place of private prayer. [4676] On the present occasion the two men, who went together to the entrance of the Temple, represented the two religious extremes in Jewish society. To the entrance of the Temple, but no farther, did the Pharisee and the Publican go together. Within the sacred enclosure - before God, where man should least have made it, began their separation. The Pharisee put himself by himself, [4677] and prayed thus: O God, I thank Thee that I am not as the rest of men - extortioners, unjust, adulterers - nor also as this Publican [there].' Never, perhaps, were words of thanksgiving spoken in less thankfulness than these. For, thankfulness implies the acknowledgement of a gift; hence, a sense of not having had ourselves what we have received; in other words, then, a sense of our personal need, or humility. But the very first act of this Pharisee had been to separate himself from all the other worshippers, and notably from the Publican, whom, as his words show, he had noticed, and looked down upon. His thanksgiving referred not to what he had received, but to the sins of others by which they were separated from him, and to his own meritorious deeds by which he was separated from them. Thus, his words expressed what his attitude indicated; and both were the expression, not of thankfulness, but of boastfulness. It was the same as their bearing at the feast and in public places; the same as their contempt and condemnation of the rest of men,' and especially the publicans;' the same that even their designation - Pharisees,' Separated ones,' implied. The rest of men' might be either the Gentiles, or, more probably, the common unlearned people, the Am haArets, whom they accused or suspected of every possible sin, according to their fundamental principle: The unlearned cannot be pious.' And, in their sense of that term, they were right - and in this lies the condemnation of their righteousness. And, most painful though it be, remembering the downright earnestness and zeal of these men, it must be added that, as we read the Liturgy of the Synagogue, we come ever and again upon such and similar thanksgiving - that they are not as the rest of men.' [4678] But this was not all. From looking down upon others the Pharisee proceeded to look up to himself. Here Talmudic writings offer painful parallelisms. They are full of references to the merits of the just, to the merits and righteousness of the fathers,' or else of Israel in taking upon itself the Law. And for the sake of these merits and of that righteousness, Israel, as a nation, expects general acceptance, pardon, and temporal benefits [4679] - for, all spiritual benefits Israel as a nation, and the pious in Israel individually, possess already, nor do they need to get them from heaven, since

they can and do work them out for themselves. And here the Pharisee in the Parable significantly dropped even the form of thanksgiving. The religious performances which he enumerated are those which mark the Pharisee among the Pharisees: I fast twice a week, and I give tithes of all that I acquire.' [4680] The first of these was in pursuance of the custom of some more righteous than the rest,' who, as previously explained, fasted on the second and fifth days of the week (Mondays and Thursdays). [4681] But, perhaps, we should not forget that these were also the regular market days, when the country-people came to the towns, and there were special Services in the Synagogues, and the local Sanhedrin met - so that these saints in Israel would, at the same time, attract and receive special notice for their fasts. As for the boast about giving tithes of all that he acquired - and not merely of his land, fruits, &c. - it has already been explained, [4682] that this was one of the distinctive characteristics of the sect of the Pharisees.' Their practice in this respect may be summed up in these words of the Mishnah: [4683] He tithes all that he eats, all that he sells, and all that he buys, and he is not a guest with an unlearned person [Am haArets, so as not possibly to partake of what may have been left untithed].'Although it may not be necessary, yet one or two quotations will help to show how truly this picture of the Pharisee was taken from life. Thus, the following prayer of a Rabbi is recorded: I thank Thee, O Lord my God, that Thou hast put my part with those who sit in the Academy, and not with those who sit at the corners [money-changers and traders]. For, I rise early and they rise early: I rise early to the words of the Law, and they to vain things. I labour and they labour: I labour and receive a reward, they labour and receive no reward. I run and they run: I run to the life of the world to come, and they to the pit of destruction.' [4684] Even more closely parallel is this thanksgiving, which a Rabbi puts into the mouth of Israel: Lord of the world, judge me not as those who dwell in the big towns [such as Rome]: among whom there is robbery, and uncleanness, and vain and false swearing.' [4685] Lastly, as regards the boastful spirit of Rabbinism, we recall such painful sayings as those of Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai, to which reference has already been made [4686] - notably this, that if there were only two righteous men in the world, he and his son were these; and if only one, it was he! [4687]The second picture, or scene, in the Parable sets before us the reverse state of feeling from that of the Pharisee. Only, we must bear in mind, that, as the Pharisee is not blamed for his giving of thanks, nor yet for his good-doing, real or imaginary, so the prayer of the Publican is not answered, because he was a sinner. In both cases what decides the rejection or acceptance of the prayer is, whether or not it was prayer. The Pharisee retains the righteousness which he had claimed for himself, whatever its value; and the Publican receives the righteousness which he asks: both have what they desire before God. If the Pharisee stood by himself,' apart from others, so did the Publican: standing afar off,' viz. from the Pharisee - quite far back, as became one who felt himself unworthy to mingle with God's people. In accordance with this: He would not so much as lift [4688] his eyes to heaven,' as men generally do in prayer, but smote his [4689] breast' - as the Jews still do in the most solemn part of their confession on the Day of Atonement - saying, God be merciful to me the sinner.' The definite article is used to indicate that he felt, as if he alone were a sinner - nay, the sinner. Not only, as has been well remarked, [4690] does he not think of any one else' (de nemine alio homine cogitat), while the Pharisee had thought of every one else; but, as he had taken a position not in front of, but behind, every one else, so, in contrast to the Pharisee, who had regarded every one but himself as a sinner, the Publican regarded every one else as righteous compared with him the sinner.' And, while the Pharisee felt no need, and uttered no petition, the Publican felt only need, and uttered only petition. The one appealed to himself for

justice, the other appealed to God for mercy.More complete contrast, therefore, could not be imagined. And once more, as between the Pharisee and the Publican, the seeming and the real, that before men and before God, there is sharp contrast, and the lesson which Christ had so often pointed is again set forth, not only in regard to the feelings which the Pharisees entertained, but also to the gladsome tidings of pardon to the lost: I say unto you, This man went down to his house justified above the other' [so according to the better reading, pa kenon]. In other words, the sentence of righteousness as from God with which the Publican went home was above, far better than, the sentence of righteousness as pronounced by himself, with which the Pharisee returned. This saying casts also light on such comparisons as between the righteous' elder brother and the pardoned prodigal, or the ninety-nine that need no repentance' and the lost that was found, or, on such an utterance as this: Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' [4691] And so the Parable ends with the general principle, so often enunciated: For every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.' And with this general teaching of the Parable fully accords the instruction of Christ to His disciples concerning the reception of little children, which immediately follows. [4692] 3. The Parable with which this series closes - that of the Unmerciful Servant, [4693] can be treated more briefly, since the circumstances leading up to it have already been explained in chapter iii. of this Book. We are now reaching the point where the solitary narrative of St. Luke again merges with those of the other Evangelists. That the Parable was spoken before Christ's final journey to Jerusalem, appears from St. Matthew's Gospel. [4694] On the other hand, as we compare what in the Gospel by St. Luke follows on the Parable of the Pharisee and Publican [4695] with the circumstances in which the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant is introduced, we cannot fail to perceive inward connection between the narratives of the two Evangelists, confirming the conclusion, arrived at on other grounds, that the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant belongs to the Peræan series, and closes it.Its connection with the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican lies in this, that Pharisaic self-righteousness and contempt of others may easily lead to unforgiveness and unmercifulness, which are utterly incompatible with a sense of our own need of Divine mercy and forgiveness. And so in the Gospel of St. Matthew this Parable follows on the exhibition of a self-righteous, unmerciful spirit, which would reckon up how often we should forgive, forgetful of our own need of absolute and unlimited pardon at the hands of God [4696] - a spirit, moreover, of harshness, that could look down upon Christ's little ones,' in forgetfulness of our own need perhaps of cutting off even a right hand or foot to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. [4697]In studying this Parable, we must once more remind ourselves of the general canon of the need of distinguishing between what is essential in a Parable, as directly bearing on its lessons, and what is merely introduced for the sake of the Parable itself, to give point to its main teaching. In the present instance, no sober interpreter would regard of the essence of the Parable the King's command to sell into slavery the first debtor, together with his wife and children. It is simply a historical trait, introducing what is analogous circumstances might happen in real life, in order to point the lesson, that a man's strict desert before God is utter hopeless, and eternal ruin and loss. Similarly, when the promise of the debtor is thus introduced: Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all,' it can only be to complete in a natural manner the first part of the Parabolic history and to prepare for the second, in which forbearance is asked by a fellow-servant for the small debt which he owes. Lastly, in the same manner, the recall of the King's original forgiveness of the great debtor can only be intended to

bring out the utter incompatibility of such harshness towards a brother on the part of one who has been consciously forgiven by God his great debt.Thus keeping apart the essentials of the Parable from the accidents of its narration, we have three distinct scenes, or parts, in this story. In the first, our new feelings towards our brethren are traced to our new relation towards God, as the proper spring of all our thinking, speaking, and acting. Notably, as regards forgiveness, we are to remember the Kingdom of God: Therefore has the Kingdom of God become like' - therefore:' in order that thereby we may learn the duty of absolute, not limited, forgiveness - not that of seven,' but of seventy times seven.' And now this likeness of the Kingdom of Heaven is set forth in the Parable of a man, a King' (as the Rabbis would have expressed it, a king of flesh and blood'), who would make his reckoning' (sunairein) with his servants' - certainly not his bondservants, but probably the governors of his provinces, or those who had charge of the revenue and finances. But after he had begun to reckon' - not necessarily at the very beginning of it - one was brought to him, a debtor of ten thousand talents.' Reckoning them only as Attic talents (1 talent = 60 minas = 6,000 dinars) this would amount to the enormous sum of about two and a quarter millions sterling. No wonder, that one who during his administration had been guilty of such peculation, or else culpable negligence, should, as the words brought to him' imply, have been reluctant to face the king. The Parable further implies, that the debt was admitted; and hence, in the course of ordinary judicial procedure - according to the Law of Moses, [4698] and the universal code of antiquity - that servant,' with his family and all his property, was ordered to be sold, [4699] and the returns paid into the treasury.Of course, it is not suggested that the payment' thus made had met his debt. Even this would, if need were, confirm the view, previously expressed, that this trait belongs not to the essentials of the Parable, but to the details of the narrative. So does the promise, with which the now terrified servant,' as he cast himself at the feet of the King, supported his plea for patience: I will pay thee all.' In truth, the narrative takes no notice of this, but, on the other hand, states: But, being moved with compassion, the lord of that servant released him [from the bondage decreed, and which had virtually begun with his sentence], and the debt forgave he him.' [4700] A more accurate representation of our relation to God could not be made. We are the debtors of our heavenly King, Who has entrusted to us the administration of what is His, and which we have purloined or misused, incurring an unspeakable debt, which we can never discharge, and of which, in the course of justice, unending bondage, misery, and utter ruin would be the proper sequence. But, if in humble repentance we cast ourselves at His Feet, He is ready, in infinite compassion, not only to release us from meet punishment, but - O blessed revelation of the Gospel! - to forgive us the debt. It is this new relationship to God which must be the foundation and the rule for our new relationship towards our fellow-servants. And this brings us to the second part, or scene in this Parable. Here the lately pardoned servant finds one of his fellow-servants, who owes him the small sum of 100 dinars, about 4l.10s. Mark now the sharp contrast, which is so drawn as to give point to the Parable. In the first case, it was the servant brought to account, and that before the King; here it is a servant finding and that his fellowservant; in the first case, he owed talents, in the second dinars (a six-thousandth part of them); in the first, ten thousand talents; in the second, one hundred dinars. Again, in the first case payment is only demanded, while in the second the man takes his fellow-servant by the throat - a not uncommon mode of harshness on the part of Roman creditors - and says: Pay what,' or according to the better reading, if thou owest anything.' And, lastly, although the words of the second debtor are almost the same [4701] as those in which the first debtor besought the King's patience, yet no mercy is

shown, but he is cast' [with violence] into prison, till he have paid what was due. [4702]It can scarcely be necessary to show the incongrousness or the guilt of such conduct. But this is the object of the third part, or scene, in the Parable. Here - again for the sake of pictorialness - the other servants are introduced as exceedingly sorry, no doubt about the fate of their fellow-servant, especially in the circumstances of the case. Then they come to their lord, and clearly set forth,' or explain' (diasaphen) what had happened, upon which the Unmerciful Servant is summoned, and addressed as wicked servant,' not only because he had not followed the example of his lord, but because, after having received such immense favour as the entire remission of his debt on entreating his master, to have refused to the entreaty of his fellow-servant even a brief delay in the payment of a small sum, argued want of all mercy and positive wickedness. And the words are followed by the manifestations of righteous anger. As he has done, so is it done to him - and this is the final application of the Parable. [4703] He is delivered to the tormentors,' not in the sense of being tormented by them, which would scarcely have been just, but in that of being handed over to such keepers of the prison, to whom criminals who were to be tortured were delivered, and who executed such punishment on them: in other words he is sent to the hardest and severest prison, there to remain till he should pay all that was due by him - that is, in the circumstances, for ever. And here we may again remark, without drawing any dogmatic inferences from the language of the Parable, that it seems to proceed on these two assumptions: that suffering neither expiates guilt, nor in itself amends the guilty, and that as sin has incurred a debt that can never be discharged, so the banishment, or rather the loss and misery of it, will be endless.We pause to notice, how near Rabbinism has come to this Parable, and yet how far it is from its sublime teaching. At the outset we recall that unlimited forgiveness - or, indeed, for more than the farthest limit of three times - was not the doctrine of Rabbinism. It did, indeed, teach how freely God would forgive Israel, and it introduces a similar Parable of a debtor appealing to his creditor, and receiving the fullest and freest release of mercy, [4704] and it also draws from it the moral, that man should similarly show mercy: but it is not the mercy of forgiveness from the heart, but of forgiveness of money debts to the poor, [4705] or of various injuries, [4706] and the mercy of benevolence and beneficence to the wretched. [4707] But, however beautifully Rabbinism at times speaks on the subject, the Gospel conception of forgiveness, even as that of mercy, could only come by blessed experience of the infinitely higher forgiveness, and the incomparably greater mercy, which the pardoned sinner has received in Christ from our Father in Heaven.But to us all there is the deepest seriousness in the warning against unmercifulness; and that, even though we remember that the case here referred to is only that of unwillingness to forgive from the heart an offending brother who actually asks for it. Yet, if not the sin, the temptation to it is very real to us all - perhaps rather unconsciously to ourselves than consciously. For, how often is our forgiveness in the heart, as well as from the heart, narrowed by limitations and burdened with conditions; and is it not of the very essence of sectarianism to condemn without mercy him who does not come up to our demands - ay, and until he shall have come up to them to the uttermost farthing?

CHAPTER XX. CHRIST'S DISCOURSES IN PERÆA - CLOSE OF THE PERÆAN MINISTRY

(St. Luke xiii.23-30, 31-35; xiv.1-11, 25-35; xvii.1-10.) From the Parables we now turn to such Discourses of the Lord as belong to this period of His Ministry. Their consideration may be the more brief, that throughout we find points of correspondence with previous or later portions of His teaching. Thus, the first of these Discourses, of which we have an outline, [4708] recalls some passages in the Sermon on the Mount,' [4709] as well as what our Lord had said on the occasion of healing the servant of the centurion. [4710] But, to take the first of these parallelisms, the differences are only the more marked for the similarity of form. These prove incontestably, not only the independence of the two Evangelists [4711] in their narratives, but, along with deeper underlying unity of thought in the teaching of Christ, its different application to different circumstances and persons. Let us mark this in the Discourse as outlined by St. Luke, and so gain fresh evidential confirmation of the trustworthiness of the Evangelic records. The words of our Lord, as recorded by St. Luke, [4712] are not spoken, as in The Sermon on the Mount,' in connection with His teaching to His disciples, but are in reply to a question addressed to Him by some one - we can scarcely doubt, a representative of the Pharisees: [4713] Lord, are they few, the saved ones [that are being saved]?' Viewed in connection with Christ's immediately preceding teaching about the Kingdom of God in its wide and deep spread, as the great Mustard-Tree from the tiniest seed, and as the Leaven hid, which pervaded three measures of meal, we can scarcely doubt that the word saved' bore reference, not to the eternal state of the soul, but to admission to the benefits of the Kingdom of God - the Messianic Kingdom, with its privileges and its judgments, such as the Pharisees understood it. The question, whether few' were to be saved, could not have been put from the Pharisaic point of view, if understood of personal salvation; [4714] while, on the other hand, if taken as applying to part in the near-expected Messianic Kingdom, it has its distinct parallel in the Rabbinic statement, that, as regarded the days of the Messiah (His Kingdom), it would be similar to what it had been at the entrance into the land of promise, when only two (Joshua and Caleb), out of all that generation, were allowed to have part in it. [4715] Again, it is only when understanding both the question of this Pharisee and the reply of our Lord as applying to the Kingdom of the Messiah - though each viewing the Kingdom' from his own standpoint - that we can understand the answering words of Christ in their natural and obvious sense, without either straining or adding to them a dogmatic gloss, such as could not have occurred to His hearers at the time. [4716] Thus viewed, we can mark the characteristic differences between this Discourse and the parallels in the Sermon on the Mount,' and understand their reason. As regarded entrance into the Messianic Kingdom, this Pharisee, and those whom he represented, are told, that this Kingdom was not theirs, as a matter of course - their question as to the rest of the world being only, whether few or many would share in it - but that all must struggle [4717] [agonise] to enter in through the narrow door.' [4718] When we remember, that in the Sermon on the Mount' the call was only to enter in,' we feel that we have now reached a period, when the access to the narrow door' was obstructed by the enmity of so many, and when it needed violence' to break through,

and take the Kingdom' by force.' [4719] This personal breaking through the opposing multitude, in order to enter in through the narrow door, was in opposition to the many - the Pharisees and Jews generally - who were seeking to enter in, in their own way, never doubting success, but who would discover their terrible mistake. Then, when once the Master of the house is risen up,' to welcome His guests to the banquet, and has shut to the door, while they, standing without, vainly call upon Him to open it, and He replies: I know you not whence ye are,' would they begin to remind Him of those covenant-privileges on which, as Israel after the flesh, they had relied (we have eaten and drunk in Thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets'). To this He would reply by a repetition of His former words, now seen to imply a disavowal of all mere outward privileges, as constituting a claim to the Kingdom, grounding alike His disavowal and His refusal to open on their inward contrariety to the King and His Kingdom: Depart from Me, all ye workers of iniquity.' It was a banquet to the friends of the King: the inauguration of His Kingdom. When they found the door shut, they would, indeed, knock, in the confident expectation that their claims would at once be recognised, and they admitted. And when the Master of the house did not recognise them, as they had expected, and they reminded Him of their outward connection, He only repeated the same words as before, since it was not outward but inward relationship that qualified the guests, and theirs was not friendship, but antagonism to Him. Terrible would then be their sorrow and anguish, when they would see their own patriarchs (we have eaten and drunk in Thy Presence') and their own prophets (Thou hast taught in our streets') within, and yet themselves were excluded from what was peculiarly theirs - while from all parts of the heathen world the welcome guests would flock to the joyous feast. And here pre-eminently would the saying hold good, in opposition to Pharisaic claims and self-righteousness: There are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.' [4720] As a further characteristic difference from the parallel passage in the Sermon on the Mount,' we note, that there the reference seems not to any special privileges in connection with the Messianic Kingdom, such as the Pharisees expected, but to admission into the Kingdom of Heaven generally. [4721] In regard to the latter also the highest outward claims would be found unavailing; but the expectation of admission was grounded rather on what was done, than on mere citizenship and its privileges. And here it deserves special notice, that in St. Luke's Gospel, where the claim is that of fellow-citizenship (eaten and drunk in Thy Presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets'), the reply is made, I know you not whence ye are;' while in the Sermon on the Mount,' where the claim is of what they had done in His Name, they are told: I never knew you.' In both cases the disavowal emphatically bears on the special plea which had been set up. With this, another slight difference may be connected, which is not brought out in the Authorised or in the Revised Version. Both in the Sermon on the Mount' [4722] and in St. Luke's Gospel, [4723] they who are bidden depart are designated as workers of iniquity.' But, whereas, in St. Matthew's Gospel the term (noma) really means lawlessness,' the word used in that of St. Luke should be rendered unrighteousness' [4724] (dika). Thus, the one class are excluded, despite the deeds which they plead, for their real contrariety to God's Law; the other, despite the plea of citizenship and privileges, for their unrighteousness. [4725] And here we may also note, as a last difference between the two Gospels, that in the prediction of the future bliss from which they were to be excluded, the Gospel of St. Luke, which had reported the plea that He had taught' in their streets,' adds, as it were in answer, to the names of the Patriarchs, [4726] mention of all the prophets.' 2. The next Discourse, noted by St. Luke, [4727] had been spoken in that very day,' [4728] as the last. It was occasioned by a pretended warning of certain of the Pharisees' to depart

from Peræa, which, with Galilee, was the territory of Herod Antipas, as else the Tetrarch would kill Him. We have previously [4729] shown reason for supposing secret intrigues between the Pharisaic party and Herod, and attributing the final imprisonment of the Baptist, at least in part, to their machinations. We also remember, how the conscience of the Tetrarch connected Christ with His murdered Forerunner, and that rightly, since, at least so far as the Pharisees wrought on the fears of that intensely jealous and suspicious prince, the imprisonment of John was as much due to his announcement of the Messiah as to the enmity of Herodias. On these grounds we can easily understand that Herod should have wished to see Jesus, [4730] not merely to gratify curiosity, nor in obedience to superstitious impulses, but to convince himself, whether He was really what was said of Him, and also to get Him into his power. Probably, therefore, the danger of which these Pharisees spoke might have been real enough, and they might have special reasons for knowing of it. But their suggestion, that Jesus should depart, could only have proceeded from a ruse to get Him Out of Peræa, where, evidently, His works of healing [4731] were largely attracting and influencing the people. But if our Lord would not be deterred by the fears of His disciples from going into Judæa, [4732] feeling that each one had his appointed working day, in the light of which he was safe, and during the brief duration of which he was bound to walk,' far less would He recede before His enemies. Pointing to their secret intrigues, He bade them, if they chose, go back to that fox,' and give to his low cunning, and to all similar attempts to hinder or arrest His Ministry, what would be a decisive answer, since it unfolded what He clearly forsaw in the near future. Depart?' [4733] - yes, depart' ye to tell that fox,' I have still a brief and an appointed time [4734] to work, and then I am perfected,' in the sense in which we all readily understand the expression, as applying to His Work and Mission. Depart!' Yes, I must "depart," or go My brief appointed time: I know that at the goal of it is death, yet not at the hands of Herod, but in Jerusalem, the slaughter-house of them that "teach in her streets."' And so, remembering that this message to Herod was spoken in the very day, perhaps the very hour that He had declared how falsely the workers of wickedness' claimed admission on account of the teaching in their streets,' and that they would be excluded from the fellowship, not only of the fathers, but of all the prophets' whom they called their own - we see peculiar meaning in the reference to Jerusalem as the place where all the prophets perished. [4735] One, Who in no way indulged in illusions, but knew that He had an appointed time, during which He would work, and at the end of which He would perish,' and where He would so perish, could not be deterred either by the intrigues of the Pharisees nor by the thought of what a Herod might attempt - not do, which latter was in far other hands. But the thought of Jerusalem - of what it was, what it might have been, and what would come to it - may well have forced from the lips of Him, Who wept over it, a cry of mingled anguish, love, and warning. [4736] It may, indeed, be, that these very words, which are reported by St. Matthew in another, and manifestly most suitable, connection, [4737] [4738] are here quoted by St. Luke, because they fully express the thought to which Christ here first gave distinct utterance. But some such words, we can scarcely doubt, He did speak even now, when pointing to His near Decease in Jerusalem. 3. The next in order of the Discourses recorded by St. Luke [4739] is that which prefaced the Parable of the Great Supper,' expounded in a previous chapter. [4740] The Rabbinic views on the Sabbath-Law have been so fully explained, that a very brief commentation will here suffice. It appears, that the Lord condescended to accept the invitation to a Sabbath-meal in the house of one of the Rulers of the Pharisees' - perhaps one of the Rulers of the Synagogue in which they had just worshipped, and where Christ may have taught. Without here discussing the

motives for this invitation, its acceptance was certainly made use of to watch Him.' And the man with the dropsy had, no doubt, been introduced for a treacherous purpose, although it is not necessary to suppose that he himself had been privy to it. On the other hand, it is characteristic of the gracious Lord, that, with full knowledge of their purpose, He sat down with such companions, and that He did His Work of power and love unrestrained by their evil thoughts. But, even so, He must turn their wickedness also to good account. Yet we mark, that He first dismissed the man healed of the dropsy before He reproved the Pharisees. [4741] It was better so - for the sake of the guests, and for the healed man himself, whose mind quite new and blessed Sabbath-thoughts would fill, to which all controversy would be jarring. And, after his departure, the Lord first spake to them, as was His wont, concerning their misapplication of the Sabbath-Law, to which, indeed, their own practice gave the lie. They deemed it unlawful to heal' on the Sabbath-day, though, when He read their thoughts and purposes as against Him, they would not answer His question on the point. [4742] And yet, if a son, [4743] or even an ox,' of any of them, had fallen into a pit,' they would have found some valid legal reason for pulling him out! Then, as to their Sabbath-feast, and their invitation to Him, when thereby they wished to lure Him to evil - and, indeed, their much-boasted hospitality: all was characteristic of these Pharisees - only external show, with utter absence of all real love; only self-assumption, pride, and self-righteousness, together with contempt of all who were regarded as religiously or intellectually beneath them - chiefly of the unlearned' and sinners,' those in the streets and lanes' of their city, whom they considered as the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind.' [4744] Even among themselves there was strife about the first places' - such as, perhaps, Christ had on that occasion witnessed, [4745] amidst mock professions of humility, when, perhaps, the master of the house had afterwards, in true Pharisaic fashion, proceeded to re-arrange the guests according to their supposed dignity. And even the Rabbis had given advice to the same effect as Christ's [4746] - and of this His words may have reminded them. [4747] But further - addressing him who had so treacherously bidden Him to this feast, Christ showed how the principle of Pharisaism consisted in self-seeking, to the necessary exclusion of all true love. Referring, for the fuller explanation of His meaning, [4748] to a previous chapter, [4749] we content ourselves here with the remark, that this self-seeking and self-righteousness appeared even in what, perhaps, they most boasted of - their hospitality. For, if in an earlier Jewish record we read the beautiful words: Let thy house be open towards the street, and let the poor be the sons of thy house,' [4750] we have, also, this later comment on them, [4751] that Job had thus had his house opened to the four quarters of the globe for the poor, and that, when his calamities befell him, he remonstrated with God on the ground of his merits in this respect, to which answer was made, that he had in this matter come very far short of the merits of Abraham. So entirely self-introspective and self-seeking did Rabbinism become, and so contrary was its outcome to the spirit of Christ, the inmost meaning of Whose Work, as well as Words, was entire self-forgetfulness and self-surrender in love.4. In the fourth Discourse recorded by St. Luke, [4752] we pass from the parenthetic account of that Sabbath-meal in the house of the Ruler of the Pharisees,' back to where the narrative of the Pharisees' threat about Herod and the reply of Jesus had left us. [4753] And, if proof were required of the great influence exercised by Jesus, and which, as we have suggested, led to the attempt of the Pharisees to induce Christ to leave Peræa, it would be found in the opening notice, [4754] as well as in the Discourse itself which He spoke. Christ did depart - from that place, though not yet from Peræa; but with Him went great multitudes.' And, in view of their professed adhesion, it was needful, and now more emphatically than ever, to

set before them all that discipleship really involved, alike of cost and of strength - the two latter points being illustrated by brief Parables' (in the wider sense of that term). Substantially, it was only what Christ had told the Twelve, when He sent them on their first Mission. [4755] Only it was now cast in a far stronger mould, as befitted the altered circumstances, in the near prospect of Christ's condemnation, with all that this would involve to His followers.At the outset we mark, that we are not here told what constituted the true disciple, but what would prevent a man from becoming such. Again, it was now no longer (as in the earlier address to the Twelve), that he who loved the nearest and dearest of earthly kin more than Christ - and hence clave to such rather than to Him - was not worthy of Him; nor that he who did not take his cross and follow after Him was not worthy of the Christ. Since then the enmity had ripened, and discipleship become impossible without actual renunciation of the nearest relationship, and, more than that, of life itself. [4756] Of course, the term hate' does not imply hatred of parents or relatives, or of life, in the ordinary sense. But it points to this, that, as outward separation, consequent upon men's antagonism to Christ, was before them in the near future, so, in the present, inward separation, a renunciation in mind and heart, preparatory to that outwardly, was absolutely necessary. And this immediate call was illustrated in twofold manner. A man who was about to begin building a tower, must count the cost of his undertaking. [4757] It was not enough that he was prepared to defray the expense of the foundations; he must look to the cost of the whole. So must they, in becoming disciples, look not on what was involved in the present following of Christ, but remember the cost of the final acknowledgement of Jesus. Again, if a king went to war, common prudence would lead him to consider whether his forces were equal to the great contest before him; else it were far better to withdraw in time, even though it involved humiliation, from what, in view of his weakness, would end in miserable defeat. [4758] So, and much more, must the intending disciple make complete inward surrender of all, deliberately counting the cost, and, in view of the coming trial, ask himself whether he had, indeed, sufficient inward strength - the force of love to Christ - to conquer. And thus discipleship, then, and, in measure, to all time, involves the necessity of complete inward surrender of everything for the love of Christ, so that if, and when, the time of outward trial comes, we may be prepared to conquer in the fight. [4759] He fights well, who has first fought and conquered within.Or else, and here Christ breaks once more into that pithy Jewish proverb - only, oh! how aptly, applying it to His disciples - Salt is good;' salt, if it have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?' [4760] We have preferred quoting the proverb in its Jewish form, [4761] [4762] to show its popular origin. Salt in such condition was neither fit to improve the land, nor, on the other hand, to be mixed with the manure. The disciple who had lost his distinctiveness would neither benefit the land, nor was he even fit, as it were, for the dunghill, and could only be cast out. And so, let him that hath ears to hear, hear the warning! 5. We have still to consider the last Discourses of Christ before the raising of Lazarus. [4763] As being addressed to the disciples, [4764] we have to connect them with the Discourse just commented upon. In point of fact, part of these admonitions had already been spoken on a previous occasion, and that more fully, to the disciples in Galilee. [4765] Only we must again bear in mind the difference of circumstances. Here, they immediately precede the raising of Lazarus, [4766] and they form the close of Christ's public Ministry in Peræa. Hence they come to us as Christ's parting admonitions to His Peræan followers.Thus viewed, they are intended to impress on the new disciples these four things: to be careful to give no offence; [4767] to be careful to take no offence; [4768] to be simple and earnest in their faith, and absolutely to trust its all-prevailing power; [4769] and yet, when they had made

experience of it, not to be elated, but to remember their relation to their Master, that all was in His service, and that, after all, when everything had been done, they were but unprofitable servants. [4770] In other words, they urged upon the disciples holiness, love, faith, and service of self-surrender and humility.Most of these points have been already considered, when explaining the similar admonitions of Christ in Galilee. [4771] The four parts of this Discourse are broken by the prayer of the Apostles, who had formerly expressed their difficulty in regard to these very requirements: [4772] Add unto us faith.' It was upon this that the Lord spake to them, for their comfort, of the absolute power of even the smallest faith, [4773] and of the service and humility of faith. [4774] The latter was couched in a Parabolic form, well calculated to impress on them those feelings which would keep them lowly. They were but servants; and, even though they had done their work, the Master expected them to serve Him, before they sat down to their own meal and rest. Yet meal and rest there would be in the end. Only, let there not be self-elation, nor weariness, nor impatience; but let the Master and His service be all in all. Surely, if ever there was emphatic protest against the fundamental idea of Pharisaism, as claiming merit and reward, it was in the closing admonition of Christ's public Ministry in Peræa: When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.'And with these parting words did He most effectually and for ever separate, in heart and spirit, the Church from the Synagogue.

CHAPTER XXI. THE DEATH AND THE RAISING OF LAZARUS - THE QUESTION OF MIRACLES AND OF THIS MIRACLE OF MIRACLES - VIEWS OF NEGATIVE CRITICISM ON THIS HISTORY - JEWISH BURYING-RITES AND SEPULCHRES.

(St. John xi.1-54.) From listening to the teaching of Christ, we turn once more to follow His working. It will be remembered, that the visit to Bethany divides the period from the Feast of the Dedication to the last Paschal week into two parts. It also forms the prelude and preparation for the awful events of the End. For, it was on that occasion that the members of the Sanhedrin formally resolved on His Death. It now only remained to settle and carry out the plans for giving effect to their purpose. This is one aspect of it. There is yet another and more solemn one. The raising of Lazarus marks the highest point (not in the Manifestation, but) in the ministry of our Lord; it is the climax in a history where all is miraculous - the Person, the Life, the Words, the Work. As regards Himself, we have here the fullest evidence alike of His Divinity and Humanity; as regards those who witnessed it, the highest manifestation of faith and of unbelief. Here, on this height, the two ways finally meet and part. And from this high point - not only from the resolution of the Sanhedrists, but from the raising of Lazarus - we have our first clear outlook on the Death and Resurrection of Christ, of which the raising of Lazarus was the typical prelude. From this height, also, have we an outlook upon the gathering of the Church at His empty Tomb, where the precious words spoken at the grave of Lazarus received their full meaning - till Death shall be no more. But chiefly do we now think of it as the Miracle of Miracles in the history of the Christ. He had, indeed, before this raised the dead; but it had been in far-off Galilee, and in circumstances essentially different. But now it would be one so well known as Lazarus, at the very gates of Jerusalem, in the sight of all men, and amidst surroundings which admitted not of mistake or doubt. If this Miracle be true, we instinctively feel all is true; and Spinoza was right in saying, [4775] that if he could believe the raising of Lazarus, he would tear to shreds his system, and humbly accept the creed of Christians. But is it true? We have reached a stage in this history when such a question, always most painful, might seem almost uncalled for. For, gradually and with increasing clearness, we have learned the trustworthiness of the Evangelic records; and, as we have followed Him, the conviction has deepened into joyous assurance, that He, Who spake, lived, and wrought as none other, is in very deed the Christ of God. And yet we ask ourselves here this question again, on account of its absolute and infinite importance; because this may be regarded as the highest and decisive moment in this History; because, in truth, it is to the historical faith of the Church what the great Confession of Peter was to that of the disciples. And, although such an inquiry may seem like the jarring of a discord in Heaven's own melody, we pursue it, feeling that, in so doing, we are not discussing what is doubtful, but rather setting forth the evidence of what is certain, for the confirmation of the faith of our hearts, and, as we humbly trust, for the establishment of the faith as it is in Jesus. At the outset, we must here once more meet, however briefly, the preliminary difficulty in regard to Miracles, of which the raising of Lazarus is, we shall not say, the greatest - for

comparison is not possible on such a point - but the most notable. Undoubtedly, a Miracle runs counter, not only to our experience, but to the facts on which our experience is grounded; and can only be accounted for by a direct Divine interposition, which also runs counter to our experience, although it cannot logically be said to run counter to the facts on which that experience is grounded. Beyond this it is impossible to go, since the argument on other grounds than of experience, be it phenomenal [observation and historical information] or real [knowledge of laws and principles] - would necessitate knowledge alike of all the laws of Nature and of all the secrets of Heaven. On the other hand (as indicated in a previous part [4776]), to argue this point only on the ground of experience (phenomenal or real), were not only reasoning à priori, but in a vicious circle. It would really amount to this: A thing has not been, because it cannot be; and it cannot be, because, so far as I know, it is not and has not been. But, to deny on such à priori prejudgment the possibility of Miracles, ultimately involves a denial of a Living, Reigning God. For, the existence of a God implies at least the possibility, in certain circumstances it may be the rational necessity, of Miracles. And the same grounds of experience, which tell against the occurrence of a Miracle, would equally apply against belief in a God. We have as little ground in experience (of a physical kind) for the one as for the other. This is not said to deter inquiry, but for the sake of our argument. For, we confidently assert and challenge experiment of it, that disbelief in a God, or Materialism, involves infinitely more difficulties, and that at every step and in regard to all things, than the faith of the Christian. But we instinctively feel that such a Miracle as the raising of Lazarus calls for more than merely logical formulas. Heart and mind crave for higher than questions of what may be logically possible or impossible. We want, so to speak, living evidence, and we have it. We have it, first of all, in the Person of the Incarnate God, Who not only came to abolish death, but in Whose Presence the continuance of disease and death was impossible. And we have it also in the narrative of the event itself. It were, indeed, an absurd demand to prove a Miracle, since to do so were to show that it was not a Miracle. But we may be rationally asked these three things: first, to show, that no other explanation is rationally possible than that which proceeds on the ground of its being a Miracle; secondly, to show, that such a view of it is consistent with itself and with all the details of the narrative; and, thirdly, that it is harmonious with what precedes and what follows the narrative. The second and third of these arguments will be the outcome of our later study of the history of this event; the first, that no other explanation of the narrative is rationally possible, must now be briefly attempted. We may here dismiss, as what would not be entertained by any one familiar with historical inquiries, the idea that such a narrative could be an absolute invention, ungrounded on any fact. Again, we may put aside as repugnant to, at least English, common sense, the theory that the narrative is consistent with the idea that Lazarus was not really dead (so, the Rationalists). Nor would any one, who had the faintest sympathy with the moral standpoint of the Gospels, entertain the view of M. Renan, [4777] that it was all a pious fraud' concocted between all parties, and that, in order to convert Jerusalem by a signal miracle, Lazarus had himself dressed up as a dead body and laid in the family tomb. Scarcely more rational is M. Renan's latest suggestion, that it was all a misunderstanding: Martha and Mary having told Jesus the wish of friends, that He should do some notable miracle to convince the Jews, and suggesting that they would believe if one rose from the dead, when He had replied, that they would not believe even if Lazarus rose from his grave - and that tradition had transformed this conversation into an actual event! Nor, finally, would English common sense readily believe (with Baur), that the whole narrative was an ideal composition to illustrate what must be regarded as the metaphysical

statement: I am the Resurrection and the Life.' Among ourselves, at least, no serious refutation of these and similar views can be necessary. Nor do the other theories advanced require lengthened discussion. The mythical explanation of Strauss is, that as the Old Testament had recorded instances of raising from the dead, so Christian tradition must needs ascribe the same to the Messiah. To this (without repeating the detailed refutation made by Renan and Baur), it is sufficient to reply: The previous history of Christ had already offered such instances, why needlessly multiply them? Besides, if it had been a legend,' such full and minute details would not have been introduced, and while the human element would have been suppressed, the miraculous would have been far more accentuated. Only one other theory on the subject requires notice: that the writer of the Fourth Gospel, or rather early tradition, had transformed the Parable of Dives and Lazarus into an actual event. In answer, it is sufficient to say: first, that (as previously shown) there is no connection between the Lazarus of the Parable and him of Bethany; secondly, that, if it had been a Parable transformed, the characters chosen would not have been real persons, and that they were such is evident from the mention of the family in different circumstances in the three Synoptic Gospels, [4778] of which the writer of the Fourth Gospel was fully aware. [4779] Lastly, as Godet remarks, whereas the Parable closes by declaring that the Jews would not believe even if one rose from the dead, the Narrative closes on this wise: [4780] Many therefore of the Jews, which came to Mary and beheld that which He did, believed on Him.' [4781] In view of these proposed explanations, we appeal to the impartial reader, whether any of them rationally accounts for the origin and existence of this history in Apostolic tradition? On the other hand, everything is clear and consistent on the supposition of the historical truth of this narrative: the minuteness of details; the vividness and pictorialness of the narrative: the characteristic manner in which Thomas, Martha, and Mary speak and act, in accordance with what we read of them in the other Gospels or in other parts of this Gospel; the Human affection of the Christ; the sublime simplicity and majesty of the manner of the Miracle; and the effects of it on friend and foe. There is, indeed, this one difficulty (not objection), that the event is not mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels. But we know too little of the plan on which the Gospels, viewed as Lives of Christ, were constructed, to allow us to draw any sufficient inference from the silence of the Synoptists, whilst we do know that the Judæan and Jerusalem Ministry of Christ, except so far as it was absolutely necessary to refer to it, lay outside the plan of the Synoptic Gospels, and formed the special subject of that by St. John. Lastly, we should remember, that in the then state of thought the introduction of another narrative of raising from the dead could not have seemed to them of such importance as it appears to us in the present state of controversy - more especially, since it was soon to be followed by another Resurrection, the importance and evidential value of which far overshadowed such an event as the raising of Lazarus. Their Galilean readers had the story of the raising of the window's son at Nain, and of Jairus' daughter at Capernaum; and the Roman world had not only all this, but the preaching of the Resurrection, and of pardon and life in the Name of the Risen One, together with ocular demonstration of the miraculous power of those who preached it. It remained for the beloved disciple, who alone stood under the Cross, alone to stand on that height from which he had first full and intense outlook upon His Death, and the Life which sprang from it, and flowed into all the world. We may now, undisturbed by preliminary objections, surrender ourselves to the sublimeness and solemnity of this narrative. Perhaps the more briefly we comment on it the better. It was while in Peræa, that this message suddenly reached the Master from the well-remembered home at Bethany, the village of Mary' - who, although the younger, is for obvious reasons first

mentioned in this history - and her sister Martha,' concerning their (younger) brother Lazarus: Lord, behold he whom Thou lovest is sick!' They are apparently the very words which the sisters' bade their messenger tell. We note as an important fact to be stored in our memory, that the Lazarus, who had not even been mentioned in the only account preserved to us of a previous visit of Christ to Bethany, [4782] is described as he whom Christ loved.' What a gap of untold events between the two visits of Christ to Bethany - and what modesty should it teach us as regards inferences from the circumstance that certain events are not recorded in the Gospels! The messenger was apparently dismissed by Christ with this reply: This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, in order that the Son of God may be glorified thereby.' We must here bear in mind, that this answer was heard by such of the Apostles as were present at the time. [4783] They would naturally infer from it that Lazarus would not die, and that his restoration would glorify Christ, either as having foretold it, or prayed for it, or effected it by His Will. Yet its true meaning - even, as we now see, its literal interpretation, was, that its final upshot was not to be the death of Lazarus, but that it was to be for the glory of God, in order that Christ as the Son of God might be made manifest. And we learn, how much more full are the Words of Christ than they often appear to us; and how truly, and even literally, they may bear quite another meaning than appears to our honest misapprehension of them - a meaning which only the event, the future, will disclose.And yet, probably at the very time when the messenger received his answer, and ere he could have brought it to the sisters, Lazarus was already dead! Nor - and this should be especially marked - did this awaken doubt in the minds of the sisters. We seem to hear the very words which at the time they said to each other when each of them afterwards repeated it to the Lord: Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother would not have died.' [4784] They probably thought the message had reached Him too late, that Lazarus would have lived if Christ had been appealed to in time, or had been able to come - at any rate, if He had been there. Even in their keenest anguish, there was no failure of trust, no doubt, no close weighing of words on their part - only the confidence of love. Yet all this while Christ knew that Lazarus had died, and still He continued two whole days where He was, finishing His work. And yet - and this is significantly noted before anything else, alike in regard to His delay and to His after-conduct - He loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus.' Had there been no after-history, or had it not been known to us, or before it became known, it might have seemed otherwise - and in similar circumstances it often does seem otherwise to us. And again, what majestic calm, what Self-restraint of Human affections and sublime consciousness of Divine Power in this delay: it is once more Christ asleep, while the disciples are despairing, in the bark almost swamped in the storm! Christ is never in haste: least of all, on His errands of love. And He is never in haste, because He is always sure.It was only after these two days that Christ broke silence as to His purposes and as to Lazarus. Though thoughts of him must have been present with the disciples, none dared ask aught, although not from misgiving, nor yet from fear. This also of faith and of confidence. At last, when His work in that part had been completed, He spoke of leaving, but even so not of going to Bethany, but into Judæa. For, in truth, His work in Bethany was not only geographically, but really, part of His work in Judæa; and He told the disciples of His purpose, just because He knew their fears and would teach them, not only for this but for every future occasion, what principle applied to them. For when, in their care and affection, they reminded the Rabbi' - and the expression here almost jars on us - that the Jews were even now seeking to stone' Him, He replied by telling them, in figurative language, that we have each our working day from God, and that while it lasts no foe can shorten it or break up or work. The day

had twelve hours, and while these lasted no mishap would befall him that walked in the way [he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world]. It was otherwise when the day was past and the night had come. When our God-given day has set, and with it the light been withdrawn which hitherto prevented our stumbling - then, if a man went in his own way and at his own time, might such mishap befall him, because,' figuratively as to light in the night-time, and really as to guidance and direction in the way, the light is not in him.'But this was only part of what Jesus said to His disciples in preparation for a journey that would issue in such tremendous consequences. He next spoke of Lazarus, their friend,' as fallen asleep' - in the frequent Jewish (as well as Christian) figurative sense of it, [4785] and of His going there to wake him out of sleep. The disciples would naturally connect this mention of His going to Lazarus with His proposed visit to Judæa, and, in their eagerness to keep Him from the latter, interposed that there could be no need for going to Lazarus, since sleep was, according to Jewish notions, one of the six, [4786] or, according to others, [4787] five symptoms or crises in recovery from dangerous illness. And when the Lord then plainly stated it, Lazarus died,' adding, what should have aroused their attention, that for their sakes He was glad He had not been in Bethany before the event, because now that would come which would work faith in them, and proposed to go to the dead Lazarus - even then, their whole attention was so absorbed by the certainty of danger to their loved Teacher, that Thomas had only one thought: since it was to be so, let them go and die with Jesus. So little had they understood the figurative language about the twelve hours on which God's sun shone to light us on our way; so much did they need the lesson of faith to be taught them in the raising of Lazarus! We already know the quiet happy home of Bethany. [4788] When Jesus reached it, He found' - probably from those who met Him by the way [4789] [4790] - that Lazarus had been already four days in the grave. According to custom, he would be buried the same day that he had died. [4791] Supposing his death to have taken place when the message for help was first delivered, while Jesus continued after that two whole days in the place where He was, this would leave about a day for His journey from Peræa to Bethany. We do not, indeed, know the exact place of His stay; but it must have been some well-known centre of activity in Peræa, since the sisters of Bethany had no difficulty in sending their messenger. At the same time we also infer that, at least at this period, some kind of communication must have existed between Christ and His more intimate disciples and friends, such as the family of Bethany - by which they were kept informed of the general plan of His Mission-journeys, and of any central station of His temporary sojourn. If Christ at that time occupied such a central station, we can the more readily understand how some of His Galilean disciples may, for a brief space, have been absent at their Galilean homes when the tidings about Lazarus arrived. Their absence may explain the prominent position taken by Thomas; perhaps, also, in part, the omission of this narrative from the Synoptic Gospels. One other point may be of interest. Supposing the journey to Bethany to have occupied a day, we would suggest the following as the order of events. The messenger of the Sisters left Bethany on the Sunday (it could not have been on the Sabbath), and reached Jesus on the Monday. Christ continued in Peræa other two days, till Wednesday, and arrived at Bethany on Thursday. On Friday the meeting of the Sanhedrists against Christ took place, while He rested in Bethany on the Friday, and, of course, on the Sabbath, and returned to Peræa and Ephraim' on the Sunday.This may be a convenient place for adding to the account already given, [4792] in connection with the burying of the widow's son at Nain, such further particulars of the Jewish observances and rites, [4793] as may illustrate the present history. Referring to the previous description, we resume, in

imagination, our attendance at the point where Christ met the bier at Nain and again gave life to the dead. But we remember that, as we are now in Judæa, the hired mourners - both mourning-men (for there were such) and mourning-women - would follow, and not, as in Galilee, precede, the body. [4794] From the narrative we infer that the burial of Lazarus did not take place in a common burying-ground, which was never nearer a town than 50 cubits, [4795] dry and rocky places being chosen in preference. Here the graves must be at least a foot and a half apart. It was deemed a dishonour to the dead to stand on, or walk over, the turf of a grave. Roses and other flowers seem to have been planted on graves. [4796] But cemeteries, or common burying-places, appear in earliest times to have been used only for the poor, [4797] or for strangers. [4798] In Jerusalem there were also two places where executed criminals were buried. [4799] All these, it is needless to say, were outside the City. But there is abundant evidence, that every place had not its own burying-ground; and that, not unfrequently, provision had to be made for the transport of bodies. Indeed, a burying-place is not mentioned among the ten requisites for every fully-organised Jewish community. [4800] The names given, both to the graves and to the burying-place itself, are of interest. As regards the former, we mention such as the house of silence;' [4801] the house of stone;' [4802] the hostelry,' or, literally, place where you spend the night;' the couch;' the resting-place;' the valley of the multitude,' or of the dead.' The cemetery was called the house of graves;' [4803] or the court of burying;' and the house of eternity.' By a euphemism, to die' was designated as going to rest,' been completed;' being gathered to the world' or to the home of light;' being withdrawn,' or hidden.' Burial without coffin seems to have continued the practice for a considerable time, and rules are given how a pit, the size of the body, was to be dug, and surrounded by a wall of loose stones to prevent the falling in of earth. When afterwards earth-burials had to be vindicated against the Parsee idea of cremation, Jewish divines more fully discussed the question of burial, and described the committal of the body to the ground as a sort of expiation. [4804] It was a curious later practice, that children who had died a few days after birth were circumcised on their graves. Children not a month old were buried without coffin or mourning, and, as some have thought, in a special place. [4805] In connection with a recent controversy it is interesting to learn that, for the sake of peace, just as the poor and sick of the Gentiles might be fed and nursed as well as those of the Jews, so their dead might be buried with those of the Jews, though not in their graves. [4806] On the other hand, a wicked person should not be buried close to a sage. [4807] Suicides were not accorded all the honours of those who had died a natural death, and the bodies of executed criminals were laid in a special place, whence the relatives might after a time remove their bones. [4808] The burial terminated by casting earth on the grave. [4809] But, as already stated, Lazarus was, as became his station, not laid in a cemetery, but in his own private tomb in a cave - probably in a garden, the favourite place of interment. Though on terms of close friendship with Jesus, he was evidently not regarded as an apostate from the Synagogue. For, every indignity was shown at the burial of an apostate; people were even to array themselves in white festive garments to make demonstration of joy. [4810] Here, on the contrary, as we gather from the sequel, every mark of sympathy, respect, and sorrow had been shown by the people in the district and by friends in the neighbouring Jerusalem. In such case it would be regarded as a privilege to obey the Rabbinic direction of accompanying the dead, so as to show honour to the departed and kindness to the survivors. As the sisters of Bethany were disciples,' we may well believe that some of the more extravagant demonstrations of grief were, if not dispensed with, yet modified. We can scarcely believe, that the hired mourners' would alternate between

extravagant praises of the dead and calls upon the attendants to lament; [4811] or that, as was their wont, they would strike on their breast, beat their hands, and dash about their feet, [4812] or break into wails and mournings songs, alone or in chorus. [4813] In all probability, however, the funeral oration would be delivered - as in the case of all distinguished persons [4814] - either in the house, [4815] or at one of the stations where the bearers changed, or at the burying-place; perhaps, if they passed it, in the Synagogue. [4816] It has previously been noted, what extravagant value was, in later times, attached to these orations, as indicating both a man's life on earth and his place in heaven. [4817] The dead was supposed to be present, listening to the words of the speaker and watching the expression on the face of the hearers. It would serve no good purpose to reproduce fragments from these orations. [4818] Their character is sufficiently indicated by the above remarks. [4819]When thinking of these tombs in gardens, [4820] we so naturally revert to that which for three days held the Lord of Life, that all details become deeply interesting. And it is, perhaps, better to give them here rather than afterwards to interrupt, by such inquiries, our solemn thoughts in presence of the Crucified Christ. Not only the rich, but even those moderately well-to-do, had tombs of their own, which probably were acquired and prepared long before they were needed, and treated and inherited as private and personal property. [4821] In such caves, or rock-hewn tombs, the bodies were laid, having been anointed with many spices, [4822] with myrtle, [4823] aloes, and, at a later period, also with hyssop, rose-oil, and rose-water. The body was dressed and, at a later period, wrapped, if possible, in the worn cloths in which originally a Roll of the Law had been held. [4824] The tombs' were either rock-hewn' or natural caves' [4825] or else large walled vaults, with niches along the sides. Such a cave' or vault' of 4 cubits' (6 feet) width, 6 cubits' (9 feet) length, and 4 cubits' (6 feet) height, contained niches' for eight bodies - three on each of the longitudinal sides, and two at the end opposite the entrance. Each niche' was 4 cubits (6 feet) long, and had a height of seven and a width of six handbreadths. As these burying niches' were hollowed out in the walls they were called Kukhin. [4826] The larger caves or vaults were 6 cubits (9 feet) wide, and 8 cubits (12 feet) long, and held thirteen bodies - four along each side-wall, three opposite to, and one on either side of the entrance. [4827] These figures apply, of course, only to what the Law required, when a vault had been contracted for. When a person constructed one for himself, the dimensions of the walls and the number of Kukhin might, of course, vary. At the entrance to the vault was a court' 6 cubits (9 feet) square, to hold the bier and its bearers. Sometimes two caves' opened on this court.' But it is difficult to decide whether the second cave,' spoken of, was intended as an ossary [4828] (ossarium). Certain it is, that after a time the bones were collected and put into a box or coffin, having first been anointed with wine and oil, and being held together by wrappings of cloths. [4829] This circumstance explains the existence of the mortuary chests, or osteophagi, so frequently found in the tombs of Palestine by late explorers, who have been unable to explain their meaning. [4830] This unclearness [4831] is much to be regretted, when we read, for example, of such a chest' as found in a cave near Bethany. [4832] One of the explorers [4833] has discovered on them fragments of Hebrew inscriptions. Up to the present, only few Hebrew memorial inscriptions have been discovered in Palestine. The most interesting are those in or near Jerusalem, dating from the first century b.c. to the first a.d. [4834] There are, also, many inscriptions found on Jewish tombs out of Palestine (in Rome, and other places), written in bad Greek or Latin, containing, perhaps, a Hebrew word, and generally ending with shalom, peace,' and adorned with Jewish symbols, such as the Seven-branched Candlestick, the Ark, the festive emblems of the Feast of Tabernacles,

and others. [4835] In general, the advice not to read such inscriptions, [4836] as it would affect the sight, seems to imply the common practice of having memorial inscriptions in Hebrew. They appear to have been graven either on the lid of the mortuary chest, or on the Golel, or great stone rolled' at the entrance to the vault, or to the court' leading into it, or else on the inside walls of yet another erection, made over the vaults of the wealthy, [4837] and which was supposed to complete the burying-place, or Qebher. These small buildings surmounting the graves may have served as shelter to those who visited the tombs. They also served as monuments,' [4838] of which we read in the Bible, in the Apocrypha, [4839] and in Josephus. [4840] [4841] In Rabbinic writings they are frequently mentioned, chiefly by the name Nephesh, [4842] soul,' person' - transferred in the sense of monument,' [4843] or, by the more Scriptural name of bamah, [4844] or, by the Greco-Aramaic, [4845] or the Hebrew designation for a building generally. But of gravestones with inscriptions we cannot find any record in Talmudic works. At the same time, the place where there was a vault or a grave was marked by a stone, which was kept whitened, [4846] to warn the passer-by against defilement. [4847]We are now able fully to realise all the circumstances and surroundings in the burial and raising of Lazarus.Jesus had come to Bethany. But in the house of mourning they knew it not. As Bethany was only about fifteen furlongs - or about two miles - from Jerusalem, many from the City, who were on terms of friendship with what was evidently a distinguished family, had come in obedience to one of the most binding Rabbinic directions - that of comforting the mourners. In the funeral procession the sexes had been separated, and the practice probably prevailed even at that time for the women to return alone from the grave. This may explain why afterwards the women went and returned alone to the Tomb of our Lord. The mourning, which began before the burial, [4848] had been shared by the friends who sat silent on the ground, or were busy preparing the mourning meal. As the company left the dead, each had taken leave of the deceased with a Depart in peace!' [4849] Then they had formed into lines, through which the mourners passed amidst expressions of sympathy, repeated (at least seven times) as the procession halted on the return to the house of mourning. [4850] Then began the mourning in the house, which really lasted thirty days, of which the first three were those of greatest, the others, during the seven days, or the special week of sorrow, of less intense mourning. But on the Sabbath, as God's holy day, all mourning was intermitted - and so they rested on the Sabbath, according to the commandment.'In that household of disciples this mourning would not have assumed such violent forms, as when we read that the women were in the habit of tearing out their hair, [4851] or of a Rabbi who publicly scourged himself. [4852] But we know how the dead would be spoken of. In death the two worlds were said to meet and kiss. [4853] And now they who had passed away beheld God. [4854] They were at rest. Such beautiful passages as Ps. cxii.6, Prov. x.7, [4855] Is. xi.10, last clause, and Is. lvii.2, [4856] were applied to them. Nay, the holy dead should be called living.' In truth, they knew about us, and unseen still surrounded us. [4857] Nor should they ever be mentioned without adding a blessing on their memory. [4858]In this spirit, we cannot doubt, the Jews were now comforting' the sisters. They may have repeated words like those quoted as the conclusion of such a consolatory speech: [4859] May the Lord of consolations ({hebrew}) comfort you! Blessed be He Who comforteth the mourners!' But they could scarcely have imagined how literally a wish like this was about to be fulfilled. For, already, the message had reached Martha, who was probably in one of the outer apartments of the house: Jesus is coming! She hastened to meet the Master. Not a word of complaint, not a murmur, nor doubt, escaped her lips - only what during those four bitter days

these two sisters must have been so often saying to each other, when the luxury of solitude was allowed them, that if He had been there their brother would not have died. And even now - when it was all too late - when they had not received what they had asked of Him by their messenger, it must have been, because He had not asked it, though he had said that this sickness was not unto death; or else because he had delayed to work it till He would come. And still she held fast by it, that even now God would give Him whatsoever He asked. Or, did they mean more: were they such words of unconscious prophecy, or sight and sound of heavenly things, as sometimes come to us in our passion of grief, or else winged thoughts of faith too soon beyond our vision? They could not have been the expression of any real hope of the miracle about to take place, or Martha would not have afterwards sought to arrest Him, when He bade them roll away the stone. And yet is not even so, that, when that comes to us which our faith had once dared to suggest, if not to hope, we feel as if it were all too great and impossible, that a very physical cannot be' separates us from it?It was in very truth and literality that the Lord meant it, when He told Martha her brother would rise again, although she understood His Words of the Resurrection at the Last Day. In answer, Christ pointed out to her the connection between Himself and the Resurrection; and, what He spoke, that He did when He raised Lazarus from the dead. The Resurrection and the Life are not special gifts either to the Church or to humanity, but are connected with the Christ - the outcome of Himself. The Resurrection of the Just and the General Resurrection are the consequence of the relation in which the Church and humanity in general stand to the Christ. Without the Christ there would have been no Resurrection. Most literally He is the Resurrection and the Life - and this, the new teaching about the Resurrection, was the object and the meaning of the raising of Lazarus. And thus is this raising of Lazarus the outlook, also, upon His own Resurrection, Who is the first-fruits from the dead.' And though the special, then present, application, or rather manifestation of it, would be in the raising of Lazarus - yet this teaching, that accompanied it, is to all believers:' He that believeth in Me, even if [though] he die, shall live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall not die for ever' [4860] (unto the Æon) - where possibly we might, for commentation, mentally insert the sign of a pause (-) between the words die' and for ever,' or unto the Æon.' It is only when we think of the meaning of Christ's previous words, as implying that the Resurrection and the Life are the outcome of Himself, and come to us only through Him and in Him, that we can understand the answer of Martha to His question: Believest thou this?' Yea, Lord, I have believed that thou art the Christ, the Son of God [with special reference to the original message of Christ [4861]], He that cometh into the world [the Coming One into the world' [4862] = the world's promised, expected, come Saviour].What else passed between them we can only gather from the context. It seems that the Master called' for Mary. This message Martha now hasted to deliver, although secretly.' Mary was probably sitting in the chamber of mourning, with its upset chairs and couches, and other melancholy tokens of mourning, as was the custom; surrounded by many who had come to comfort them; herself, we can scarcely doubt, silent, her thoughts far away in that world to, and of which the Master was to her the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' As she heard of His coming and call, she rose quickly,' and the Jews followed her, under the impression that she was again going to visit, and to sweep at the tomb of her brother. For, it was the practice to visit the grave, especially during the first three days. [4863] When she came to Jesus, where He still stood, outside Bethany, she was forgetful of all around. It was, as if sight of Him melted what had frozen the tide of her feelings. She could only fall at His Feet, and repeat the poor words with which she and her sister had these four weary days

tried to cover the nakedness of their sorrow: poor words of consolation, and poor words of faith, which she did not, like her sister, make still poorer of by adding the poverty of her hope to that of her faith - the poverty of the future to that of the past and present. To Martha that had been the maximum, to Mary it was the minimum of her faith; for the rest, it was far, far better to add nothing more, but simply to worship at His Feet.It must have been a deeply touching scene: the outpouring of her sorrow, the absoluteness of her faith, the mute appeal of her tears. And the Jews who witnessed it were moved as she, and wept with her. What follows is difficult to understand; still more difficult to explain: not only from the choice of language, which is peculiarly difficult, but because its difficulty springs from the yet greater difficulty of expressing what it is intended to describe. The expression, groaned in spirit,' cannot mean that Christ was moved with indignation in the spirit,' since this could not have been the consequence of witnessing the tears of Mary and what, we feel sure, was the genuine emotion of the Jews. Of the various interpretations, [4864] that commends itself most to us, which would render the expression: He vehemently moved His Spirit and troubled Himself.' One, whose insight into such questions is peculiarly deep, has reminded us [4865] that the miracles of the Lord were not wrought by the simple word of power, but that in a mysterious way the element of sympathy entered into them. He took away the sufferings and diseases of men in some sense by taking them upon Himself.' If, with this most just view of His Condescension to, and union with, humanity as its Healer, by taking upon Himself its diseases, we combine the statement formerly made about the Resurrection, as not a gift or boon but the outcome of Himself - we may, in some way, not understand, but be able to gaze into, the unfathomed depth of that The anthropic fellow-suffering which was both vicarious and redemptive, and which, before He became the Resurrection to Lazarus, shook His whole inner Being, when, in the words of St. John, He vehemently moved His Spirit and troubled Himself.'And now every trait is in accord. Where have ye laid him?' So truly human - as if He, Who was about to raise the dead, needed the information where he had been laid; so truly human, also, in the underlying tenderness of the personal address, and in the absorption of the whole Theanthropic energy on the mighty burden about to be lifted and lifted away. So, also, as they bade Him come and see, were the tears that fell from Him (dkrusen), not like the violent lamentation (klausen) that burst from Him at sight and prophetic view of doomed Jerusalem. [4866] Yet we can scarcely think that the Jews rightly interpreted it, when they ascribed it only to His love for Lazarus. But surely there was not a touch either of malevolence or of irony, only what we feel to be quite natural in the circumstances, when some of them asked it aloud: Could not this One, Which opened the eyes of the blind, have wrought so that [in order] this one also should not die?' Scarcely was it even unbelief. They had so lately witnessed in Jerusalem that Miracle, such as had not been heard' since the world began;' [4867] that it seemed difficult to understand how, seeing there was the will (in His affection for Lazarus), there was not the power - not to raise him from the dead, for that did not occur to them, but to prevent his dying. Was there, then, a barrier in death? And it was this, and not indignation, which once more caused that Theanthropic recurrence upon Himself, when again He vehemently moved His Spirit.' And now they were at the cave which was Lazarus' tomb. He bade them roll aside the great stone which covered its entrance. [4868] Amidst the awful pause which preceded obedience, one voice only was raised. It was that of Martha. Jesus had not spoken of raising Lazarus. But what was about to be done? She could scarcely have thought that He merely wished to gaze once more upon the face of the dead. Something nameless had seized her. She dared not believe; she dared not disbelieve. Did she, perhaps, not dread a failure, but feel misgivings, when

thinking of Christ as in presence of commencing corruption before these Jews - and yet, as we so often, still love Him even in unbelief? It was the common Jewish idea that corruption commenced on the fourth day, that the drop of gall, which had fallen from the sword of the Angel and caused death, was then working its effect, and that, as the face changed, the soul took its final leave from the resting-place of the body. [4869] Only one sentence Jesus spake of gentle reproof, of reminder of what He had said to her just before, and of the message He had sent when first He heard of Lazarus' illness, [4870] but, oh so full of calm majesty and consciousness of Divine strength. And now the stone was rolled away. We all feel that the fitting thing here was prayer - yet not petition, but thanksgiving that the Father heard' Him, not as regarded the raising of Lazarus, which was His Own Work, but in the ordering and arranging of all the circumstances - alike the petition and the thanksgiving having for their object them that stood by, for He knew that the Father always heard Him: that so they might believe, that the Father had sent Him. Sent of the Father - not come of Himself, not sent of Satan - and sent to do His Will!And in doing this Will, He was the Resurrection and the Life. One loud command spoken into that silence; one loud call to that sleeper; one flash of God's Own Light into that darkness, and the wheels of life again moved at the outgoing of The Life. And, still bound hand and foot with graveclothes [bands,' Takhrikhin], and his face with the napkin, Lazarus stood forth, shuddering and silent, in the cold light of earth's day. In that multitude, now more pale and shuddering than the man bound in the graveclothes, the Only One majestically calm was He, Who before had been so deeply moved and troubled Himself, as He now bade them Loose him, and let him go.'We know no more. Holy Writ in this also proves its Divine authorship and the reality of what is here recorded. The momentarily lifted veil has again fallen over the darkness of the Most Holy Place, in which is only the Ark of His Presence and the cloudy incense of our worship. What happened afterwards, how they loosed him, what they said, what thanks, or praise, or worship, the sisters spoke, and what were Lazarus' first words, we know not. And better so. Did Lazarus remember aught of the late past, or was not rather the rending of the grave a real rending from the past: the awakening so sudden, the transition so great, that nothing of the bright vision remained, but its impress - just as a marvellously beautiful Jewish legend has it, that before entering this world, the soul of a child has seen all of heaven and hell, of past, present, and future; but that, as the Angel strikes it on the mouth to waken it into this world, all of the other has passed from the mind? Again we say: We know not - and it is better so.And here abruptly breaks off this narrative. Some of those who had seen it believed on Him; others hurried back to Jerusalem to tell it to the Pharisees. Then was hastily gathered a meeting of the Sanhedrists, [4871] not to judge Him, but to deliberate what was to be done. That He was really doing these miracles, there could be no question among them. Similarly, all but one or two had no doubt as to the source of these miracles. If real, [4872] they were of Satanic agency - and all the more tremendous they were, the more certainly so. But whether really of Satanic power, or merely a Satanic delusion, one thing, at least, was evident, that, if He were let alone, all men would believe on Him? And then, if He headed the Messianic movement of the Jews as a nation, alike the Jewish City and Temple, and Israel as a nation, would perish in the fight with Rome. But what was to be done? They had not the courage of, though the wish for, judicial murder, till he who was the High-Priest, Caiaphas, reminded them of the well-known Jewish adage, that it is better one man should die, than the community perish.' [4873] Yet, even so, he who spoke was the High-Priest; and for the last time, ere in speaking the sentence he spoke it for ever as against himself and the office he held, spake through him God's Voice, not as regards the counsel of murder, but this, that His Death should be

for that nation' - nay, as St. John adds, not only for Israel, but to gather into one fold all the now scattered children of God.This was the last prophecy in Israel; with the sentence of death on Israel's true High-Priest died prophecy in Israel, died Israel's High-Priesthood. It had spoken sentence upon itself. This was the first Friday of dark resolve. Henceforth it only needed to concert plans for carrying it out. Some one, perhaps Nicodemus, sent word of the secret meeting and resolution of the Sanhedrists. That Friday and the next Sabbath Jesus rested in Bethany, with the same majestic calm which He had shown at the grave of Lazarus. Then He withdrew, far away to the obscure bounds of Peræa and Galilee, to a city of which the very location is now unknown. [4874] And there He continued with His disciples, withdrawn from the Jews - till He would make His final entrance into Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XXII. ON THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM - DEPARTURE FROM EPHRAIM BY WAY OF SAMARIA AND GALILEE - HEALING OF TEN LEPERS - PROPHETIC DISCOURSE OF THE COMING KINGDOM - ON DIVORCE: JEWISH VIEWS OF IT - THE BLESSING TO LITTLE CHILDREN

(St. Matt. xix.1, 2; St. Mark x.1; St. Luke xvii.11; St. Luke xvii.12-19; St. Matt. xix.3-12; St. Mark x.2-12; St. Matt. xix.13-15; St. Mark x.13-16; St. Luke xviii.15-17.) The brief time of rest and quiet converse with His disciples in the retirement of Ephraim was past, and the Saviour of men prepared for His last journey to Jerusalem. All the three Synoptic Gospels mark this, although with varying details. [4875] From the mention of Galilee by St. Matthew, and by St. Luke of Samaria and Galilee - or more correctly, between (along the frontiers of) Samaria and Galilee,' we may conjecture that, on leaving Ephraim, Christ made a very brief detour along the northern frontier to some place at the southern border of Galilee - perhaps to meet at a certain point those who were to accompany him on his final journey to Jerusalem. This suggestion, for it is no more, is in itself not improbable, since some of Christ's immediate followers might naturally wish to pay a brief visit to their friends in Galilee before going up to Jerusalem. And it is further confirmed by the notice of St. Mark, [4876] that among those who had followed Christ there were many women which came up with Him unto Jerusalem.' For, we can scarcely suppose that these many women' had gone with Him in the previous autumn from Galilee to the Feast of Tabernacles, nor that they were with Him at the Feast of the Dedication, or had during the winter followed Him through Peræa, nor yet that they had been at Bethany. [4877] All these difficulties are obviated if, as suggested, we suppose that Christ had passed from Ephraim along the border of Samaria to a place in Galilee, there to meet such of His disciples as would go up with Him to Jerusalem. The whole company would then form one of those festive bands which travelled to the Paschal Feast, nor would there be anything strange or unusual in the appearance of such a band, in this instance under the leadership of Jesus. Another and deeply important notice, furnished by SS. Matthew and Mark, is, that during this journey through Peræa, great multitudes' resorted to, and followed Him, and that He healed' [4878] and taught them.' [4879] This will account for the incidents and Discourses by the way, and also how, from among many deeds, the Evangelists may have selected for record what to them seemed the most important or novel, or else best accorded with the plans of their respective narratives. [4880] Thus, to begin with, St. Luke alone relates the very first incident by the way, [4881] and the first Discourse. [4882] Nor is it difficult to understand the reason of this. To one who, like St. Matthew, had followed Christ in His Galilean Ministry, or, like St. Mark, had been the penman of St. Peter, there would be nothing so peculiar or novel in the healing of lepers as to introduce this on the overcrowded canvas of the last days. Indeed, they had both already recorded what may be designated as a typical healing of lepers. [4883] But St. Luke had not recorded such healing before; and the restoration of ten at the same time would seem to the beloved physician' matter, not only new in his narrative, but of the deepest importance. Besides, we have already

seen, that the record of the whole of this East-Jordan Ministry is peculiar to St. Luke; and we can scarcely doubt that it was the result of personal inquiries made by the Evangelist on the spot, in order to supplement what might have seemed to him a gap in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. This would explain his fulness of detail as regards incidents, and, for example, the introduction of the history of Zacchæus, which to St. Mark, or rather to St. Peter, but especially to St. Matthew (himself once a publican), might appear so like that which they had so often witnessed and related, as scarcely to require special narration. On the same ground we account for the record by St. Luke of Christ's Discourse predictive of the Advent of the Messianic Kingdom. [4884] This Discourse is evidently in its place at the beginning of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem. But the other two Evangelists merge it in the account of the fuller teaching on the same subject during the last days of Christ's sojourn on earth. [4885] It is a further confirmation of our suggestion as to the road taken by Jesus, that of the ten lepers whom, at the outset of His journey, He met when entering into a village, one was a Samaritan. It may have been that the district was infested with leprosy; or these lepers may, on tidings of Christ's approach, have hastily gathered there. It was, as fully explained in another place, [4886] in strict accordance with Jewish Law, that these lepers remained both outside the village and far from Him to Whom they now cried for mercy. And, without either touch or even command of healing, Christ bade them go and show themselves as healed to the priests. For this it was, as will be remembered, not necessary to repair to Jerusalem. Any priest might declare unclean' or clean' provided the applicants presented themselves singly, and not in company, [4887] for his inspection. [4888] And they went at Christ's bidding, even before they had actually experienced the healing! So great was their faith, and, may we not almost infer, the general belief throughout the district, in the power of the Master.' And as they went, the new life coursed in their veins. Restored health began to be felt, just as it ever is, not before, nor yet after believing, but in the act of obedience of a faith that has not yet experienced the blessing. But now the characteristic difference between these men appeared. Of the ten, equally recipients of the benefit, the nine Jews continued their way - presumably to the priests - while the one Samaritan in the number at once turned back, with a loud voice glorifying God. The whole event may not have occupied many minutes, and Jesus with his followers may still have stood on the same spot whence He bade the ten lepers go show themselves to the priests. He may have followed them with his eyes, as, but a few steps on their road of faith, health overtook them, and the grateful Samaritan, with voice of loud thanksgiving, hastened back to his Healer. No longer now did he remain afar off, but in humblest reverence fell on his face at the Feet of Him to Whom he gave thanks. This Samaritan [4889] had received more than new bodily life and health: he had found spiritual life and healing. But why did the nine Jews not return? Assuredly, they must have had some faith when first seeking help from Christ, and still more when setting out for the priests before they had experienced the healing. But perhaps, regarding it from our own standpoint, we may overestimate the faith of these men. Bearing in mind the views of the Jews at the time, and what constant succession of miraculous cures - without a single failure - had been witnessed these years, it cannot seem strange that lepers should apply to Jesus. Not yet perhaps did it, in the circumstances, involve very much greater faith to go to the priests at His bidding - implying, of course, that they were or would be healed. But it was far different to turn back and to fall down at His feet in lowly worship and thanksgiving. That made a man a disciple. Many questions here suggest themselves: Did these nine Jews separate from the one Samaritan when they felt healed, common misfortune having made them companions and brethren, while the bond was snapped so

soon as they felt themselves free of their common sorrow? The History of the Church and of individual Christians furnishes, alas! not a few analogous instances. Or did these nine Jews, in their legalism and obedience to the letter, go on to the priests, forgetful that, in obeying the letter, they violated the spirit of Christ's command? Of this also there are, alas! only too many parallel cases which will occur to the mind. Or was it Jewish pride, which felt it had a right to the blessings, and attributed them, not to the mercy of Christ, but to God; or, rather, to their own relation as Israel to God? Or, what seems to us the most probable, was it simply Jewish ingratitude and neglect of the blessed opportunity now within their reach - a state of mind too characteristic of those who know not the time of their visitation' - and which led up to the neglect, rejection, and final loss of the Christ? Certain it is, that the Lord emphasised the terrible contrast in this between the children of the household and this stranger.' [4890] And here another important lesson is implied in regard to the miraculous in the Gospels. The history shows how little spiritual value or efficacy they attach to miracles, and how essentially different in this respect their tendency is from all legendary stories. The lesson conveyed in this case is, that we may expect, and even experience, miracles, without any real faith in the Christ; with belief, indeed, in His Power, but without surrender to His Rule. According to the Gospels, a man might either seek benefit from Christ, or else receive Christ through such benefit. In the one case, the benefit sought was the object, in the other, the means; in the one, it was the goal, in the other, the road to it; in the one, it gave healing, in the other, brought salvation; in the one, it ultimately led away from, in the other, it led to Christ and to discipleship. And so Christ now spake it to this Samaritan: Arise, go thy way; thy faith has made thee whole.' But to all time there are here to the Church lessons of most important distinction. 2. The Discourse concerning the Coming of the Kingdom, which is reported by St. Luke immediately after the healing of the ten lepers, [4891] will be more conveniently considered in connection with the fuller statement of the same truths at the close of our Lord's Ministry. [4892] It was probably delivered a day or so after the healing of the lepers, and marks a farther stage in the Peræan journey towards Jerusalem. For, here we meet once more the Pharisees as questioners. [4893] This circumstance, as will presently appear, is of great importance, as carrying us back to the last mention of an interpellation by the Pharisees. [4894] 3. This brings us to what we regard as, in point of time, the next Discourse of Christ on this journey, recorded both by St. Matthew, and, in briefer form, by St. Mark. [4895] These Evangelist place it immediately after their notice of the commencement of this journey. [4896] For reasons previously indicated, St. Luke inserts the healing of the lepers and the prophetic Discourse, while the other two Evangelists omit them. On the other hand, St. Luke omits the Discourse here reported by St. Matthew and St. Mark, because, as we can readily see, its subject-matter would, from the standpoint of his Gospel, not appear of such supreme importance as to demand insertion in a narrative of selected events. The subject-matter of that Discourse is, in answer to Pharisaic tempting,' and exposition of Christ's teaching in regard to the Jewish law and practice of divorce. The introduction of this subject in the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark seems, to say the least, abrupt. But the difficulty is entirely removed, or, rather, changed into undesigned evidence, when we fit it into the general history. Christ had advanced farther on His journey, and now once more encountered the hostile Pharisees. It will be remembered that He had met them before in the same part of the country, [4897] [4898] and answered their taunts and objections, among other things, by charging them with breaking in spirit that Law of which they professed to be the exponents and representatives. And this He had proved by reference to their views and teaching on the subject of divorce. [4899]

This seems to have rankled in their minds. Probably they also imagined, it would be easy to show on this point a marked difference between the teaching of Jesus and that of Moses and the Rabbis, and to enlist popular feeling against Him. Accordingly, when these Pharisees again encountered Jesus, now on his journey to Judæa, they resumed the subject precisely where it had been broken off when they had last met Him, only now with the object of tempting Him.' Perhaps it may also have been in the hope that, by getting Christ to commit Himself against divorce in Peræa - the territory of Herod - they might enlist against Him, as formerly against the Baptist, the implacable hatred of Herodias. [4900] But their main object evidently was to involve Christ in controversy with some of the Rabbinic Schools. This appears from the form in which they put the question, whether it was lawful to put away a wife for every cause?' [4901] St. Mark, who gives only a very condensed account, omits this clause; but in Jewish circles the whole controversy between different teachers turned upon this point. All held that divorce was lawful, the only question being as to its grounds. We will not here enter on the unsavoury question of Divorce' among the Jews, [4902] to which the Talmud devotes a special tractate. [4903] There can, however, be no question that the practice was discouraged by many of the better Rabbis, alike in word [4904] and by their example; [4905] nor yet, that the Jewish Law took the most watchful care of the interests of the woman. In fact, if any doubt were raised as to the legal validity of the letter of divorce, the Law always pronounced against the divorce. At the same time, in popular practice, divorce must have been very frequent; while the principles underlying Jewish legislation on the subject are most objectionable. [4906] These were in turn due to a comparatively lower estimate of woman, and to an unspiritual view of the marriage-relation. Christianity has first raised woman to her proper position, not by giving her a new one, but by restoring and fully developing that assigned to her in the Old Testament. Similarly, as regards marriage, the New Testament - which would have us to be, in one sense, eunuchs for the Kingdom of God,' has also fully restored and finally developed what the Old Testament had already implied. And this is part of the lesson taught in this Discourse, both to the Pharisees and to the disciples.To begin with, divorce (in the legal sense) was regarded as a privilege accorded only to Israel, not to the Gentiles. [4907] [4908] On the question: what constituted lawful grounds of divorce, the Schools were divided. Taking their departure from the sole ground of divorce mentioned in Deut. xxiv.1: a matter of shame [literally, nakedness],' the School of Shammai applied the expression only to moral transgressions, [4909] and, indeed, exclusively to unchastity. [4910] It was declared that, if a woman were as mischievous as the wife of Ahab, or [according to tradition] as the wife of Korah, it were well that her husband should not divorce her, except it be on the ground of adultery. [4911] At the same time this must not be regarded as a fixed legal principle, but rather as an opinion and good counsel for conduct. The very passages, from which the above quotations are made, also afford only too painful evidence of the laxity of views and practices current. And the Jewish Law unquestionably allowed divorce on almost any grounds; the difference being, not as to what was lawful, but on what grounds a man should set the Law in motion, and make use of the absolute liberty which it accorded him. Hence, it is a serious mistake on the part of Commentators to set the teaching of Christ on this subject by the side of that of Shammai.But the School of Hillel proceeded on different principles. It took the words, matter of shame' in the widest possible sense, and declared it sufficient ground for divorce if a woman had spoiled her husband's dinner. [4912] [4913] Rabbi Akiba thought, that the words, [4914] if she find no favour in his eyes,' implied that it was sufficient if a man had found another woman more attractive than his wife. All agreed that

moral blame made divorce a duty, [4915] and that in such cases a woman should not be taken back. [4916] According to the Mishnah, [4917] if they transgressed against the Law of Moses or of Israel. The former is explained as implying a breach of the laws of tithing, of setting apart the first of the dough, and of purification. The latter is explained as referring to such offences as that of going in public with uncovered head, of spinning in the public streets, or entering into talk with men, to which others add, that of brawling, or of disrespectfullyspeaking of her husband's parents in his presence. A troublesome, [4918] or quarrelsome wife might certainly be sent away; [4919] and ill repute, or childlessness (during ten years) were also regarded as valid grounds of divorce. [4920]Incomparably as these principles differ from the teaching of Christ, it must again be repeated, that no real comparison is possible between Christ and even the strictest of the Rabbis, since none of them actually prohibited divorce, except in case of adultery, nor yet laid down those high eternal principles which Jesus enunciated. But we can understand how, from the Jewish point of view, tempting Him,' they would put the question, whether it was lawful to divorce a wife for every cause.' [4921] Avoiding their cavils, the Lord appealed straight to the highest authority - God's institution of marriage. He, Who at the beginning [4922] [from the first, originally, {hebrew}] [4923] had made them male and female, had in the marriage-relation joined them together,' to the breaking of every other, even the nearest, relationship, to be one flesh' - that is, to a union which was unity. Such was the fact of God's ordering. It followed, that they were one - and what God had willed to be one, man might not put asunder. Then followed the natural Rabbinic objection, why, in such case, Moses had commanded a bill of divorcement. Our Lord replied by pointing out that Moses had not commanded divorce, only tolerated it on account of their hardness of heart, and in such case commanded to give a bill of divorce for the protection of the wife. And this argument would appeal the more forcibly to them, that the Rabbis themselves taught that a somewhat similar concession had been made [4924] by Moses in regard to female captives of war, as the Talmud has it, on account of the evil impulse.' [4925] But such a separation,our Lord continued, had not been provided for in the original institution, which was a union to unity. Only one thing could put an end to that unity - its absolute breach. Hence, to divorce one's wife (or husband) while this unity lasted, and to marry another, was adultery, because, as the divorce was null before God, the original marriage still subsisted - and, in that case, the Rabbinic Law would also have forbidden it. The next part of the Lord's inference, that whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery,' is more difficult of interpretation. Generally, it is understood as implying that a woman divorced for adultery might not be married. But it has been argued, [4926] that, as the literal rendering is, whoso marrieth her when put away,' it applies to the woman whose divorce had just before been prohibited, and not, as is sometimes thought, to a woman divorced [under any circumstances].' Be this as it may, the Jewish Law, which regarded marriage with a woman divorced under any circumstances as unadvisable, [4927] absolutely forbade that of the adulterer with the adulteress. [4928] Whatever, therefore, may be pleaded, on account of the hardness of heart' in modern society, in favour of the lawfulness of relaxing Christ's law of divorce, which confines dissolution of marriage to the one ground (of adultery), because then the unity of God's making has been broken by sin - such a retrocession was at least not in the mind of Christ, nor can it be considered lawful, either by the Church or for individual disciples. But, that the Pharisees had rightly judged, when tempting Him,' what the popular feeling on the subject would be, appears even from what His disciples' [not necessarily the Apostles] afterwards said to Him. They waited to express their dissent till they were alone with Him in the house,' [4929] and then urged that, if it

were as Christ had taught, it would be better not to marry at all. To which the Lord replied, [4930] that this saying' of the disciples, [4931] it is not good to marry,' could not be received by all men, but only by those to whom it was given.' For, there were three cases in which abstinence from marriage might lawfully be contemplated. In two of these it was, of course, natural; and, where it was not so, a man might, for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake' - that is, in the service of God and of Christ - have all his thoughts, feelings, and impulses so engaged that others were no longer existent. For, we must here beware of a twofold misunderstanding. It is not bare abstinence from marriage, together, perhaps, with what the German Reformers called immunda continentia (unchaste continency), which is here commended, but such inward preoccupation with the Kingdom of God as would remove all other thoughts and desires. [4932] It is this which requires to be given' of God; and which he that is able to receive it' - who has the moral capacity for it - is called upon to receive. Again, it must not be imagined that this involves any command of celibacy: it only speaks of such who in the active service of the Kingdom feel, that their every thought is so engrossed in the work, that wishes and impulses to marriage are no longer existent in them. [4933] [4934]4. The next incident is recorded by the three Evangelists. [4935] It probably occurred in the same house where the disciples had questioned Christ about His teaching on the Divinely sacred relationship of marriage. And the account of His blessing of infants' and little children' most aptly follows on the former teaching. It is a scene of unspeakable sweetness and tenderness, where all is in character - alas! even the conduct of the disciples' as we remember their late inability to sympathise with the teaching of the Master. And it is all so utterly unlike what Jewish legend would have invented for its Messiah. We can understand how, when One Who so spake and wrought, rested in the house, Jewish mothers should have brought their little children,' and some their infants,' to Him, that He might touch,' put His Hands on them, and pray.' What power and holiness must these mothers have believed to be in His touch and prayer; what life to be in, and to come from Him; and what gentleness and tenderness must His have been, when they dared so to bring these little ones! For, how utterly contrary it was to all Jewish notions, and how incompatible with the supposed dignity of a Rabbi, appears from the rebuke of the disciples. It was an occasion and an act when, as the fuller and more pictorial account of St. Mark inform us, Jesus was much displeased' - the only time this strong word is used of our Lord [4936] - and said unto them: Suffer the little children to come to Me, [4937] hinder them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God.' Then He gently reminded His own disciples of their grave error, by repeating what they had apparently forgotten, [4938] that, in order to enter the Kingdom of God, it must be received as by a little child - that here there could be no question of intellectual qualification, nor of distinction due to a great Rabbi, but only of humility, receptiveness, meekness, and a simple application to, and trust in, the Christ. And so He folded these little ones in His Arms, put His Hands upon them, and blessed them, [4939] and thus for ever consecrated that child-life, which a parent's love and faith brought to Him; blessed it also by the laying-on of His Hands - as it were, ordained it,' as we fully believe to all time, strength because of His enemies.'

CHAPTER XXIII. THE LAST INCIDENTS IN PERÆA - THE YOUNG RULER WHO WENT AWAY SORROWFUL - TO LEAVE ALL FOR CHRIST - PROPHECY OF HIS PASSION - THE REQUEST OF SALOME, AND OF JAMES AND JOHN.

(St. Matt. xix.16-22; St. Mark x.17-22; St. Luke xviii.18-23; St. Matt. xix.23-30; St. Mark x.23-31; St. Luke xviii.24-30; St. Matt. xx.17-19; St. Mark x.32-34: St. Luke xviii.31-34; St. Matt. xx.20-28; St. Mark x.35-45.) As we near the goal, the wondrous story seems to grow in tenderness and pathos. It is as if all the loving condescension of the Master were to be crowded into these days; all the pressing need also, and the human weaknesses of His disciples. And with equal compassion does He look upon the difficulties of them who truly seek to come to Him, and on those which, springing from without, or even from self and sin, beset them who have already come. Let us try reverently to follow His steps, and learn of His words. As He was going forth into the way' [4940] - we owe this trait, as one and another in the same narrative, to St. Mark - probably at early morn, as He left the house where He had for ever folded into His Arms and blessed the children brought to Him by believing parents - His progress was arrested. It was a young man,' a ruler,' [4941] probably of the local Synagogue, [4942] who came with all haste, running,' and with lowliest gesture [kneeling], [4943] to ask what to him, nay to us all, is the most important question. Remembering that, while we owe to St. Mark the most graphic touches, [4944] St. Matthew most fully reports the words that had been spoken, we might feel inclined to adopt that reading of them in St. Matthew [4945] which is not only most strongly supported, but at first sight seems to remove some of the difficulties of exposition. This reading would omit in the address of the young ruler the word good' before Master, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?' and would make Christ's reply read: Why askest thou Me concerning the good [that which is good]? One there is Who is good.' This would meet not only the objection, that in no recorded instance was a Jewish Rabbi addressed as Good Master,' but the obvious difficulties connected with the answer of Christ, according to the common reading: Why callest thou Me good? none is good, save only One: God.' But on the other side it must be urged, that the undoubted reading of the question and answer in St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels agrees with that of our Authorised Version, and hence that any difficulty of exposition would not be removed, only shifted, while the reply of Christ tallies far better with the words Good Master,' the strangeness of such an address from Jewish lips giving only the more reason for taking it up in the reply: Why callest thou Me good? none is good save only One: God.' Lastly, the designation of God as the only One good' agrees with one of the titles given Him in Jewish writings: The Good One of the world' ({hebrew}). [4946] [4947] The actual question of the young Ruler is one which repeatedly occurs in Jewish writings, as put to a Rabbi by his disciples. Amidst the different answers given, we scarcely wonder that they also pointed to observance of the Law. And the saying of Christ seems the more adapted to the young Ruler when we recall this sentence from the Talmud: There is nothing else that is good but the Law.' [4948] But here again the similarity is only of form, not of substance. For, it will be noticed, that, in

the more full account by St. Matthew, Christ leads the young Ruler upwards through the table of the prohibitions of deeds to the first positive command of deed, and then, by a rapid transition, to the substitution for the tenth commandment in its negative form of this wider positive and all-embracing command: [4949] Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Any Jewish Ruler,' but especially one so earnest, would have at once answered a challenge on the first four commandments by Yes' - and that not self-righteously, but sincerely, though of course in ignorance of their real depth. And this was not the time for lengthened discussion and instruction; only for rapid awakening, to lead up, if possible, from earnestness and a heart-drawing towards the master to real discipleship. Best here to start from what was admitted as binding - the ten commandments - and to lead from that in them which was least likely to be broken, step by step, upwards to that which was most likely to awaken consciousness of sin. And the young Ruler did not, as that other Pharisee, reply by trying to raise a Rabbinic disputation over the Who is neighbour to me?' [4950] but in the sincerity of an honest heart answered that he had kept - that is, so far as he knew them - all these things from his youth.' [4951] On this St. Matthew puts into his mouth the question - What lack I yet?' Even if, like the other two Evangelists, he had not reported it, we would have supplied this from what follows. There is something intensely earnest, genuine, generous, even enthusiastic, in the higher cravings of the soul in youth, when that youth has not been poisoned by the breath of the world, or stricken with the rottenness of vice. The soul longs for the true, the higher, the better, and, even if strength fails of attainment, we still watch with keen sympathy the form of the climber upwards. Much more must all this have been the case with a Jewish youth, especially in those days; one, besides, like this young Ruler, in whose case affluence of circumstances not only allowed free play, but tended to draw out and to give full scope to the finer feelings, and where wealth was joined with religiousness and the service of a Synagogue. There was not in him that pride of riches, nor the self-sufficiency which they so often engender; nor the pride of conscious moral purity and aim after righteousness before God and man; nor yet the pride of the Pharisee or of the Synagogue-Ruler. What he had seen and heard of the Christ had quickened to greatest intensity all in him that longed after God and heaven, and had brought him in this supreme moral earnestness, lowly, reverently, to the Feet of Him in Whom, as he felt, all perfectness was, and from Whom all perfectness came. He had not been first drawn to Christ, and thence to the pure, as were the publicans and sinners; but, like so many - even as Peter, when in that hour of soul-agony he said: To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life,' - he had been drawn to the pure and the higher, and therefore to Christ. To some the way to Christ is up the Mount of Transfiguration, among the shining Beings of another world; to some it is across dark Kedron, down the deep Garden of Gethsemane with its agonies. What matters it, if it equally lead to Him, and equally bring the sense of need and experience of pardon to the seeker after the better, and the sense of need and experience of holiness to the seeker after pardon? And Jesus saw it all: down, through that intense upward look; inwards, through that question, What lack I yet?' far deeper down than that young man had ever seen into his own heart - even into depths of weakness and need which he had never sounded, and which must be filled, if he would enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Jesus saw what he lacked; and what He saw, He showed him. For, looking at him' in his sincerity and earnestness, He loved him' - as He loves those that are His Own. One thing was needful for this young man: that he should not only become His disciple, but that, in so doing, he should come and follow' Christ. We can all perceive how, for one like this young man, such absolute and entire coming and following Christ was needful. And again,

to do this, it was in the then circumstances both of this young man and of Christ necessary, that he should go and part with all that he had. And what was an outward, was also, as we perceive it, an inward necessity; and so, as ever, Providence and Grace would work together. For, indeed, to many of us some outward step is often not merely the means of but absolutely needful for, spiritual decision. To some it is the first open profession of Christ; to others, the first act of self-denial, or the first distinct No'-saying; to some, it may be, it is the first prayer, or else the first act of self-consecration. Yet it seems, as if it needed not only the word of God but a stroke of some Moses'-rod to make the water gush forth from the rock. And thus would this young Ruler have been perfect;' and what he had given to the poor have become, not through merit nor by way of reward, but really treasure in heaven.' [4952] What he lacked - was earth's poverty and heaven's riches; a heart fully set on following Christ: and this could only come to him through willing surrender of all. And so this was to him alike the means, the test, and the need. To him it was this; to us it may be something quite other. Yet each of us has a lack - something quite deep down in our hearts, which we may never yet have known, and which we must know and give up, if we would follow Christ. And without forsaking, there can be no following. This is the law of the Kingdom - and it is such, because we are sinners, because sin is not only the loss of the good, but the possession of something else in its place. There is something deeply pathetic in the mode in which St. Mark describes it: he was sad' - the word painting a dark gloom that overshadowed the face of the young man. [4953] Did he then not lack it, this one thing? We need scarcely here recall the almost extravagant language in which Rabbinism describes the miseries of poverty; [4954] we can understand his feelings without that. Such a possibility had never entered his mind: the thought of it was terribly startling. That he must come and follow Christ, then and there, and in order to do so, sell all that he had and give it away among the poor, and be poor himself, a beggar, that he might have treasure in heaven; and that this should come to him as the one thing needful from that Master in Whom he believed, from Whose lips he would learn the one thing needful, and who but a little before had been to him the All in All! It was a terrible surprise, a sentence of death to his life, and of life to his death. And that it should come from His lips, at Whose Feet he had run to kneel, and Who held for him the keys of eternal life! Rabbinism had never asked this; if it demanded almsgiving, it was in odious boastfulness; [4955] while it was declared even unlawful to give away all one's possessions [4956] - at most, only a fifth of them might be dedicated. [4957] And so, with clouded face he gazed down into what he lacked - within; but also gazed up in Christ on what he needed. And, although we hear no more of him, who that day went back to his rich home very poor, because very sorrowful,' we cannot but believe that he, whom Jesus loved, yet found in the poverty of earth the treasure of heaven. Nor was this all. The deep pity of Christ for him, who had gone that day, speaks also in his warning to his disciples. [4958] But surely those are not only riches in the literal sense which make it so difficult for a man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven [4959] - so difficult, as to amount almost to that impossibility which was expressed in the common Jewish proverb, that a man did not even in his dreams see an elephant pass through the eye of a needle. [4960] But when in their perplexity the disciples put to each other the saddened question: Who then can be saved? He pointed them onward, then upward, as well as inward, teaching them that, what was impossible of achievement by man in his own strength, God would work by His Almighty Grace. It almost jars on our ears, and prepares us for still stranger and sadder to come, when Peter, perhaps as spokesman of the rest, seems to remind the Lord that they had forsaken all to follow Him. St. Matthew records also the special question which Simon

added to it: What shall we have therefore?' and hence his Gospel alone makes mention of the Lord's reply, in so far as it applied only to the Apostles. For, that reply really bore on two points: on the reward which all who left everything to follow Christ would obtain; [4961] and on the special acknowledgment awaiting the Apostles of Christ. [4962] In regard to the former we mark, that it is twofold. They who had forsaken all for His sake' [4963] and the Gospel's,' [4964] for the Kingdom of God's sake' - and these three expressions explain and supplement each other - would receive in this time' manifold more' of new, and better, and closer relationships of a spiritual kind for those which they had surrendered, although, as St. Mark significantly adds, to prevent all possible mistakes, with persecutions.' But by the side of this stands out unclouded and bright the promise for the world to come' of everlasting life.' As regarded the Apostles personally, some mystery lies on the special promise to them. [4965] We could quite understand, that the distinction of rule to be bestowed on them might have been worded in language taken from the expectations of the time, in order to make the promise intelligible to them. But, unfortunately, we have no explanatory information to offer. The Rabbis, indeed, speak of a renovation or regeneration of the world ({hebrew}) which was to take place after the 7,000 or else 5,000 years of the Messianic reign. [4966] Such a renewal of all things is not only foretold by the prophets, [4967] and dwelt upon in later Jewish writings, [4968] but frequently referred to in Rabbinic literature. [4969] [4970] But as regards the special rule or judgment' of the Apostles, or ambassadors of the Messiah, we have not, and, of course, cannot expect any parallel in Jewish writings. That the promise of such rule and judgment to the Apostles is not peculiar to what is called the Judaic Gospel of St. Matthew, appears from its renewal at a later period, as recorded by St. Luke. [4971] Lastly, that it is in accordance with Old Testament promise, will be seen by a reference to Dan. vii.9, 10, 14, 27; and there are few references in the New Testament to the blessed consummation of all things in which such renewal of the world, [4972] and even the rule and judgment of the representatives of the Church, [4973] are not referred to. However mysterious, therefore, in their details, these things seem clear, and may without undue curiosity or presumption be regarded as the teaching of our Lord: the renewal of earth; the share in His rule and judgment which He will in the future give to His saints; the special distinction which He will bestow on His Apostles, corresponding to the special gifts, privileges, and rule with which He had endowed them on earth, and to their nearness to, and their work and sacrifices for Him; and, lastly, we may add, the preservation of Israel as a distinct, probably tribal, nation. [4974] As for the rest, as so much else, it is behind the veil,' and, even as we see it, better for the Church that the veil has not been further lifted.The reference to the blessed future with its rewards was followed by a Parable, recorded, as, with one exception, all of that series, only by St. Matthew. It will best be considered in connection with the last series of Christ's Parables. [4975] But it was accompanied by what, in the circumstances, was also a most needful warning. [4976] Thoughts of the future Messianic reign, its glory, and their own part in it might have so engrossed the minds of the disciples as to make them forgetful of the terrible present, immediately before them. In such case they might not only have lapsed into that most fatal Jewish error of a Messiah-King, Who was not Saviour, the Crown without the Cross, but have even suffered shipwreck of their faith, when the storm broke on the Day of His Condemnation and Crucifixion. If ever, it was most needful in that hour of elation to remind and forewarn them of what was to be expected in the immediate future. How truly such preparation was required by the disciples, appears from the narrative itself.There was something sadly mysterious in the words with which Christ had closed His Parable, that the last should be first and the first last [4977]

[4978] - and it had carried dark misgivings to those who heard it. And now it seemed all so strange! Yet the disciples could not have indulged in illusions. His own sayings on at least two previous occasions, [4979] however ill or partially understood, must have led them to expect at any rate grievous opposition and tribulations in Jerusalem, and their endeavour to deter Christ from going to Bethany to raise Lazarus proves, that they were well aware of the danger which threatened the Master in Judæa. [4980] Yet not only was He now going up [4981] to Jerusalem,' but there was that in His bearing which was quite unusual. As St. Mark writes, He was going before them' - we infer, apart and alone, as One, busy with thoughts all engrossing, Who is setting Himself to do His great work, and goes to meet it. And going before them was Jesus; and they were amazed [utterly bewildered, viz. the Apostles]; and those who were following, were afraid.' [4982] It was then that Jesus took the Apostles apart, and in language more precise than ever before, told them how all things that were written by the prophets shall be accomplished on the Son of Man' [4983] - not merely, that all that had been written concerning the Son of Man should be accomplished, but a far deeper truth, all-comprehensive as regards the Old Testament: that all its true prophecy ran up into the sufferings of the Christ. As the three Evangelists report it, the Lord gave them full details of His Betrayal, Crucifixion, and Resurrection. And yet we may, without irreverence, doubt whether on that occasion He had really entered into all those particulars. In such case it would seem difficult to explain how, as St. Luke reports, they understood none of these things, and the saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken;' and again, how afterwards the actual events and the Resurrection could have taken them so by surprise. Rather do we think, that the Evangelists report what Jesus had said in the light of after-events. He did tell them of His Betrayal by the leaders of Israel, and that into the hands of the Gentiles; of His Death and Resurrection on the third day - yet in language which they could, and actually did, misunderstand at the time, but which, when viewed in the light of what really happened, was perceived by them to have been actual prediction of those terrible days in Jerusalem and of the Resurrection-morning. At the time they may have thought that it pointed only to His rejection by Jews and Gentiles, to Sufferings and Death - and then to a Resurrection, either of His Mission or to such a reappearance of the Messiah, after His temporary disappearance, as Judaism expected.But all this time, and with increasing fierceness, were terrible thoughts contending in the breast of Judas; and beneath the tramp of that fight was there only a thin covering of earth, to hide and keep from bursting forth the hellish fire of the master-passion within.One other incident, more strange and sad than any that had preceded, and the Peræan stay is for ever ended. It almost seems, as if the fierce blast of temptation, the very breath of the destroyer, were already sweeping over the little flock, as if the twilight of the night of betrayal and desertion were already falling around. And now it has fallen on the two chosen disciples, James and John - the sons of thunder,' and one of them, the beloved disciple!' Peter, the third in that band most closely bound to Christ, had already had his fierce temptation, [4984] and would have it more fiercely - to the uprooting of life, if the Great High-Priest had not specially interceded for him. And, as regards these two sons of Zebedee and of Salome, [4985] we know what temptation had already beset them, how John had forbidden one to cast out devils, because he followed not with them, [4986] and how both he and his brother, James, would have called down fire from heaven to consume the Samaritans who would not receive Christ. [4987] It was essentially the same spirit that now prompted the request which their mother Salome preferred, [4988] not only with their full concurrence, but, as we are expressly told, [4989] with their active participation. There is the same faith in the Christ, the same allegiance to Him, but also the

same unhallowed earnestness, the same misunderstanding - and, let us add, the same latent self-exaltation, as in the two former instances, in the present request that, as the most honoured of His guests, and also as the nearest to Him, they might have their places at His Right Hand and at His Left in His Kingdom. [4990] Terribly incongruous as is any appearance of self-seeking at that moment and with that prospect before them, we cannot but feel that there is also an intenseness of faith and absoluteness of love almost sublime, when the mother steps forth from among those who follow Christ to His Suffering and Death, to proffer such a request with her sons, and for them. And so the Saviour seems to have viewed it. With unspeakable patience and tenderness, He, Whose Soul is filled with the terrible contest before Him, bears with the weakness and selfishness which could cherish such thoughts and ambitions even at such a time. To correct them, He points to that near prospect, when the Highest is to be made low. Ye know not what ye ask!' The King is to be King through suffering - are they aware of the road which leads to that goal? Those nearest to the King of sorrows must reach the place nearest to Him by the same road as He. Are they prepared for it; prepared to drink that cup of soul-agony, which the Father will hand to Him - to submit to, to descend into that baptism of consecration, when the floods will sweep over Him? [4991] In their ignorance, and listening only to the promptings of their hearts, they imagine that they are. Nay, in some measure it would be so; yet, finally to correct their mistake: to sit at His Right and at His Left Hand, these were not marks of mere favour for Him to bestow - in His own words: it is not Mine to give except to them for whom it is prepared of My Father.'But as for the other ten, when they heard of it, it was only the pre-eminence which, in their view, James and John had sought, which stood out before them, to their envy, jealousy, and indignation. [4992] And so, in that tremendously solemn hour would the fierce fire of controversy have broken out among them, who should have been most closely united; would jealousy and ambition have filled those who should have been most humble, and fierce passions, born of self, the world and Satan, have distracted them, whom the thought of the great love and the great sacrifice should have filled. It was the rising of that storm on the sea, the noise and tossing of those angry billows, which He hushed into silence when He spoke to them of the grand contrast between the princes of the Gentiles as they lord it over them,' or the great among them' as they domineer' [4993] over men, and their own aims - how, whosoever would be great among them, must seek his greatness in service - not greatness through service, but the greatness of service; and, whosever would be chief or rather first' among them, let it be in service. And had it not been thus, was it not, would it not be so in the Son of Man - and must it not therefore be so in them who would be nearest to Him, even His Apostles and disciples? The Son of Man - let them look back, let them look forward - He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. And then, breaking through the reserve that had held Him, and revealing to them the inmost thoughts which had occupied Him when He had been alone and apart, going before them on the way, He spoke for the first time fully what was the deepest meaning of His Life, Mission, and Death: to give His Life a ransom for many' [4994] [4995] - to pay with His Life-Blood the price of their redemption, to lay down His Life for them: in their room and stead, and for their salvation.These words must have sunk deep into the heart of one at least in that company. [4996] A few days later, and the beloved disciple tells us of this Ministry of His Love at the Last Supper, [4997] and ever afterwards, in his writings or in his life, does he seem to bear them about with him, and to re-echo them. Ever since also have they remained the foundation-truth, on which the Church has been built: the subject of her preaching, and the object of her experience. [4998]

CHAPTER XXIV. IN JERICHO AND AT BETHANY - JERICHO - A GUEST WITH ZACCHÆUS - THE HEALING OF BLIND BARTIMÆUS - THE PLOT AT JERUSALEM - AT BETHANY, AND IN THE HOUSE OF SIMON THE LEPER

(St. Luke xix.1-10; St. Matt. xx.29-34; St. Mark x.46-52; St. Luke xviii.35-43; St. John xi.55-xii.1; St. Matt. xxvi.6-13; St. Mark xiv.3-9; St. John xii.2-11.) ONCE more, and now for the last time, were the fords of Jordan passed, and Christ was on the soil of Judæa proper. Behind Him were Peræa and Galilee; behind Him the Ministry of the Gospel by Word and Deed; before Him the final Act of His Life, towards which all had consciously tended. Rejected as the Messiah of His people, not only in His Person but as regarded the Kingdom of God, which, in fulfilment of prophecy and of the merciful Counsel of God, He had come to establish, He was of set purpose going up to Jerusalem, there to accomplish His Decease, to give His Life a Ransom for many.' And He was coming, not, as at the Feast of Tabernacles, privately, but openly, at the head of His Apostles, and followed by many disciples - a festive band going up to the Paschal Feast, of which Himself was to be the Lamb' of sacrifice. The first station reached was Jericho, the City of Palms,' a distance of only about six hours from Jerusalem. The ancient City occupied not the site of the present wretched hamlet, but lay about half an hour to the north-west of it, by the so-called Elisha-Spring. A second spring rose an hour further to the north-north-west. The water of these springs, distributed by aqueducts, gave, under a tropical sky, unsurpassed fertility to the rich soil along the plain' of Jericho, which is about twelve or fourteen miles wide. The Old Testament history of the City of Palms' is sufficiently known. It was here also that King Zedekiah had, on his flight, been seized by the Chaldeans, [4999] and thither a company of 345 men returned under Zerubbabel. [5000] In the war of liberation under the Maccabees the Syrians had attempted to fortify Jericho. [5001] These forts were afterwards destroyed by Pompey in his campaign. Herod the Great had first plundered, and then partially rebuilt, fortified, and adorned Jericho. It was here that he died. [5002] His son Archelaus also built there a palace. At the time of which we write, it was, of course, under Roman dominion. Long before, it had recovered its ancient fame for fertility and its prosperity. Josephus describes it as the richest part of the country, and calls it a little Paradise. Antony had bestowed the revenues of its balsam-plantations as an Imperial gift upon Cleopatra, who in turn sold them to Herod. Here grew palm-trees of various kinds, sycamores, the cypress-flower, [5003] the myrobalsamum, which yielded precious oil, but especially the balsam-plant. If to these advantages of climate, soil, and productions we add, that it was, so to speak, the key of Judæa towards the east, that it lay on the caravan-road from Damascus and Arabia, that it was a great commercial and military centre, and lastly, its nearness to Jerusalem, to which it formed the last station' on the road of the festive pilgrims from Galilee and Peræa - it will not be difficult to understand either its importance or its prosperity. We can picture to ourselves the scene, as our Lord on that afternoon in early spring beheld it. There it was, indeed, already summer, for, as Josephus tells us, [5004] even in winter the inhabitants could only bear the lightest clothing of linen. We are approaching it

from the Jordan. It is protected by walls, flanked by four forts. These walls, the theatre, and the amphitheatre, have been built by Herod; the new palace and its splendid gardens are the work of Archelaus. All around wave groves of feathery palms, rising in stately beauty; stretch gardens of roses, and especially sweet-scented balsam-plantations, the largest behind the royal gardens, of which the perfume is carried by the wind almost out to sea, and which may have given to the city its name (Jericho, the perfumed'). It is the Eden of Palestine, the very fairyland of the old world. And how strangely is this gem set! Deep down in that hollowed valley, through which tortuous Jordan winds, to lose his waters in the slimy mass of the Sea of Judgment. The river and the Dead Sea are nearly equidistant from the town, about six miles. Far across the river rise the mountains of Moab, on which lies the purple and violet colouring. Towards Jerusalem and northwards stretch those bare limestone hills, the hiding-place of robbers along the desolate road towards the City. There, and in the neighbouring wilderness of Judæa, are also the lonely dwellings of anchorites, while over all this strangely varied scene has been flung the many-coloured mantle of a perpetual summer. And in the streets of Jericho a motley throng meets: pilgrims from Galilee and Peræa, priests who have a station' here, traders from all lands, who have come to purchase or to sell, or are on the great caravan-road from Arabia and Damascus - robbers and anchorites, wild fanatics, soldiers, courtiers, and busy publicans - for Jericho was the central station for the collection of tax and custom, both on native produce and on that brought from across Jordan. And yet it was a place for dreaming also, under that glorious summer-sky, in those scented groves - when these many figures from far-off lands and that crowd of priests, numbering, according to tradition, half those in Jerusalem, [5005] seemed fleeting as in a vision, and (as Jewish legend had it) the sound of Temple-music came from Moriah, borne in faint echoes on the breeze, like the distant sound of many waters. [5006] It was through Jericho that Jesus, having entered,' was passing. [5007] [5008] Tidings of the approach of the festive band, consisting of His disciples and Apostles, and headed by the Master Himself, must have preceded Him, these six miles from the fords of Jordan. His Name, His Works, His Teaching - perhaps Himself, must have been known to the people of Jericho, just as they must have been aware of the feelings of the leaders of the people, perhaps of the approaching great contest between them and the Prophet of Nazareth. Was He a good man; had He wrought those great miracles in the power of God or by Satanic influence - was He the Messiah or the Antichrist; would He bring salvation to the world, or entail ruin on His own nation? Conquer or be destroyed? Was it only one more in the long list of delusions and illusions, or was the long-promised morning of heaven's own day at last to break? Close by was Bethany, whence tidings had come; most incredible yet unquestioned and unquestionable, of the raising of Lazarus, so well known to all in that neighbourhood. And yet the Sanhedrin - it was well known - had resolved on His death! At any rate there was no concealment about Him; and here, in face of all, and accompanied by His followers - humble and unlettered, it must be admitted, but thoroughly convinced of His superhuman claims, and deeply attached - Jesus was going up to Jerusalem to meet His enemies! It was the custom, when a festive band passed through a place, that the inhabitants gathered in the streets to bid their brethren welcome. And on that afternoon, surely, scarce any one in Jericho but would go forth to see this pilgrim-band. Men - curious, angry, half-convinced; women, holding up their babes, it may be for a passing blessing, or pushing forward their children that in after years they might say they had seen the Prophet of Nazareth; traders, soldiers, a solid wall of onlookers before their gardens was this crowd' along the road by which Jesus was to pass.' Would He only pass through the place, or be the guest of some of the

leading priests in Jericho; would He teach, or work any miracle, or silently go on His way to Bethany? Only one in all that crowd seemed unwelcome; alone, and out of place. It was the chief of the Publicans' - the head of the tax and customs department. As his name shows, he was a Jew; but yet that very name Zacchæus, Zakkai,' the just,' or pure,' sounded like mockery. We know in what repute Publicans were held, and what opportunities of wrong-doing and oppression they possessed. And from his after-confession it is only too evident, that Zacchæus had to the full used them for evil. And he had got that for which he had given up alike his nation and his soul: he was rich.' If, as Christ had taught, it was harder for any rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, what of him who had gotten his riches by such means? And yet Zacchæus was in the crowd that had come to see Jesus. What had brought him? Certainly, not curiosity only. Was it the long working of conscience; or a dim, scarcely self-avowed hope of something better; or had he heard Him before; or of Him, that He was so unlike those harsh leaders and teachers of Israel, who refused all hope on earth and in heaven to such as him, that Jesus received - nay, called to Him the publicans and sinners? Or was it only the nameless, deep, irresistible inward drawing of the Holy Ghost, which may perhaps have brought us, as it has brought many, we know not why or how, to the place and hour of eternal decision for God, and of infinite grace to our souls? Certain it is, that, as so often in such circumstances, Zacchæus encountered only hindrances which seemed to render his purpose almost impossible. The narrative is singularly detailed and pictorial. Zacchæus, trying to push his way through the press,' and repulsed; Zacchæus, little of stature,' and unable to look over the shoulders of others: it reads almost like a symbolical story of one who is seeking to see Jesus,' but cannot push his way because of the crowd - whether of the self-righteous, or of his own conscious sins, that seem to stand between him and the Saviour, and which will not make room for him, while he is unable to look over them because he is, so to speak, little of stature.' Needless questions have been asked as to the import of Zacchæus' wish to see who Jesus was.' It is just this vagueness of desire, which Zacchæus himself does not understand, which is characteristic. And, since he cannot otherwise succeed, he climbs up one of those wide-spreading sycamores in a garden, perhaps close to his own house, along the only road by which Jesus can pass - to see Him.' Now the band is approaching, through that double living wall: first, the Saviour, viewing that crowd, with, ah! how different thoughts from theirs - surrounded by His Apostles, the face of each expressive of such feelings as were uppermost; conspicuous among them, he who carried the bag,' with furtive, uncertain, wild glance here and there, as one who seeks to gather himself up to a terrible deed. Behind them are the disciples, men and women, who are going up with Him to the Feast. Of all persons in that crowd the least noted, the most hindered in coming - and yet the one most concerned, was the Chief Publican. It is always so - it is ever the order of the Gospel, that the last shall be first. Yet never more self-unconscious was Zacchæus than at the moment when Jesus was entering that garden-road, and passing under the overhanging branches of that sycamore, the crowd closing up behind, and following as He went along. Only one thought - without ulterior conscious object, temporal or spiritual - filled his whole being. The present absolutely held him - when those wondrous Eyes, out of which heaven itself seemed to look upon earth, were upturned, and that Face of infinite grace, never to be forgotten, beamed upon him the welcome of recognition, and He uttered the self-spoken invitation in which the invited was the real Inviter, the guest the true Host. Did Jesus know Zacchæus before - or was it only all open to His Divine gaze as He looked up and saw him?' This latter seems, indeed, indicated by the must' of His abiding in

the house of Zacchæus - as if His Father had so appointed it, and Jesus come for that very purpose. And herein, also, seems this story spiritually symbolical. As bidden by Christ, Zacchæus made haste and came down.' Under the gracious influence of the Holy Ghost he received Him rejoicing.' Nothing was as yet clear to him, and yet all was joyous within his soul. In that dim twilight of the new day, and at this new creation, the Angels sang and the Sons of God shouted together, and all was melody and harmony in his heart. But a few steps farther, and they were at the house of the Chief Publican. Strange hostelry this for the Lord; yet not stranger in that Life of absolute contrasts than that first hostelry, the same, even as regards its designation in the Gospel, [5009] as when the manager had been His cradle; not so strange, as at the Sabbath-feast of the Pharisee Rulers of the Synagogue. But now the murmur of disappointment and anger ran through the accompanying crowd - which perhaps had not before heard what had passed between Jesus and the Publican, certainly, had not understood, or else not believed its import - because He was gone to be guest with a man that was a sinner. Oh, terribly fatal misunderstanding of all that was characteristic of the Mission of the Christ! oh, terribly fatal blindness and jealousy! But it was this sudden shock of opposition which awoke Zacchæus to full consciousness. The hands so rudely and profanely thrust forward only served to rend the veil. It often needs some such sudden shock of opposition, some sudden sharp contest, to waken the new convert to full consciousness, to bring before him, in clear outline, alike the past and the present. In that moment Zacchæus saw it all: what his past had been, what his present was, what his future must be. Standing forth, not so much before the crowd as before the Lord, and not ashamed, nay, scarcely conscious of the confession it implied - so much is the sorrow of the past in true repentance swallowed up by the joy of the present - Zacchæus vowed fourfold restoration, as by a thief, [5010] of what had become his through false accusation, [5011] as well as the half of all his goods to the poor. And so the whole current of his life had been turned, in those few moments, through his joyous reception of Christ, the Saviour of sinners; and Zacchæus the public robber, the rich Chief of the Publicans, had become an almsgiver. It was then, when it had been all done in silence, as mostly all God's great works, that Jesus spake it to him, for his endless comfort, and in the hearing of all, for their and our teaching: This day became - arose - there salvation to this house,' forasmuch as,' truly and spiritually, this one also is a son of Abraham.' And, as regards this man, and all men, so long as time endureth: For the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost.' The Evangelistic record passes with significant silence over that night in the house of Zacchæus. It forms not part of the public history of the Kingdom of God, but of that joy with which a stranger intermeddleth not. It was in the morning, when the journey in company with His disciples was resumed, that the next public incident occurred in the healing of the blind by the wayside. [5012] The small divergences in the narratives of the three Evangelists are well known. It may have been that, as St. Matthew relates, there were two blind men sitting by the wayside, and that St. Luke and St. Mark mention only one - the latter by name as Bar Timæus' - because he was the spokesman. But, in regard to the other divergence, trifling as it is, that St. Luke places the incident at the arrival, the other two Evangelists at the departure of Jesus from Jericho, it is better to admit our inability to conciliate these differing notes of time, than to make clumsy attempts at harmonising them. We can readily believe that there may have been circumstances unknown to us, which might show these statements to be not really diverging. And, if it were otherwise, it would in no way affect the narrative itself. Historical information could only have been derived from local sources; and we have already seen reason to infer that St. Luke had gathered his from

personal inquiry on the spot. And it may have been, either that the time was not noted, or wrongly noted, or that this miracle, as the only one in Jericho, may have been reported to him before mention was made of the reception by Christ of Zacchæus. In any case, it shows the independence of the account of St. Luke from that of the other two Evangelists. Little need be said of the incident itself: it is so like the other Deeds of His Life. So to speak - it was left in Jericho as the practical commentary, and the seal on what Christ had said and done the previous evening in regard to Zacchæus. Once more the crowd was following Jesus, as in the morning He resumed the journey with His disciples. And, there by the wayside, begging, sat the blind men - there, where Jesus was passing. As they heard the tramp of many feet and the sound of many voices, they learned that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. It is all deeply touching, and deeply symbolical. But what must their faith have been, when there, in Jericho, they not only owned Him as the true Messiah, but cried - in the deep significance of that special mode of address, as coming from Jewish lips: [5013] Jesus, Thou Son of David, have mercy on me!' It was quite in accordance with what one might almost have expected - certainly with the temper of Jericho, as we learned it on the previous evening, when many,' the multitude,' they which went before,' would have bidden that cry for help be silent as an unwarrantable intrusion and interruption, if not a needless and meaningless application. But only all the louder and more earnest rose the cry, as the blind felt that they might for ever be robbed of the opportunity that was slipping past. And He, Who listens to every cry of distress, heard this. He stood still, and commanded the blind to be called. Then it was that the sympathy of sudden hope seized the multitude' the wonder about to be wrought fell, so to speak, in its heavenly influences upon them, as they comforted the blind in the agony of rising despair with the words, He calleth thee.' [5014] As so often, we are indebted to St. Mark for the vivid sketch of what passed. We can almost see Bartimæus as, on receiving Christ's summons, he casts aside his upper garment and hastily comes. That question: what he would that Jesus should do unto him, must have been meant for those around more than for the blind. The cry to the son of David had been only for mercy. It might have been for alms - though, as the address, so the gift bestowed in answer, would be right royal - after the order of David.' But our general cry for mercy must ever become detailed when we come into the Presence of the Christ. And the faith of the blind rose to the full height of the Divine possibilities opened before them. Their inward eyes had received capacity for The Light, before that of earth lit up their long darkness. In the language of St. Matthew, Jesus had compassion on them and touched their eyes.' This is one aspect of it. The other is that given by St. Mark and St. Luke, in recording the words with which He accompanied the healing: Thy faith has saved thee.' [5015]And these two results came of it: all the people, when they saw it gave praise unto God;' and, as for Bartimæus, though Jesus had bidden him go thy way,' yet, immediately he received his sight,' he followed Jesus in the way,' glorifying God. [5016] And this is Divine disobedience, or rather the obedience of the spirit as against the observance of the letter. [5017]The arrival of the Paschal band from Galilee and Peræa was not in advance of many others. In truth, most pilgrims from a distance would probably come to the Holy City some days before the Feast, for the sake of purification in the Temple, since those who for any reason needed such - and there would be few families that did not require it - generally deferred it till the festive season brought them to Jerusalem. We owe this notice, and that which follows, to St. John, [5018] and in this again recognise the Jewish writer of the Fourth Gospel. It was only natural that these pilgrims should have sought for Jesus, and, when they did not find Him, discuss among themselves the probability of His coming to the Feast. His absence would, after the work which He

had done these three years, the claim which He made, and the defiant denial of it by the priesthood and the Sanhedrin, have been regarded as a virtual surrender to the enemy. There was a time when He need not have appeared at the Feast - when, as we see it, it was better He should not come. But that time was past. The chief priests and the Pharisees also knew it, and they had given commandment that, if any one knew where He was, he would show it, that they might take Him.' It would be better to ascertain where He lodged, and to seize Him before He appeared in public, in the Temple.But it was not as they had imagined. Without concealment Christ came to Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom He had raised from the dead. He came there six days before the Passover - and yet His coming was such that they could not take Him.' [5019] They might as well take Him in the Temple; nay, more easily. For, the moment His stay in Bethany became known, much people [5020] of the Jews' came out, not only for His sake, but to see that Lazarus whom He had raised from the dead. And, of those who so came, many went away believing. And how, indeed, could it be otherwise? Thus one of their plans was frustrated, and the evil seemed only to grow worse. The Sanhedrin could perhaps not be moved to such flagrant outrage of all Jewish Law, but the chief priests,' who had no such scruples, consulted how they might put Lazarus also to death. [5021] Yet, not until His hour had come could man do aught against Christ or His disciples. And, in contrast to such scheming, haste and search, we mark the majestic calm and quiet of Him Who knew what was before Him. Jesus had arrived at Bethany six days before the Passover - that is, on a Friday. [5022] The day after was the Sabbath, and they made Him a supper.' [5023] It was the special festive meal of the Sabbath. The words of St. John seem to indicate that the meal was a public one, as if the people of Bethany had combined to do Him this honour, and so share the privilege of attending the feast. In point of fact, we know from St. Matthew and St. Mark that it took place in the house of Simon the Leper' - not, of course, an actual leper - but one who had been such. Perhaps his guestchamber was the largest in Bethany; perhaps the house was nearest to the Synagogue; or there may have been other reasons for it, unknown to us - least likely is the suggestion that Simon was the husband of Martha, [5024] or else her father. [5025] But all is in character. Among the guests is Lazarus: and, prominent in service, Martha; and Mary (the unnamed woman of the other two Gospels, which do not mention that household by name), is also true to her character. [5026] She had an alabaster' [5027] of spikenard genuine,' which was very precious. It held a litra' ({hebrew} or {hebrew}) which was a Roman pound,' and its value could not have been less than nearly 9l. Remembering the price of Nard, [5028] as given by Pliny, [5029] and that the Syrian was only next in value to the Indian, which Pliny regarded as the best [5030] ointment of genuine' [5031] Nard - unadulterated and unmixed with any other balsam [5032] (as the less expensive kinds were), such a price (300 dinars = nearly 9l.) would be by no means excessive; indeed, much lower than at Rome. But, viewed in another light, the sum spent was very large, remembering that 200 dinars (about 6l.) nearly sufficed to provide bread for 5,000 men with their families, and that the ordinary wages of a labourer amounted to only one dinar a day.We can here offer only conjectures, But it is, at least, not unreasonable to suppose - remembering the fondness of Jewish women for such perfumes [5033] - that Mary may have had that alabaster' of very costly ointment from olden days, before she had learned to serve Christ. Then, when she came to know Him, and must have learned how constantly that Decease, of which He ever spoke, was before His Mind, she may have put it aside, kept it,' against the day of His burying.' And now the decisive hour had come. Jesus may have told her, as He had told the disciples, what was before Him in Jerusalem at the Feast, and she would

be far more quick to understand, even as she must have known far better than they, how great was the danger from the Sanhedrin. And it is this believing apprehension of the mystery of His Death on her part, and this preparation of deepest love for it - this mixture of sorrow, faith, and devotion - which made her deed so precious, that, wherever in the future the Gospel would be preached, this also that she had done would be recorded for a memorial of her. [5034] And the more we think of it, the better can we understand, how at that last feast of fellowship, when all the other guests realised not - no, not even His disciples - how near the end was, she would come aforehand to anoint His Body for the burying.' [5035] [5036] Her faith made it a twofold anointing: that of the best Guest at the last feast, and that of preparation for that Burial which, of all others, she apprehended as so terribly near. And deepest humility now offered, what most earnest love had provided, and intense faith, in view of what was coming, applied. And so she poured the precious ointment over His Head, over His Feet [5037] - then, stooping over them, wiped them with her hair, as if, not only in evidence of service and love, but in fellowship of His Death. [5038] And the house was filled'- and to all time His House, the Church, is filled - with the odour of the ointment.'It is ever the light which throws the shadows of objects - and this deed of faith and love now cast the features of Judas in gigantic dark outlines against the scene. He knew the nearness of Christ's Betrayal, and hated the more; she knew of the nearness of His precious Death, and loved the more. It was not that he cared for the poor, when, taking the mask of charity, he simulated anger that such costly ointment had not been sold, and the price given to the poor. For he was essentially dishonest, a thief,' and covetousness was the underlying master-passion of his soul. The money, claimed for the poor, would only have been used by himself. Yet such was his pretence of righteousness, such his influence as a man of prudence' among the disciples, and such their sad weakness, that they, or at least some,' [5039] expressed indignation among themselves and against her who had done the deed of love, which, when viewed in the sublimeness of a faith, that accepted and prepared for the death of a Saviour Whom she so loved, and to Whom this last, the best service she could, was to be devoted, would for ever cause her to be though of as an example of loving. There is something inexpressibly sad, yet so patient, gentle, and tender in Christ's Let her alone.' Surely, never could there be waste in ministry of love to Him! Nay, there is unspeakable pathos in what He says of His near Burying, as if He would still their souls in view of it. That He, Who was ever of the poor and with them, Who for our sakes became poor, that through His poverty we might be made rich, should have to plead for a last service of love to Himself, and for Mary, and as against a Judas, seems indeed, the depth of self-abasement. Yet, even so, has this falsely-spoken plea for the poor become a real plea, since He has left us this, as it were, as His last charge, and that by His own Death, that we have the poor always with us. And so do even the words of covetous dishonesty become, when passing across Him, transformed into the command of charity, and the breath of hell is changed into the summer-warmth of the Church's constant service to Christ in the ministry to His poor.

Chapter 90

Book V. THE CROSS AND THE CROWN.

Ave, Scala peccatorum, Qua ascendit rex coelorum, Ut ad choros Angelorum Homo sic ascenderet; In te vitam reparavit Auctor vitæ, proles David, Et sic se humiliavit. Ut mundum redimeret. Ap. Daniel, Thes. Hymnol. vol. v. p.183. The blessing from the cloud that showers, In wondrous twofold birth Of heaven is and earth -He is both yours, ye hosts, and ours:Hosannah, David's Son,For victory is won!He left us with a blessing here,And took it to the sky;The blessing from on highBespeaks to us His Presence near:Hosannah, David's Son,For victory is won!'(From an Ascension Hymn). - A. E.

CHAPTER I. THE FIRST DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - PALM-SUNDAY - THE ROYAL ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM

(St. Matt. xxi.1-11; St. Mark xi.1-11; St. Luke xix.29-44; St. John xii.12-19.) At length the time of the end had come. Jesus was about to make Entry into Jerusalem as King: King of the Jews, as Heir of David's royal line, with all of symbolic, typic, and prophetic import attaching to it. Yet not as Israel after the flesh expected its Messiah was the Son of David to make triumphal entrance, but as deeply and significantly expressive of His Mission and Work, and as of old the rapt seer had beheld afar off the outlined picture of the Messiah-King: not in the proud triumph of war-conquests, but in the meek' rule of peace. It is surely one of the strangest mistakes of modern criticism to regard this Entry of Christ into Jerusalem as implying that, fired by enthusiasm, He had for the moment expected that the people would receive Him as the Messiah. [5040] And it seems little, if at all better, when this Entry is described as an apparent concession to the fevered expectations of His disciples and the multitude . . . the grave, sad accommodation to thoughts other than His own to which the Teacher of new truths must often have recourse when He finds Himself misinterpreted by those who stand together on a lower level.' [5041] Apologies' are the weakness of Apologetics' - and any accommodation' theory can have no place in the history of the Christ. On the contrary, we regard His Royal Entry into the Jerusalem of Prophecy and of the Crucifixion as an integral part of the history of Christ, which would not be complete, nor thoroughly consistent, without it. It behoved Him so to enter Jerusalem, because He was a King; and as King to enter it in such manner, because He was such a King - and both the one and the other were in accordance with the prophecy of old. It was a bright day in early spring of the year 29, when the festive procession set out from the home at Bethany. There can be no reasonable doubt as to the locality of that hamlet (the modern El-Azariye, of Lazarus'), perched on a broken rocky plateau on the other side of Olivet. More difficulty attaches to the identification of Bethphage, which is associated with it, the place not being mentioned in the Old Testament, though repeatedly in Jewish writings. But, even so, there is a curious contradiction, since Bethphage is sometimes spoken of as distinct from Jerusalem, [5042] while at others it is described as, for ecclesiastical purposes, part of the City itself. [5043] Perhaps the name Bethphage - house of figs' - was given alike to that district generally, and to a little village close to Jerusalem where the district began. [5044] And this may explain the peculiar reference, in the Synoptic Gospels, to Bethphage (St. Matthew), and again to Bethphage and Bethany.' [5045] For, St. Matthew and St. Mark relate Christ's brief stay at Bethany and His anointing by Mary not in chronological order, [5046] but introduce it at a later period, as it were, in contrast to the betrayal of Judas. [5047] Accordingly, they pass from the Miracles at Jericho immediately to the Royal Entry into Jerusalem - from Jericho to Bethphage,' or, more exactly, to Bethphage and Bethany,' leaving for the present unnoticed what had occurred in the latter hamlet. Although all the four Evangelists relate Christ's Entry into Jerusalem, they seem to do so from different standpoints. The Synoptists accompany Him from Bethany, while St. John, in accordance with the general scheme of his narrative, seems to follow from Jerusalem that multitude which, on tidings of His approach, hastened to meet Him. Even this circumstance, as

also the paucity of events recorded on that day, proves that it could not have been at early morning that Jesus left Bethany. Remembering, that it was the last morning of rest before the great contest, we may reverently think of much that may have passed in the Soul of Jesus and in the home of Bethany. And now He has left that peaceful resting-place. It was probably soon after His outset, that He sent the two disciples' - possibly Peter and John [5048] - into the village over against' them - presumably Bethphage. There they would find by the side of the road an ass's colt tied, whereon never man had sat. We mark the significant symbolism of the latter, in connection with the general conditions of consecration to Jehovah [5049] - and note in it, as also in the Mission of the Apostles, that this was intended by Christ to be His Royal and Messianic Entry. This colt they were to loose and to bring to Him. The disciples found all as He had said. When they reached Bethphage, they saw, by a doorway where two roads met, the colt tied by its mother. As they loosed it, the owners' and certain of them that stood by' [5050] asked their purpose, to which, as directed by the Master, they answered: The Lord [the Master, Christ] hath need of him,' when, as predicted, no further hindrance was offered. In explanation of this we need not resort to the theory of a miraculous influence, nor even suppose that the owners of the colt were themselves disciples.' Their challenge to the two,' and the little more than permission which they gave, seem to forbid this idea. Nor is such explanation requisite. From the pilgrim-band which had accompanied Jesus from Galilee and Peræa, and preceded Him to Jerusalem, from the guests at the Sabbath-feast in Bethany, and from the people who had gone out to see both Jesus and Lazarus, the tidings of the proximity of Jesus and of His approaching arrival must have spread in the City. Perhaps that very morning some had come from Bethany, and told it in the Temple, among the festive bands - specially among his own Galileans, and generally in Jerusalem, that on that very day - in a few hours - Jesus might be expected to enter the City. Such, indeed, must have been the case, since, from St. John's account, a great multitude' went forth to meet Him.' The latter, we can have little doubt, must have mostly consisted, not of citizens of Jerusalem, whose enmity to Christ was settled, but of those that had come to the Feast.' [5051] With these went also a number of Pharisees,' their hearts filled with bitterest thoughts of jealousy and hatred. [5052] And, as we shall presently see, it is of great importance to keep in mind this composition of the multitude.' If such were the circumstances, all is natural. We can understand, how eager questioners would gather about the owners of the colt (St. Mark), there at the cross-roads at Bethphage, just outside Jerusalem; and how, so soon as from the bearing and the peculiar words of the disciples they understood their purpose, the owners of the ass and colt would grant its use for the solemn Entry into the City of the Teacher of Nazareth,' [5053] Whom the multitude was so eagerly expecting; and, lastly, how, as from the gates of Jerusalem tidings spread of what had passed in Bethphage, the multitude would stream forth to meet Jesus. Meantime Christ and those who followed Him from Bethany had slowly entered on [5054] the well-known caravan-road from Jericho to Jerusalem. It is the most southern of three, which converge close to the City, perhaps at the very place where the colt had stood tied. The road soon loses sight of Bethany. It is now a rough, but still broad and well-defined mountain-track, winding over rock and loose stones; a steep declivity on the left; the sloping shoulder of Olivet above on the right; fig-trees below and above, here and there growing out of the rocky soil.' [5055] Somewhere here the disciples who brought the colt' must have met Him. They were accompanied by many, and immediately followed by more. For, as already stated, Bethphage - we presume the village - formed almost part of Jerusalem, and during Easter-week must have been crowded by pilgrims, who could not find accommodation within the City walls. And

the announcement, that disciples of Jesus had just fetched the beast of burden on which Jesus was about to enter Jerusalem, must have quickly spread among the crowds which thronged the Temple and the City. As the two disciples, accompanied, or immediately followed by the multitude, brought the colt' to Christ, two streams of people met' - the one coming from the City, the other from Bethany. The impression left on our minds is, that what followed was unexpected by those who accompanied Christ, that it took them by surprise. The disciples, who understood not, [5056] till the light of the Resurrection-glory had been poured on their minds, the significance of these things,' even after they had occurred, seem not even to have guessed, that it was of set purpose Jesus was about to make His Royal Entry into Jerusalem. Their enthusiasm seems only to have been kindled when they saw the procession from the town come to meet Jesus with palm-branches, cut down by the way, and greeting Him with Hosanna-shouts of welcome. Then they spread their garments on the colt, and set Jesus thereon - unwrapped their loose cloaks from their shoulders and stretched them along the rough path, to form a momentary carpet as He approached.' Then also in their turn they cut down branches from the trees and gardens through which they passed, or plaited and twisted palm-branches, and strewed them as a rude matting in His way, while they joined in, and soon raised to a much higher pitch [5057] the Hosanna of welcoming praise. Nor need we wonder at their ignorance at first of the meaning of that, in which themselves were chief actors. We are too apt to judge them from our standpoint, eighteen centuries later, and after full apprehension of the significance of the event. These men walked in the procession almost as in a dream, or as dazzled by a brilliant light all around - as if impelled by a necessity, and carried from event to event, which came upon them in a succession of but partially understood surprises. They had now ranged themselves: the multitude which had come from the City preceding, that which had come with Him from Bethany following the triumphant progress of Israel's King, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.' Gradually the long procession swept up and over the ridge where first begins "the descent of the Mount of Olives" towards Jerusalem. At this point the first view is caught of the south-eastern corner of the City. The Temple and the more northern portions are hid by the slope of Olivet on the right; what is seen is only Mount Zion, now for the most part a rough field.' But at that time it rose, terrace upon terrace, from the Palace of the Maccabees and that of the High-Priest, a very city of palaces, till the eye rested in the summit on that castle, city, and palace, with its frowning towers and magnificent gardens, the royal abode of Herod, supposed to occupy the very site of the Palace of David. They had been greeting Him with Hosannas! But enthusiasm, especially in such a cause, is infectious. They were mostly stranger-pilgrims that had come from the City, chiefly because they had heard of the raising of Lazarus. [5058] And now they must have questioned them which came from Bethany, who in turn related that of which themselves had been eyewitnesses. [5059] We can imagine it all - how the fire would leap from heart to heart. So He was the promised Son of David - and the Kingdom was at hand! It may have been just as the precise point of the road was reached, where the City of David' first suddenly emerges into view, at the descent of the Mount of Olives,' that the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen.' [5060] As the burning words of joy and praise, the record of what they had seen, passed from mouth to mouth, and they caught their first sight of the City of David,' adorned as a bride to welcome her King, Davidic praise to David's Greater Son wakened the echoes of old Davidic Psalms in the morning-light of their fulfilment. Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. . . . Blessed the Kingdom that

cometh, the Kingdom of our father David. . . . Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. . . . Hosanna . . . Hosanna in the highest . . .Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest.' They were but broken utterances, partly based upon Ps. cxviii., partly taken from it - the Hosanna,' [5061] or Save now,' and the Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the Lord,' [5062] forming part of the responses by the people with which this Psalm was chanted on certain of the most solemn festivals. [5063] Most truly did they thus interpret and apply the Psalm, old and new Davidic praise mingling in their acclamations. At the same time it must be remembered that, according to Jewish tradition, Ps. cxviii. vv.25-28, was also chanted antiphonally by the people of Jerusalem, as they went to welcome the festive pilgrims on their arrival, the latter always responding in the second clause of each verse, till the last verse of the Psalm vv.25-28 [5064] was reached, which was sung by both parties in unison, Psalm ciii.17 being added by way of conclusion. [5065] But as the shout rang through the long defile,' carrying evidence far and wide, that, so far from condemning and forsaking, more than the ordinary pilgrim-welcome had been given to Jesus - the Pharisees, who had mingled with the crowd, turned to one another with angry frowns: Behold [see intently], how ye prevail nothing! See - the world [5066] is gone after Him!' It is always so, that, in the disappointment of malice, men turn in impotent rage against each other with taunts and reproaches. Then, psychologically true in this also, they made a desperate appeal to the Master Himself, Whom they so bitterly hated, to check and rebuke the honest zeal of His disciples. He had been silent hitherto - alone unmoved, or only deeply moved inwardly - amidst this enthusiastic crowd. He could be silent no longer - but, with a touch of quick and righteous indignation, pointed to the rocks and stones, telling those leaders of Israel, that, if the people held their peace, the very stones would cry out. [5067] [5068] It would have been so in that day of Christ's Entry into Jerusalem. And it has been so ever since. Silence has fallen these many centuries upon Israel; but the very stones of Jerusalem's ruin and desolateness have cried out that He, Whom in their silence they rejected, has come as King in the Name of the Lord. Again the procession advanced. The road descends a slight declivity, and the glimpse of the City is again withdrawn behind the intervening ridge of Olivet. A few moments and the path mounts again, it climbs a rugged ascent, it reaches a ledge of smooth rock, and in an instance the whole City bursts into view. As now the dome of the Mosque El-Aksa rises like a Ghost from the earth before the traveller stands on the ledge, so then must have risen the Temple-tower; as now the vast enclosure of the Mussulman sanctuary, so then must have spread the Temple courts; as now the grey town on its broken hills, so then the magnificent City, with its background - long since vanished away - of gardens and suburbs on the western plateau behind. Immediately before was the Valley of the Kedron, here seen in its greatest depth as it joins the Valley of Hinnom, and thus giving full effect to the great peculiarity of Jerusalem, seen only on its eastern side - its situation as of a City rising out of a deep abyss. It is hardly possible to doubt that this rise and turn of the road - this rocky ledge - was the exact point where the multitude paused again, and "He, when He beheld the City, wept over it.'" Not with still weeping (dkrusen), as at the grave of Lazarus, but with loud and deep lamentation (klausen). The contrast was, indeed, terrible between the Jerusalem that rose before Him in all its beauty, glory, and security, and the Jerusalem which He saw in vision dimly rising on the sky, with the camp of the enemy around about it on every side, hugging it closer and closer in deadly embrace, and the very stockade' which the Roman Legions raised around it; [5069] then, another scene in the shifting panorama, and the city laid with the ground, and the gory bodies of her children among her ruins; and yet another scene: the silence and desolateness of death by the

Hand of God - not one stone left upon another! We know only too well how literally this vision has become reality; and yet, though uttered as prophecy by Christ, and its reason so clearly stated, Israel to this day knows not the things which belong unto its peace, and the upturned scattered stones of its dispersion are crying out in testimony against it. But to this day, also do the tears of Christ plead with the Church on Israel's behalf, and His words bear within them precious seed of promise.We turn once more to the scene just described. For, it was no common pageantry; and Christ's public Entry into Jerusalem seems so altogether different from - we had almost said, inconsistent with - His previous mode of appearance. Evidently, the time for the silence so long enjoined had passed, and that for public declaration had come. And such, indeed, this Entry was. From the moment of His sending forth the two disciples to His acceptance of the homage of the multitude, and His rebuke of the Pharisee's attempt to arrest it, all must be regarded as designed or approved by Him: not only a public assertion of His Messiahship, but a claim to its national acknowledgment. And yet, even so, it was not to be the Messiah of Israel's conception, but He of prophetic picture: just and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass.' [5070] It is foreign to our present purpose to discuss any general questions about this prophecy, or even to vindicate its application to the Messiah. But, when we brush aside all the trafficking and bargaining over words, that constitutes so much of modern criticism, which in its care over the lesson so often loses the spirit, there can, at least, be no question that this prophecy was intended to introduce, in contrast to earthly warfare and kingly triumph, another Kingdom, of which the just King would be the Prince of Peace, Who was meek and lowly in His Advent, Who would speak peace to the heathen, and Whose sway would yet extend to earth's utmost bounds. Thus much may be said, that if there ever was true picture of the Messiah-King and His Kingdom, it is this, and that, if ever Israel was to have a Messiah or the world a Saviour, He must be such as described in this Prophecy - not merely in the letter, but in the spirit of it. And as so often indicated, it was not the letter but the spirit of prophecy - and of all prophecy - which the ancient Synagogue, and that rightly, saw fulfilled in the Messiah and His Kingdom. Accordingly, with singular unanimity the Talmud and the ancient Rabbinic authorities have applied this prophecy to the Christ. [5071] Nor was it quoted by St. Matthew and St. John in the stiffness and deadness of the letter. On the contrary (as so often in Jewish writings, two prophets - Isa. lxii.11, and Zech. ix.9 - are made to shed their blended light upon this Entry of Christ, as exhibiting the reality, of which the prophetic vision had been the reflex. Nor yet are the words of the Prophets given literally - as modern criticism would have them weighed out in the critical balances - either from the Hebrew text, or form the LXX. rendering; but their real meaning is given, and they are Targumed' by the sacred writers. according to their wont. Yet who that sets the prophetic picture by the side of the reality - the description by the side of Christ's Entry into Jerusalem - can fail to recognise in the one the real fulfilment of the other? Another point seems to require comment. We have seen reasons to regard the bearing of the disciples as one of surprise, and that, all through these last scenes, they seem to have been hurried from event to event. But the enthusiasm of the people - their royal welcome of Christ - how is it to be explained, and how reconciled with the speedy and terrible reaction of His Betrayal and Crucifixion? Yet it is not so difficult to understand it; and, if we only keep clear of unconscious exaggeration, we shall gain in truth and reasonableness what we lose in dramatic effect. It has already been suggested, that the multitude which went to meet Jesus must have consisted chiefly of pilgrim-strangers. The overwhelming majority of the citizens of Jerusalem were bitterly and determinately hostile to Christ. But we know that, even so, the Pharisees dreaded to take the final

steps against Christ during the presence of these pilgrims at the Feast, apprehending a movement in His favour. [5072] It proved, indeed, otherwise; for these country-people were but ill-informed; they dared not resist the combined authority of their own Sanhedrin and of the Romans. Besides, the prejudices of the populace, and especially of an Eastern populace, are easily raised, and they readily sway from one extreme to the opposite. Lastly, the very suddenness and completeness of the blow, which the Jewish authorities delivered, would have stunned even those who had deeper knowledge, more cohesion, and greater independence than most of them who, on that Palm-Sunday, had gone forth from the City.Again, as regards their welcome of Christ, deeply significant as it was, we must not attach to it deeper meaning than it possessed. Modern writers have mostly seen in it the demonstrations of the Feast of Tabernacles, [5073] as if the homage of its services had been offered to Christ. It would, indeed, have been symbolic of much about Israel if they had thus confounded the Second with the First Advent of Christ, the Sacrifice of the Passover with the joy of the Feast of Ingathering. But, in reality, their conduct bears not that interpretation. It is true that these responses from Ps. cxviii., which formed part of what was known as the (Egyptian) Hallel, [5074] were chanted by the people on the Feast of Tabernacles also, but the Hallel was equally sung with responses during the offering of the Passover, at the Paschal Supper, and on the Feasts of Pentecost and of the Dedication of the Temple. The waving of the palm-branches was the welcome of visitors or kings, [5075] and not distinctive of the Feast of Tabernacles. At the latter, the worshippers carried, not simple palm-branches, but the Lulabh, which consisted of palm, myrtle, and willow branches interwinted. Lastly, the words of welcome from Ps. cxviii. were (as already stated) those with which on solemn occasions the people also greeted the arrival of festive pilgrims, [5076] although, as being offered to Christ alone, and as accompanied by such demonstrations, they may have implied that they hailed Him as the promised King, and have converted His Entry into a triumph in which the people did homage. And, if proof were required of the more sober, and, may we not add, rational view here advocated, it would be found in this, that not till after His Resurrection did even His own disciples understand the significance of the whole scene which they had witnessed, and in which they had borne such a part.The anger and jealousy of the Pharisees understood it better, and watched for the opportunity of revenge. But, for the present, on that bright spring-day, the weak, excitable, fickle populace streamed before Him through the City-gates, through the narrow streets, up the Temple-mount. Everywhere the tramp of their feet, and the shout of their acclamations brought men, women, and children into the streets and on the housetops. The City was moved, and from mouth to mouth the question passed among the eager crowd of curious onlookers: Who is He?' And the multitude answered - not, this is Israel's Messiah-King, but: This is Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.' And so up into the Temple!He alone was silent and sad among this excited multitude, the marks of the tears He had wept over Jerusalem still on His cheek. It is not so, that an earthly King enters His City in triumph; not so, that the Messiah of Israel's expectation would have gone into His Temple. He spake not, but only looked round about upon all things, as if to view the field on which He was to suffer and die. And now the shadows of evening were creeping up; and, weary and sad, He once more returned with the twelve disciples to the shelter and rest of Bethany.

CHAPTER II. THE SECOND DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - THE BARREN FIG-TREE - THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE - THE HOSANNA OF THE CHILDREN

(St. Matt. xxi.12-22; St. Mark xi.15-26; St. Luke xix.45-48.) How the King of Israel spent the night after the triumphal Entry into His City and Temple, we may venture reverently to infer. His royal banquet would be fellowship with the disciples. We know how often His nights had been spent in lonely prayer, [5077] and surely it is not too bold to associate such thoughts with the first night in Passion week. Thus, also, we can most readily account for that exhaustion and faintness of hunger, which next morning made Him seek fruit on the fig-tree on His way to the City. It was very early [5078] on the morning of the second day in Passion-week (Monday), when Jesus, with his disciples, left Bethany. In the fresh, crisp, spring air, after the exhaustion of that night, He hungered.' By the roadside, as so often in the East, a solitary tree [5079] grew in the rocky soil. It must have stood on an eminence, where it caught the sunshine and warmth, for He saw it afar off,' [5080] and though spring had but lately wooed nature into life, it stood out, with its wide-spreading mantle of green, against the sky. It was not the season of figs,' but the tree, covered with leaves, attacted His attention. It might have been, that they hid some of the fruit which hung through the winter, or else the springing fruits of the new crop. For it is a well-known fact, that in Palestine the fruit appears before the leaves,' [5081] and that this fig-tree, whether from its exposure or soil, was precocious, is evident from the fact that it was in leaf, which is quite unusual at that season on the Mount of Olives, [5082] The old fruit would, of course, have been edible, and in regard to the unripe fruit we have the distinct evidence of the Mishnah, [5083] confirmed by the Talmud, [5084] that the unripe fruit was eaten, so soon as it began to assume a red colour - as it is expressed, in the field, with bread,' or, as we understand it, by those whom hunger overtook in the fields, whether working or travelling. But in the present case there was neither old nor new fruit, but leaves only.' It was evidently a barren fig-tree, cumbering the ground, and to be hewn down. Our mind almost instinctively reverts to the Parable of the Barren Fig-tree, which He had so lately spoken. [5085] To Him, Who but yesterday had wept over the Jerusalem that knew not the day of its visitation, and over which the sharp axe of judgment was already lifted, this fig-tree, with its luxuriant mantle of leaves, must have recalled, with pictorial vividness, the scene of the previous day. Israel was that barren fig-tree; and the leaves only covered their nakedness, as erst they had that of our first parents after their Fall. And the judgment, symbolically spoken in the Parable, must be symbolically executed in this leafy fig-tree, barren when searched for fruit by the Master. It seems almost an inward necessity, not only symbolically but really also, that Christ's Word should have laid it low. We cannot conceive that any other should have eaten of it after the hungering Christ had in vain sought fruit thereon. We cannot conceive that anything should resist Christ, and not be swept away. We cannot conceive, that the reality of what He had taught should not, when occasion came, be visibly placed before the eyes of the disciples. Lastly, we seem to feel (with Bengel) that, as always, the manifestation of His true Humanity, in hunger, should be accompanied by that of His Divinity, in the power of His Word of judgment. [5086] With St.

Matthew, who, for the sake of continuity, relates this incident after the events of that day (the Monday) and immediately before those of the next, [5087] we anticipate what was only witnessed on the morrow. [5088] As St. Matthew has it: on Christ's Word the fig-tree immediately withered away. But according to the more detailed account of St. Mark, it was only next morning, when they again passed by, that they noticed the fig-tree had withered from its very roots. The spectacle attracted their attention, and vividly recalled the Words of Christ, to which, on the previous day, they had, perhaps, scarcely attached sufficient importance. And it was the suddenness and completeness of the judgment that had been denounced, which now struck Peter, rather than its symbolic meaning. It was rather the Miracle than its moral and spiritual import - the storm and earthquake rather than the still small Voice - which impressed the disciples. Besides, the words of Peter are at least capable of this interpretation, that the fig-tree had withered in consequence of, rather than by the Word of Christ. But He ever leads His own from mere wonderment at the Miraculous up to that which is higher. [5089] His answer now combined all that they needed to learn. It pointed to the typical lesson of what had taken place: the need of realising, simple faith, the absence of which was the cause of Israel's leafy barrenness, and which, if present and active, could accomplish all, however impossible it might seem by outward means. [5090] And yet it was only to have faith in God;' such faith as becomes those who know God; a faith in God, which seeks not and has not its foundation in anything outward, but rests on Him alone. To one who shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass, it shall be to him.' [5091] And this general principle of the Kingdom, which to the devout and reverent believer needs neither explanation nor limitation, received its further application, specially to the Apostles in their coming need: Therefore I say unto you, whatsoever things, praying, ye ask for, believe that ye have received them [not, in the counsel of God, [5092] but actually, in answer to the prayer of faith], and it shall be to you.' These two things follow: faith gives absolute power in prayer, but it is also its moral condition. None other than this is faith; and none other than faith - absolute, simple, trustful - gives glory to God, or has the promise. This is, so to speak, the New Testament application of the first Table of the Law, summed up in the Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' But there is yet another moral condition of prayer closely connected with the first - a New Testament application of the second Table of the Law, summed up in the Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' If the first moral condition was God-ward, the second is man-ward; if the first bound us to faith, the second binds us to charity, while hope, the expectancy of answered prayer, is the link connecting the two. Prayer, unlimited in its possibilities, stands midway between heaven and earth; with one hand it reaches up to heaven, with the other down to earth; in it, faith prepares to receive, what charity is ready to dispense. He who so prays believes in God and loves man; such prayer is not selfish, self-seeking, self-conscious; least of all, is it compatible with mindfulness of wrongs, or an unforgiving spirit. This, then, is the second condition of prayer, and not only of such all-prevailing prayer, but even of personal acceptance in prayer. We can, therefore, have no doubt that St. Mark correctly reports in this connection this as the condition which the Lord attaches to acceptance, that we previously put away all uncharitableness. [5093] [5094] We remember, that the promise had a special application to the Apostles and early disciples; we also remember, how difficult to them was the thought of full forgiveness of offenders and persecutors; [5095] and again, how great the temptation to avenge wrongs and to wield miraculous power in the vindication of their authority. [5096] In these circumstances Peter and his fellow-disciples, when assured of the unlimited power of the prayer of faith, required all the more to be both reminded and warned of this

as its second moral condition: the need of hearty forgiveness, if they had aught against any. From this digression we return to the events of that second day in Passion-week (the Monday), which began with the symbolic judgment on the leafy, barren fig-tree. The same symbolism of judgment was to be immediately set forth still more clearly, and that in the Temple itself. On the previous afternoon, when Christ had come to it, the services were probably over, and the Sanctuary comparatively empty of worshippers and of those who there carried on their traffic. When treating of the first cleansing of the Temple, at the beginning of Christ's Ministry, sufficient has been said to explain the character and mode of that nefarious traffic, the profits of which went to the leaders of the priesthood, as also how popular indignation was roused alike against this trade and the traders. We need not here recall the words of Christ; Jewish authorities sufficiently describe, in even stronger terms, this transformation of the House of Prayer' into a den of robbers.' [5097] If, when beginning to do the business' of His Father, and for the first time publicly presenting Himself with Messianic claim, it was fitting He should take such authority, and first cleanse the Temple' of the nefarious intruders who, under the guise of being God's chief priests, made His House one of traffic, much more was this appropriate now, at the close of His Work, when, as King, He had entered His City, and publicly claimed authority. At the first it had been for teaching and warning, now it was in symbolic judgment; what and as He then began, that and so He now finished. Accordingly, as we compare the words, and even some of the acts, of the first cleansing' with those accompanying and explaining the second, we find the latter, we shall not say, much more severe, but bearing a different character - that of final judicial sentence. [5098] Nor did the Temple-authorities now, as on the former occasion, seek to raise the populace against Him, or challenge His authority by demanding the warrant of a sign.' The contest had reached quite another stage. They heard what He said in their condemnation, and with bitter hatred in their hearts sought for some means to destroy Him. But fear of the people restrained their violence. For, marvellous indeed was the power which He wielded. With rapt attention the people hung entranced on his lips, [5099] astonished' at those new and blessed truths which dropped from them. All was so other than it had been! By His authority the Temple was cleansed of the unholy, thievish traffic which a corrupt priesthood carried on, and so, for the time, restored to the solemn Service of God; and that purified House now became the scene of Christ's teaching, when He spake those words of blessed truth and of comfort concerning the Father - thus truly realising the prophetic promise of a House of Prayer for all the nations.' [5100] And as those traffickers were driven from the Temple, and He spake, there flocked in from porches and Temple-Mount the poor sufferers - the blind and the lame - to get healing to body and soul. It was truly spring-time in that Temple, and the boys that gathered about their fathers and looked in turn from their faces of rapt wonderment and enthusiasm to the Godlike Face of the Christ, and then on those healed sufferers, took up the echoes of the welcome at His entrance into Jerusalem - in their simplicity understanding and applying them better - as they burst into Hosanna to the Son of David.' It rang through the courts and porches of the Temple, this Children's Hosanna. They heard it, whom the wonders He had spoken and done, so far from leading to repentance and faith, had only filled with indignation. Once more in their impotent anger they sought, as the Pharisees had done on the day of His Entry, by a hypocritical appeal to His reverence for God, not only to mislead, and so to use His very love of the truth against the truth, but to betray Him into silencing those Children's Voices. But the undimmed mirror of His soul only reflected the light. [5101] These Children's Voices were Angels' Echoes, echoes of the far-off praises of heaven, which children's souls had caught and

children's lips welled forth. Not from the great, the wise, nor the learned, but out of the mouth of babes and sucklings' has He perfected praise.' [5102] And this, also, is the Music of the Gospel.

Chapter 93

CHAPTER III. THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - THE EVENTS OF THAT DAY - THE QUESTION OF CHRIST'S AUTHORITY - THE QUESTION OF TRIBUTE TO CÆSAR - THE WIDOW'S FARTHING - THE GREEKS WHO SOUGHT TO SEE JESUS - SUMMARY AND RETROSPECT OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY O

(St. Matthew xxi.23-27; St. Mark xi.27-33; St. Luke xx.1-8; St. Matt. xxii.15-22; St. Mark xii.13-17; St. Luke xx.20-26; St. Matt. xxii.41-46; St. Luke xxi.1-4; St. John xii.20-50.) THE record of this third day is so crowded, the actors introduced on the scene are so many, the occurrences so varied, and the transitions so rapid, that it is even more than usually difficult to arrange all in chronological order. Nor need we wonder at this, when we remember that this was, so to speak, Christ's last working-day - the last, of His public Mission to Israel, so far as its active part was concerned; the last day in the Temple; the last, of teaching and warning to Pharisees and Sadducees; the last, of his call to national repentance. That what follows must be included in one day, appears from the circumstance that its beginning is expressly mentioned by St. Mark [5103] in connection with the notice of the withering of the fig-tree, while its close is not only indicated in the last words of Christ's Discourses, as reported by the Synoptists, [5104] but the beginning of another day is afterwards equally clearly marked. [5105] Considering the multiplicity of occurrences, it will be better to group them together, rather than follow the exact order of their succession. Accordingly, this chapter will be devoted to the events of the third day in Passion Week. 1. As usually, the day commenced [5106] with teaching in the Temple. [5107] We gather this from the expression: as He was walking,' [5108] viz., in one of the Porches, where, as we know considerable freedom of meeting, conversing, or even teaching, was allowed. It will be remembered, that on the previous day the authorities had been afraid to interfere with Him. In silence they had witnessed, with impotent rage, the expulsion of their traffic-mongers; in silence they had listened to His teaching, and seen His miracles. Not till the Hosanna of the little boys - perhaps those children of the Levites who acted as choristers in the Temple [5109] - wakened them from the stupor of their fears, had they ventured on a feeble remonstrance, in the forlorn hope that He might be induced to conciliate them. But with the night and morning other counsels had come. Besides, the circumstances were somewhat different. It was early morning, the hearers were new, and the wondrous influence of His Words had not yet bent them to His Will. From the formal manner in which the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders are introduced, [5110] and from the circumstance that they so met Christ immediately on His entry into the Temple, we can scarcely doubt that a meeting, although informal, [5111] of the authorities had been held to concert measures against the growing danger. Yet, even so, cowardice as well as cunning marked their procedure. They dared not directly oppose Him, but endeavoured, by attacking Him on the one point where he seemed to lay Himself open to it, to arrogate to themselves the appearance of strict legality, and so to turn popular feeling against Him. For, there was no principle more firmly established by universal consent than that authoritative teaching [5112] required previous authorisation. Indeed, this logically followed from

the principle of Rabbinism. All teaching must be authoritative, since it was traditional - approved by authority, and handed down from teacher to disciple. The highest honour of a scholar was, that he was like a well-plastered cistern, from which not a drop had leaked of what had been poured into it. The ultimate appeal in cases of discussion was always to some great authority, whether an individual Teacher or a Decree by the Sanhedrin. In this manner had the great Hillel first vindicated his claim to be the Teacher of his time and to decide the disputes then pending. And, to decide differently from authority, was either the mark of ignorant assumption or the outcome of daring rebellion, in either case to be visited with the ban.' And this was at least one aspect of the controversy as between the chief authorities and Jesus. No one would have thought of interfering with a mere Haggadist - a popular expositor, preacher, or teller of legends. But authoritatively to teach, required other warrant. In fact there was regular ordination (Semikhah) to the office of Rabbi, Elder, and Judge, for the three functions were combined in one. According to the Mishnah, the disciples' sat before the Sanhedrin in three rows, the members of the Sanhedrin being recruited successively from the front-rank of the Scholars. [5113] At first the practice is said to have been for every Rabbi to accredit his own disciples. But afterwards this right was transferred to the Sanhedrin, with the proviso that this body might not ordain without the consent of its Chief, though the latter might do so without consent of the Sanhedrin. [5114] But this privilege was afterwards withdrawn on account of abuses. Although we have not any description of the earliest mode of ordination, the very name - Semikhah - implies the imposition of hands. Again, in the oldest record, reaching up, no doubt, to the time of Christ, the presence of at least three ordained persons was required for ordination. [5115] At a later period, the presence of an ordained Rabbi, with the assessorship of two others, even if unordained, was deemed sufficient. [5116] In the course of time certain formalities were added. The person to be ordained had to deliver a Discourse; hymns and poems were recited; the title Rabbi' was formally bestowed on the candidate, and authority given him to teach and to act as Judge [to bind and loose, to declare guilty or free]. Nay, there seem to have been even different orders, according to the authority bestowed on the person ordained. The formula in bestowing full orders was: Let him teach; let him teach; let him judge; let him decide on questions of first-born; [5117] let him decide; let him judge!' At one time it was held that ordination could only take place in the Holy Land. Those who went abroad took with them their letters of orders.' [5118] At whatever periods some of these practices may have been introduced, it is at least certain that, at the time of our Lord, no one would have ventured authoritatively to teach without proper Rabbinic authorisation. The question, therefore, with which the Jewish authorities met Christ, while teaching, was one which had a very real meaning, and appealed to the habits and feelings of the people who listened to Jesus. Otherwise, also, it was cunningly framed. For, it did not merely challenge Him for teaching, but also asked for His authority in what He did, referring not only to His Work generally, but, perhaps, especially to what had happened on the previous day. They were not there to oppose Him; but, when a man did as He had done in the Temple, it was their duty to verify his credentials. Finally, the alternative question reported by St. Mark: or' - if Thou hast not proper Rabbinic commission - who gave Thee this authority to do these things?' seems clearly to point to their contention, that the power which Jesus wielded was delegated to Him by none other than Beelzebul. The point in our Lord's reply seems to have been strangely overlooked by commentators. [5119] As His words are generally understood, they would have amounted only to silencing His questioners - and that, in a manner which would, under ordinary circumstances, be scarcely regarded as either fair or ingenuous. It

would have been simply to turn the question against themselves, and so in turn to raise popular prejudice. But the Lord's words meant quite other. He did answer their question, though He also exposed the cunning and cowardice which prompted it. To the challenge for His authority, and the dark hint about Satanic agency, He replied by an appeal to the Baptist. He had borne full witness to the Mission of Christ from the Father, and all men counted John, that he was a prophet indeed.' Were they satisfied? What was their view of the Baptism in preparation for the Coming of Christ? No? They would not, or could not answer! If they said the Baptist was a prophet, this implied not only the authorisation of the Mission of Jesus, but the call to believe on Him. On the other hand, they were afraid publicly to disown John! And so their cunning and cowardice stood out self-condemned, when they pleaded ignorance - a plea so grossly and manifestly dishonest, that Christ, having given what all must have felt to be a complete answer, could refuse further discussion with them on this point. 2. Foiled in their endeavor to involve Him with the ecclesiastical, they next attempted the much more dangerous device of bringing Him into collision with the civil authorities. Remembering the ever watchful jealousy of Rome, the reckless tyranny of Pilate, and the low artifices of Herod, who was at that time in Jerusalem, [5120] we instinctively feel, how even the slightest compromise on the part of Jesus in regard to the authority of Cæsar would have been absolutely fatal. If it could have been proved, on undeniable testimony, that Jesus had declared Himself on the side of, or even encouraged, the so-called Nationalist' party, He would quickly perished, like Judas of Galilee. [5121] The Jewish leaders would thus have readily accomplished their object, and its unpopularity have recoiled only on the hated Roman power. How great the danger was which threatened Jesus, may be gathered from this, that, despite His clear answer, the charge that He prevented the nation, forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, was actually among those brought against Him before Pilate. [5122] The plot, for such it was, [5123] was most cunningly concocted. The object was to spy' out His inmost thoughts, [5124] and, if possible, entangle' Him in His talk. [5125] For this purpose it was not the old Pharisees, whom He knew and would have distrusted, who came, but some of their disciples - apparently fresh, earnest, zealous, conscientious men. With them had combined certain of the Herodians' - of course, not a sect nor religious school, but a political party at the time. We know comparatively little of the deeper political movements in Judæa, only so much as it has suited Josephus to record. But we cannot be greatly mistaken in regarding the Herodians as a party which honestly accepted the House of Herod as occupants of the Jewish throne. Differing from the extreme section of the Pharisees, who hated Herod, and from the Nationalists,' it might have been a middle or moderate Jewish party - semi-Roman and semi-Nationalist. We know that it was the ambition of Herod Antipas again to unite under his sway of the whole of Palestine; but we know not what intrigues may have been carried on for that purpose, alike with the Pharisees and the Romans. Nor is it the first time in this history, that we find the Pharisees and the Herodians combined. [5126] Herod may, indeed, have been unwilling to incur the unpopularity of personally proceeding against the Great Prophet of Nazareth, expecially as he must have had so keen a remembrance of what the murder of John had cost him. Perhaps he would fain, if he could, have made use of Him, and played Him off as the popular Messiah against the popular leaders. But, as matters had gone, he must have been anxious to rid himself of what might be a formidable rival, while, at the same time, his party would be glad to join with the Pharisees in what would secure their gratitude and allegiance. Such, or similar, may have been the motives which brought about this strange alliance of Pharisees and Herodians. Feigning themselves just men, they now came to Jesus with honeyed

words, intended to disarm His suspicions, but, by an appeal to His fearlessness and singleness of moral purpose, to induce Him to commit Himself without reserve. Was it lawful for them to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? were they to pay the capitation-tax [5127] of one drachm, or to refuse it? We know how later Judaism would have answered such a question. It lays down the principle, that the right of coinage implies the authority of levying taxes, and indeed constitutes such evidence of de facto government as to make it duty absolutely to submit to it. [5128] So much was this felt, that the Maccabees, and, in the last Jewish war, Bar Kokhabh, the false Messiah, issued a coinage dating from the liberation of Jerusalem. We cannot therefore doubt, that this principle about coinage, taxation, and government was generally accepted in Judæa. On the other hand, there was a strong party in the land; with which, not only politically but religiously, many of the noblest spirits would sympathise, which maintained, that to pay the tribute-money to Cæsar was virtually to own his royal authority, and so to disown that of Jehovah, Who alone was Israel's King. They would argue, that all the miseries of the land and people were due to this national unfaithfulness. Indeed, this was the fundamental principle of the Nationalist movement. History has recorded many similar movements, in which strong political feelings have been strangely blended with religious fanaticism, and which have numbered in their ranks, together with unscrupulous partisans, not a few who were sincere patriots or earnest religionists. It has been suggested in a former part of this book, that the Nationalist movement may have had an important preparatory bearing on some of the earlier followers of Jesus, perhaps at the beginning of their inquiries, just as, in the West, Alexandrian philosophy moved to many a preparation for Christianity. [5129] At any rate, the scruple expressed by these men would, if genuine, have called forth sympathy. [5130] But what was the alternative here presented to Christ? To have said No, would have been to command rebellion; to have said simply Yes, would have been to give a painful shock to keep feeling, and, in a sense, in the eyes of the people, the lie to His own claim of being Israel's Messiah-King! But the Lord escaped from this temptation' - because, being true, it was no real temptation to Him. [5131] Their knavery and hypocrisy He immediately perceived and exposed, in this also responding to their appeal of being true.' Once more and emphatically must we disclaim the idea that Christ's was rather an evasion of the question than a reply. It was a very real rather, when pointing to the image and inscription on the coin, [5132] for which He had called, He said, What is Cæsar's render to Cæsar, and what is God's to God.' [5133] It did far more than rebuke their hypocrisy and presumption; it answered not only that question of theirs to all earnest men of that time, as it would present itself to their minds, but it settles to all time and for all circumstances the principle underlying it. Christ's Kingdom is not of this world; a true Theocracy is not inconsistent with submission to the secular power in things that are really its own; politics and religion neither include, nor yet exclude, each other; they are, side by side, in different domains. The State is Divinely sanctioned, and religion is Divinely sanctioned - and both are equally the ordinance of God. On this principle did Apostolic authority regulate the relations between Church and State, even when the latter was heathen. The question about the limits of either province has been hotly discussed by sectarians on either side, who have claimed the saying of Christ in support of one or the opposite extreme which they have advocated. And yet, to the simple searcher after duty, it seems not so difficult to see the distinction, if only we succeed in purging ourselves of logical refinements and strained references.It was an answer not only most truthful, but of marvellous beauty and depth. It elevated the controversy into quite another sphere, where there was no conflict between what was due to God and to man - indeed, no conflict at all, but

Divine harmony and peace. Nor did it speak harshly of the Nationalist aspirations, nor yet plead the cause of Rome. It said not whether the rule of Rome was right or should be permanent - but only what all must have felt to be Divine. And so they, who had come to entangle' Him, went away,' not convinced nor converted, but marvelling exceedingly. [5134]3. Passing for the present from the cavils of the Sadducees and the gainslaying of the Scribes, we come unexpectedly on one of those sweet pictures - a historical miniature, as it is presented to us - which affords real relief to the eye amidst the glare all around. [5135] From the bitter malice of His enemies and the predicted judgment upon them, we turn to the silent worship of her who gave her all, and to the words with which Jesus owned it, all unknown to her. It comes to us the more welcome, that it exhibits in deed what Christ had said to those hypocrites who had discussed it, whether the tribute given to Cæsar was not robbing God of what was His. Truly here was one, who, in the simplicity of her humble worship, gave to the Lord what was His!Weary with the contention, the Master had left those to whom He had spoken in the Porches, and, while the crowd wrangled about His Words or His Person, had ascended the flight of steps which led from the Terrace' into the Temple-building. From these steps - whether those leading up to the Beautiful Gate,' or one of the side gates - He could gain full view into The Court of the Women,' into which they opened. On these steps, or within the gate (for in no other place was it lawful), He sat Him down, watching the multitude. The time of Sacrifice was past, and those who still lingered had remained for private devotion, for private sacrifices, or to pay their vows and offerings. Although the topography of the Temple, especially of this part of it, is not without its difficulties, we know that under the colonnades, which surrounded the Court of the Women,' but still left in the middle room for more than 15,000 worshippers, provision was made for receiving religious and charitable shaped boxes (Shopharoth); somewhere here also we must locate two chambers: [5136] that of the silent,' for gifts to be distributed in secret to the children of the pious poor, and that where votive vessels were deposited. Perhaps there was here also a special chamber for offerings. [5137] These trumpets' bore each inscriptions, marking the objects of contribution - whether to make up for past neglect, to pay for certain sacrifices, to provide incense, wood, or for other gifts.As they passed to this or that treasury-box, it must have been a study of deep interest, especially on that day, to watch the givers. Some might come with appearance of self-righteousness, some even with ostentation, some as cheerfully performing a happy duty. Many that were rich cast in much' - yes, very much, for such was the tendency that (as already stated) a law had to be enacted, forbidding the gift of the Temple of more than a certain proportion of one's possessions. And the amount of such contributions may be inferred by recalling the circumstances, that, at the time of Pompey and Crassus, the Temple-Treasury, after having lavishly defrayed every possible expenditure, contained in money nearly half a million, and precious vessels to the value of nearly two millions sterling. [5138] And as Jesus so sat on these steps, looking out on the ever-shifting panorama, His gaze was riveted by a solitary figure. The simple words of St. Mark sketch a story of singular pathos. It was one pauper widow.' We can see her coming alone, as if ashamed to mingle with the crowd of rich givers; ashamed to have her offering seen; ashamed, perhaps, to bring it; a widow,' in the garb of a desolate mourner; her condition, appearance, and bearing that of a pauper.' He observed her closely and read her truly. She held in her hand only the smallest coins, two Perutahs,' and it should be known that it was not lawful to contribute a less amount. [5139] Together these two Perutahs made a guadrans, which was the ninety-sixth part of a denar, itself of the value of about sevenpence. But it was all her living' (bos), perhaps all that she had been able

to save out of her scanty housekeeping; more probably, all that she had to live upon for that day and till she wrought for more. And of this she now made humble offering unto God. He spake not to her words of encouragement, for she walked by faith; He offered not promise of return, for her reward was in heaven. She knew not that any had seen it - for the knowledge of eyes turned on her, even His, would have flushed with shame the pure cheek of her love; and any word, conscious notice, or promise would have married and turned aside the rising incense of her sacrifice. [5140] But to all time has it remained in the Church, like the perfume of Mary's alabaster that filled the house, this deed of self-denying sacrifice. More, far more, than the great gifts of their superfluity,' which the rich cast in, was, and is to all time, the gift of absolute self-surrender and sacrifice, tremblingly offered by the solitary mourner. And though He spake not to her, yet the sunshine of his words must have fallen into the dark desolateness of her heart; and, though perhaps she knew not why, it must have been a happy day, a day of rich feast in the heart, that when she gave up her whole living' unto God. And so, perhaps, is every sacrifice for God all the more blessed, when we know not of its blessedness.Would that to all time its lesson had been cherished, not theoretically, but practically, by the Church! How much richer would have been her treasury:' twice blessed in gift and givers. But so is not legend written. If it had been a story invented for a purpose or adorned with the tinsel of embellishment, the Saviour and the widow would not have so parted - to meet and to speak not on earth, but in heaven. She would have worshipped, and He spoken or done some great thing. Their silence was a tryst for heaven.4. One other event of solemn joyous import remains to be recorded on that day. [5141] But so closely is it connected with what the Lord afterwards spoke, that the two cannot be separated. It is narrated only by St. John, who, as before explained, [5142] tells it as one of a series of progressive manifestations of the Christ: first in His Entry into the City, and then in the Temple - successively, to the Greeks, by the Voice from Heaven, and before the people.Precious as each part and verse here is, when taken by itself, there is some difficulty in combining them , and in showing their connection, and its meaning. But here we ought not to forget, that we have, in the Gospel-narrative, only the briefest account - as it were, headings, summaries, outlines, rather than a report. Nor do we know the surrounding circumstances. The words which Christ spoke after the request of the Greeks to be admitted to His Presence may bear some special reference also to the state of the disciples, and their unreadiness to enter into and share His predicted sufferings. And this may again be connected with Christ's prediction and Discourse about the last things.' [5143] For the position of the narrative in St. John's Gospel seems to imply that it was the last event of the day - nay, the conclusion of Christ's public Ministry. If this be so, words and admonitions, otherwise somewhat mysterious in their connection, would acquire a new meaning.It was then, as we suppose, the evening of a long weary day of teaching. As the sun had been hastening towards its setting in red, He had spoken of that other sun-setting, with the sky all aglow in judgement, and of the darkness that was to follow - but also of the better Light would arise in it. And in those Temple-porches they had been hearing Him - seeing Him in His wonder-working yesterday, hearing Him in His wonder-speaking that day - those men of other tongues.' They were Proselytes,' Greeks by birth, who had groped their way to the proch of Judaism, just as the first streaks of light were falling within upon his altar. They must have been stirred in their inmost being; felt, that it was just for such as they, and to them that He spoke; that this was what in the Old Testament they had guessed, anticipated, dimly hoped for, if they had not seen it - its grand faith, its grander hope, its grandest reality. Not one by one, and almost by stealth, were they thenceforth

to come to the gate; but the portals were to be flung wide open, and as the golden light streamed out upon the way, He stood there, that bright Divine Personality, Who was not only the Son of David, but the Son of Man, to bid them the Father's welcome of good pleasure to the Kingdom. And so, as the lengthening shadows gathered around the Temple-court and porches, they would fain have seen' Him, not afar off, but near: spoken to Him. They had became Proselytes of Righteousness;' they would become disciples of the Lord our Righteousness;' as Proselytes they had come to Jerusalem to worship,' and they would learn to praise. Yet, in the simple self-unconscious modesty of their religious childhood, they dared not go to Jesus directly, but came with their request to Philip of Bethsaida. [5144] We know not why to him: whether from family connections, or that his education, or previous circumstances, connected Philip with these Greeks,' or whether anything in his position in the Apostolic circle, or something that had just occurred, influenced their choice. And he also - such was the ignorance of the Apostles of the inmost meaning of their Master - dared not go directly to Jesus, but went ot his own townsman, who had been his early friend and fellow-disciple, and now stood so close to the Person of the Master - Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter. Together the two came to Jesus, Andrew apparently foremost. The answer of Jesus implies what, at any rate, we would have expected, that the request of these Gentile converts was granted, though this is not expressly stated, and it is extremely difficult to determine whether, and what portion of what He spake was addressed to the Greeks, and what to the disciples. Perhaps we should regard the opening words as bearing reference to the request of the Greeks, and hence as primarily addressed to the disciples, [5145] but also as serving as introduction of the words that follow, which were spoken primarily the Greeks, [5146] but secondarily also to the disciples, and which bear on that terrible, very near, mystery of His Death, and their Baptism into it.As we see these Greeks' approaching, the beginning of Christ's History seems re-enacted at its close. Not now in the stable of Bethlehem, but in the Temple, are the wise men,' the representatives of the Gentile world, offering their homage to the Messiah. But the life which had then begun was now all behind Him - and yet, in a sense, before Him. The hour of decision was about to strike. Not merely as the Messiah of Israel, but in His world-wide bearing as the Son of Man,' was He about to be glorified by receiving the homage of the Gentile world, of which the symbol and the firstfruits were now before Him. But only in one way could He thus be glorified: by dying for the salvation ot the world, and so opening the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers. On a thousand hills was the glorious harvest to tremble in the golden sunlight; but the corn of wheat falling into the ground, must, as it falls, die, burst its envelope, and so spring into a very manifoldedness of life. Otherwise would it have remained alone. This is the great paradox of the Kingdom of God - a paradox which has its symbol and analogon in nature, and which has also almost become the law of progress in history: that life which has not sprung of death abideth alone, and is really death, and that death is life. A paradox this, which has its ultimate reason in this, that sin has entered into the world.And as to the Master, the Prince of Life, so to the disciples, as bearing forth the life. If, in this world of sin, He must fall as the seed-corn into the ground and die, that many may spring of Him, so must they also hate their life, that they may keep it unto life eternal. Thus serving, they must follow Him, that where He is they may also be, for the Father will honour them that honour the Son.It is now sufficiently clear to us, that our Lord spake primarily to these Greeks, and secondarily to His disciples, of the meaning of His impending Death, of the necessity of faithfulness to Him in it, and of the blessing attaching thereto. Yet was not unconscious of the awful realities which this involved. [5147] He was true,

Man, and His Human Soul was troubled in view of it: [5148] True Man, therefore He felt it; True Man, therefore He spake it, and so also sympathised with them in their coming struggle. Truly Man, but also truly more than Man - and hence both the expressed desire, and at the same tine the victory over that desire: What shall I say? [5149] "Father, save Me from this hour? [5150] But for this cause came I unto this hour!"' And the seeming discord is resolved, as both the Human and the Divine in the Son - faith and sight - join in glorious accord; Father, glorify Thy Name!'Such appeal and prayer, made in such circumstances, could not have remained unacknowledged, if He was the Messiah, Son of God. As at His Baptism, so at this Baptism of self-humiliation and absolute submission to suffering, came the Voice from Heaven, audible to all, but its words intelligible only to Him: I both glorified it, and will again glorify it!' [5151] Words these, which carried the Divine seal of confirmation to all Christ's past work, and assured it for that which was to come. The words of confirmation could only be for Himself; the Voice' was for all. What mattered it, that some spoke of it as thunder on a spring-evening, while others, with more reason, thought of Angel-Voices? To him it bore the assurance, which had all along been the ground of His claims, as it was the comfort in His Sufferings, that, as God had in the past glorified Himself in the Son, so would it be in the future in the perfecting of the work given Him to do. And this He now spake, as, looking on those Greeks as the emblem and firstfruits of the work finished in His Passion, He saw of the travail of His Soul, and was satisfied. Of both He spake in the prophetic present. To His view judgement had already come to this world, as it lay in the power of the Evil One, since the Prince of it was cast out from his present rule. And, in place of it, the Crucified Christ, lifted up out of the earth' - in the twofold sense - was, as the result of His Work, drawing, with sovereign, conquering power, all' unto Him, and up with Him. The Jews who heard it, so far understood Him, that His words referred to His removal from earth, or His Death, since this was a common Jewish mode of expression ({hebrew}). [5152] [5153] But they failed to understand His special reference to the manner of it. And yet, in view of the peculiarly shameful death to the cross, it was most important that He should ever point to it also. But, even in what they understood, they had a difficulty. They understood Him to imply that He would be taken from earth; and yet they had always been taught from the Scriptures [5154] that the Messiah was, when fully manifested, to abide for ever, or, as the Rabbis put it, that His Reign was to be followed by the Resurrection. Or did He refer to any other One by the expression, Son of Man?' Into the controversial part of the question the Lord did not enter; nor would it have been fitting to have so in that hour.' But to their inquiry He fully replied, and that with such earnest, loving admonition as became His last address in the Temple. Yes; it was so! But a little while would the Light be among them. [5155] Let them hasten to avail themselves of it, [5156] lest darkness overtake them - and he that walked in darkness knew not wither he went. Oh, that His love could have arrested them! While they still had the Light,' would that they might learn to believe in the Light, that so they might become the children of Light!They were His last words of appeal to them, ere He withdrew to spend His Sabbath of soul before the Great Contest. [5157] And the writer of the Fourth Gospel gathers up, by way of epilogue, the great contrast between Israel and Christ. [5158] Although He had shown so many miracles, they believe not on Him - and this their wilful unbelief was the fulfillment of Esaias' prophecy of old concerning the Messiah. [5159] On the other hand, their wilful unbelief was also the judgement of God in accordiance with prophecy. [5160] Those who have followed the course of this history must have learned this above all, that the rejection of Christ by the Jews was not an isolated act, but the outcome and direct result of their whole previous religious development. In face of the clearest

evidence, they did not believe, because they could not believe. The long course of their resistance to the prophetic message, and their perversion of it, was itself a hardening of their hearts, although at the same time a God-decreed sentence on their resistance. [5161] Because they would not believe - through this their mental obscuration, which came upon them in Divine judgement, although in the natural course of their self-chosen religious development - therefore, despite all evidence, they did not believe, when He came and did such miracles before them. And all this in accordance with prophecy, when Isaiah saw in far-off vision the bright glory [5162] of Messiah, and spoke of Him. Thus far Israel as a nation. And though, even among their chief rulers,' there were many who believed on him, yet dared they not make confession,' from fear that the Pharisees would put them out of the Synagogues, with all the terrible consequences which this implied. For such surrender of all were they not prepared, whose intellect might be convinced, but whose heart was not converted - who loved the glory of men more than the glory of God.'Such was Israel. On the other hand, what was the summary of the Christ's activity? His testimony now rose so loud, as to be within hearing of all (Jesus cried'). [5163] From first to last that testimony had pointed from Himself up to the Father. Its substance was the reality and the realisation of that which the Old Testimony had pointed from Himself up to the Father. Its substance was the reality and the realisation of that which the Old Testament had infolded and gradually unfolded to Israel, and through Israel to the world: the Fatherhood of God. To believe on him was really not faith in him, but faith in him that sent Him. A step higher: To behold Christ was to behold Him that had sent Him. [5164] To combine these two: Christ had come a light into the world, God had sent Him as as the Sun of Righteousness, that by believing on him as the God-sent, men might attain moral vision - no longer abide in darkness,' but in the bright spiritual light that and risen. But as for the others, there were those who heard and did not keep [5165] His words; and, again, who rejected, Him, and did not receive His words. Neither in one nor the other case was the controversy as between His sayings and men. As regarded the one class, He had come into the world with the Word of salvation, not with the sword of judgement. As regarded His open enemies, He left the issue till the evidence of His word should appear in the terrible judgenment of the last Day.Once more, and more empatic than ever, was the final appeal to His Mission by the Father. [5166] From first to last it had not been His own work: what He should say, and what He should speak, the Father Himself' had given Him commandment. Nay, this commandment, and what He spoke in it, was not mere teaching, nor Law: it was Life everlasting. And so it is, and ever shall be, eternal thanks to the love of Him Who sent, and the grace of Him Who came: that the things which He spake, He spake as the Father said unto Him. These two things, then, are the final summary by the Apostle of the History of the Christ in His public activity. On the one hand, he shows us how Israel, hardened in the self-chosen course of its religious development, could not, and, despite the clearest evidence, did not, believe. And, on the other hand, he sets before us the Christ absolutely surrendering Himself to do the Will and Work of the Father; witnessed by the Father; revealing the Father; coming as the Light of the world to chase away its moral darkness; speaking to all men, bringing to them salvation, not judgment, and leaving the vindication of His Word to its manifestation in the Last Day; and finally, as the Christ, Whose every message is commanded of God, and Whose every commandment is life everlasting - and therefore and so speaking it, as the Father said unto Him.These two things: concerning the history of Israel and their necessary unbelief, and concerning the Christ as God-sent, God-witnessed, God-revealing, bringing light and life as the Father's gift and command - the Christ as absolutely surrendering Himself to this Mission and

embodying it - are the sum of the Gospel-narratives. They explain their meaning, and set forth their object and lessons.

Chapter 94

CHAPTER IV. THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - THE LAST CONTROVERSIES AND DISCOURSES - THE SADDUCEES AND THE RESURRECTION - THE SCRIBE AND THE GREAT COMMANDMENT - QUESTION TO THE PHARISEES ABOUT DAVID'S SON AND LORD - FINAL WARNING TO THE PEOPLE: THE EIGHT W

(St. Matt. xxii.23-33; St. Mark xii.18-27; St. Luke xx.27-39; St. Matt. xxii.34-40; St. Mark xii.28-34; St. Matt. xxii.41-46; St. Mark xii.35-40; St. Luke xx.40-47; St. Matt. xxiii.) THE last day in the Temple was not to pass without other temptations' than that of the Priests when they questioned His authority, or of the Pharisees when they cunningly sought to entangle Him in His speech. Indeed, Christ had on this occasion taken a different position; He had claimed supreme authority, and thus challenged the leaders of Israel. For this reason, and because at the last we expect assaults from all His enemies, we are prepared for the controversies of that day. We remember that, during the whole previous history, Christ had only on one occasion come into public conflict with the Sadducees, when, characteristically, they had asked of Him a sign from heaven.' [5167] Their Rationalism would lead them to treat the whole movement as beneath serious notice, the outcome of ignorant fanaticism. Nevertheless, when Jesus assumed such a position in the Temple, and was evidently to such extent swaying the people, it behoved them, if only to guard their position, no longer to stand by. Possibly, the discomfiture and powerlessness of the Pharisees may also have had their influence. At any rate, the impression left is, that those of them who now went to Christ were delegates, and that the question which they put had been well planned. [5168] Their object was certainly not serious argument, but to use the much more dangerous weapon of ridicule. Persecution the populace might have resented; for open opposition all would have been prepared; but to come with icy politeness and philosophic calm, and by a well-turned question to reduce the renowned Galilean Teacher to silence, and show the absurdity of His teaching, would have been to inflict on His cause the most damaging blow. To this day such appeals to rough and ready common-sense are the main stock-in-trade of that coarse infidelity, which, ignoring alike the demands of higher thinking and the facts of history, appeals - so often, alas! effectually - to the untrained intellect of the multitude, and - shall we not say it? - to the coarse and lower in us all. Besides, had the Sadducees succeeded, they would at the same time have gained a signal triumph for their tenets, and defeated, together with the Galilean Teacher, their own Pharisaic opponents. The subject of attack was to be the Resurrection [5169] - the same which is still the favourite topic for the appeals of the coarser forms of infidelity to the common sense' of the masses. Making allowance for difference of circumstances, we might almost imagine we were listening to one of our modern orators of materialism. And in those days the defence of belief in the Resurrection laboured under twofold difficulty. It was as yet a matter of hope, not of faith: something to look forward to, not to look back upon. The isolated events recorded in the Old Testament, and the miracles of Christ - granting that they were admitted - were rather instances of resuscitation than of Resurrection. The grand fact of history, than which none is better attested -

the Resurrection of Christ - had not yet taken place, and was not even clearly in view of any one. Besides, the utterances of the Old Testament on the subject of the hereafter' were, as became alike that stage of revelation and the understanding of those to whom it was addressed, far from clear. In the light of the New Testament it stands out in the sharpest proportions, although as an Alpine height afar off; but then that Light had not yet risen upon it. Besides, the Sadducees would allow no appeal to the highly poetic language of the Prophets, to whom, at any rate, they attached less authority, but demanded proof from that clear and precise letter of the Law, every tittle and iota of which the Pharisees exploited for their doctrinal inferences, and from which alone they derived them. Here, also, it was the Nemesis of Pharisaism, that the postulates of their system laid it open to attack. In vain would the Pharisees appeal to Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, or the Psalms. [5170] To such an argument as from the words, this people will rise up,' [5171] the Sadducees would rightly reply, that the context forbade the application to the Resurrection; to the quotation of Isaiah xxvi.19, they would answer that that promise must be understood spiritually, like the vision of the dry bones in Ezekiel; while such a reference as to this, causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak,' [5172] would scarcely require serious refutation. [5173] Of similar character would be the argument from the use of a special word, such as return' in Gen. iii.19, [5174] or that from the twofold mention of the word cut off' in the original of Num. xv.31, as implying punishment in the present and in the future dispensation. [5175] Scarcely more convincing would be the appeal to such passages as Deut. xxxii.39: I kill and make alive,' [5176] or the statement that, whenever a promise occurs in the form which in Hebrew represents the future tense, [5177] it indicates a reference to the Resurrection. Perhaps more satisfactory, although not convincing to a Sadducee, whose special contention it was to insist on proof from the Law, [5178] might be an appeal to such passages as Dan. xii.2, 13, [5179] or to the restoration of life by certain of the prophets, with the superadded canon, that God had in part prefiguratively wrought by His prophets whatever He would fully restore in the future. If Pharisaic argumentation had failed to convince the Sadducees on Biblical grounds, it would be difficult to imagine that, even in the then state of scientific knowledge, any enquiring person could have really believed that there was a small bone in the spine which was indestructible, and from which the new man would spring; [5180] or that there existed even now a species of mice, or else of snails, which gradually and visibly developed out of the earth. [5181] Many clever sayings of the Pharisees are, indeed, here recorded in their controversies, as on most subjects, and by which a Jewish opponent might have been silenced. But here, especially, must it have been felt that a reply was not always an answer, and that the silencing of an opponent was not identical with proof of one's own assertion. And the additions with which the Pharisees had encumbered the doctrine of the Resurrection would not only surround it with fresh difficulties, but deprive the simple fact of its grand majesty. Thus, it was a point in discussion, whether a person would rise in his clothes, which one Rabbi tried to establish by a reference to the grain of wheat, which was buried naked,' but rose clothed. [5182] Indeed, some Rabbis held, that a man would rise in exactly the same clothes in which he had been buried, while others denied this. [5183] On the other hand, it was beautifully argued that body and soul must be finally judged together, so that, in their contention to which of them the sins of man had been due, justice might be meted out to each - or rather to the two in their combination, as in their combination they had sinned. [5184] Again, it was inferred from the apparition of Samuel [5185] that the risen would look exactly as in life - have even the same bodily defects, such as lameness, blindness, or deafness. It is argued, that they were only afterwards to be healed, lest enemies

might say that God had not healed them when they were alive, but that He did so when they were dead, and that they were perhaps not the same persons. [5186] In some respects even more strange was the contention that, in order to secure that all the pious of Israel should rise on the sacred soil of Palestine, [5187] there were cavities underground in which the body would roll till it reached the Holy Land, there to rise to newness of life. [5188] But all the more, that it was so keenly controverted by heathens, Sadducees, and heretics, as appears from many reports in the Talmud, and that it was so encumbered with realistic legends, should we admire the tenacity with which the Pharisees clung to this doctrine. The hope of the Resurrection-world appears in almost every religious utterance of Israel. It is the spring-bud on the tree, stript by the long winter of disappointment and persecution. This hope pours its morning carol into the prayer which every Jew is bound to say on awakening; [5189] it sheds its warm breath over the oldest of the daily prayers which date from before the time of our Lord; [5190] in the formula from age to age,' world without end,' it forms, so to speak, the rearguard to every prayer, defending it from Sadducean assault; [5191] it is one of the few dogmas denial of which involves, according to the Mishnah, the loss of eternal life, the Talmud explaining, almost in the words of Christ - that in the retribution of God this is only measure according to measure;' [5192] nay, it is venerable even in its exaggeration, that only our ignorance fails to perceive it in every section of the Bible, and to hear it in every commandment of the Law. But in the view of Christ the Resurrection would necessarily occupy a place different from all this. It was the innermost shrine in the Sanctuary of His Mission, towards which He steadily tended; it was also, at the same time, the living corner-stone of that Church which he had builded, and its spire, which, as with uplifted finger, ever pointed all men heavenwards. But of such thoughts connected with His Resurrection Jesus could not have spoken to the Sadducees; they would have been unintelligible at that time even to His own disciples. He met the cavil of the Sadducees majestically, seriously, and solemnly, with words most lofty and spiritual, yet such as they could understand, and which, if they had received them, would have led them onwards and upwards far beyond the standpoint of the Pharisees. A lesson this to us in our controversies. The story under which the Sadducees conveyed their sneer was also intended covertly to strike at their Pharisaic opponents. The ancient ordinance of marrying a brother's childless widow [5193] [5194] had more and more fallen into discredit, as its original motive ceased to have influence. A large array of limitations narrowed the number of those on whom this obligation now devolved. Then the Mishnah laid it down that, in ancient times, when the ordinance of such marriage was obeyed in the spirit of the Law, its obligation took precedence of the permission of dispensation, but that afterwards this relationship became reversed. [5195] Later authorities went further. Some declared every such union, if for beauty, wealth, or any other than religious motives, as incestuous, [5196] while one Rabbi absolutely prohibited it, although opinions continued divided on the subject. But what here most interests us is, that what are called in the Talmud the Samaritans,' but, as we judge, the Sadducees, held the opinion that the command to marry a brother's widow only applied to a betrothed wife, not to one that had actually been wedded. [5197] This gives point to the controversial question, as addressed to Jesus. A case such as they told, of a woman who had successively been married to seven brothers, might, according to Jewish Law, have really happened. [5198] Their sneering question now was, whose wife she was to be in the Resurrection. This, of course, on the assumption of the grossly materialistic views of the Pharisees. In this the Sadducean cavil was, in a sense, anticipating certain objections of modern materialism. It proceeded on the assumption that the relations of time would apply to

eternity, and the conditions of the things seen hold true in regard to those that are unseen. But perchance it is otherwise; and the future may reveal what in the present we do not see. The reasoning as such may be faultless; but, perchance, something in the future may have to be inserted in the major or the minor, which will make the conclusion quite other! All such cavils we would meet with the twofold appeal of Christ to the Word [5199] and to the Power of God - how God has manifested, and how He will manifest Himself - the one flowing from the other. In His argument against the Sadducees Christ first appealed to the power of God. [5200] What God would work was quite other than they imagined: not a mere re-awakening, but a transformation. The world to come was not to be a reproduction of that which had passed away - else why should it have passed away - but a regeneration and renovation; and the body with which we were to be clothed would be like that which Angels bear. What, therefore, in our present relations is of the earth, and of our present body of sin and corruption, will cease; what is eternal in them will continue. But the power of God will transform all - the present terrestrial into the future heavenly, the body of humiliation into one of exaltation. This will be the perfecting of all things by that Almighty Power by which He shall subdue all things to Himself in the Day of His Power, when death shall be swallowed up in victory. And herein also consists the dignity of man, in virtue of the Redemption introduced, and, so to speak, begun at his Fall, that man is capable of such renovation and perfection - and herein, also, is the power of God,' that He hath quickened us together with Christ, so that here already the Church receives in Baptism into Christ the germ of the Resurrection, which is afterwards to be nourished and fed by faith, through the believer's participation in the Sacrament of fellowship with His body and Blood. [5201] Nor ought questions here to rise, like dark clouds, such as of the perpetuity of those relations which on earth are not only so precious to us, but so holy. Assuredly, they will endure, as all that is of God and good; only what in them is earthly will cease, or rather be transformed with the body. Nay, and we shall also recognise each other, not only by the fellowship of the soul; but as, even now, the mind impresses its stamp on the features, so then, when all shall be quite true, shall the soul, so to speak, body itself forth, fully impress itself on the outward appearance, and for the first time shall we then fully recognise those whom we shall now fully know - with all of earth that was in them left behind, and all of God and good fully developed and ripened into perfectness of beauty. But it was not enough to brush aside the flimsy cavil, which had only meaning on the supposition of grossly materialistic views of the Resurrection. Our Lord would not merely reply, He would answer the Sadducees; and more grand or noble evidence of the Resurrection has never been offered than that which He gave. Of course as speaking to the Sadducees, He remained on the ground of the Pentateuch; and yet it was not only to the Law but to the whole Bible that He appealed, nay, to that which underlay Revelation itself: the relation between God and man. Not this nor that isolated passage only proved the Resurrection: He Who, not only historically but in the fullest sense, calls Himself the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, cannot leave them dead. Revelation implies, not merely a fact of the past - as is the notion which traditionalism attaches to it - a dead letter; it means a living relationship. He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto Him.'The Sadducees were silenced, the multitude was astonished, and even from some of the Scribes the admission was involuntarily wrung: Teacher, Thou hast beautifully said.' One point, however, still claims our attention. It is curious that, as regards both these arguments of Christ, Rabbinism offers statements closely similar. Thus, it is recorded as one of the frequent sayings of a later Rabbi, that in the world to come there would be neither eating nor drinking, fruitfulness nor

increase, business nor envy, hatred nor strife, but that the just would sit with crowns on their heads, and feast on the splendor of the Shekhinah. [5202] This reads like a Rabbinic adaptation of the saying of Christ. As regards the other point, the Talmud reports a discussion on the Resurrection between Sadducees,' or perhaps Jewish heretics (Jewish-Christian heretics), in which Rabbi Gamaliel II. at last silences his opponents by an appeal to the promise [5203] that ye may prolong your days in the land which the Lord sware unto your father to give unto them' - unto them,' emphasises the Rabbi, not unto you.' [5204] Although this almost entirely misses the spiritual meaning conveyed in the reasoning of Christ, it is impossible to mistake its Christian origin. Gamaliel II. lived after Christ, but at a period when there was lively intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians; while, lastly, we have abundant evidence that the Rabbi was acquainted with the sayings of Christ, and took part in the controversy with the Church. [5205] On the other hand, Christians in his day - unless heretical sects - neither denied that Resurrection, nor would they have so argued with the Jewish Patriarch; while the Sadducees no longer existed as a party engaging in active controversy. But we can easily perceive, that intercourse would be more likely between Jews and such heretical Jewish Christians as might maintain that the Resurrection was past, and only spiritual. The point is deeply interesting. It opens such further questions as these: In the constant intercourse between Jewish Christians and Jews, what did the latter learn? and may there not be much in the Talmud which is only an appropriation and adaptation of what had been derived from the New Testament?2. The answer of our Lord was not without its further results. As we conceive it, among those who listened to the brief but decisive passage between Jesus and the Sadducees were some Scribes' - Sopherim, or, as they are also designated, lawyers,' teachers of the Law,' experts, expounders, practitioners of the Jewish Law. One of them, perhaps he who exclaimed: Beautifully said, Teacher! hastened to the knot of Pharisees, whom it requires no stretch of the imagination to picture gathered in the Temple on that day, and watching, with restless, ever foiled malice, the Saviour's every movement. As the Scribe' came up to them, he would relate how Jesus had literally gagged' and muzzled' [5206] the Sadducees - just as, according to the will of God, we are by well-doing to gag the want or knowledge of senseless men.' There can be little doubt that the report would give rise to mingled feelings, in which that prevailing would be, that, although Jesus might thus have discomfited the Sadducees, He would be unable to cope with other questions, if only properly propounded by Pharisaic learning. And so we can understand how one of the number, perhaps the same Scribe, would volunteer to undertake the office; [5207] and how his question was, as St. Matthew reports, in a sense really intended to tempt' Jesus.We dismiss here the well-known Rabbinic distinctions of heavy' and light' commandments, because Rabbinism declared the light' to be as binding as the heavy,' [5208] those of the Scribes more heavy' (or binding) than those of Scripture, [5209] and that one commandment was not to be considered to carry greater reward, and to be therefore more carefully observed, than another. [5210] That such thoughts were not in the mind of the questioner, but rather the grand general problem - however himself might have answered it - appears even from the form of his inquiry: Which [qualis] is the great - the first' [5211] - commandment in the Law?' So challenged, the Lord could have no hesitation in replying. Not to silence him, but to speak the absolute truth, He quoted the well-remembered words which every Jew was bound to repeat in his devotions, and which were ever to be on his lips, living or dying, as the inmost expression of his faith: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.' And then continuing, He repeated the command concerning love to God which is the outcome of that

profession. But to have stopped here would have been to propound a theoretic abstraction without concrete reality, a mere Pharisaic worship of the letter. As God is love - His Nature so manifesting itself - so is love to God also love [5212] to man. And so this second is like' the first and great commandment.' It was a full answer to the Scribe when He said: There is none other commandment greater than these.' But it was more than an answer, even deepest teaching, when, as St. Matthew reports, He added: on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' [5213] It little matters for our present purpose how the Jews at the time understood and interpreted these two commandments. [5214] They would know what it meant that the Law and the Prophets hung' on them, for it was a Jewish expression ({hebrew}). He taught them, not that any one commandment was greater or smaller, heavier or lighter, than another - might be set aside or neglected, but that all sprang from these two as their root and principle, and stood in living connection with them. It was teaching similar to that concerning the Resurrection; that, as concerning the promises, so concering the commandments, all Revelation was one connected whole; not disjointed ordinances of which the letter was to be weighed, but a life springing from love to God and love to man. So noble was the answer, that for the moment the generous enthusiasm of the Scribe, who had previously been favorably impressed by Christ's answer to the Sadducees, was kindled. For the moment, at least, traditionalism lost its sway; and, as Christ pointed to it, he saw the exceeding moral beauty of the Law. He was not far from the Kingdom of God. [5215] Whether or not he ever actually entered it, is written on the yet unread page of its history.3. The Scribe had originally come to put his question with mixed motives, partially inclined towards Him from His answer to the Sadducees, and yet intending to subject Him to the Rabbinic test. The effect now wrought in him, and the silence which from that moment fell on all His would-be questioners, induced Christ to follow up the impression that had been made. Without addressing any one in particular, He set before them all, what perhaps was the most familiar subject in their theology, that of the descent of Messiah. Whose Son was He? And when they replied: The Son of David,' [5216] He referred them to the opening words of Psalm cx., in which David called the Messiah Lord.' The argument proceeded, of course, on the two-fold supposition that the Psalm was Davidic and that it was Messianic. Neither of these statements would have been questioned by the ancient Synagogue. But we could not rest satisfied with the explanation that this sufficed for the purpose of Christ's argument, if the foundation on which it rested could be seriously called in question. Such, however, is not the case. To apply Psalm cx., verse by verse and consistently, to any one of the Maccabees, were to undertake a critical task which only a series of unnatural explanations of the language could render possible. Strange, also, that such an interpretation of what at the time of Christ would have been a comparatively young composition, should have been wholly unknown alike to Sadducee and Pharisee. For our own part, we are content to rest the Messianic interpretation on the obvious and natural meaning of the words taken in connection with the general teaching of the Old Testament about the Messiah, on the undoubted interpretation of the ancient Jewish Synagogue, [5217] on the authority of Christ, and on the testimony of History.Compared with this, the other question as to the authorship of the Psalm is of secondary importance. The character of infinite, nay, Divine, superiority to any earthly Ruler, and of course to David, which the Psalm sets forth in regard to the Messiah, would sufficiently support the argument of Christ. But, besides, what does it matter, whether the Psalm was composed by David, or only put into the mouth of David (David's or Davidic), which, on the supposition of Messianic application, is the only rational alternative?But we should greatly err if we

thought that, in calling the attention of His hearers to this apparent contradiction about the Christ, the Lord only intended to show the utter incompetence of the Pharisees to teach the higher truths of the Old Testament. Such, indeed, was the case - and they felt it in His Presence. [5218] But far beyond this, as in the proof which He gave for the Ressurection, and in the view which He presented of the great commandment, the Lord would point to the grand harmonious unity of Revelation. Viewed separately, the two statements, that Messiah was David's Son, and that David owned Him Lord, would seem incompatible. But in their combination in the Person of the Christ, how harmonious and how full of teaching - to Israel of old, and to all men - concerning the nature of Christ's Kingdom and of His Work!It was but one step from this demonstration of the incompetence of Israel's teachers for the position they claimed to a solemn warning on this subject. And this appropriately constitutes Christ's Farewell to the Temple, to its authorieites, and to Israel. As might have been expected, we have the report of it in St. Matthew's Gospel. [5219] Much of this had been said before, but in quite other connection, and therefore with different application. We notice this, when comparing this Discourse with the Sermon on the Mount, and, still more, with what Christ had said when at the meal in the house of the Pharisee in Peræa. [5220] But here St. Matthew presents a regular series of charges against the representatives of Judaism, formulated in logical manner, taking up successively one point after the other, and closing with the expression of deepest compassion and longing for that Jerusalem, whose children He would fain have gathered under His sheltering wings from the storm of Divine judgment. To begin with - Christ would have them understand, that, in warning them of the incompetence of Israel's teachers for the position which they occupied, He neither wished for Himself nor His disciples the place of authority which they claimed, nor yet sought to incite the people to reisitance thereto. On the contrary, so long as they held the place of authority they were to be regarded - in the language of the Mishnah [5221] - as if instituted by Moses himself, as sitting in Moses' seat, and were to be obeyed, so far as merely outward observances were concerned. We regard this direction, not as of merely temporary application, but as involving as important principle. But we also recall that the ordinances to which Christ made reference were those of the Jewish canon-law, and did not involve anything which could really affect the conscience - except that of the ancient, or of our modern Pharisees. But while they thus obeyed their outward directions, they were equally to eschew the spirit which characterised their observances. [5222] In this respect of twofold charge is laid against them: of want of spiritual earnestness and love, [5223] and of more externalism, vanity, and self-seeking. [5224] And here Christ interrupted His Discourse to warn His disciples against the first beginnings of what had led to such fearful consequences, and to point them to the better way. [5225]This constitutes the first part of Christ's charge. Before proceeding to those which follow, we may give a few illustrative explanations. Of the opening accusation about the binding (truly in bondage: desmeo) of heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and laying them on men's shoulders, proof can scarcely be required. As frequently shown, Rabbinism placed the ordinances of tradition above those of the Law, [5226] and this by a necessity of the system, since they were professedly the authoritative exposition and the supplement of the written Law. [5227] And although it was a general rule, that no ordinance should be enjoined heavier that the congregation could bear, [5228] yet (as previously stated) it was admitted, that whereas the words of the Law contained what lightened' and what made heavy,' the words of the Scribes contained only what made heavy.' [5229] Again, it was another principle, that were an aggravation' or increase of the burden had once been introduced, it must continue to be observed. [5230] Thus

the burdens became intolerable. And the blame rested equally on both the great Rabbinic Schools. For, although lthe School of Hillel was supposed in general to make the yoke lighter, and that of Shammai heavier, yet not only did they agree on many points, [5231] but the School of Hillel was not unfrequently even more strict than that of his rival. [5232] In truth, their differences seem too often only prompted by a spirit of opposition, so that the serious business of religion became in their hands one of rival authority and mere wrangling. [5233]It is not so easy to understand the second part of Christ's accusation. There were, indeed, many hypocrites among them, who might, in the language of the Talmud, alleviate for themselves and make heavy for others. [5234] Yet the charge of not moving them with the finger could scarcely apply to the Pharisees as a party - not even in this sense, that Rabbinic ingenuity mostly found some means of evading what was unpleasant. But, as previously explained, [5235] we would understand the word rendered move' as meaning to set in motion,' or move away,' in the sense that they did not alleviate' where they might have done so, or else with reference to their admitted principle, that their ordinances always made heavier, never lighter - always imposed grievous burdens, but never, not even with the finger, moved them away.With this charge of unreality and want of love, those of externalism, vanity, and self-seeking are closely connected. Here we can only make selection from the abundant evidence in our support of it. By a merely external interpretation of Exod. xiii.9, 16, and Deut. vi.8; xi.18, practice of wearing Phylacteries or, as they were called, Tephillin, prayer-fillets,' was introduced. [5236] These, as will be remembered, were square capsules, covered with leather, containing on small scrolls of parchment, these four sections of the law: Exod. xiii.1-10; 11-16: Deut. vi.4-9; xi.13-21. The Phylacteries were fastened by long leather straps to the forehead, and round the left arm, near the heart. Most superstitious reverence was attached to them, and in later times they were even used as amulets. Nevertheless, the Talmud itself gives confirmation that the practice of constantly wearing phylacteries - or, it might be, making them broad, and enlarging the borders of the garments, we intended for to be seen of men.' Thus we are told of a certain man who had done so, in order to cover his dishonest practices in appropriating what had been entrusted to his keeping. [5237] Nay, the Rabbis had in so many words to lay it down as a principle, than the Phylacteries were not to be worn for show. [5238] Detailed proof is scarcely required of the charge of vanity and self-seeking in claiming marked outward honours, such as the upper-most places at feasts and in the Synagogue, respectful salutations in the market, the ostentatious repetition of the title Rabbi,' or Abba,' Father,' or Master,' [5239] [5240] or the distinction of being acknowledged as greatest.' The very earnestness with which the Talmud sometimes warns against such motives for study or for piety sufficiently establishes it. But, indeed, Rabbinic writings lay down elaborate directions, what place is to be assigned to the Rabbis, according to their rank, and to their disciples, [5241] and how in the College the most learned, but at feast the most aged, among the Rabbis, are to occupy the upper seats.' [5242] So weighty was the duty of respectful salutation by the title Rabbi, that to neglect it would involve the heaviest punishment. [5243] Two great Rabbis are described as literally complaining, that they must have lost the very appearance of learning, since in the market-place they only had been greeted with May your peace be great,' without the addition My masters.' [5244]A few further illustrations of the claims which Rabbinism preferred may throw light on the words of Christ. It reads like a wretched imitation from the New Testament, when the heathen Governor of Cæsarea is represented as rising up before Rabbis because he beheld the faces as it were of Angels;' or like an adaptation of the well-known story about Constantine the Great when

the Governor of Antioch is described as vindicating a similar mark of respect to the Rabbis by this, that he had seen their faces and by them conquered in battle. [5245] From another Rabbi rays of light are said to have visibly proceeded. [5246] According to some, they were Epicuraeans, who had no part in the world to come, who referred slightingly to these Rabbis.' [5247] To sypply a learned man with the means of gaining money in trade, would procure a high place in heaven. [5248] It was said that, according to Prov. viii.15, the sages were to be saluted as kings; [5249] nay, in some respects, they were higher - for, as between a sage and a king, it would be duty to give the former priority in redemption from captivity, since every Israelite was fit to be a king, but the loss of a Rabbi could not easily be made up. [5250] But even this is not all. The curse of a Rabbi, even if uncaused, would surely come to pass. [5251] It would be too painful to repeat some of the miracles pretended to have been done by them or for them, occasionally in protection of a lie; or to record their disputes which among them was greatest,' or how they established their respective claims. [5252] Nay, their self-assertion extended beyond this life, and a Rabbi went so far as to order that he should be buried in white garments, to show that he was worthy of appearing before his Maker. [5253] But perhaps the climax of blasphemous self-assertion is reached in the story, that, in a discussion in heaven between God and the heavenly Academy on a Halakhic question about purity, a certain Rabbi - deemed that most learned on the subject - was summoned to decide the point! As his soul passed from the body he exclaimed: Pure, pure,' which the Voice from Heaven applied to the state of the Rabbi's soul; and immediately afterwards a letter had fallen from heaven to inform the sages of the purpose of which the Rabbi had been summoned to the heavenly assembly, and afterwards another enjoing a week's universal mourning for him on pain of excommunication. [5254]Such daring profanities must have crushed out all spiritual religion, and reduced it to a mere intellectual display, in which the Rabbi was always chief - here and hereafter. Repulsive as such legends are, they will at least help us to understand what otherwise might seem harsh in our Lord's denunciations of Rabbinism. In view of all this, we need not discuss the Rabbinic warnings against pride and self-seeking when connected with study, nor their admonitions to humility. [5255] For, the question here is, what Rabbinism regarded as pride, and what as humility, in its teachers? Nor is it maintained that all were equally guilty in this matter; and what passed around may well have led more earnest to energetic admonitions to humility and unselfishness. but no ingenuity can explain away the facts as above stated, and, when such views prevailed, it would have been almost superhuman wholly to aviod what our Lord denounced as characteristic of Pharisaism. And in this sense, not with Pharisaic painful literalism, but as opposed to Rabbinic bearing, are we to understand the Lord's warning ot His own not to claim among brethen to be Rabbi,' or Abba,' or guide.' [5256] The Law of the Kindgom, as repeatedly taught, [5257] was the opposite. As regarede aims, they were to seek the greatness of service; and as regarded that acknowledgment which would come from God, it would be the exaltation of humiliation.It was not a break in the Discourse, [5258] rather an intensification of it, when Christ now turned to make final denunication of Pharisaism in its sin and hypocrisy. [5259] Corresponding to the eight Beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount with which His public Ministry began, He now closed it with eight denunciations of woe. [5260] These are the fourthpouring of His holy wrath, the last and fullest testimony against those whose guilt would involve Jerusalem in common sin and common judgement. Step by step, with logical sequence and intensified pathos of energy, is each charge advanced, and with it the Woe of Divine wrath announced. The first Woe against Pharisaism was on their shutting the Kingdom of God against

men by their opposition to the Christ. All knew how exclusive were their pretensions in confining piety to the possesion of knowledge, and that they declared it impossible for an ignorant person to be pious. Had they taught men the Scriptures, and shown them the right way, they would have been true to their office; but woe to them who, in their positions as leaders, had themselves stood back with their backs to the door of the Kingdom, and prevented the entrance of others.The second Woe was on their covetousness and hypocrisy. They made long prayers, [5261] but how often did it only cover the vilest selfishness, even to the devouring' of widow's houses. We can scarcely expect the Talmud here to furnish us with illustrative instances, and yet at least one such is recorded; [5262] and we recall how often broad phylacteries covered fraudulent minds.The third Woe was on their proselytism, which issued only in making their converts twofold more the children of hell than themselves. Against this charge, rightly understood, Judaism has in vain sought to defend itself. It is, indeed, true that, in its pride and exclusiveness, Judaism seemed to denounce proselytism, laid down strict rules to test the sincerity of converts, and spoke of them in general contempt [5263] as a plague of leprosy.' [5264] Yet the bitter complaint of classical writers, [5265] [5266] the statements of Josephus, [5267] the frequent allusions in the New Testament and even the admissions of the Rabbis, prove their zeal for making proselytes - which, indeed, but for its moral sequences, would neither have deserted nor drawn down the denunciation of a woe.' Thus the Midrash, commenting on the words: [5268] the souls that they had gotten in Haran,' refers it to the converts which Abraham had made, adding that every proselyte was to be regarded as if a soul had been created. [5269] [5270] To this we may add the pride with which Judaism looked back upon the 150,000 Gibeonite converts said to have been made whem David avenged the sin of Saul; [5271] the satisfaction with which it looked forward to the times of Messiah as those of spontaneous conversion to the Synagogue; [5272] and not the unfrequent instances in which a spirit favourableto proselytism is exhibited in Jewish writings, [5273] as, also, such a saying as this, that when Israel is obedient to the will of God, He brings in as converts to Judaism all the just of the nations, such as Jethro, Rahab, Ruth, &c. [5274] But after all, may the Lord not have referred, not to conversion to Judaism in general, but to proselytism to the sect of the Pharisees, which was undoubtedly sought to the compassing of sea and land?The fourth Woe is denounced on the moral blindness of these guides rather than on their hypocrisy. From the nature of things it is not easy to understand the precise allusion of Christ. It is true that the Talmud makes the strangest distinction between an oath or adjuration, such as by heaven' or by earth,' which is not supposed to be binding; and that by any of the letters of which Divine Being, when the oath is supposed to be binding. [5275] But itseems more likely that our Lord refers to oaths or adjurations in connection with vows, where the casuistry was of the most complicated kind. In general, the Lord here condemns the arbitrariness of all such Jewish distinctions, which, by attaching excessive value to the letter of an oath or vow, really tended to diminish its sanctity. All such distinctions argued folly and more blindness.The fifth Woe referred to one of the best-known and strangest Jewish ordinances, which extended the mosaic law of tithing, in most burdensome minuteness, even to the smallest products of the soil that were esculent and could be preserved, [5276] such as anise. Of these, according to some, not only the seeds, but, in certain cases, even the leaves and stalks, had to be tithed. [5277] And this, together with grievous omission of the weightier matters of the Law: judgement, mercy, and faith. Truly, this was to strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel!' We remember that this conscientiousness in tithing constituted one of the characteristics of the Pharisees; but we could scarcely be prepared for such an instance of it, as

when the Talmud gravely assures us that the ass of a certain Rabbi had been so well trained as to refuse corn of which the tithes had not been taken! [5278] And experience, not only in the past but in the present, has only too plainly shown, that a religious zeal which expends itself on trifles has not room nor strength left for the weightier matters of the Law.From tithing to purification the transition was natural. [5279] It constituted the second grand characteristic of Pharasaic piety. We have seen with what punctiliousness questions of outward purity of vessels were discussed. But woe to the hypocrisy which, caring for the outside, heeded not whether that which filled the cup and platter had been procured by extortion or was used for excess. And, alas for the blindness which perceived not, that internal purity was the real condition of that which was outward! Woe similarly to another species of hypocrisy, of which, indeed, the preceding were but the outcome: that of outward appearance of righteousness, while heart and mind were full of iniquity - just as those annually-whited sepulchres of theirs seemed so fair outwardly, but within were full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. Woe, lastly, to that hypocrisy which built and decorated sepulchres of prophets and righteous men, and by so doing sought to shelter itself from share in the guilt of those who had killed them. It was not spiritual repentance, but national pride, which actuated them in this, the same spirit of self-sufficiency, pride, and impenitence which had led their fathers to commit the murders. And were they not about to imbrue their hands in the blood of Him to Whom all the prophets had pointed? Fast were they in the Divine judgement filling up the measure of their fathers.And thicker and heavier than ever before fell the hailstorm of His denunciations, as He foretold the certain doom which awaited their national impenitence. [5280] Prophets, wise men, and scribes would be sent them of Him; and only murder, sufferings, and persecutions would await them - not reception of their message and warnings. And so would they become heirs of all the blood of martyred saints, from that of him whom Scripture records as the first one murdered, down to that last martyr of Jewish unbelief of whom tradition spoke in such terms - Zechariah, [5281] stoned by the king's command in the Court of the Temple, [5282] whose blood, as legend had it, did not dry up those two centuries and a half, but still bubbled on the pavement, when Nebuzar-adan entered the Temple, and at last avenged it. [5283]And yet it would not have been Jesus, if, while denouncing certain judgement on them who, by continuance and completion of the crimes of their fathers, through the same unbelief, had served themselves heirs to all their guilt, He had not also added to it the passionate lament of a love which, even when spurned, lingered with regretful longing over the lost. [5284] They all knew the common illustration of the hen gathering her young brood for shelter, [5285] and they knew also what of Divine protection, blessing, and rest it implied, when they spoke of being gathered under the wings of the Shekhinah. Fain and often would Jesus have given to Israel, His people, that shelter, rest, protection, and blessing - but they would not. Looking around on those Temple-buildings - that House, it shall be left to them desolate! And he quitted its courts with these words, that they of Israel should not see Him again till, the night of their unbelief past, they would welcome His return with a better Hosanna than that which greeted His Royal Entry three days before. And this was the Farewell' and the parting of Israel's Messiah from Israel and its temple. Yet a Farewell which promised a coming again; and a parting which implied a welcome in the future from a believing people to a gracious, pardoning King!

Chapter 95

CHAPTER V. THE THIRD DAY IN PASION-WEEK - THE LAST SERIES OF PARABLES: TO THE PHARISEES AND TO THE PEOPLE - ON THE WAY TO JERUSALEM: THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD - IN THE TEMPLE: THE PARABLE OF THE NO' AND YES' OF THE TWO SONS - THE PARABL

(ST. Matt. xix.30, xx.16; St. Matt. xxi.28-32; St. Mark xii.1-12; St. Luke xx.9-19; St. Matt. xxii.1-14.) ALTHOUGH it may not be possible to mark their exact succession, it will be convenient here to group together the last series of Parables. Most, if not all of them, were spoken on that third day in Passion week: the first four to a more general audience; the last three (to be treated in another chapter) to the disciples, when, on the evening of that third day, on the Mount of Olives, [5286] He told them of the Last Things.' They are the Parables of Judgment, and in one form or another treat of the End.' 1. The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. [5287] As treating of the End,' this Parable evidently belongs to the last series, although it may have been spoken previously to Passion-Week, perhaps on that Mission-journey in Peræa, in connection with which it is recorded by St. Matthew. At any rate, it stands in internal relation with what passed on that occasion, and must therefore be studied with reference to it. We remember, that on the occasion of the rich young ruler's failure to enter the Kingdom, to which he was so near, Christ had uttered an earnest warning on the danger of riches.' [5288] In the low spiritual stage which the Apostles had as yet attained, it was, perhaps only natural that Peter should, as spokesman of the rest, have, in a kind of spiritual covetousness, clutched at the promised reward, and that in a tone of self-righteousness he should have reminded Christ of the yet part of what He, the Lord. had always to bear, and bore so patiently and lovingly, from their ignorance and failure to understand Him and His work. And this want of true sympathy, this constant contending with the moral dulness even of those nearest to Him, must have been part of His great humiliation and sorrow, one element in the terrible solitariness of His Life, which made Him feel that, in the truest sense, the Son of Man had not where to lay His Head.' And yet we also mark the wondrous Divine generosity which, even in moments of such sore disappointment, would not let Him take for nought what should have been freely offered in the gladsome service of grateful love. Only there was here deep danger to the disciples: danger of lapsing into feelings kindred to those with which the Pharisees viewed the pardoned Publicans, or th elder son in the Parable his younger brother; danger of misunderstanding the right relations, and with it the very character of the Kingdom, and of work in and for it. It is to this that the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard refers. The principle which Christ lays down is, that, while nothing done for Him shall lose its rewared, yet, from one reason or another, no forecast can be made, no inferences of self-righteousness may be drawn. It does not by any means follow, that most work done, at least, to our seeing and judging, shall entail a greater reward. On the contrary, many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first.' Not all, not yet always and necessarily, but many.' And in such cases no wrong has been done; there exists no claim, even in view of the promises of due acknowledgement of work. Spiritual pride and

self-assertion can only be the outcome either of misunderstanding God's relation to us, or else of a wrong state of mind towards others; [5289] - that is, it betokens mental or moral unfitness. Of this the Parable of the Labourers is an illustration. It teaches nothing beyond this. [5290] But, while illustrating how it may come that some who were first are last,' and how utterly mistaken or wrong is the thought that they must necessarily receive more than others, who, seemingly, have done more - how, in short, work for Christ is not a ponderable quantity, so much for so much, nor yet we the judges of when and why a worker has come - it also conveys much that is new, and, in many respects, most comforting. We mark, first, the bearing of the householder, who went out immediately, at earliest morn (ma pro), to hire labourers into his vineyard.' That he did not send his steward, but went himself, [5291] and with the dawn of morning, shows both that there was much work to do, and the householder's anxiety to have it done. That householder is God, and the vineyard His Kingdom; the labourers, whom with earliest morning He seeks in the market-place of busy life, are His Servants. With these he agreed for a denarius a day, which was the ordianry wages for a day's labour, [5292] and so sent them into the vineyard; in other words, He told them He would pay the reward promised to labourers. So passed the early hours of the morning. About the third hour (the Jewish working day being reckoned from sunrise to sunset), that is, probably as it was drawing towards a close, he went out again, and, as he saw others' standing idle in the market-place, he said to them, Go ye also into the vineyard.' There was more than enough to do in that vineyard; enough and more to employ them. And when he came, they had stood in the marketplace ready and waiting to go to work, yet idle' - unemployed as yet. It might not have been precisely their blame that they had not gone before; they were others' than those in the market-place when the Master had first come, and they had not been there at that time. Only as he now sent them, he made no definite promise. They felt that in their special circumstances they had no claim; he told them, that whatsoever was right he would give them; and they implicitly trusted to his word, to his justice and goodness. And so happened it yet again, both at the sixth and at the ninth hour of the day. We repeat, that in none of these instances was it the guilt of the labourers - in the sense of being due to their unwillingness or refusal - that they had not before gone into the vineyard. For some reason - perhaps by their fault, perhaps not, they had not been earlier in the market-place. But as soon as they were there and called, they went, although, of course, the loss of time, however caused, implied loss of work. Neither did the Master in any case make, nor they ask for, other promise than that implied in his word and character. These four things, then, stand out clearly in the Parable: the abundance of work to be done in the vineyard; th anxiety of the householder to secure all available labourers; the circumstance that, not from unwillingness or refusal, but because they had not been there and available, the labourers had come at later hours; and that, when they had so come, they were ready to go into the vineyard without promise of definite reward, simply trusting to the truth and goodness of him whom they went to serve. We think here of those last,' the Gentiles from the east, west, north, and south; [5293] of the converted publicans and sinners; of those, a great part of whose lives has, alas! been spent somewhere else, and who have only come at a late hour into the market-place; nay, of them also whose opportunities, capacity, strength, or time have been very limited - and we thank God for the teaching of this Parable. And if doubt should still exist, it must be removed by the concluding sentences of this part of the Parable, in which the householder is represented as going out at the last hour, when, finding others standing [5294] he asks them why they stood there all the day idle, to which they reply, that no man had hired them. These also are, in turn, sent into the vineyard,

though apparently without any expressed promise at all. [5295] It thus appears, that in proportion to the lateness of their work was the felt absence of any claim on the part of the labourers, and their simple reliance on their employer. And now it is even. The time for working is past, and the Lord of the vineyard bids His Steward [here the Christ] pay His labourers. But here the first surprise awaits them. The order of payment is the inverse of that of labour: beginning from the last unto the first.' This is almost a necessary part of the Parable. For, if the first labourers had been paid first, they would either have gone away without knowing what was done to the last, or, if they had remained, their objection could not have been urged, except on the ground of manifest malevolence towards their neighbours. After having received their wages, they could not have objected that they had not received enough, but only that the others had received too much. But it was not the scope of the Parable to charge with conscious malevolence those who sought a higher reward or deemed themselves entitled to it. Again, we notice, as indicating the disposition of the later labourers, that those of the third hour did not murmur, because they had not got more than they of the eleventh hour. This is in accordance with their not having made any bargain at the first, but trusted entirely to the householder. But they of the first hour had their cupidity excited. Seeing what the others had received, they expected. to have more than their due. When they like wise received every man a denarius, they murmured, as if injustice had been done them. And, as mostly in like circumstances, truth and fairness seemed on their side. For, selecting the extreme case of the eleventh hour labourers, had not the Householder made those who had wrought [5296] only one hour equal to them who had borne the burden of the day and the heat?' Yet, however fair their reasoning might seem, they had no claim in truth or equity, for had they not agreed for one denarius with him? And it had not even been in the general terms of a day's wages, but they had made the express bargain of one denarius. They had gone to work with a stipulated sum as their hire distinctly in view. They now appealed to justice; but from first to last they had had justice. This as regards the so much for so much' principle of claim, law, work, and pay. But there was yet another aspect than that of mere justice. Those other labourers, who had felt that, owning to the lateness of their appearance, they had no claim - and, alas! which of us must not feel how late we have been in coming, and hence how little we can have wrought - had made no bargain, but trusted to the Master. And as they had believed, so was it unto them. Not because they made or had any claim - I will, however, to give unto this last, even as unto thee' - the word I will' (thlo) being emphatically put first to mark the good pleasure' of His grace as the ground of action. Such a Master could not have given less to those who had come when called, trusting to His goodness, and not in their deserts. The reward was now reckoned, not of work nor of debt, but of grace. [5297] In passing we also mark, as against cavillers, the profound accord between what negative critics would call the true Judaic Gospel' of St. Matthew, and what constitutes the very essence of the anti-Judaic teaching' of St. Paul - and we ask our opponents to reconcile on their theory what can only be explained on the ground that St. Paul, like St. Matthew, was the true disciple of the true Teacher, Jesus Christ. But if all is to be placed on the new ground of grace, with which, indeed, the whold bearing of the later labourers accords, then (as St. Paul also shows) the laboureres who murmured were guilty either of ignorance in failing to perceive the sovereignty of grace - that it is within His power to do with His own as He willeth [5298] - or else of malevolence, when, instead of with grateful joy, they looked on with an evil eye - and this in proportion as the Householder' was good. But such a state of mind may be equally that of the Jews, [5299] and of the Gentiles. [5300] And so, in this illustrative case of the Parable, the first shall be last, and the

last first.' [5301] And in other instances also, though not in all - many shall be last that are first; and first that are last.' [5302] But He is the God, Sovereign in grace, in Whose Vineyard there is work to do for all, however limited their time, power, or opportunity; Whose laboureres we are, if His Children; Who, in His desire for the work, and condescension and patience towards the workers, goeth out into the market-place even to the eleventh hour, and, with only gentlest rebuke for not having earlier come thither and thus lost our day in idleness, still, even to the last, bids us come; Who promises what is right, and gives far more than is due to them who simply trust Him: the God not of the Jews nor of the Gentiles only, but our Father; the God Who not only pays, but freely gives of His own, and in Whose Wisdom and by Whose Grace it may be, that, even as the first shall be last, so the last shall be first. Another point still remains to be noticed. If anywhere, we expect in these Parables, addressed to the people, forms of teaching and speaking with which they were familiar - in other words, Jewish parallels. But we equally expect that the teaching of Christ, while conveyed under illustrations with which the Jews were familiar, would be entirely different in spirit. And such we find it notably in the present instances. To begin with, according to Jewish Law, if a man engaged a labourer without any definite bargain, but on the statement that he would be paid as one or another of the labourers in the place, he was, according to some, only bound to pay the lowest wages in the place; but, according to the majority, the average between the lowest and the highest. [5303] [5304] Again, as regards the letter of the Parable itself, we have a remarkable parallel in a funeral oration on a Rabbi, who died at the early age of twenty-eight. The text chosen was: The sleep of a labouring man is sweet,' [5305] and this was illustrated by a Parable of a king who had a vineyard, and engaged many labourers to work in it. One of them was distinguished above the rest by his ability. So the king took him by the hand, and walked up and down with him. At even, when the labourers were paid, this one received the same wages as the others, just as if he had wrought the whole day. Upon this the others murmured, because he who had wrought only two hours had received the same as they who had laboured the whole day, when the king replied: Why murmur ye? This labourer has by his skill wrought as much in two hours as you during the whole day.' [5306] This in reference to the great merits of the deceased young Rabbi.But it will be observed that, with all its similarity of form, the moral of the Jewish Parable is in exactly the opposite direction from the teaching of Christ. The same spirit of work and pay breathes in another Parable, which is intended to illustrate the idea that God had not revealed the reward attaching to each commandment, in order that men might not neglect those which brought less return. A king - so the Parable runs - had a garden, for which he hired labourers without telling them what their wages would be. In the evening he called them, and, having ascertained from each under what tree he had been working, he paid them according to the value of the trees on which they had been engaged. And when they said that he ought to have told them, which trees would bring the labourers most pay, the king replied that thereby a great part of his garden would have been neglected. So had God in like manner only revealed the reward of the greatest of the commandments, that to honour father and mother, [5307] and that of the least, about letting the mother-bird fly away [5308] - attaching to both precisely the same reward. [5309]To these, if need were, might be added other illustrations of that painful reckoning about work, or else sufferings, and reward, which characterises Jewish theology, as it did those labourers in the Parable. [5310]2. The second Parable in this series - or perhaps rather illustration - was spoken within the Temple. The Savior had been answering the question of the Pharisees as to His authority by an appeal to the testimony of the Baptist. This led Him to refer to the twofold

reception of that testimony - on the one hand, by the Publicans and harlots, and, on the other, by the Pharisees.The Parable, [5311] which now follows, introduces a man who has two sons. He goes to the first, and in language of affection (tknon) bids him go and work in his vineyard. The son curtly and rudely refuses; but afterwards he changes his mind [5312] and goes. [5313] Meantime the father, when refused by the one, has gone to his other son on the same errand. The contrast here is marked. The tone is most polite, and the answer of the son contains not only a promise, be we almost see him going: I, sir! - and he did not go.' The application was easy. The first son represented the Publicans and harlots, whose curt and rude refusal of the Father's call was implied in their life of reckless sin. But afterwards they changed their mind - and went into the Father's vineyard. The other Son, with his politeness of tone and ready promise, but utter neglect of obligations undertaken, represented the Pharisees with their hypocritical and empty professions. And Christ obliged them to make application of the Parable. When challenged by the Lord, which of the two had done the will of his father, they could not avoid the answer. Then it was that, in language equally stern and true. He pointed the moral. The Baptist had come preaching righteousness, and, while the self-righteous Pharisees had not believed him, those sinners had. And yet, even when the Pharisees saw the effect on these former sinners, they changed not their minds that they might believe. Therefore the Publicans and harlots would and did go into the Kingdom before them.3. Closely connected with the two preceding Parables, and, indeed, with the whole tenor of Christ's sayings at that time, is that about the Evil Husbandmen in the Vineyard. [5314] As in the Parable about the Labourers sought by the Householder at different times, the object here is to set forth the patience and goodness of the owner, even towards the evil. And as, in the Parable of the Two Sons, reference is made to the practical rejection of the testimony of the Baptist by the Jews, and their consequent self-exclusion from the Kingdom, so in this there is allusion to John as greater than the prophets, [5315] to the exclusion of Israel as a people from their position in the Kingdom, [5316] and to their punishment as individuals. [5317] Only we mark here a terrible progression. The neglect and non-belief which had appeared in the former Parable have now ripened into rebellion, deliberate, aggravated, and carried to its utmost consequences in the murder of the King's only and loved Son. Similarly, what formerly appeared as their loss, in that sinners went into the Kingdom of God before them, is now presented alike as their guilt and their judgment, both national and individual. The Parable opens, like that in Is. v., with a description of the complete arrangements made by the Owner of the Vineyard, [5318] to show how everything had been done to ensure a good yield of fruit, and what right the Owner had to expect at least a share in it. In the Parable, as in the prophecy, the Vineyard represents the Theocracy, although in the Old Testament, necesaary, as identified with the nation of Israel, [5319] while in the Parable the two are distinguished, and the nation is represented by the labourers to whom the Vineyeard was let out.' Indeed, the whole structure of the Parable shows, that the husbandmen are Israel as a nation, although they are addressed and dealt with in the persons of their representatives and leaders. And so it was spoken to the people,' [5320] and yet the chief priests and Pharisees' rightly perceived that He spake of them.' [5321]This vineyard the owner had let out to husbandmen, while he himself travelled away' [abroad], as St. Luke adds, for a long time.' From the language it is evident, that the husbandmen had the full management of the vineyard. We remember, that there were three modes of dealing with land. According to one of these (Arisuth), the labourers' employed received a certaain portion of the fruits, say, a third or fourth of the produce. [5322] In such cases it seems, at least sometimes, to have been the practice, besides giving them a

proportion of the produce, to provide also the seed (for a field) and to pay wages to the labourers. [5323] The other two modes of letting land were, either that the tenant paid a money rent to the proprietor, [5324] or else that he agreed to give the owner a definite amount of produce, whether the harvest had been good or bad. [5325] Such leases were given by the year or for life: sometimes the lease was even hereditary, passing from father to son. [5326] There can scarcely be a doubt that it is the latter kind of lease (Chakhranutha, from {hebrew}) which is referred to in the Parable, the lessees being bound to give the owner a certain amount of fruits in their season.Accordingly, when the time of the fruits drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen to receive his fruits' - the part of them belonging to him, or, as St. Mark and St. Luke express it, of the fruits of the vineyard.' We gather, that it was a succession of servants, who received increasingly ill treatment from them evil husbandmen. We might have expected that the owner would now have taken severe measures; but instead of this he sent, in his patience and goodness, other servants' - not more,' [5327] which would scarcely have any meaning, but greater than the first,' no doubt, with the idea that their greater authority would command respect. And when these also received the same treatment, we must regard it as involving, not only additional, but increased guilt on the part of the husbandmen. Once more, and with deepening force, does the question arise, what measures the owner would now take. But once more we have only a fresh and still greater display of his patience and unwillingness to believe that these husbandmen were so evil. As St. Mark pathetically put it, indicating not only the owner's goodness, but the spirit of determined rebellion and the wickedness of the husbandmen: He had yet one, a beloved son - he sent him last unto them,' on the supposition that they would reverence him. The result was different. The appearance of the legal heir made them apprehensive of their tenure. Practically, the vineyard was already theirs; by killing the heir, the only claimant to it would be put out of the way, and so thevineyard become in every respect their own. For, the husbandmen proceeded on the idea, that as the owner was abroad' for a long time,' he would not personally interfere - an impression strengthened by the circumstance that he had not avenged the former ill-usage of his servants, but only sent others in the hope of influencing them by gentleness. So the labourers. taking him [the son], cast him forth out of the vineyard, and killed him' - the first action indicating that by violence they thrust him out of his possession, before they wickedly slew him.The meaning of the Parable is sufficiently plain. The owner of the vineyard, God, had let out His Vineyard - the Theocracy - to His people of old. The covenant having been instituted, He withdrew, as it were - the former direct communication between Him and Israel ceased. Then in due season He sent His Servants,' the prophets, to gather His fruits - they had had theirs in all the temporal and spiritual advantages of the covenant. But, instead of returning the fruits meet unto repentance, they only ill-treated His messengers, and that increasingly, even unto death. In His longsuffering He next sent on the same errand greater' than them - John the Baptist. [5328] And when he also received the same treatment, He sent last His own Son, Jesus Christ. His appearance made them feel, that it was now a decisive struggle for the Vineyard - and so, in order to gain its possession for themselves, they cast the rightful heir out of His own possession, and then killed Him! And they must have understood the meaning of the Parable, who had served themselves heirs to their fathers in the murder of all the prophets. [5329] who had just been convicted of the rejection of the Baptist's message, and whose hearts were even then full of murderous thoughts against the rightful Heir of the Vineyard. But, even so, they must speak their own judgment. In answer to His challenge, what in their view the owner of the vineyard would do to these husbandmen, the chief

priests and Pharisees could only reply: As evil men evilly will he destroy them. And the vineyard will He let out to other husbandmen, which shall render Him the fruits in their season.' [5330]The application was obvious, and it was made by Christ, first, as always, by a reference to the prophetic testimony, showing not only the unity of all God's teaching, but also the continuity of the Israel of the present with that of old in their resistance and rejection of God's counsel and messengers. The quotation, than which none more applicable could be imagined, was from Ps. cxviii.22, 23, and is made in the (Greek) Gospel of St. Matthew - not necessarily by Christ - from the LXX. Version. The only, almost verbal, difference between it and the original is, that, whereas in the latter the adoption of the stone rejected by the builders as head of the corner (this,' hoc, {hebrew}) is ascribed to Jehovah, in the LXX. its original designation (ate) as head of the corner (previous to the action of the builders), is traced to the Lord. And then followed, in plain and unmistakable language, the terrible prediction, first, nationally, that the Kingdom of God would be taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof;' and then individually, that whosoever stumbled at that stone and fell over it, in personal offence or hostility, should be broken in pieces, [5331] but whosoever stood in the way of, or resisted its progress, and on whom therefore it fell, it would scatter Him as dust.'Once more was their wrath roused, but also their fears. They knew that He spake of them, and would fain have laid hands on Him; but they feared the people, who in those days regarded Him as a prophet. And so for the present they left Him, and went their way.4. If Rabbinic writings offer scarcely any parallel to the preceding Parable, that of the Marriage-Feast of the King's Son and the Wedding Garment [5332] seems alsmost reproduced in Jewish tradition. In its oldest form [5333] it is ascribed to Jochanan ben Zakkai, who flourished about the time of the composition of the Gospel of St. Matthew. It appears with variety of, or with additional details in Jewish commentaries. [5334] But while the Parable of our Lord only consists of two parts, [5335] forming one whole and having one lesson, the Talmud divides it into two separate Parables, of which the one is intended to show the necessity of being prepared for the next world - to stand in readiness for the King's feast; [5336] while the other [5337] is meant to teach that we ought to be able to present our soul to God at the last in the same state of purity in which we had (according to Rabbinic notions) originally received it. [5338] Even this shows the infinite difference between the Lord's and the Rabbinic use of the Parable. [5339] In the Jewish Parable a King is represented as inviting to a feast, [5340] without, however, fixing the exact time for it. The wise adorn themselves in time, and are seated at the door of the palace, so as to be in readiness, since, as they argue, no elaborate preparation for a feast can be needed in a palace; while the foolish go away to their work, arguing there must be time enough, since there can be no feast without preparation. (The Midrash has it, that, when inviting the guests, the King had told them to wash, anoint, and array themselves in their festive garments; and that the foolish, arguing that, from the preparation of the food and the arranging of the seats, they would learn when the feast was to begin, had gone, the mason to his cask of lime, the potter to his clay, the smith to his furnace, the fuller to his bleaching-ground.) But suddenly comes the King's summons to the feast, when the wise appear festively adorned, and the King rejoices over them, and they are made to sit down, eat and drink; while he is wroth with the foolish, who appear squalid, and are ordered to stand by and look on in anguish, hunger and thirst.The other Jewish Parable [5341] is of a king who committed to his servants the royal robes. The wise among them carefully laid them by while the foolish put them on when they did their work. After a time the king asked back the robes, when the wise could restore them clean, while the foolish had them soiled. Then the king rejoiced over

the wise, and, while the robes were laid up in the treasury, they were bidden go home in peace. But to the foolish he commanded that the robes should be handed over to the fuller, and that they themselves should be cast into prison.' We readily see that the meaning of this Parable was, that a man might preserve His soul perfectly pure, and so enter into peace, while the careless, who had lost their orginal purity (no original sin here), would, in the next world, by suffering, both expiate their guilt and purify their souls. When, from these Rabbinic preversions, we turn to the Parable of our Lord, its meaning is not difficult to understand. The King made a marriage [5342] for his Son, when he sent his Servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding. Evidently, as in the Jewish Parable, and as before in that of the guests invited to the Great Supper, [5343] a preliminary general invitation had preceded the announcement that all was ready. Indeed, in the Midrash on Lament. iv.2, [5344] it is expressly mentioned among other distinctions of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that none of them went to a feast till the invitation had been given and repeated. But in the Parable those invited would not come. It reminds us both of the Parable of the labourers for the Vineyard, sought at different times, and of the repeated sending of messengers to those Evil Husbandmen for the fruits that were due, when we are next told that the king sent forth other servants to tell them to come, for he had made ready his early meal' (riston, not dinner,' as in the Authorised and Revised Version), and that, no doubt with a view to the later meal, the oxen and fatlings were killed. These repeated endeavours to call, to admonish, and to invite, form a characteristic feature of these Parables, showing that it was one of the central objects ot our Lord's teaching to exhibit the longsuffering and goodness of God. Instead of giving heed to these repeated and pressing calls, in the words of the Parable: but they (the one class) made light of it, and went away, the one to his own land, the other unto his own merchandise.'So the one class; the other made not light of it, but acted even worse than the first. But the rest laid hands on his servants, entreated them shamefully, and killed them.' By this we are to understand, that, when the servants came with the second and more pressing message, the one class showed their contempt for the king, the wedding of his son, and the feast, and their preference for and preoccupation with their own possessions or acquisitions - their property or their trading, their enjoyments or their aims and desires. And, when these had gone, and probably the servants still remanied to plead the message of their Lord, the rest evil entreated, and then killed them - proceeding beyond mere contempt, want of interest, and preoccupation with their own affairs, to hatred and murder. The sin was the more aggravated that he was their king, and the messengers had invited them to a feast, and that one in which every loyal subject should have rejoiced to take part. Theirs was, therefore, not only murder, but also rebellion against their sovereign. On this the King, in his wrath sent forth his armies, which - and here the narrative in point of time anticipates the event - destroyed the murderers, and burnt their city. [5345]But the condign punishment of these rebels forms only part of the Parable. For it still leaves the wedding unprovided with guests, to sympathise with the joy of the king, and partake of his feast. And so the narrative continues: [5346] Then' - after the king had given commandment for his armies to go forth, he said to his servants, The wedding indeed is ready, but they that were bidden were not worthy. Go ye therefore into the partings of the highways (where a number of roads meet and cross), and, as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage.' We remember that the Parable here runs parallel to that other, when first the outcasts from the city-lanes, and then the wanderers on the world's highway, were brought in to fill the place of the invited guests. [5347] At first sight it seems as if there were no connection between the declaration that those who had been bidden had proved

themselves unworthy, and the direction to go into the crossroads and gather any whom they might find, since the latter might naturally be regarded as less likely to prove worthy. Yet this is one of the main points in the Parable. The first invitation had been sent to selected guests - to the Jews - who might have been expected to be worthy,' but had proved themselves unworthy; the next was to be given, not to the chosen city or nation, but to all that travelled in whatever direction on the world's highway, reaching them where the roads of life meet and part.We have already in part anticipated the interpretation of this Parable. The Kingdom' is here, as so often in the Old and in the New Testament, likened to a feast, and more specifically to a marriage-feast. But we mark as distinctive, that the King makes it for His Son, Thus Christ, as Son and Heir of the Kingdom, forms the central Figure in the Parable. This is the first point set before us. The next is, that the chosen, invited guests were the ancient Covenant-People - Israel. To them God had sent first under the Old Testament. And, although they had not given heed to His call, yet a second class of messengers was sent to them under the New Testament. And the message of the latter was, that the early meal' was ready (Christ's first coming), and that all preparations had been made for the great evening-meal (Christ's Reign). Another prominent truth is set forth in the repeated message of the King, which points to the goodness and longsuffering of God. Next, our attention is drawn to the refusal of Israel, which appears in the contemptuous neglect and preoccupation with their things of one party, and the hatred, resistance, and murder by the other. Then follow in quick succesion the command of judgement on the nation, and the burning of their city - God's army being, in this instance, the Romans - and, finally, the direction to go into the crossways to invite all men, alike Jews and Gentiles. With verse 10 begins the second part of the Parable. The Servants' - that is, the New Testament messengers - had fulfilled their commission; they had brought in as many as they found, both bad and good: that is, without respect to their previous history, or their moral and religious state up the time of their call; and the wedding was filled with guests' - that is, the table at the marriage-feast was filled with those who as guests lay around it' (nakeimnon). But, if ever we are to learn that we must not expect on earth - not even at the King's marriage-table - a pure Church, it is, surely, from what now follows. The King entered to see His guests, and among them he described one of who had not on a wedding garment. Manifestly, the quickness of the invitation and the previous unpreparedness. As the guests had been travellers, and as the feast was in the King's palace, we cannot be mistaken in supposing that such garments were supplied in the palace itself to all those who sought them. And with this agrees the circumstance, that the man so addressed was speechless' [literally, gagged,' or muzzled']. [5348] His conduct argued utter insensibility as regarded that to which he had been called - ignorance of what was due to the King, and what became such a feast. For, although no previous state of preparedness was required of the invited guests, all being bidden, whether good or bad, yet the fact remained that, if they were to take part in the feast, they must put on a garment suited to the occasion. All are invited to the Gospel-feast; but they who will partake of it must put on the King's wedding-garment of Evangelical holiness. And whereas it is said in the Parable, that only one was described without this garment, this is intended to teach, that the King will only generally view His guests, but that each will be separately examined, and that no one - no, not a single individual - will be able to escape discovery amidst the mass of guests, if he has not the wedding-garment.' In short, in that day of trial, it is not a scrutiny of Churches, but of individuals in the Church. And so the King bade the servants - diaknois - not the same who had previously carried the invitation (dolois), but others - evidently here the Angels, His ministers,' to bind him hand and foot, and to cast him out into the

darkness, the outer' - that is, unable to offer resistance and as a punished captive, he was to be cast out into that darkness which is outside the brilliantly lighted guest-chamber of the King. And, still further to mark that darkness outside, it is added that this is the well-known place of suffering and anguish: There shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.'And here the Parable closes with the general statement, applicable alike to the first part of the Parable - to the first invited guests, Israel - and to the second, the guests from all the world: For' (this is the meaning of the whole Parable) many are called, but few chosen.' [5349] For the understanding of these words we have to keep in view that, logically, the two clauses must be supplemented by the same words. Thus, the verse would read: Many are called out of the world by God to partake of the Gospel-feast, but few out of the world - not, out of the called - are chosen by God to partake of it. The call to the feast and the choice for the feast are not identical. The call comes to all; but it may outwardly accepted, and a man may sit down to the feast, and yet he may not be chosen to partake of the feast, because he has not the wedding-garment of converting, sanctifying grace. And so one may be thrust from the marriage-board into the darkness without, with its sorrow and anguish.Thus, side by side, yet wide apart, are these two - God's call and God's choice. The connecting-link between them is the taking of the wedding-garment, freely given in the Palace. Yet, we must seek it, ask it, put it on. And so here also, we have, side by side, God's gift and man's activity. And still, to all time, and to all men, alike in its warning, teaching, and blessing, it is true: Many are called, but few are chosen!'

Chapter 96

CHAPTER VI. THE EVENING OF THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES: DISCOURES TO THE DISCIPLES CONCERNING THE LAST THINGS.

(St. Matt. xxiv.; St. Mark xiii.; St. Luke xxi.5-38; xii.35-48.) THE last and most solemn denunciation of Jerusalem had been uttered, the last and most terrible prediction of judgment upon the Temple spoken, and Jesus was suiting the action to the word. It was as if He had cast the dust of His Shoes against the House' that was to be left desolate.' And so He quitted for ever the Temple and them that held office in it. They had left the Sanctuary and the City, had crossed black Kidron, and were slowly climbing the Mount of Olives. A sudden turn in the road, and the Sacred Building was once more in full view. Just then the western sun was pouring his golden beams on tops of marble cloister and on the terrced courts, and glittering on the golden spikes on the roof of the Holy Place. In the setting, even more than in the rising sun, must the vast proportions, the symmetry, and the sparkling sheen of this mass of snowy marble and gold have stood out gloriously. And across the black valley, and up the slopes of Olivet, lay the dark shadows of these gigantic walls built of massive stones, some of them nearly twenty-four feet long. Even the Rabbis, despite their hatred of Herod, grow enthusiastic, and dream that the very Temple-walls would have been covered with gold, had not the variegated marble, resembling the waves of the sea, seemed more beauteous. [5350] It was probably as they now gazed on all this grandeur and strength, that they broke the slience imposed on them by gloomy thoughts of the near desolaateness of that House, which the Lord had predicted. [5351] One and another pointed out to Him those massive stones and splendid buildings, or speak of the rich offerings with which the Temple was adorned. [5352] It was but natural that the contrast between this and the predicted desolation should have impressed them; natural, also, that they should refer to it - not as matter of doubt, but rather as of question. [5353] Then Jesus, probably turning to one - perhaps to the first, or else the principal - of His questioners, [5354] spoke fully of that terrible contrast between the present and the near future, when, as fulfilled with almost incredible literality, [5355] not one stone would be left upon another that was not upturned. In silence they pursued their way. Upon the Mount of Olives they sat down, right over against the Temple. Whether or not the others had gone farther, or Christ had sat apart with these four, Peter and James and John and Andrew are named [5356] as those who now asked Him further of what must have weighed so heavily on their hearts. It was not idle curiosity, although inquiry on such as subject, even merely for the sake of information, could scarcely have been blamed in a Jew. But it did concern them personally, for had not the Lord conjoined the desolateness of that House' with His own absence? He had explained the former as meaning the ruin of the City and the utter destruction of the Temple. But to His prediction of it had been added these words: Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord.' In their view, this could only refer to His Second Coming, and to the End of the world as connected with it. This explains the twofold question which the four now addressed to Christ: Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy Coming, and of the consummation of the age?' [5357] Irrespective of other sayings, in which a distinction between

these two events is made, we can scarely believe that the disciple could have conjoined the desolation of the Temple with the immediate Advent of Christ and the end of the world. For, in the saying which gave rise to their question, Christ had placed an indefinite period between the two. Between the desolation of the House and their new welcome to Him, would intervene a period of indefinate length, during which they would not see Him again. The disciples could not have overlooked this; and hence neither their question, nor yet the Discourse of our Lord, have been intended to conjoin the two. It is necessary to keep this in view when studying the words of Christ; and any different impression must be due to the exceeding compression in the language of St. Matthew, and to this, that Christ would purposely leave indefinite the interval between the desolation of the house' and His own Return. Another point of considerable importance remains to be noticed. When the Lord, on quitting the Temple, Said: Ye shall not see Me henceforth,' He must have referred to Israel in their national capacity - to the Jewish polity in Church and State. If so, the promise in the text of visible reappearence must also apply to the Jewish Commonwealth, to Israel in their national capacity. Accordingly, it is suggested that in the present passage Christ refers to His Advent, not from the general cosmic viewpoint of universal, but from the Jewish standpoint of Jewish, history, in which the destruction of Jerusalem and the appearance of false Christs are the last events of national history, to be followed by the dreary blank and silence of the many centuries of the Gentile dispensation,' broken and silence of the events that usher in His Coming. [5358] Keeping in mind, then, that the disciples could not have conjoined the desolation of the Temple with the immediate Advent of Christ into His Kingdom and the end of the world, their question to Christ was twofold: When would these things be? and, What would be the signs of His Royal Advent and the consummation of the Age?' On the former the Lord gave no information; to the latter His Discourse on the Mount of Olives was directed. On one point the statement of the Lord had been so novel as almost to account for their question. Jewish writings speak very frequently of the so-called sorrows of the Messiah' (Chebhley shel Mashiach. [5359] [5360]) These were partly those of the Messiah, and partly - perhaps chiefly - those coming of the Messiah. There can be no purpose in describing them in detail, since the particulars mentioned vary so much, and the descriptions are so fanciful. But they may generally be characteristed as marking a period of internal corruption [5361] and of outward distress, especially of famine and war, of which land of Palestine was to be the scene, and in which Israel were to be the chief sufferers. [5362] As the Rabbinic notices which we posses all date from after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is, of course, impossible to make any absolute assertion on the point; but, as a matter of fact, none of them refers to desolattion of the City and Temple as one of the signs' or sorrows' of the Messiah. It is true that isolated voices proclaimed that fate of the Sanctuary, but not in any connection with the triumphant Advent of Messiah; [5363] and, if we are to judge from the hope entertained by the fanatics during the last siege of Jerusalem, they rather expected a Divine, not doubt Messianic, interposition to save the City and Temple, even at the last moment. [5364] When Christ, therefore, proclaimed the desolation of the house,' and even placed it in indirect connection with His Advent, He taught that which must have been alike new and unexpected. This may be the most suitable place for explaining the Jewish expectation connected with the Advent of the Messiah. Here we have first to dismiss, as belonging to a later period, the Rabbinic fiction of two Messiahs: the one, the primary and reigning, the Son of David; the other, the secondary and warfaring Messiah, the Son of Ephraim or of Manasseh. The earliest Talmudic reference to this second Messiah [5365] dates from the third century of our era, and contains the strange and almost blasphemous notices

that the prophecy of Zechariah, [5366] concerning the mourning for Him Whom they had pierced, referred to Messiah the Son of Joseph, Who would be killed in the war of Gog and Magog; [5367] and that, when Messiah the Son of David saw it, He asked life' of God, who gave it to Him, as it is written in Ps. ii.: Ask of Me, and I will give Thee,' upon which God informed the Messiah that His father David had already asked and obtained this for Him, according to Ps. xxi.4. Generally the Messiah, Son of Joseph, is connected with the gathering and restoration of the ten tribes. Later Rabibninc writings connect all the sufferngs of the Messiah for sin with this Son of Joseph. [5368] The war in which the Son of Joseph' succumbed would finally be brought to a victorious termination by the Son of David,' when the supremacy of Israel would be restored, and all nations walk in His Light. It is scarcely matter for surprise, that the various notices about the Messiah, Son of Joseph, are confused and sometimes inconsistent, considering the circumstances in which this dogma originated. Its primary reason was, no doubt, controversial. When hardly pressed by Christian argument about the Old Testament prophecies of the sufferings of the Messiah, the fiction about the Son of Joseph as distinct from the Son of David would offer a welcome means of escape. [5369] Besides, when in the Jewish rebellion [5370] under the false Messiah BarKokhba' (the Son of a Star' [5371]) the latter succumbed to the Romans and was killed, the Synagogue deemed it necessary to rekindle Israel's hope, that had been quenched in blood, by the picture to two Messiahs, of whom the first should fall in warfare, while the second, the Son of David, would carry the contest to a triumphant issue. [5372] In general, we must here remember that there is a difference between three terms used in Jewish writings to designate that which is to succeed the present dispensation' or world' (Olam hazzeh), although the distinction is not always consistently carried out. This happy period would begin with the days of the Messiah' ({hebrew}). These would stretch into the coming age' (Athid labho), and end with the world to come' (Olam habba) - although the latter is sometimes made to include the whole of that period. [5373] The most divergent opinions are expressed of the duration of the Messianic period. It seems like a round number when we are told that it would last for three generations. [5374] In the fullness discussion on the subject, [5375] the opinions of different Rabbis are mentioned, who variously fix the period at form forty to one, two, and even seven thousands years, according to fanciful analogies. [5376] Where statements rest on such fanciful considerations, we can scarecly attach serious value to them, nor expect agreement. This remark holds equally true in regard to most of the other points involved. Suffice it to say, that, according to general opinion, the Birth of the Messiah would be unknown to His contemporaries; [5377] that He would appear, carry on His work, then disappear - probably for forty-five days; then reappear again, and destroy the hostile powers of the world, notably Edom,' Armilos,' the Roman Power - the fourth and last world-empire (sometimes it is said: through Ishmael). Ransomed Israel would now be miraculously gathered from the ends of the earth, and brought back to their own land, the ten tribes sharing in their restoration, but this only on condition of their having repented of their former sins. [5378] According to the Midrash, [5379] all circumcised Israel would then be released from Gehenna, and the dead be raised - according to some authorities, by the Messiah, to Whom God would give the Key of the Resurrection of the Dead.' [5380] This Resurrection would take place in the land of Israel, and those of Israel who had been buried elsewhere would have to roll under ground - not without suffering pain [5381] - till they reach the sacred soil. Probably the reason of this strange idea, which was supported by an appeal to the direction of Jocob and Joseph as to their last resting-place, was to induce the Jews, after the final desolation of their land, not to quit Palestine. This Ressurection, which is variously

supposed to take place at the beginning or during the course of the Messianic manifestation, would be announced by the blowing of the great trumpet. [5382] [5383] It would be difficult to say how many of these strange and confused views prevailed at the time of Christ; [5384] which of them were universally entertained as real dogmas; or from what source they had been originally derived. Probably many of them were popularly entertained, and afterwards further developed - as we believe, with elements distorted from Christian teaching. We have now reached the period of the coming age' (the Athid labho, or sæculum futurum). All the resistance to God would be concentrated in the great war of Gog and Magog, and with it the prevalence of all the wickedness be conjoined. And terrible would be the straits of Israel. Three times would the enemy seek to storm the Holy City. But each time would the assault be repelled - at the last with complete destruction of the enemy. The sacred City would now be wholly rebuilt and inhabited. But oh, how different from of old! Its Sabbath-boundaries would be strewed with pearls and precious gems. The City itself would be lifted to a height of some nine miles - nay, with realistic application of Is. xlix.20, it would reach up to the throne of God, while it would extend from Joppa as far as the gates of Damascus! For, Jerusalem was to be the dwelling-place of Israel, and the resort of all nations. But more glorious in Jerusalem would be the new Temple which the Messiah was to rear, and to which those five things were to be restored which had been wanting in the former Sanctuary; the Golden Candlestick, the Ark, and Heaven-lit fire on the Altar, the Holy Ghost, and the Cherubim. And the land of Israel would then be as wide as it had been sketched in the promise which God had given to Abraham, and which had never before been fulfilled - since the largest extent of Israel's rule had only been over seven nations, whereas the Divine promise extended it over ten, if not over the whole earth.Strangely realistic and exaggerated by Eastern imagination as these hopes sound, there is connected with them, a point of deepest interest on which, as explained in another place, [5385] remarkable divergence of opinion prevailed. It concerns the Services of the rebuilt Temple, and the observance of The Law in Messianic days. One party here insisted on the restoration of all the ancient Services, and the strict observance of the Mosiac and Rabbinic Law - nay, on its full imposition on the Gentile nation. [5386] But this view must have been at least modified by the expectation, that the Messiah would give a new Law. [5387] But was this new Law to apply only to the Gentiles, or also to Israel? Here again there is divergence of opinions. According to some, this Law would be binding on Israel, but not on the Gentiles, or else the latter would have a modified or condensed series of ordinances (at most thirty commandments). But the most liberal view, and, as we may suppose, that most accetptable to the enlightened, was, that in the furture only these two festive seasons would be observed: The Day of Atonment, and the Feast of Esther (or else that of Tabernacles), and that of all the sacrifices only thank-offerings would be continued. [5388] Nay, opinion went even further, and many held that in Messianic days the distictions of pure and impure, lawful and unlawful, as regarded food, would be abolished. [5389] There can be little doubt that these different views were entertained even in the days of our Lord and in Apostolic times, and they account for the exceeding bitterness with which the extreme Pharisaic party in the Church at Jerusalem contended, that the Gentile converts must be circumcised, and the full weight of the yoke of the Law laid on their necks. And with a view to this new Law, which God would give to his world through the Messiah, the Rabbis divided all time into three periods: the primitive, that under the Law, and that of the Messiah. [5390]It only remains briefly to describe the beatitude of Israel, both physical and moral, in those days, the state of the nations, and, lastly, the end of that age' and its merging into the world to come' (Olam habba).

Morally, this would be a period of holiness, of forgiveness, and of peace. Without, there would be no longer enemies nor oppressors. And within the City and Land a more than Paradisiacal state would prevail, which is depicted in even more than the usual realistic Eastern language. For that vast new Jerusalem (not in heaven, but in the literal Palestine) Angels were to cut gems 45 feet long and broad (30 cubits), and place them in its gates; [5391] the windows and gates were to be of precious stones, the walls of silver, gold, and gems, while all kinds of jewels would be strewed about, of which every Israelite was at liberty to take. Jerusalem would be as large as, at present, all Palestine, and Palestine as all the world. [5392] Corresponding to this miraculous extension would be a miraculous elevation of Jerusalem into the air. [5393] And it is one of the strangest mixtures of self-righteousness and realism with deeper and more spiritual thoughts, when the Rabbis prove by references to the prophetic Scriptures, that every event and miracle in the history of Israel would find its counterpart, or rather larger fulfilment, in Messianic days. Thus, what was recorded of Abraham [5394] would, on account of his merit, find, clause by clause, its counterpart in the future: Let a little water be fetched,' in what is predicted in Zech. xiv.8; wash your feet,' in what is predicted in Is. iv.5; rest yourselves under the tree,' in what is said in Is. iv.4; and I will fetch a morsel of bread,' in the promise of Ps. lxxii.16. [5395] But by the side of this we find much coarse realism. The land would spontaneously produce the best dresses and the finest cakes; [5396] the wheat would grow as high as palm-trees, nay, as the mountains, while the wind would miraculously convert the grain into flour, and cast it into the valleys. Every tree would become fruit-bearing; [5397] nay, they were to break forth, and to bear fruit every day; [5398] daily was every woman to bear child, so that ultimately every Israelitish family would number as many as all Israel at the time of the Exodus. [5399] All sickness and disease, and all that could hurt, would pass away. As regarded death, the promise of its final abolition [5400] was, with characteristic ingenuity, applied to Israel, while the statement that the child should die an hundred years old [5401] was understood as referring to the Gentiles, and as teaching that, although they would die, yet their age would be greatly prolonged, so that a centenarian would be regarded as only a child. Lastly, such physical and outward loss as Rabbinism regarded as the consequence of the Fall, [5402] would be again restored to man. [5403] [5404]It would be easy to multiply quotations even more realistic than these, if such could serve any good purpose. The same literalism prevails in regard to the reign of King Messiah over the nations of the world. Not only is the figurative language of the prophets applied in the most external manner, but illustrative details of the same character are added. Jerusalem would, as the residence of the Messiah, become the capital of the world, and Israel take the place of the (fourth) world-monarchy, the Roman Empire. After the Roman Empire none other was to rise, for it was to be immediately followed by the reign of Messiah. [5405] But that day, or rather that of the fall of the (ten) Gentile nations, which would inaugurate the Empire of Messiah, was among the seven things unknown to man. [5406] Nay, God had conjured Israel not to communicate to the Gentiles the mystery of the calculation of the times. [5407] But the very origin of the wicked world-Empire had been caused by Israel's sin. It had been (ideally) founded [5408] when Solomon contracted alliance with the daughter of Pharaoh, while Romulus and Remus rose when Jeroboam set up the worship of the two calves. Thus, what would have become the universal Davidic Rule had, through Israel's sin, been changed into subjection to the Gentiles. Whether or not these Gentiles would in the Messianic future become proselytes, seems a moot question. Sometimes it is affirmed; [5409] at others it is stated that no proselytes would then be received, [5410] and for this good reason, that in the final war and rebellion those

proselytes would, from fear, cast off the yoke of Judaism and join the enemies.That war, which seems a continuation of that Gog and Magog, would close the Messianic era. The nations, who had hitherto given tribute to Messiah, would rebel against Him, when He would destroy them by the breath of His mouth, so that Israel alone would be left on the face of the earth. [5411] The duration of that period of rebellion is stated to be seven years. It seems, at least, a doubtful point, whether a second or general Resurrection was expected, the more probable view being, that there was only one Resurrection, and that of Israel alone, [5412] or, at any rate, only of the studious and the pious, [5413] and that this was to take place at the beginning of the Messianic reign. If the Gentiles rose at all, it would only be immediately again to die. [5414] [5415]Then the final Judgment would commence. We must here once more make distinction between Israel and the Gentiles, with whom, nay, as more punishable than they, certain notorious sinners, heretics, and all apostates, were to be ranked. Whereas to Israel the Gehenna, to which all but the perfectly righteous had been consigned at death, had proved a kind of purgatory, from which they were all ultimately delivered by Abraham, [5416] or, according to some of the later Midrashim, by the Messiah, no such deliverance was in prospect for the heathen nor for sinners of Israel. [5417] The question whether the fiery torments suffered (which are very realistically described) would at last end in annihilation, is one which at different times received different answeres, as fully explained in another place. [5418] At the time of Christ the punishment of the wicked was certainly regarded as of eternal duration. Rabbi José, a teacher of the second century, and a representative of the more rationalistic school, says expressly, The fire of Gehinnom is never quenched.' [5419] And even the passage, so often (although only partially) quoted, to the effect, that the final torments of Gehenna would last for twelve months, after which body and soul would be annihilated, excepts from this a number of Jewish sinners, specially mentioned, such as hereties, Epicureans, apostates, and persecutors, who are designated as children of Gehenna' (ledorey doroth, to ages of ages'). [5420] And with this other statements agree, [5421] so that at most it would follow that, while annihilation would await the less guilty, the most guilty were to be reserved for etenal punishment. Such, then, was the final Judgment, to be held in the valley of Jehoshaphat by God, at the head of the Heavenly Sanhedrin, composed of the elders of Israel. [5422] Realistic as its description is, even this is terribly surpassed by a passage [5423] in which the supposed pleas for mercy by the various nations are adduced and refuted, when, after an unseemly contention between God and the Gentiles - equally shocking to good taste and blasphemous - about the partiality that had been shown to Israel, the Gentiles would be consigned to punishment. All this in a manner revolting to all reverent feeling. And the contrast between the Jewish picture of the last Judgment and that outlined in the Gospel is so striking, as alone to vindicate (were such necessary) the eschatological parts of the New Testament, and to prove what infinite distance there is between the Teaching of Christ and the Theology of the Synagogue.After the final judgment we must look for the renewal of heaven and earth. In the latter neither physical [5424] nor moral darkness would any longer prevail, since the Yetser haRa, or Evil impulse,' would be destroyed. [5425] [5426] And renewed earth would bring forth all without blemish and in Paradisiacal perfection, while alike physical and moral evil had ceased. Then began the Olam habba,' or world to come.' The question, whether any functions or enjoyments of the body would continue, is variously answered. The reply of the Lord to the question of the Sadducees about marriage in the other world seems to imply, that materialistic views on the subject were entertained at the time. Many Rabbinic passages, such as about the great feast upon Leviathan and Behemoth prepared for the righteous

in the latter days, [5427] confirm only too painfully the impression of grossly materialistic expectations. [5428] On the other hand, passages may be quoted in which the utterly unmaterial character of the world to come' is insisted upon in most emphatic language. [5429] In truth, the same fundamental divergences here exist as on other points, such as the abode of the beatified, the visible or else invisible glory which they would enjoy, and even the new Jerusalem. And in regard to the latter, [5430] as indeed to all those references to the beatitudes of the world to come, it seems at least doubtful, whether the Rabbis may not have intended to describe rather the Messianic days than the final winding up of all things.To complete this sketch of Jewish opinions, it is necessary, however briefly, to refer to the Pseudepigraphic Writings, [5431] which, as will be remembered, expressed the Apocalyptic expectancies of the Jews before the time of Christ. But here we have always to keep in mind this twofold difficulty: that the language used in works of this kind is of a highly figurative character, and must therefore not be literally pressed; and that more than one of them, notably IV. Esdras, dates from post-Christian times, and was, in important respects, admittedly influenced by Christian teaching. But in the main the picture of Messianic times in these writings is the same as the presented by the Rabbis. Briefly, the Pseudepigraphic view may be thus sketched. [5432] Of the so-called Wars of the Messiah' there had been already a kind of prefigurement in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, when armed soldiery had been seen to carry on warfare in the air. [5433] This sign is mentioned in the Sibylline Books [5434] as marking the coming end, together with the sight of swords in the starlit sky at night, the falling of dust from heaven, the extinction of the sunlight and appearance of the moon by day, and the dropping of blood from the rocks. A somewhat similar, though even more realistic, picture is presented in connection with the blast of the third trumpet in IV. (II.) Esdras. [5435] Only that there the element of moral judgment is more clearly introduced. This appears still more fully in another passage of the same book, [5436] in which, apparently in connection with the Judgment, the influence of Christian teaching, although in an externalised form, may be clearly traced. A perhaps even more detailed description of the wickedness, distress, and physical desolation upon earth at that time, is given in the Book of Jubilees. [5437]At last, when these distresses have reached their final height, when signs are in the sky, ruin upon earth, and the unburied bodies that cover the ground are devoured by birds and wild beasts, or else swallowed up by the earth, [5438] would God send the King,' Who would put an end to unrighteousness. Then would follow the last war against Jerusalem, in which God would fight from heaven with the nations, when they would submit to, and own Him. [5439] But while in the Book of Enoch and in another work of the same class [5440] the judgment is ascribed to God, and the Messiah represented as appearing only afterwards, [5441] [5442] in the majority of these works the judgment or its execution is assigned to the Messiah. [5443]In the land thus restored to Israel, and under the rule of King Messiah, the new Jerusalem would be the capital, purified from the heathen, [5444] enlarged, nay, quite transformed. This Jerusalem had been shown to Adam before his Fall, [5445] but after that both it and Paradise had been withdrawn from him. It had again been shown to Abraham, [5446] to Moses, and to Ezra. [5447] The splendour of this new Jerusalem is described in most glowing language. [5448] [5449] Of the glorious Kingdom thus instituted, the Messiah would be King, [5450] [5451] although under the supremacy of God. His reign would extend over the heathen nations. The character of their submission was differently viewed, according to the more or less Judaic standpoint of the writers. Thus, in the Book of Jubilees [5452] the seed of Jacob are promised possession of the whole earth; they would rule over all nations according to their pleasure; and after that draw the whole

earth unto themselves, and inherit it for ever.' In the Assumption of Moses' [5453] this ascendency of Israel seems to be conjoined with the idea of vengeance upon Rome, [5454] although the language employed is highly figurative. [5455] On the other hand, in the Sibylline Books [5456] the nations are represented as, in view of the blessings enjoyed by Israel, themselves turning to acknowledge God, when perfect mental enlightenment and absolute righteousness, as well as physical well-being, would prevail under the rule and judgeship (whether literal or figurative) of the Prophets. [5457] The most Grecian' view of the Kingdom, is, of course, that expressed by Philo. He anticipates, that the happy moral condition of man would ultimately affect the wild beasts, which, relinquishing their solitary habits, would first become gregarious; then, imitating the domestic animals, gradually come to respect man as their master, nay, become as affectionate and cheerful as Maltese dogs.' Among men, the pious and virtuous would bear rule, their dignity inspiring respect, their terror fear, and their beneficence good will. [5458] Probably intermediate between this extreme Grecian and the Judaic conception of the Millennium, are such utterances as ascribe the universal acknowledgment of the Messiah to the recognition, that God had invested Him with glory and power, and that His Reign was that of blessing. [5459] It must have been remarked, that the differences between the Apocalyptic teaching of the Pseudepigrapha and that of the New Testament are as marked as those between the latter and that of the Rabbis. Another point of divergence is, that the Pseudepigrapha uniformly represent the Messianic reign as eternal, not broken up by any further apostasy or rebellion. [5460] Then would the earth be renewed, [5461] [5462] and this would be followed, lastly, by the Resurrection. In the Apocalypse of Baruch, [5463] as by the Rabbis, it is set forth that men would rise in exactly the same condition which they had borne in life, so that, by being recognised, the reality of the Resurrection would be attested, while in the re-union of body and soul each would receive its due meed for the sins committed in their state of combination while upon earth. [5464] But after that a transformation would take place: of the just into the Angelic splendour of their glory, while, on view of this, the wicked would correspondingly fade away. [5465] Josephus states that the Pharisees taught only a Resurrection of the Just. [5466] As we know that such was not the case, we must regard this as one of the many assertions made by that writer for purposes of his own - probably to present to outsiders the Pharisaic doctrine in the most attractive and rational light of which it was capable. Similarly, the modern contention, that some of the Pseudepigraphic Writings propound the same view of only a Resurrection of the Just, [5467] is contrary to evidence. [5468] There can be no question that, according to the Pseudepigrapha, in the general Judgment, which was to follow the universal Resurrection, the reward and punishment assigned are represented as of eternal duration, although it may be open to question, as in regard to Rabbinic teaching, which of those who had been sinners would suffer final and endless torment.The many and persistent attempts, despite the gross inconsistencies involved, to represent the teaching of Christ concerning the Last Things' as only the reflection of contemporary Jewish opinion, have rendered detailed evidence necessary. When, with the information just summarised, we again turn to the questions addressed to Him by the disciples, we recall that (as previously shown) they could not have conjoined, or rather confounded, the when' of these things' - that is, of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple - with the when' of His Second Coming and the end of the Age.' We also recall the suggestion, that Christ referred to His Advent, as to His disappearance, from the Jewish standpoint of Jewish, rather than from the general cosmic view-point of universal, history.As regards the answer of the Lord to the two questions of His disciples, it may be said that the first

part of His Discourse [5469] is intended to supply information on the two facts of the future: the destruction of the Temple, and His Second Advent and the end of the Age,' by setting before them the signs indicating the approach or beginning of these events. But even here the exact period of each is not defined, and the teaching given intended for purely practical purposes. In the second part of His Discourse [5470] the Lord distinctly tells them, what they are not to know, and why; and how all that was communicated to them was only to prepare them for that constant watchfulness, which has been to the Church at all times the proper outcome of Christ's teaching on the subject. This, then we may take as a guide in our study: that the words of Christ contain nothing beyond what was necessary for the warning and teaching of the disciples and of the Church.The first Part of Christ's Discourse [5471] consists of four Sections, [5472] of which the first describes the beginning of the birth-woes' [5473] [5474] of the new Age' about to appear. The expression: The End is not yet' [5475] clearly indicates, that it marks only the earliest period of the beginning - the farthest terminus a quo of the birth-woes.' [5476] Another general consideration, which seems of importance, is, that the Synoptic Gospels report this part of the Lord's Discourse in almost identical language. If the inference from this seems that their accounts were derived from a common source - say, the report of St. Peter - yet this close and unvarying repetition also conveys an impression, that the Evangelists themselves may not have fully understood the meaning of what they recorded. This may account for the rapid and unconnected transitions from subject to subject. At the same time it imposes on us the duty of studying the language anew, and without regard to any scheme of interpretation. This only may be said, that the obvious difficulties of negative criticism are here equally great, whether we suppose the narratives to have been written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem.1. The purely practical character of the Discourse appears from its opening words. [5477] They contain a warning, addressed to the disciples in their individual, not in their corporate, capacity, against being led astray.' This, more particularly in regard to Judaic seductions leading them after false Christs. Though in the multitude of impostors, who, in the troubled times between the rule of Pilate and the destruction of Jerusalem, promised Messianic deliverance to Israel, few names and claims of this kind have been specially recorded, yet the hints in the New Testament, [5478] and the references, however guarded, by the Jewish historian, [5479] imply the appearance of many such seducers. And their influence, not only upon Jews, but on Jewish Christians, might be the more dangerous, that the latter would naturally regard the woes,' which were the occasion of their pretensions, as the judgements which would usher in the Advent of their Lord. Against such seduction they must be peculiarly on their guard. So far for the things' connected with the destruction of Jerusalem and the overthrow of the Jewish commonwealth. But, taking a wider and cosmic view, they might aslso be misled by either rumours of war at a distance, or by actual warfare, [5480] so as to believe that the dissolution of the Roman Empire, and with it the Advent of Christ, was at hand. [5481] [5482] This also would be a Misapprehension, grievously misleading, and to be carefully guarded against. Although primarily applying to them, yet alike the peculiarly Judaic, or, it might be even Christian, and the general cosmic sources of misapprehension as to the near Advent of Christ, must not be limited to the times of the Apostles. They rather indicate these twofold grounds of misapprehension which in all ages have misled Christians into an erroneous expectancy of the immediate Advent of Christ: the seductions of false Messiahs, or, it may be, teachers, and violent distrubances in the political world. So far as Israel was concerned, these attained their climax in the great rebellion against Rome under the false Messiah, Bar Kokhba, in the time of Hadrian, [5483] although echoes of

similar false claims, or hope of them, have again and again roused Israel during the night of these any centuries into brief, startled waking. And, as regards the more general cosmic signs, have not Christians, in the early ages watched, not only the wars on the boundaries of the Empire, but the condition of the state in the age of Nero the risings, turmoils, and threatenings; and so onwards, those of later generations, even down to the commotions of our own period, as if they betokened the immediate Advent of Christ, instead of marking in them only the beginning of the birth-woes of the new Age?'2. From the warning to Christians as individuals, the Lord next turns to give admonition to the Church in her corporate capacity. Here we mark, that the events now described [5484] must not be regarded as following, with strict chronological precision, those referred to in the previous verses. Rather is it intended to indicate a general nexus and partly after, those formerly predicted. They form, in fact, the continuation of the birth-woes.' This appears even from the language used. Thus, while St. Matthew writes: Then' (tte at that time) shall they deliver you up,' St. Luke places the persecutions before all these things;' [5485] while St. Mark, who reports this part of the Discourse most fully, omits every note of time, and only emphasises the admonition which the fact conveys. [5486] As regards the admonition itself, expressed in this part of the Lord's Discourse, [5487] we notice that, as formerly to individuals, so now to the Church, two sources of danger are pointed out: internal from heresies (false prophets') and the decay of faith, [5488] and external, from persecutions, whether Judaic and from their own kindred, or from the secular powers throughout the world. But, along with these two dangers, two consoling facts are also pointed out. As regards the persecutions in prospect, full Divine aid is promised to Christians - alike to individuals and to the Church. Thus all care and fear may be dismissed: their testimony shall neither be silenced, nor shall the Church be suppressed or extinguished; but inward joyousness, outward perseverance, and final triumph, are secured by the Presence of the Risen Saviour with, and the felt indwelling of the Holy Ghost in His Church. And, as for the other and equally consoling fact: despite the persecution of Jews and Gentiles, before the End cometh this the Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the inhabited earth for a testimony to all the nations.' [5489] This, then, is really the only sign of the End' of the present Age.'3. From these general predicitons, the Lord proceeds, in the third part of this Discourse, [5490] to advertise the Disciples of the great historic fact immediately before them, and of the dangers which might spring from it. In truth, we have here His answer to their question, When shall these things be?' [5491] not, indeed, as regards the when, but the what of them. And with this He conjoins the present application of His general warning regarding false Christs, given in the first part of this Discourse. [5492] The fact of which He now, in this third part of His Discourse, advertises them, is the destruction of Jerusalem. Its twofold dangers would be - outwardly, the difficulties and perils which at that time would necessarily beset men, and especially the members of the infant-Church; and, religiously, the pretensions and claims of false Christs or prophets at a period when all Jewish thinking and expectancy would lead men to anticipate the near Advent of the Messiah. There can be no question, that from both these dangers the warning of the Lord delivered the Church. As directed by him, the members of the Christian Church fled at an early period of the siege. [5493] of Jerusalem to Pella, while the words in which He had told that His Coming would not be in secret, but with the brighteness of that lightning which shot across the sky, prevented not only their being deceived, but perhaps even the record, if not the rise of many who otherwise would have deceived them. As for Jerusalem, the prophetic vision initially fulfilled in the days of Antiochus [5494] would once more, and now fully, become reality, and the abomination of desolation [5495] stand in the

Holy Place. This, together with tribulation to Israel, unparalledled in the terrible past of its history, and unequalled even in its bloody future. Nay, so dreadful would be the persecution, that, if Divine mercy had not interposed for the sake of the followers of Christ, the whole Jewish race that inhabited the land would have been swept away. [5496] But on the morrow of that day no new Maccabee would arise, no Christ come, as Israel fondly hoped; but over that carcase would the vultures gather; [5497] and so through all the Age of the Gentiles, till converted Israel should raise the welcoming shout: Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the Lord!' 4. [5498] The Age of the Gentiles, the end of the Age,' and with it the new allegiance of His now penitent people Israel; the sign of the Son of Man in heaven,' perceived by them; the conversion of all the world, the Coming of Christ, the last Trumpet, the Resurrection of the dead - such, in most rapid sketch, is the outline which the Lord draws of His Coming and the End of the world.It will be remembered that this had been the second question of the disciples. [5499] We again recall, that the disciples did not, indeed, could not have connected, as immediately subsequent events, the destruction of Jerusalem and His Second Coming, since he had expressly placed between them the period - apparently protracted - of His Absence, [5500] with the many events that were to happen in it - notably, the preaching of the Gospel over the whole inhabited earth. [5501] Hitherto the Lord had, in His Discourse, dwelt in detail only on those events which would be fulfilled before this generation should pass. [5502] It had been for admonition and warning that He had spoken, not for the gratification of curiosity. It had been prediction of the immediate future for practical purposes, with such dim and general indication of the more distant future of the Church as was absolutely necessary to mark her position in the world as one of persecution, with promise, however, of His Presence and Help; with indication also of her work in the world, to its terminus ad quem - the preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom to all nations on earth.More than this concerning the future of the Church could not have been told without defeating the very object of the admonition and warning which Christ had exclusively in view, when answering the question of the disciples. Accordingly, what follows in ver.29, describes the history, not of the Church - far less any visible physical signs in the literal heavens - but, in prophetic imagery, the history of the hostile powers of the world, with its lessons. A constant succession of empires and dynasties would characterise politically - and it is only the political aspect with which we are here concerned - the whole period after the extinction of the Jewish State. [5503] Immediately after that would follow the appearance to Israel of the Sign' of the Son of Man in heaven, and with it the conversion of all nations (as previously predicted), [5504] the Coming of Christ, [5505] and, finally, the blast of the last Trumpet and the Resurrection. [5506]5. From this rapid outline of the future the Lord once more turned to make present application to the disciplies; nay, application, also, to all times. From the fig-tree, under which, on that spring afternoon, they may have rested on the Mount of Olives, they were to learn a parable.' [5507] We can picture Christ taking one of its twigs, just as its softening tips were bursting into young leaf. Surely, this meant that summer was nigh - not that it had actually come. The distinction is important. For, it seems to prove that all these things,' which were to indicate to them that it [5508] was near, even at the doors, and which were to be fulfilled ere this generation had passed away, could not have referred, to the last signs connected with the immediate Advent of Christ, [5509] but must apply to the previous prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish Commonwealth. At the same time we again admit, that the language of the Synoptists seems to indicate, that they had not clearly understood the words of the Lord which they reported, and that in their own minds they had associated the last signs' and the Advent of Christ with the

fall of the City. Thus may they have come to expect that Blessed Advent even in their own days.II. It is at least a question, whether the Lord, while distinctly indicating these facts, and intended to remove the doubt and uncertainty of their sucession from the minds of His disciples. To have done so would have necessitated that which, in the opening sentence of the Second Division of this Discourse, [5510] He had expressly declared to lie beyond their ken. The when' - the day and the hour of His Coming - was to remain hidden from men and Angels. [5511] Nay, even the Son Himself - as they viewed Him and as He spake to them - knew it not. [5512] It formed no part of His present Messianic Mission, nor subject for His Messianic Teaching. Had it done so, all the teaching that follows concerning the need of constant watchfulness, and the pressing duty of working for Christ in faith, hope, and love - with purity, self-denial, and endurance - would have been lost. The peculiar attitude of the Church: with loins grit for work, since the time was short, and the Lord might come at any moment; with her hands busy; her mind faithful; her face upturned towards the Sun that was so soon to rise; and her ear straining to catch the first notes of heaven's song of triumph - all this would have been lost! What has sustained the Church during the night of sorrow these many centuries; what has nerved her courage for the battle, with steadfastness to bear, with love to work, with patience and joy in disappointments - would all have been lost! The Church would not have been that of the New Testament, had she known the mystery of that day and hour, and not ever waited as for the immediate Coming of her Lord and Bridegroom. And what the Church of the New Testament has been, and is, that her Lord and Master made her, and by no agency more effectually than by leaving undetermined the precise time of His return. To the world this would indeed become the occasion for utter carelessness and practical disbelief of the coming Judgment. [5513] As in the days of Noah the long delay of threatened judgment had led to absorption in the ordinary engagements of life, to the entire disbelief of what Noah had preached, so would it be in the future. But that day would come certainly and unexpectedly, to the sudden seperation of those who were engaged in the same daily business of life, of whom one might be taken up (paralambnetai, received'), the other left to the destruction of the coming Judgment. [5514]But this very mixture of the Church with the world in the ordinary avocations of life indicated a greater danger. As in all such, the remedy which the Lord would set before us is not negative in the avoidance of certain things, but positive. [5515] We shall best succeed, not by going out of the world, but by being watchful in it, and keeping fresh on our hearts, as well as our minds, the fact that he is our Lord, and that we are, and always most lovingly, to look and long for His Return. Otherwise twofold damage might come to us. Not expecting the arrival of the Lord in the night-time (which is the most unlikely for His Coming), we might go to sleep, and the Enemy, taking advantage or it, rob us of our peculiar treasure. [5516] Thus the Church, not expecting her lord, might become as poor as the world. This would be loss. But there might be even worse. According to the Master's appointment, each one had, during Christ's absence, his work for Him, and the reward of grace, or else the punishment of neglect, were in assured prospect. The faithful steward, to whom the Master had entrusted the care of His household, to supply His found faithful, be rewarded by advancement to far larger and more responsible work. On the other hand, belief on the delay of the Lord's Return would lead to neglect to the Master's work, to unfaithfulness, tyranny, self-indulgence and sin. [5517] And when the Lord suddenly came, as certianly he would come, there would be not only loss, but damage, hurt, and the punishment awarded to the hypocrites. Hence, let the Church be ever on her watch, [5518] let her ever be in readiness! [5519] And how terribly the moral consequences of unreadiness, and the punishment threatened, have

ensued, the history of the Church during these eighteen centuries has only too often and too sadly shown. [5520]

CHAPTER VII. EVENING OF THE THIRD DAY IN PASSION-WEEK-ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES-LAST PARABLES: TO THE DISCIPLES CONCERNING THE LAST THINGS-THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS-THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS-SUPPLEMENTARY PARABLE OF THE MINAS AND THE KING'S RECKONING W

(St. Matt. xxv.1-13; St. Matt. xxv.14-30; St. Luke xix.11-28.) 1. As might have been expected, the Parables concerning the Last Things are closely connected with the Discourse of the Last Things, which Christ had just spoken to His Disciples. In fact, that of the Ten Virgins, which seems the fullest in many-sided meaning, is, in its main object, only an illustration of the last part of Christ's Discourse. [5521] Its great practical lessons had been: the unexpectedness of the Lord's Coming; the consequences to be apprehend from its delay; and the need of personal and constant preparedness. Similarly, the Parable of the Ten Virgins may, in its great outlines, be thus summarised: Be ye personally prepared; be ye prepared for any length of time; be ye prepared to go to Him directly. Before proceeding, we mark that this Parable also is connected with those that had preceeded. But we notice not only connection, but progression. Indeed, it would be deeply interesting, alike historically and for the better understanding of Christ's teaching, but especially as showing its internal unity and development, and the credibility of the Gospel-narratives, generally to trace this connection and progress. And this, not merely in the three series of parables which mark the three stages of His History - the Parables of the Founding of the Kingdom, of its Character, and of its Consummation - but as regards the parables themselves, that so the first might be joined to the last as a string of heavenly pearls. But this lies beyond our task. Not so, to mark the connection between the Parable of the Ten Virgins and that of the Man without the Wedding-Garment. Like the Parable of the Ten Virgins, it had pointed to the future. If the exclusion and punishment of the Unprepared Guest did not primarily refer to the Last Day, or to the Return of Christ, but perhaps rather to what would happen in death, it pointed, at least secondarily, to the final consummation. On the other hand, in the Parable of the Ten Virgins this final consumation is the primary point. So far, then, there is both connection and advance. Again, from the appearance and the fate of the Unprepared Guest we learned, that not every one who, following the Gospel-call, comes to the Gospel-feast, will be allowed to partake of it; but that God will search and try each one individually. There is, indeed, a society of guests - the Church; but we must not expect either that the Church will, while on earth, be wholly pure, or that its purification will be achieved by man. Each guest may, indeed, come to the banqueting-hall, but the final judgment as to his worthiness belongs to God. Lastly, the Parable also taught the no less important opposite lesson, that each individual is personally responsible; that we cannot shelter ourselves in the community of the Church, but that to partake of the feast requireth personal and individual preparation. To express it in modern terminology: It taught Churchism as against one-sided individualism, and spiritual individualism as against dead Churchism. All these important lessons are carried forward in the Parable of the Ten Virgins. If the union of the Ten Virgins for the purpose

of meeting the Bridegroom, and their à priori claims to enter in with Him - which are, so to speak, the historical data and necessary premisses in the Parable - point to the Church, the main lessons of the Parade are the need of individual, personal, and spirtual preparation. Only such will endure the trial of the long delay of Christ's Coming; only such will stand that of an immediate summons to meet the Christ. It is late at even - the world's long day seems past, and the Coming of the Bridegroom must be near. The day and the hour we know not, for the bridegroom has been far away. Only this we know, that it is the Evening of the Marriage which the Bridegroom had fixed, and that his word of promise may be relied upon. Therefore all has been made ready within the bridal house, and is in waiting there; and therefore the Virgins prepare to go forth to meet Him on His Arrival. The Parable proceeds on the assumption that the Bridegroom is not in the town, but somewhere far away; so that it cannot be known at what precise hour He may arrive. But it is known that He will come that night; and the Virgins who are to meet Him have gathered - presumably in the house where the Marriage is to take place - waiting for the summons to go forth and welcome the Bridegroom. The common mistake, that the Virgins are represented in verse 1 as having gone forth on the road to meet the Bridegroom, is not only irrational - since it is scarcely credible that they would all have fallen asleep by the wayside, and with lamps in their hands - but incompatible with the circumstance, [5522] that at midnight the cry is suddenly raised to go forth and meet Him. In these circumstances, no precise parallel can be derived from the ordinary Jewish marriage-processions, where the bridgegroom, accompanied by his groomsmen and friends, went to the bride's house, and thence conducted the bride, with her attendant maidens and friends, into his own or his parents' home. But in the Parable, the Bridegroom comes from a distance and goes to the bridal house. Accordingly, the bridal procession is to meet Him on His Arrival, and escort Him to the bridal place. No mention is made of the Bride, either in this Parable of in that or the Marriage of the King's Son. This, for reasons connected with their application: since in the one case the Wedding Guests, in the other the Virgins, occupy the place of the Bride. And here we must remind ourselves of the general canon, that, in the interpretation of a Parable, details must not be too closely pressed. The Parables illustrate the Sayings of Christ, as the Miracles His Doings; and alike the Parables and the Miracles present only one or another, not all the aspects of the truth. Another archæological inquiry will, perhaps, be more helpful to our understanding of this Parable. The lamps' - not torches' - which the Ten Virgins carried, were of well-known construction. They bear in Talmudic wrtings commonly the name Lappid, but the Aramaised from the Greek word in the New Testament also occurs as Lampad and Lampadas. [5523] The lamp consisted of a round receptacle for pitch or oil for the wick. This was placed in a hollow cup or deep saucer - the Beth Shiqqua [5524] - which was fastened by a pointed end into a long wooden pole, on which it was borne aloft. According to Jewish authorities, [5525] it was the custom in the East to carry in a bridal procession about ten such lamps. We have the less reason to doubt that such was also the case in Palestine, since, according to rubric, ten was the number required to be present at any office or ceremony, such as at the benedictions accompanying the marriage-ceremonies. And, in the peculiar circurmstances supposed in the Parable, Ten Virgins are represented as going forth to meet the Bridegroom, each bearing her lamp. The first point which we mark is, that the Ten Virgins brought, presumably to the bridal house, their own [5526] lamps.' Emphasis must be laid on this. Thus much was there of personal preparation on the part of all. But while the five that were wise brought also oil in the vessels' [5527] [presumably the hollow receptacles in which the lamp proper stood], the five foolish Virgins neglected to do so, no doubt

expecting that their lamps would be filled out of some common stock in the house. In the text the foolish Virgins are mentioned before the wise, [5528] because the Parable turns to this. We cannot be at a loss to interpret the meaning of it. The Brideggroom far away is Christ, Who is come for the Marriage-Feast from the far country' - the Home above - certainly on that night, but we know not at what hour of it. The ten appointed bridal companions who are to go forth to meet Him are His professed disciples, and they gather in the bridal house in readiness to welcome His arrival. It is night, and a marriage-procession: therefore, they must go forth with their lamps. All of them have brought their own lamps, they all have the Christian, or say, the Church-profession: the lamp, in the hollow cup on the top of the pole. But only the wise Virgins have more than this - the oil in the vessels, without which the lamps cannot give their light. The Christian or Church-profession is but an empty vessel on the top of a pole, without the oil in the vessels. We here remember the words of Christ: Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father Which is in heaven.' [5529] The foolishness of the Virgins, which consisted in this that they had ommited to bring their oil, is thus indicated in the text: All they which [atines] [5530] were foolish, when they brought their own lamps, brought not with them oil:' they brought their own lamps, but not their own oil. This (as already explained), probably, not from forgetfulness - for they could scarcely have forgotten the need of oil, but from the wilful neglect, in the belief that there would be a common stock in the house, out of which they would be supplied, or that there would be sufficient time for the supply of their need after the announcement that the Bridegroom was coming. They had no conception either of any personal obligation in this matter, nor that the call would come so suddenly, nor yet that there would be so little interval between the arrival of the Bridegroom and the closing of the door.' And so they deemed it not necessary to undertake what must have involved both trouble and carefulness, the bringing their own oil in the hollow vessels in which the lamps were fixed. We have proceeded on the supposition that the oil was not carried in separate vessels, but in those attached to the lamps. It seems scarcely likely that these lamps had been lighted while waiting in the bridal house, where the Virgins assembled, and which, no doubt, was festively illuminated: Many practical objections to this view will readily occur. The foolishness of the five Virgins therefore consisted, not (as is commonly supposed) in their want of perseverance - as if the oil had been consumed before the Bridegroom came, and they had only not provided themselves with a sufficient extra-supply - but in the entire absence of personal preparation, [5531] having brought no oil of their own in their lamps. This corresponds to their conducts, who, belonging to the Church - having the profession' - being bridal companions provided with lamps, ready to go forth, and expecting to share in the wedding feast - neglect the preparation of grace, personal conversation and holiness, trusting that in the hour of need the oil may be supplied out of the common stock. But they know not, or else heed not, that every one must be personally prepared for meeting the Bridegroom, that the call will be sudden, that the stock of oil is not common, and that the time between His arrival and the shutting of the door will be awfully brief. For - and here begins the second scene in the Parable - the interval between the gathering of the Virgins in readiness to meet Him, and the arrival of the Bridegroom is much longer than had been anticipated. And so it came, that both the wise and the foolish Virgins slumbered and slept.' Manifestly, this is but a secondary trait in the Parable, chiefly intended to accentuate the surprise of the sudden announcement of the Bridegroom. The foolish Virgins did not ultimately fail because of their sleep, nor yet were the wise reproved of it. True, it was evidence of their weakness - but then it was night; all the world was asleep; and their own drowsiness might be in

proportion to their former excitement. What follows is intended to bring into prominence the startling suddenness of the Bridegroom's Coming. It is midnight - when sleep is deepest - when suddenly there was a cry, Behold, the Bridegroom cometh! Come ye out to the meeting of Him. Then all those Virgins awoke, and prepared (trimmed) their lamps.' This, not in the sense of heightening the low flame in their lamps, but in that of hastily drawing up the wick and lighting it, when, as there was no oil in the vessels, the flame, of course, immediately died out. Then the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are going out. But the wise answered, saying: Not at all [5532] - it will never [5533] suffice for us and you! Go ye rather to the sellers, and buy for your own selves.' This advice must not be regarded as given in irony. This trait is introduced to point out the proper source of supply - to emphasise that the oil must be their own, and also to prepare for what follows. But while they were going to buy, the Bridegroom came; and the ready ones [they that were ready] went in with Him to the Marriage-Feast, and the door was shut,' The sudden cry at midnight: The Bridegroom cometh!' had come with startling surprise both to the wise and the foolish Virgins; to the one class it had come only unexpectedly, but to the other also unpreparedly. Their hope of sharing or borrowing the oil of the wise Virgins being disappointed, the foolish were, of course, unable to meet the Bridegroom. And while they hurried to the sellers of oil, those that had been ready not only met; but entered with the Bridegroom into the bridal house, and the door was shut. It is of no importance here, whether or not the foolish Virgins finally succeeded in obtaining oil - although this seems unlikely at that time of night - since it could no longer be of any possible use, as its object was to serve in the festive procession, which was now past. Nevertheless, and when the door was shut, those foolish Virgins came, calling on the Bridegroom to open to them. But they had failed in that which could alone give them a claim to admission. Professing to be bridesmaids, they had not been in the bridal procession, and so, in truth and righteousness, He could only answer from within: Verily I say unto you, I know you not.' This, not only in punishement, but in the right order of things. The personal application of this Parable to the disciples, which the Lord makes, follows almost of necessity. Watch therefore, for ye know not the day, nor the hour.' [5534] Not enough to be in waiting with the Church; His Coming will be far on in the night; it will be sudden; it will be rapid: be prepared therefore, be ever and personnally prepared! Christ will come when least expected - at midnight - and when the Church, having become accustomed to His long delay, has gone to sleep. So sudden will be His Coming, that after the cry of announcement there will not be time for anything but to go forth to meet Him; and so rapid will be the end, that, ere the foolish Virgins can return, the door has been for ever closed. To present all this in the most striking manner, the Parable takes the form of a dialogue, first between the foolish and the wise Virgins, in which the latter only state the bare truth when saying, that each has only sufficient oil for what is superfluous. Lastly, we are to learn from the dialogue between the foolish Virgins and the Bridegroom, that it is impossible in the day of Christ's Coming to make up for neglect of previous preparation, and that those who have failed to meet Him, even though the bridal Virgins, shall be finally excluded as being strangers to the Bridegroom. 2. The Parable of the Talents - their use and misuse [5535] - follows closely on the admonition to watch, in view of the sudden and certain Return of Christ, and the reward or punishment which will then be meted out. Only that, whereas in the Parable of the Ten Virgins the reference was to the personal state, in that of the Talents' it is to the personal work of the Disciples. In the former instance, they are portrayed as the bridal maidens who are to welcome His Return; in the latter, as the servants who are to give an account of their stewardship.From its close

connection with what precedes, the Parable opens almost abruptly with the words: For [it is] like a Man going abroad, [who] called His own servants, and delivered to them His goods.' The emphasis rests on this, that they were His own servants, and to act for His interest. His property was handed over to them, not for safe custody, but that they might do with it as best they could in the interest of their Master. This appears from what immediately follows: and so to one He gave five talents (about 1,170l.), but to one two (about 468l.), and to one one (=6,000 denarii, about 234l.), to each according to his own capability' [5536] - that is, He gave to each according to his capacity, in proportion as He deemed severally qualified for larger or smaller administration. And He journeyed abroad straightway.' [5537] Having entrusted the management of His affairs to His servants, according to their capacity, He at once went away.Thus far we can have no difficulty in understanding the meaning of the Parable. Our Lord, Who has left us for the Father's Home, is He Who has gone on the journey abroad, and to His own servants has He entrusted, not for custody, but to use for Him in the time between His departure and His return, what He claims as His own goods.' We must not limit this to the administration of His Word, nor to the Holy Ministry, although these may have been pre-eminently in view. It referes generally to all that a man has, wherewith to serve Christ; for, all that the Christian has - his time, money, opportunities, talents, or learning (and not only the Word'), is Christ's, and is entrusted to us, not for custody, but to trade withal for the absent Master - to further the progress of His Kingdom. And to each of us He gives according to our capacity for working - mental, moral, and even physical - to one five, to another two, and to another one talent.' This capacity for work lies not within our own power; but it is in our power to use for Christ whatever we may have.And here the characteristic difference appears. He that received the five talents went and traded with them, and made other five talents. In like manner he that had received the two gained [5538] other two.' As each had received according to his ability, so each worked according to his power, as good and faithful servants of their Lord. If the outward result was different, their labour, devotion, and faithfulness were equal. It was otherwise with him who had least to do for his Master, since only one talent had been entrusted to him. He went away, digged up earth, and hid the money of his Lord.' The prominent fact here is, that he did not employ it for the Master, as a good servant, but shunned alike the labour and the responsibility, and acted as if it had been some stranger's, and not his Lord's property. In so doing he was not only unfaithful to his trust, but practically disowned that he was a servant who had received much, two others are introduced in the Parable, who had both received comparatively little - one of whom was faithful, while the other in idle selfishness hid the money, not heeding that it as his Lord's.' Thus, while the second servant, although less had been entrusted to him was as faithful and conscientious as he to whom much had been given, and while both had, by their gain, increased the possessions of their Master, the third had by his conduct rendered the money of his Lord a dead, useless, buried thing.And now the second scene opens. But after a long time cometh the Lord of those servants, and maketh reckoning [5539] with them.' The notice of the long absence of the Master not only connects this with the Parable of the Ten Virgins, but is intended to show that the delay might have rendered the servants who traded more careless, while it also increased the guilt of him, who all this time had not done anything with his Master's money. And now the first of the servants, without speaking of his labour in trading, or his merit in making' money, answers with simple joyousness: Lord, five talents deliveredst Thou unto me. See, other five talents have I gained besides.' [5540] We can almost see his honest face beaming with delight, as he points to his Master's increased possession. His approval was all that the faithful servant had looked for, for

which he had toiled during that long absence. And we can understand, how the Master welcomed and owned that servant, and assigned to him meet reward. The latter was twofold. Having proved his faithfulness and capacity in a comparatively limited sphere, one much greater would be assigned to him. For, to do the work, and increase the wealth of his Master, had evidently been his joy and privilege, as well as his duty. Hence also the second part of his reward - that of entering into the joy of his Lord - must not be confined to sharing in the festive meal at His return, still less to advancement from the position of a servant to that of a friend who shares his Master's lordship. It implies far more than this: even satisfied heart-sympathy with the aims and gains of his Master, and participation in them, with all that thus conveys. A similar result followed on the reckoning with the servant to whom two talents had been entrusted. We mark that, although he could only speak of two talents gained, he met his Master with the same frank joyness as he who had made five. For he had been as faithful, and laboured as earnestly as he to whom more had been entrusted. And what is more important, the former difference between the two servants, dependent on greater or less capacity for work, now ceased, and the second servant received precisely the same welcome and exactly the same reward, and in the same terms, as the first. And yet a deeper, and in some sense mysterious, truth comes to us in connection with the words: Thou has been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things.' Surely, then, if not after death, yet in that other dispensation,' there must be work to do for Christ, for which the preparation is in this life by faithful application for Him of what He has entrusted to us - be it much or little. This gives quite a new and blessed meaning to the life that now is - as most truly and in all its aspects part of that into which it is to unfold. No; not the smallest share of talents,' if only faithfully used for Christ, can be lost, not merely as regards His acknowledgement, but also their further and wider employment. And may we not suggest, that this may, if not explain, yet cast the halo of His purpose and Presence around what so often seems mysterious in the removal of those who had just attained to opening, or to full usefulness, or even of those who are taken from us in the early morn of youth and loveliness. The Lord may have need' of them, where or how we know not - and beyond this working-day and working-world there are many things' over which the faithful servant in little may be set,' that he may still do, and with greatly enlarged opportunities and powers, the work for Christ which he had loved so well, while at the same time he also shares the joy of his Lord.It only remains to refer to the third servant, whose sad unfaithfulness and failure of service we already, in some measure, understand. Summoned to his account, he returned the talent entrusted to him with this explanation, that, knowing his Master to be a hard man, reaping where he did not sow, and gathering (the corn) where He did not winnow,' [5541] he had been afraid of incurring responsibility, [5542] and hence hid in the earth the talent which he now restored. It needs no comment to show that his own words, however honest and self-righteous they might sound, admitted dereliction of his work and duty as a servant, and entire misunderstanding as well as heart-alienation from his Master. He served Him not, and he knew Him not; he loved Him not, and he sympathised not with Him. But, besides, his answer was also an insult and a medacious pretext. He had been idle and unwilling to work for his Master. If he worked it would be for himself. He would not incur the difficulties, the self-denial, perhaps the reproach, connected with his Master's work. We recognise here those who, although His servants, yet, from self-indulgence and wordliness, will not do work for Christ with the one talent entrusted to them - that is, even though the responsibility and claim upon them be the smallest; and who deem it sufficient to hide it in the ground - not to lose it - or to preserve it, as they imagine, from being used for evil, without using it

to trade for Christ. The falseness of the excuse, that he was afraid to do anything with it - an excuse too often repeated in our days - lest, peradventure, he might do more harm than good, was now fully exposed by the Master. Confessedly, it proceeded from a want of knowledge of Him, as if He were a hard, exacting Master, not One Who reckons even the least service as done to Himself; from misunderstanding also of what work for Christ is, in which nothing can ever fail or be lost; and, lastly, from want of joyous sympathy with it. And so the Master put aside the flimsy pretext. Addressing him as a wicked and slothful servant,' He pointed out that, even on his own showing, if he had been afraid to incur responsibility , he might have cast' (a word intended to mark the absence of labour) the money to the bankers,' when, at His return, He would have received His own, with interest.' Thus he might, without incurring responsibility, or much labour, have been, at least in a limited sense, faithful to his duty and trust as a servant.The reference to the practice of lodging money, at interest, with the bankers, raises questions too numerous and lengthly for full discussion in this place. The Jewish Law distinguished between interest' and increase' (neshekh and tarbith), and entered into many and intricate details on the subject. [5543] Such transactions were forbidden with Israelites, but allowed with Gentiles. As in Rome, the business of money-changers' (argentarii, nummularii) and that of bankers' (collectarii, mensularii) seem to have run into each other. The Jewish bankers' bear precisely the same name (Shulchani, mensularius, trapeztes). In Rome very high interest seems to have been charged in early times; by-and-by it was lowered, till it was fixed, first at 8½, and then at 4 1/6, per cent. But these laws were not of permanent duration. Practically, usury was unlimited. It soon became the custom to charge monthly interest at the rate of 1 per cent a month. Yet there were prosperous times, as at the close of the Republic, when the rate of interest was so low as 4 percent; during the early Empire it stood at 8 per cent. This, of course, in what we may call fair business transactions. Beyond them, in the almost incredible extravagance, luxury, and indebtedness of even some of the chief historical personages, most usurious transactions took place (especailly in the provinces), and that by people in high position (Brutus in Cyprus, and Seneca in Britain). Money was lent at 12, 24, and even 48 per cent.; the bills bore a larger sum than that actually received; and the interest was added to the capital, so that debt and interest alike grew. In Greece there were regular State banks, while in Rome such provision was only made under exceptional circumstances. Not unfrequently the twofold business of money-changing and banking was combined. Such bankers' undertook to make payments, to collect moneys and accounts, to place out money at interest - in short, all the ordinary business of this kind. [5544] There can be no question that the Jewish bankers of Palestine and elsewhere were engaged in the same undertakings, while the dispersion of their race over the world would render it more easy to have trusted correspondents in every city. Thus, we find that Herod Agrippa borrowed from the Jewish Alabarch at Alexandria the sum of 20,000 drachms, which was paid him in Italy, the commission and interest on it amounting to no less than 8 1/2 per cent. (2,500 drachms). [5545] We can thus understand the allusion to the bankers,' with whom the wicked and unfaithful servant might have lodged his lord's money, if there had been truth in his excuse. To unmask its hollowness is the chief object of this part of the Parable. Accordingly, it must not be too closely pressed; but it would be in the spirit of the Parable to apply the expression to the indirect employment of money in the service of Christ, as by charitable contributions, &c. But the great lesson intended is, that every good and faithful servant of Christ must, whatever his circumstances, personally and directly use such talent as he may have to make gain for Christ. Tried by this test, how few seem to have

understood their relation to Christ, and how cold has the love of the Church grown in the long absence of her lord!But as regards the unprofitable' servant in the Parable, the well-known punishment of him that had come to the Marriage-Feast without the wedding-garment shall await him, while the talent, which he had failed to employ for his master, shall be entrusted to him who had shown himself most capable of working. We need not seek an elaborate interpretation for this. It points to the principle, equally true in every administration of God, that unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall be placed in abundance; [5546] but as to him that hath not, [5547] also what he hath shall be away from him.' Not a cynical rule this, such as the world, in its selfishness or worship of success, caricatures it; nor yet the worship of superior force; but this, that faithful use for God of every capacity will ever open fresh opportunities, in proportion as the old ones have been used, while spiritual unprofitableness must end in utter loss even of that which, however humble, might have been used, at one time or another, for God and for good.3. To these Parables, that of the King who on his return makes reckoning with His servants and His enemies may be regarded as supplemental. It is recorded only by St. Luke, and placed by him in somewhat loose connection with the conversion of Zacchæus. [5548] The most superficial perusal will show such unmistakable similarity with the Parable of The Talents,' that their identity will naturally suggest itself to the reader. On the other hand, there are remarkable divergences in detail, some of which seem to imply a different standpoint from which the same truth is viewed. We have also now the additional feature of the message of hatred on the part of the citizens, and their fate in consequence of it. It may have been that Christ spoke the two Parables on the two different occasions mentioned respectively by St. Luke and St. Matthew - the one on the journey to Jerusalem, the other on the Mount of Olives. And yet it seems difficult to believe that He would, with a few days of telling the Parable recorded by St. Luke, have repeated it in almost the same words to the disciples, who must have heard it in Jericho. This objection would not be so serious, if the Parable addressed, in the first instance, to the disciples (that of the Talents) had been afterwards repeated (in the record of St. Luke) in a wider circle, and not, as according to the Synoptists, the opposite. If, however, we are to regard the two Parables of the Talents and of the Pieces of Money as substantially the same, we would be disposed to consider the recension by St. Matthew as the original, being the more homogeneous and compact, while that of St. Luke would seem to combine with this another Parable, that of the rebellious citizens. Perhaps it is safest to assume, that, on His way to Jerusalem, when his adherents (not merely the disciples) would naturally expect that He would inaugurate His Messianic Kingdom, Christ may have spoken the latter Parable, to teach them that the relation in which Jerusalem stood towards Him, and its fate, were quite different form what they imagined, and that His Entrance into the City and the Advent of His Kingdom would be separated by a long distance of time. Hence the prospect before them was that of working, not of reigning; after that would the reckoning come, when the faithful worker would become the trusted ruler. These points were, of course, closely connected with the lessons of the Parable of the Talents, and, with the view of presenting the subject as a whole, St. Luke may have borrowed details from that Parable, and supplemented its teaching by presenting another aspect of it.It must be admitted, that if St. Luke had really these two Parables in view (that of the King and of the Talents), and wished to combine them into new teaching, he has most admirably welded them together. For, as the Nobleman Who is about to entrust money to His servants, is going abroad to receive a Kingdom, it was possible to represent Him alike in relation to rebellious citizens and to His own servants, and to connect their reward with His Kingdom.' And so the two

Parables are joined by deriving the illustration from political instead of social life. It has been commonly supposed, that the Parable contains an allusion to what had happened after the death of Herod the Great, when his son Archelaus hastened to Rome to obtain confirmation of his father's will, while a Jewish deputation followed to oppose his appointment - an act of rebellion which Archelaus afterwards avenged in the blood of his enemies. The circumstance must have been still fresh in popular remembrance, although more than thirty years had elapsed. But if otherwise, applications to Rome for installation to the government, and popular opposition thereto, were of such frequent occurence amidst the quarrels and intrigues of the Herodians, that no difficulty could have been felt in understanding the allusions of the Parable. A brief analysis will suffice to point out the special lessons of this Parable. It introduces a certain Nobleman,' Who has claims to the throne, but has not yet received the formal appointment from the suzerain power. As He is going away to receive it, He deals as yet only with His servants. His object, apparently, is to try their aptitude, devotion, and faithfulness: and so He hands - not to each according to his capacity, but to all equally, a sum, not large (such as talents), but small - to each a mina,' equal to 100 drachms, or about 3l.5s. of our money. To trade with so small a sum would, of course, be much more difficult, and success would imply greater ability, even as it would require more constant labour. Here we have some traits in which this differs from the Parable of the Talents. The same small sum is supposed to have been entrusted to all, in order to show which of them was most able and most earnest, and hence who should be called to largest employment, and with it to greatest honour in the Kingdom. While the Nobleman' was at the court of His suzerain, a deputation of His fellow-citizens arrived to urge this resolution of theirs: We will not that this One reign over us.' It was simply an expression of hatred; it stated no reason, and only urged personal opposition, even if such were in the face of the personal wish of the sovereign who appointed him king.In the last scene, the King, now duly appointed, has returned to His country. He first reckons with His servants, when it is found that all but one have been faithful to their trust, though with varying success (the mina of the one having grown into ten; that of another into five, and so on). In strict accordance with that success is now their further appointment to rule - work here corresponding to rule there, which, however, as we know from the Parable of the Talents, is also work for Christ: a rule that is work, and work that is rule. At the same time, the acknowledgment is the same to all the faithful servants. Similarly, the motives, the reasoning, and the fate of the unfaithful servant are the same as in the Parable of the Talents. But as regards His enemies,' that would not have Him reign over them - manifestly, Jerusalem and the people of Israel - who, even after He had gone to receive the Kingdom, continued the personal hostility of their We will not that this One shall reign over us' - the ashes of the Temple, the ruins of the City, the blood of the fathers, and the homeless wanderings of their children, with the Cain curse branded on their brow and visible to all men, attest, that the King has many ministers to execute that judgment which obstinate rebellion must surely bring, if His Authority is to be vindicated, and His Rule to secure submission.

CHAPTER VIII. THE FOURTH DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - JESUS IN HIS LAST SABBATIC REST BEFORE HIS AGONY, AND THE SANHEDRISTS IN THEIR UNREST - THE BETRAYAL - JUDAS: HIS CHARACTER, APOSTASY, AND END.

(St. Matt. xxvi.1-5, 14-16; St. Mark xiv.1, 2, 10, 11; St. Luke xxii.1-6.) FROM the record of Christ's Sayings and Doings, furnished by St. Matthew, we turn once more to that of public events, as, from one or another aspect they are related by all the Evangelists. With the Discourses in the Temple the public Teaching of Christ had come to an end; with that spoken on the Mount of Olives, and its application in the Parables of the Virgins' and the Talents,' the instruction of the disciples had been concluded. What follows in His intercourse with His own is parænetic, [5549] rather than teaching - exhortation, advice, and consolation: rather, perhaps, all these combined. The three busy days of Passion-Week were past. The day before that on which the Paschal Lamb was to be slain, with all that was to follow, would be one of rest, a Sabbath to His Soul before its Great Agony. He would refresh Himself, gather Himself up for the terrible conflict before Him. And He did so as the Lamb of God - meekly submitting Himself to the Will and Hand of His Father, and so fulfilling all types, from that of Isaac's sacrifice on Mount Moriah to the Paschal Lamb in the Temple; and bringing the reality of all prophecy, from that of the Woman's Seed that would crush the Serpent's head to that of the Kingdom of God in its fullness, when its golden gates would be flung open to all men, and Heaven's own light flow out to them as they sought its way of peace. Only two days more, as the Jews reckoned them [5550] - that Wednesday and Thursday - and at its Even the Paschal supper! And Jesus knew it well, and He passed that day of rest and preparation in quiet retirement with His disciples - perhaps in some hollow of the Mount of Olives, near the home of Bethany - speaking to them of His Crucifixion on the near Passover. They sorely needed His words; they, rather than He, needed to be prepared for what was coming. But what Divine calm, what willing obedience, and also what outgoing of love to them, with full consciousness of what was before Him, to think and speak of this only on that day! So would not a Messiah of Jewish conception have acted; nay, He would not have been placed in such circumstances. So would not a Messiah of ambitious aims or of Jewish Nationalist aspirations have acted; He would have done what the Sanhedrin feared, and raised a tumult of the people,' prepared for it as the multitude was, which had so lately raised the Hosanna-cry in street and Temple. So would a disillusioned enthusiast not have acted; he would have withdrawn from the impending fate. But Jesus knew it all - far more the agony of shame and suffering, even the unfathomable agony of soul. And the while He thought only of them in it all. Such thinking and speaking is not that of Man - it is that of the Incarnate Son of God, the Christ of the Gospels. He had, indeed, before that, sought gradually to prepare them for what was to happen on the morrow's night. He had pointed to it in dim figure at the very opening of His Ministry, on the first occasion that he had taught in the Temple, [5551] as well as to Nicodemus. [5552] He had hinted it, when He spoke of the deep sorrow when the Bridegroom would be taken from them, [5553] of

the need of taking up His cross, [5554] of the fulfilment in Him of the Jonah-type, [5555] of His Flesh which He would give for the life of the world, [5556] as well as in what might have seemed the Parabolic teaching about the Good Shepherd, Who laid down His life for the Sheep, [5557] and the Heir Whom the evil husbandmen cast out and killed. [5558] But He had also spoken of it quite directly - and this, let us specially notice, always when some highpoint in His History had been reached, and the disciples might have been carried away into Messianic expectations of an exaltation without humiliation, a triumph not a sacrifice. We remember, that the first occasion on which He spoke thus clearly was immediately after that confession of Peter, which laid the foundation of the Church, against which the gates of hell should not prevail; [5559] the next, after descending from the Mount of Transfiguration; [5560] the last, on preparing to make His triumphal Messianic Entry into Jerusalem. [5561] The darker hints and Parabolic sayings might have been misunderstood. Even as regarded the clear prediction of His Death, preconceived ideas could find no room for such a fact. Deep veneration, which could not associate it with His Person, and love which could not bear the thought of it, might, after the first shock of the words was past, and their immediate fulfilment did not follow, suggest some other possible explanation of the prediction. But on that Wednessday it was impossible to misunderstand; it could scarcely have been possible to doubt what Jesus said of His near Crucifixion. [5562] If illusions had still existed, the last two days must have rudely dispelled them. The triumphal Hosannas of His Entry into the City, and the acclamations in the Temple, had given place to the cavils of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Scribes, and with a Woe' upon it Jesus had taken His last departure from Israel's sanctuary. And better far than those rulers, whom conscience made cowards, did the disciples know how little reliance could be placed on the adherence of the multitude.' And now the Master was telling it to them in plain words; was camly contemplating it, and that not as in the dim future, but in the immediate present - at that very Passover, from which scarcely two days separated them. Much as we wonder at their brief scattering on His arrest and condemnation, those humble disciples must have loved Him much to sit around Him in mournful silence as He thus spake, and to follow Him unto His Dying. But to one of them, in whose heart the darkness had long been gathering, this was the decisive moment. The prediction of Christ, which Judas as well as the others must have felt to be true, extinguished the last glimmering of such light of Christ as his soul had been capable of receiving. In its place flared up the lurid flame of hell. By the open door out of which he had thrust the dying Christ Satan entered into Judas.' [5563] Yet, even so, not permanently. [5564] It may, indeed, be doubted, whether, since God is in Christ, such can ever be the case in any human soul, at least on this side eternity. Since our world's night has been lit up by the promise from Paradise, the rosy hue of its morning has lain on the edge of the horizon, deepening into gold, brightening into day, growing into midday-strength and evening-glory. Since God's Voice wakened earth by its early Christmas-Hymn, it has never been quite night there, nor can it ever be quite night in any human soul. [5565] But it is a terrible night-study, that of Judas. We seem to tread our way over loose stones of hot molten lava, as we climb to the edge of the crater, and shudderingly look down its depths. And yet there, near there, have stood not only St. Peter in the night of his denial, but mostly all of us, save they whose Angels have always looked up into the Face of our Father in heaven. And yet, in our weakness, we have even wept over them! There, near there, have we stood, not in the hours of our weakness, but in those of our sore temptation, when the blast of doubt had almost quenched the flickering light, or the storm of passion or self-will broken the bruised reed. But He prayed for us - and through the night came over desolate moor and stony

height the Light of His Presence, and above the wild storm rose the Voice of Him, Who has come to seek and to save that which was lost. Yet near to us, close to us, was the dark abyss; and we can never more forget out last, almost sliding, foothold as we quitted its edge. A terrible night-study this of Judas, and best to make it here, at once, from its beginning to its end. We shall indeed, catch sudden glimpse of him again, as the light of the torches flashes on the traitor-face in Gethsemane; and once more hear his voice in the assemblage of the haughty, sneering councillors of Israel, when his footfall on the marble pavement of the Temple-halls; and the clink of those thirty accursed pieces of silver shall waken the echoes, wake also the dirge of despair in his soul, and he shall flee from the night of his soul into the night that for ever closes around him. But all this as rapidly as we may pass from it, after this present brief study of his character and history. We remember, that Judas, the man of Kerioth,' was, so far as we know, the only disciple of Jesus from the province of Judæa. This circumstance; that he carried the bag, i.e. was treasurer and administrator of the small common stock of Christ and His disciples; and that he was both a hypocrite and a thief [5566] - this is all that we know for certain of his history. From the circumstance that he was appointed to such office of trust in the Apostolic community, we infer that he must have been looked up to by the others as an able and prudent man, a good administrator. And there is probably no reason to doubt, that he possessed the natural gift of administration or of government' (kubrnesis). [5567] The question, why Jesus left him the bag' after he knew him to be a thief - which, as we believe, he was not at the beginning, and only became in the course of time and in the progress of disappointment - is best answered by this other: Why He originally allowed it to be entrusted to Judas? It was not only because he was best fitted - probably, absolutely fitted - for such work, but also in mercy to him, in view of his character. To engage in that for which a man is naturally fitted is the most likely means of keeping him from brooding, dissatisfaction, alienation, and eventual apostasy. On the other hand, it must be admitted that, as mostly all our life-temptations come to us from that for which we have most aptitude, when Judas was alienated and unfaithful in heart, this very thing became also his greatest temptation, and, indeed, hurried him to his ruin. But only after he had first failed inwardly. And so, as ever in like circumstances, the very things which might have been most of blessing become most of curse, and the judgment of hardening fulfills itself by that which in itself is good. Nor could the bag' have been afterwards taken from him without both exposing him to the others, and precipitating his moral destruction. And so he had to be left to the process of inward ripening, till all was ready for the sickle. This very gift of government' in Judas may also help us to understand how he may have been first attracted to Jesus, and through what process, when alienated, he came to end in that terrible sin which had cast its snare about him. The gift of government' would, in its active aspect, imply the desire for it. From thence to ambition in its worst, or selfish, aspect, there is only a step - scarcely that: rather, only different moral premisses. [5568] Judas was drawn to Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, and he believed in Him as such, possibly both earnestly and ardently; but he expected that His would be the success, the result, and the triumphs of the Jewish Messiah, and he also expected personally and fully to share in them. How deep-rooted were such feelings even in the best, purest, and most unselfish of Jesus' disciples, we gather from the request of the mother of John and James for her sons, and from Peter's question: What shall we have?' it must have been sorrow, the misery of moral loneliness, and humiliation, to Him Who was Unselfishness Incarnate, Who lived to die and was full to empty Himself, to be associated with such as even His most intimate disciples, who in this sense also could not watch with Him even one hour, and in whom, at the end of His Ministry,

such heaviness was mentally and morally the outcrop, if not the outcome. And in Judas all this must have been an hundredfold more than in them who were in heart true to Christ. He had, from such conviction as we have described, joined the movement at its very commencement. Then, multitudes in Galilee followed His Footsteps, and watched for His every appearance; they hung entranced on His lips in the Synagogue or on the Mount;' they flocked to Him from every town, village, and hamlet; they bore the sick and dying to His Feet, and witnessed, awestruck, how conquered devils gave their testimony to His Divine Power. It was the spring-time of the movement, and all was full of promise - land, people, and disciples. The Baptist, who had bowed before Him and testified to Him, was still lifting his voice to proclaim the near Kingdom. But the people had turned after Jesus, and He swayed them. And, oh! what power was there in His Face and Word, and His look and deed. And Judas, also, had been one of them who, on their early Mission, had temporarily had power given Him, so that the very devils had been subject to them. But, step by step, had come the disappointment. John was beheaded, and not avenged; on the contrary, Jesus withdrew Himself. This constant withdrawing, whether from enemies or from success - almost amounting to flight - even when they would have made Him a King; this refusal to show Himself openly, either at Jerusalem, as His own brethen had taunted Him, or, indeed, anywhere else; this uniform preaching of discouragement to them, when they came to Him elated and hopeful at some success; this gathering enmity of Israel's leaders, and His marked avoidance of, or, as some might have put it, His failure in taking up the repeated public challenge of the Pharisees to show a sign from heaven; last, and chief of all, this constant and growing reference to shame, disaster, and death - what did it all mean, if not disappointment of all those hopes and expectations which had made Judas at the first a disciple of Jesus? He that so knew Jesus, not only in His Words and Deeds, but in His inmost Thoughts, even to His night-long communing with God on the hill-side, could not have seriously believed in the coarse Pharisaic charge of Satanic agency as the explanation of all. Yet, from the then Jewish standpoint, he could scarcely have found it impossible to suggest some other explanation of His miraculous power. But, as increasingly the moral and spiritual aspect of Christ's Kingdom must have become apparent to even the dullest intellect, the bitter disappointment of his Messianic thoughts and hopes must have gone on, increasing in proportion as, side by side with it, the process of moral alienation, unavoidably connected with his resistance to such spiritual manifestation, continued and increased. And so the mental and the moral alienation went on together, affected by and affecting each other. As if we were pressed to name a definite moment when the process of disintegration, at least sensibly, began, we would point to that Sabbath-morning at Capernaum, when Christ had preached about His Flesh as the Food of the World, and so many of His adherents ceased to follow after Him; nay, when the leaven so worked even in His disciplies, that He turned to them with the searching question - intended to show them the full import of the crisis - whether they also would leave Him? Peter conquered by grasping the moral element, because it was germane to him and to the other true disciples: To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.' But this moral element was the very cliff on which Judas made shipwreck. After this, all was wrong, and increasingly so. We see disappointment in his face when not climbing the Mount of Transfiguration, and disappointment in the failure to heal the lunatick child. In the disputes by the way, in the quarrels who was greatest among them, in all the pettiness of misunderstandings and realistic folly of their questions or answers, we seem to hear the echo of his voice, to see the result of his influence, the leaven of his presence. And in it all we mark the downward hastening of his

course, even to the moment when, in contrast to the deep love of a Mary, he first stands before us unmasked, as heartless, hyprocritical, full of hatred - disappointed ambition having broken down into selfishness, and selfishness slid into covetousness, even to the crime of stealing that which was destined for the poor. For, when an ambition which rests only on selfishness gives way there lies close by it the coarse lust of covetousness, as the kindred passion and lower expression of that other form of selfishness. When the Messianic faith of Judas gave place to utter disappointment, the moral and spiritual character of Christ's Teaching would affect him, not sympathetically but antipathetically. Thus, that which should have opened the door of his heart, only closed and double-barred it. His attachment to the Person of Jesus would give place to actual hatred, though only of a temporary character; and the wild intenseness of his Eastern nature would set it all in flame. Thus, when Judas had lost his slender foothold, or, rather, when it had slipped from under him, he fell down, down the eternal abyss. The only hold to which he could cling was the passion of his soul. As he laid hands on it, it gave way, and fell with him into fathomless depths. We, each of us, have also some master-passion; and if, which God forbid! we should lose our foothold, we also would grasp this master-passion, and it would give way, and carry us with it into the eternal dark and deep.On that spring day, in the restfulness of Bethany, when the Master was taking His sad and solemn Farewell of sky and earth, of friends and disciples, and told them what was to happen only two days later at the Passover, it was all settled in the soul of Judas. Satan entered' it. Christ would be crucified; this was quite certain. In the general cataclysm let Judas have at least something. And so, on that sunny afternoon, he left them out there, to seek speech of them that were gathered, not in their ordinary meeting-place, but in the High-Priest's Palace. Even this indicates that it was an informal meeting, consultative rather than judicial. For, it was one of the principles of Jewish Law that, in criminal cases, sentence must be spoken in the regular meeting-place of the Sanhedrin. [5569] The same inference is conveyed by the circumstance, that the captain of the Temple-guard and his immediate subordinates seem to have been taken into the council, [5570] no doubt to concert the measures for the actual arrest of Jesus. There had previously been a similar gathering and consultation, when the report of the raising of Lazarus reached the authorities of Jerusalem. [5571] The practical resolution adopted at that meeting had apparently been, that a strict watch should henceforth be kept on Christ's movements, and that every one of them, as well as the names of His friends, and the places of His secret retirement, should be communicated to the authorities, with the view to His arrest at the proper moment. [5572]It was probably in professed obedience to this direction, that the traitor presented himself that afternoon in the Palace of the High-Priest Caiaphas. [5573] Those assembled there were the chiefs' of the Priesthood - no doubt, the Temple-officials, heads of the course of Priests, and connections of the High-Priestly family, who constituted what both Josephus and the Talmud designate as the Priestly Council. [5574] All connected with the Temple, its ritual, administration, order, and laws, would be in their hands. Moreover, it was but natural, that the High-Priest and his council should be the regular official medium between the Roman authorities and the people. In matters which concerned, not ordinary misdemeanours, but political crimes (such as it was wished to represent the movement of Jesus), or which affected the status of the established religion, the official chiefs of the Priest-hood would, of course, be the persons to appeal, in conjunction with the Sanhedrists, to the secular authorities. This, irrespective of the question - to which reference will be made in the sequel - what place the Chief Priests held in the Sanhedrin. But in that meeting in the Palace of Caiaphas, besides these Priestly Chiefs, the

leading Sanhedrists (Scribes and Elders') were also gathered. They were deliberating how Jesus might be taken by subtilty and killed. Probably they had not yet fixed on any definite plan. Only at this conclusion had they arrived - probably in consequence of the popular acclamations at His Entry into Jerusalem, and of what had since happened - that nothing must be done during the Feast, for fear of some popular tumult. They knew only too well the character of Pilate, and how in any such tumult all parties - the leaders as well as the led - might experience terrible vengeance.It must have been intense relief when, in their perplexity, the traitor now presented himself before them with his proposals. Yet his reception was not such as he may have looked for. He probably expected to be hailed and treated as a most important ally. They were, indeed, glad, and covenanted to give him money,' even as he promised to dog His steps, and watch for the opportunity which they sought. In truth, the offer of the betrayer changed the whole aspect of matters. What formerly they dreaded to attempt seemed now both safe and easy. They could not allow such an opportunity to slip; it was one that might never occur again. Nay, might it not even seem, from the defection of Judas, as if dissatisfaction and disbelief had begun to spread in the innermost circle of Christ's disciples? Yet, withal, they treated Judas not as an honoured associate, but as a common informer, and a contemptible betrayer. This was not only natural but, in the circumstances, the wisest policy, alike in order to save their own dignity, and to keep most secure hold on the betrayer. And, after all, it might be said, so as to minimise his services, that Judas could really not do much for them - only show them how they might seize Him at unawares in the absence of the multitude, to avoid the possible tumult of an open arrest. So little did they understand Christ! And Judas had at last to speak it out barefacedly - so selling himself as well as the Master: What will ye give me?' It was in literal fulfilment of prophecy, [5575] that they weighed out' to him [5576] from the very Temple-treasury those thirty pieces of silver (about 3l.15s.). [5577] And here we mark, that there is always terrible literality about the prophecies of judgment, while those of blessing far exceed the words of prediction. And yet it was surely as much in contempt of the seller as of Him Whom he sold, that they paid the legal price of a slave. Or did they mean some kind of legal fiction, such as to buy the Person of Jesus at the legal price of a slave, so as to hand it afterwards over to the secular authorities? Such fictions, to save the conscience by a logical quibble, are not so uncommon - and the case of the Inquisitors handing over the condemned heretic to the secular authorities will recur to the mind. But, in truth, Judas could not now have escaped their toils. They might have offered him ten or five pieces of silver, and he must still have stuck to his bargain. Yet none the less do we mark the deep symbolic significance of it all, in that the Lord was, so to speak, paid for out of the Temple-money which was destined for the purchase of sacrifices, and that He, Who took on Him the form of a servant, [5578] was sold and bought at the legal price of a slave. [5579]And yet Satan must once more enter the heart of Judas at that Supper, before he can finally do the deed. [5580] But, even so, we believe it was only temporarily, not for always - for, he was still a human being, such as on this side eternity we all are - and he had still a conscience working in him. With this element he had not reckoned in his bargain in the High Priest's Palace. On the morrow of His condemnation would it exact a terrible account. That night in Gethsemane never more passed from his soul. In the thickening and encircling gloom all around, he must have ever seen only the torch-light glare as it fell on the pallid Face of the Divine Sufferer. In the terrible stillness before the storm, he must have ever heard only these words: Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?' He did not hate Jesus then - he hated nothing; he hated everything. He was utterly desolate, as the storm of despair swept over his

disenchanted soul, and swept him before it. No one in heaven or on earth to appeal to; no one, Angel or man, to stand by him. Not the priests, who had paid him the price of blood, would have aught of him, not even the thirty pieces of silver, the blood-money of his Master and of his own soul - even as the modern Synagougue, which approves of what has been done,but not of the deed, will have none of him! With their See thou to it!' they sent him reeling back into his darkness. Not so could conscience be stilled. And, louder than the ring of the thirty silver pieces as they fell on the marble pavement of the Temple, rang it ever in his soul, I have betrayed innocent blood!' Even if Judas possessed that which on earth cleaves closest and longest to us - a woman's love - it could not have abode by him. It would have turned into madness and fled; or it would have withered, struck by the lightning-flash of that night of terrors.Deeper - farther out into the night! to its farthest bounds - where rises and falls the dark flood of death. The wild howl of the storm has lashed the dark waters into fury: they toss and break in wild billows at his feet. One narrow rift in the cloud-curtain over-head, and, in the pale, deathlike light lies the Figure of the Christ, so calm and placid, untouched and unharmed, on the storm-tossed waters, as it had been that night lying on the Lake of Galilee, when Judas had seen Him come to them over the surging billows, and then bid them be peace. Peace! What peace to him now - in earth or heaven? It was the same Christ, but thorn-crowned, with nail-prints in His Hands and Feet. And this Judas had done to the Master! Only for one moment did it seem to lie there; then it was sucked up by the dark waters beneath. And again the cloud-curtain is drawn, only more closely; the darkness is thicker, and the storm wilder than before. Out into that darkness, with one wild plunge - there, where the Figure of the Dead Christ had lain on the waters! And the dark waters have closed around him in eternal silence.In the lurid morn that broke on the other shore where the flood cast him up, did he meet those searching, loving Eyes of Jesus, Whose gaze he knew so well - when he came to answer for the deeds done in the flesh? And - can there be a store in the Eternal Compassion for the Betrayer of Christ?

CHAPTER IX. THE FIFTH DAY IN PASSION-WEEK - MAKE READY THE PASSOVER!'

St. Matt. xxvi.17-19; St. Mark xiv.12-16; St. Luke xxii.7-13; St. John xiii.1.) When the traitor returned from Jerusalem on the Wednesday afternoon, the Passover, in the popular and canonical, though not in the Biblical sense, was close at hand. It began on the 14th Nisan, that is, from the appearance of the first three stars on Wednesday evening [the evening of what had been the 13th], and ended with the first three stars on Thursday evening [the evening of what had been the 14th day of Nisan]. As this is an exceedingly important point, it is well here to quote the precise language of the Jerusalem Talmud: [5581] What means: On the Pesach? [5582] On the 14th [Nisan].' And so Josephus describes the Feast as one of eight days, [5583] evidently reckoning its beginning on the 14th, and its close at the end of the 21st Nisan. The absence of the traitor so close upon the Feast would therefore, be the less noticed by the others. Necessary preparations might have to be made, even though they were to be guests in some house - they knew not which. These would, of course, devolve on Judas. Besides, from previous conversations, they may also have judged that the man of Kerioth' would fain escape what the Lord had all that day been telling them about, and which was now filling their minds and hearts. Everyone in Israel was thinking about the Feast. For the previous month it had been the subject of discussion in the Academies, and, for the last two Sabbaths at least, that of discourse in the Synagogues. [5584] Everyone was going to Jerusalem, or had those near and dear to them there, or at least watched the festive processions to the Metropolis of Judaism. It was a gathering of universal Israel, that of the memorial of the birth-night of the nation, and of its Exodus, when friends from afar would meet, and new friends be made; when offerings long due would be brought, and purification long needed be obtained - and all worship in that grand and glorious Temple, with its gorgeous ritual. National and religious feelings were alike stirred in what reached far back to the first, and pointed far forward to the final Deliverance. On that day a Jew might well glory in being a Jew. But we must not dwell on such thoughts, nor attempt a general description of the Feast. Rather shall we try to follow closely the footsteps of Christ and His disciples, and see or know only what on that day they saw and did. For ecclesiastical purposes Bethphage and Bethany seem to have been included in Jerusalem. But Jesus must keep the Feast in the City itself, although, if His purpose had not been interrupted, He would have spent the night outside its walls. [5585] The first preparations for the Feast would commence shortly after the return of the traitor. For, on the evening [of the 13th] commenced the 14th of Nisan, when a solemn search was made with lighted candle throughout each house for any leaven that might be hidden, or have fallen aside by accident. Such was put by in a safe place, and afterwards destroyed with the rest. In Galilee it was the usage to abstain wholly from work; in Judea the day was divided, and actual work ceased only at noon, though nothing new was taken in hand even in the morning. This division of the day for festive purposes was a Rabbinic addition; and, by way of a hedge around it, an hour before midday was fixed after which nothing leavened might be eaten. The more strict abstained from it even an hour earlier (at ten o'clock), lest the eleventh hour might insensibly run into the forbidden midday. But there could

be little real danger of this, since, by way of public notification, two desecrated thankoffering cakes were laid on a bench in the Temple, the removal of one of which indicated that the time for eating what was leavened had passed; the removal of the other, that the time for destroying all leaven had come. [5586] It was probably after the early meal, and when the eating of leaven had ceased, that Jesus began preparations for the Paschal Supper. St. John, who, in view of the details in the other Gospels, summarises, and, in some sense, almost passes over, the outward events, so that their narration may not divert attention from those all-important teachings which he alone records, simply tells by way of preface and explanation - alike of the Last Supper' and of what followed - that Jesus, knowing that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father [5587] . . . having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end.' [5588] But St. Luke's account of what actually happened, being in some points the most explicit, requires to be carefully studied, and that without thought of any possible consequences in regard to the harmony of the Gospels. It is almost impossible to imagine anything more evident, than that he wishes us to understand that Jesus was about to celebrate the ordinary Jewish Paschal Supper. And the Day of Unleavened Bread came, on which the Passover must be sacrificed.' [5589] The designation is exactly that of the commencement of the Pascha, which, as we have seen, was the 14th Nisan, and the description that of the slaying of the Paschal Lamb. What follows is in exact accordance with it: And He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the Pascha, that we may eat it.' Then occur these three notices in the same account: And . . . they made ready the Pascha;' [5590] and when the hour was come, He reclined [as usual at the Paschal Supper], and the Apostles with Him;' [5591] and, finally, these words of His: [5592] With desire I have desired to eat this Pascha with you.' And with this fully agrees the language of the other two Synoptists, St. Matt. xxvi.17-20, and St. Mark xiv.12-17. [5593] No ingenuity can explain away these facts. The suggestion, that in that year the Sanhedrin had postponed the Paschal Supper form Thursday evening (the 14th-15th Nisan) to Friday evening (15-16th Nisan), so as to avoid the Sabbath following on the first day of the feast - and that the Paschal Lamb was therefore in that year eaten on Friday, the evening of the day on which Jesus was crucified, is an assumption void of all support in history or Jewish tradition. [5594] Equally untenable is it, that Christ had held the Paschal Supper a day in advance of that observed by the rest of the Jewish world - a supposition not only inconsistent with the plain language of the Synoptists, but impossible, since the Paschal Lamb could not have been offered in the Temple, and, therefore, no Paschal Supper held, out of the regular time. But, perhaps, the strangest attempt to reconcile the statement of the Synoptists with what is supposed inconsistent with it in the narration of St. John [5595] is, that while the rest of Jerusalem, including Christ and His Apostles, partook of the Paschal Supper, the chief priests had been interrupted in, or rather prevented from it by their proceedings against Jesus - that, in fact, they had not touched it when they feared to enter Pilate's Judgment-Hall; [5596] and that, after that, they went back to eat it, turning the Supper into a breakfast.' [5597] Among the various objections to this extraordinary hypothesis, this one will be sufficient, that such would have been absolutely contrary to one of the plainest rubrical directions, which has it: The Pascha is not eaten but during the night, nor yet later than the middle of the night.' [5598] It was, therefore, with the view of preparing the ordinary Paschal Supper that the Lord now sent Peter and John. [5599] For the first time we see them here joined together by the Lord, these two, who henceforth were to be so closely connected: he of deepest feeling with him of quickest action. And their question, where He would have the Paschal Meal prepared, gives us a

momentary glimpse of the mutual relation between the Master and His Disciples; how He was still the Master, even in their most intimate converse, and would only tell them what to do just when it needed to be done; and how they presumed not to ask beforehand (far less to propose, or to interfere), but had simple confidence and absolute submission as regarded all things. The direction which the Lord gave, while once more evidencing to them, as it does to us, the Divine foreknowledge of Christ, had also its deep human meaning. Evidently, neither the house where the Passover was to be kept, nor its owner, [5600] was to be named beforehand within hearing of Judas. That last Meal with its Institution of the Holy Supper, was not to be interrupted, nor their last retreat betrayed, till all had been said and done, even to the last prayer of Agony in Gethsemane. We can scarcely err in seeing in this combination of foreknowledge with prudence the expression of the Divine and the Human: the two Natures in One Person.' The sign which Jesus gave the two Apostles reminds us of that by which Samuel of old had conveyed assurance and direction to Saul. [5601] On their entrance into Jersalem they would meet a man - manifestly a servant - carrying a pitcher of water. Without accosting, they were to follow him, and, when they reached the house, to deliver to its owner this message: [5602] The Master saith, My time is at hand - with thee [i.e. in thy house the emphasis is on this] I hold [5603] the Passover with My disciples. [5604] Where is My [5605] hostelry [or hall'], where I shall eat the Passover with My disciples?' [5606] Two things here deserve marked attention. The disciples were not bidden ask for the chief or Upper Chamber,' but for what we have rendered, for want of better, by hostelry,' or hall' - katluma - the place in the house where, as in an open Khan, the beasts of burden were unloaded, shoes and staff, or dusty garment and burdens put down - if an apartment, at least a common one, certain not the best. Except in this place, [5607] [5608] the word only occurs as the designation of the inn' or hostelry' in Bethlehem, where the Virgin-Mother brought forth her first-born Son, and laid Him in a manger. [5609] He Who was born in a hostelry' - Katalyma - was content to ask for His last Meal in a Katalyma. Only, and this we mark secondly, it must be His own: My Katalyma.' It was a common practice, that more than one company partook of the Paschal Supper in the same apartment. [5610] [5611] In the multitude of those who would sit down to the Paschal Supper this was unavoidable, for all partook of, including women and children, [5612] only excepting those who were Levitically unclean. And, though each company might not consist of less than ten, it was not to be larger than that each should be able to partake of at least a small portion of the Paschal Lamb [5613] - and we know how small lambs are in the East. But, while He only asked for His last Meal in the Katalyma, some hall opening on the open court, Christ would have it His own - to Himself, to eat the Passover alone with His Apostles. Not even a company of disciples - such as the owner of the house unquestionably was - nor yet, be it marked, even the Virgin-Mother, might be present; witness what passed, hear what He said, or be at the first Institution of His Holy Supper. To us at least this also recalls the words of St. Paul: I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you.' [5614] There can be no reasonable doubt that, as already hinted, the owner of the house was a disciple, although at festive seasons unbounded hospitality was extended to strangers generally, and no man in Jerusalem considered his house as strictly his own, far less would let it out for hire. [5615] But no mere stranger would, in answer to so mysterious a message, have given up, without further questioning, his best room. Had he known Peter and John; or recognised Him Who sent the message by the announcement that it was The Master;' or by the words to which His Teaching had attached such meaning: that His time had come; or even by the peculiar emphasis of His command: With thee [5616] I hold the Pascha with

My disciples?' It matters little which it was, and, in fact, the impression on the mind almost is, that the owner of the house had not, indeed, expected, but held himself ready for such a call. It was the last request of the dying Master - and could he have refused it? But he would do more than immediately and unquestioningly comply. The Master would only ask for the hall:' as He was born in a Katalyma, so He would have been content to eat there His last Meal - at the same time meal, feast, sacrifice, and institution. But the unnamed disciple would assign to Him, not the Hall, but the best and chiefest, the upper chamber,' or Aliyah, at the same time the most honourable and the most retired place, where from the outside stairs entrance and departure might be had without passing through the house. And the upper room' was large,' furnished and ready.' [5617] From Jewish authorities we know, that the average dining-apartment was computed at fifteen feet square; [5618] the expression furnished,' no doubt, refers to the arrangement of coches all round the Table, except at its end, since it was a canon, that the very poorest must partake of that Supper in a reclining attitude, to indicate rest, safety, and liberty; [5619] while the term ready' seems to point to the ready provision of all that was required for the Feast. In that case, all that the disciples would have to make ready' would be the Paschal Lamb,' and perhaps that first Chagigah, or festive Sacrifice, which, if the Paschal Lamb itself would not suffice for Supper, was added to it. And here it must be remembered, that it was of religion to fast till the Paschal Supper - as the Jerusalem Talmud explains, [5620] in order the better to relish the Supper. Perhaps it is not wise to attempt lifting the veil which rests on the unnamed such an one,' whose was the privilege of being the last Host of the Lord and the first Host of His Church, gathered within the new bond of the fellowship of His Body and Blood. And yet we can scarcely abstain from speculating. To us at least it seems most likely, that it was the house of Mark's father (then still alive) - a large one, as we gather from Acts xii.13. For, the most obvious explanation of the introduction by St. Mark alone of such an incident as that about the young man who was accompanying Christ as He was led away captive, and who, on fleeing from those that would have laid hold on him, left in their hands the inner garment which he had loosely cast about him, as, roused from sleep, he had rushed into Gethsemane, is, that he was none other than St. Mark himself. If so, we can understand it all: how the traitor may have first brought the Temple-guards, who had come to seize Christ, to the house of Mark's father, where the Supper had been held, and that, finding Him gone, they had followed to Gethsemane, for Judas knew the place, for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with His disciples' [5621] - and how Mark, startled from his sleep by the appearance of the armed men, would hastily cast about him his loose tunic and run after them; then, after the flight of the disciples, accompany Christ, but escape intended arrest by leaving his tunic in the hands of his would-be captors. If the view formerly expressed is correct, that the owner of the house had provided all that was needed for the Supper, Peter and John would find there the Wine for the four Cups, the cakes of unleavened Bread, and probably also the bitter herbs.' Of the latter five kinds are mentioned, [5622] which were to be dipped once in salt water, or vinegar, and another time in a mixture called Charoseth (a compound made of nuts, raisins, apples almonds, &c. [5623]) - although this Charoseth was not obligatory. The wine was the ordinary one of the country, only red; it was mixed with water, generally in the proportion of one part to two of water. [5624] The quantity for each of the four Cups is stated by one authority as five-sixteenths of a log, which may be roughly computed at half a tumbler - of course mixed with water. [5625] The Paschal Cup is described (according to the rubrical measure, which of course would not always be observed) as two fingers long by two fingers broad, and its height as a finger, half a finger, and one-third of a finger. All

things being, as we presume, ready in the furnished upper room, it would only remain for Peter and John to see to the Paschal Lamb, and anything else required for the Supper, possibly also to what was to be offered as Chagigah, or festive sacrifice, and afterwards eaten at the Supper. If the latter were to be brought, the disciples would, of course, have to attend earlier in the Temple. The cost of the Lamb, which had to be provided, was very small. So low a sum as about threepence of our money is mentioned for such a sacrifice. [5626] But this must refer to a hypothetical case rather than to the ordinary cost, and we prefer the more reasonable computation, from one Sela [5627] to three Selaim, [5628] i.e. from 2s.6d. to 7s.6d. of our money. If we mistake not, these purchases had, however, already been made on the previous afternoon by Judas. It is not likely that they would have been left to the last; nor that He Who had so lately condemned the traffic in the Courts of the Temple would have sent His two disciples thither to purchase the Paschal Lamb, which would have been necessary to secure an animal that had passed Levitical inspection, since on the Passover-day there would have been no time to subject it to such scrutiny. On the other hand, if Judas had made this purchase, we perceive not only on what pretext he may have gone to Jerusalem on the previous afternoon, but also how, on his way from the Sheep-market to the Temple, to have his lamb inspected, he may have learned that the Chief-Priests and Sanhedrists were just then in session in the Palace of the High-Priest close by. [5629] On the supposition just made, the task of Peter and John would, indeed, have been simple. They left the house of Mark with wondering but saddened hearts. Once more had they had evidence, how the Master's Divine glance searched the futher in all its details. They had met the servant with the pitcher of water; they had delivered their message to the master of the house; and they had seen the large Upper Room furnished and ready. But this prescience of Christ afforded only further evidence, that what He had told of His impending Crucifixion would also come true. And now it would be time for the ordinary Evening-Service and Sacrifice. Ordinarily this began about 2.30 p.m. - the daily Evening-Sacrifice being actually offered up about an hour later; but on this occasion, on account of the Feast, the Service was an hour earlier. [5630] As at about half-past one of our time the two Apostles ascended the Temple-Mount, following a dense, motley crowd of joyous, chatting pilgrims, they must have felt terribly lonely among them. In all that crowd how few to sympathise with them; how many enemies! The Temple-Courts were thronged to the utmost by worshippers from all countries and from all parts of the land. The Priests' Court was filled with white-robed Priests and Levites - for on that day all the twenty-four Courses were on duty, and all their services would be called for, although only the Course for that week would that afternoon engage in the ordinary service, which preceded that of the Feast. Almost mechanically would they witness the various parts of the well-remembered ceremonial. There must have been a peculiar meaning to them, a mournful significance, in the language of Ps. lxxxi., as the Levites chanted it that afternoon in three sections, broken three times by the threefold blast from the silver trumpets of the Priests.Before the incense was burnt for the Evening Sacrifice, or yet the lamps in the Golden Candlestick were trimmed for the night, the Paschal-Lambs were slain. The worshippers were admitted in three divisions within the Court of the Priests. When the first company had entered, the massive Nicanor Gates - which led from the Court of the Women to that of Israel - and the other side-gates into the Court of the Priests, were closed. A threefold blast from the Priests' trumpets intimated that the Lambs were being slain. This each Israelite did for himself. We can scarcely be mistaken in supposing that Peter and John would be in the first of the three companies into which the offerers were divided; for they must have been anxious to be gone, and to meet the Master

and their brethren in that Upper Room.' Peter and John [5631] had slain the Lamb. In two rows the officiating Priest stood, up to the great Altar of Burnt-offering. As one caught up the blood from the dying Lamb in a golden bowl. he handed it to his colleague, receiving in return an empty bowl; and so the blood was passed on to the Great Altar, where it was jerked in one jet at the base of the Altar. [5632] While this was going on, the Hallel [5633] was being chanted by the Levites. We remember that only the first line of every Psalm was repeated by the worshippers; while to every other line they responded by a Halleluyah, till Ps. cxviii. was reached, when, besides the first, these three lines were also repeated: -Save now, I beseech Thee, Lord;O Lord, I beseech Thee, send now prosperity.Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the Lord.As Peter and John repeated them on that afternoon, the words must have sounded most deeply significant. But their minds must have also reverted to that triumphal Entry into the City a few days before, when Israel had greeted with these words the Advent of their King. And now - was it not, as if it had only been an anticipation of the Hymn, when the blood of the Paschal Lamb was being shed?Little more remained to be done. The sacrifice was laid on staves which rested on the shoulders of Peter and John, flayed, cleansed, and the parts which were to be burnt on the Altar removed and prepared for burning. The second company of offerers could not have proceeded far in the service, when the Apostles, bearing their Lamb, were wending their way back to the home of Mark, there to make final preparations for the Supper.' The Lamb would be roasted on a pomegranate spit that passed right through it from mouth to vent, special care being taken that, in roasting, the Lamb did not touch the oven. Everything else, also, would be made ready: the Chagigah for supper (if such was used); the unleavened cakes, the bitter herbs, the dish with vinegar, and that with Charoseth would be placed on a table which could be carried in and moved at will; finally, the festive lamps would be prepared.It was probably as the sun was beginning to decline in the horizon that Jesus and the other ten disciples descended once more over the Mount of Olives into the Holy City. Before them lay Jerusalem in her festive attire. All around, pilgrims were hastening towards it. White tents dotted the sward, gay with the bright flowers of early spring, or peered out from the gardens or the darker foliage of the olive plantations. From the gorgeous Temple buildings, dazzling in their snow-white marble and gold, on which the slanting rays of the sun were reflected, rose the smoke of the Altar of Burnt-offering. These courts were now crowded with eager worshippers, offering for the last time, in the real sense, their Paschal Lambs. The streets must have been thronged with strangers, and the flat roofs covered with eager gazers, who either feasted their eyes with a first sight of the sacred City for which they had so often longed, or else once more rejoiced in view of the well-known localities. It was the last day-view which the Lord could take, free and unhindered, of the Holy City till His Resurrection. Once more, in the approaching night of His Betrayal, would He look upon it in the pale light of the full moon. He was going forward to accomplish His Death in Jerusalem; to fulfil type and prophecy, and to offer Himself up as the true Passover Lamb - "the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sin of the world." They who followed Him were busy with many thoughts. They knew that terrible events awaited them, and they had only shortly before been told that these glorious Temple-buildings, to which, with a national pride not unnatural, they had directed the attention of their Master, were to become desolate, not one stone being left upon the other. Among them, revolving his dark plans, and goaded on by the great Enemy, moved the betrayer. And now they were within the City. Its Temple, its royal bridge, its splendid palaces, its busy marts, its streets filled with festive pilgrims, were well known to them, as they made their way to the house where the guest-chamber had been

prepared. Meanwhile, the crowd came down from the Temple-Mount, each bearing on his shoulders the sacrificial Lamb, to make ready for the Paschal Supper.' [5634]

CHAPTER X. THE PASCHAL SUPPER - THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

(St. Matt. xxvi.17-19; St. Mark xiv.12-16; St. Luke xxii.7-13; St. John xiii.1; St. Matt. xxvi.20; St. Mark xiv.17; St. Luke xxii.14-16; St. Luke xxii.24-30St. Luke xxii.17, 18; St. John xiii.2-20; St. Matt. xxvi.21-24; St. Mark xiv.18-21; St. Luke xxii.21-23; St. John xiii.21-26; St. Matt. xxvi.25; St. John xiii.26-38; St. Matt. xxvi.26-29; St. Mark xiv.22-25; St. Luke xxii.19, 20.) THE period designated as between the two evenings,' [5635] when the Paschal Lamb was to be slain, was past. There can be no question that, in the time of Christ, it was understood to refer to the interval between the commencement of the sun's decline and what was reckoned as the hour of his final disappearance (about 6 P.M.). The first three stars had become visible, and the threefold blast of the Silver Trumpets from the Temple-Mount rang it out to Jerusalem and far away, that the Pascha had once more commenced. In the festively-lit Upper Chamber' of St. Mark's house the Master and the Twelve were now gathered. Was this place of Christ's last, also that of the Church's first, entertainment; that, where the Holy Supper was instituted with the Apostles, also that, where it was afterwards first partaken of by the Church; the Chamber where He last tarried with them before His Death, that in which He first appeared to them after His Resurrection; that, also, in which the Holy Ghost was poured out, even as (if the Last Supper was in the house of Mark) it undoubtedly was that in which the Church was at first wont to gather for common prayer? [5636] We know not, and can only venture to suggest, deeply soul-stirring as such thoughts and associations are. So far as appears, or we have reason to infer, this Passover was the only sacrifice ever offered by Jesus Himself. We remember indeed, the first sacrifice of the Virgin-Mother at her Purification. But that was hers. If Christ was in Jerusalem at any Passover before His Public Ministry began, He would, of course, have been a guest at some table, not the Head of a Company (which must consist of at least ten persons). Hence, He would not have been the offerer of the Paschal lamb. And of the three Passovers since His Public Ministry had begun, at the first His Twelve Apostles had not been gathered, [5637] so that He could not have appeared as the Head of a Company; while at the second He was not in Jerusalem but in the utmost parts of Galilee, in the borderland of Tyre and Sidon, where, of course, no sacrifice could be brought. [5638] Thus, the first, the last, the only sacrifice which Jesus offered was that in which, symbolically, He offered Himself. Again, the only sacrifice which He brought is that connected with the Institution of His Holy Supper; even as the only purification to which He submitted was when, in His Baptism, He sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin.' But what additional meaning does this give to the words which He spake to the Twelve as He sat down with them to the Supper: With desire have I desired to eat this Pascha with you before I suffer.' And, in truth, as we think of it, we can understand not only why the Lord could not have offered any other Sacrifice, but that it was most fitting He should have offered this one Pascha, partaken of its commemorative Supper, and connected His own New Institution with that to which this Supper pointed. This joining of the Old with the New, the one symbolic Sacrifice which He offered with the One Real Sacrifice, the feast on the sacrifice with that other Feast upon the One Sacrifice, seems to cast light on the

words with which He followed the expression of His longing to eat that one Pascha with them: I say unto you, I will not eat any more [5639] thereof, [5640] until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God.' And has it not been so, that this His last Pascha is connected with that other Feast in which He is ever present with His Church, not only as its Food but as its Host, as both the Pascha and He Who dispenses it? With a Sacrament did Jesus begin His Ministry: it was that of separation and consecration in Baptism. With a second Sacrament did He close His Ministry: it was that of gathering together and fellowship in the Lord's Supper. Both were into His Death: yet not as something that had power over Him, but as a Death that has been followed by the Resurrection. For, if in Baptism we are buried with Him, we also rise with Him; and if in the Holy Supper we remember His Death, it is as that of Him Who is risen again - and if we show forth that Death, it is until He come again. And so this Supper, also, points forward to the Great Supper at the final consummation of His Kingdom. Only one Sacrifice did the Lord offer. We are not thinking now of the significant Jewish legend, which connected almost every great event and deliverance in Israel with the Night of the Passover. But the Pascha was, indeed, a Sacrifice, yet one distinct from all others. It was not of the Law, for it was instituted before the Law had been given or the Covenant ratified by blood; nay, in a sense it was the cause and the foundation of all the Levitical Sacrifices and of the Covenant itself. And it could not be classed with either one or the other of the various kinds of sacrifices, but rather combined them all, and yet differed from them all. Just as the Priesthood of Christ was real, yet not after the order of Aaron, so was the Sacrifice of Christ real, yet not after the order of Levitical sacrifices but after that of the Passover. And as in the Paschal Supper all Israel were gathered around the Paschal Lamb in commemoration of the past, in celebration of the present, in anticipation of the future, and in fellowship in the Lamb, so has the Church been ever since gathered together around its better fulfilment in the Kingdom of God. It is difficult to decide how much, not only of the present ceremonial, but even of the Rubric for the Paschal Supper, as contained in the oldest Jewish Documents, may have been obligatory at the time of Christ. Ceremonialism rapidly develops, too often in proportion to the absence of spiritual life. Probably in the earlier days, even as the ceremonies were simpler, so more latitude may have been left in their observance, provided that the main points in the ritual were kept in view. We may take it, that, as prescribed, all would appear at the Paschal Supper in festive array. We also know, that, as the Jewish Law directed, they reclined on pillows around a low table, each resting on his left hand, so as to leave the right free. But ancient Jewish usage casts a strange light on the painful scene with which the Supper opened. Sadly humiliating as it reads, and almost incredible as it seems, the Supper began with a contention among them, which of them should be accounted to be greatest.' We can have no doubt that its occasion was the order in which they should occupy places at the table. We know that this was subject of contention among the Pharisees, and that they claimed to be seated according to their rank. [5641] A similar feeling now appeared, alas! in the circle of the disciples and at the Last Supper of the Lord. Even if we had not further indications of it, we should instinctively associate such a strife with the presence of Judas. St. John seems to refer to it, at least indirectly, when he opens his narrative with this notice: And during supper, the devil having already cast it into his heart, that Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, shall betray Him.' [5642] For, although the words form a general introduction to what follows, and refer to the entrance of Satan into the heart of Judas on the previous afternoon, when he sold his Master to the Sanhedrists, they are not without special significance as place in connection with the Supper. But we are not left to general conjecture in regard to the influence of Judas in this strife. There is,

we believe, ample evidence that he not only claimed, but actually obtained, the chief seat at the table next to the Lord. This, as previously explained, was not, as is generally believed, at the right, but at the left of Christ, not below, but above Him, on the couches or pillows on which they reclined. From the Gospel-narratives we infer, that St. John must have reclined next to Jesus, on His Right Hand, since otherwise he could not have leaned back on His Bosom. This, as we shall presently show, would be at one end - the head of the table, or, to be more precise, at one end of the couches. For, dismissing all conventional ideas, we must think of it as a low Eastern table. In the Talmud, [5643] the table of the disciples of the sages is described as two parts covered with a cloth, the other third being left bare for the dishes to stand on. There is evidence that this part of the table was outside the circle of those who were ranged around it. Occasionally a ring was fixed in it, by which the table was suspended above the ground, so as to preserve it from any possible Levitical defilement. During the Paschal Supper, it was the custom to remove the table at one part of the service; or, if this be deemed a later arrangement, the dishes at least would be taken off and put on again. This would render it necessary that the end of the table should protrude beyond the line of guests who reclined around it. For, as already repeatedly stated, it was the custom to recline at table, lying on the left side and leaning on the left hand, the feet stretching back towards the ground, and each guest occupying a separate divan or pillow. It would, therefore, have been impossible to place or remove anything from the table from behind the guests. Hence, as a matter of necessity, the free end of the table, which was not covered with a cloth, would protrude beyond the line of those who reclined around it. We can now form a picture of the arrangement. Around a low Eastern table, oval or rather elongated, two parts covered with a cloth, and standing or else suspended, the single divans or pillows are ranged in the form of an elongated horseshoe, leaving free one end of the table, somewhat as in the accompanying woodcut. Here A represents the table, B B respectively the ends of the two rows of single divans on which each guest reclines on his left side, with his head (C) nearest the table, and his feet (D) stretching back towards the ground. figure 5 Figure 5a. So far for the arrangement of the table. Jewish documents are equally explicit as to that of the guests. It seems to have been quite an established rule [5644] that, in a company of more than two, say of three, the chief personage or Head - in this instance, of course, Christ - reclined on the middle divan. We know from the Gospel-narrative that John occupied the place on His right, at that end of the divans - as we may call it - at the head of the table. But the chief place next to the Master would be that to His left, or above Him. In the strife of the disciples, which should be accounted the greatest, this had been claimed, and we believe it to have been actually occupied, by Judas. This explains how, Christ whispered to John by what sign to recognise the traitor, [5645] none of the other disciples heard it. It also explains, how Christ would first hand to Judas the sop, which formed part of the Paschal ritual, beginning with him as the chief guest at the table, without thereby exciting special notice. Lastly, it accounts for the circumstance that, when Judas, desirous of ascertaining whether his treachery was known, dared to ask whether it was he, and received the affirmative answer, [5646] no one at table knew what had passed. But this could not have been the case, unless Judas had occupied the place next to Christ; in this case, necessarily that at His left, or the post of chief honour. As regards Peter, we can quite understand how, when the Lord with such loving words rebuked their self-seeking and taught them of the greatness of Christian humility, he should, in his petuosity of shame, have rushed to take the lowest place at the other end of the table. [5647] Finally, we can now understand how Peter could beckon to John, who sat at the opposite end of the table, over against

him, and ask him across the table, who the traitor was. [5648] The rest of the disciples would occupy such places as were most convenient, or suited their fellowship with one another. The words which the Master spoke as He appeased their unseemly strife must, indeed, have touched them to the quick. First, He showed them, not so much in the language of even gentlest reproof as in that of teaching, the difference between worldly honour and distinction in the Church of Christ. In the world kingship lay in supremacy and lordship, and the title of Benefactor accompanied the sway of power. But in the Church the greater' would not exercise lordship, but become as the less and the younger [the latter referring to the circumstance, that age next to learning was regarded among the Jews as a claim to distinction and the chief seats]; while, instead of him that had authority being called Benefactor, the relationship would be reversed, and he that served would be chief. Self-forgetful humility instead of worldly glory, service instead of rule: such was to be the title to greatness and to authority in the Church. [5649] Having thus shown them the character and title to that greatness in the Kingdom, which was in prospect for them, He pointed them in this respect also to Himself as their example. The reference here is, of course, not to the act of symbolic foot-washing, which St. Luke does not relate - although, as immediately following on the words of Christ, it would illustrate them - but to the tenor of His whole Life and the object of His Mission, as of One Who served, not was served. Lastly, He woke them to the higher consciousness of their own calling. Assuredly, they would not lose their reward; but not here, nor yet now. They had shared, and would share His trials' [5650] - His being set at nought, despised, persecuted; but they would also share His glory. As the Father had covenanted' to Him, so He covenanted' and bequeathed to them a Kingdom, in order,' or so that,' in it they might have festive fellowship of rest and of joy with Him. What to them must have been temptations,' and in that respect also to Christ, they had endured: instead of Messianic glory, such as they may at first have thought of, they had witnessed only contradiction, denial, and shame - and they had continued' with Him. But the Kingdom was also coming. When His glory was manifested, their acknowledgement would also come. Here Israel had rejected the King and His Messengers, but then would that same Israel be judged by their word. A Royal dignity this, indeed, but one of service; a full Royal acknowledgement, but one of work. In that sense were Israel's Messianic hopes to be understood by them. Whether or not something beyond this may also be implied, and, in that day when He again gathers the outcasts of Israel, some special Rule and Judgment may be given to His faithful Apostles, we venture not to determine. Sufficient for us the words of Christ in their primary meaning. [5651] So speaking, the Lord commenced that Supper, which in itself was symbol and pledge of what He had just said and promised. The Paschal Supper began, as always, [5652] by the Head of the Company taking the first cup, and speaking over it the thanksgiving.' The form presently in use consists really of two benedictions - the first over the wine, the second for the return of this Feastday with all that it implies, and for being preserved once more to witness it. [5653] Turning to the Gospels, the words which follow the record of the benediction on the part of Christ [5654] seem to imply, that Jesus had, at any rate, so far made use of the ordinary thanksgiving as to speak both these benedictions. We know, indeed, that they were in use before His time, since it was in dispute between the Schools of Hillel and Shammai, whether that over the wine or that over the day should take precedence. That over the wine was quite simple: Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, Who hast created the fruit of the Vine!' The formula was so often used in blessing the cup, and is so simple, that we need not doubt that these were the very words spoken by our Lord. It is otherwise as regards the benediction over the day,' which is not only

more composite, but contains words expressive of Israel's national pride and self-righteousness, such as we cannot think would have been uttered by our Lord. With this exception, however, they were no doubt identical in contents with the present formula. This we infer from what the Lord added, as He passed the cup round the circle of the disciples. [5655] No more, so He told them, would He speak the benediction over the fruit of the vine - not again utter the thanks over the day' that they had been preserved alive, sustained, and brought to this season.' Another Wine, and at another Feast, now awaited Him - that in the future, when the Kingdom would come. It was to be the last of the old Paschas; the first, or rather the symbol and promise, of the new. And so, for the first and last time, did He speak the twofold benediction at the beginning of the Supper.The cup, in which, according to express Rabbinic testimony, [5656] the wine had been mixed with water before it was blessed,' had passed round. The next part of the ceremonial was for the Head of the Company to rise and wash hands.' It is this part of the ritual of which St. John [5657] records the adaptation and transformation on the part of Christ. The washing of the disciples' feet is evidently connected with the ritual of handwashing.' Now this was done twice during the Paschal Supper: [5658] the first time by the Head of the Company alone, immediately after the first cup; the second time by all present, at a much later part of the service, immediately before the actual meal (on the Lamb, &c.). If the footwashing had taken place on the latter occasion, it is natural to suppose that, when the Lord rose, all the disciples would have followed His example, and so the washing of their feet would have been impossible. Again, the footwashing, which was intended both as a lesson and as an example of humility and service, [5659] was evidently connected with the dispute which of them should be accounted to be greatest.' If so, the symbolical act of our Lord must have followed close on the strife of the disciples, and on our Lord's teaching what in the Church constituted rule and greatness. Hence the act must have been connected with the first handwashing - that by the Head of the Company - immediately after the first cup, and not with that at a later period, when much else had intervened.All else fits in with this. For clearness' sake, the account given by St. John [5660] may here be recapitulated. The opening words concerning the love of Christ to His own unto the end form the general introduction. [5661] Then follows the account of what happened during Supper' [5662] - the Supper itself being left undescribed - beginning, by way of explanation of what is to be told about Judas, with this: The Devil having already cast into his (Judas') heart, that Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, shall betray Him.' General as this notice is, it contains much that requires special attention. Thankfully we feel, that the heart of man was not capable of originating the Betrayal of Christ; humanity had fallen, but not so low. It was the Devil who had cast' it into Judas' heart - with force and overwhelming power. [5663] Next, we mark the full description of the name and parentage of the traitor. It reads like the wording of a formal indictment. And, although it seems only an introductory explanation, it also points to the contrast with the love of Christ which persevered to the end, [5664] even when hell itself opened its mouth to swallow Him up; the contrast, also, between what Jesus and what Judas were about to do, and between the wild storm of evil that raged in the heart of the traitor and the calm majesty of love and peace which reigned in that of the Saviour.If what Satan had cast into the heart of Judas explains his conduct so does the knowledge which Jesus possessed account for that He was about to do. [5665] [5666] Many as are the thoughts suggested by the words, Knowing that the Father had given all things into His Hands, and that He came forth from God, and goeth unto God' - yet, from evident connection, they must in the first instance be applied to the Footwashing, of which they are, so to speak, the logical antecedent. It was His greatest act of

humiliation and service, and yet He never lost in it for one moment aught of the majesty or consciousness of His Divine dignity; for He did it with the full knowledge and assertion that all things were in His Hands, and that He came forth from and was going unto God - and He could do it, because He knew this. Here, not side by side, but in combination, are the Humiliation and Exaltation of the God-Man. And so, during Supper,' which had begun with the first cup, He riseth from Supper.' The disciples would scarcely marvel, except that He should conform to that practice of handwashing, which, as He had often explained, was, as a ceremonial observance, unavailing for those who were not inwardly clean, and needless and unmeaning in them whose heart and life had been purified. But they must have wondered as they saw Him put off His upper garment, gird Himself with a towel, and pour water into a basin, like a slave who was about to perform the meanest service. From the position which, as we have shown, Peter occupied at the end of the table, it was natural that the Lord should begin with him the act of footwashing. [5667] Besides, had He first turned to others, Peter must either have remonstrated before, or else his later expostulation would have been tardy, and an act either of self-righteousness or of needless voluntary humility. As it was, the surprise with which he and the others had witnessed the preparation of the Lord burst into characteristic language when Jesus approached him to wash his feet. Lord - Thou - of me washest the feet!' It was the utterance of deepest reverence for the Master, and yet of utter misunderstanding of the meaning of His action, perhaps even of His Work. Jesus was now doing what before He had spoken. The act of externalism and self-righteousness represented by the washing of hands, and by which the Head of the Company was to be distinguished from all others and consecrated, He changed into a footwashing, in which the Lord and Master was to be distinguished, indeed, from the others - but by the humblest service of love, and in which He showed by His example what characterised greatness in the Kingdom, and that service was evidence of rule. And, as mostly in every symbol, there was the real also in this act of the Lord. For, by sympathetically sharing in this act of love and service on the part of the Lord, they who had been bathed - who had previously become clean in heart and spirit - now received also that cleansing of the feet,' of active and daily walk, which cometh from true heart-humility, in opposition to pride, and consisteth in the service which love is willing to render even to the uttermost.But Peter had understood none of these things. He only felt the incongruousness of their relative positions. And so the Lord, partly also wishing thereby to lead his impetuosity to the absolute submission of faith, and partly to indicate the deeper truth he was to learn in the future, only told him, that though he knew it not now, he would understand hereafter what the Lord was doing. Yes, hereafter - when, after that night of terrible fall, he would learn by the Lake of Galilee what it really meant to feed the lambs and to tend the sheep of Christ; yes, hereafter - when no longer, as when he had been young, he would gird himself and walk whither he would. But, even so, Peter could not content himself with the prediction that in the future he would understand and enter into what Christ was doing in washing their feet. Never, he declared, could he allow it. The same feelings, which had prompted him to attempt withdrawing the Lord from the path of humiliation and suffering, [5668] now asserted themselves again. It was personal affection, indeed, but it was also unwillingness to submit to the humiliation of the Cross. And so the Lord told him, that if He washed him not, he had no part with Him. Not that the bare act of washing gave him part in Christ, but that the refusal to submit to it would have deprived him of it; and that, to share in this washing, was, as it were, the way to have part in Christ's service of love, to enter into it, and to share it.Still, Peter did not understand. But as, on that morning by the Lake of Galilee, it appeared

that, when he had lost all else, he had retained love, so did love to the Christ now give him the victory - and, once more with characteristic impetuosity, he would have tendered not only his feet to be washed, but his hands and head. Yet here, also, was there misunderstanding. There was deep symbolical meaning, not only in that Christ did it, but also in what He did. Submission to His doing it meant symbolically share and part with Him - part in His Work. What He did, meant His work and service of love; the constant cleansing of one's walk and life in the love of Christ, and in the service of that love. It was not a meaningless ceremony of humiliation on the part of Christ, not yet one where submission to the utmost was required; but the action was symbolic, and meant that the disciple, who was already bathed and made clean in heart and spirit, required only this - to wash his feet in spiritual consecration to the service of love which Christ had here shown forth in symbolic act. And so His Words referred not, as is so often supposed, to the forgiveness of our daily sins - the introduction of which would have been wholly abrupt and unconnected with the context - but, in contrast to all self-seeking, to the daily consecration of our life to the service of love after the example of Christ.And still do all these words come to us in manifold and ever-varied application. In the misunderstanding of our love to Him, we too often imagine that Christ cannot will or do what seems to us incongruous on His part, or rather, incongruous with what we think about Him. We know it not now, but we shall understand it hereafter. And still we persist in our resistance, till it comes to us that so we would even lose our part in and with Him. Yet not much, not very much, does He ask, Who giveth so much. He that has washed us wholly would only have us cleanse our feet for the service of love, as He gave us the example. They were clean, these disciples, but not all. For He knew that there was among them he that was betraying Him.' [5669] He knew it, but not with the knowledge of an inevitable fate impending far less of an absolute decree, but with that knowledge which would again and again speak out the warning, if by any means he might be saved. What would have come, if Judas had repented, is as idle a question as this: What would have come if Israel, as a nation, had repented and accepted Christ? For, from our human standpoint, we can only view the human aspect of things - that earthwards; and here every action is not isolated, but ever the outcome of a previous development and history, so that a man always freely acts, yet always in consequence of an inward necessity.The solemn service of Christ now went on in the silence of reverent awe. [5670] None dared ask Him nor resist. It was ended, and He had resumed His upper garment, and again taken His place at the Table. It was His now to follow the symbolic deed by illustrative words, and to explain the practical application of what had just been done. Let it not be misunderstood. They were wont to call Him by the two highest names of Teacher and Lord, and these designations were rightly His. For the first time He fully accepted and owned the highest homage. How much more, then, must His Service of love, Who was their Teacher and Lord, serve as example [5671] of what was due [5672] by each to his fellow-disciple and fellow-servant! He, Who really was Lord and Master, had rendered this lowest service to them as an example that, as He had done, so should they do. No principle better known, almost proverbial in Israel, than that a servant was not to claim greater honour than his master, nor yet he that was sent than he who had sent him. They knew this, and now also the meaning of the symbolic act of footwashing; and if they acted it out, then theirs would be the promised Beatitude.' [5673]This reference to what were familiar expressions among the Jews, especially noteworthy in St. John's Gospel, leads us to supplement a few illustrative notes from the same source. The Greek word for the towel,' with which our Lord girded Himself, occurs also in Rabbinic writings, to denote the towel used in washing and at baths (Luntith and Aluntith). Such girding was the

common mark of a slave, by whom the service of footwashing was ordinarily performed. And, in a very interesting passage, the Midrash [5674] contrasts what, in this respect, is the way of man with what God had done for Israel. For, He had been described by the prophet as performing for them the service of washing, [5675] and others usually rendered by slaves. [5676] Again, the combination of these two designations, Rabbi and Lord,' or Rabbi, Father, and Lord,' was among those most common on the part of disciples. [5677] The idea, that if a man knows (for example, the Law) and does not do it, it were better for him not to have been created, [5678] is not unfrequently expressed. But the most interesting reference is in regard to the relation between the sender and the sent, and a servant and his master. In regard to the former, it is proverbially said, that while he that is sent stands on the same footing as he who sent him, [5679] yet he must expect less honour. [5680] And as regards Christ's statement that the servant is not greater than his Master,' there is a passage in which we read this, in connection with the sufferings of the Messiah: It is enough for the servant that he be like his Master.' [5681]But to return. The footwashing on the part of Christ, in which Judas had shared, together with the explanatory words that followed, almost required, in truthfulness, this limitation: I speak not of you all.' For it would be a night of terrible moral sifting to them all. A solemn warning was needed by all the disciples. But, besides, the treachery of one of their own number might have led them to doubt whether Christ had really Divine knowledge. On the other hand, this clear prediction of it would not only confirm their faith in Him, but show that there was some deeper meaning in the presence of a Judas among them. [5682] We come here upon these words of deepest mysteriousness: I know those I chose; but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth My Bread lifteth up his heel against Me!' [5683] It were almost impossible to believe, even if not forbidden by the context, that this knowledge of which Christ spoke, referred to an eternal foreknowledge; still more, that it meant Judas had been chosen with such foreknowledge in order that this terrible Scripture might be fulfilled in him. Such foreknowledge and foreordination would be to sin, and it would involve thoughts such as only the harshness of our human logic in its fatal system-making could induce anyone to entertain. Rather must we understand it as meaning that Jesus had, from the first, known the inmost thoughts of those He had chosen to be His Apostles; but that by this treachery of one of their number, the terrible prediction of the worst enmity, that of ingratitude, true in all ages of the Church, would receive its complete fulfilment. [5684] The word that' - that the Scripture may be fulfilled,' does not mean in order that,' or for the purpose of;' it never means this in that connection; [5685] and it would be altogether irrational to suppose that an event happened in order that a special prediction might be fulfilled. Rather does it indicate the higher internal connection in the succession of events, when an event had taken place in the free determination of its agents, by which, all unknown to them and unthought of by others, that unexpectedly came to pass which had been Divinely foretold. And herein appears the Divine character of prophecy, which is always at the same time announcement and forewarning, that is, has besides its predictive a moral element: that, while man is left to act freely, each development tends to the goal Divinely foreseen and foreordained. Thus the word that' marks not the connection between causation and effect, but between the Divine antecedent and the human subsequent. There is, indeed, behind this a much deeper question, to which brief reference has already formerly been made. Did Christ know from the beginning that Judas would betray Him, and yet, so knowing, did He choose him to be one of the Twelve? Here we can only answer by indicating this as a canon in studying the Life on earth of the God-Man, that it was part of His Self-exinanition - of that emptying Himself, and taking upon

Him the form of a Servant [5686] - voluntarily to forego His Divine knowledge in the choice of His Human actions. So only could He, as perfect Man, have perfectly obeyed the Divine Law. For, if the Divine had determined Him in the choice of His Actions, there could have been no merit attaching to His Obedience, nor could He be said to have, as perfect Man, taken our place, and to have obeyed the Law in our stead and as our Representative, nor yet be our Ensample. But if His Divine knowledge did not guide Him in the choice of His actions, we can see, and have already indicated, reasons why the discipleship and service of Judas should have been accepted, if it had been only as that of a Judæan, a man in many respects well fitted for such an office, and the representative of one of the various directions which tended towards the reception of the Messiah.We are not in circumstances to judge whether or not Christ spoke all these things continuously, after He had sat down, having washed the disciples' feet. More probably it was at different parts of the meal. This would also account for the seeming abruptness of this concluding sentence: [5687] He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth Me.' And yet the internal connection of thought seems clear. The apostasy and loss of one of the Apostles was known to Christ. Would it finally dissolve the bond that bound together the College of Apostles, and so invalidate their Divine Mission (the Apostolate) and its authority? The words of Christ conveyed an assurance which would be most comforting in the future, that any such break would not be lasting, only transitory, and that in this respect also the foundation of God standeth.'In the meantime the Paschal Supper was proceeding. We mark this important note of time in the words of St. Matthew: as they were eating,' [5688] or, as St. Mark expresses it, as they reclined and were eating.' [5689] According to the Rubric, after the washing' the dishes were immediately to be brought on the table. Then the Head of the Company would dip some of the bitter herbs into the salt-water or vinegar, speak a blessing, and partake of them, then hand them to each in the company. Next, he would break one of the unleavened cakes (according to the present ritual the middle of the three), of which half was put aside for after supper. This is called the Aphiqomon, or after-dish, and as we believe that the bread' of the Holy Eucharist was the Aphiqomon, some particulars may here be of interest. The dish in which the broken cake lies (not the Aphiqomon), is elevated, and these words are spoken: This is the bread of misery which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt. All that are hungry, come and eat; all that are needy, come, keep the Pascha.' In the more modern ritual the words are added: This year here, next year in the land of Israel; this year bondsmen, next year free!' On this the second cup is filled, and the youngest in the company is instructed to make formal inquiry as to the meaning of all the observances of that night, [5690] when the Liturgy proceeds to give full answers as regards the festival, its occasion, and ritual. The Talmud adds that the table is to be previously removed, so as to excite the greater curiosity. [5691] We do not suppose that even the earlier ritual represents the exact observances at the time of Christ, or that, even if it does so, they were exactly followed at that Paschal Table of the Lord. But so much stress is laid in Jewish writings on the duty of fully rehearsing at the Paschal Supper the circumstances of the first Passover and the deliverance connected with it, that we can scarcely doubt that what the Mishnah declares as so essential formed part of the services of that night. And as we think of our Lord's comment on the Passover and Israel's deliverance, the words spoken when the unleavened cake was broken come back to us, and with deeper meaning attaching to them.After this the cup is elevated, and then the service proceeds somewhat lengthily, the cup being raised a second time and certain prayers spoken. This part of the service concludes with the two first Psalms in the series called the Hallel,' [5692] when the cup is raised a third time, a prayer spoken, and the cup

drunk. This ends the first part of the service. And now the Paschal meal begins by all washing their hands - a part of the ritual which we scarcely think Christ observed. It was, we believe, during this lengthened exposition and service that the trouble in spirit' of which St. John speaks [5693] passed over the soul of the God-Man. Almost presumptuous as it seems to inquire into its immediate cause, we can scarcely doubt that it concerned not so much Himself as them. His Soul could not, indeed, but have been troubled, as, with full consciousness of all that it would be to Him - infinitely more than merely human suffering - He looked down into the abyss which was about to open at His Feet. But He saw more than even this. He saw Judas about to take the last fatal step, and His Soul yearned in pity over him. The very sop which He would so soon hand to him, although a sign of recognition to John, was a last appeal to all that was human in Judas. And, besides all this, Jesus also saw, how, all unknown to them, the terrible tempest of fierce temptation would that night sweep over them; how it would lay low and almost uproot one of them, and scatter all. It was the beginning of the hour of Christ's utmost loneliness, of which the climax was reached in Gethsemane. And in the trouble of His Spirit did He solemnly testify' to them of the near Betrayal. We wonder not, that they all became exceeding sorrowful, and each asked, Lord, is it I?' This question on the part of the eleven disciples, who were conscious of innocence of any purpose of betrayal, and conscious also of deep love to the Master, affords one of the clearest glimpses into the inner history of that Night of Terror, in which, so to speak, Israel became Egypt. We can now better understand their heavy sleep in Gethsemane, their forsaking Him and fleeing, even Peter's denial. Everything must have seemed to these men to give way; all to be enveloped in outer darkness, when each man could ask whether he was to be the Betrayer. The answer of Christ left the special person undetermined, while it again repeated the awful prediction - shall we not add, the most solemn warning - that it was one of those who took part in the Supper. It is at this point that St. John resumes the thread of the narrative. [5694] As he describes it, the disciples were looking one on another, doubting of whom He spake. In this agonising suspense Peter beckoned from across the table to John, whose head, instead of leaning on his hand, rested, in the absolute surrender of love and intimacy born of sorrow, on the bosom of the Master. [5695] Peter would have John ask of whom Jesus spake. [5696] And to the whispered question of John, leaning back as he was on Jesus' breast,' the Lord gave the sign, that it was he to whom He would give the sop' when He had dipped it. Even this perhaps was not clear to John, since each one in turn received the sop.'At present, the Supper itself begins by eating, first, a piece of the unleavened cake, then of the bitter herbs dipped in Charoseth, and lastly two small pieces of the unleavened cake, between which a piece of bitter radish has been placed. But we have direct testimony, that, about the time of Christ, [5697] the sop' [5698] which was handed round consisted of these things wrapped together: flesh of the Paschal Lamb, a piece of unleavened bread, and bitter herbs. [5699] This, we believe, was the sop,' which Jesus, having dipped it for him in the dish, handed first to Judas, as occupying the first and chief place at Table. But before He did so, probably while He dipped it in the dish, Judas, who could not but fear that his purpose might be known, reclining at Christ's left hand, whispered into the Master's ear, Is it I, Rabbi?' It must have been whispered, for no one at the Table could have heard either the question of Judas or the affirmative answer of Christ. [5700] It was the last outgoing of the pitying love of Christ after the traitor. Coming after the terrible warning and woe on the Betrayer, [5701] it must be regarded as the final warning and also the final attempt at rescue on the part of the Saviour. It was with full knowledge of all, even of this that his treachery was known, though he may have attributed the information not to Divine insight

but to some secret human communication, that Judas went on his way to destruction. We are too apt to attribute crimes to madness; but surely there is normal, as well as mental mania; and it must have been in a paroxysm of that, when all feeling was turned to stone, and mental self-delusion was combined with moral perversion, that Judas took' [5702] from the Hand of Jesus the sop.' It was to descend alive into the grave - and with a heavy sound the gravestone fell and closed over the mouth of the pit. That moment Satan entered again into his heart. But the deed was virtually done; and Jesus, longing for the quiet fellowship of His own with all that was to follow, bade him do quickly that he did.But even so there are questions connected with the human motives that actuated Judas, to which, however, we can only give the answer of some suggestions. Did Judas regard Christ's denunciation of woe' on the Betrayer not as a prediction, but as intended to be deterrent - perhaps in language Orientally exaggerated - or if he regarded it as a prediction, did he not believe in it? Again, when after the plain intimation of Christ and His Words to do quickly what he was about to do, Judas still went to the betrayal, could he have had an idea - rather, sought to deceive himself, that Jesus felt that He could not escape His enemies, and that He rather wished it to be all over? Or had all his former feelings towards Jesus turned, although temporarily, into actual hatred which every Word and Warning of Christ only intensified? But above all and in all we have, first and foremost, to think of the peculiarly Judaic character of his first adherence to Christ; of the gradual and at last final and fatal disenchantment of his hopes; of his utter moral, consequent upon his spiritual, failure; of the change of all that had in it the possibility of good into the actuality of evil; and, on the other hand, of the direct agency of Satan in the heart of Judas, which his moral and spiritual ship-wreck rendered possible.From the meal scarcely begun Judas rushed into the dark night. Even this has its symbolic significance. None there knew why this strange haste, unless from obedience to something that the Master had bidden him. [5703] Even John could scarely have understood the sign which Christ had given of the traitor. Some of them thought, he had been directed by the words of Christ to purchase what was needful for the feast: others, that he was bidden go and give something to the poor. Gratuitous objection has been raised, as if this indicated that, according to the Fourth Gospel, this meal had not taken place on the Paschal night, since, after the commencement of the Feast (on the 15th Nisan), it would be unlawful to make purchases. But this certainly was not the case. Sufficient here to state, that the provision and preparation of the needful food, and indeed of all that was needful for the Feast, was allowed on the 15th Nisan. [5704] And this must have been specially necessary when, as in this instance, the first festive day, or 15th Nisan, was to be followed by a Sabbath, on which no such work was permitted. On the other hand, the mention of these two suggestions by the disciples seems almost necessarily to involve, that the writer of the Fourth Gospel had placed this meal in the Paschal Night. Had it been on the evening before, no one could have imagined that Judas had gone out during the night to buy provisions, when there was the whole next day for it, nor would it have been likely that a man should on any ordinary day go at such an hour to seek out the poor. But in the Paschal Night, when the great Temple-gates were opened at midnight to begin early preparations for the offering of the Chagigah, or festive sacrifice, which was not voluntary but of due, and the remainder of which was afterwards eaten at a festive meal, such preparations would be quite natural. And equally so, that the poor, who gathered around the Temple, might then seek to obtain the help of the charitable. The departure of the betrayer seemed to clear the atmosphere. He was gone to do his work; but let it not be thought that it was the necessity of that betrayal which was the cause of Christ's suffering of soul. He offered Himself willingly - and though it was brought

about through the treachery of Judas, yet it was Jesus Himself Who freely brought Himself a Sacrifice, in fulfilment of the work which the Father had given Him. And all the more did He realise and express this on the departure of Judas. So long as he was there, pitying love still sought to keep him from the fatal step. But when the traitor was at last gone, the other side of His own work clearly emerged into Christ's view. And this voluntary sacrifical aspect is further clearly indicated by His selection of the terms Son of Man' and God' instead of Son' and Father.' [5705] Now is glorified the Son of Man, and God is glorified in Him. [5706] And God shall glorify Him in Himself, and straightway shall He glorify Him.' If the first of these sentences expressed the meaning of what was about to take place, as exhibiting the utmost glory of the Son of Man in the triumph of the obedience of His Voluntary Sacrfice, the second sentence pointed out its acknowledgment by God: the exaltation which followed the humiliation, the reward [5707] as the necessary sequel of the work, the Crown after the Cross.Thus far for one aspect of what was about to be enacted. As for the other - that which concerned the disciples: only a little while would He still be with them. Then would come the time of sad and sore perplexity - when they would seek Him, but could not come whither He had gone - during the terrible hours between His Crucifixion and His manifested Resurrection. With reference to that period especially, but in general to the whole time of His Separation from the Church on earth, the great commandment, the bond which alone would hold them together, was that of love one to another, and such love as that which He had shown towards them. And this - shame on us, as we write it! - was to be the mark to all men of their discipleship. [5708] As recorded by St. John, the words of the Lord were succeeded by a question of Peter, indicating perplexity as to the primary and direct meaning of Christ's going away. On this followed Christ's reply about the impossibility of Peter's now sharing his Lord's way of Passion, and, in answer to the disciple's impetuous assurance of his readiness to follow the Master not only into peril, but to lay down his Life for Him, the Lord's indication of Peter's present unpreparedness and the prediction of His impending denial. It may have been, that all this occurred in the Supper-Chamber and at the time indicated by St. John. But it is also recorded by the Synoptists as on the way to Gethsemane, and in, what we may term, a more natural connection. Its consideration will therefore be best reserved till we reach that stage of the history.We now approach the most solemn part of that night: The Institution of the Lord's Supper. It would manifestly be beyond the object, as assuredly it would necessarily stretch beyond the limits, of the present work, to discuss the many questions and controversies which, alas! have gathered around the Words of the Institution. On the other hand, it would not be truthful wholly to pass them by. On certain points, indeed, we need have no hesitation. The Institution of the Lord's Supper is recorded by the Synoptists, although without reference to those parts of the Paschal Supper and its Services with which one or another of its acts must be connected. In fact, while the historical nexus with the Paschal Supper is evident, it almost seems as if the Evangelists had intended, by their studied silence in regard to the Jewish Feast, to indicate that with this Celebration and the new Institution the Jewish Passover had for ever ceased. On the other hand, the Fourth Gospel does not record the new Institution - it may have been, because it was so fully recorded by the others; or for reasons connected with the structure of that Gospel; or it may be accounted for on other grounds. [5709] But whatever way we may account for it, the silence of the Fourth Gospel must be a sore difficulty to those who regard it as an Ephesian product of symbolico-sacramentarian tendency, dating from the second century.The absence of a record by St. John is compensated by the narrative of St Paul in 1 Cor. xi.23-26, to which must be added as

supplementary the reference in 1 Cor. x.16 to the Cup of Blessing which we bless' as fellowship of the Blood of Christ, and the Bread which we break' as fellowship of the Body of Christ.' We have thus four accounts, which may be divided into two groups: St Matthew and St. Mark, and St. Luke and St. Paul. None of these give us the very words of Christ, since these were spoken in Aramæan. In the renderings which we have of them one series may be described as the more rugged and literal, the other as the more free and paraphrastic. The differences between them are, of course, exceedingly minute; but they exist. As regards the text which underlies the rendering in our A.V., the difference suggested are not of any practical importance, [5710] with the exception of two points. First, the copula is' [This is My Body,' This is My Blood'] was certainly not spoken by the Lord in the Aramaic, just as it does not occur in the Jewish formula in the breaking of bread at the beginning of the Paschal Supper. Secondly, the words: Body which is given,' or, in 1 Cor. xi.24, broken,' and Blood which is shed,' should be more correctly rendered: is being given,' broken,' shed.' If we now ask ourselves at what part of the Paschal Supper the new Institution was made, we cannot doubt that it was before the Supper was completely ended. [5711] We have seen, that Judas had left the Table at the beginning of the Supper. The meal continued to its end, amidst such conversation as has already been noted. According to the Jewish ritual, the third Cup was filled at the close of the Supper. This was called, as by St. Paul, [5712] the Cup of Blessing,' partly, because a special blessing' was pronounced over it. It is described as one of the ten essential rites in the Paschal Supper. Next, grace after meat' was spoken. But on this we need not dwell, nor yet on the washing of hands' that followed. The latter would not be observed by Jesus as a religious ceremony; while, in regard to the former, the composite character of this part of the Paschal Liturgy affords internal evidence that it could not have been in use at the time of Christ. But we can have little doubt, that the Institution of the Cup was in connection with this third Cup of Blessing.' [5713] If we are asked, what part of the Paschal Service corresponds to the Breaking of Bread,' we answer, that this being really the last Pascha, and the cessation of it, our Lord anticipated the later rite, introduced when, with the destruction of the Temple, the Paschal as all other Sacrifices ceased. While the Paschal Lamb was still offered, it was the Law that, after partaking of its flesh, nothing else should be eaten. But since the Paschal Lamb had ceased, it is the custom after the meal to break and partake as Aphikomon, or after-dish, of that half of the unleavened cake, which, as will be remembered, had been broken and put aside at the beginning of the Supper. The Paschal Sacrifice having now really ceased, and consciously so to all the disciples of Christ, He anticipated this, and connected with the breaking of the Unleavened Cake at the close of the Meal the institution of the breaking of Bread in the Holy Eucharist.What did the Institution really mean, and what does it mean to us? We cannot believe that it was intended as merely a sign for remembrance of His Death. Such remembrance is often equally vivid in ordinary acts of faith or prayer; and it seems difficult, if no more than this had been intended, to account for the Institution of a special Sacrament, and that with such solemnity, and as the second great rite of the Church - that for its nourishment. Again, if it were a mere token of remembrance, why the Cup as well as the Bread? Nor can we believe, that the copula is' - which, indeed, did not occur in the words spoken by Christ Himself - can be equivalent to signifies.' As little can it refer to any change of substance, be it in what is called Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. If we may venture an explanation, it would be that this,' received in the Holy Eucharist, conveys to the soul as regards the Body and Blood of the Lord, the same effect as the Bread and the Wine to the body - receiving of the Bread and the Cup in the Holy Communion is, really, though spiritually, to the Soul what the outward

elements are to the Body: that they are both the symbol and the vehicle of true, inward, spiritual feeding on the Very Body and Blood of Christ. So is this Cup which we bless fellowship of His Blood, and the Bread we break of His Body - fellowship with Him Who died for us, and in His dying; fellowship also in Him with one another, who are joined together in this, that for us this Body was given, and for the remission of our sins this precious Blood was shed. [5714]Most mysterious words these, yet most blessed mystery this of feeding on Christ spiritually and in faith. Most mysterious - yet he who takes from us our mystery takes from us our Sacrament.' [5715] And ever since has this blessed Institution lain as the golden morning-light far out even in the Church's darkest night - not only the seal of His Presence and its pledge, but also the promise of the bright Day at His Coming. For as often as we eat this Bread and drink this Cup, we do show forth the Death of the Lord' - for the life of the world, to be assuredly yet manifested - till He come.' Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly!'

CHAPTER XI. THE LAST DISCOURSES OF CHRIST - THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION.

(St. John xiv.; xv.; xvi.; xvii.) THE new Institution of the Lord's Supper did not finally close what passed at that Paschal Table. According to the Jewish Ritual, the Cup is filled a fourth time, and the remaining part of the Hallel [5717] repeated. Then follow, besides Ps. cxxxvi., a number of prayers and hymns, of which the comparatively late origin is not doubtful. The same remark applies even more strongly to what follows after the fourth Cup. But, so far as we can judge, the Institution of the Holy Supper was followed by the Discourse recorded in St. John xiv. Then the concluding Psalms of the Hallel were sung, [5718] after which the Master left the Upper Chamber.' The Discourse of Christ recorded in St. John xvi., and His prayer, [5719] were certainly uttered after they had risen from the Supper, and before they crossed the brook Kidron. [5720] In all probability they were, however, spoken before the Savior left the house. We can scarcely imagine such a Discourse, and still less such a Prayer, to have been uttered while traversing the narrow streets of Jerusalem on the way to Kidron. 1. In any case there cannot be doubt, that the first Discourse [5721] was spoken while still at the Supper-Table. It connects itself closely with that statement which had caused them so much sorrow and perplexity, that, whither He was going, they could not come. [5722] If so, the Discourse itself may be arranged under these four particulars: explanatory and corrective; [5723] explanatory and teaching; [5724] hortatory and promissory; [5725] promissory and consolatory. [5726] Thus there is constantand connected progress, the two great elements in the Discourse being: teaching and comfort. At the outset we ought, perhaps, to remember the very common Jewish idea, that those in glory occupied different abodes, corresponding to their ranks. [5727] If the words of Christ, about the place whither they could not follow Him, had awakened any such thoughts, the explanation which He now gave must effectually have dispelled them. Let not their hearts, then, be troubled at the prospect. As they believed in God, so let them also have trust in Him. [5728] It was His Father's House of which they were thinking, and although there were many mansions,' or rather stations,' in it - and the choice of this word may teach us something - yet they were all in that one House. Could they not trust Him in this? Surely, if it had been otherwise, He would have told them, and not left them to be bitterly disappointed in the end. Indeed, the object of His going was the opposite of what they feared: it was to prepare by His Death and Resurrection a place for them. Nor let them think that His going away would imply permanent separation, because He had said they could not follow Him thither. Rather did His going, not away, but to prepare a place for them, imply His Coming again, primarily as regarded individuals at death, and secondarily as regarded the Church - that He might receive them unto Himself, there to be with Him. Not final separation, then, but ultimate gathering to Himself, did His present going away mean. And whither I go, ye know the way.' [5729] Jesus had referred to His going to the Father's House, and implied that they knew the way which would bring them thither also. But His Words had only the more perplexed, at least some of them. If, when speaking of their not being able to go whither He went, He had not referred to a separation between them in that land far away, whither was He going? And, in their ignorance of this, how

could they find their way thither? If any Jewish ideas of the disappearance and the final manifestation of the Messiah lurked beneath the question of Thomas, the answer of the Lord placed the matter in the clearest light. He had spoken of the Father's House of many stations,' but only one road led thither. They must all know it: it was that of personal apprehension of Christ in the life, the mind, and the heart. The way to the Father was Christ; the full manifestation of all spiritual truth, and the spring of the true inner life were equally in Him. Except through Him, no man could consciously come to the Father. Thomas had put his twofold question thus: What was the goal? and, what was the way to it? [5730] In His answer Christ significantly reversed this order, and told them first what was the way - Himself; and then what was the goal. If they had spiritually known Him as the way, they would also have known the goal, the Father, and now, by having the way clearly pointed out, they must also know the goal, God; nay, He was, so to speak, visibly before them - and, gazing on Him, they saw the shining track up to heaven, the Jacob's ladder at the top of which was the Father. [5731] But once more appeared in the words of Philip that carnal literalising, which would take the words of Christ in only an external sense. [5732] Sayings like these help us to perceive the absolute need of another Teacher, the Holy Spirit. Philip understood the words of Christ as if He held out the possibility of an actual sight of the Father; and this, as they imagined, would for ever have put an end to all their doubts and fears. We also, too often, would fain have such solution of our doubts, if not by actual vision, yet by direct communication from on high. In His reply Jesus once more and emphatically returned to this truth, that the vision, which was that of faith alone, was spiritual, and in no way external; and that this manifestation had been, and was fully, though spiritually and to faith, in Him. Or did Philip not believe that the Father was really manifested in Christ, because he did not actually behold Him? Those words which had drawn them and made them feel that heaven was so near, they were not His own. but the message which He had brought them from the Father; those works which He had done, they were the manifestation of the Father's dwelling' in Him. Let them then believe this vital union between the Father and Him - and, if their faith could not absolutely rise to that height, let it at least rest on the lower level of the evidence of His works. And so would He still lead us upwards, from the experience of what He does to the knowledge of what He is. Yea, and if they were ever tempted to doubt His works, faith might have evidence of them in personal experience. Primarily, no doubt, the words [5733] about the greater works which they who believed in Him would do, because He went to the Father, refer to the Apostolic preaching and working in its greater results after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. To this also must primarily refer the promise of unlimited answer to prayer in His Name. [5734] But in a secondary, yet most true and blessed, sense, both these promises have, ever since the Ascension of Christ, also applied both to the Church and to all individual Christians. A twofold promise, so wide as this, required, it must be felt, not indeed limitation, but qualification - let us say, definition - so far as concerns the indication of its necessary conditions. Unlimited power of working by faith and of praying in faith is qualified by obedience to His Commandments, such as is the outcome of personal love to Him. [5735] And for such faith, which compasseth all things in the obedience of love to Christ, and can obtain all by the prayer of faith in His Name, there will be a need of Divine Presence ever with them. [5736] While He had been with them, they had had one Paraclete, [5737] or Advocate,' Who had pleaded with them the cause of God, explained and advocated the truth, and guarded and guided them. Now that His outward Presence was to be withdrawn from earth, and He was to be their Paraclete or Advocate in Heaven with the Father, [5738] He would, as His first act of advocacy, pray the Father, Who

would send them another Paraclete, or Advocate, who would continue with them for ever. To the guidance and pleadings of that Advocate they could implicitly trust themselves, for He was the Spirit of Truth.' The world, indeed, would not listen to His pleadings, nor accept Him as their Guide, for the only evidence by which they judged was that of outward sight and material results. But theirs would be other Empirics: and experience not outward, but inward and spiritual. They would know the reality of His Existence and the truth of His pleadings by the continual Presence with them as a body of this Paraclete, and by His dwelling in them individually. Here (as Bengel justly remarks) begins the essential difference between believers and the world. The Son was sent into the world; not so the Holy Spirit. Again, the world receives not the Holy Spirit, because it knows Him not; the disciples know Him, because they possess Him. Hence to have known' and to have' are so conjoined, that not to have known is the cause of not having, and to have is the cause of knowing. [5739] In view of this promised Advent of the other Advocate, Christ could tell the disciples that He would not leave them orphans' in this world. Nay, in this Advocate Christ Himself came to them. True, the world, which only saw and knew what fell within the range of its sensuous and outward vision (ver.17), would not behold Him, but they would behold Him, because He lived, and they also would live - and hence there was fellowship of spiritual life between them. [5740] On that day of the Advent of His Holy Spirit would they have full knowledge, because experience, of the Christ's Return to the Father, and of their own being in Christ, and of His being in them. And, as regarded this threefold relationship, this must be ever kept in view: to be in Christ meant to love Him, and this was: to have and to keep His commandments; Christ's being in the Father implied, that they who were in Christ or loved Him would be loved also of His Father; and, lastly, Christ's being in them implied, that He would love them and manifest Himself to them. [5741] One outstanding novel fact here arrested the attention of the disciples. It was contrary to all their Jewish ideas about the future manifestation of the Messiah, and it led to the question of one of their number, Judas - not Iscariot: Lord, what has happened, that to us Thou wilt manifest Thyself, and not to the world?' Again they thought of an outward, while He spoke of a spiritual and inward manifestation. It was of this coming of the Son and the Father for the purpose of making station' with them [5742] that He spoke, of which the condition was love to Christ, manifested in the keeping of His Word, and which secured the love of the Father also. On the other hand, not to keep His Word was not to love Him, with all that it involved, not only as regarded the Son, but also the Father, since the Word which they heard was the Father's. [5743] Thus far then for this inward manifestation, springing from life-fellowship with Christ, rich in the unbounded spiritual power of faith, and fragrant with the obedience of love. All this He could say to them now in the Father's Name - as the first Representative, Pleader, and Advocate,' or Paraclete. But what, when He was no longer present with them? For that He had provided another Paraclete,' Advocate, or Pleader. This Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, Whom the Father will send in My Name, that same will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all things that I said to you.' It is quite evident, that the interpretation of the term Paraclete as the Comforter' will not meet the description here given of His twofold function as teaching all, and recalling all, that Christ Himself had said. Nor will the other interpretation of Advocate' meet the requirements, if we regard the Advocate as one who pleads for us. But if we regard the Paraclete or Advocate as the Representative of Christ, and pleading, as it were, for Him, the cause of Christ, all seems harmonious. Christ came in the Name of the Father, as the first Paraclete, as His Representative; the Holy Spirit comes in the Name of Christ, as the second Paraclete, the Representative of Christ, Who is in the Father. As such the

second Paraclete is sent by the Father in Name of the first Paraclete, and He would both complete in them, and recall to them, His Cause. And so at the end of this Discourse the Lord returned again, and now with fuller meaning, to its beginning. Then He had said: Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me.' Now, after the fuller communication of His purpose, and of their relation to Him, He could convey to them the assurance of peace, even His Own peace, as His gift in the present, and His legacy for the future. [5744] In their hearing, the fact of His going away, which had filled them with such sorrow and fear, had now been conjoined with that of His Coming [5745] to them. Yes, as He had explained it, His departure to the Father was the necessary antecedent and condition of His Coming to them in the permanent Presence of the other Paraclete, the Holy Ghost. That Paraclete, however, would, in the economy of grace, be sent by the Father alone. In the dispensation of grace, the final source from whence all cometh, Who sendeth both the Son and the Holy Ghost, is God the Father. The Son is sent by the Father, and the Holy Ghost also, though proceeding from the Father and the Son, is sent by the Father in Christ's Name. In the economy of grace, then, the Father is greater than the Son. And the return of the Son to the Father marks alike the completion of Christ's work, and its perfection, in the Mission of the Holy Ghost, with all that His Advent implies. Therefore, if, discarding thoughts of themselves, they had only given room to feelings of true love to Him, instead of mourning they would have rejoiced because He went to the Father, with all that this implied, not only of rest and triumph to Him, but of the perfecting of His Work - since this was the condition of that Mission of the Holy Ghost by the Father, Who sent both the Son and the Holy Spirit. And in this sense also should they have rejoiced, because, through the presence of the Holy Ghost in them, as sent by the Father in His greater' work, they would, instead of the present selfish enjoyment of Christ's Personal Presence, have the more power of showing their love to Him in apprehending His Truth, obeying His Commandments, doing His Works, and participating in His Life. [5746] Not that Christ expected them to understand the full meaning of all these words. But afterwards, when it had all come to pass, they would believe. [5747] With the meaning and the issue of the great contest on which He was about to enter thus clearly before Him, did He now go forth to meet the last assault of the Prince of this World.' [5748] But why that fierce struggle, since in Christ he hath nothing?' To exhibit to the world' the perfect love which He had to the Father; how even to the utmost of self-exinanition, obedience, submission, and suffering He was doing as the Father had given Him commandment, when He sent Him for the redemption of the world. In the execution of this Mission He would endure the last sifting assault and contest on the part of the Enemy, and, enduring, conquer for us. And so might the world be won from its Prince by the full manifestation of Christ, in His infinite obedience and righteousness, doing the Will of the Father and the Work which He had given Him, and in His infinite love doing the work of our salvation. [5749]2. The work of our salvation! To this aspect of the subject Christ now addressed Himself, as He rose from the Supper-Table. If in the Discourse recorded in the fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel the Godward aspect of Christ's impending departure was explained, in that of the fifteenth chapter the new relation is set forth which was to subsist between Him and His Church. And this - although epigrammatic sayings are so often fallacious - may be summarised in these three words: Union, Communion, Disunion. The Union between Christ and His Church is corporate, vital, and effective, alike as regards results and blessings. [5750] This Union issues in Communion - of Christ with His disciples, of His disciples with Him, and of His disciples among themselves. The principle of all these is love: the love of Christ to the disciples, the love of the disciples to Christ, and the love in

Christ of the disciples to one another. [5751] Lastly, this Union and Communion has for its necessary counterpart Disunion, separation from the world. The world repudiates them for their union with Christ and their communion. But, for all that, there is something that must keep them from going out of the world. They have a Mission in it, initiated by, and carried on in the power of, the Holy Ghost - that of uplifting the testimony of Christ. [5752]As regards the relation of the Church to the Christ Who is about to depart to the Father, and to come to them in the Holy Ghost as His Representative, it is to be one of Union, corporate, vital, and effective. In the nature of it, such a truth could only be set forth by illustration. When Christ said: I am the Vine, the true one, and My Father is the Husbandman;' or again, Ye are the branches' - bearing in mind that, as He spake it in Aramaic, the copulas am,' is,' and are,' would be omitted - He did not mean that He signified the Vine or was its sign, nor the Father that of the Husbandman, nor yet the disciples that of the branches. What He meant was, that He, the Father, and the disciples, stood in exactly the same relationship as the Vine, the Husbandman, and the branches. That relationship was of corporate union of the branches with the Vine for the production of fruit to the Husbandman, Who for that purpose pruned the branches. Nor can we forget in this connection, that, in the old Testament, and partially in Jewish thought, [5753] the Vine was the symbol of Israel, not in their national but in their Church-capacity. Christ, with His disciples as the branches, is the Vine, the true One' - the reality of all types, the fulfilment of all promises. They are many branches, yet a grand unity in that Vine; there is one Church of which He is the Head, the Root, the Sustenance, the Life. And in that Vine will the object of its planting of old be realised: to bring forth fruit unto God.Yet, though it be one Vine, the Church must bear fruit not only in her corporate capacity, but individually in each of the branches. It seems remarkable that we read of branches in Him that bear not fruit. This must apparently refer to those who have by Baptism been inserted into the Vine, but remain fruitless, since a merely outward profession of Christ could scarcely be described as a branch in' Him. On the other hand, every fruit-bearing branch the Husbandman cleanseth' [5754] - not necessarily nor exclusively by pruning, but in whatever manner may be requisite - so that it may produce the largest possible amount of fruit. As for them, the process of cleansing had already' been accomplished through, or because of [the meaning is much the same], the Word which He had spoken unto them. If that condition of fruit-bearing now existed in them in consequence of the impression of His Word, it followed as a cognate condition that they must abide in Him, and He would abide in them. Nay, this was a vital condition of fruit-bearing, arising from the fundamental fact that He was the Vine and they the branches. The proper, normal condition of every branch in that Vine was to bear much fruit, of course, in proportion to its size and vigour. But, both figuratively and really, the condition of this was to abide in Him, since apart' from Him they could do nothing. It was not like a force once set in motion that would afterwards continue of itself. It was a life, and the condition of its permanence was continued union with Christ, from Whom alone it could spring. And now as regarded the two alternatives: he that abode not in Him was the branch cast outside' and withering, which, when ready for it, men would cast into the fire - with all of symbolic meaning as regards the gatheres and the burning that the illustration implies. On the other hand, if the corporate and vital union was effective, if they abode in Him, and in consequence, His Words abode in them, then: Whatsoever ye will ye shall ask, and it shall be done to you.' It is very noteworthy that the unlimitedness of prayer is limited, or, rather, conditioned, by our abiding in Christ and His Words in us, [5755] just as in St. John xiv.12-14 it is conditioned by fellowship with Him, and in St. John xv.16 by permanent fruitfulness. [5756] For, it

were the most dangerous fanaticism, and entirely opposed to the teaching of Christ, to imagine that the promise of Christ implies such absolute power - as if prayer were magic - that a person might ask for anything, no matter what it was, in the assurance of obtaining his request. [5757] In all moral relations, duties and privileges are correlative ideas, and in our relation to Christ conscious immanence in Him and of His Word in us, union and communion with Him, and the obedience of love, are the indispensable conditions of our privileges. The beliver may, indeed, ask for anything, because he may always and absolutely go to God; but the certainty of special answers to prayer is proportionate to the degree of union and communion with Christ. And such unlimited liberty of prayer is connected with our bearing much fruit, because thereby the Father is glorified and our discipleship evidenced. [5758] [5759]This union, being inward and moral, necesarily unfolds into communion, of which the principle is love. Like as the Father loved Me, even so loved I you. Abide in My love. If ye keep My commandments, ye shall abide in the love that is Mine (n t gp t m).' We mark the continuity in the scale of love: the Father towards the Son, and the Son towards us; and its kindredness of forthgoing. And now all that the disciples had to do was to abide in it. This is connected, not with sentiment nor even with faith, but with obedience. [5760] Fresh supplies are drawn by faith, but continuance in the love of Christ is the manifestation and the result of obedience. It was so even with the Master Himself in His relation to the Father. And the Lord immediately explained [5761] what His object was in saying this. In this, also, were they to have communion with Him: communion in that joy which was His in consequence of His perfect obedience. These things have I spoken to you, in order that the joy that is Mine (char m) may be [5762] in you, and your joy may be fulfilled [completed].'But what of those commandments to which such importance attached? Clean as they now were through the Words which He had spoken, one great commandment stood forth as specially His Own, consecrated by His Example and to be measured by His observance of it. From whatever point we view it, whether as specially demanded by the pressing necessities of the Church; or as, from its contrast to what Heathenism exhibited, affording such striking evidence of the power of Christianity; [5763] or, on the other hand, as so congruous to all the fundamental thoughts of the Kingdom: the love of the Father in sending His Son for man, the work of the Son in seeking and saving the lost at the price of His Own Life, and the new bond which in Christ bound them all in the fellowship of a common calling, common mission, and common interests and hopes - love of the brethren was the one outstanding Farewell-Command of Christ. [5764] And to keep His commandments was to be His friend. And they were His friends. No longer' did He call them servants, for the servant knew not what his lord did. He had now given them a new name, and with good reason: You have I called friends, because all things which I heard of My Father I made known to you.' And yet deeper did He descend, in pointing them to the example and measure of His love as the standard of theirs towards one another. And with this teaching He combined what He had said before, of bearing fruit and of the privilege of fellowship with Himself. They were His friends; He had proved it by treating them as such in now opening up before them the whole counsel of God. And that friendship: Not you did choose Me, but I did choose you' - the object of His choosing' [that to which they were appointed'] being, that, as they went forth into the world, they should bear fruit, that their fruit should be permanent, and that they should possess the full privilege of that unlimited power to pray of which He had previously spoken. [5765] All these things were bound up with obedience to His commands, of which the outstanding one was to love one another.' [5766]But this very choice on His part, and their union of love in Him and to one another, also implied not only separation

from, but repudiation by, the world. [5767] For this they must be prepared. It had come to Him, and it would be evidence of their choice to discipleship. The hatred of the world showed the essential difference and antagonism between the life-principle of the world and theirs. For evil or for good, they must expect the same treatment as their Master. Nay, was it not their privilege to realise, that all this came upon them for His sake? and should they not also remember, that the ultimate ground of the world's hatred was ignorance of Him Who had sent Christ? [5768] And yet, though this should banish all thoughts of personal resentment, their guilt who rejected Him was truly terrible. Speaking to, and in, Israel, there was no excuse for their sin - the most awful that could be conceived; since, most truly: He that hateth Me, hateth My Father also.' For, Christ was the Sent of God, and God manifest. It was a terrible charge this to bring against God's ancient people Israel. And yet there was, besides the evidence of His Words, that of His Works. [5769] If they could not apprehend the former, yet, in regard to the latter, they could see by comparison with the works of other men that they were unique. [5770] They saw it, but only hated Him and His Father, ascribing it all to the power and agency of Beelzebul. And so the ancient prophecy had now been fulfilled: They hated Me gratuitously.' [5771] But all was not yet at an end: neither His Work through the other Advocate, nor yet theirs in the world. When the Advocate is come, Whom I will send to you from the Father - the Spirit of the Truth - Who proceedeth from the Father [goeth forth on His Mission as sent by the Father], [5772] this Same will bear witness about Me. And ye also bear witness, [5773] because ye are with Me from the beginning.' 3. The last of the parting Discourses of Christ, in the sixteenth chapter of St. John, was, indeed, interrupted by questions from the disciples. But these, being germane to the subject, carry it only forward. In general, the subjects treated in it are: the new relations arising from the departure of Christ and the coming of the other Advocate. Thus the last point needed would be supplied - chap. xiv. giving the comfort and teaching in view of His departure; chap. xv. describing the personal relations of the disciples towards Christ, one another, and the world; and chap. xvi. fixing the new relations to be established.The chapter appropriately opens by reflecting on the predicted enmity of the world. [5774] Christ had so clearly foretold it, lest this should prove a stumbling-block to them. Best, to know distinctly that they would not only be put out of the Synagogue, but that everyone who killed them would deem it to offer a religious service to God.' So, no doubt, Saul of Tarsus once felt, and so did many others who, alas! never became Christians. Indeed, according to Jewish Law, a zealot' might have slain without formal trial those caught in flagrant rebellion against God - or in what might be regarded as such, and the Synagogue would have deemed the deed as meritorious as that of Phinehas. [5775] It was a sorrow, and yet also a comfort, to know that this spirit of enmity arose from ignorance of the Father and Christ. Although they had in a general way been prepared for it before, yet He had not told it all so definitely and connectedly from the beginning, because He was still there. [5776] But now that He was going away, it was absolutely necessary to do so. For even the mention of it had thrown them into such confusion of personal sorrow, that the main point, whither Christ was going, had not even emerged into their view. [5777] [5778] Personal feelings had quite engrossed them, to the forgetfulness of their own higher interests. He was going to the Father, and this was the condition, as well as the antecedent of His sending the Paraclete.But the Advent of the Advocate' would mark a new era, as regarded the Church [5779] and the world. It was their Mission to go forth into the world and to preach Christ. That other Advocate, as the Representative of Christ, would go into the world and convict on the three cardinal points on which their preaching turned. These three points on which all Missioning

proceeds, are - Sin, Righteousness, and Judgment. And on these would the New Advocate convict the world. Bearing in mind that the term convict' is uniformly used in the Gospels [5780] for clearly establishing or carrying home guilt, [5781] we have here three separate facts presented to us. As the Representative of Christ, the Holy Ghost will carry home to the world, establish the fact of its guilt in regard to sin - on the ground that the world believes not in Christ. Again, as the Representative of Christ, He will carry home to the world the fact of its guilt in regard to righteousness - on the ground that Christ has ascended to the Father, and hence is removed from the sight of man. Lastly, as the Representative of Christ, He will establish the fact of the world's guilt, because of this: that its Prince, Satan, has already been judged by Christ - a judgment established in His sitting at the Right Hand of God, and which will be vindicated at His Second Coming. Taking, then, the three great facts in the History of the Christ: His First Coming to salvation, His Resurrection and Ascension, and His Sitting at the Right Hand of God, of which His Second Coming to Judgment is the final issue, this Advocate of Christ will in each case convict the world of guilt; in regard to the first - concerning sin, because it believes not on Him Whom God has sent; in regard to the second - concerning righteousness, because Christ is at the Father's Right Hand; and, in regard to the third - concerning judgment, because that Prince whom the world still owns has already been judged by Christ's Session at the Right Hand of God, and by His Reign, which is to be completed in His Second Coming to Earth.Such was the cause of Christ which the Holy Spirit as the Advocate would plead to the world, working conviction as in a hostile guilty party. Quite other was that cause of Christ which, as His Advocate, He would plead with the disciples, and quite other in their case the effect of His advocacy. We have, even on the present occasion, marked how often the Lord was hindered, as well as grieved, by the misunderstanding and unbelief of man. Now it was the self-imposed law of His Mission, the outcome of His Victory in the Temptation in the Wilderness, that He would not achieve His Mission in the exercise of Divine Power, but by treading the ordinary path of humanity. This was the limitation which He set to Himself - one aspect of His Self-exinanition. But from this His constant sorrow must also have flowed, in view of the unbelief of even those nearest to Him. It was, therefore, not only expedient, but even necessary for them, since at present they could not bear more, that Christ's Presence should be withdrawn, and His Representative take His place, and open up His Cause to them. And this was to be His special work to the Church. As Advocate, not speaking from [5782] Himself, but speaking whatsoever He shall hear - as it were, according to His heavenly brief' - He would guide them into all truth. And here His first declaration' would be of the things that are coming.' A whole new order of things was before the Apostles - the abolition of the Jewish, the establishment of the Christian Dispensation, and the relation of the New to the Old, together with many kindred questions. As Christ's Representative, and speaking not from Himself, the Holy Spirit would be with them, not suffer them to go astray into error or wrong, but be their wayleader' into all truth. Further, as the Son glorified the Father, so would the Spirit glorify the Son, and in analogous manner - because He shall take of His and declare' it unto them. This would be the second line, as it were, in the declarations' of the Advocate, Representative of Christ. And this work of the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father, in His declaration about Christ, was explained by the circumstance of the union and communication between the Father and Christ. [5783] And so - to sum up, in one brief Farewell, all that He had said to them - there would be a little while' in which they would not behold' Him (okti theoret me), and again a little while and they would see' Him (psesth me), though in quite different manner, as even the wording shows. [5784] [5785] If we had entertained any doubt of the

truth of the Lord's previous words, that in their absorbedness in the present the disciples had not thought of the whither' to which Christ was going, and that it was needful for them that He should depart and the other Advocate come, [5786] this conviction would be forced upon us by their perplexed questioning among themselves as to the meaning of the twofold little while,' and of all that He had said about, and connected with, His going to the Father. They would fain have asked, yet dared not. But He knew their thoughts, and answered them. That first little while' comprised those terrible days of His Death and Entombment, when they would weep and lament, but the world rejoice. Yet their brief sorrow would be turned into joy. It was like the short sorrow of childbearing - afterwards no more remembered in the joy that a human being had been born into the world. Thus would it be when their present sorrow would be changed into the Resurrection-joy - a joy which no man could ever afterwards take from them. On that day of joy would He have them dwell in thought during their present night of sorrow. That would be, indeed, a day of brightness, in which there would be no need of their making further inquiry of Him (m ok rotsete). [5787] All would then be clear in the new light of the Resurrection. A day this, when the promise would become true, and whatsoever they asked the Father (atsete), He would give it them in Christ's Name. [5788] Hitherto they had not yet asked in His Name; let them ask: they would receive,and so their joy be completed. Ah! that day of brightness. Hitherto He had only been able to speak to them, as it were, in parables and allegory, but then would He declare' to them in all plainness about the Father. And, as He would be able to speak to them directly and plainly about the Father, so would they then be able to speak directly to the Father - as the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it, come with plainness' [5789] or directness' to the throne of grace. They would ask directly in the Name of Christ; and no longer would it be needful, as at present, first to come to Him that He may inquire' of the Father about' them (rotso per mn). For, God loved them as lovers of Christ, and as recognising that He had come forth from God. And so it was - He had come forth from out the Father [5790] when He came into the world, and, now that He was leaving it, He was going to the Father.The disciples imagined that they understood this at least. Christ had read their thoughts, and there was no need for anyone to put express questions. [5791] He knew all things, and by this they believed - it afforded them evidence - that He came forth from [5792] God. But how little did they know their own hearts! The hour had even come when they would be scattered, every man to his own home, and leave Him alone - yet, truly, He would not be alone, because the Father would be with Him. [5793] Yet, even so, His latest as His first thought [5794] was of them; and through the night of scattering and of sorrow did He bid them look to the morning of joy. For, the battle was not theirs, nor yet the victory doubtful: I [emphatically] have overcome [it is accomplished] the world.' [5795]We now enter most reverently what may be called the innermost Sanctuary. [5796] For the first time we are allowed to listen to what was really the Lord's Prayer,' [5797] and, as we hear, we humbly worship. That Prayer was the great preparation for His Agony, Cross, and Passion; and, also, the outlook on the Crown beyond. In its three parts [5798] it seems almost to look back on the teaching of the three previous chapters, [5799] and convert them into prayer. [5800] We see the great High-Priest first solemnly offering up Himself, and then consecrating and interceding for His Church and for her work.The first part of that Prayer [5801] is the consecration of Himself by the Great High-Priest. The final hour had come. In praying that the Father would glorify the Son, He was really not asking anything for Himself, but that the Son' might [5802] glorify' the Father. For, the glorifying of the Son - His support, and then His Resurrection, was really the completion of the work which the Father had given Him to do, as well as its

evidence. It was really in accordance (even as') with the power or authority which the Father gave Him over all flesh,' [5803] when He put all things under His Feet as the Messiah - the object of this Messianic Rule being, that the totality' (the all, pn) that Thou hast given Him, He should give to them eternal life.' The climax in His Messianic appointment, the object of His Rule over all flesh, was the Father's gift to Christ of the Church as a totality and a unity; and in that Church Christ gives to each individually eternal life. What follows [5804] seems an intercalated sentence, as shown even by the use of the particle and,' with which the all-important definition of what is eternal life' is introduced, and by the last words in the verse. But although embodying, so to speak, as regards the form, the record which St. John had made of Christ's Words, we must remember that, as regards the substance, we have here Christ's own Prayer for that eternal life to each of His own people. And what constitutes the eternal life?' Not what we so often think, who confound with the thing its effects or else its results. It refers not to the future, but to the present. It is the realisation of what Christ had told them in these words: Ye believe in God, believe also in Me.' It is the pure sunlight on the soul, resulting in, or reflecting the knowledge of Jehovah; the Personal, Living, True God, and of Him Whom He did send, Jesus Christ. These two branches of knowledge must not so much be considered as co-ordinate, but rather as inseparable. Returning from this explanation of the eternal life' which they who are bathed in the Light possess even now and here, the Great High-Priest first offered up to the Father that part of His work which was on earth and which He had completed. And then, both as the consummation and the sequel of it, He claimed what was at the end of His Mission: His return to that fellowship of essential glory, which He possessed together with the Father before the world was. [5805] The gift of His consecration could not have been laid on more glorious Altar. Such Cross must have been followed by such Crown. [5806] And now again His first thought was of them for whose sake He had consecrated Himself. These He now solemnly presented to the Father. [5807] He introduced them as those (the individuals) whom the Father had specially given to him out of the world. As such they were really the Father's, and given over the Christ - and He now presented them as having kept the Word of the Father. Now they knew that all things whatsoever the Father had given the Son were of the Father. This was the outcome, then, of all His teaching, and the sum of all their learning - perfect confidence in the Person of Christ, as in His Life, Teaching, and Work sent not only of God, but of the Father. Neither less nor yet more did their knowledge' represent. All else that sprang out of it they had yet to learn. But it was enough, for it implied everything; chiefly these three things - that they received the words which He gave them as from the Father; that they knew truly that Christ had come out from the Father; and that they believed that the Father had sent Him. And, indeed, reception of Christ's Word, knowledge of His Essential Nature, and faith in His Mission: such seem the three essential characteristics of those who are Christ's.And now He brought them in prayer before the Father. [5808] He was interceding, not for the world' that was His by right of His Messiahship, but for them whom the Father had specially given Him. They were the Father's in the special sense of covenant-mercy, and all that in that sense was the Father's was the Son's, and all that was the Son's was the Father's. Therefore, although all the world was the Son's, He prayed not now for it; and although all in earth and heaven were in the Father's Hand, He sought not now His blessing on them, but on those whom, while He was in the world, He had shielded and guided. They were to be left behind in a world of sin, evil, temptation, and sorrow, and He was going to the Father. And this was His prayer: Holy Father, keep them in Thy Name which Thou hast given Me, that so (in order that) they may be one (a unity, n), as We are.' The peculiar address, Holy Father,' shows

that the Saviour once more referred to the keeping in holiness, and what is of equal importance, that the unity' of the Church sought for was to be primarily one of spiritual character, and not a merely outward combination. Unity in holiness and of nature, as was that of the Father and Son, such was the great object sought, although such union would, if properly carried out, also issue in outward unity. But while moral union rather than outward unity was in His view, our present unhappy divisions,' arising so often from wilfulness and unreadiness to bear slight differences among ourselves - each other's burdens - are so entirely contrary not only to the Christian, but even to the Jewish, spirit, that we can only trace them to the heathen element in the Church.While He was with them,' He kept' them in the Father's Name. Them whom the Father had given Him, by the effective drawing of His grace within them, He guarded (phlaxa) and none from among them was lost, except the son of perdition - and this, according to prophecy. But ere He went to the Father, He prayed thus for them, that in this realised unity of holiness the joy that was His [5809] (tn charn tn mn), might be completed' in them. [5810] And there was the more need of this, since they were left behind with nought but His Word in a world that hated them, because, as Christ, so they also were not of it [from' it, k]. Nor yet did Christ ask with a view to their being taken out of the world, but with this that' [in order that] the Father should keep them [preserve, terss] from the Evil One.' [5811] And this the more emphatically, because, even as He was not, so were they not out of the world,' which lay in the Evil One. And the preservative which He sought for them was not outward but inward, the same in kind as while He had been with them, [5812] only coming now directly from the Father. It was sanctification in the truth,' [5813] with this significant addition: The word that is Thine (lgos ss) is truth.' [5814]In its last part this intercessory Prayer of the Great High-Priest bore on the work of the disciples and its fruits. As the Father had sent the Son, so did the Son send the disciples into the world, in the same manner, and on the same Mission. And for their sakes He now solemnly offered Himself, consecrated' or sanctified' Himself, that they might in truth' [5815] - truly - be consecrated. And in view of this their work, to which they were consecrated, did Christ pray not for them alone, but also for those who, through their word, would believe in Him, in order,' or that so,' all may be one' - form a unity. Christ, as sent by the Father, gathered out the original unity;' they, as sent by Him, and consecrated by His consecration, were to gather others, but all were to form one great unity, through the common spiritual communication. As Thou in Me, and I also in Thee, so that [in order that] they also may be in Us, so that [in order that] the world may believe that Thou didst send Me.' And the glory that Thou hast given Me' - referring to His Mission in the world, and His setting apart and authorisation for it - I have given to them, so that [in order that] [in this respect also] they may be one, even as We are One [a unity]. [5816] I in them, and Thou in Me, so that they may be perfected into One' - the ideal unity and real character of the Church, this - so that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them as Thou lovedst Me.' After this unspeakably sublime consecration of His Church, and communication to her of His glory as well as of His Work, we cannot marvel at what follows and concludes the Lord's Prayer.' [5817] We remember the unity of the Church - a unity in Him, and as that between the Father and the Son - as we listen to this: That which Thou hast given Me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with Me - so that they may gaze [behold] on the glory that is Mine, which Thou hast given Me [be sharers in the Messianic glory]: because Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world.'And we all would fain place ourselves in the shadow of this final consecration of Himself and of His Church by the Great High-Priest, which is alike final appeal, claim, and prayer: O Righteous Father, the world knew Thee not, but I know Thee, and these know

that Thou sentest Me. And I made known unto them Thy Name, and will make it known, so that [in order that] the love wherewith Thou lovedst Me may be in them, and I in them.' This is the charter of the Church: her possession and her joy; her faith, her hope also, and love; and in this she standeth, prayeth, and worketh.

CHAPTER XII. GETHSEMANE

(St. Matt. xxvi.30-56; St. Mark xiv.26-52; St. Luke xxii.31-53; St. John xviii.1-11.) We turn once more to follow the steps of Christ, now among the last He trod upon earth. The hymn,' with which the Paschal Supper ended, had been sung. Probably we are to understand this of the second portion of the Hallel, [5818] sung some time after the third Cup, or else of Psalm cxxxvi., which, in the present Ritual, stands near the end of the service. The last Discourses had been spoken, the last Prayer, that of Consecration, had been offered, and Jesus prepared to go forth out of the City, to the Mount of Olives. The streets could scarcely be said to be deserted, for, from many a house shone the festive lamp, and many a company may still have been gathered; and everywhere was the bustle of preparation for going up to the Temple, the gates of which were thrown open at midnight. Passing out by the gate north of the Temple, we descend into a lonely part of the valley of black Kidron, at that season swelled into a winter torrent. Crossing it, we turn somewhat to the left, where the road leads towards Olivet. Not many steps farther (beyond, and on the other side of the present Church of the Sepulchre of the Virgin) we turn aside from the road to the right, and reach what tradition has since earliest times - and probably correctly - pointed out as Gethsemane,' the Oil-press.' It was a small property enclosed (choron), a garden' in the Eastern sense, where probably, amidst a variety of fruit trees and flowering shrubs, was a lowly, quiet summer-retreat, connected with, or near by, the Olive-press.' The present Gethsemane is only some seventy steps square, and though its old gnarled olives cannot be those (if such there were) of the time of Jesus, since all trees in that valley - those also which stretched their shadows over Jesus - were hewn down in the Roman siege, they may have sprung from the old roots, or from the odd kernels. But we love to think of this Garden' as the place where Jesus often' - not merely on this occassion, but perhaps on previous visits to Jerusalem - gathered with His disciples. It was a quiet resting-place, for retirement, prayer, perhaps sleep, and a trysting-place also where not only the Twelve, but others also, may have been wont to meet the Master. And as such it was known to Judas, and thither he led the armed band, when they found the Upper Chamber no longer occupied by Jesus and His disciples. Whether it had been intended that He should spend part of the night there, before returning to the Temple, and whose that enclosed garden was - the other Eden, in which the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven, bore the penalty of the first, and in obeying gained life - we know not, and perhaps ought not to inquire. It may have belonged to Mark's father. But if otherwise, Jesus had loving disciples even in Jerusalem, and, we rejoice to think, not only a home at Bethany, and an Upper Chamber furnished in the City, but a quiet retreat and trysting-place for His own under the bosom of Olivet, in the shadow of the garden of the Oil-press.' The sickly light of the moon was falling full on them as they were crossing Kidron. It was here, we imagine, after they had left the City behind them, that the Lord addressed Himself first to the disciples generally. We can scarcely call it either prediction or warning. Rather, as we think of that last Supper, of Christ passing through the streets of the City for the last time into that Garden, and especially of what was now immediately before Him, does what He spake seem natural, even necessary. To them - yes, to them all - He would that night be even a stumbling-block. And so had it been foretold of old, [5819] that the Shepherd would be smitten, and the sheep scattered. Did

this prophecy of His suffering, in its grand outlines, fill the mind of the Saviour as He went forth on His Passion? Such Old Testament thoughts were at any rate present with Him, when, not unconsciously nor of necessity, but as the Lamb of God, He went to the slaughter. A peculiar significance also attaches to His prediction that, after He was risen, He would go before them into Galilee. [5820] For, with their scattering upon His Death, it seems to us, the Apostolic circle or College, as such, was for a time broken up. They continued, indeed, to meet together as individual disciples, but the Apostolic bond was temporarily dissolved. This explains many things: the absence of Thomas on the first, and his peculiar position on the second Sunday; the uncertainty of the disciples, as evidenced by the words of those on the way to Emmaus; as well as the seemingly strange movements of the Apostles - all which are quite changed when the Apostolic bond is restored. Similarly, we mark, that only seven of them seem to have been together by the Lake of Galilee, [5821] and that only afterwards the Eleven met Him on the mountain to which He had directed them. [5822] It was here that the the Apostolic circle or College was once more re-formed, and the Apostolic commission renewed, [5823] and thence they returned to Jerusalem, once more sent forth from Galilee, to wait the final events of His Ascension, and the Coming of the Holy Ghost. But in that night they understood none of these things. While all were staggering under the blow of their predicted scattering, the Lord seems to have turned to Peter individually. What he said, and how He put it, equally demand our attention: Simon, Simon' [5824] - using His old name when referring to the old man in him - Satan has obtained [out-asked, xtsato] you, for the purpose of sifting like as wheat. But I have made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not.' The words admit us into two mysteries of heaven. This night seems to have been the power of darkness,' when, left of God, Christ had to meet by himself the whole assault of hell, and to conquer in His own strength as Man's Substitute and Representative. It is a great mystery: but quite consistent with itself. We do not, as others, here see any analogy to the permission given to Satan in the opening chapter of the Book of Job, always supposing that this embodies a real, not an allegorical story. But in that night the fierce wind of hell was allowed to sweep unbroken over the Saviour, and even to expend its fury upon those that stood behind in His Shelter. Satan had out-asked,' obtained it - yet not to destroy, nor to cast down, but to sift,' like as wheat [5825] is shaken in a sieve to cast out of it what is not grain. Hitherto, and no farther, had Satan obtained it. In that night of Christ's Agony and loneliness, of the utmost conflict between Christ and Satan, this seems almost a necessary element. This, then, was the first mystery that had passed. And this sifting would affect Peter more than the others. Judas, who loved not Jesus at all, has already fallen; Peter, who loved Him - perhaps not most intensely, but, if the expression be allowed, most extensely - stood next to Judas in danger. In truth, though most widely apart in their direction, the springs of their inner life rose in close proximity. There was the same readiness to kindle into enthusiasm, the same desire to have public opinion with him, the same shrinking from the Cross, the same moral inability or unwillingness to stand alone, in the one as in the other. Peter had abundant courage to sally out, but not to stand out. Viewed in its primal elements (not in its development), Peter's character was, among the disciples, the likest to that of Judas. If this shows what Judas might have become, it also explains how Peter was most in danger that night; and, indeed, the husks of him were cast out of the sieve in his denial of the Christ. But what distinguished Peter from Judas was his faith' of spirit, soul, and heart - of spirit, when he apprehended the spiritual element in Christ; [5826] of soul, when he confessed Him as the Christ; [5827] and of heart, when he could ask Him to sound the depths of his inner being, to find there

real, personal love to Jesus. [5828] The second mystery of that night was Christ's supplication for Peter. We dare not say, as the High-Priest - and we know not when and where it was offered. But the expression is very strong,as of one who has need of a thing. [5829] And that for which He made such supplication was, that Peter's faith should not fail. This, and not that something new might be given him, or the trial removed from Peter. We mark, how Divine grace presupposes, not supersedes, human liberty. And this also explains why Jesus had so prayed for Peter, not for Judas. In the former case there was faith, which only required to be strengthened against failure - an eventuality which, without the intercession of Christ, was possible. To these words of His, Christ added this significant commission: And thou, when thou hast turned again, confirm thy brethren.' [5830] And how fully he did this, both in the Apostolic circle and in the Church, history has chronicled. Thus, although such may come in the regular moral order of things, Satan has not even power to sift' without leave of God; and thus does the Father watch in such terrible sifting over them for whom Christ has prayed. This is the first fulfilment of Christ's Prayer, that the Father would keep them from the Evil One.' [5831] Not by any process from without, but by the preservation of their faith. And thus also may we learn, to our great and unspeakable comfort, that not every sin - not even conscious and wilful sin - implies the failure of our faith, very closely though it lead to it; still less, our final rejection. On the contrary, as the fall of Simon was the outcome of the natural elements in him, so would it lead to their being brought to light and removed, thus fitting him the better for confirming his brethren. And so would light come out of darkness. From our human standpoint we might call such teaching needful: in the Divine arrangement it is only the Divine sequent upon the human antecedent. We can understand the vehement earnestness and sincerity with which Peter protested against of any failure on his part. We mostly deem those sins farthest which are nearest to us; else, much of the power of their temptation would be gone, and temptation changed into conflict. The things which we least anticipate are our falls. In all honesty - and not necessarily with self elevation over the others - he said, that even if all should be offended in Christ, he never could be, but was ready to go with Him into prison and death. And when, to enforce the warning, Christ predicted that before the repeated crowing of the cock [5832] ushered in the morning, [5833] Peter would thrice deny that he knew Him, Peter not only persisted in his asseverations, but was joined in them by the rest. Yet - and this seems the meaning and object of the words of Christ which follow - they were not aware terribly changed the former relations had become, and what they would have to suffer in consequence. [5834] When formerly He had sent forth, both without provision and defence, had they lacked anything? No! But now no helping hand would be extended to them; nay, what seemingly they would need even more than anything else would be a sword' - defence against attacks, for at the close of His history He was reckoned with transgressors. [5835] The Master a crucified Malefactor - what could His followers expect? But once more they understood Him in a grossly realistic manner. These Galileans, after the custom of their countrymen, [5836] had provided themselves with short swords, which they concealed under their upper garment. It was natural for men of their disposition, so imperfectly understanding their Master's teaching, to have taken what might seem to them only a needful precaution in coming to Jerusalem. At least two of them - among them Peter - now produced swords. [5837] But this was not the time of reason with them, and our Lord simply put it aside. Events would only too soon teach them. They had now reached the entrance of Gethsemane. It may have been that it led through the building with the oil-press,' and that the eight Apostles, who were not to come nearer to the Bush burning, but not

consumed,' were left there. Or they may have been taken within the entrance of the Garden, and left there, while, pointing forward with a gesture of the Hand, He went yonder' and prayed [5838] According to St. Luke, He added the parting warning to pray that they might not enter into temptation. Eight did He leave there. The other three - Peter, James and John - companions before of His glory, both when He raised the daughter of Jairus [5839] and on the Mount of Transfiguration [5840] - He took with Him farther. If in that last contest His Human Soul craved for the presence of those who stood nearest Him and loved Him best, or if He would have them baptized with His Baptism, and drink of His Cup, these were the three of all others to be chosen. And now of a sudden the cold flood broke over Him. Within these few moments He had passed from the calm of assured victory into the anguish of the contest. Increasingly, with every step forward, He became sorrowful,' full of sorrow, sore amazed,' and desolate.' [5841] He told them of the deep sorrow of His Soul (psuch) even unto death, and bade them tarry there to watch with Him. Himself went forward to enter the contest with prayer. Only the first attitude of the wrestling Saviour saw they, only the first words in that Hour of Agony did they hear. For, as in our present state not uncommonly in the deepest emotions of the soul, and as had been the case on the Mount of Transfiguration, irresistible sleep crept over their frame. But what, we may reverently ask, was the cause of this sorrow unto death of the Lord Jesus Christ? Not fear, either of bodily or mental suffering: but Death. Man's nature, created of God immortal, shrinks (by the law of its nature) from the dissolution of the bond that binds body to soul. Yet to fallen man Death is not by any means fully Death, for he is born with the taste of it in his soul. Not so Christ. It was the Unfallen Man dying; it was He, Who had no experience of it, tasting Death, and that not for Himself but for every man, emptying the cup to its bitter dregs. It was the Christ undergoing Death by man and for man; the Incarnate God, the God-Man, submitting Himself vicariously to the deepest humilition, and paying the utmost penalty: Death - all Death. No one as He could know what Death was (not dying, which men dread, but Christ dreaded not); no one could taste its bitterness as He. His going into Death was His final conflict with Satan for man, and on his behalf. By submitting to it He took away the power of Death; He disarmed Death by burying his shaft in His own Heart. And beyond this lies the deep, unutterable mystery of Christ bearing the penalty due to our sin, bearing our death, bearing the penalty of the broken Law, the accumulated guilt of humanity, and the holy wrath of the Righteous Judge upon them. And in view of this mystery the heaviness of sleep seems to steal over our apprehension. Alone, as in His first conflict with the Evil One in the Temptation in the wilderness, must the Saviour enter on the last contest. With what agony of soul He took upon Him now and there the sins of the world, and in taking expiated them, we may learn from this account of what passed, when, with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death,' He offered up prayers and supplications.' [5842] And - we anticipate it already - with these results: that He was heard; that He learned obedience by the things which He suffered; that He was made perfect; and that He became: to us the Author of Eternal Salvation, and before God, a High-Priest after the order of Melchizedek. Alone - and yet even this being parted from them' (pespsthe), [5843] implied sorrow. [5844] [5845] And now, on His knees,' prostrate on the ground, prostrate on His Face, began His Agony. His very address bears witness to it. It is the only time, so far as recorded in the Gospels, when He addressed God with the personal pronoun: My Father.' [5846] [5847] The object of the prayer was, that, if it were possible, the hour might pass away from Him.' [5848] The subject of the prayer (as recorded by the three Gospels) was, that the Cup itself might pass away, yet always with the limitation, that not His Will

but the Father's might be done. The petition of Christ, therefore, was subject not only to the Will of the Father, but to His own Will that the Father's Will might be done. [5849] We are here in full view of the deepest mystery of our faith: the two Natures in One Person. Both Natures spake here, and the if it be possible' of St. Matthew and St. Mark is in St. Luke if Thou be willing.' In any case, the possibility' is not physical - for with God all things are possible - but moral: that of inward fitness. Was there, then, any thought or view of a possibility,' that Christ's work could be accomplished without that hour and Cup? Or did it only mark the utmost limit of His endurance and submission? We dare not answer; we only reverently follow what is recorded. It was in this extreme Agony of Soul almost unto death, that the Angel appeared (as in the Temptation in the wilderness) to strengthen' and support His Body and Soul. And so the conflict went on, with increasing earnestness of prayer, all that terrible hour. [5850] For, the appearance of the Angel must have intimated to Him, that the Cup could not pass away. [5851] And at the close of that hour - as we infer from the fact that the disciples must still have seen on His Brow the marks of the Bloody Sweat [5852] - His Sweat, mingled with Blood, [5853] fell in great drops on the ground. And when the Saviour with this mark of His Agony on His Brow [5854] returned to the three, He found that deep sleep held them. While He lay in prayer, they lay in sleep; and yet where soul-agony leads not to the one, it often induces the other. His words, primarily addressed to Simon,' roused them, yet not sufficiently to fully carry to their hearts either the loving reproach, the admonition to Watch and pray' in view of the coming temptation, or the most seasonable warning about the weakness of the flesh, even where the spirit was willing, ready and ardent (prthumon).The conflict had been virtually, though not finally, decided, when the Saviour went back to the three sleeping disciples. He now returned to complete it, though both the attitude in which He prayed (no longer prostrate) and the wording of His Prayer - only slightly altered as it was - indicate how near it was to perfect victory. And once more, on His return to them, He found that sleep had weighted their eyes, and they scarce knew what answer to make to Him. Yet a third time He left them to pray as before. And now He returned victorious. After three assualts had the Tempter left Him in the wilderness; after the threefold conflict in the Garden he was vanquished. Christ came forth triumphant. No longer did He bid His disciples watch. They might, nay they should, sleep and take rest, ere the near terrible events of His Betrayal - for, the hour had come when the Son of Man was to be betrayed into the hands of sinners.A very brief period of rest this, [5855] soon broken by the call of Jesus to rise and go to where the other eight had been left, at the entrance of the Garden - to go forward and meet the band which was coming under the guidance of the Betrayer. And while He was speaking, the heavy tramp of many men and the light of lanterns and torches indicated the approach of Judas and his band. During the hours that had passed all had been prepared. When, according to arrangement, he appeared at the High-Priestly Palace, or more probably at that of Annas, who seems to have had the direction of affairs, the Jewish leaders first communicated with the Roman garrison. By their own admission they possessed no longer (for forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem) the power of pronouncing capital sentence. [5856] It is difficult to understand how, in view of this fact (so fully confirmed in the New Testament), it could have been imagined (as so generally) that the Sanhedrin had, in regular session, sought formally to pronounce on Jesus what, admittedly, they had not the power to execute. Nor, indeed, did they, when appealing to Pilate, plead that they had pronounced sentence of death, but only that they had a law by which Jesus should die. [5857] It was otherwise as regarded civil causes, or even minor offences. The Sanhedrin, not possessing the power of the sword, had, of course, neither

soldiery, nor regularly armed band at command. The Temple-guard' under their officers served merely for purposes of police, and, indeed, were neither regularly armed nor trained. [5858] Nor would the Romans have tolerated a regular armed Jewish force in Jerusalem.We can now understand the progress of events. In the fortress of Antonia, close to the Temple and connected with it by two stairs, [5859] lay the Roman garrison. But during the Feast the Temple itself was guarded by an armed Cohort, consisting of from 400 to 600 men, [5860] so as to prevent or quell any tumult among the numerous pilgrims. [5861] It would be to the captain of this Cohort' that the Chief Priests and leaders of the Pharisees would, in the first place, apply for an armed guard to effect the arrest of Jesus, on the ground that it might lead to some popular tumult. This, without necessarily having to state the charge that was to be brought against Him, which might have led to other complications. Although St. John speaks of the band' by a word (spera) which always designates a Cohort' - in this case the Cohort,' the definite article marking it as that of the Temple - yet there is no reason for believing that the whole Cohort was sent. Still, its commander would scarcely have sent a strong detachment out of the Temple, and on what might lead to a riot, without having first referred to the Procurator, Pontius Pilate. And if further evidence were required, it would be in the fact that the band was led not by a Centurion, but by a Chiliarch, [5862] which, as there were no intermediate grades in the Roman army, must represent one of the six tribunes attached to each legion. This also explains not only the apparent preparedness of Pilate to sit in judgment early next morning, but also how Pilate's wife may have been disposed for those dreams about Jesus which so affrighted her. This Roman detachment, armed with swords and staves' - with the latter of which Pilate on other occasions also directed his soldiers to attack them who raised a tumult [5863] - was accompanied by servants from the High-Priest's Palace, and other Jewish officers, to direct the arrest of Jesus. They bore torches and lamps placed on the top of poles, so as to prevent any possible concealment. [5864]Whether or not this was the great multitude' mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Mark, or the band was swelled by volunteers or curious onlookers, is a matter of no importance. Having received this band, Judas proceeded on his errand. As we believe, their first move was to the house where the Supper had been celebrated. Learning that Jesus had left it with His disciples, perhaps two or three hours before, Judas next directed the band to the spot he knew so well: to Gethsemane. A signal by which to recognise Jesus seemed almost necessary with so large a band, and where escape or resistance might be apprehended. It was - terrible to say - none other than a kiss. As soon as he had so marked Him, the guard were to seize, and lead Him safely away.Combining the notices in the four Gospels, we thus picture to ourselves the succession of events. As the band reached the Garden, Judas went somewhat in advance of them, [5865] and reached Jesus just as He had roused the three and was preparing to go and meet His captors. He saluted Him, Hail, Rabbi,' so as to be heard by the rest, and not only kissed but covered Him with kisses, kissed Him repeatedly, loudly, effusively (katephilesen). The Saviour submitted to the indignity, not stopping, but only saying as He passed on: Friend, that for which thou art here;' [5866] [5867] and then, perhaps in answer to his questioning gesture: Judas, with a kiss deliverest thou up the Son of Man?' [5868] If Judas had wished, by thus going in advance of the band and saluting the Master with a kiss, even now to act the hypocrite and deceive Jesus and the disciples, as if he had not come with the armed men, perhaps only to warn Him of their approach, what the Lord said must have reached his inmost being. Indeed, it was the first mortal shaft in the soul of Judas. The only time we again see him, till he goes on what ends in his self-destruction, is as he stands, as it were sheltering himself, with the

armed men. [5869]It is at this point, as we suppose, that the notices from St. John's Gospel [5870] come in. Leaving the traitor, and ignoring the signal which he had given them, Jesus advanced to the band, and asked them: Whom seek ye?' To the brief spoken, perhaps somewhat contemptuous, Jesus the Nazarene,' He replied with infinite calmness and majesty: I am He.' The immediate effect of these words was, we shall not say magical, but Divine. They had no doubt been prepared for quite other: either compromise, fear, or resistance. But the appearance and majesty of that calm Christ - heaven in His look and peace on His lips - was too overpowering in its effects on that untutored heathen soldiery, who perhaps cherished in their hearts secret misgivings of the work they had in hand. The foremost of them went backward, and they fell to the ground. But Christ's hour had come. And once more He now asked them the same question as before, and, on repeating their former answer, He said: I told you that I am He; if therefore ye seek Me, let these go their way,' - the Evangelist seeing in this watchful care over His own the initial fulfilment of the words which the Lord had previously spoken concerning their safe preservation, [5871] not only in the sense of their outward preservation, but in that of their being guarded from such temptations as, in their then state, they could not have endured.The words of Christ about those that were with Him seem to have recalled the leaders of the guard to full consciousness - perhaps awakened in them fears of a possible rising at the incitement of His adherents. Accordingly, it is here that we insert the notice of St. Matthew, [5872] and of St. Mark, [5873] that they laid hands on Jesus and took Him. Then it was that Peter, [5874] seeing what was coming, drew the sword which he carried, and putting the question to Jesus, but without awaiting His answer, struck at Malchus, [5875] the servant [5876] of the High-Priest - perhaps the Jewish leader of the band - cutting off his ear. But Jesus immediately restrained all such violence, and rebuked all self-vindication by outward violence (the taking of the sword that had not been received) - nay, with it all merely outward zeal, pointing to the fact how easily He might, as against this cohort,' have commanded Angelic legions. [5877] [5878] He had in wrestling Agony received from His Father that Cup to drink, [5879] [5880] and the Scriptures must in that wise be fulfilled. And so saying, He touched the ear of Malchus, and healed him. [5881]But this faint appearance of resistance was enough for the guard. Their leaders now bound Jesus. [5882] It was to this last, most underserved and uncalled-for indignity that Jesus replied by asking them, why they had come against Him as against a robber - one of those wild, murderous Sicarii. Had He not been all that week daily in the Temple, teaching? Why not then seize Him? But this hour' of theirs that had come, and the power of darkness' - this also had been foretold in Scripture! And as the ranks of the armed men now closed around the bound Christ, none dared to stay with Him, lest they also should be bound as resisting authority. So they all forsook Him and fled. But there was one there who joined not in the flight, but remained, a deeply interested onlooker. When the soldiers had come to seek Jesus in the Upper Chamber of his home, Mark, roused from sleep, had hastily cast about him the loose linen garment or wrapper [5883] that lay by his bedside, and followed the armed band to see what would come of it. He now lingered in the rear, and followed as they led away Jesus, never imagining that they would attempt to lay hold on him, since he had not been with the disciples nor yet in the Garden. But they, [5884] perhaps the Jewish servants of the High-Priest, had noticed him. They attempted to lay hold on him, when, disengaging himself from their grasp, he left his upper garment in their hands, and fled.So ended the first scene in the terrible drama of that night.

CHAPTER XIII. THURSDAY NIGHT - BEFORE ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS - PETER AND JESUS.

(St. John xviii.12-14; St. Matt. xxvi.57, 58; St. Mark xiv.53, 54; St. Luke xxii.54, 55; St. John xviii.24, 15-18; St. John xviii.19-23; St. Matt. xxvi.69, 70; St. Mark xiv.66-68; St. Luke xxii.56, 57; St. John xviii.17, 18; St. Matt. xxvi.71, 72; St. Mark xiv.69, 70; St. Luke xxii.58; St. John xviii.25; St. Matt. xxvi.59-68; St. Mark xiv.55-65; St. Luke xxii.67-71, 63-65; St. Matt. xxvi.73-75; St. Mark xiv.70-72; St. Luke xxii.59-62; St. John xviii.26, 27.) IT was not a long way that they led the bound Christ. Probably through the same gate by which He had gone forth with His disciples after the Paschal Supper, up to where, on the slope between the Upper City and the Tyropoeon, stood the well-known Palace of Annas. There were no idle saunterers in the streets of Jerusalem at that late hour, and the tramp of the Roman guard must have been too often heard to startle sleepers, or to lead to the inquiry why that glare of lamps and torches, and Who was the Prisoner, guarded on that holy night by both Roman soldiers and servants of the High-Priest. If every incident in that night were not of such supreme interest, we might dismiss the question as almost idle, why they brought Jesus to the house of Annas, since he was not at that time the actual High-Priest. That office now devolved on Caiaphas, his son-in-law, who, as the Evangelist significantly reminds us, [5885] had been the first to enunciate in plain words what seemed to him the political necessity for the judicial murder of Christ. [5886] There had been no pretence on his part of religious motives or zeal for God; he had cynically put it in a way to override the scruples of those old Sanhedrists by raising their fears. What was the use of discussing about forms of Law or about that Man? it must in any case be done; even the friends of Jesus in the Council, as well as the punctilious observers of Law, must regard His Death as the less of two evils. He spoke as the bold, unscrupulous, determined man that he was; Sadducee in heart rather than by conviction; a worthy son-in-law of Annas. No figure is better known in contemporary Jewish history than that of Annas; no person deemed more fortunate or successful, but none also more generally execrated than the late High-Priest. He had held the Pontificate for only six or seven years; but it was filled by not fewer than five of his sons, by his son-in-law Caiaphas, and by a grandson. And in those days it was, at least for one of Annas' disposition, much better to have been than to be High-Priest. He enjoyed all the dignity of the office, and all its influence also, since he was able to promote to it those most closely connected with him. And, while they acted publicly, he really directed affairs, without either the responsibility or the restraints which the office imposed. His influence with the Romans he owned to the religious views which he professed. to his open partisanship of the foreigner, and to his enormous wealth. The Sadducean Annas was an eminently safe Churchman, not troubled with any special convictions nor with Jewish fanaticism, a pleasant and a useful man also who was able to furnish his friends in the Prætorium with large sums of money. We have seen what immense revenues the family of Annas must have derived from the Temple-booths, and how nefarious and unpopular was the traffic. The names of those bold, licentious, unscrupulous, degenerate sons of Aaron were spoken with whispered curses. [5887] Without referring to Christ's interference with that Temple-traffic, which, if His authority had prevailed, would, of course, have

been fatal to it, we can understand how antithetic in every respect a Messiah, and such a Messiah as Jesus, must have been to Annas. He was as resolutely bent on His Death as his son-in-law, though with his characteristic cunning and coolness, not in the hasty, bluff manner of Caiaphas. It was probably from a desire that Annas might have the conduct of the business, or from the active, leading part which Annas took in the matter; perhaps for even more prosaic and practical reasons, such as that the Palace of Annas was nearer to the place of Jesus' capture, and that it was desirable to dismiss the Roman soldiery as quickly as possible - that Christ was first brought to Annas, and not to the actual High-Priest. In any case, the arrangement was most congruous, whether as regards the character of Annas, or the official position of Caiaphas. The Roman soldiers had evidently orders to bring Jesus to the late High-Priest. This appears from their proceeding directly to him, and from this, that apparently they returned to quarters immediately on delivering up their prisoner. [5888] And we cannot ascribe this to any official position of Annas in the Sanhedrin, first, because the text implies that it had not been due to this cause, [5889] and, secondly, because, as will presently appear, the proceedings against Christ were not those of the ordinary and regular meetings of the Sanhedrin. No account is given of what passed before Annas. Even the fact of Christ's being first brought to him is only mentioned in the Fourth Gospel. As the disciples had all forsaken Him and fled, we can understand that they were in ignorance of what actually passed, till they had again rallied, at least so far, that Peter and another disciple,' evidently John, followed Him into the Palace of the High-priest' - that is, into the Palace of Caiaphas, not of Annas. For as, according to the three Synoptic Gospels, the Palace of the High-Priest Caiaphas was the scene of Peter's denial, the account of it in the Fourth Gospel [5890] [5891] must refer to the same locality, and not to the Palace of Annas, while the suggestion that Annas and Caiaphas occupied the same dwelling is not only very unlikely in itself, but seems incompatible with the obvious meaning of the notice, [5892] Now Annas sent Him bound unto Caiaphas the High-Priest.' But if Peter's denial, as recorded by St. John, is the same as that described by the Synoptists, and took place in the house of Caiaphas, then the account of the examination by the High-Priest, [5893] which follows the notice about Peter, must also refer to that by Caiaphas, not Annas. [5894] We thus know absolutely nothing of what passed in the house of Annas - if, indeed, anything passed - except that Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas. [5895] Of what occurred in the Palace of Caiaphas we have two accounts. That of St. John [5896] seems to refer to a more private interview between the High-Priest and Christ, at which, apparently, only some personal attendants of Caiaphas were present, from one of whom the Apostle may have derived his information. [5897] The second account is that of the Synoptists, and refers to the examination of Jesus at dawn of day [5898] by the leading Sanhedrists, who had been hastily summoned for the purpose. It sounds almost like presumption to say, that in His first interview with Caiaphas Jesus bore Himself with the majesty of the Son of God, Who knew all that was before Him, and passed through it as on the way to the accomplishment of His Mission. The questions of Caiaphas bore on two points: the disciples of Jesus, and His teaching - the former to incriminate Christ's followers, the latter to incriminate the Master. To the first inquiry it was only natural that He should not have condescended to return an answer. The reply to the second was characterised by that openness' which He claimed for all that He had said. [5899] [5900] If there was to be not unprejudiced, but even fair inquiry, let Caiaphas not try to extort confessions to which he had no legal right, nor to ensnare Him when the purpose was evidently murderous. If he really wanted information, there could be no difficulty in procuring witnesses to speak to His doctrine: all Jewry

knew it. His was no secret doctrine (in secret I spake nothing'). He always spoke in Synagogue and in the Temple, whither all the Jews gather together.' [5901] If the inquiry were a fair one, let the judge act judicially, and ask not Him, but those who had heard Him. It must be admitted, that the answer sounds not like that of one accused, who seeks either to make apology, or even greatly cares to defend himself. And there was in it that tone of superiority which even injured human innocence would have a right to assume before a nefarious judge, who sought to ensnare a victim, not to elicit the truth. It was this which emboldened one of those servile attendants, with the brutality of an Eastern in such circumstances, to inflict on the Lord that terrible blow. Let us hope that it was a heathen, not a Jew, who so lifted his hand. We are almost thankful that the text leaves it in doubt, whether it was with the palm of the hand, or the lesser indignity - with a rod. Humanity itself seems to reel and stagger under this blow. In pursuance of His Human submission, the Divine Sufferer, without murmuring or complaining, or without asserting His Divine Power, only answered in such tone of patient expostulation as must have convicted the man of his wrong, or at least have left him speechless. May it have been that these words and the look of Christ had gone to his heart, and that the now strangely-silenced malefactor became the confessing narrator of this scene to the Apostle John? 2. That Apostle was, at any rate, no stranger in the Palace of Caiaphas. We have already seen that, after the first panic of Christ's sudden capture and their own flight, two of them at least, Peter and John, seem speedily to have rallied. Combining the notices of the Synoptists [5902] with the fuller details, in this respect, of the Fourth Gospel, [5903] we derive the impression that Peter, so far true to his word, had been the first to stop in his flight and to follow afar off.' If he reached the Palace of Annas in time, he certainly did not enter it, bnt probably waited outside during the brief space which preceded the transference of Jesus to Caiaphas. He had now been joined by John, and the two followed the melancholy procession which escorted Jesus to the High-Priest. John seems to have entered the court' along with the guard, [5904] while Peter remained outside till his fellow-Apostle, who apparently was well known in the High-Priest's house, had spoken to the maid who kept the door - the male servants being probably all gathered in the court [5905] - and so procured his admission. Remembering that the High-Priest's Palace was built on the slope of the hill, and that there was an outer court, from which a door led into the inner court, we can, in some measure, realise the scene. As previously stated, Peter had followed as far as that inner door, while John had entered with the guard. When he missed his fellow-disciple, who was left outside this inner door, John went out,' and, having probably told the waiting-maid that this was a friend of his, procured his admission. While John now hurried up to be in the Palace, and as near Christ as he might, Peter advanced into the middle of the court, where, in the chill spring night, a coal fire had been lighted. The glow of the charcoal, around which occasionally a blue flame played, threw a peculiar sheen on the bearded faces of the men as they crowded around it, and talked of the events of that night, describing, with Eastern volubility, to those who had not been there what had passed in the Garden, and exchanging, as is the manner of such serving-men and officials, opinions and exaggerated denunciations concerning Him Who had been captured with such unexpected ease, and was now their master's safe Prisoner. As the red light glowed and flickered, it threw the long shadows of these men across the inner court, up the walls towards the gallery that ran round, up there, where the lamps and lights within, or as they moved along apartments and corridors, revealed other faces: there, where, in an inner audience-chamber, the Prisoner was confronted by His enemy, accuser, and judge. What a contrast it all seemed between the Purification of the Temple only a few days before, when the

same Jesus had overturned the trafficking tables of the High-Priest, and as He now stood, a bound Prisoner before him, at the mercy of every menial who might carry favour by wantonly insulting Him? It was a chill night when Peter, down beneath,' [5906] looked up to the lighted windows. There, among the serving-men in the court, he was in every sense without.' [5907] He approached the group around the fire. He would hear what they had to say; besides, it was not safe to stand apart; he might be recognised as one of those who had only escaped capture in the Garden by hasty flight. And then it was chill - and not only to the body, the chill had struck to his soul. Was he right in having come there at all? Commentators have discussed it as involving neglect of Christ's warning. As if the love of any one who was, and felt, as Peter, could have credited the possibility of what he had been warned of; and, if he had credited it, would, in the first moments of returning flood after the panic of his flight, have remembered that warning, or with cool calculation acted up to the full measure of it! To have fled to his home and shut the door behind him, by way of rendering it impossible to deny that he knew Christ, would not have been Peter nor any true disciple. Nay, it would itself have been a worse and more cowardly denial than that of which he was actually guilty. Peter followed afar off, thinking of nothing else but his imprisoned Master, and that he would see the end, whatever it might be. But now it was chill, very chill, to body and soul, and Peter remembered it all; not, indeed, the warning, but that of which he had been warned. What good could his confession do? perhaps much possible harm; and why was he there?Peter was very restless, and yet he must seem very quiet. He sat down' among the servants, [5908] then he stood up among them. [5909] It was this restlessness of attempted indifference which attracted the attention of the maid who had at the first admitted him. As in the uncertain light she scanned the features of the mysterious stranger, she boldly charged him, [5910] though still in a questioning tone, with being one of the disciples of the Man Who stood incriminated up there before the High-Priest. And in the chattering of his soul's fever, into which the chill had struck, Peter vehemently denied all knowledge of Him to Whom the woman referred, nay, of the very meaning of what she said. He had said too much not to bring soon another charge upon himself. We need not inquire which of the slightly varying reports in the Gospels represents the actual words of the woman or the actual answer of Peter. Perhaps neither; perhaps all - certainly, she said all this, and, certainly, he answered all that, though neither of them would confine their words to the short sentences reported by each of the Evangelists.What had he to do there? And why should he incriminate himself, or perhaps Christ, by a needless confession to those who had neither the moral nor the legal right to exact it? That was all he now remembered and thought; nothing about any denial of Christ. And so, as they were still chatting together, perhaps bandying words, Peter withdrew. We cannot judge how long time had passed, but this we gather, that the words of the woman had either not made any impression on those around the fire, or that the bold denial of Peter had satisfied them. Presently, we find Peter walking away down the porch,' [5911] which ran round and opened into the outer court.' [5912] He was not thinking of anything else now than how chilly it felt, and how right he had been in not being entrapped by that woman. And so he heeded it not, while his footfall sounded along the marble-paved porch, that just at this moment a cock crew.' But there was no sleep that night in the High-Priest's Palace. As he walked down the porch towards the outer court, first one maid met him; and then, as he returned from the outer court, he once more encountered his old accuser, the door-portress; and as he crossed the inner court to mingle again with the group around the fire, where he had formerly found safety, he was first accosted by one man, and then they all around the fire turned upon him, and each and all had the

same thing to say, the same charge, that he was also one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth. But Peter's resolve was taken; he was quite sure it was right; and to each separately, and to all together, he gave the same denial, more brief now, for he was collected and determined, but more emphatic - even with an oath. [5913] And once more he silenced suspicion for a time. Or, perhaps, attention was now otherwise directed.3. For, already, hasty footsteps were heard along the porches and corridors, and the maid who that night opened the gate at the High-Priest's Palace was busy at her post. They were the leading Priests, Elders, and Sanhedrists, [5914] who had been hastily summoned to the High-Priest's Palace, and who were hurrying up just as the first faint streaks of gray light were lying on the sky. The private examination by Caiaphas we place (as in the Gospel of St. John) between the first and second denial of Peter; the first arrival of Sanhedrists immediately after his second denial. The private inquiry of Caiaphas had elicited nothing; and, indeed, it was only preliminary. The leading Sanhedrists must have been warned that the capture of Jesus would be attempted that night, and to hold themselves in readiness when summoned to the High-Priest. This is not only quite in accordance with all the previous and after circumstances in the narrative, but nothing short of a procedure of such supreme importance would have warranted the presence for such a purpose of these religious leaders on that holy Passover-night. But whatever view be taken, thus much at least is certain, that it was no formal, regular meeting of the Sanhedrin. We put aside, as à priori reasoning, such considerations as that protesting voices would have been raised, not only from among the friends of Jesus, but from others whom (with all their Jewish hatred of Christ) we cannot but regard as incapable of such gross violation of justice and law. But all Jewish order and law would have been grossly infringed in almost every particular, if this had been a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin. [5915] We know what their forms were, although many of them (as so much in Rabbinic accounts) may represent rather the ideal than the real - what the Rabbis imagined should be, rather than what was; or else what may date from later times. According to Rabbinic testimony, there were three tribunals. In towns numbering less than 120 (or, according to one authority, 230 [5916]) male inhabitants, there was only the lowest tribunal, that consisting of three Judges. [5917] Their jurisdiction was limited, and notably did not extend to capital causes. [5918] The authority of the tribunal of next instance - that of twenty-three [5919] - was also limited, although capital causes lay within its competence. The highest tribunal was that of seventy-one, or the Great Sanhedrin, which met first in one of the Temple-Chambers, the so-called Lishkath haGazith - or Chamber of Hewn Stones - and at the time of which we write in the booths of the sons of Annas.' [5920] The Judges of all these Courts were equally set apart by ordination (Semikhah), originally that of the laying on of hands. Ordination was conferred by three, of whom one at least must have been himself ordained, and able to trace up his ordination through Joshua to Moses. [5921] This, of course, on the theory that there had been a regular succession of ordained Teachers, not only up to Ezra, but beyond him to Joshua and Moses. The members of the tribunals of twenty-three were appointed by the Great Sanhedrin. [5922] The members of the tribunals of three were likewise appointed by the Great Sanhedrin, which entrusted to men, specially accredited and worthy, the duty of travelling through the towns of Palestine and appointing and ordaining in them the men best fitted for the office. [5923] The qualifications mentioned for the office remind us of those which St. Paul indicates as requisite for the Christian eldership. [5924]Some inferences seem here of importance, as throwing light on early Apostolic arrangements - believing, as we do, that the outward form of the Church was in great measure derived from the Synagogue. First, we notice that there was regular ordination,

and, at first at least, by the laying on of hands. Further, this ordination was not requisite either for delivering addresses or conducting the liturgy in the Synagogue, but for authoritative teaching, and especially for judicial functions, to which would correspond in the Christian Church the power of the Keys - the administration of discipline and of the Sacraments as admitting into, and continuing in the fellowship of the Church. Next, ordination could only be conferred by those who had themselves been rightly ordained, and who could, therefore, through those previously ordained, trace their ordination upwards. Again, each of these Colleges of Presbyters' had its Chief or President. Lastly, men entrusted with supreme (Apostolic) authority were sent to the various towns to appoint elders in every city.' [5925]The appointment to the highest tribunal, or Great Sanhedrin, was made by that tribunal itself, either by promoting a member of the inferior tribunals or one from the foremost of the three rows, in which the disciples' or students sat facing the Judges. The latter sat in a semicircle, under the presidency of the Nasi (prince') and the vice-presidency of the Ab-beth-din (father of the Court of Law'). [5926] At least twenty-three members were required to form a quorum. [5927] We have such minute details of the whole arrangements and proceedings of this Court as greatly confirms our impression of the chiefly ideal character of some of the Rabbinic notices. Facing the semicircle of Judges, we are told, there were two shorthand writers, to note down, respectively, the speeches in favour and against the accused. Each of the students knew, and sat in his own place. In capital causes the arguments in defence of and afterwards those incriminating the accused, were stated. If one had spoken in favour, he might not again speak against the panel. Students might speak for, not against him. He might be pronounced not guilty' on the same day on which the case was tried; but a sentence of guilty' might only be pronounced on the day following that of the trial. It seems, however, at least doubtful, whether in case of profanation of the Divine Name (Chillul haShem), judgment was not immediately executed. [5928] Lastly, the voting began with the youngest, so that juniors might not be influenced by the seniors; and a bare majority was not sufficient for condemnation. These are only some of the regulations laid down in Rabbinic writings. It is of greater importance to enquire, how far they were carried out under the iron rule of Herod and that of the Roman Procurators. Here we are in great measure left to conjecture. We can well believe that neither Herod nor the Procurators would wish to abolish the Sanhedrin, but would leave to them the administration of justice, especially in all that might in any way be connected with purely religious questions. Equally we can understand, that both would deprive them of the power of the sword and of decision on all matters of political or supreme importance. Herod would reserve to himself the final disposal in all cases, if he saw fit to interfere, and so would the Procurators, who especially would not have tolerated any attempt at jurisdiction over a Roman citizen. In short, the Sanhedrin would be accorded full jurisdiction in inferior and in religious matters, with the greatest show, but with the least amount, of real rule or of supreme authority. Lastly, as both Herod and the Procurators treated the High-Priest, who was their own creature, as the real head and representative of the Jews; and as it would be their policy to curtail the power of the independent and fanatical Rabbis, we can understand how, in great criminal causes or in important investigations, the High-Priest would always preside - the presidency of the Nasi being reserved for legal and ritual questions and discussions. And with this the notices alike in the New Testament and in Josephus accord.Even this brief summary about the Sanhedrin would be needless, if it were a question of applying its rules of procedure to the arraignment of Jesus. For, alike Jewish and Christian evidence establish the fact, that Jesus was not formally tried and condemned by the Sanhedrin. It is admitted on all hands, that forty years

before the destruction of the Temple the Sanhedrin ceased to pronounce capital sentences. This alone would be sufficient. But, besides, the trial and sentence of Jesus in the Palace of Caiaphas would (as already stated) have outraged every principle of Jewish criminal law and procedure. Such causes could only be tried, and capital sentence pronounced, in the regular meeting-place of the Sanhedrin, [5929] [5930] not, as here, in the High-Priest's Palace; no process, least of all such an one, might be begun in the night, not even in the afternoon, [5931] [5932] although if the discussion had gone on all day, sentence might be pronounced at night. [5933] Again, no process could take place on Sabbaths or Feastdays, [5934] or even on the eves of them, [5935] [5936] although this would not have nullified proceedings, and it might be argued on the other side, that a process against one who had seduced the people should preferably by carried on, and sentence executed, at the great public Feasts, [5937] for the warning of all. Lastly, in capital causes there was a very elaborate system of warning and cautioning witnesses, [5938] while it may safely be affirmed, that at a regular trial Jewish Judges, however prejudiced, would not have acted as the Sanhedrists and Caiaphas did on this occasion.But as we examine it more closely, we perceive that the Gospel-narratives do not speak of a formal trial and sentence by the Sanhedrin. Such references as to the Sanhedrin' (council'), or to all the Sanhedrin,' must be taken in the wider sense, which will presently be explained. On the other hand, the four Gospels equally indicate that the whole proceedings of that night were carried on in the Palace of Caiaphas, and that during that night no formal sentence of death was pronounced. St. John, indeed, does not report the proceedings at all; St. Matthew [5939] only records the question of Caiaphas and the answer of the Sanhedrists; and even the language of St. Mark does not convey the idea of a formal sentence. [5940] And when in the morning, in consequence of a fresh consultation, also in the Palace of Caiaphas, they led Jesus to the Prætorium, it was not as a prisoner condemned to death of whom they asked the execution, [5941] but as one against whom they laid certain accusations worthy of death, [5942] while, when Pilate bade them judge Jesus according to Jewish Law, they replied, not: that they had done so already, but, that they had no competence to try capital causes. [5943]4. But although Christ was not tried and sentenced in a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin, there can, alas! be no question that His Condemnation and Death were the work, if not of the Sanhedrin - yet of the Sanhedrists, of the whole body of them (all the council'), in the sense of expressing what was the judgment and purpose of all the Supreme Council and Leaders of Israel, with only very few exceptions. We bear in mind, that the resolution to sacrifice Christ had for some time been taken. Terrible as the proceedings of that night were, they even seem a sort of concession - as if the Sanhedrists would fain have found some legal and moral justification for what they had determined to do. They first sought witness,' or as St. Matthew rightly designates it, false witness' against Christ. [5944] Since this was throughout a private investigation, this witness could only have been sought from their own creatures. Hatred, fanaticism, and unscruplous Eastern exaggeration would readily misrepresent and distort certain sayings of Christ, or falsely impute others to Him. But it was altogather too hasty and excited an assemblage, and the witnesses contradicted themselves so grossly, or their testimony so notoriously broke down, that for very shame such trumped-up charges had to be abandoned. And to this result the majestic calm of Christ's silence must have greatly contributed. On directly false and contradictory testimony it must be best not to cross-examine at all, not to interpose, but to leave the false witness to destroy itself. Abandoning this line of testimony, the Priests next brought forward probably some of their own order, who on the first Purgation of the Temple had been present when

Jesus, in answer to the challenge for a sign' in evidence of His authority, had given them that mysterious sign' of the destruction and upraising of the Temple of His Body. [5945] [5946] They had quite misunderstood it at the time, and its reproduction now as the ground of a criminal charge against Jesus must have been directly due to Caiaphas and Annas. We remember, that this had been the first time that Jesus had come into collision, not only with the Temple authorities, but with the avarice of the family of Annas.' We can imagine how the incensed High-Priest would have challenged the conduct of the Temple-officials, and how, in reply, he would have been told what they had attempted, and how Jesus had met them. Perhaps it was the only real inquiry which a man like Caiaphas would care to institute about what Jesus said. And here, in its grossly distorted form, and with more than Eastern exaggeration of partisanship it was actually brought forward as a criminal charge!Dexterously manipulated, the testimony of these witnesses might lead up to two charges. It would show that Christ was a dangerous seducer of the people, Whose claims might have led those who believed them to lay violent hands on the Temple, while the supposed assertion, that He would [5947] or was able [5948] to build the Temple again within three days, might be made to imply Divine or magical pretensions. [5949] A certain class of writers have ridiculed this part of the Sanhedrist plot against Jesus. It is, indeed, true, that, viewed as a Jewish charge, it might have been difficult, if not impossible, to construe a capital crime out of such charges, although, to say the least, a strong popular prejudice might thus have been raised against Jesus - and this, no doubt, was one of the objects which Caiaphas had in view. But it has been strangely forgotten that the purpose of the High-Priest was not to formulate a capital charge in Jewish Law, since the assembled Sanhedrists had no intention so to try Jesus, but to formulate a charge which would tell before the Roman Procurator. And here none other could be so effective as that of being a fanatical seducer of the ignorant populace, who might lead them on to wild tumultuous acts. Two similar instances, in which the Romans quenched Jewish fanaticism in the blood of the pretenders and their deluded followers, will readily recur to the mind. [5950] In any case, Caiaphas would naturally seek to ground his accusation of Jesus before Pilate on anything rather than His claims to Messiahship and the inheritance of David. It would be a cruel irony if a Jewish High-Priest had to expose the loftiest and holiest hope of Israel to the mockery of a Pilate; and it might prove a dangerous proceeding, whether as regarded the Roman Governor or the feelings of the Jewish people.But this charge of being a seducer of the people also broke down, through the disagreement of the two witnesses whom the Mosaic Law required, [5951] and who, according to Rabbinic ordinance, had to be separately questioned. [5952] But the divergence of their testimony does not exactly appear in the differences in the accounts of St. Matthew and of St. Mark. If it be deemed necessary to harmonise these two narratives, it would be better to regard both as relating the testimony of these two witnesses. What St. Mark reported may have been followed by what St. Matthew records, or vice versâ, the one being, so to speak, the basis of the other. But all this time Jesus preserved the same majestic silence as before, nor could the impatience of Caiaphas, who sprang from his seat to confront, and, if possible, browbeat his Prisoner, extract from Him any reply.Only one thing now remained. Jesus knew it well, and so did Caiaphas. It was to put the question, which Jesus could not refuse to answer, and which, once answered, must lead either to His acknowledgement or to His condemnation. In the brief historical summary which St. Luke furnishes, there is an inversion of the sequence of events, by which it might seem as if what he records had taken place at the meeting of the Sanhedrists [5953] on the next morning. But a careful consideration of what passed there obliges us to regard the report of

St. Luke as referring to the night-meeting described by St. Matthew and St. Mark. The motive for St. Luke's inversion of the sequence of events may have been, [5954] that he wished to group in a continuous narrative Peter's threefold denial, the third of which occurred after the night-sitting of the Sanhedrin, at which the final adjuration of Caiaphas elicited the reply which St. Luke records, as well as the other two Evangelists. Be this as it may, we owe to St. Luke another trait in the drama of that night. As we suppose, the simple question was first addressed to Jesus, whether He was the Messiah? to which He replied by referring to the needlessness of such an enquiry, since they had predetermined not to credit His claims, nay, had only a few days before in the Temple refused [5955] to discuss them. [5956] It was upon this that the High-Priest, in the most solemn manner, adjured the True One by the Living God, Whose Son He was, to say it, whether He were the Messiah and Divine - the two being so joined together, not in Jewish belief, but to express the claims of Jesus. No doubt or hesitation could here exist. Solemn, emphatic, calm, majestic, as before had been His silence, was now His speech. And His assertion of what He was, was conjoined with that of what God would show Him to be, in His Resurrection and Sitting at the Right Hand of the Father, and of what they also would see, when He would come in those clouds of heaven that would break over their city and polity in the final storm of judgment. They all heard it - and, as the Law directed when blasphemy was spoken, the High Priest rent both his outer and inner garment, with a rent that might never be repaired. [5957] But the object was attained. Christ would neither explain, modify, nor retract His claims. They had all heard it; what use was there of witnesses, He had spoken Giddupha, [5958] blaspheming.' Then, turning to those assembled, he put to them the usual question which preceded [5959] the formal sentence of death. As given in the Rabbinical original, it is: [5960] What think ye gentlemen? And they answered, if for life, "For life!" and if for death, "For death."' [5961] But the formal sentence of death, which, if it had been a regular meeting of the Sanhedrin, must now have been spoken by the President, [5962] was not pronounced. [5963]There is a curious Jewish conceit, that on the Day of Atonement the golden band on the High Priest's mitre, with the graven words, Holiness unto Jehovah,' atoned for those who had blasphemed. [5964] It stands out in terrible contrast to the figure of Caiaphas on that awful night. Or did the unseen mitre on the True and Eternal High-Priest's Brow, marking the consecration of His Humiliation to Jehovah, plead for them who in that night were gathered there, the blind leaders of the blind? Yet amidst so many most solemn thoughts, some press prominently forward. On that night of terror, when all the enmity of man and the power of hell were unchained, even the falsehood of malevolence could not lay any crime to His charge, nor yet any accusation be brought against him other than the misrepresentation of His symbolic Words. What testimony to Him this solitary false and ill-according witness! Again: They all condemned Him to be worthy of death.' Judaism itself would not now re-echo this sentence of the Sanhedrists. And yet is it not after all true - that He was either the Christ, the Son of God, or a blasphemer? This Man, alone so calm and majestic among those impassioned false judges and false witnesses; majestic in His silence, majestic in His speech; unmoved by threats to speak, undaunted by threats when He spoke; Who saw it all - the end from the beginning; the Judge among His judges, the Witness before His witnesses: which was He - the Christ or a blaspheming impostor? Let history decide; let the heart and conscience of mankind give answer. If He had been what israel said, He deserved the death of the Cross; if He is what the Christmas-bells of the Church, and the chimes of the Resurrection-morning ring out, then do we rightly worship Him as the Son of the Living God, the Christ, the Saviour of men.5. It was after this meeting of the Sanhedrists had broken up, that, as

we learn from the Gospel of St. Luke, the revolting insults and injuries were perpetrated on Him by the guards and servants of Caiaphas. All now rose in combined rebellion against the Perfect Man: the abject servility of the East, which delighted in insults on One Whom it could never have vanquished, and had not even dared to attack; that innate vulgarity, which loves to trample on fallen greatness, and to deck out in its own manner a triumph where no victory has been won; the brutality of the worse than animal in man (since in him it is not under the guidance of Divine instinct), and which, when unchained, seems to intensify in coarseness and ferocity; [5965] and the profanity and devilry which are wont to apply the wretched witticisms of what is misnomered common sense and the blows of tyrannical usurpation of power to all that is higher and better, to what these men cannot grasp and dare not look up to, and before the shadows of which, when cast by superstition, they cower and tremble in abject fear! And yet these insults, taunts, and blows which fell upon that lonely Sufferer, not defenceless, but undefending, not vanquished, but uncontending, not helpless, but majestic in voluntary self-submission for the highest purpose of love - have not only exhibited the curse of humanity, but also removed it by letting it descend on Him, the Perfect Man, the Christ, the Son of God. And ever since has every noble-hearted sufferer been able on the strangely clouded day to look up, and follow what, as it touches earth, is the black misty shadow, to where, illumined by light from behind, it passes into the golden light - a mantle of darkness as it enwraps us, merging in light up there where its folds seem held together by the Hand from heaven.This is our Sufferer - the Christ or a blasphemer; and in that alternative which of us would not choose the part of the Accused rather than of His judges? So far as recorded, not a word escaped His Lips; not a complaint, nor murmur; nor utterance of indignant rebuke, nor sharp cry of deeply sensitive, pained nature. He was drinking, slowly, with the consciousness of willing self-surrender, the Cup which His Father had given Him. And still His Father - and this also specially in His Messianic relationship to man.We have seen that, when Caiaphas and the Sanhedrists quitted the audience-chamber, Jesus was left to the unrestrained licence of the attendants. Even the Jewish Law had it, that no prolonged death' (Mithah Arikhta) might be inflicted, and that he who was condemned to death was not to be previously scourged. [5966] At last they were weary of insult and smiting, and the Sufferer was left alone, perhaps in the covered gallery, or at one of the windows that overlooked the court below. About one hour had passed [5967] since Peter's second denial had, so to speak, been interrupted by the arrival of the Sanhedrists. Since then the excitement of the mock-trial, with witnesses coming and going, and, no doubt, in Eastern fashion repeating what had passed to those gathered in the court around the fire; then the departure of the Sanhedrists, and again the insults and blows inflicted on the Sufferer, had diverted attention from Peter. Now it turned once more upon him; and, in the circumstances, naturally more intensely than before. The chattering of Peter, whom conscience and consciousness made nervously garrulous, betrayed him. This one also was with Jesus the Nazarene; truly, he was of them - for he was also a Galilean! So spake the bystanders; while, according to St. John, a fellow-servant and kinsman of that Malchus, whose ear Peter, in his zeal, had cut off in Gethsemane, asserted that he actually recognised him. To one and all these declarations Peter returned only a more vehement denial, accompanying it this time with oaths to God and imprecations on himself. The echo of his words had scarcely died out - their diastole had scarcely returned them with gurgling noise upon his conscience - when loud and shrill the second cock-crowing was heard. There was that in its harsh persistence of sound that also wakened his memory. He now remembered the words of warning prediction which the Lord had spoken. He

looked up; and as he looked, he saw, how up there, just at that moment; the Lord turned round [5968] and looked upon him - yes, in all that assembly, upon Peter! His eyes spake His Words; nay, much more; they searched down to the innermost depths of Peter's heart, and broke them open. They had pierced through all self-delusion, false shame, and fear: they had reached the man, the disciple, the lover of Jesus. Forth they burst, the waters of conviction, of true shame, of heart-sorrow, of the agonies of self-condemnation; and, bitterly weeping, he rushed from under those suns that had melted the ice of death and burnt into his heart - out from that cursed place of betrayal by Israel, by its High Priest - and even by the representative Disciple.Out he rushed into the night. Yet a night lit up by the stars of promise - chiefest among them this, that the Christ up there - the conquering Sufferer - had prayed for him. God grant us in the night of our conscious self-condemnation the same star-light of His Promises, the same assurance of the intercession of the Christ, that so, as Luther puts it, the particularness of the account of Peter's denial, as compared with the briefness of that of Christ's Passion, may carry to our hearts this lesson: The fruit and use of the sufferings of Christ is this, that in them we have the forgiveness of our sins.'

CHAPTER XIV. THE MORNING OF GOOD FRIDAY.

(St. Matt. xxvii.1, 2, 11-14; St. Mark xv. i-5; St. Luke xxiii.1-5; St. John xviii.28-38; St. Luke xxiii.6-12; St. Matt. xxvii.3-10; St. Matt. xxvii.15-18; St. Mark St. Matt. xxvii.20-31;; St. Mark xv.11-20; St. Luke xxiii.18-25; St. John St. Matt. xxvii.20-31; St. Mark xv.11-20; St. Luke xxiii.18-25; St. John xix.1-16.) The pale grey light had passed into that of early morning, when the Sanhedrists once more assembled in the Palace of Caiaphas. [5969] A comparison with the terms in which they who had formed the gathering of the previous night are described will convey the impression, that the number of those present was now increased, and that they who now came belonged to the wisest and most influential of the Council. It is not unreasonable to suppose, that some who would not take part in deliberations which were virtually a judicial murder might, once the resolution was taken, feel in Jewish casuitry absolved from guilt in advising how the informal sentence might best be carried into effect. It was this, and not the question of Christ's guilt, which formed the subject of deliberation on that early morning. The result of it was to bind' Jesus and hand Him over as a malefactor to Pilate, with the resolve, if possible, not to frame any definite charge; [5970] but, if this became necessary, to lay all the emphasis on the purely political, not the religious aspect of the claims of Jesus. [5971] [5972] To us it may seem strange, that they who, in the lowest view of it, had committed so grossly unrighteous, and were now coming on so cruel and bloody a deed, should have been prevented by religious scruples from entering the Prætorium.' And yet the student of Jewish casuistry will understand it; nay, alas, history and even common observation furnish only too many parallel instances of unscrupulous scrupulosity and unrighteous conscientiousness. Alike conscience and religiousness are only moral tendencies natural to man; whither they tend, must be decided by considerations outside of them: by enlightenment and truth. [5973] The Prætorium,' to which the Jewish leaders, or at least those of them who represented the leaders - for neither Annas nor Caiaphas seems to have been personally present - brought the bound Christ, was (as always in the provinces) the quarters occupied by the Roman Governor. In Cæsarea this was the Palace of Herod, and there St. Paul was afterwards a prisoner. But in Jerusalem there were two such quarters: the fortress Antonia, and the magnificent Palace of Herod at the north-western angle of the Upper City. Although it is impossible to speak with certainty, the balance of probability is entirely in favour of the view that, when Pilate was in Jerusalem with his wife, he occupied the truly royal abode of Herod, and not the fortified barracks of Antonia. [5974] From the slope at the eastern angle, opposite the Temple-Mount, where the Palace of Caiaphas stood, up the narrow streets of the Upper City, the melancholy procession wound to the portals of the grand Palace of Herod. It is recorded, that they who brought Him would not themselves enter the portals of the Palace, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover.' Few expressions have given rise to more earnest controversy than this. On two things at least we can speak with certainty. Entrance into a heathen house did Levitically render impure for that day - that is, till the evening. [5975] The fact of such defilement is clearly attested both in the New Testament [5976] and in the Mishnah, though its reasons might be various. [5977] A person who had so become Levitically unclean was technically called Tebhul Yom (bathed of the day'). The other point is, that, to have so become impure' for the day, would not have disqualified

for eating the Paschal Lamb, since the meal was partaken of after the evening, and when a new day had begun. In fact, it is distinctly laid down [5978] that the bathed of the day,' that is, he who had been impure for the day and had bathed in the evening, did partake of the Paschal Supper, and an instance is related, [5979] when some soldiers who had guarded the gates of Jerusalem immersed,' and ate the Paschal Lamb. It follows that those Sanhedrists could not have abstained from entering the Palace of Pilate because by so doing they would have been disqualified for the Paschal Supper. The point is of importance, because many writers have interpreted the expression the Passover' as referring to the Paschal Supper, and have argued that, according to the Fourth Gospel, our Lord did not on the previous evening partake of the Paschal Lamb, or else that in this respect the account of the Fourth Gospel does not accord with that of the Synoptists. But as, for the reason just stated, it is impossible to refer the expression Passover' to the Paschal Supper, we have only to inquire whether the term is not also applied to other offerings. And here both the Old Testament [5980] and Jewish writings [5981] show, that the term Pesach, or Passover,' was applied not only to the Paschal Lamb, but to all the Passover sacrifices, especailly to what was called the Chagigah, or festive offering (from Chag, or Chagag, to bring the festive sacrifice usual at each of the three Great Feasts). According to the express rule (Chag. i.3) the Chagigah was brought on the first festive Paschal Day. [5982] It was offered immediately after the morning-service, and eaten on that day - probably some time before the evening, when, as we shall by-and-by see, another ceremony claimed public attention. We can therefore quite understand that, not on the eve of the Passover but on the first Paschal day, the Sanhedrists would avoid incurring a defilement which, lasting till the evening, would not only have involved them in the inconvenience of Levitical defilement on the first festive day, but have actually prevented their offering on that day the Passover, festive sacrifice, or Chagigah. For, we have these two express rules: that a person could not in Levitical defilement offer the Chagigah; and that the Chagigah could not be offered for a person by some one else who took his place (Jer. Chag.76 a, lines 16 to 14 from bottom). These considerations and canons seem decisive as regards the views above expressed. There would have been no reason to fear defilement' on the morning of the Paschal Scrafice; but entrance into the Prætorium on the morning of the first Passover-day would have rendered it impossible for them to offer the Chagigah, which is also designated by the term Pesach. It may have been about seven in the morning, probably even earlier, [5983] when Pilate went out to those who summoned him to dispense justice. The question which he addressed to them seems to have startled and disconcerted them. Their procedure had been private; it was of the very essence of proceedings at Roman Law that they were in public. Again, the procedure before the Sanhedrists had been in the form of a criminal investigation, while it was of the essence of Roman procedure to enter only on definite accusations. [5984] Accordingly, the first question of Pilate was, what accusation they brought against Jesus. The question would come upon them the more unexpectedly, that Pilate must, on the previous evening, have given his consent to the employment of the Roman guard which effected the arrest of Jesus. Their answer displays humiliation, ill-humour, and an atempt at evasion. If He had not been a malefactor,' they would not have delivered' [5985] Him up! On this vague charge Pilate, in whom we mark throughout a strange reluctance to proceed - perhaps from unwillingness to please the Jews, perhaps from a desire to wound their feelings on the tenderest point, perhaps because restrained by a Higher Hand - refused to proceed. He proposed that the Sanhedrists should try Jesus according to the Jewish Law. This is another important trait, as apparently implying that

Pilate had been previously aware both of the peculiar claims of Jesus, and that the action of the Jewish authorities had been determined by envy.' [5986] But, under ordinary circumstances, Pilate would not have wished to hand over a person accused of so grave a charge as that of setting up Messianic claims to the Jewish authorities, to try the case as a merely religious question. [5987] Taking this in connection with the other fact, apparently inconsistent with it, that on the previous evening the Governor had given a Roman guard for the arrest of the prisoner, and with this other fact of the dream and warning of Pilate's wife, a peculiar impression is conveyed to us. We can understand it all, if, on the previous evening, after the Roman guard had been granted, Pilate had spoken of it to his wife, whether because he knew her to be, or because she might be interested in the matter. Tradition has given her the name Procula; [5988] while an Apocryphal Gospel describes her as a convert to Judaism; [5989] while the Greek Church has actually placed her in the Catalogue of Saints. What if the truth lay between these statements, and Procula had not only been a proselyte, like the wife of a previous Roman Governor, [5990] but known about Jesus and spoken of Him to Pilate on that evening? This would best explain his relutance to condemn Jesus, as well as her dream of Him. As the Jewish authorities had to decline the Governor's offer to proceed against Jesus before their own tribunal, on the avowed ground that they had not power to pronounce capital sentence, [5991] it now behoved them to formulat a capital charge. This is recorded by St. Luke alone. [5992] It was, that Jesus had said, He Himself was Christ a King. It will be noted, that in so saying they falsely imputed to Jesus their own political expectations concerning the Messiah. But even this is not all. They prefaced it by this, that He perverted the nation and forbade to give tirbute to Cæsar. The latter charge was so grossly unfounded, that we can only regard it as in their mind a necessary inference from the premiss that He claimed to be King. And, as telling most against Him, they put this first and foremost, treating the inference as if it were a fact - a practice this only too common in controversies, political, religious, or private. This charge of the Sanhedrists explains what, according to all the Evangelists, passed within the Prætorium. We presume that Christ was within, probably in charge of some guards. The words of the Sanhedrists brought peculiar thoughts of Pilate. He now called Jesus and asked Him: Thou art the King of the Jews?' There is that mixture of contempt for all that was Jewish, and of that general cynicism which could not believe in the existence of anything higher, we mark a feeling of awe in regard to Christ, even though the feeling may partly have been of superstition. Out of all that the Sanhedrists had said, Pilate took only this, that Jesus claimed to be a King. Christ, Who had not heard the charge of His accusers, now ignored it, in His desire to stretch out salvation even to a Pilate. Not heeding the implied irony, He first put it to Pilate, whether the question - be it criminal charge or inquiry - was his own, or merely the repeitition of what His Jewish accusers had told Pilate of Him. The Governor quickly disowned any personal inquiry. How could he raise any such question? he was not a Jew, and the subject had no general interest. Jesus' own nation and its leader had handed Him over as a criminal: what had He done? The answer of Pilate left nothing else for Him Who, even in that supreme hour, thought only of others, not of Himself. but to bring before the Roman directly that truth for which his words had given the opening. It was not, as Pilate had implied, a Jewish question: it was one of absolute truth; it concerned all men. The Kingdom of Christ was not of this world at all, either Jewish or Gentile. Had it been otherwise, He would have led His followers to a contest for His claims and aims, and not have become a prisoner of the Jews. One word only in all this struck Pilate. So then a King art Thou!' He was incapable of apprehending the higher thought and truth. We mark in his words the same mixture of scoffing and

misgiving. Pilate was now in no doubt as to the nature of the Kingdom; his exclamation and question applied to the Kingship. That fact Christ would now emphasise in the glory of His Humiliation. He accepted what Pilate said; He adopted his words. But He added to them an appeal, or rather an explanation of His claims, such as a heathen, and a Pilate, could understand. His Kingdom was not of this world, but of that other world which He had come to reveal, and to open to all believers. Here was the truth! His Birth or Incarnation, as the Sent of the Father, and His own voluntary Coming into this world - for both are referred to in His words [5993] - had it for their object to testify of the truth concerning that other world, of which was His Kingdom. This was no Jewish-Messianic Kingdom, but one that appealed to all men. And all who had moral affinity to the truth' would listen to His testimony, and so come to own Him as King.' But these words struck only a hollow void, as they fell on Pilate. It was not merely cynicism, but utter despair of all that is higher - a moral suicide - which appears in his question: What is truth?' He had understood Christ, but it was not in him to respond to His appeal. He, whose heart and life had so little kinship to the truth,' could not sympathise with, though he dimly perceived, the grand aim of Jesus' Life and Work. But even the question of Pilate seems an admission, an implied homage to Christ. Assuredly, he would not have so opened his inner being to one of the priestly accusers of Jesus. That man was no rebel, no criminal! They who brought Him were moved by the lowest passions. And so he told them, as he went out, that he found no fault in Him. Then came from the assembled Sanhedrists a perfect hailstorm of accusations. As we picture it to ourselves, all this while the Christ stood near, perhaps behind Pilate, just within the portals of the Prætorium. And to all this clamour of charges He made no reply. It was as if the surging of the wild waves broke far beneath against the base of the rock, which, untouched, reared its head far aloft to the heavens. But as He stood in the calm silence of Majesty, Pilate greatly wondered. Did this Man not even fear death; was He so conscious of innocence, so infinitely superior to those around and against Him, or had He so far conquered Death, that He would not condescend to their words? And why then had He spoken to him of His Kingdom and of that truth? Fain would he have withdrawn from it all; not that he was moved for absolute truth or by the personal innocence of the Sufferer, but that there was that in the Christ which, perhaps for the first time in his life, had made him reluctant to be unrighteous and unjust. And so, when, amidst these confused cries, he caught the name Galilee as the scene of Jesus' labours, he gladly seized on what offered the prospect of devolving the responsibility on another. Jesus was a Galilean, and therefore belonged to the jurisdiction of King Herod. To Herod, therefore, who had come for the Feast to Jerusalem, and there occupied the old Maccabean Palace, close to that of the High-Priest, Jesus was now sent. [5994] [5995]To St. Luke alone we owe the account of what passed there, as, indeed, of so many traits in this last scene of the terrible drama. [5996] The opportunity now offered was welcome to Herod. It was a mark of reconciliation (or might be viewed as such) between himself and the Roman, and in a manner flattering to himself, since the first step had been taken by the Governor, and that, by an almost ostentatious acknowledgement of the rights of the Tetrarch, on which possibly their former feud may have turned. Besides, Herod had long wished to see Jesus, of Whom he had heard so many things. [5997] In that hour coarse curiosity, a hope of seeing some magic performances, was the only feeling that moved the Tetrarch. But in vain did he ply Christ with questions. He was as silent to him as formerly against the virulent charges of the Sanhedrists. But a Christ Who would or could do no signs, nor even kindle into the same denunciations as the Baptist, was, to the coarse realism of Antipas, only a helpless figure that might be insulted and scoffed at, as did the Tetrarch

and his men of war. [5998] And so Jesus was once more sent back to the Prætorium.It is in the interval during which Jesus was before Herod, or probably soon afterwards, that we place the last weird scene in the life of Judas, recorded by St. Matthew. [5999] We infer this from the circumstance, that, on the return of Jesus from Herod, the Sanhedrists do not seem to have been present, since Pilate had to call them together, [6000] presumably from the Temple. And here we recall that the Temple was close to the Maccabean Palace. Lastly, the impression left on our minds is, that henceforth the principal part before Pilate was sustained by the people,' the Priests and Scribes rather instigating them than conducting the case against Jesus. It may therefore well have been, that, when the Sanhedrists went from the Maccabean Palace into the Temple, as might be expected on that day, only a part of them returned to the Prætorium on the summons of Pilate.But, however that may have been, sufficient had already passed to convince Judas what the end would be. Indeed, it is difficult to believe that he could have deceived himself on this point from the first, however he had failed to realise the fact in its terrible import till after his deed. The words which Jesus had spoken to him in the Garden must have burnt into his soul. He was among the soldiery that fell back at His look. Since then Jesus had been led bound to Annas, to Caiaphas, to the Prætorium, to Herod. Even if Judas had not been present at any of these occasions, and we do not suppose that his conscience had allowed this, all Jerusalem must by that time have been full of the report, probably in even exaggerated form. One thing he saw: that Jesus was condemned. Judas did not repent' in the Scriptural sense; but a change of mind and feeling' came over him. [6001] Even had Jesus been an ordinary man, and the relation to Him of Judas been the ordinary one, we could understand his feelings, especially considering his ardent temperament. The instant before and after sin represents the difference of feeling as portrayed in the history of the Fall of our first parents. With the commission of sin, all the bewitching, intoxicating influence, which incited to it, has passed away, and only the naked fact remains. All the glamour has been dispelled; all the reality abideth. If we knew it, probably scarcely one out of many criminals but would give all he has, nay, life itself, if he could recall the deed done, or awake from it to find it only an evil dream. But it cannot be; and the increasingly terrible is, that it is done, and done for ever. Yet this is not repentance,' or, at least, God alone knows whether it is such; it may be, and in the case of Judas it only was, change of mind and feeling' towards Jesus. Whether this might have passed into repentance, whether, if he had cast himself at the Feet of Jesus, as undoubtedly he might have done, this would have been so, we need not here ask. The mind and feelings of Judas, as regarded the deed he had done, and as regarded Jesus, were now quite other; they became increasingly so with ever-growing intensity. The road, the streets, the people's faces - all seemed now to bear witness against him and for Jesus. He read it everywhere; he felt it always; he imagined it, till his whole being was on flame. What had been; what was; what would be! Heaven and earth receded from him; there were voices in the air, and pangs in the soul - and no escape, help, counsel, or hope anywhere. It was despair, and his a desperate resolve. He must get rid of these thirty pieces of silver, which, like thirty serpents, coiled round his soul with terrible hissing of death. Then at least his deed would have nothing of the selfish in it: only a terrible error, a mistake, to which he had been incited by these Sanhedrists. Back to them with the money, and let them have it again! And so forward he pressed amidst the wondering crowd, which would give way before that haggard face with the wild eyes, that crime had made old in those few hours, till he came upon that knot of priests and Sanhedrists, perhaps at that very moment speaking of it all. A most unwelcome sight and intrusion on them, this necessary but odious figure in the drama -

belonging to its past, and who should rest in its obscurity. But he would be heard; nay, his words would cast the burden on them to share it with him, as with hoarse cry he broke into this: I have sinned - in that I have betrayed - innocent blood!' They turned from him with impatience, in contempt, as so often the seducer turns from the seduced - and, God help such, with the same fiendish guilt of hell: What is that to us? See thou to it!' And presently they were again deep in conversation or consultation. For a moment he stared wildly before him, the very thirty pieces of silver that had been weighed to him, and which he had now brought back, and would fain have given them, still clutched in his hand. For a moment only, and then he wildly rushed forward, towards the Sanctuary itself, [6002] probably to where the Court of Israel bounded on that of the Priests, where generally the penitents stood in waiting, while in the Priests' Court the sacrifice was offered for them. He bent forward, and with all his might hurled from him [6003] those thirty pieces of silver, so that each resounded as it fell on the marble pavement.Out he rushed from the Temple, out of Jerusalem, into solitude.' [6004] Whither shall it be? Down into the horrible solitude of the Valley of Hinnom, the Tophet' of old, with its ghastly memories, the Gehenna of the future, with its ghostly associations. But it was not solitude, for it seemed now peopled with figures, faces, sounds. Across the Valley, and up the steep sides of the mountain! We are now on the potter's field' of Jeremiah - somewhat to the west above where the Kidron and Hinnom valleys merge. It is cold, soft clayey soil, where the footsteps slip, or are held in clammy bonds. Here jagged rocks rise perpendicularly: perhaps there was some gnarled, bent, stunted tree. [6005] Up there climbed to the top of that rock. Now slowly and deliberately he unwound the long girdle that held his garment. It was the girdle in which he had carried those thirty pieces of silver. He was now quite calm and collected. With that girdle he will hang himself [6006] on that tree close by, and when he has fastened it, he will throw himself off from that jagged rock.It is done; but as, unconscious, not yet dead perhaps, he swung heavily on that branch, under the unwonted burden the girdle gave way, or perhaps the knot, which his trembling hands had made, unloosed, and he fell heavily forward among the jagged rocks beneath, and perished in the manner of which St. Peter reminded his fellow-disciples in the days before Pentecost. [6007] [6008] But in the Temple the priests knew not what to do with these thirty pieces of money. Thier unscrupulous scrupulosity came again upon them. It was not lawful to take into the Temple-treasury, for the purchase of sacred things, money that had been unlawfully gained. In such cases the Jewish Law provided that the money was to be restored to the donor, and, if he insisted on giving it, that he should be induced to spend it for something for the public weal. This explains the apparent discrepancy between the accounts in the Book of Acts and by St. Matthew. By a fiction of law the money was still considered to be Judas', and to have been applied by him [6009] in the purchase of the well-known potter's field,' for the charitable purpose of burying in it strangers. [6010] But from henceforth the old name of potter's field,' became popularly changed into that of field of blood' (Haqal Dema). And yet it was the act of Israel through its leaders: they took the thirty pieces of silver - the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field!' It was all theirs, though they would have fain made it all Judas': the valuing, the selling, and the purchasing. And the potter's field' - the very spot on which Jeremiah had been Divinely directed to prophesy against Jerusalem and against Israel: [6011] how was it now all fulfilled in the light of the completed sin and apostasy of the people, as prophetically described by Zechariah! This Tophet of Jeremiah, now that they had valued and sold at thirty shekel Israel's Messiah-Shepherd - truly a Tophet, and become a field of blood! Surely, not an accidental coincidence this, that it should be the place of

Jeremy's announcement of judgment: not accidental, but veritably a fulfilment of his prophecy! And so St. Matthew, targuming this prophecy in form [6012] as in its spirit, and in true Jewish manner stringing to it the prophectic description furnished by Zechariah, sets the event before us as the fulfilment of Jeremy's prophecy. [6013] We are once more outside the Prætorium, to which Pilate had summoned from the Temple Sanhedrists and people. The crowd was momentarily increasing from the town. [6014] It was not only to see what was about to happen, but to witness another spectacle, that of the release of a prisoner. For it seems to have been the custom, that at the Passover [6015] the Roman Governor released to the Jewish populace some notorious prisoner who lay condemned to death. A very significant custom of release this, for which they now began to clamour. It may have been, that to this also they were incited by the Sanhedrist who mingled among them. For if the stream of popular sympathy might be diverted to Bar-Abbas, the doom of Jesus would be the more securely fixed. On the present occasion it might be the more easy to influence the people, since Bar-Abbas belonged to that class, not uncommon at the time, which, under the colourable pretence of political aspirations, committed robbery and other crimes. But these movements had deeply struck root in popular sympathy. A strange name and figure, Bar-Abbas. That could scarcely have been his real name. It means Son of the Father.' [6016] Was he a political Anti-Christ? And why, if there had not been some conjunction between them, should Pilate have proposed the alternative of Jesus or Bar-Abbas, and not rather that of one of the two malefactors who were actually crucified with Jesus?But when the Governor, hoping to enlist some popular sympathy, put this alternative to them - nay, urged it, on the ground that neither he nor yet Herod had found any crime in Him, and would even have appeased their thirst for vengeance by offering to submit Jesus to the cruel punishment of scourging, it was in vain. It was now that Pilate sat down on the judgment seat.' But ere he could proceed, came that message from his wife about her dream, and the warning entreaty to have nothing to do with that righteous man.' An omen such as a dream, and an appeal connected with it, especially in the circumstances of that trial, would powerfully impress a Roman. And for a few moments it seemed as if the appeal to popular feeling on behalf of Jesus might have been successful. [6017] But once more the Sanhedrists prevailed. Apparently, all who had been followers of Jesus had been scattered. None of them seem to have been there; and if one or another feeble voice might have been raised for Him, it was hushed in fear of the Sanhedrists. It was Bar-Abbas for whom, incited by the priesthood, the populace now clamoured with increasing vehemence. To the question - half bitter, half mocking - what they wished him to do with Him Whom their own leaders had in their accusation called King of the Jews,' surged back, louder and louder, the terrible cry: Crucify him!' That such a cry should have been raised, and raised by Jews, and before the Roman, and against Jesus, are in themselves almost inconceivable facts, to which the history of these eighteen centuries has made terrible echo. In vain Pilate expostulated, reasoned, appealed. Popular frenzy only grew as it was opposed.All reasoning having failed, Pilate had recourse to one more expedient, which, under ordinary circumstances, would have been effective. [6018] When a Judge, after having declared the innocence of the accused, actually rises from the judgment-seat, and by a symbolic act pronounces the execution of the accused a judicial murder, from all participation in which he wishes solemnly to clear himself, surely no jury would persist in demanding sentence of death. But in the present instance there was even more. Although we find allusions to some such custom among the heathen, [6019] that which here took place was an essentially Jewish rite, which must have appealed the more forcibly to the Jews that it was done by Pilate. And, not only the rite, but

the very words were Jewish. [6020] They recall not merely the rite prescribed in Deut. xxi.6, &c., to mark the freedom from guilt of the elders of a city where untracked murder had been committed, but the very words of such Old Testament expressions as in 2 Sam. iii.28, and Ps. xxvi.6, lxxiii.13, [6021] and, in later times, in Sus. ver.46. The Mishnah bears witness that this rite was continued. [6022] As administering justice in Israel, Pilate must have been aware of this rite. [6023] It does not affect the question, whether or not a judge could, especially in the circumstances recorded, free himself from guilt. Certainly, he could not; but such conduct on the part of a Pilate appears so utterly unusual, as, indeed, his whole bearing towards Christ, that we can only account for it by the deep impression which Jesus had made upon him. All the more terrible would be the guilt of Jewish resistance. There is something overawing in Pilate's, See ye to it' - a reply to the Sanhedrists' See thou to it,' to Judas, and in the same words. It almost seems, as if the scene of mutual imputation of guilt in the Garden of Eden were being reenacted. The Mishnah tells us, that, after the solemn washing of hands of the elders and their disclaimer of guilt, priest responded with this prayer: Forgive it to Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, O Lord, and lay not innocent blood upon Thy people Israel!' But here, in answer to Pilate's words, came back that deep, hoarse cry: His Blood be upon us,' and - God help us! - on our children!' Some thirty years later, and on that very spot, was judgment pronounced against some of the best in Jerusalem; and among the 3,600 victims of the Governor's fury, of whom not a few were scourged and crucified right over against the Prætorium, were many of the noblest of the citizens of Jerusalem. [6024] A few years more, and hundreds of crosses bore Jewish mangled bodies within sight of Jerusalem. And still have these wanderers seemed to bear, from century to century, and from land to land, that burden of blood; and still does it seem to weigh on us and our children.' The Evangelists have passed as rapidly as possible over the last scenes of indignity and horror, and we are too thankful to follow their example. Bar-Abbas was at once released. Jesus was handed over to the soldiery to be scourged and crucified, although final and formal judgment had not yet been pronounced. [6025] Indeed, Pilate seems to have hoped that the horrors of the scourging might still move the people to desist from the ferocious cry for the Cross. [6026] For the same reason we may also hope, that the scourging was not inflicted with the same ferocity as in the case of Christian martyrs, when, with the object of eliciting the incrimination of others, or else recantation, the scourge of leather thongs was loaded with lead, or armed with spikes and bones, which lacerated back, and chest, and face, till the victim sometimes fell down before the judge a bleeding mass of torn flesh. But, however modified, and without repeating the harrowing realism of a Cicero, scourging was the terrible introduction to crucifixion - the intermediate death.' Stripped of His clothes, His hands tied and back bent, the Victim would be bound to a column or stake, in front of the Prætorium. The scourging ended, the soldiery would hastily cast upon Him His upper garments, and lead Him back into the Prætorium. Here they called the whole cohort together, and the silent, faint Sufferer became the object of their ribald jesting. From His bleeding Body they tore the clothes, and in mockery arrayed Him in scarlet or purple. [6027] For crown they wound together thorns, and for sceptre they placed in His Hand a reed. Then alternately, in mock proclamation they hailed Him King, or worshipped Him as God, and smote Him or heaped on Him other indignities. [6028]Such a spectacle might well have disarmed enmity, and for ever allayed worldly fears. And so Pilate had hoped, when, at his bidding, Jesus came forth from the Prætorium, arrayed as a mock-king, and the Governor presented Him to the populace in words which the Church has ever since treasured: Behold the Man!' But, so far from appeasing, the sight

only incited to fury the chief priests' and their subordinates. This Man before them was the occasion, that on this Paschal Day a heathen dared in Jerusalem itself insult their deepest feeling, mock their most cherished Messianic hopes! Crucify!' Crucify!' resounded from all sides. Once more Pilate appealed to them, when, unwittingly and unwillingly, it elicited this from the people, that Jesus had claimed to be the Son of God.If nothing else, what light it casts on the mode in which Jesus had borne Himself amidst those tortures and insults, that this statement of the Jews filled Pilate with fear, and led him to seek again converse with Jesus within the Prætorium. The impression which had been made at the first, and been deepened all along, had now passed into the terror of superstition. His first question to Jesus was, whence He was? And when, as was most fitting - since he could not have understood it - Jesus returned no answer, the feelings of the Romans became only the more intense. Would he not speak; did He not know that he had absolute power to release or to crucify' Him? [6029] Nay, not absolute power - all power came from above; but the guilt in the abuse of power was far greater on the part of apostate Israel and its leaders, who knew whence power came, and to Whom they were responsible for its exercise.So spake not an impostor; so spake not an ordinary man - after such sufferings and in such circumstances - to one who, whencesoever derived, had the power of life or death over Him. And Pilate felt it - the more keenly, for his cynicism and disbelief of all that was higher. And the more earnestly did he now seek to release Him. But, proportionately, the louder and fiercer was the cry of the Jews for His Blood, till they threatened to implicate in the charge of rebellion against Cæsar the Governor himself, if he persisted in unwonted mercy.Such danger a Pilate would never encounter. He sat down once more in the judgment-seat, outside the Prætorium, in the place called Pavement,' and, from its outlook over the City, Gabbatha,' [6030] the rounded height.' So solemn is the transaction that the Evangelist pauses to note once more the day - nay, the very hour, when the process had commenced. It had been the Friday in Passover-week, [6031] and between six and seven of the morning. [6032] And at the close Pilate once more in mockery presented to them Jesus: Behold your King!' [6033] Once more they called for His Crucifixion - and, when again challenged, the chief priests burst into the cry, which preceded Pilate's final sentence, to be presently executed: We have no king but Cæsar!'With this cry Judaism was, in the person of its representatives, guilty of denial of God, of blasphemy, of apostasy. It committed suicide; and, ever since, has its dead body been carried in show from land to land, and from century to century: to be dead, and to remain dead, till He come a second time, Who is the Resurrection and the Life!

CHAPTER XV. CRUCIFIED, DEAD, AND BURIED.'

(St. Matt. xxvii.31-43: St. Mark xv.20-32(a); St. Luke xxiii.26-38; St. John xix.16-24; St. Matt. xxviii.44; St. Mark xv.32(b); St. Luke xxiii.39-43; St. John xix.25-27; St. Matt. xxvii.45-56; St. Mark xv.33-41; St. Luke xxiii.44-49; St. John xix.28-30; St. John xix.31-37; St. Matt. xxvii.57-61; St. Mark xv.42-47; St. Luke xxiii.50-56; St. John xix.38-42; St. Matt. xxvii.62-66.) It matters little as regards their guilt, whether, pressing the language of St. John, [6034] we are to understand that Pilate delivered Jesus to the Jews to be crucified, or, as we rather infer, to his own soldiers. This was the common practice, and it accords both with the Governor's former taunt to the Jews, [6035] and with the after-notice of the Synoptists. They, to whom He was delivered,' led Him away to be crucified:' and they who so led Him forth compelled' the Cyrenian Simon to bear the Cross. We can scarcely imagine, that the Jews, still less the Sanhedrists, would have done this. But whether formally or not, the terrible crime of slaying, with wicked hands, their Messiah-King rests, alas, on Israel. Once more was He unrobed and robed. The purple robe was torn from His Wounded Body, the crown of thorns from His Bleeding Brow. Arrayed again in His own, now blood-stained, garments, He was led forth to execution. Only about two hours and a half had passed [6036] since the time that He had first stood before Pilate (about half-past six), [6037] when the melancholy procession reached Golgotha (at nine o'clock a.m.). In Rome an interval, ordinarily of two days, intervened between a sentence and its execution; but the rule does not seem to have applied to the provinces, [6038] if, indeed, in this case the formal rules of Roman procedure were at all observed. The terrible preparations were soon made: the hammer, the nails, the Cross, the very food for the soldiers who were to watch under each Cross. [6039] Four soldiers would be detailed for each Cross, the whole being under the command of a centurion. As always, the Cross was borne to the execution by Him Who was to suffer on it - perhaps His Arms bound to it with cords. But there is happily no evidence - rather, every indication to the contrary - that, according to ancient custom, the neck of the Sufferer was fastened within the patibulum, two horizontal pieces of wood, fastened at the end, to which the hands were bound. Ordinarily, the procession was headed by the centurion, [6040] or rather, preceded by one who proclaimed the nature of the crime, [6041] and carried a white, wooden board, on which it was written. Commonly, also, it took the longest road to the place of execution, and through the most crowded streets, so as to attract most public attention. But we would suggest, that alike this long circuit and the proclamation of the herald were, in the present instance, dispensed with. They are not hinted at in the text, and seem incongruous to the festive season, and the other circumstances of the history. Discarding all later legendary embellishments, [6042] as only disturbing, we shall try to realise the scene as described in the Gospels. Under the leadership of the centurion, whether or not attended by one who bore the board with the inscription, or only surrounded by the four soldiers, of whom one might carry this tablet, Jesus came forth bearing His Cross. He was followed by two malefactors - robbers' - probably of the class then so numerous, that covered its crimes by pretensions of political motives. These two, also, would bear each his cross, and probably be attended each by four soldiers. Crucifixion was not a Jewish mode of punishment, although the Maccabee King Jannæus had so far forgotten the claims of both humanity and religion as on one occasion to crucify not less than

800 persons in Jerusalem itself. [6043] But even Herod, with all cruelty, did not resort to this mode of execution. Nor was it employed by the Romans till after the time of Cæsar, when, with the fast increasing cruelty of punishments, it became fearfully common in the provinces. Especially does it seem to characterise the domination of Rome in Judæa under every Governor. During the last siege of Jerusalem hundreds of crosses daily arose, till there seemed not sufficient room nor wood for them, and the soldiery diversified their horrible amusement by new modes of crucifixion. So did the Jewish appeal to Rome for the Crucifixion of Israel's King come back in hundredfold echoes. But, better than such retribution, the Cross of the God-Man hath put an end to the punishment of the cross, and instead, made the Cross the symbol of humanity, civilisation, progress, peace, and love. As mostly all abominations of the ancient world, whether in religion or life, crucifixion was of Phoenician origin, although Rome adopted, and improved on it. The modes of execution among the Jews were: strangulation, beheading, burning, and stoning. In all ordinary circumstances the Rabbis were most reluctant to pronounce sentence of death. This appears even from the injunction that the Judges were to fast on the day of such a sentence. [6044] Indeed, two of the leading Rabbis record it, that no such sentence would ever have been pronounced in a Sanhedrin of which they had been members. The indignity of hanging - and this only after the criminal had been otherwise executed - was reserved for the crimes of idolatry and blasphemy. [6045] The place where criminals were stoned (Beth haSeqilah) was on an elevation about eleven feet high, from whence the criminal was thrown down by the first witness. If he had not died by the fall, the second witness would throw a large stone on his heart as he lay. If not yet lifeless, the whole people would stone him. [6046] At a distance of six feet from the place of execution the criminal was undressed, only the covering absolutely necessary for decency being left. [6047] [6048] In the case of Jesus we have reason to think that, while the mode of punishment to which He was subjected was un-Jewish, every concession would be made to Jewish custom, and hence we thankfully believe that on the Cross He was spared the indignity of exposure. Such would have been truly un-Jewish. [6049] Three kinds of Cross were in use: the so-called St. Andrew's Cross (x, the Crux decussata), the Cross in the form of a T (Crux Commissa), and the ordinary Latin Cross (+, Crux immissa). We believe that Jesus bore the last of these. This would also most readily admit of affixing the board with the threefold inscription, which we know His Cross bore. Besides, the universal testimony of those who lived nearest the time (Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others), and who, alas! had only too much occasion to learn what crucifixion meant, is in favour of this view. This Cross, as St. John expressly states, Jesus Himself bore at the outset. And so the procession moved on towards Golgotha. Not only the location, but even the name of that which appeals so strongly to every Christian heart, is matter of controversy. The name cannot have been derived from the skulls which lay about, since such exposure would have been unlawful, and hence must have been due to the skull-like shape and appearance of the place. Accordingly, the name is commonly explained as the Greek form of the Aramæan Gulgalta, or the Hebrew Gulgoleth, which means a skull. Such a description would fully correspond, not only to the requirements of the narrative, but to the appearance of the place which, so far as we can judge, represents Golgotha. We cannot here explain the various reasons for which the traditional site must be abandoned. Certain it is, that Golgotha was outside the gate,' [6050] and near the City.' [6051] In all likelihood it was the usual place of execution. Lastly, we know that it was situated near gardens, where there were tombs, and close to the highway. The three last conditions point to the north of Jerusalem. It must be remembered that the third wall, which afterwards surrounded

Jerusalem, was not built till several years after the Crucifixion. The new suburb of Bezetha extended at that time outside the second wall. Here the great highway passed northwards; close by, were villas and gardens; and here also rockhewn sepulchres have been discovered, which date from that period. But this is not all. The present Damascus Gate in the north of the city seems, in most ancient tradition, to have borne the name of St. Stephen's Gate, because the Proto-Martyr was believed to have passed through it to his stoning. Close by, then, must have been the place of execution. And at least one Jewish tradition fixes upon this very spot, close by what is known as the Grotto of Jeremiah, as the ancient place of stoning' (Beth haSeqilah). And the description of the locality answers all requirements. It is a weird, dreary place, two or three minutes aside from the high road, with a high, rounded, skull-like rocky plateau, and a sudden depression or hollow beneath, as if the jaws of the skull had opened. Whether or not the tomb of the Herodian period in the rocky knoll to the west of Jeremiah's Grotto' was the most sacred spot upon earth - the Sepulchre in the Garden,' we dare not positively assert, though every probability attaches to it. [6052] Thither, then, did that melancholy procession wind, between eight and nine o'clock on that Friday in Passover week. From the ancient Palace of Herod it descended, and probably passed through the gate in the first wall, and so into the busy quarter of Acra. As it proceeded, the numbers who followed from the Temple, from the dense business-quarter through which it moved, increased. Shops, bazaars, and markets were, indeed, closed on the holy feast-day. But quite a crowd of people would come out to line the streets and to follow; and, especially, women, leaving their festive preparations, raised loud laments, not in spiritual recognition of Christ's claims, but in pity and sympathy. [6053] [6054] And who could have looked unmoved on such a spectacle, unless fanatical hatred had burnt out of his bosom all that was human? Since the Paschal Supper Jesus had not tasted either food or drink. After the deep emotion of that Feast, with all of holiest institution which it included; after the anticipated betrayal of Judas, and after the farewell to His disciples, He had passed into Gethsemane. There for hours, alone - since His nearest disciples could not watch with Him even one hour - the deep waters had rolled up to His soul. He had drunk of them, immersed, almost perished in them. There had he agonised in mortal conflict, till the great drops of blood forced themselves on His Brow. There had He been delivered up, while they all had fled. To Annas, to Caiaphas, to Pilate, to Herod, and again to Pilate; from indignity to indignity, from torture to torture, had He been hurried all that livelong night, all that morning. All throughout He had borne Himself with a Divine Majesty, which had awakened alike the deeper feelings of Pilate and the infuriated hatred of the Jews. But if His Divinity gave its true meaning to His Humanity, that Humanity gave its true meaning to His voluntary Sacrifice. So, far, then, from seeking to hide its manifestations, the Evangelists, not indeed needlessly but unhesitatingly, put them forward. [6055] Unrefreshed by food or sleep, after the terrible events of that night and morning, while His pallid Face bore the blood-marks from the crown of thorns, His mangled Body was unable to bear the weight of the Cross. No wonder the pity of the women of Jerusalem was stirred. But ours is not pity, it is worship at the sight. For, underlying His Human Weakness was the Divine Strength which led Him to this voluntary self-surrender and self-exinanition. It was the Divine strength of His pity and love which issued in His Human weakness. Up to that last Gate which led from the Suburb' towards the place of execution did Jesus bear His Cross. Then, as we infer, His strength gave way under it. A man was coming from the opposite direction, one from that large colony of Jews which, as we know, had settled in Cyrene. [6056] He would be specially noticed; for, few would at that hour, on the festive

day, come out of the country,' [6057] although such was not contrary to the Law. So much has been made of this, that it ought to be distinctly known that travelling, which was forbidden on Sabbaths, was not prohibited on feast-days. [6058] Besides, the place whence he came - perhaps his home - might have been within the ecclesiastical boundary of Jerusalem. At any rate, he seems to have been well known, at least afterwards, in the Church - and his sons Alexander and Rufus even better than he. [6059] Thus much only can we say with certainty; to identify them with persons of the same name mentioned in other parts of the New Testament can only be matter of speculation. [6060] But we can scarcely repress the thought that Simon the Cyrenian had not before that day been a disciple; had only learned to follow Christ, when, on that day, as he came in by the Gate, the soldiery laid hold on him, and against his will forced him to bear the Cross after Christ. Yet another indication of the need of such help comes to us from St. Mark, [6061] who uses an expression [6062] which conveys, though not necessarily that the Saviour had to be borne, yet that He had to be supported to Golgotha from the place where they met Simon. Here, where, if the Saviour did not actually sink under His burden, it yet required to be transferred to the Cyrenian, while Himself henceforth needed bodily support, we place the next incident in this history. [6063] While the Cross was laid on the unwilling Simon, the women who had followed with the populace closed around the Sufferer, raising their lamentations. [6064] At His Entrance into Jerusalem, [6065] Jesus had wept over the daughters of Jerusalem; as He left it for the last time, they wept over Him. But far different were the reasons for His tears from theirs of mere pity. And, if proof were required of His Divine strength, even in the utmost depth of His Human weakness - how, conquered, He was Conqueror - it would surely be found in the words in which He bade them turn their thoughts of pity where pity would be called for, even to themselves and their children in the near judgment upon Jerusalem. The time would come, when the Old Testament curse of barrenness [6066] would be coveted as a blessing. To show the fulfilment of this prophetic lament of Jesus, it is not necessary to recall the harrowing details recorded by Josephus, [6067] when a frenzied mother roasted her own child, and in the mockery of desperateness reserved the half of the horrible meal for those murderers who daily broke in upon her to rob her of what scanty food had been left her; nor yet other of those incidents, too revolting for needless repetition, which the historian of the last siege of Jerusalem chronicles. But how often, these many centuries, must Israel's women have felt that terrible longing for childlessness, and how often must the prayer of despair for the quick death of falling mountains and burying hills rather than prolonged torture [6068] have risen to the lips of Israel's sufferers! And yet, even so, these words were also prophetic of a still more terrible future! [6069] For, if Israel had put such flame to its green tree' how terribly would the Divine judgment burn among the dry wood of an apostate and rebellious people, that had so delivered up its Divine King, and pronounced sentence upon itself by pronouncing it upon Him! And yet natural, and, in some respects, genuine, as were the tears of the daughters of Jerusalem,' mere sympathy with Christ almost involves guilt, since it implies a view of Him which is essentially the opposite of that which His claims demand. These tears were the emblem of that modern sentiment about the Christ which, in its effusiveness, offers insult rather than homage, and implies rejection rather than acknowledgment of Him. We shrink with horror from the assumption of a higher standpoint, implied in so much of the modern so-called criticism about the Christ. But even beyond this, all mere sentimentalism is here the outcome of unconsciousness of our real condition. When a sense of sin has been awakened in us, we shall mourn, not for what Christ has suffered, but for what He suffered for us. The effusiveness of mere sentiment is impertinence or

folly: impertinence, if He was the Son of God; folly, if He was merely Man. And, even from quite another point of view, there is here a lesson to learn. It is the peculiarity of Romanism ever to present the Christ in His Human weakness. It is that of an extreme section on the opposite side, to view Him only in His Divinity. Be it ours ever to keep before us, and to worship as we remember it, that the Christ is the Saviour God-Man.It was nine of the clock when the melancholy procession reached Golgotha, and the yet more melancholy preparations for the Crucifixion commenced. Avowedly, the punishment was invented to make death as painful and as lingering as the power of human endurance. First, the upright wood was planted in the ground. It was not high, and probably the Feet of the Sufferer were not above one or two feet from the ground. Thus could the communication described in the Gospels take place between Him and others; thus, also, might His Sacred Lips be moistened with the sponge attached to a short stalk of hyssop. Next, the transverse wood (antenna) was placed on the ground, and the Sufferer laid on it, when His Arms were extended, drawn up, and bound to it. Then (this not in Egypt, but in Carthage and in Rome) a strong, sharp nail was driven, first into the Right, then into the Left Hand (the clavi trabales). Next, the Sufferer was drawn up by means of ropes, perhaps ladders; [6070] the transverse either bound or nailed to the upright, and a rest or support for the Body (the cornu or sedile) fastened on it. Lastly, the Feet were extended, and either one nail hammered into each, or a larger piece of iron through the two. We have already expressed our belief that the indignity of exposure was not offered at such a Jewish execution. And so might the crucified hang for hours, even days, in the unutterable anguish of suffering, till consciousness at last failed.It was a merciful Jewish practice to give to those led to execution a draught of strong wine mixed with myrrh so as to deaden consciousness. [6071] This charitable office was performed at the cost of, if not by, an association of women in Jerusalem. [6072] That draught was offered to Jesus when He reached Golgatha. [6073] But having tasted it, and ascertained its character and object, He would not drink it. It was like His former refusal of the pity of the daughters of Jerusalem.' No man could take His Life from Him; He had power to lay it down, and to take it up again. Nor would He here yield to the ordinary weakness of our human nature; nor suffer and die as if it had been a necessity, not a voluntary self-surrender. He would meet Death, even in his sternest and fiercest mood, and conquer by submitting to the full. A lesson this also, though one difficult, to the Christian sufferer.And so was He nailed to His Cross, which was placed between, probably somewhat higher than, those of the two malefactors crucified with Him. [6074] One thing only still remained: to affix to His Cross the so-called title' (titulus), on which was inscribed the charge on which He had been condemned. As already stated, it was customary to carry this board before the prisoner, and there is no reason ffor supposing any exception in this respect. Indeed, it seems implied in the circumstance, that the title' had evidently been drawn up under the direction of Pilate. It was - as might have been expected, and yet most significantly [6075] - trilingual: in Latin, Greek, and Aramæan. We imagine, that it was written in that order, [6076] and that the words were those recorded by the Evangelists (excepting St. Luke, [6077] who seems to give a modification of the orginal, or Aramæan, text). The inscription given by St. Matthew exactly corresponds with that which Eusebius [6078] records as the Latin titulus on the cross of one of the early martyrs. We therefore conclude, that it represents the Latin words. Again, it seems only natural, that the fullest, and to the Jews most offensive, description should have been in Aramæan, which all could read. Very significantly this is given by St. John. It follows, that the inscription given by St. Mark must represent that in Greek. Although much less comprehensive, it had the same number of words, and precisely the same

number of letters, as that in Aramæan, given by St. John. [6079] It seems probable, that the Sanhedrists had heard from some one, who had watched the procession on its way to Golgotha, of the inscription which Pilate had written on the titulus' - partly to avenge himself on, and partly to deride, the Jews. It is not likely that they would have asked Pilate to take it down after it had been affixed to the Cross; and it seems scarcely credible, that they would have waited outside the Prætorium till the melancholy procession commenced its march. We suppose that, after the condemnation of Jesus, the Sanhedrists had gone from the Prætorium into the Temple, to take part in its services. When informed of the offensive tablet, they hastened once more to the Prætorium, to induce Pilate not to allow it to be put up. This explains the inversion in the order of the account in the Gospel of St. John, [6080] or rather, its location in that narrative in immediate connection with the notice, that the Sanhedrists were afraid the Jews who passed by might be influenced by the inscription. We imagine, that the Sanhedrists had originally no intention of doing anything so un-Jewish as not only to gaze at the sufferings of the Crucified, but to even deride Him in His Agony - that, in fact, they had not intended going to Golgotha at all. But when they found that Pilate would not yield to their remonstrances, some of them hastened to the place of Crucifixion, and, mingling with the crowd, sought to incite their jeers, so as to prevent any deeper impression [6081] which the significant words of the inscription might have produced. [6082]Before nailing Him to the Cross, the soldiers parted among them the poor worldly inheritance of His raiment. [6083] On this point there are slight seeming differences [6084] between the notices of the Synoptists and the more detailed account of the Fourth Gospel. Such differences, if real, would afford only fresh evidence of the general trustworthiness of the narrative. For, we bear in mind that, of all the disciples, only St. John witnessed the last scenes, and that therefore the other accounts of it circulating in the early Church must have been derived, so to speak, from second sources. This explains, why perhaps the largest number of seeming discrepancies in the Gospels occurs in the narrative of the closing hours in the Life of Christ, and how, contrary to what otherwise we might have expected, the most detailed as well as precise account of them comes to us from St. John. In the present instance these slight seeming differences may be explained in the following manner. There was, as St. John states, first a division into four parts - one to each of the soldiers - of such garments of the Lord as were of nearly the same value. The head-gear, the outer cloak-like garment, the girdle, and the sandals, would differ little in cost. But the question, which of them was to belong to each of the soldiers, would naturally be decided, as the Synoptists inform us, by lot.But, besides these four articles of dress, there was the seamless woven inner garment, [6085] by far the most valuable of all, and for which, as it could not be partitioned without being destroyed, they would specially cast lots [6086] (as St. John reports). Nothing in this world can be accidental, since God is not far from any of us. But in the History of the Christ the Divine purpose, which forms the subject of all prophecy, must have been constantly realised; nay, this must have forced itself on the mind of the observer, and the more irresistibly when, as in the present instance, the outward circumstances were in such sharp contrast to the higher reality. To St. John, the loving and loved disciple, greater contrast could scarcely exist than between this rough partition by lot among the soldiery, and the character and claims of Him Whose garments they were thus apportioning, as if He had been a helpless Victim in their hands. Only one explanation could here suggest itself: that there was a special Divine meaning in the permission of such an event - that it was in fulfilment of ancient prophecy. As he gazed on the terrible scene, the words of the Psalm [6087] [6088] which portrayed the desertion, the sufferings, and the contempt even unto death of

the Servant of the Lord, stood out in the red light of the Sun setting in Blood. They flashed upon his mind - for the first time he understood them; [6089] and the flames which played around the Sufferer were seen to be the sacrificial fire that consumed the Sacrifice which He offered. That this quotation is made in the Fourth Gospel alone, proves that its writer was an eyewitness; that it was made in the Fourth Gospel at all, that he was a Jew, deeply imbued with Jewish modes of religious thinking. And the evidence of both is the stronger, as we recall the comparative rareness, and the peculiarly Judaic character of the Old Testament quotations in the Fourth Gospel. [6090]It was when they thus nailed Him to the Cross, and parted His raiment, that He spake the first of the so-called Seven Words:' Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' [6091] Even the reference in this prayer to what they do' (not in the past, nor future) points to the soldiers as the primary, though certainly not the sole object of the Saviour's prayer. [6092] [6093] But higher thoughts also come to us. In the moment of the deepest abasement of Christ's Human Nature, the Divine bursts forth most brightly. It is, as if the Saviour would discard all that is merely human in His Sufferings, just as before He had discarded the Cup of stupefying wine. These soldiers were but the unconscious instruments: the form was nothing; the contest was between the Kingdom of God and that of darkness, between the Christ and Satan, and these sufferings were but the necessary path of obedience, and to victory and glory. When He is most human (in the moment of His being nailed to the Cross), then is He most Divine, in the utter discarding of the human elements of human instrumentality and of human suffering. Then also in the utter self-forgetfulness of the God-Man - which is one of the aspects of the Incarnation - does He only remember Divine mercy, and pray for them who crucify Him; and thus also does the Conquered truly conquer His conquerors by asking for them what their deed had forfeited. And lastly, in this, that alike the first and the last of His Utterances begin with Father,' does He show by the unbrokenness of His faith and fellowship the real spiritual victory which He has won. And He has won it, not only for the martyrs, who have learned from Him to pray as He did, but for everyone who, in the midst of all that seems most opposed to it, can rise, beyond mere forgetfulness of what is around, to realising faith and fellowship with God as the Father,' - who through the dark curtain of cloud can discern the bright sky, and can feel the unshaken confidence, if not the unbroken joy, of absolute trust. This was His first Utterance on the Cross - as regarded them; as regarded Himself; and as regarded God. So, surely, suffered not Man. Has this prayer of Christ been answered? We dare not doubt it; nay, we perceive it in some measure in those drops of blessing which have fallen upon heathen men, and have left to Israel also, even in its ignorance, a remnant according to the election of grace. [6094]And now began the real agonies of the Cross - physical, mental, and spiritual. It was the weary, unrelieved waiting, as thickening darkness gradually gathered around. Before sitting down to their melancholy watch over the Crucified, [6095] the soldiers would refresh themselves, after their exertion in nailing Jesus to the Cross, lifting it up, and fixing it, by draughts of the cheap wine of the country. As they quaffed it, they drank to Him in their coarse brutality, and mockingly came to Him, asking Him to pledge them in response. Their jests were, indeed, chiefly directed not against Jesus personally, but in His Representative capacity, and so against the hated, despised Jews, whose King they now derisively challenged to save Himself. [6096] Yet even so, it seems to us of deepest significance, thatHe was so treated and derided in His Representative Capacity and as the King of the Jews. It is the undesigned testimony of history, alike as regarded the character of Jesus and the future of Israel. But what from almost any point of view we find so difficult to understand is, the unutterable abasement of the Leaders of Israel - their

moral suicide as regarded Israel's hope and spiritual existence. There, on that Cross, hung He, Who at least embodied that grand hope of the nation; Who, even on their own showing, suffered to the extreme for that idea, and yet renounced it not, but clung fast to it in unshaken confidence; One, to Whose Life or even Teaching no objection could be offered, save that of this grand idea. And yet, when it came to them in the ribald mockery of this heathen soldiery, it evoked no other or higher thoughts in them; and they had the indescribable baseness of joining in the jeer at Israel's great hope, and of leading the popular chorus in it!For, we cannot doubt, that - perhaps also by way of turning aside the point of the jeer from Israel - they took it up, and tried to direct it against Jesus; and that they led the ignorant mob in the piteous attempts at derision. And did none of those who so reviled Him in all the chief aspects of His Work feel, that, as Judas had sold the Master for nought and committed suicide, so they were doing in regard to their Messianic hope? For, their jeers cast contempt on the four great facts in the Life and Work of Jesus, which were also the underlying ideas of the Messianic Kingdom: the new relationship to Israel's religion and the Temple (Thou that destroyest the Temple, and buildest it in three days'); the new relationship to the Father through the Messiah, the Son of God (if Thou be the Son of God'); the new all-sufficient help brought to body and soul in salvation (He saved others'); and, finally, the new relationship to Israel in the fulfilment and perfecting of its Mission through its King (if He be the King of Israel'). On all these, the taunting challenge of the Sanhedrists, to come down from the Cross, and save Himself, if he would claim the allegiance of their faith, cast what St. Matthew and St. Mark characterise as the blaspheming' [6097] of doubt. We compare with theirs the account of St. Luke and St. John. That of St. Luke reads like the report of what had passed, given by one who throughout had been quite close by, perhaps taken part in the Crucifixion [6098] - one might almost venture to suggest, that it had been furnished by the Centurion. [6099] The narrative of St. John reads markedly like that of an eyewitness, and he a Judæan. [6100] And as we compare both the general Judæan cast and Old Testament quotations in this with the other parts of the Fourth Gospel, we feel as if (as so often), under the influence of the strongest emotions, the later development and peculiar thinking of so many years afterwards had for the time been effaced from the mind of St. John, or rather given place to the Jewish modes of conception and speech, familiar to him in earlier days. Lastly, the account of St. Matthew seems as if written from the priestly point of view, as if it had been furnished by one of the Priests or Sanhedrist party, present at the time.Yet other inferences come to us. First, there is a remarkable relationship between what St. Luke quotes as spoken by the soldiers: If Thou art the King of the Jews, save Thyself,' and the report of the words in St. Matthew: [6101] He saved others - Himself He cannot save. He [6102] is the King of Israel! Let Him now come down from the Cross, and we will believe on Him!' These are the words of the Sanhedrists, and they seem to respond to those of the soldiers, as reported by St. Luke, and to carry them further. The if' of the soldiers: If Thou art the King of the Jews,' now becomes a direct blasphemous challenge. As we think of it, they seem to re-echo, and now with the laughter of hellish triumph, the former Jewish challenge for an outward, infallible sign to demonstrate His Messiahship. But they also take up, and re-echo, what Satan had set before Jesus in the Temptation of the wilderness. At the begining of His Work, the Tempter had suggested that the Christ should achieve absolute victory by an act of presumptuous self-assertion, utterly opposed to the spirit of the Christ, but which Satan represented as an act of trust in God, such as He would assuredly own. And now, at the close of His Messianic Work, the Tempter suggested, in the challenge of the Sanhedrists, that Jesus had suffered absolute defeat,

and that God had publicly disowned the trust which the Christ had put in Him. He trusteth in God: let Him deliver Him now, if He will have Him.' [6103] Here, as in the Temptation of the Wilderness, the words misapplied were those of Holy Scripture - in the present instance those of Ps. xxii.8. And the quotation, as made by the Sanhedrists, is the more remarkable, that, contrary to what is generally asserted by writers, this Psalm [6104] was Messianically applied by the ancient Synagogue. [6105] More especially was this verse, [6106] which precedes the mocking quotation of the Sanhedrists, expressly applied to the sufferings and the derision which Messiah was to undergo from His enemies: All they that see Me laugh Me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head.' [6107] [6108] The derision of the Sanhedrists under the Cross was, as previously stated, not entirely spontaneous, but had a special motive. The place of Crucifixion was close to the great road which led from the North to Jerusalem. On that Feast-day, when, as there was no law to limit, as on the weekly day of rest, locomotion to a Sabbath day's journey,' many would pass in and out of the City, and the crowd would naturally be arrested by the spectacle of the three Crosses. Equally naturally would they have been impressed by the titulus over the Cross of Christ. The words, describing the Sufferer as the King of the Jews,' might, when taken in connection with what was known of Jesus, have raised most dangerous questions. And this the presence of the Sanhedrists was intended to prevent, by turning the popular mind in a totally different direction. It was just such a taunt and argumentation as would appeal to that coarse realism of the common people, which is too often misnamed common sense.' St. Luke significantly ascribes the derision of Jesus only to the Rulers, [6109] and we repeat, that that of the passers by, recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, was excited by them. Thus here also the main guilt rested on the leaders of the people. [6110]One other trait comes to us from St. Luke, confirming our impression that his account was derived from one who had stood quite close to the Cross, probably taken official part in the Crucifixion. St. Matthew and St. Mark merely remark in general, that the derision of the Sanhedrists and people was joined in by the thieves on the Cross. [6111] A trait this, which we feel to be not only psychologically true, but the more likely of occurrence, that any sympathy or possible alleviation of their sufferings might best be secured by joining in the scorn of the leaders, and concentrating popular indignation upon Jesus. But St. Luke also records a vital difference between the two robbers' on the Cross. [6112] The impenitent thief takes up the jeer of the Sanhedrists: Art Thou not the Christ? [6113] Save Thyself and us!' The words are the more significant, alike in their bearing on the majestic calm and pitying love of the Saviour on the Cross, and on the utterance of the penitent thief,' that - strange as it may sound - it seems to have been a terrible phenomenon, noted by historians, [6114] that those on the cross were wont to utter insults and imprecations on the onlookers, goaded nature perhaps seeking relief in such outbursts. Not so when the heart was touched in true repentance.If a more close study of the words of the penitent thief' may seem to diminish the fulness of meaning which the traditional view attaches to them, they gain all the more as we perceive their historic reality. His first words were of reproof to his comrade. In that terrible hour, amidst the tortures of a slow death, did not the fear of God creep over him - at least so far as to prevent his joining in the vile jeers of those who insulted the dying agonies of the Sufferer? [6115] And this all the more, in the peculiar circumstances. They were all three sufferers; but they two justly, while He Whom he insulted had done nothing amiss. From this basis of fact, the penitent rapidly rose to the height of faith. This is not uncommon, when a mind is learning the lessons of truth in the school of grace. Only, it stands out here the more sharply, because of the dark background against which it is traced in such broad and brightly shining

outlines. The hour of the deepest abasement of the Christ was, as all the moments of His greatest Humilation, to be marked by a manifestation of His Glory and Divine Character - as it were, by God's testimony to Him in history, if not by the Voice of God from heaven. And, as regarded the penitent' himself, we notice the progression in his soul. No one could have been ignorant - least of all those who were led forth with Him to crucifixion, that Jesus did not suffer for any crime, nor for any political movement, but because He professed to embody the great hope of Israel, and was rejected by its leaders. And, if any had been ignorant, the title' over the Cross and the bitter enmity of the Sanhedrists, which followed Him with jeers and jibes, where even ordinary humanity, and still more Jewish feeling, would have enjoined silence, if not pity, must have shown what had been the motives of the condemnation' of Jesus. But, once the mind was opened to perceive all these facts, the progress would be rapid. In hours of extremity a man may deceive himself and fatally mistake fear for the fear of God, and the remembrance of certain external knowledge for spiritual experience. But, if a man really learns in such seasons, the teaching of years may be compressed into moments, and the dying thief on the Cross might outdistance the knowledge gained by Apostles in their years of following Christ.One thing stood out before the mind of the penitent thief,' who in that hour did fear God. Jesus had done nothing amiss. And this surrounded with a halo of moral glory the inscription on the Cross, long before its words acquired a new meaniag. But how did this Innocent One bear Himself in suffering? Right royally - not in an earthly sense, but in that in which alone He claimed the Kingdom. He had so spoken to the women who had lamented Him, as His faint form could no longer bear the burden of the Cross; and He had so refused the draught that would have deadened consciousness and sensibility. Then, as they three were stretched on the transverse beam, and, in the first and sharpest agony of pain, the nails were driven with cruel stroke of hammer through the quivering flesh, and, in the nameless agony that followed the first moments of the Crucifixion, only a prayer for those who in ignorance, were the instruments of His torture, had passed His lips. And yet He was innocent, Who so cruelly suffered. All that followed must have only deepened the impression. With what calm of endurance and majesty of silence He had borne the insult and jeers of those who, even to the spiritually unenlightened eye, must have seemed so infinitely far beneath Him! This man did feel the fear' of God, who now learned the new lesson in which the fear of God was truly the beginning of wisdom. And, once he gave place to the moral element, when under the fear of God he reproved his comrade, this new moral decision became to him, as so often, the beginning of spiritual life. Rapidly he now passed into the light, and onwards and upwards: Lord, remember me, when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom!' The familiar words of our Authorised Version - When Thou comest into Thy Kingdom' - convey the idea of what we might call a more spiritual meaning of the petition. But we can scarcely beleive, that at that moment it implied either that Christ was then going into His Kingdom, or that the penitent thief' looked to Christ for admission into the Heavenly Kingdom. The words are true to the Jewish point of vision of the man. He recognised and owned Jesus as the Messiah, and he did so, by a wonderful forthgoing of faith, even in the utmost Humiliation of Christ. And this immediately passed beyond the Jewish standpoint, for he expected Jesus soon to come back in His Kingly might and power, when he asked to be remembered by Him in mercy. And here we have again to bear in mind that, during the Life of Christ upon earth, and, indeed, before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, men always first learned to believe in the Person of the Christ, and then to know His teaching and His Mission in the forgiveness of sins. It was so in this case also. If the penitent thief' had learned to know the Christ, and to ask for gracious recognition in His coming Kingdom, the

answering assurance of the Lord conveyed not only the comfort that his prayer was answered, but the teaching of spiritual things which he knew not yet, and so much needed to know. The penitent' had spoken of the future, Christ spoke of to-day'; the penitent had prayed about that Messianic Kingdom which was to come, Christ assured him in regard to the state of the disembodied spirits, and conveyed to him the promise that he would be there in the abode of the blessed - Paradise' - and that through means of Himself as the Messiah: Amen, I say unto thee - To-day with Me shalt thou be in the Paradise.' Thus did Christ give him that spiritual knowledge which he did not yet possess - the teaching concerning the to-day,' the need of gracious admission into Paradise, and that with and through Himself - in other words, concerning the forgiveness of sins and the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers. This, as the first and foundation-creed of the soul, was the first and foundation-fact concerning the Messiah.This was the Second Utterance from the Cross. The first had been of utter self-forgetfullness; the second of deepest, wisest, most gracious spiritual teaching. And, had He spoken none other than these, He would have been proved to be the Son of God. [6116]Nothing more would require to be said to the penitent' on the Cross. The events which followed, and the words which Jesus would still speak, would teach him more fully thatn could otherwise have been done. Some hours - probably two - had passed since Jesus had been nailed to the Cross. We wonder how it came that St. John, who tells us some of the incidents with such exceeding particularity, and relates all with the vivid realisation of a most deeply interested eyewitness, should have been silent as to others - especially as to those hours of derision, as well as to the conversion of the penitent thief. His silence seems to us to have been due to absence from the scene. We part company with him after his detailed account of the last scene before Pilate. [6117] The final sentence pronounced, we suppose him to have hurried into the City, and to have acquainted such of the disciples as he might find - but especially those faithful women and the Virgin-Mother - with the terrible scenes that had passed since the previous evening. Thence he returned to Golgotha, just in time to witness the Crucifixion, which he again describes with peculiar fulness of details. [6118] When the Saviour was nailed to the Cross, St. John seems once more to have returned to the City - this time, to bring back with him those-women, in company of whom we now find him standing close to the Cross. A more delicate, tender, loving service could not have been rendered than this. Alone, of all the disciples, he is there - not afraid to be near Christ, in the Palace of the High-Priest, before Pilate, and now under the Cross. And alone he renders to Christ this tender service of bringing the women and Mary to the Cross, and to them the protection of his guidance and company. He loved Jesus best; and it was fitting that to his manliness and affection should be entrusted the unspeakable privilege of Christ's dangerous inheritance. [6119]The narrative [6120] leaves the impression that with the beloved disciple these four women were standing close to the Cross: the Mother of Jesus, the Sister of His Mother, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary of Magdala. [6121] A comparison with what is related by St. Matthew [6122] and St. Mark [6123] supplies further important particulars. We read there of only three women, the name of the Mother of our Lord being omitted. But then it must be remembered that this refers to a later period in the history of the Crucifixion. It seems as if John had fulfilled to the letter the Lord's command: Behold thy mother,' and literally from that very hour' taken her to his own home. If we are right in this supposition, then, in the absence of St. John - who led away the Virgin-Mother from that scene of horror - the other three women would withdraw to a distance, where we find them at the end, not by the Cross,' as in St. John xix.25, but beholding from afar,' and now joined by others also, who had loved and followed Christ. We further

notice that, the name of the Virgin-Mother being omitted, the other three are the same as mentioned by St. John; only, Mary of Clopas is now described as the mother of James and Jose,' [6124] and Christ's Mother's Sister' as Solome' [6125] and the mother of Zebedee's children.' [6126] Thus Salome, the wife of Zebedee and St. John's mother, was the sister of the Virgin, and the beloved disciple the cousin (on the mother's side) of Jesus, and the nephew of the Virgin. This also helps to explain why the care of the Mother had been entrusted to him. Nor was Mary the wife of Clopas unconnected with Jesus. What we have every reason to regard as a trustworthy account [6127] describes Clopas as the brother of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin. Thus, not only Salome as the sister of the Virgin, but Mary also as the wife of Clopas, would, in a certain sense, have been His aunt, and her sons His cousins. And so we notice among the twelve Apostles five cousins of the Lord: the two sons of Salome and Zebedee, and the three sons of Alphæus or Clopas [6128] and Mary: James, Judas surnamed Lebbæus and Thaddæus, and Simon surnamed Zelotes or Cananæan. [6129]We can now in some measure realise events. When St. John had seen the Saviour nailed to the Cross, he had gone to the City and brought with him for a last mournful farewell the Virgin, accompanied by those who, as most nearly connected with her, would naturally be with her: her own sister Salome, the sister-in-law of Joseph and wife (or more probably widow) of Clopas, and her who of all others had experienced most of His blessed power to save - Mary of Magdala. Once more we reverently mark His Divine calm of utter self-forgetfulness and His human thoughtfulness for others. As they stood under the Cross, He committed His Mother to the disciple whom He loved, and established a new human relationship between him and her who was nearest to Himself. [6130] And calmly, earnestly, and immediately did that disciple undertake the sacred charge, and bring her - whose soul the sword had pierced - away from the scene of unutterable woe to the shelter of his home. [6131] And this temporary absence of John from the Cross may account for the want of all detail in his narrative till quite the closing scene. [6132]Now at last all that concerned the earthward aspect of His Mission - so far as it had to be done on the Cross - was ended. He had prayed for those who had nailed Him to it, in ignorance of what they did; He had given the comfort of assurance to the penitent, who had owned His Glory in His Humiliation; and He had made the last provision of love in regard to those nearest to Him. So to speak, the relations of His Humanity - that which touched His Human Nature in any direction - had been fully met. He had done with the Human aspect of His Work and with earth. And, appropriately, Nature seemed now to take sad farewell of Him, and mourned its departing Lord, Who, by His Personal connection with it, had once more lifted it from the abasement of the Fall into the region of the Divine, making it the dwelling-place, the vehicle for the manifestation, and the obedient messenger of the Divine.For three hours had the Saviour hung on the Cross. It was midday. And now the Sun was craped in darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour. No purpose can be served by attempting to trace the source of this darkness. It could not have been an eclipse, since it was the time of full moon; nor can we place reliance on the later reports on this subject of ecclesiastical writers. [6133] It seems only in accordance with the Evangelic narrative to regard the occurrence of the event as supernatural, while the event itself might have been brought about by natural causes; and among these we must call special attention to the earthquake in which this darkness terminated. [6134] For, it is a well-known phenomenon that such darkness not unfrequently precedes earthquakes. On the other hand, it must be freely admitted, that the language of the Evangelists seems to imply that this darkness extended, not only over the land of Israel, but over the inhabited earth. The expression must, of course, not be pressed to its full

literality, but explained as meaning that it extended far beyond Judæa and to other lands. No reasonable objection can be raised from the circumstance, that neither the earthquake nor the preceding darkness are mentioned by any profane writer whose works have been preserved, since it would surely not be maintained that an historical record must have been preserved of every earthquake that occurred, and of every darkness that may have preceded it. [6135] But the most unfair argument is that, which tries to establish the unhistorical character of this narrative by an appeal to what are described as Jewish sayings expressive of similar expectancy. [6136] It is quite true that in old Testament prophecy - whether figuratively or really - the darkening, though not only of the sun, but also of the moon and stars, is sometimes connected, not with the Coming of Messiah, still less with His Death, but with the final Judgement. [6137] But Jewish tradition never speaks of such an event in connection with Messiah, or even with the Messianic judgments, and the quotations from Rabbinic writings made by negative critics must be characterised as not only inapplicable but even unfair. [6138] But to return from this painful digression. The three hours' darkness was such not only to Nature; Jesus, also, entered into darkness: Body, Soul, and Spirit. It was now, not as before, a contest - but suffering. Into this, to us, fathomless depth of the mystery of His Sufferings, we dare not, as indeed we cannot, enter. It was of the Body; yet not of the Body only, but of physical life. And it was of the Soul and Spirit; yet not of them alone, but in their conscious relation to man and to God. And it was not of the Human only in Christ, but in its indissolube connection with the Divine: of the Human, where it reached the utmost verge of humiliation to body, soul, and spirit - and in it of the Divine, to utmost self-exinanition. The increasing, nameless agonies of the Crucifixion [6139] were deepening into the bitterness of death. All nature shrinks from death, and there is a physical horror of the separation between body and soul which, as a purely natural phenomenon, is in every instance only overcome, and that only by a higher principle. And we conceive that the purer the being the greater the violence of the tearing asunder of the bond with which God Almighty originally bound together body and soul. In the Perfect Man this must have reached the highest degree. So, also, had in those dark hours the sense of man-forsakenness and His own isolation from man; so, also, had the intense silence of God, the withdrawal of God, the sense of His God-forsakenness and absolute loneliness. We dare not here speak of punitive suffering, but of forsakenness and loneliness. And yet as we ask ourselves how this forsakenness can be thought of as so complete in view of His Divine consciousness, which at least could not have been wholly extinguished by His Self-exinanition, we feel that yet another element must be taken into account. Christ on the Cross suffered for man; He offered Himself a sacrifice; He died for our sins, that, as death was the wages of sin, so He died as the Representative of man - for man and in room of man; He obtained for man eternal redemption,' [6140] having given His Life a ransom, [6141] for many.' For, men were redeemed' with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot;' [6142] and Christ gave Himself for us, that He might "redeem" us from all iniquity;' [6143] He gave Himself "a ransom" for all;' [6144] Christ died for all;' [6145] Him, Who knew no sin, God made sin for us;' Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us' - and this, with express reference to the Crucifixion. [6146] This sacrifice, vicarious, expiatory, and redemptive character of His Death, if it does not explain to us, yet helps us to understand, Christ's sense of God-forsakenness in the surpreme moment of the Cross; if one might so word it - the passive character of His activeness through the active character of His passiveness.It was this combination of the Old Testament idea of sacrifice, and of the Old Testament ideal of willing

suffering as the Servant of Jehovah, now fulfilled in Christ, which found its fullest expression in the language of the twenty-second Psalm. It was fitting - rather, it was true - that the willing suffering of the true Sacrifice should now find vent in its opening words: My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' - Eli, Eli, lema sabachthanei? [6147] These words, cried with a loud voice [6148] at the close of the period of extreme agony, [6149] marked the climax and the end of this suffering of Christ, of which the utmost compass was the withdrawal of God and the felt loneliness of the Sufferer. But they that stood by the Cross, misinterpreting the meaning, and mistaking the opening words for the name Elias, imagined that the Sufferer had called for Elias. We can scarcely doubt, that these were the soldiers who stood by the Cross. They were not necessarily Romans; on the contrary, as we have seen, these Legions were generally recruited from Provincials. On the other hand, no Jew would have mistaken Eli for the name of Elijah, not yet misinterpreted a quotation of Psalm xxii.1 as a call for that prophet. And it must be remembered, that the words were not whispered, but cried with a loud voice. But all entirely accords with the misunderstanding of non-Jewish soldiers, who, as the whole history shows, had learned from His accusers and the infuriated mob snatches of a distorted story of the Christ.And presently the Sufferer emerged on the other side. It can scarcely have been a minute or two from the time that the cry from the twenty-second Psalm marked the high-point of His Agony, when the words I thirst' [6150] seem to indicate, by the prevalence of the merely human aspect of the suffering, that the other and more terrible aspect of sin-bearing and God-forsakenness was past. To us, therefore, this seems the beginning, if not of Victory, yet of Rest, of the End. St. John alone records this Utterance, prefacing it with this distinctive statement, that Jesus so surrendered Himself to the human feeling, seeking the bodily relief by expressing His thirst: knowing that all things were now finished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled.' [6151] In other words, the climax of The anthropic Suffering in His feeling of God-forsakenness, which had led to the utterance of Psalm xxii.1, was now, to His consciousness, the end of all which in accordance with Scripture-prediction He had to bear. He now could and did yield Himself to the mere physical wants of His Body. It seems as if St. John, having perhaps just returned to the scene, and standing with the women afar off,' beholding these things, [6152] had hastened forward on the cry from Psalm xxii., [6153] and heard Him express the feeling of thirst, which immediately followed. And so St. John alone supplies the link between that cry and the movement on the part of the soldiers, which St. Matthew and St. Mark, as well as St. John, report. For, it would be impossible to understand why, on what the soldiers regarded as a call for Elijah, one of them should have hastened to relieve His thirst, but for the Utterance recorded in the Fourth Gospel. But we can quite understand it, if the Utterance, I thirst,' followed immediately on the previous cry.One of the soldiers - may we not be allowed to believe, one who either had already learned from that Cross, or was about to learn, to own Him Lord - moved by sympathy, now ran to offer some slight refreshment to the Sufferer by filling a sponge with the rough wine of the soldiers and putting it to His lips, having first fastened it to the stem (reed') of the caper (hyssop'), which is said to grow to the height of even two or three feet. [6154] But, even so, this act of humanity was not allowed to pass unchallenged by the coarse jibes of the others who would bid him leave the relief of the Sufferer to the agency of Elijah, which in their opinion He had invoked. Nor should we perhaps wonder at the weakness of that soldier himself, who, though he would not be hindered in his good deed, yet averted the opposition of the others by apparently joining in their mockery. [6155]By accepting the physical refreshment offered Him, the Lord once more indicated the completion of the work of His Passion. For, as He would not enter on it with His

senses and physical consciousness lulled by narcotised wine, so He would not pass out of it with senses and physical consciousness dulled by the absolute failure of life-power. Hence He took what for the moment restored the physical balance, needful for thought and word. And so He immediately passed on to taste death for every man.' For, the two last sayings' of the Saviour now followed in rapid succession: first, that with a loud voice, which expressed it, that the work given Him to do, as far as concerned His Passion, was finished;' [6156] and then, that in the words of Psalm xxxi.5, in which He commended His Spirit into the Hands of the Father. [6157] Attempts at comment could only weaken the solemn thoughts which the words awaken. Yet some points should be noted for our teaching. His last cry with a loud voice' was not like that of one dying. St. Mark notes, that this made such deep impression on the Centurion. [6158] In the language of the early Christian hymn, it was not Death which approached Christ, but Christ Death: He died without death. [6159] Christ encountered Death, not as conquered, but as the Conqueror. And this also was part of His work, and for us: now the beginning of His Triumph. And with this agrees the peculiar language of St. John, that He bowed the Head, and gave up the Spirit' (t pnema).Nor should we fail to mark the peculiarities of His last Utterance. The My God' of the fourth Utterance had again passed into the Father' of conscious fellowship. And yet neither in the Hebrew original of this Psalm, nor in its Greek rendering by the LXX., does the word Father' occur. Again, in the LXX. translation of the Hebrew text this word expressive of entrustment - the commending - is in the future tense; on the lips of our Lord it is in the present tense. [6160] And the word, in its New Testament sense, means not merely commending: it is to deposit, to commit for safe keeping. [6161] That in dying - or rather meeting and overcoming Death - He chose and adapted these words, is matter for deepest thankfulness to the Church. He spoke them for His people in a twofold sense: on their behalf, that they might be able to speak them; and for them,' that henceforth they might speak them after Him. How many thousands have pillowed their heads on them when going to rest! They were the last words of a Polycarp, a Bernard, Huss, Luther, and Melanchthon. And to us also they may be the fittest and the softest lullaby. And in the Spirit' which He had committed to God did He now descend into Hades, and preached unto the spirits in prison.' [6162] But behind this great mystery have closed the two-leaved gates of brass, which only the Hand of the Conqueror could burst open.And now a shudder ran through Nature, as its Sun had set. We dare not do more than follow the rapid outlines of the Evangelic narrative. As the first token, it records the rending of the Temple-Veil in two from the top downward to the bottom; as the second, the quaking of the earth, the rending of the rocks and the opening of the graves. Although most writers have regarded this as indicating the strictly chronological succession, there is nothing in the text to bind us to such a conclusion. Thus, while the rending of the Veil is recorded first, as being the most significant token to Israel, it may have been connected with the earthquake, although this alone might scarcely account for the tearing of so heavy a Veil from the top to the bottom. Even the latter circumstance has its significance. That some great catastrophe, betokening the impending destruction of the Temple, had occurred in the Sanctuary about this very time, is confirmed by not less than four mutually independent testimonies: those of Tacitus, [6163] of Josephus, [6164] of the Talmud, [6165] and of earliest Christian tradition [6166] . The most important of these are, of course, the Talmud and Josephus. The latter speaks of the mysterious extinction of the middle and chief light in the Golden Candlestick, forty years before the destruction of the Temple; and both he and the Talmud refer to a supernatural opening by themselves of the great Temple-gates that had been previously closed, which was regarded as a portent of the

coming destruction of the Temple. We can scarcely doubt, that some historical fact must underlie so peculiar and widespread a tradition, and we cannot help feeling that it may be a distorted version of the occurrence of the rending of the Temple-Veil (or of its report) at the Crucifixion of Christ. [6167] But even if the rending of the Temple-Veil had commenced with the earthquake, and, according to the Gospel to the Hebrews, with the breaking of the great lintel over the entrance, it could not be wholly accounted for in this manner. According to Jewish tradition, there were, indeed, two Veils before the entrance to the Most Holy Place. [6168] The Talmud explains this on the ground that it was not known, whether in the former Temple the Veil had hung inside or outside the entrance and whether the partition-wall had stood in the Holy or Most Holy Place. [6169] Hence (according to Maimonides) [6170] there was not any wall between the Holy and Most Holy Place, but the space of one cubit, assigned to it in the former Temple, was left unoccupied, and one Veil hung on the side of the Holy, the other on that of the Most Holy Place. According to an account dating from Temple-times, there were altogether thirteen Veils used in various parts of the Temple - two new ones being made every year. [6171] The Veils before the Most Holy Place were 40 cubits (60 feet) long, and 20 (30 feet) wide, of the thickness of the palm of the hand, and wrought in 72 squares, which were joined together; and these Veils were so heavy, that, in the exaggerated language of the time, it needed 3000 priests to manipulate each. If the Veil was at all such as is described in the Talmud, it could not have been rent in twain by a mere earthquake or the fall of the lintel, although its composition in squares fastened together might explain, how the rent might be as described in the Gospel.Indeed, everything seems to indicate that, although the earthquake might furnish the physical basis, the rent of the Temple-Veil was - with reverence be it said - really made by the Hand of God. As we compute, it may just have been the time when, at the Evening-Sacrifice, the officiating Priesthood entered the Holy Place, either to burn the incense or to do other sacred service there. To see before them, not as the aged Zacharias at the beginning of this history the Angel Gabriel, but the Veil of the Holy Place rent from top to bottom - that beyond it they could scarcely have seen - and hanging in two parts from its fastenings above and at the side, was, indeed, a terrible portent, which would soon become generally known, and must, in some form or other, have been preserved in tradition. And they all must have understood, that it meant that God's Own Hand had rent the Veil, and for ever deserted and thrown open that Most Holy Place where He had so long dwelt in the mysterious gloom, only lit up once a year by the glow of the censer of him, who made atonement for the sins of the people. [6172]Other tokens were not wanting. In the earthquake the rocks were rent, and their tombs opened. This, as Christ descended into Hades. And when He ascended on the third day, it was with victorious saints who had left those open graves. To many in the Holy City on that ever-memorable first day, and in the week that followed, appeared the bodies of many of those saints who had fallen on sleep in the sweet hope of that which had now become reality. [6173]But on those who stood under the Cross, and near it, did all that was witnessed make the deepest and most lasting impression. Among them we specially mark the Centurion under whose command the soldiers had been. Many a scene of horror must he have witnessed in those sad times of the Crucifixion, but none like this. Only one conclusion could force itself on his mind. It was that which, we cannot doubt, had made its impression on his heart and conscience. Jesus was not what the Jews, His infuriated enemies, had described Him. He was what He professed to be, what His bearing on the Cross and His Death attested Him to be: righteous,' and hence, the Son of God.' From this there was only a step to personal allegiance to Him, and, as previously suggested, we may possibly owe to him some of

those details which St. Luke alone has preserved.The brief spring-day was verging towards the evening of the Sabbath.' In general, the Law ordered that the body of a criminal should not be left hanging unburied over night. [6174] Perhaps in ordinary circumstances the Jews might not have appealed so confidently to Pilate as actually to ask [6175] him to shorten the sufferings of those on the Cross, since the punishment of crucifixion often lasted not only for hours but days, ere death ensued. But here was a special occasion. The Sabbath about to open was a high-day' - it was both a Sabbath and the second Paschal Day, which was regarded as in every respect equally sacred with the first - nay, more so, since the so-called Wavesheaf was then offered to the Lord. And what the Jews now proposed to Pilate was, indeed, a shortening, but not in any sense a mitigation, of the punishment. Sometimes there was added to the punishment of crucifixion that of breaking the bones (crurifragium, skelokopa) by means of a club or hammer. This would not itself bring death, but the breaking of the bones was always followed by a coup de grâce, by sword, lance, or stroke (the perforatio or percussio sub alas), which immediately put an end to what remained of life. [6176] Thus the breaking of the bones' was a sort of increase of punishment, by way of compensation for its shortening by the final stroke that followed. It were unjust to suppose, that in their anxiety to fulfil the letter of the Law as to burial on the eve of that high Sabbath, the Jews had sought to intensify the sufferings of Jesus. The text gives no indication of this; and they could not have asked for the final stroke to be inflicted without the breaking of the bones,' which always preceded it. The irony of this punctilious care for the letter of the Law about burial and high Sabbath by those who had betrayed and crucified their Messiah on the first Passover-day is sufficiently great, and, let us add, terrible, without importing ficticious elements. St. John, who, perhaps, immediately on the death of Christ, left the Cross, alone reports circumstance. Perhaps it was when he concerted with Joseph of Arimathæa, with Nicodemus, or the two Marys, measures for the burying of Christ, that he learned of the Jewish deputation to Pilate, followed it to Prætorium, and then watched how it was all carried out on Golgotha. He records, how Pilate acceded to the Jewish demand, and gave directions for the crurifragium, and premission for the after-removal of the dead bodies, which otherwise might have been left to hang, till putrescence or birds of prey had destroyed them. But St. John also tells us what he evidently regards as so great a prodigy that he specially vouches for it, pledging his own veracity, as an eyewitness, and grounding on it an appeal to the faith of those to whom his Gospel is addressed. It is, that certain things came to pass [not as in our A. V., were done'] that the Scripture should be fulfilled,' or, to put it otherwise, by which the Scripture was fulfilled. These things were two, to which a third phenomenon, not less remarkable, must be added. For, first, when, in the crurifragium, the soldiers had broken the bones of two malefactors, and then came to the Cross of Jesus, they found that He was dead already, and so a bone of Him' was not broken.' Had it been otherwise, the Scripture concerning the Paschal Lamb, [6177] as well that concerning the Righteous Suffering Servant of Jehovah, [6178] would have been broken. In Christ alone these two ideas of the Paschal Lamb and the Righteous Suffering Servant of Jehovah are combined into a unity and fulfilled in their highest meaning. And when, by a strange concurrence of circumstances, it came to pass' that, contrary to what might have been expected, a bone of Him' was not broken' this outward fact served as the finger to point to the predictions which were fulfilled of Him.Not less remarkable is the second fact. If, on the Cross of Christ, these two fundamental ideas in the prophetic description of the work of the Messiah had been set forth: the fulfilment of the Paschal Sacrifice, which, as that of the Covenant, underlay all sacrifices, and the fulfilment of the ideal of

the Righteous Servant of God, suffering in a world that hated God, and yet proclaimed and realising His Kingdom, a third truth remained to be exhibited. It was not in regard to the character, but the effects, of the Work of Christ - its reception, alike in the present and in the future. This had been indicated in the prophecies of Zechariah, [6179] which foretold how, in the day of Israel's final deliverance and national conversion, God would pour out the spirit of grace and of supplication, and as they shall look on Him Whom they pierced,' the spirit of true repentance would be granted them, alike nationally and individually. The application of this to Christ is the more striking, that even the Talmud refers the prophecy to the Messiah. [6180] And as these two things really applied to Christ, alike in His rejection and in His future return, [6181] so did the strange historical occurence at His Crucifixion once more point to it as the fulfilment of Scripture prophecy. For, although the soldiers, on finding Jesus dead, broke not one of His Bones, yet, as it was necessary to make sure of His Death, one of them, with a lance, pierced His Side,' with a wound so deep, that Thomas might afterwards have thrust his hand into His Side. [6182]And with these two, as fulfilling Holy Scripture, yet a third phenonmenon was associated, symbolic of both. As the soldier pierced the side of the Dead Christ, forthwith came there out Blood and Water.' It has been thought by some, [6183] that there was physical cause for this - that Christ had literally died of a broken heart, and that, when the lance pierced first the lung filled with blood and then the pericardium filled with serous fluid, [6184] there flowed from the wound this double stream. [6185] In such cases, the lesson would be that reproach had literally broken His Heart. [6186] But we can scarcely believe that St. John could have wished to convey this without clearly setting it forth - thus assuming on the part of his readers knowledge of an obscure, and, it must be added, a scientifically doubtful phenomenon. Accordingly, we rather believe that to St. John, as to most of us, the significance of the fact lay in this, that out of the Body of One dead had flowed Blood and Water - that corruption had not fastened on Him. Then, there would be the symbolic meaning conveyed by the Water (from the pericardium) and the Blood (from the heart) - a symbolism most true, if corruption had no power nor hold on Him - if in Death He was not dead, if He vanquished Death and Corruption, and in this respect also fulfilled the prophetic ideal of not seeing corruption. [6187] To this symbolic bearing of the flowing of Water and Blood from His pierced side, on which the Evangelist dwells in his Epistle, [6188] and to its external expression in the symbolism of the two Sacraments, we can only point the thoughtful Christian. For, the two Sacraments mean that Christ had come; that over Him, Who was crucified for us and loved us unto death with His broken heart, Death and Corruption had no power; and that He liveth for us with the pardoning and cleansing power of His offered Sacrifice. Yet one other scene remains to be recorded. Whether before, or, more probably, after the Jewish deputation to the Roman Governor, another and a strange application came to Pilate. It was from one apparently well known, a man not only of wealth and standing, [6189] whose noble bearing [6190] corresponded to his social condition, and who was known as a just and a good man. [6191] Joseph of Arimathæa was a Sanhedrist, [6192] but he had not consented either to the counsel or the deed of his colleagues. It must have been generally known that he was one of those which waited for the Kingdom of God.' But he had advanced beyond what that expression implies. Although secretly, for fear of the Jews. [6193] he was a disciple of Jesus. It is in strange contrast to this fear,' that St. Mark tells us, that, having dared,' [6194] he went in unto Pilate and asked for the Body of Jesus.' Thus, under circumstances the most unlikely and unfavorable, were his fears converted into boldness, and he, whom fear of the Jews had restrained from making open avowal of discipleship during the life-time of Jesus, not

only professed such of the Crucified Christ, [6195] but took the most bold and decided step before Jews and Gentiles in connection with it. So does trial elicit faith, and the wind, which quenches the feeble flame that plays around the outside, fan into brightness the fire that burns deep within, though for a time unseen. Joseph of Arimathæa, now no longer a secret disciple, but bold in the avowal of his reverent love, would show to the Dead Body of his Master all veneration. And the Divinely ordered concurrence of circumstances not only helped his pious purpose, but invested all with deepest symbolic significance. It was Friday afternoon, and the Sabbath was drawing near. [6196] No time therefore was to be lost, if due honour were to be paid to the Sacred Body. Pilate give it to Joseph of Arimathæa. Such was within his power, and a favour not unfrequently accorded in like circumstances. [6197] But two things must have powerfully impressed the Roman Governor, and deepened his former thoughts about Jesus: first, that the death on the Cross had taken place so rapidly, a circumstance on which he personally questioned the Centurion, [6198] and then the bold appearance and request of such a man as Joseph of Arimathæa. [6199] Or did the Centurion express to the Governor also some such feeling as that which had found utterance under the Cross in the words: Truly this Man was the Son of God?'The proximity of the holy Sabbath, and the consequent need of haste, may have suggested or determined the proposal of Joseph to lay the Body of Jesus in his own rock-hewn new tomb, [6200] wherein no one had yet been laid. [6201] The symbolic significance of this is the more marked, that the symbolism was undersigned. These rock-hewn sepulchres, and the mode of laying the dead in them, have been very fully described in connection with the burying of Lazarus [6202] We may therefore wholly surrender overselves to the sacred thoughts that gather around us. The Cross was lowered and laid on the ground; the curel nails drawn out, and the ropes unloosed. Joseph, with those who attended him, wrapped' the Sacred Body in a clean linen cloth,' and rapidly carried It to the rock-hewn tomb in the garden close by. Such a rock-hewn tomb or cave (Meartha) had niches (Kukhin), where the dead were laid. It will be remembered, that at the entrance to the tomb' - and within the rock' - there was a court,' nine feet square, where ordinarly the bier was deposited, and its bearers gathered to do the last offices for the Dead. Thither we suppose Joseph to have carried the Sacred Body, and then the last scene to have taken place. For now another, kindered to Joseph in spirit, history, and position, had come. The same spiritual Law, which had brought Joseph to open confession, also constrained the profession of that other Sanhedrist, Nicodemus. We remember, how at the first he had, from fear of detection,come to Jesus by night, and with what bated breath he had pleaded with his colleagues not so much the cause of Christ, as on His behalf that of law and justice. [6203] He now came, bringing a roll' of myrrh and aloes, in the fragrant mixture well known to the Jews for puroses of anointing or burying.It was in the court' of the tomb that the hasty embalmment - if such it may be called - took place. None of Christ's former disciples seem to have taken part in the burying. John may have withdrawn to bring tidings to, and to comfort the Virgin-Mother; the others also, that had stood after off, beholding,' appear to have left. Only a few faithful ones, [6204] notably among them Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, the mother of Joses, stood over against the tomb, watching at some distance where and how the Body of Jesus was laid. It would scarcely have been in accordance with Jewish manners, if these women had mingled more closely with the two Sanhedrists and their attendants. From where they stood they could only have had a dim view of what passed within the court, and this may explain how, on their return, they prepared spices and ointments' [6205] for the more full honours which they hoped to pay the Dead after the Sabbath was past. [6206] For, it is of the greatest importance

to remember, that haste characterised all that was done. It seems as if the clean linen cloth' in which the Body had been wrapped, was now torn into cloths' or swathes, into which the Body, limb by limb, was now bound,' [6207] no doubt, between layers of myrrh and aloes, the Head being wrapped in a napkin. And so they laid Him to rest in the inche of the rock-hewn new tomb. And as they went out, they rolled, as was the custom, a great stone' - the Golel - to close the entrance to the tomb, [6208] probably leaning against it for support, as was the practice, a smaller stone - the so-called Dopheq. [6209] It would be where the one stone was laid against the other, that on the next day, Sabbath though it was, the Jewish authorities would have affixed the seal, so that the slightest disturbance might become apparent. [6210] . . .

. . .

. .It was probably about the same time, that a noisy throng prepared to follow delegates from the Sanhedrin to the ceremony of cutting the Passover-sheaf. The Law had it, "he shall bring a sheaf [literally, the Omer] with the first-fruits of your harvest, unto the priest; and he shall wave the Omer before Jehovah, to be accepted for you." This Passover-sheaf was reaped in public the evening before it was offered, and it was to witness this ceremony that the crowd had gathered around the elders. Already on the 14th Nisan the spot whence the first sheaf was to be reaped had been marked out, by tying together in bundles, while still standing, the barley that was to be cut down, according to custom, in the sheltered Ashes-Valley across Kidron. When the time for cutting the sheaf had arrived - that is, on the evening of the 15th Nisan, even though it were a Sabbath, just as the sun went down, three men, each with a sickle and basket, set to work. Clearly to bring out what was distinctive in the ceremony, they first asked of the bystanders three times each of these questions: "Has the sun gone down?" "With this sickle?" "Into this basket?" "On this Sabbath? (or first Passover-day)" - and, lastly, "shall I reap?" Having each time been answered in the affirmative, they cut down barley to the amount of one ephah, or about three pecks and three pints of our English measure. This is not the place to follow the ceremony farther - how the corn was threshed out, parched, ground, and one omer of the flour, mixed with oil and frankincense, waved before the Lord in the Temple on the second Paschal day (or 16th of Nisan). But, as this festive procession started, amidst loud demonstrations, a small band of mourners turned from having laid their dead Master in His resting-place. The contrast is as sad as it is suggestive. And yet, not in the Temple, nor by the priest, but in the silence of that garden-tomb, was the first Omer of the new Paschal flour to be waved before the Lord.' [6211]. . .

. . .

. .Now on the morrow, which is after the preparation [the Friday], the chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, which He was yet alive, After three days I rise again. Command, therefore, that the sephulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply His disciples come and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Take a guard, go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them.'. . .

. . .

. .But was there really need for it? Did they, who had spent what remained of daylight to prepare spices wherewith to anoint the Dead Christ, expect His Body to be removed, or did they expect - perhaps in their sorrow even think of His word: I rise again?' But on that holy Sabbath, when the Sanhedrists were thinking of how to make sure of the Dead Christ, what were the thoughts of Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus, of Peter and John, of the other disciples, and especially of the loving women who only waited for the first streak of Easter-light to do their last service of love? What were their thoughts of God - what of Christ - what of the Words He had spoken, the Deeds He had wrought, the salvation He had come to bring, and the Kingdom of Heaven which He was to open to all believers?Behind Him had closed the gates of Hades; but upon them rather than upon Him had fallen the shadows of death. Yet they still loved Him - and stronger than death was love.

CHAPTER XVI. ON THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST FROM THE DEAD.

The history of the Life of Christ upon earth closes with a Miracle as great as that of its inception. It may be said that the one casts light upon the other. If He was what the Gospels represent Him, He must have been born of a pure Virgin, without sin, and He must have risen from the Dead. If the story of His Birth be true, we can believe that of His Resurrection; if that of His Resurrection be true, we can believe that of His Birth. In the nature of things, the latter was incapable of strict historical proof; and, in the nature of things, His Resurrection demanded and was capable of the fullest historical evidence. If such exists, the keystone is given to the arch; the miraculous Birth becomes almost a necessary postulate, and Jesus is the Christ in the full sense of the Gospels. And yet we mark, as another parallel point between the account of the miraculous Birth and that of the Resurrection, the utter absence of details as regards these events themselves. If this circumstance may be taken as indirect evidence that they were not legendary, it also imposes on us the duty of observing the reverent silence so well-befitting the case, and not intruding beyond the path which the Evangelic narrative has opened to us. That path is sufficiently narrow, and in some respects difficult; not, indeed, as to the great event itself, nor as to its leading features, but as to the more minute details. And here, again, our difficulties arise, not so much from any actual disagreement, as from the absence of actual identity. Much of this is owning to the great compression in the various narratives, due partly to the character of the event narrated, partly to the incomplete information possessed by the narrators - of whom only one was strictly an eyewitness, but chiefly to this, that to the different narrators the central point of interest lay in one or the other aspect of the circumstances connected with the Resurrection. Not only St. Matthew, [6212] but also St. Luke, so compresses the narrative that the distinction of points of time' is almost effaced. St. Luke seems to crowd into the Easter Evening what himself tells us occupied forty days. [6213] His is, so to speak, the pre-eminently Jerusalem account of the evidence of the Resurrection; that of St. Matthew the pre-eminently Galilean account of it. Yet each implies and corroborates the facts of the other. [6214] In general we ought to remember, that the Evangelists, and afterwards St. Paul, are not so much concerned to narrate the whole history of the Resurrection as to furnish the evidence for it. And here what is distinctive in each is also characteristic of his special view-point. St. Matthew describes the impression of the full evidence of that Easter morning on friend and foe, and then hurries us from the Jerusalem stained with Christ's Blood back to the sweet Lake and the blessed Mount where first He spake. It is, as if he longed to realise the Risen Christ in the scenes where he had learned to know Him. St. Mark, who is much more brief, gives not only a mere summary, [6215] but, if one might use the expression, tells it as from the bosom of the Jerusalem family, from the house of his mother Mary. [6216] St. Luke seems to have made most full inquiry as to all the facts of the Resurrection, and his narrative might almost be inscribed: Easter Day in Jerusalem.' St. John paints such scenes - during the whole forty days, whether in Jerusalem or Galilee - as were most significant and teachful of this threefold lesson of his Gospels: that Jesus was the Christ, that He was the Son of God, and that,

believing, we have life in His Name. Lastly, St. Paul - as one born out of due time - produces the testimony of the principal witnesses to the fact, in a kind of ascending climax. [6217] And this the more effectively, that he is evidently aware of the difficulties and the import of the question, and has taken pains to make himself acquainted with all the facts of the case. The question is of such importance, alike in itself and as regards this whole history, that a discussion, however brief and even imperfect, [6218] preliminary to the consideration of the Evangelic narrations, seems necessary. What thoughts concerning the Dead Christ filled the minds of Joseph of Arimathæa, of Nicodemus, and of the other disciples of Jesus, as well as of the Apostles and of the pious women? They believed Him to be dead, and they did not expect Him to rise again from the dead - at least, in our accepted sense of it. Of this there is abundant evidence from the moment of His Death, in the burial spices brought by Nicodemus, in those prepared by the women (both of which were intended as against corruption), in the sorrow of the women at the empty tomb, in their supposition that the Body had been removed, in the perplexity and bearing of the Apostle, in the doubts of so many, and indeed in the express statement: For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead.' [6219] And the notice in St. Matthew's Gospel, [6220] that the Sanhedrists had taken precautions against His Body being stolen, so as to give the appearance of fulfilment to His prediction that He would rise again after three days [6221] - that, therefore, they knew of such a prediction, and took it in the literal sense - would give only more emphasis to the opposite bearing of the disciples and their manifest non-expectancy of a literal Resurrection. What the disciples expected, perhaps wished, was not Christ's return in glorified corporeity, but His Second Coming in glory into His Kingdom. But if they regarded Him as really dead and not to rise again in the literal sense, this had evidently no practical effect, not only on their former feelings towards Him, but even on their faith in Him as the promised Messiah. [6222] This appears from the conduct of Joseph and Nicodemus, from the language of the women, and from the whole bearing of the Apostles and disciples. All this must have been very different, if they had regarded the Death of Christ, even on the Cross, as having given the lie to His Messianic Claims. [6223] On the contrary, the impression left on our minds is, that, although they deeply grieved over the loss of their Master, and the seeming triumph of His foes, [6224] yet His Death came to them not unexpectedly, but rather as of internal necessity and as the fulfilment of His often repeated prediciton. Nor can we wonder at this, since He had, ever since the Transfiguration, laboured, against all their resistance and reluctance, to impress on them the act of His Betrayal and Death. He had, indeed - although by no means so frequently or clearly - also referred to His Resurrection. But of this they might, according to their Jewish ideas, form a very different conception from that of a literal Resurrection of that Crucified Body in a glorified state, and yet capable of such terrestial intercourse as the Risen Christ held with them. And if it be objected that, in such case, Christ must have clearly taught them all this, it is sufficient to answer, that there was no need for such clear teaching on the point at that time; that the event itself would soon and best teach them; that it would have been impossible really to teach it, except by the event; and that any attempt at it would have involved a far fuller communication on this mysterious subject than, to judge from what is told us in Scripture, it was the purpose of Christ to impart in our present state of faith and expectancy. Accordingly, from their point of view, the prediction of Christ might have referred to the continuance of His Work, to his Vindication, or to some apparition of Him, whether from heaven or on earth - such as that of the saints in Jerusalem after the Resurrection, or that of Elijah in Jewish belief - but especially to His return in glory; certainly, not to the Resurrecton as it

actually took place. The fact itself would be quite foreign to Jewish ideas, which embraced the continuance of the soul after death and the final resurrection of the body, but not a state of spiritual corporeity, far less, under conditions such as those described in the Gospels. [6225] Elijah, who is so constantly introduced in Jewish tradition, is never represented as sharing in meals or offering his body for touch; nay, the Angels who visited Abraham are represented as only making show of, not really, eating. [6226] Clearly, the Apostles had not learned the Resurrection of Christ either from the Scriptures - and this proves that the narrative of it was not intended as a fulfilment of previous expectancy - nor yet from the predictions of Christ to that effect; although without the one, and especially without the other, the empty grave would scarcely have wrought in them the assured conviction of the Resurrection of Christ. [6227] This brings us to the real question in hand. Since the Apostles and others evidently believed Him to be dead, and expected not His Resurrection, and since the fact of His Death was not to them a formidable, if any, objection to His Messianic Character - such as might have induced them to invent or imagine a Resurrection - how are we to account for the history of the Resurrection with all its details in all the four Gospels and by St. Paul? The details, or signs' are clearly intended as evidences to all of the reality of the Resurrection, without which it would not have been believed; and their multiplication and variety must, therefore, be considered as indicating what otherwise would have been not only numerous but insuperable difficulties. similarly, the language of St. Paul [6228] implies a careful and searching inquiry on his part; [6229] the more rational, that, besides intrinsic difficulties and Jewish preconceptions against it, the objections to the fact must have been so often and coarsely obtruded on him, whether in disputation or by the jibes of the Greek scholars and students who derided his preaching. [6230] Hence, the question to be faced is this: Considering their previous state of mind and the absence of any motive, how are we to account for the change of mind on the part of the disciples in regard to the Resurrection? There can at least be no question, that they came to believe, and with the most absolute certitude, in the Resurrection as an historical fact; nor yet, that it formed the basis and substances of all their preaching of the Kingdom; nor yet, that St. Paul, up to his conversion a bitter enemy of Christ, was fully persuaded of it; nor - to go a step back - that Jesus Himself expected it. Indeed, the world would not have been converted to a dead Jewish Christ, however His intimate disciples might have continued to love His memory. But they preached everywhere, first and foremost, the Resurrection from the dead! In the language of St. Paul: If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God . . . ye are yet in your sins.' [6231] We must here dismiss what probably underlies the chief objection to the Resurrection: its miraculous character. The objection to Miracles, as such, proceeds on that false Supernaturalism, which traces a Miracle to the immediate fiat of the Almighty without any intervening links; [6232] and, as already shown, it involves a vicious petitio principii. But, after all, the Miraculous is only the to us unprecedented and uncognisable - a very narrow basis on which to refuse historical investigation. And the historian has to account for the undoubted fact, that the Resurrection was the fundamental personal conviction of the Apostles and disciples, the basis of their preaching, and the final support of their martyrdom. What explanation then can be offered of it? 1. We may here put aside two hypotheses, now universally discarded even in Germany, and which probably have never been seriously entertained in this country. They are that of gross fraud on the part of the disciples, who had stolen the Body of Jesus - as to which even Strauss remarks, that such a falsehood is wholly incompatible with their after-life, heroism, and martyrdom; - and again this, that Christ had not

been really dead when taken from the Cross, and that He gradually revived again. Not to speak of the many absurdities which this theory involves, [6233] it really shifts - if we acquit the disciples of complicity - the fraud upon Christ Himself. 2. The only other explanation, worthy of attention, is the so called Vision-hypothesis:' that the Apostles really believed in the Resurrection, but the mere visions of Christ had wrought in them this belief. The hypothesis has been variously modified. According to some, these visions were the outcome of an excited imagination, of a morbid state of the nervous system. To this there is, of course, the preliminary objection, that such visions presuppose a previous expectancy of the event, which, as we know, is the opposite of the fact. Again, such a Vision-hypothesis' in no way agrees with the many details and circumstances narrated in connection with Risen One, Who is described as having appeared not only to one or another in the retirement of the chamber, but to many, and in a manner and circumstances which render the idea of a mere vision impossible. Besides, the visions of an excited imagination would not have endured and led to such results; most probably they would soon have given place to corresponding depression. The Vision-hypothesis' is not much improved, if we regard the supposed vision as the result of reflection - that the disciples, convinced that the Messiah could not remain dead (and this again is contrary to fact) had wrough themselves first into a persuasion that He must rise, and then into visions of the Risen [6234] One. Nor yet would it commend itself more to our mind, if were to assume that thes visions had been directly sent from God Himself, [6235] to attest the fact that Christ lived. For, we have here to deal with a series of facts that cannot be so explained, such as the showing them His Sacred Wounds; the offer touch them; the command to handle Him, so as to convince themselves of His real corporeity; the eating with the disciples; the appearance by the Lake of Galilee, and others. Besides, the Vision-hypothesis' has to account for the events of the Easter-morning, and especially for the empty tomb from which the great stone had been rolled, and in which the very cerements [6236] of death were seen by those who entered it. In fact, such a narrative as that recorded by St. Luke [6237] seems almost designed to render the Vision-hypothesis' impossible. We are expressly told, that the appearance of the Risen Christ, so far from meeting their anticipations, had affrighted them, and that they had thought it spectral, on which Christ had reassured them, and bidden them handle Him, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold Me having.' Lastly, who removed the Body of Christ from the tomb? Six weeks afterwards, Peter preached the Resurrection of Christ in Jerusalem. If Christ's enemies had removed the Body, they could easily have silenced Peter; if His friends, they would have been guilty of such fraud, as not even Strauss deems possible in the circumstances. The theories of deception, delusion, [6238] and vision being thus impossible, and the à priori objection to the fact, as involving a Miracle, being a petitio principii, the historical student is shut up to the simple acceptance of the narrative. To this conclusion the unpreparedness of the disciples, their previous opinions, their new testimony unto martyrdom, the foundation of the Christian Church, the testimony of so many, singly and in company, and the series of recorded manifestations during forty days, and in such different circumstances, where mistake was impossible, had already pointed with unerring certainty. [6239] And even if slight discrepancies, nay, some not strictly historical details, which might have been the outcome of earliest tradition in the Apostolic Church, could be shown in those accounts which were not of eyewitnesses, it would assuredly not invalidate the great fact itself, which may unhesitatingly be pronounced that best established in history. At the same time we would carefully guard ourselves against the admission that those hypothetical flaws really exist in the narratives. On the contrary, we believe them

capable of the most satisfactory arrangement, unless under the strain of hypercriticism. The importance of all this cannot be adequately expressed in words. A dead Christ might have been a Teacher and Wonder-worker, and remembered and loved as such. But only a Risen and Living Christ could be the Saviour, the Life, and the Life-Giver, and as such preached to all men. And of this most blessed truth we have the fullest and most unquestionable evidence. We can, therefore, implictly yeild ourselves to the impression of these narratives, and, still more, to the realisation of that most sacred and blessed fact. This is the foundation of the Chruch, the inscription on the banner of her armies, the strength and comfort of every Christian heart, and the grand hope of humanity: The Lord is risen indeed.' [6240]THE CROSS AND THE CROWN

CHAPTER XVII. ON THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD; HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN'

(St. Matt. xxviii.1-10; St. Mark xvi.1-11; St. Luke xxiv.1-12; St. John xx.1-18; St. Matt. xxviii.11-15; St. Mark xvi.12, 13; St. Luke xxiv.13-35; 1 Cor. xv.5; St. Mark xvi.14; St. Luke xxiv.36-43; St. John xx.19-25; St. John xx.26-29; St. Matt. xxviii.16; St. John xxi.1-24; St. Matt. xxviii.17-20; St. Mark xvi.15-28; 1 Cor. xv.6; St. Luke xxiv.44-53; St. Mark xvi.19, 20; Acts i.3-12.) GREY dawn was streaking the sky, when they who had so lovingly watched Him to His Burying were making their lonely way to the rock-hewn Tomb in the Garden. [6241] Considerable as are the difficulties of exactly harmonising the details in the various narratives - if, indeed, importance attaches to such attempts - we are thankful to know that any hesitation only attaches to the arrangement of minute particulars, [6242] and not to the great facts of the case. And even these minute details would, as we shall have occasion to show, be harmonious, if only we knew all the circumstances. The difference, if such it may be called, in the names of the women, who at early morn went to the Tomb, scarce requires elaborate discussion. It may have been, that there were two parties, starting from different places to meet at the Tomb, and that this also accounts for the slight difference in the details of what they saw and heard at the Grave. At any rate, the mention of the two Marys and Joanna is supplemented in St. Luke [6243] by that of the other women with them,' while, if St. John speaks only of Mary Magdalene, [6244] her report to Peter and John: We know not where they have laid Him,' implies, that she had not gone alone to the Tomb. It was the first day of the week [6245] - according to Jewish reckoning the third day from His Death. [6246] The narrative leaves the impression that the Sabbath's rest had delayed their visit to the Tomb; but it is at least a curious coincidence that the relatives and friends of the deceased were in the habit of going to the grave up to the third day (when presumably corruption was supposed to begin), so as to make sure that those laid there were really dead. [6247] Commenting on this, that Abraham described Mount Moriah on the third day, [6248] the Rabbis insist on the importance of the third day' in various events connected with Israel, and specially speak of it in connection with the resurrection of the dead, referring in proof to Hos. vi.2. [6249] In another place, appealing to the same prophetic saying, they infer from Gen. xxii.7, that God never leaves the just more than three days in anguish. [6250] In mourning also the third day formed a sort of period, because it was thought that the soul hovered round the body till the third day, when it finally parted from its tabernacle. [6251] Although these things are here mentioned, we need scarcely say that no such thoughts were present with the holy mourners who, in the grey of that Sunday-morning, [6252] went to the Tomb. Whether or not there were two groups of women who started from different places to meet at the Tomb, the most prominent figure among them was Mary Magdalene [6253] - as prominent among the pious women as Peter was among the Apostles. She seems to have reached the Grave, [6254] and, seeing the great stone that had covered its entrance rolled away, hastily judged that the Body of the Lord had been removed. Without waiting for further inquiry, she ran back to inform Peter and John of the fact. The Evangelist here explains, that there had been a great earthquake, and that the Angel of the Lord, to human sight as lightning and in brilliant white

garment, had rolled back the stone, and sat upon it, when the guard, affrighted by what they heard and saw, and especially by the look and attitude of heavenly power in the Angel, had been seized with mortal faintness. Remembering the events connected with the Crucifixion, which had no doubt been talked about among the soldiery, and bearing in mind the impression of such a sight on such minds, we could readily understand the effect on the two sentries who that long night had kept guard over the solitary Tomb. The event itself (we mean: as regards the rolling away of the stone), we suppose to have taken place after the Resurrection of Christ, in the early dawn, while the holy women were on their way to the Tomb. The earth-quake cannot have been one in the ordinary sense, but a shaking of the place, when the Lord of Life burst the gates of Hades to re-tenant His Glorified Body, and the lightning-like Angel descended from heaven to roll away the stone. To have left it there, when the Tomb was empty, would have implied what was no longer true. But there is a sublime irony in the contrast between man's elaborate precautions and the ease with which the Divine Hand can sweep them aside, and which, as throughout the history of Christ and of His Church, recalls the prophetic declaration: He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh at them.' While the Magdalene hastened, probably by another road, to the abode of Peter and John, the other women also had reached the Tomb, either in one party, or, it may be, in two companies. They had wondered and feared how they could accomplish their pious purpose - for, who would roll away the stone for them? But, as often, the difficulty apprehended no longer existed. Perhaps they thought that the now absent Mary Magdalene had obtained help for this. At any rate, they now entered the vestibule of the Sepulchre. Here the appearance of the Angel filled them with fear. But the heavenly Messenger bade them dismiss apprehension; he told them that Christ was not there, nor yet any longer dead, but risen, as indeed, He had foretold in Galilee to His disciples; finally, he bade them hasten with the announcements to the disciples, and with this message, that, as Christ had directed them before, they were to meet Him in Galilee. It was not only that this connected, so to speak, the wondrous present with the familiar past, and helped them to realise that it was their very Master; nor yet that in the retirement, quiet, and security of Galilee, there would be best opportunity for fullest manifestation, as to the five hundred, and for final conversation and instruction. But the main reason, and that which explains the otherwise strange, almost exclusive, prominence given at such a moment to the direction to meet Him in Galilee, has already been indicated in a previous chapter. [6255] With the scattering of the Eleven in Gethsemane on the night of Christ's betrayal, the Apostolic College was temporarily broken up. They continued, indeed, still to meet together as individual disciples, but the bond of the Apostolate was for the moment, dissolved. And the Apostolic circle was to be reformed, and the Apostolic Commission renewed and enlarged, in Galilee; not, indeed, by its Lake, where only seven of the Eleven seem to have been present, [6256] but on the mountain where He had directed them to meet Him. [6257] Thus was the end to be like the beginning. Where He had first called, and directed them for their work, there would He again call them, give fullest directions, and bestow new and amplest powers. His appearances in Jerusalem were intended to prepare them for all this, to assure them completely and joyously of the fact of His Resurrection - the full teaching of which would be given in Galilee. And when the women, perplexed and scarcely conscious, obeyed the command to go in and examine for themselves the now empty niche in the Tomb, they saw two Angels [6258] - probably as the Magdalene afterwards saw them - one at the head, the other at the feet, where the Body of Jesus had lain. They waited no longer, but hastened, without speaking to anyone, to carry to the disciples the tidings of which they could not

even yet grasp the full import. [6259] 2. But whatever unclearness of detail may rest on the narratives of the Synoptists, owing to their great compression, all is distinct when we follow the steps of the Magdalene, as these traced in the Fourth Gospel. Hastening from the Tomb, she ran to the lodging of Peter and to that of John - the repetition of the preposition to' probably marking, that the two occupied different, although perhaps closely adjoining, quarters. [6260] Her startling tidings induced them to go at once - and they went towards the sepulchre.' But they began to run, the two together' - probably so soon as they were outside the town and near the Garden.' John, as the younger, outran Peter. [6261] Reaching the Sepulchre first, and stooping down, he seeth' (blpei) the linen clothes, but, from his position, not the napkin which lay apart by itself. If reverence and awe prevented John from entering the Sepulchre, his impulsive companion, who arrived immediately after him, thought of nothing else than the immediate and full clearing up of the mystery. As he entered the sepulchre, he steadfastly (intently) beholds' (theore) in one place the linen swathes that had bound about His Head. There was no sign of haste, but all was orderly, leaving the impression of One Who had leisurely divested Himself of what no longer befitted Him. Soon the other disciples' followed Peter. The effect of what he saw was, that he now believed in his heart that the Master was risen - for till then they had not yet derived from Holy Scripture the knowledge that He must rise again. And this also is most instructive. It was not the belief previously derived from Scripture, that the Christ was to rise from the Dead, which led to expectancy of it, but the evidence that He had risen which led them to the knowledge of what Scripture taught on the subject. 3. Yet whatever light had risen in the inmost sanctuary of John's heart, he spake not his thoughts to the Magdalene, whether she had reached the Sepulchre ere the two left it, or met them by the way. The two Apostles returned to their home, either feeling that nothing more could be learned at the Tomb, or to wait for further teaching and guidance. Or it might even have been partly due to a desire not to draw needless attention to the empty Tomb. But the love of the Magdalene could not rest satisfied, while doubt hung over the fate of His Sacred Body. It must be remembered that she knew only of the empty Tomb. For a time she gave away the agony of her sorrow; then, as she wiped away her tears, she stopped to take one more look into the Tomb, which she thought empty, when, as she intently gazed' (theore), the Tomb seemed no longer empty. At the head and feet, where the Sacred Body had lain, were seated two Angels in white. Their question, so deeply true from their knowledge that Christ had risen: Woman, why weepest thou?' seems to have come upon the Magdalene with such overpowering suddenness, that, without being able to realise - perhaps in the semi-gloom - who it was that had asked it, she spake, bent only on obtaining the information she sought: Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not [6262] where they have laid Him.' So is it often with us, that, weeping, we ask the question of doubt or fear, which, if we only knew, would never have risen to our lips; nay, that heaven's own Why?' fails to impress us, even when the Voice of its Messengers would gently recall us from the error of our impatience. But already another was to given to the Magdalene. As she spake, she became conscious of another Presence close to her. Quickly turning round, she gazed' (theore) on One Whom she recognised not, but regarded as the gardener, from His presence there and from His question: Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?' The hope, that she might now learn what she sought, gave wings to her words - intensity and pathos. If the supposed gardener had borne to another place the Sacred Body, she would take It away, if she only knew where It was laid. This depth and agony of love, which made the Magdalene forget even the restraints of a Jewish woman's intercourse with a stranger, was the

key that opened the Lips of Jesus. A moment's pause, and He spake her name in those well-remembered accents, that had first unbound her from sevenfold demoniac power and called her into a new life. It was as another unbinding, another call into a new life. She had not known His appearance, just as the others did not know at first, so unlike, and yet so like, was the glorified Body to that which they had known. But she could not mistake the Voice, especially when It spake to her, and spake her name. So do we also often fail to recognise the Lord when He comes to us in another form' [6263] than we had known. But we cannot fail to recognise Him when He speaks to us and speaks our name. Perhaps we may here be allowed to pause, and, from the nonrecognition of the Risen Lord till He spoke, ask this question: With what body shall we rise? Like or unlike the past? Assuredly, most like. Our bodies will then be true; for the soul will body itself forth according to its past history - not only impress itself, as now on the features, but express itself - so that a man may be known by what he is, and as what he is. Thus, in this respect also, has the Resurrection a moral aspect, and is the completion of the history of mankind and of each man. And the Christ also must have borne in His glorified Body all that He was, all that even His most intimate disciples had not known nor understood while He was with them, which they now failed to recognise, but knew at once when He spake to them. It was precisely this which now prompted the action of the Magdalene - prompted also, and explains, the answer of the Lord. As in her name she recognised His Name, the rush of old feeling came over her, and with the familiar Rabboni!' [6264] - my Master - she would fain have grasped Him. Was it the unconscious impulse to take hold on the precious treasure which she had thought for ever lost; the unconscious attempt to make sure that it was not merely an apparition of Jesus from heaven, but the real Christ in His corporeity on earth; or a gesture of generation, the beginning of such acts of worship as her heart prompted? Probably all these; and yet probably she was not at the moment distinctly conscious of either or of any of these feelings. But to them all there was one answer, and in it a higher direction, given by the words of the Lord: Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to the Father.' Not the Jesus appearing from heaven - for He had not yet ascended to the Father; not the former intercourse, not the former homage and worship. There was yet a future of completion before Him in the Ascension, of which Mary knew not. Between that future of completion and the past of work, the present was a gap - belonging partly to the past and partly to the future. The past could not be recalled, the future could not be anticipated. The present was of reassurance, of consolation, of preparation, of teaching. Let the Magdalene go and tell His brethren' of the Ascension. So would she best and most truly tell them that she had seen Him; so also would they best learn how the Resurrection linked the past of His Work of love for them to the future: I ascend unto My Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God.' Thus, the fullest teaching of the past, the clearest manifestation of the present, and the brightest teaching of the future - all as gathered up in the Resurrection - came to the Apostles through the mouth of love of her out of whom He had cast seven devils. 4. Yet another scene on that Easter morning does St. Matthew relate, in explanation of how the well-known Jewish Calumny had arisen that the disciples had stolen away the Body of Jesus. He tells, how the guard had reported to the chief priests what had happened, and how they had turn had bribed the guard to spread this rumor, at the same time promising that if the fictitious account of their having slept while the disciples robbed the Sepulchre should reach Pilate, they would intercede on their behalf. Whatever else may be said, we know that from the time of Justin Martyr [6265] [6266] this has been the Jewish explanation. [6267] Of late, however, it has, among thoughtful Jewish writers, given place to the so-called Vision-hypothesis,' to which full reference

has already been made. 5. It was the early afternoon of that spring-day perhaps soon after the early meal, when two men from that circle of disciples left the City. Their narrative affords deeply interesting glimpses into the circle of the Church in those first days. The impression conveyed to us is of utter bewilderment, in which only some things stood out unshaken and firm: love to the Person of Jesus; love among the brethren; mutual confidence and fellowship; together with a dim hope of something yet to come - if not Christ in His Kingdom, yet some manifestation of, or approach to it. The Apostolic College seems broken up into units; even the two chief Apostles, Peter and John, are only certain of them that were with us.' And no wonder; for they are no longer Apostles' - sent out. Who is to send them forth? Not a dead Christ! And what would be their commission, and to whom and whither? And above all rested a cloud of utter uncertainty and perplexity. Jesus was a Prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people. But their rulers had crucified Him. What was to be their new relation to Jesus; what to their rulers? And what of the great hope of the Kingdom, which they had connected with Him?Thus they were unclear on that very Easter Day even as to His Mission and Work: unclear as to the past, the present, and the future. What need for the Resurrection, and for the teaching which the Risen One alone could bring! These two men had on that very day been in communication with Peter and John. And it leaves on us the impression, that, amidst the general confusion, all had brought such tidings as they, or had come to hear them, and had tried but failed, to put it all into order or to see light around it. The women' had come to tell of the empty Tomb and of their vision of Angels, who said that He was alive. But as yet the Apostles had no explanation to offer. Peter and John had gone to see for themselves. They had brought back confirmation of the report that the Tomb was empty, but they had seen neither Angels nor Him Whom they were said to have declared alive. And, although the two had evidently left the circle of the disciples, if not Jerusalem, before the Magdalene came, yet we know that even her account did not carry conviction to the minds of those that heard it. [6268]Of the two, who on that early spring afternoon left the City in company, we know that one bore the name of Cleopas. [6269] The other, unnamed, has for that very reason, and because the narrative of that work bears in its vividness the character of personal recollection, been identified with St. Luke himself. If so, then, as has been finely remarked, [6270] each of the Gospels would, like a picture, bear in some dim corner the indication of its author: the first, that of the publican;' that by St. Mark, that of the young man, who, in the night of the Betrayal, had fled from his captors; that of St. Luke in the Companion of Cleopas; and that of St. John, in the disciple whom Jesus loved. Uncertainty, almost equal to that about the second traveller to Emmaus, rests on the identification of that place. [6271] But such great probability attaches, if not to the exact spot, yet to the locality, or rather the valley, that we may in imagination follow the two companies on their road.We have leave the City by the Western Gate. A rapid progress for about twenty-five minutes, and we have reached the edge of the plateau. The blood-strained City, and the cloud-and-gloom-capped trying-place of the followers of Jesus, are behind us; and with every step forward and upward the air seems fresher and freer, as if we felt in it the scent of mountains, or even the far-off breezes of the sea. Other twenty-five or thirty minutes - perhaps a little more, passing here and there country-houses - and we pause to look back, now on the wide prospect far as Bethlehem. Again we pursue our way. We are now getting beyond the dreary, rocky region, and are entering on a valley. To our right is the pleasant spot that marks the ancient Nephtoah, [6272] on the border of Judah, now occupied by the village of Lifta. A short quarter of an hour more, and we have left the well-paved Roman road and are heading up a lovely valley. The path gently

climbs in a north-westerly direction, with the height on which Emmaus stands prominently before us. About equidistant are, on the right Lifta, on the left Kolonieh. The roads from these two, describing almost a semicircle (the one to the north-west, the other to the north-east), meet about a quarter of a mile to the south of Emmaus (Hammoza, Beit Mizza). What an oasis this in a region of hills! Among the course of the stream, which babbles down, and low in the valley is crossed by a bridge, are scented orange-and lemon-gardens, olive-groves, luscious fruit trees, pleasant enclosures, shady nooks, bright dwellings, and on the height lovely Emmaus. A sweet spot to which to wander on that spring afternoon; [6273] a most suitable place where to meet such companionship, and to find such teaching, as on that Easter Day.It may have been where the two roads from Lifta and Kolonieh meet, that the mysterious Stranger, Whom they knew not, their eyes being holden,' joined the two friends. Yet all these six or seven miles [6274] their converse had been of Him, and even now their flushed faces bore the marks of sadness [6275] on account of those events of which they had been speaking - disappointed hopes, all the more bitter for the perplexing tidings about the empty Tomb and the absent Body of the Christ. So is Christ often near to us when our eyes are holden, and we know Him not; and so do ignorance and unbelief often fill our hearts with sadness, even when truest joy would most become us. To the question of the Stranger about the topics of a conversation which had so visibly affected them, [6276] they replied in language which shows that they were so absorbed by it themselves, as scarcely to understand how even a festive pilgrim and stranger in Jerusalem could have failed to know it, or perceive its supreme importance. Yet, strangely unsympathetic as from His question He might seem, there was that in His Appearance which unlocked their inmost hearts. They told Him their thoughts about this Jesus; how He had showed Himself a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people; [6277] then, how their rulers had crucified Him; and, lastly, how fresh perplexity had come to them from the tidings which the women had brought, and which Peter and John had so far confirmed, but were unable to explain. Their words were almost childlike in their simplicity, deeply truthful, and with a pathos and earnest craving for guidance and comfort that goes straight to the heart. To such souls it was, that the Risen Saviour would give His first teaching. The very rebuke with which He opened it must have brought its comfort. We also, in our weakness, are sometimes sore distrest when we hear what, at the moment, seem to us insuperable difficulties raised to any of the great of our holy faith; and, in perhaps equal weakness, feel comforted and strengthened, when some great one' turns them aside, or avows himself in face of them a believing disciple of Christ. As if man's puny height could reach up to heaven's mysteries, or any big infant's strength were needed to steady the building which God has reared on that great Cornerstone! But Christ's rebuke was not of such kind. Their sorrow arose from their folly in looking only at the things seen, and this, from their slowness to believe what the prophets had spoken. Had they attended to this, instead of allowing it all. Did not the Scriptures with one voice teach this twofold truth about the Messiah, that He was to suffer and to enter into His glory? Then why wonder - why not rather expect, that He had suffered, and that Angels had proclaimed Him alive again? He spake it, and fresh hope sprang up in their hearts, new thoughts rose in their minds. Their eager gaze was fastened on Him as He now opened up, one by one, the Scriptures, from Moses and all the prophets, and in each well-remembered passage interpreted to them the things concerning Himself. Oh, that we had been there to hear - though in silence of our hearts also, if only we crave for it, and if we walk with Him, He sometimes so opens from the Scriptures - nay, from all the Scriptures, that which comes not to us by critical study: the things concerning Himself.' All too

quickly fled the moments. The brief space was traversed, and the Stranger seemed about to pass on from Emmaus - not the feigning it, but really: for, the Christ will only abide with us if our longing and loving constrain Him. But they could not part with Him. They constrained Him.' Love made them ingenious. It was toward evening; the day was far spent; He must even abide with them. What rush of thought and feeling comes to us, as we think of it all, and try to realise time, scenes, circumstances in our experience, that are blessedly akin to it.The Master allowed Himself to be constrained. He went in to be their guest, as they thought, for the night. The simple evening-meal was spread. He sat down with them to the frugal board. And now He was no longer the Stranger; He was the Master. No one asked, or questioned, as He took the bread and spake the words of blessing, then, breaking, gave it to them. But that moment it was, as if an unfelt Hand had been taken from their eyelids, as if suddenly the film had been cleared from their sight. And as they knew Him, He vanished from their view - for, that which He had come to do had been done. They were unspeakably rich and happy now. But, amidst it all, one thing forced itself ever anew upon them, that, even while their eyes had yet been holden, their hearts had burned within them, while He spake to them and opened to them the Scriptures. So, then, they had learned to full the Resurrection-lesson - not only that He was risen indeed, but that it needed not His seen Bodily Presence, if only He opened up to the heart and mind all the Scriptures concerning Himself. And this, concerning those other words about holding' and touching' Him - about having converse and fellowship with Him as the Risen One, had been also the lesson taught the Magdalene, when He would not suffer her loving, worshipful touch, pointing her to the Ascension before Him. This is the great lesson concerning the Risen One, which the Church fully learned in the Day of Pentecost.6. That same afternoon, in circumstances and manner to us unknown, the Lord had appeared to Peter. [6278] We may perhaps suggest, that it was after His manifestation at Emmaus. This would complete the cycle of mercy: first, to the loving sorrow of the woman; next, to the loving perplexity of the disciples; then, to the anxious heart of the stricken Peter - last, in the circle of the Apostles, which was again drawing together around the assured fact of His Ressurrection.7. These two in Emmaus could not have kept the good tidings to themselves. Even if they had not remembered the sorrow and perplexity in which they had left their fellow-disciples in Jersalem that forenoon, they could not have kept it to themselves, could not have remained in Emmaus, but must have gone to their brethren in the City. So they left the uneaten meal, and hastened back the road they had travelled with the now well-known Stranger - but, ah, with what lighter hearts and steps!They knew well the trysting-place where to find the Twelve' - nay, not the Twelve now, but the Eleven' - and even thus their circle was not complete, for, as already stated, it was broken up, and at least Thomas was not with the others on that Easter-Evening of the first Lord's Day.' But, as St. Luke is careful to inform us, [6279] with the others who then associated with them. This is of extreme importance, as marking that the words which the Risen Christ spake on that occasion were addressed not to the Apostles as such - a thought forbidden also by the absence of Thomas - but to the Church, although it may be as personified and represented by such of the Twelve,' or rather Eleven,' as were present on the occasion.When the two from Emmanus arrived, they found the little band as sheep sheltering within the fold from the storm. Whether they apprehended persecution simply as disciples, or because the tidings of the empty Tomb, which had reached the authorities, would stir the fears of the Sanhedrists, special precautions had been taken. The outer and inner doors were shut, alike to conceal their gathering and to prevent surprise. But those assembled were now sure of at least one thing. Christ was risen. And when they from Emmanus

told their wondrous story, the others could antiphonally reply by relating how He had appeared, not only to the Magdalene, but also to Peter. And still they seem not yet to have understood His Ressurection; to have regarded it as rather an Ascension to Heaven, from which He had made manifestation, that as the reappearance of His real, though glorified Corporeity. They were sitting at meat [6280] - if we may infer from the notice of St. Mark, and from what happened immediately afterwards, discussing, not without considerable doubt and misgiving, the real import of these appearances of Christ. That to the Magdalene seems to have been put aside - at least, it is not mentioned, and, even in regard to the others, they seem to have been considered, at any rate by some, rather as what we might call spectral appearances. But all at once He stood in the midst of them. The common salutation - on His Lips not common, but a reality - fell on their hearts at first with terror rather than joy. They had spoken of spectral appearances, and now they believed they were gazing' (theoren) on a spirit.' This the Saviour first, and once for all, corrected, by the exhibition of the glorified marks of His Sacred Wounds, and by bidding them handle Him to convince themselves, that His was a real Body, and what they saw not a disembodied spirit. [6281] The unbelief of doubt now gave place to the not daring ot believe all that it meant, for very gladness, and for wondering whether there could now be any longer fellowship or bond between this Risen Christ and them in their bodies. It was to remove this also, which, though from another aspect, was equally unbelief, that the Saviour now partook before them of their supper of broiled fish, [6282] thus holding with them true human fellowship as of old. [6283]It was this lesson of His continuity - in the strictest sense - with the past, which was required in order that the Church might be, so to speak, reconstituted now in the Name, Power, and Spirit of the Risen One Who had lived and died. Once more He spake the Peace be unto you!' and now it was to them not occasion of doubt or fear, but the well-known salutation of their old Lord and Master. It was followed by the re-gathering and constituting of the Church as that of Jesus Christ, the Risen One. The Church of the Risen One was to be the Ambassador of Christ, as He had been the Delegate of the Father. The Apostles were [say rather, the Church was'] commissioned to carry on Christ's work, and not to begin a new one.' [6284] As the Father has sent Me [in the past, for His Mission was completed], even so send [6285] I you [in the constant, present, till His coming again].' This marks the threefold relation of the Church to the Son, to the Father, and to the world, and her position in it. In the same manner, for the same purpose, nay, so far as possible, with the same qualification and the same authority as the Father had sent Christ, does He commission His Church. And so it was that He made it a very real commission when He breathed on them, not individually but as an assembly, and said: Take ye the [6286] Holy Ghost;' and this, manifestly not in the absolute sense, since the Holy Ghost was not yet given, [6287] but as the connecting link with, and the qualification for, the authority bestowed on the Church. Or, to set forth another aspect of it by somewhat inverting the order of the words: Alike the Mission of the Church and her authority to forgive or retain sins are connected with a personal qualification: Take ye the Holy Ghost;' - in which the word take' should also be marked. This is the authority which the Church possesses, not ex opere operato, but as not connected with the taking and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the Church.It still remains to explain, so far as we can, these two points: in what this power of forgiving and retaining sins consists, and in what manner it resides in the Church. In regard to the former we must first inquire what idea it would convey to those to whom Christ spake the words. It has already been explained, [6288] that the power of loosing' and binding' referred to the legislative authority claimed by, and conceded to, the Rabbinic College. Similarly, as previously stated, that

here referred to applied to their juridical or judicial power, according to which they pronounced a person either, Zakkai,' innocent or free;' absolved,' Patur;' or else liable,' guilty,' Chayyabh' (whether liable to punishment or sacrifice.) In the true sense, therefore, this is rather administrative, disciplinary power, the power of the keys' - such as St. Paul would have had the Corinthian Church put in force - the power of admission and exclusion, of the authoritative declaration of the forgiveness of sins, in the exercise of which power (as it seems to the present writer) the authority for the administration of the Holy Sacraments is also involved. And yet it is not, as is sometimes represented, absolution from sin,' which belongs only to God and to Christ as Head of the Church, but absolution of the sinner, which He has delegated to His Church: Whosesover sins ye forgive, they are forgiven.' These words also teach us, that the Rabbis claimed in virtue of their office, that the Lord bestowed on His Church in virtue of her receiving, and of the indwelling of, the Holy Ghost.In answering the second question proposed, we must bear in mind one important point. The power of binding' and loosing' had been primarily committed to the Apostles, [6289] and exercised by them in connection with the Church. [6290] On the other hand, that of forgiving and retaining sins, in the sense explained, was primarily bestowed on the Church, and excercised by her through her representatives, the Apostles, and those to whom they committed rule. [6291] Although, therefore, the Lord on that night committed this power to His Church, it was in the person of her representatives and rulers. The Apostles alone could exercise legislative function, [6292] but the Church, has to the end of time the power of the keys.' 8. There had been absent from the circle of disciples on that Easter-Evening one of the Apostles, Thomas. Even when told of the marvellous events at that gathering, he refused to believe, unless he had personal and sensous evidence of the truth of the report. It can scarecly have been, that Thomas did not believe in the fact that Christ's Body had quitted the Tomb, or that He had really appeared. But he held fast by what we may term the Vision-hypothesis, or, in this case, rather the spectral theory. But until this Apostle also had come to conviction of the Resurrection in the only real sense - of the identical though glorified Corporeity of the Lord, and hence of the continuity of the past with the present and future, it was impossible to re-form the Apostlic Circle, or to renew the Apostolic commission, since its primal message was testimony concerning the Risen One. This, if we may so suggest, seems the reason why the Apostles still remain in Jerusalem, instead of hastening, as directed, to meet the Master in Galilee.A quiet week had passed, during which - and this also may be for our twofold learning - the Apostles excluded not Thomas, [6293] nor yet Thomas withdrew from the Apostles. Once more the day of days had come - the Octave of the Feast. From that Easter-Day onwards the Church must, even without special institution, have celebrated the weekly-recurring memorial of His Resurrection, as that when He breathed on the Church the breath of a new life, and consecrated it to be His Representative. Thus, it was not only the memorial of His Resurrection, but the birthday of the Church, even as Pentatecost was her baptism day. On that Octave, then, the disciples were again gathered, under circumstances precisely similar to those of Easter, but now Thomas was also with them. Once more - and it is again specially marked: the doors being shut' [6294] - the Risen Saviour appeared in the midst of the disciples with the well-known salutation. He now offered to Thomas the demanded evidence; but it was no longer either needed or sought. With a full rush of feeling he yielded himself to the blessed conviction, which once formed, must immediately have passed into act of adoration: My Lord and my God!' The fullest confession this hitherto made, and which truly embraced the whole outcome of the new conviction concerning the reality of Christ's Resurrection. We remember how,

under similar circumstances, Nathnael had been the first to utter fullest confession. [6295] We also remember the analogous reply of the Saviour. As then, so now, He pointed to the higher: to a faith which was not the outcome of sight, and therefore limited and bounded by sight, whether of the sense or of perception by the intellect. As one has finely remarked: This last and greatest of the Beatitudes is the pecuilar hertiage of the later Church' [6296] - and thus most aptly comes as the consecration gift of that Church.9. The next scene presented to us is once again by the Lake of Galilee. The manifestation to Thomas, and, with it, the restoration of unity in the Aspostic Circle, had originally concluded the Gospel of St. John. [6297] But the report which had spread in the early Church, that Disciple whom Jesus loved was not to die, led him to add to his Gospel, by way of Appendix, and account of the events with which this expectancy had connected itself. It is most instructive to the critic, when challenged at every step to explain why one or another fact is not mentioned or mentioned only in one Gospel, to find that, but for the correction of a possible misapprehension in regard to the aged Apostle, the Fourth Gospel would have contained no reference to the manifestation of Christ in Galilee, nay, to the presence of the disciples there before the Ascension. Yet, for all that St. John had it in his mind. And should we not learn from this, that what appear to us strange omissions, which, when held by the side of the other Gospel-narratives, seem to involve discrepancies, may be capable of the most satisfactory explanation, if we only knew all the circumstance?The history itself sparkles like a gem in its own peculiar setting. It is of green Galilee, and of the blue Lake, and recalls the early days and scenes of this history. As St. Matthew has it, [6298] the eleven disciples went away into Galilee' - probably immediately after that Octave of the Easter. [6299] It can scarcely be doubted, that they made known not only the fact of the Resurrection, but the trysting which the Risen One had given them - perhaps at that Mountain where He had spoken His first Sermon.' And so it was, that some doubted,' [6300] and that He afterwards appeared to the five hundred at once. [6301] But on that morning there were by the Lake of Tiberias only seven of the disciples. Five of them only are named. They are those who most closely kept in company with Him - perhaps also they who lived nearest the Lake.The scene is introduced by Peter's proposal to go a-fishing. It seems as if the old habits had come back to them with the old associations. Peter's companions naturally proposed to join him. [6302] All that still, clear night they were on the Lake, but caught nothing. Did not this recall to them for former event, when James and John, and Peter and Andrew were called to be Aspostles, and did it not specially recall to Peter the searching and sounding of his heart on the morning that followed? [6303] But so utterly self-unconscious were they, and, let us add, so far is this history from any trace of legendary design, [6304] that not the slightest indication of this appears. Early morning was breaking, and under the rosy glow above the cool shadows were still lying on the pebbly beach.' There stood the Figure of One Whom they recognised not - nay, not even when He spake. Yet His Words were intended to bring them this knowledge. The direction to cast the net to the right side of the ship brought them, as He had said, the haul for which they had toiled all night in vain. And more than this: such a multitude of fishes, enough for the disciple whom Jesus loved,' and whose heart may previously have misgiven him. He whispered it to Peter: It is the Lord, and Simon, only reverently gathering about him his fisher's upper garment, [6305] cast himself into the sea. Yet even so, except to be sooner by the side of Christ, Peter seems to have gained nothing by his haste. The others, leaving the ship, and transferring themselves to a small boat, which must have been attached to it followed, rowing the short distance of about one hundred yards, [6306] and dragging after them the net, weighted with the fishes. They stepped on

the beach, hallowed by His Presence, in silence, as if they had entered Church or Temple. They dared not even dispose of the netful of fishes which they had dragged on shore, until He directed them what to do. This only they notice, that some unseen hand had prepared the morning meal, which, when asked by the Master, they had admitted they had not of their own. And now Jesus directed them to bring the fish they had caught. When Peter dragged up the weight net, it was found full of great fishes, not less than a hundred and fifty-three in number. There is no need to attach any symbolic import to that number, as the Fathers and later writers have done. We can quite understand - nay, it seems almost natural, that, in the peculiar circumstances, they should have counted the large fishes in that miraculous draught that still left the net unbroken. [6307] It may have been, that they were told to count the fishes - partly, also, to show the reality of what had taken place. But on the fire the coals there seems to have been only one fish, and beside it only one bread. [6308] To this meal He now bade them, for they seem still to have hung back in reverent awe, nor durst they ask him, Who He was, well knowing it was the Lord. This, as St. John notes, was the third appearance of Christ to the disciples as a body. [6309]10. And still this morning of blessing was not ended. The frugal meal was past, with all its significant teaching of just sufficient provision for His servants, and abundant supply in the unbroken net beside them. But some special teaching was needed, more even that that to Thomas, for him whose work was to be so prominent among the Apostles, whose love was so ardent, and yet in its very ardour so full of danger to himself. For, our dangers spring not only from deficiency, but it may be from excess of feeling, when that feeling is not commensurate with inward strength. Had Peter not confessed, quite honestly, yet, as the event proved, mistakingly, that his love to Christ would endure even an ordeal that would disperse all the others? [6310] And had he not, almost immediately afterwards, and though prophetically warned of it, thrice denied his Lord? Jesus had, indeed, since then appeared specially to Peter as the Risen One. But this threefold denial still, stood, as it were, uncancelled before the other disciples, nay, before Peter himself. It was to this that the threefold question to the Risen Lord now referred. Turning to Peter, with pointed though most gentle allusion to be danger of self-confidence - a confidence springing from only a sense of personal affection, even though genuine - He asked: Simon, son of Jona' - as it were with fullest reference to what he was naturally - lovest thou Me more than these?' Peter understood it all. No longer with confidence in self, avoiding the former reference to the others, and even with marked choice of a different word to express his affection [6311] from that which the Saviour had used, he replied, appealing rather to his Lord's, than to his own consciousness: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' And even here the answer of Christ is characteristic. it was to set him first the humblest work, that which needed most tender care and patience: Feed [provide with food] My Lambs.'Yet a second time came the same question, although now without the reference to the others, and, with the same answer by Peter, the now varied and enlarged commission: Feed [shepherd, pomaine] My Sheep.' Yet a third time did Jesus repeat the same question, now adopting in it the very word which Peter had used to express his affection. Peter was grieved at this threefold repetition. It recalled only too bitterly his threefold denial. And yet the Lord was not doubtful of Peter's love, for each time He followed up His question with a fresh Apostle commission; but now that He put it for the third time, Peter would have the Lord send down the sounding-line quite into the lowest deep of this heart: Lord, Thou knowest all things - Thou perceivest [6312] that I love Thee!' And now the Saviour spake it: Feed [provide food for] My sheep.' His Lamb, His Sheep, to be provided for, to be tended as such! And only love can do such

service.Yes, and Peter did love the Lord Jesus. He had loved Him when he said it, only too confident in the strength of his feelings, that he would follow the Master even unto death. And Jesus saw it all - yea, and how this love of the ardent temperament which had once made him rove at wild liberty, would give place to patient work of love, and be crowned with that martyrdom which, when the beloved disciple wrote, was already matter of the past. And the very manner of death by which he was to glorify God was indicated in the words of Jesus.As He spake them, He joined the symbolic action to His Follow Me.' This command, and the encourgement of being in death literally made like Him - following Him - were Peter's best strength. He obeyed; but as he turned to do so, he saw another following. As St. John himself puts it, it seems almost to convey that he had longed to share Peter's call, with all that it implied. For, St. John speaks of himself as the disciple whom Jesus loves, and he reminds us that in that night of betrayal he had been specially a sharer with Peter, nay, had spoken what the other had silently asked of him. Was it impatience, was it a touch of the old Peter, or was it a simple inquiry of brotherly interest which prompted the question, as he pointed to John: Lord - and this man, what?' Whatever had been the motive, to him, as to us all, when perplexed about those who seem to follow Christ, we ask it - sometimes in bigoted narrowness, sometines in igornace, folly, or jealousy - is this answer: What is that to thee? follow thou Me.' For John also had his life-work for Christ. It was to tarry' while He was coming [6313] - to tarry those many years in patient labour, while Christ was coming. But what did it mean? The saying went aboard among the brethren that John was not to die, but to tarry till Jesus came again to reign, when death would be swallowed up in victory. But Jesus had not so said, only: If I will that he tarry while I am coming.' What that Coming' was, Jesus had not said, and John knew not. So, then, there are things, and connected with His Coming, on which Jesus has left the veil, only to be lifted by His own Hand - which He means us not to know at present, and which we should be content to leave as He has left them.11. Beyond this narrative we have only briefest notices: by St. Paul, of Christ manifesting Himself to James, which probably finally decided him for Christ, and the Eleven meeting Him at the mountain, where He had appointed them; by St. Luke, of the teaching in the Scriptures during the forty days of communication between the Risen Christ and the disciples.But this twofold testimony comes to us from St. Matthew and St. Mark, that then the worshipping disciples were once more formed into the Apostolic Circle - Apostles, now, of the Risen Christ. And this was the warrent of their new commission: All power (authority) has been given to Me in heaven and on earth.' And this was their new commission: Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' And this was their work: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.' And this is His final and sure promise: And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'12. We are once more in Jersualem, whither He had bidden them go to tarry for the fulfilment of the great promise. The Pentecost was drawing nigh. And on that last day - the day of His Ascension - He led them forth to the well-remembered Bethany. From where He had made His last triumphal Entry into Jersualem before His Crucifixion, would He make His truimphant Entry visibly into Heaven. Once more would they have asked Him about that which seemed to them the final consummation - the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel. But such questions became them not. Theirs was to be work, not rest; suffering, not triumph. The great promise before them was of spiritual, not outward, power: of the Holy Ghost - and their call not yet to reign with Him, but to bear witness for Him. And, as He so spake, He lifed His Hands in blessing upon them, and, as He was visbly taken up, a cloud received Him. And still they gazed, with

upturned faces, on that luminous cloud which had received Him, and two Angels spake to them this last message from him, that He should so come in like manner - as they had beheld Him going into heaven.And so their last question to Him, ere He had parted from them, was also answered, and with blessed assurance. Reverently they worshipped Him; then, with great joy, returned to Jersualem. So it was all true, all real - and Christ sat down at the Right Hand of God!' Henceforth, neither doubting, ashamed, nor yet afraid, they were continually in the Temple, blessing God,' And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed. Amen.'Amen! It is so. Ring out the bells of heaven; sing forth the Angelic welcome of worship; carry it to the utmost bound of earth! Shine forth from Bethany, Thou Sun of Righteousness, and chase away earth's mist and darkness, for Heaven's golden day has broken!Easter Morning, 1883. - Our task is ended - and we also worship and look up. And we go back from this sight into a hostile world, to love, and to live, and to work for Risen Christ. But as earth's day is growing dim, and, with earth's gathering darkness, breaks over it heaven's storm, we ring out - as of old they were wont, from church-tower, to the mariners that hugged a rock-bound coast - our Easter-bells to guide them who are belated, over the storm-tossed sea, beyond the breakers, into the desired haven. Ring out, earth, all thy Easter-chimes; bring you offerings, all ye people; worship in faith, for -This Jesus, When was received up from you into heaven, shall so come, in like manner as ye beheld Him going into heaven.' Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly!'

APPENDIX I. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC WRITINGS

(See vol. i. pp.37, 38, and other places.)ONLY the briefest account of these can be given in this place; barely more than an enumeration.I. The Book of Enoch. - As the contents and the literature of this remarkable book, which is quoted by St. Jude (vv.14, 15), have been fully described in Dr. Smith's and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography (vol. ii. pp.124-128), we may here refer to it the more shortly.It comes to us from Palestine, but has only been preserved in an Ethiopic translation (published by Archbishop Laurence [Oxford, 1838; in English transl.3rd ed.1821-1838; German transl. by A. G. Hoffmann], then from five different MSS. by Professor Dillmann [Leipzig, 1851; in German transl. Leipzig, 1853]). But even the Ethiopic translation is not from the original Hebrew or Aramaic, but from a Greek version, of which a small fragment has been discovered (ch. lxxxix.42-49; published by Cardinal Mai. Comp. also Gildemeister, Zeitschr. d. D. Morg. Ges. for 1855, pp.621-624, and Gebhardt, Merx' Arch. ii.1872, p.243).As regards the contents of the work: An Introduction of five brief chapters, and the book (which, however, contains not a few spurious passages) consists of five parts, followed by a suitable Epilogue. The most interesting portions are those which tell of the Fall of the Angels and its consequences, of Enoch's rapt journeys through heaven and earth, and of what he saw and heard (ch. vi.-xxxvi.); the Apocalyptic portions about the Kingdom of Heaven and the Advent of the Messiah (lxxxiii-xci.); and, lastly, the hortatory discourses (xci.-cv.). When we add, that it is pervaded by a tone of intense faith and earnestness about the Messiah, the last things,' and other doctrines specially brought out in the New Testament, its importance will be understood. Altogether the Book of Enoch contains 108 chapters.From a literary point of view, it has been arranged (by Schürer and others) into three parts: - 1. The Original Work (Grundschrift), ch. i.-xxxvi.; lxxii.-cv. This portion is supposed to date from about 175 b.c.2. The Parables, ch. xxxvii.- liv.6; lv.3-lix.; lxi.-lxiv.; lxix.26-lxxi. This part also dates previous to the Birth of Christ - perhaps from the time of Herod the Great.3. The so-called Noachian Sections, ch. liv.7-lv.2; lx.; lxv.-lxix.25. To these must be added ch. cvi., and the later conclusion in ch. cviii. On the dates of all these portions it is impossible to speak definitely.II. Even greater, though a different interest, attaches to the Sibylline Oracles, written in Greek hexameters. [6314] In their present form they consist of twelve books, together with several fragments. Passing over two large fragments, which seem to have originally formed the chief part of the introduction to Book III., we have (1) the two first Books. These contain part of an older and Hellenist Jewish Sibyl, as well as of a poem by the Jewish Pseudo-Phocylides, in which heathen myths concerning the first ages of man are curiously welded with Old Testament views. The rest of these two books was composed, and the whole put together, not earlier than the close of the second century, perhaps by a Jewish Christian. (2) The third Book is by far the most interesting. Besides the fragments already referred to, vv.97-807 are the work of a Hellenist Jew, deeply imbued with the Messianic hope. This part dates from about 160 before our era, while vv.49-96 seem to belong to the year 31 b.c. The rest (vv.1-45, 818-828) dates from a later period. We must here confine our attention to the most ancient portion of the work. For our present purpose, we may arrange it into three parts. In the first, the ancient heathen theogony is recast in a Jewish mould - Uranus becomes Noah; Shem, Ham, and Japheth are Saturn, Titan, and Japetus, while the building of the

Tower of Babylon is the rebellion of the Titans. Then the history of the world is told, the Kingdom of Israel and of David forming the centre of all. What we have called the second is the most curious part of the work. It embodies ancient heathen oracles, so to speak, in a Jewish recension, and interwoven with Jewish elements. The third part may be generally described as anti-heathen, polemical, and Apocalyptic. The Sibyl is thoroughly Hellenistic in spirit. She is loud and earnest in her appeals, bold and defiant in the tone of her Jewish pride, self-conscious and triumphant in her anticipations. But the most remarkable circumstance is, that this Judaising and Jewish Sibyl seems to have passed - though possibly only in parts - as the oracles of the ancient Erythræan Sibyl, which had predicted to the Greeks the fall of Troy, and those of the Sibyl of Cumæ, which, in the infancy of Rome, Tarquinius Superbus had deposited in the Capitol, and that as such it is quoted from by Virgil (in his 4th Eclogue) in his description of the Golden Age.Of the other Sibylline Books little need be said. The 4th, 5th, 9th, and 12th Books were written by Egyptian Jews at dates varying from the year 80 to the third century of our era. Book VI. is of Christian origin, the work of a Judaising Christian, about the second half of the second century. Book VIII., which embodies Jewish portions, is also of Christian authorship, and so are Books X. and XI. III. The collection of eighteen hymns, which in their Greek version bear the name of the Psalter of Solomon, must originally have been written in Hebrew, and dates from more than half a century before our era. They are the outcome of a soul intensely earnest, although we not unfrequently meet expressions of Pharisiac self-religiousness. [6315] It is a time of national sorrow in which the poet sings, and it almost seems as if these Psalms' had been intended to take up one or another of the leading thoughts in the corresponding Davidic Psalms, and to make, as it were, application of them to the existing circumstances. [6316] Though somewhat Hellenisttic in its cast, the collection breathes ardent Messianic expectancy, and firm faith in the resurrection, and eternal reward and punishment (iii.16; xiii.9, 10; xiv.2, 6, 7; xv.11 to the end).IV. Another work of that class - Little Genesis,' or The Book of Jubilees' - has been preserved to us in its Ethiopic translation (though a Latin version of part of it has lately been discovered) and is a Haggadic Commentary on Genesis. Professing to be a revelation to Moses during the forty days on Mount Sinai, it seeks to fill lacunæ in the sacred history, specially in reference to its chronology. Its character is hortatory and warning, and it breathes a strong anti-Roman spirit. It was written by a Palestinian in Hebrew, or rather Aramæan, probably about the time of Christ. The name, Book of Jubilees,' is derived from the circumstance that the Scripture-chronology is arranged according to Jubilee periods of forty-nine years, fifty of these (or 2,450 years) being counted from the Creation to the entrance into Canaan.V. Among the Pseudepigraphic Writings we also include the 4th Book of Esdras, which appears among our Apocrypha as 2 Esdras ch. iii.-xiv. (the two first and the two last chapters being spurious additions). The work, originally written in Greek, has only been preserved in translation into five different languages (Latin, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian). It was composed probably about the end of the first century after Christ. From this circumstance, and the influence of Christianity on the mind of the writer, who, however, is an earnest Jew, its interest and importance can be scarcely exaggerated. The name of Ezra was probably assumed, because the writer wished to treat mainly of the mystery of Israel's fall and restoration.The other Pseudepigraphic Writings are: -VI. The Ascension (ch. i.-v.) and Vision (ch. vi.-xi.) of Isaiah, which describes the martyrdom of the prophet (with a Christian interpolation [ch. iii.14-iv.22] ascribing his death to prophecy of Christ, and containing Apocalyptic portions), and then what he saw in heaven. The book is probably based on an older Jewish account, but is chiefly of Christian

heretical authroship. It exists only in translations, of which that in Ethiopic (with Latin and English versions) has been edited by Archibishop Laurence.VII. The Assumption of Moses (probably quoted in St. Jude ver.9) also exists only in translation, and is really a fragment. It consists of twelve chapters. After an Introduction (ch. i.), containing an address of Moses to Joshua, the former, professedly, opens to Joshua the future of Israel to the time of Varus. This is followed by an Apocalyptic portion, beginning at ch. vii. and ending with ch. x. The two concluding chapters are dialogues between Joshua and Moses. The book dates probably from about the year 2 b.c., or shortly afterwards. Besides the Apocalyptic portions the interest lies chiefly in the fact that the writer seems to belong to the Nationalist party, and that we gain some glimpses of the Apocalyptic views and hopes - the highest spiritual tendency - of that deeply interesting movement. Most markedly, this Book at least is strongly anti-Pharisaic, especially in its opposition to their purifications (ch. vii.). We would here specially note a remarkable resemblance between 2 Tim. iii.1-5 and this in Assump. Mos. vii.3-10: (3) Et regnabunt de his homines pestilentiosi et impii, dicentes se esse iustos, (4) et hi suscitabunt iram animorum suorum, qui erunt homines dolosi, sibi placentes, ficti in omnibus suiset onmi hora diei amantes convivia, devoratores gulæ (5) ... (6) [paupe] rum bonorum comestores, dicentes se haec facere propter misericordiam eorum, (7) sed et exterminatores, queruli et fallaces, celantes se ne possint cognosci, impii in scelere, pleni et inquitate ab oriente usque ad occidentem, (8) dicentes: habebimus discubitiones et luxurian edentes et bibentes, et potabimus nos, tamquam principes erimus. (9) Et manus eorum et dentes inmunda tractabunt, et os eorum loquetur ingentia, et superdicent: (10) noli [tu me] tangere, ne inquines me ...' But it is very significant, that instead of the denunciation of the Pharisees in vv.9,10 of the Assumptio, we have in 2 Tim. iii.5. the words having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.'VIII. The Apocalypse of Baruch. - This also exists only in Syriac translation, and is apparently fragmentary, since the vision promised in ch lxxvi.3 is not reported, while the Epistle of Baruch to the two and a half tribes in Babylon, referred to in lxxvii.19, is also missing. The book had been divided into seven sections(i.-xii.; xiii.-xx.; xxi.-xxxxiv.; xxxv.-xlvi.; xlvii.-lii.; liii.-lxxvi.; lxxvii.-lxxxvii.). The whole is in a form of revelation to Baruch, and of his replies, and questions, or of notices about his bearing, fast, prayers, &c. The most interesting parts are in sections v. and vi. In the former we mark (ch. xlviii.31-41) the reference to the consequence of the sin of our first parents (ver.42; comp. also xvii.3; xxiii.4; liv.15, 19), and in ch. xlix. the discussion and information; with what body and in what form the dead shall rise, which is answered, not as by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. - though the question raised (1 Cor. xv.35) is precisely the same - but in the strictly Rabbinic manner, described by us in Vol. ii. pp.398, 399. In section vi. we specially mark (ch. lxix.-lxxiv.) the Apocalyptic descriptions of the Last Days, and of the Reign and Judgment of Messiah. In general, the figurative language in that Book is instructive in regard to the phraseology used in the Apocalyptic portions of the New Testament. Lastly, we mark that the views on the consequences of the Fall are much more limited than those expressed in 4 Esdras. Indeed, they do not go beyond physical death as the consequence of the sin of our first parents (see especially liv.19: Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animæ suæ tantum; nos vero unusquisque fuit animæ suæ Adam). At the same time, it seems to use, as if perhaps the reasoning rather than the language of the writer indicated hesitation on his part (liv.14-19; comp. also first clause of xlviii.43). It almost seems as if liv.14-19 were intended as against the reasoning of St. Paul, Rom. v.12 to the end. In this respect the passage in Baruch is most interesting, not only in itself (see for ex. ver.16: Certo enim qui credit recipiet mercedem), but in reference to the teaching of 4 Esdras which, as regards

original sin, takes another direction than Baruch. But I have little doubt that both allude to the - to them - novel teaching of St. Paul on that doctrine. Lastly, as regards the question when this remarkable work was written, we would place its composition after the destruction of Jerusalem. Most writers date it before the publication of 4 Esdras, Even the appearance of a Pseudo-Baruch and Pseudo-Esdras are significant of the political circumstances and the religious hopes of the nation. For criticism and fragments of other Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, comp. Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test., 2 vols. (ed.2, 1722). The Psalter of Sol., IV. Esdr. (or, as he puts it, IV. and V. Esd.), the Apocal of Baruch, and the Assumption of Mos., have been edited by Fritzsche (Lips.1871); other Jewish (Hebrew) O. T. Pseudepigraphs - though of a later date - in Jellinek's beth haMidrash (6 vols.), passim. A critical review of the literature of the subject would here be out of place.

APPENDIX II. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA AND RABBINIC THEOLOGY.

(See vol. i. pp.42, 45, 47, 53). (Ad. vol. i. p.42, note 4.) In comparing the allegorical Canons of Philo with those of Jewish traditionalism, we think first of all of the seven exegetical canons which are ascribed to Hillel. These bear chiefly the character of logical deductions, and as such were largely applied in the Halakhah. These seven canons were next expanded by R. Ishmael (in the first century) into thirteen, by the analysis of one of them (the 5th) into six, and the addition of this sound exegetical rule, that where two verses seem to be contradictory, their conciliation must be sought in a third passage. The real rules for the Haggadah - if such there were - were the thirty-two canons of R. José the Galilean (in the second century). It is here that we meet so much that is kindred in form to the allegorical canons of Philo. [6317] Only they are not rationalising, and far more brilliant in their application. Most taking results - at least to a certain class of minds - might be reached by finding in each consonant of a word the initial letter of another (Notariqon). Thus, the word MiSBeaCH (altar) was resolved into these four words, beginning respectively with M, S, B, CH: Forgiveness, Merit, Blessing, Life. Then there was Gematria, by which every letter in a word was resolved into its arithmetical equivalent. Thus, the two words Gog and Magog = 70, which was the supposed number of all the heathen nations. Again, in Athbash the letters of the Hebrew alphabet were transposed (the first for the last of the alphabet, and so on), so that SHeSHaKH(Jer. xxv.26; li.41) became BaBeL, while in Albam, the twenty-two Hebrew letters were divided into two rows, which might be exchanged (L for A, M for B, &c.). In other respects also the Palestinian had the advantage of the Alexandrian mode of interpretation. There was at least ingenuity, if not always truth, in explaining a word by resolving it into two others, [6318] or in discussing the import of exclusive particles (such as only,' but,' from,'), and inclusives (such as also,' with,' all,') or in discovering shades of meaning from the derivation of a word, as in the eight synonyms for poor' - of which one (Ani), indicated simply the poor;' another (Ebhyon, from abhah), one who felt both need and desire; a third (misken), one humiliated; a fourth (rash from rush), one who had been emptied of his property; a fifth (dal), one who property had become exhausted; a sixth (dakh), one who felt broken down; a seventh (makh), one who had come down; and the eighth (chelekh), one who was wretched - or in discussing such differences as between amar, to speak gently, and dabhar, to speak strongly - and many others. [6319] Here intimate knowledge of the language and tradition might be of real use. At other times striking thoughts were suggested, as when it was pointed out that all mankind was made to spring from one man, in order to show the power of God, since all coins struck from the same machine were precisely the same, while in man, whatever the resemblance, there was still a difference in each. 2. (Ad vol. i. p.45, and note 3.) The distinction between the unapproachable God and God as manifest and manifesting Himself, which lies at the foundation of so much in the theology of Philo in regard to the intermediary beings' - Potencies' - and the Logos, occurs equally in Rabbinic theology, [6320] though there it is probably derived from a different source. Indeed, we regard this as explaining the marked and striking avoidance of all anthropomorphisms in the Targumim. It also accounts for the designation of God by two classes of terms, of which in our view, the first expresses the idea of God as revealed, the other that of God as revealing Himself; or, to put it otherwise, which indicate, the one a state, the other an act on the

part of God. The first of these classes of designations embraces two terms: yeqara, the excellent glory, and Shekhinah, or Shekhintha, the abiding Presence. [6321] On the other hand, God, as in the act of revealing himself, is described by the term Memra, the Logos,' the word.' A distinction of ideas also obtains between the terms Yeqara and Shekhinah. The former indicates, as we think, the inward and upward, the latter the outward and downward, aspect of the revealed God. This distinction will appear by comparing the use of the two words in the Targumim, and even by the consideration of passages in which the two are placed side by side (as for ex., in the Targum Onkelos on Ex. xvii.16; Numb. xiv.14; in Pseudo-Jonathan, Gen. xvi.13, 14; in the Jerusalem Targum, Ex. xix.18; and in the Targum Jonathan, Is. vi.1, 3; Hagg. i.8). Thus, also, the allusion in 2 Pet. i.17, to the voice from the excellent glory' (ts megaloprepos dxes) must have been the Yeqara. [6322] The varied use of the terms Shekhinah and Yeqara, and then Memra, in the Targum of Is. vi., is very remarkable. In ver.1 it is the Yeqara, and its train - the heavenward glory - which fills the Heavenly Temple. In ver.3 we hear the Trishagion in connection with the dwelling of His Shekhintha, while the splendour (Ziv) of His Yeqara fills the earth - as it were, falls down to it. In ver.5 the prophet dreads, because he had seen the Yeqara of the Shekhinah, while in ver.6 the coal is taken from before the Shekhintha (which is) upon the throne of the Yeqara (a remarkable expression, which occurs often; so especially in ix. xvii.16). Finally, in ver.8, the prophet hears the voice of the Memra of Jehovah speaking the words of vv.9, 10. It is intensely interesting to notice that in St. John xii.40, these words are prophetically applied in connection with Christ. Thus St. John applies to the Logos what the Targum understands of the Memra of Jehovah. But, theologically, by far the most interesting and important point, with reference not only to the Logos of Philo, but to the term Logos as employed in the Fourth Gospel, is to ascertain the precise import of the equivalent expression Memra in the Targumim. As stated in the text of this book (vol. i. p.47), the term Memra as applied to God, occurs 176 times in the Targum Onkelos, 99 times in the Jerusalem Targum, and 321 times in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. We subjoin the list of these passages, arranged in three classes. Those in Class I. mark where the term does not apply to this, or where it is at least doubtful; those in Class II. where the fair interpretation of a passage shows; and Class III. where it is undoubted and unquestionable, that the expression Memra refers to God as revealing Himself, that is the Logos. Classified List of all the Passages in which the term Memra' occurs in the Targum Onkelos. (The term occurs 176 times. Class III., which consists of those passages in which the term Memra bears undoubted application to the Divine Personality as revealing Himself, comprises 79 passages). [6323] CLASS I. Inapplicable or Doubtful: Gen. xxvi.5; Ex. ii.25; v.2; vi.8; xv.8, 10, 26; xvi.8; xvii.1; xxiii.21, 22; xxv.22; xxxii.13; Lev. xviii.30; xxii.9; xxvi.14, 18, 21, 27; Num. iii.39, 51; iv.37, 41, 45, 49; ix.18 (bis), 19, 20 (bis), 23 quat; x.13; xiii.3; xiv.11, 22, 30, 35; xx.12, 24; xxiii.19; xxiv.4;16; xxvii.14; xxxiii.2, 38; xxxvi.5; Deut. i.26; iv.30; viii.3, 20; xiii.5, 19 (in our Version 4, 18); xv.5; xxvi.15, 18; xxvii.10; xxviii.1, 2, 15, 45, 62; xxx.2, 8, 10, 20. An examination of these passages would show that, for caution's sake, we have sometimes put down as inapplicable' or doubtful' what, viewed in connection with other passages in which the word is used, appears scarcely doubtful. It would take too much space to explain why some passages are put in the next class, although the term Memra seems to be used in a manner parallel to that in Class I. Lastly, the reason why some passages appear in Class III., when others, somewhat similar are placed in Class II., must be sought in the context and connection of a verse. We must ask the reader to believe that each passage had been carefully studied by itself, and that our conclusions have been determined by careful consideration, and by the fair meaning to be put

on the language of Onkelos. CLASS II. Fair: Gen. vii.16; xx.3; xxxi.3, 24; Ex. xix.5; Lev. viii.35; xxvi.23; Numb. xi.20; 23; xiv.41; xxii.9, 18, 20; xxiii.3, 4, 16; xxvii.21; xxxvi.2; Deut. i.32; iv 24, 33, 36; v.24, 25, 26; ix 23 (bis) ; xxxi.23; xxxiv.5. CLASS III. Undoubted: Gen iii.8, 10; vi.6 (bis), 7; viii.21; ix.12, 13, 15,16, 17; xv.1, 6; xvii.2, 7, 10, 11; xxi.20, 22, 23; xxii.16; xxiv.3; xxvi.3, 24, 28; xxviii.15, 20 21; xxxi.49, 50; xxxv.3; xxxix, 2, 3, 21, 23; x1viii.21; xlix.24, 25; Ex. iii.12; iv.12, 15; x.10; xiv.31; xv.2; xviii.19; xix.17; xxix.42, 43; xxx.6; xxxi.13, 17; xxxiii.22, Lev. xx.23; xxiv.12; xxvi 9; 11, 30, 46; Numb. xiv.9 (bis), 43; xvii.19 (in our Version v.4); xxi.5; xxiii.21; Deut. i.30; ii.7; iii.22; iv.37; v.5; ix.3; xviii.16, 19, xx.1; xxiii.15; xxxi.6, 8; xxxii.51; xxxiii.3, 27. Of most special interest is the rendering of Onkelos of Deut. xxxiii.27, where instead of underneath are the everlasting arms,' Onkelos has it: And by His Memra was the world made,' exactly as in St. John i.10. This divergence of Onkelos from the Hebrew text is utterly unaccountable, nor has any explanation of it, as far as I know, been attempted. Winer, whose inaugural dissertation De Onkeloso ejusque Paraphrasi chaldaica' (Lips.1820), most modern writers have simply followed (with some amplifications, chiefly from Luzatto's Philoxenus,' {hebrew} makes no reference to this passage, nor do his successors, so far as I know. It is curious that, as our present Hebrew text has three words, so has the rendering of Onkelos, and that both end with the same word.In classifying the passages in which the word Memra occurs in the Jerusalem Targum and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, we have reversed the previous order, and Class I. represents the passages in which the term undoubtedly applies to the Personal manifestation of God; Class II., in which this is the fair interpretation; Class III., in which application is, to say the most, doubtful.Classified List of Passages (according to the above scheme) in which the term Memra' occurs in the Targum Jerushalmi on the Pentateuch.Class I. Of undoubted application to a Personal Manifestation of God: Gen. i.27; iii.9, 22; v.24; vi.3; viii.16; xv.1; xvi.3; xix.24; xxi.33; xxii 8,14; xxviii.10; xxx.22 (bis); xxxi.9; xxxv.9 (quat.); xxxviii.25; xl.23; exod. iii.14; vi.3; xii.42 (quat.); xiii.18; xiv.15, 24, 25; xv.12, 25 (bis); xix.5, 7, 8, 9 (bis); xx.1, 24; xxv.4; xxvii.16; Deut. i.1; iii.2; iv.34; xxvi.3, 14, 17, 18; xxviii.27, 68; xxxiii.15, 39, 51; xxxiii.2, 7; xxxiv.9, 10, 11.Class II. Where such application is fair: Gen. v.24; xxi.33; Ex. vi.3; xv.1; Lev. i.1; Numb. xxiii.15, 21; xxiv.4, 16; Deut. xxxii.1, 40.Class III. Where such application is doubtful: Gen. vi.6; xviii.1, 17; xxii.14 (bis); xxx.22; xl.23; xlix.18; Ex. xiii.19; xv.2, 26; xvii.19; xix.3; Deut. i.1; xxxii.18; xxxiv.4, 5.Classified List of Passages in which the term Memra' occurs in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch.Class I. Undoubted: Gen. ii.8, 10, 24; iv.26; v.2; vii.16; ix.12, 13, 15, 16, 17; xi.8; xii.17; xv.1; xvii.2, 7, 10, 11; xviii.5; xix.24 (bis); xx.6, 18: xxi.22; 22, 23, 33; xxii.1; xxiv, 3; xxvi.3, 24, 28; xxvii.28, 31; xxviii.10, 15, 20; xxix.12; xxxi.3, 50; xxxv.3, 9; xxxix.2, 3, 21, 23; xli.1; xlvi.4; xlviii.9, 21; xlix.25; 1.20; Exod. i.21; ii.5; iii.12; vii.25; x.10; xii.23, 29; xiii.8, 15, 17; xiv.25, 31; xv.25; xvii.13, 15, 16 (bis); xviii.19; xx.7; xxvi.28; xxix.42, 43; xxx.6, 36; xxxi.13, 17; xxxii.35; xxxiii.9, 19; xxxiv.5; xxxvi.33; Lev. i.1 (bis); vi.2; viii.35; ix.23; xx.23; xxiv.12 (bis); xxvi.11, 12, 30, 44, 46; Numb. iii.16, 39, 51; iv.37, 41, 45, 49; ix.18 (bis), 19, 20, (bis), 23 (ter); x.13, 35, 36; xiv.9, 41, 43; xvi.11, 26; xvii.4; xxi.5, 6, 8, 9, 34; xxii.18, 19, 28; xxiii.3, 4, 8 (bis), 16, 20, 21; xxiv.13; xxvii.16; xxxi.8; xxxiii.4; Deut. i.10, 30, 43; ii.7, 21; iii.22; iv.3, 7, (bis) 20, 24, 33, 36; v.5 (bis), 11, 22, 23, 24 (bis), 25, 26; vi.13, 21, 22; ix.3;xi.23; xii.5, 11; xviii.19; xx.1; xxi.20; xxiv.18, 19; xxvi.5, 14, 18; xxviii.7,9, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 35, 48, 49, 59, 61, 63, 68; xxix.2, 4; xxx.3, 4, 5, 7; xxxi.5, 8, 23; xxxii.6, 9, 12, 36; xxxiii.29; xxxiv.1, 5, 10, 11.Class II. Fair: Gen. v.24; xv.6; xvi.1, 13; xviii.17; xxii.16; xxix.31; xxx.22; xlvi.4; Ex. ii.23; iii.8, 17, 19; iv.12; vi.8, xii.27; xiii.5, 17; xxxii.13; xxxiii.12, 22; Lev. xxvi.44; Numb. xiv.30; xx.12, 21; xxii.9, 20; xxiv.4, 16, 23; Deut. viii.3; xi.12; xxix.23; xxxi.2, 7; xxxii.18, 23, 26,38, 39, 43, 48, 50, 51;

xxxiii.3, 27; xxxiv.6.Class III. Doubtful: Gen. iv.3, 6 (bis); viii.1, 21; xxii.18; xxvi.5 (bis); Ex. iv.15; v.2; ix.20, 21; x.29; xiv.7; xv.2, 8; xix.5; xxv.22; Lev. xviii.30; xxii.9; xxvi.40; Numb. vi.27; ix.8; xii.6; xiv.11, 22, 35;xv.34; xx.24; xxiii.19; xxvii.14; xxxiii.2.38; xxxvi.5; Deut. i.26, 32; iv.30; v.5; viii.20; ix.23; xi.1; xiii.18; xv.5; xix.15; xxv.18; xxvi.17; xxvii.10; xxviii.1, 15, 45, 62; xxx.2, 8, 9, 10; xxxi.12; xxxiii.9.(Ad vol. i. p.53, note 4.) Only one illustration of Philo's peculiar method of interpreting the Old Testament can here be given. It will at the same time show how he found confirmation for his philosophical speculations in the Old Testament, and further illustrate his system of moral theology in its most interesting, but also most difficult, point. The question is, how the soul was to pass from its state of sensuousness and sin to one of devotion to reason, which was religion and righteousness. It will be remarked that the change from the one state to the other is said to be accomplished in one of three ways: by study, by practice, or through a good natural disposition (mthesis, skesis, ephua) exactly as Aristotle put it. But Philo found a symbol for each, and for a preparatory state in each, in Scripture. The three Patriarchs represented this threefold mode of reaching the supersensuous: Abraham, study; Jacob, practice; Isaac, a good disposition; while Enos, Enoch, and Noah, represented the respective preparatory stages. Enos (hope), the first real ancestor of our race, represented the mind awakening to the existence of a better life. Abraham (study) received command to leave the land' (sensuousness). But all study was threefold. It was, first, physical - Abram in the land of Ur, contemplating the starry sky, but not knowing God. Next to the physical was that intermediate' (mse) study, which embraced the ordinary cycle of knowledge' (nkklios paidea). This was Abram after he left Haran, and that knowledge was symbolised by his union with Hagar, who tarried (intermediately) between Kadesh and Bered. But this stage also was insufficient, and the soul must reach the third and highest stage, that of Divine philosophy (truly, the love of wisdom, philosopha) where eternal truth was the subject of contemplation. Accordingly, Abram left Lot, he became Abraham, and he was truly united to Sarah, no longer Sarai. Onwards and ever upwards would the soul now rise to the knowledge of virtue. of heavenly realities, nay, of the nature of God Himself. But there was yet another method than study,' by which the soul might rise - that of askesis, discipline, practice, of which Scripture speaks in Enoch and Jacob. Enoch - whom God took, and he was not' (Gen. v.24) - meant the soul turning from the lower to the higher, so that it was no longer found in its former place of evil. From Enoch, as the preparatory stage, we advance to Jacob, first merely fleeing from sensuous entanglements (from Laban), then contending with the affections, ridding himself of five of the seventy-five souls with which he had entered Egypt (Deut. x.22, comp. with Gen. xlvi.27), often nearly misled by the Sophists (Dinah and Hamor), often nearly failing and faint in the conflict (Jacob's wrestling), but holpen by God, and finally victorious, when Jacob became Israel.But the highest of all was the spiritual life which came neither from study nor discipline, but through a good disposition. Here we have, first of all, Noah, who symbolises only the commencement of virtue, since we read not of any special virtue in him. Rather is he rest - as the name implies - good, relatively to those around. It was otherwise with Isaac, who was perfect before his birth (and hence chosen), even as Rebekah meant constancy in virtue. In that state the soul enjoyed true rest (the Sabbath, Jerusalem) and joy, which Isaac's name implied. But true virtue, which was also true wisdom, was Paradise, whence issued the one stream (goodness), which again divided into four branches (the four Stoic virtues): - Pison, prudence' (phrnesis); Gihon, fortitude' (ndra); Tigris, desire' (pithuma), and Euphrates, justice' (dikaiosne). And yet, though these be the Stoic virtues, they all spring from Paradise, the Garden of God - and all that is good, and all help to it, comes to us ultimately from God Himself,

and is in God.

APPENDIX III. RABBINIC VIEWS AS TO THE LAWFULNESS OF IMAGES, PICTORIAL REPRESENTATIONS ON COINS, ETC.

(See vol. i. p.89, note 3.) On this point, especially as regarded images, statues, and coins, the views of the Rabbis underwent (as stated in the text) changes and modifications according to the outward circumstances of the people. The earlier and strictest opinions, which absolutely forbade any representation, were relaxed in the Mishnah, and still further in the Talmud. In tracing this development, we mark as a first stage that a distinction was made between having such pictorial representations and making use of them, in the sense of selling or bartering them; and again between making and finding them. The Mishnah forbids only such representations of human beings as carry in their hand some symbol of power, such as a staff, bird, globe, or as the Talmud adds, a sword, or even a signet-ring (Ab. Z. iii.1). The Commentaries explain that this must refer to the making use of them, since their possession was, at any rate, prohibited. The Talmud adds (Ab. Z.40 b, 41 a) that these were generally representations of kings, that they were used for purposes of worship, and that their prohibition applied only to villages, not to towns, where they were used for ornament. Similarly the Mishnah directs that everything bearing a representation of sun or moon, or of a dragon, was to be thrown into the Dead Sea (Ab. Z. iii.3). On the other hand, the Talmud quotes (Ab. Z.42 b) a proposition (Boraita), to the effect that all representations of the planets were allowed, except those of the sun and moon, [6324] likewise all statues except those of man, and all pictures except those of a dragon, the discussion leading to the conclusion that in two, if not in all the cases mentioned, the Talmudic directions refer to finding, not making such. So stringent, indeed, was the law as regarded signet-rings, that it was forbidden to have raised work on them, and only such figures were allowed as were sunk beneath the surface, although even then they were not to be used for sealing (Ab. Z.43 b). But this already marks a concession, accorded apparently to a celebrated Rabbi, who had such a ring. Still further in the same direction is the excuse, framed at a later period, for the Rabbis who worshipped in a Synagogue that had a statue of a king to the effect that they could not be suspected of idolatory, since the place, and hence their conduct, was under the inspection of all men. This more liberal tendency had, indeed, appeared at a much earlier period, in the case of the Nasi Gamaliel II., who made use of a public bath at Acco in which there was a statue of Aphrodite. The Mishnah (Ab. Z. iii.4) puts this twofold plea into his mouth, that he had not gone into the domain of the idol, but the idol came into his, and that the statue was there for ornament, not for worship. The Talmud endorses, indeed, these arguments, but in a manner showing that the conduct of the great Gamaliel was not really approved of (Ab. Z.44 b). But a statue used for idolatrous purposes was not only to be pulverized, but the dust cast to the winds or into the sea, lest it might possible serve as manure to the soul! (Ab. Z. iii.3.) This may explain how Josephus ventured even to blame King Solomon for the figures on the Brazen sea and on his throne (Ant. viii.7.5), and how he could excite a fanatical rabble at Tiberias, to destroy the palace of Herod Antipas because it contained figures of living creatures' (Life 12). [6325]

Chapter 111

APPENDIX IV. AN ABSTRACT OF JEWISH HISTORY FROM THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE ACCESSION OF HEROD

(See Book I. ch. viii.) The political connection of the Grecian world, and, with it, the conflict with Hellenism, may be said to have connected with the victorious progress of Alexander the Great through the then known world (333 b.c.). [6326] It was not only that his destruction of the Persian empire put an end to the easy and peaceful allegiance which Judæa had owned to it for about two centuries, but that the establishment of such a vast Hellenic empire. as was the aim of Alexander, introduced a new element into the world of Asia. Everywhere the old civilisation gave way before the new. So early as the commencement of the second century before Christ, Palestine was already surrounded, north, east, and west, with a girdle of Hellenic cities, while in the interior of the land itself Grecianism had its foothold in Galilee and was dominant in Samaria. But this is not all. After continuing the frequent object of contention between the rulers of Egypt and Syria, Palestine ultimately passed from Egyptian to Syrian domination during the reign of Seleucus IV. (187-175 b.c.). His successor was that Antiochus IV., Epiphanes (175-164), whose reckless determination to exterminate Judaism, and in its place to substitute Hellenism, led to the Maccabean rising. Mad as this attempt seems, it could scarcely have been made had there not been in Palestine itself a party to favour his plans. In truth, Grecianism, in its worst form, had long before made its way, slowly but surely, into the highest quarters. For the proper understanding of this history its progress must be briefly indicated. After the death of Alexander, Palestine passed first under Egyptian domination. Although the Ptolemies were generally favourable to the Jews (at least of their own country), those of Palestine at times felt the heavy hand of the conqueror (Jos. Ant. xii.1.1). Then followed the contests between Syria and Egypt for its possession, in which the county must have severely suffered. As Josephus aptly remarks (Ant. xii.3.3), whichever partly gained, Palestine was like a ship in a storm which is tossed by the waves on both sides.' Otherwise it was a happy time, because one of the comparative independence. The secular and spiritual power was vested in the hereditary High-Priests, who paid for their appointment (probably annually) the sum of twenty (presumably Syrian) talents, amounting to five ordinary talents, or rather less than 1,200l. [6327] Besides this personal, the country paid a general tribute, its revenues being let to the highest bidder. The sum levied on Judæa itself has computed at 81,900l. (350 ordinary talents). Although this tribute appears by no means excessive, bearing in mind that in later times the dues from the balsam-district around Jericho were reckoned at upwards of 46,800l. (200 talents), the hardship lay in the mode of levying it by strangers, often unjustly, and always harshly, and in the charges connected with its collection. This cause of complaint was indeed, removed in the course of time, but only by that which led to far more serious evils. The succession of the High-Priests, as given in Nehem. xii.10, 11, 22, furnishes the following names: Jeshua. Joiakin, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, [6328] Jonathan, and Jaddua, who was the contemporary of Alexander the Great. After the death of Jaddua, we have the following list: [6329] Onias I. (Jos. Ant. xi, 8.7), Simon I. the Just [6330] (Ant. xii.2.5), Eleazar, Manasseh (Ant. xii.4.1),

Onias II., Simon II. (Ant. xii.4.10), Onias III., Jason (Ant. xii.5.1), Menelaus, and Alcimus (Ant. xii.9.7), with whom the series of the Pontiffs is brought down to the Maccabees. Internal peace and happiness ceased after the death of Simon the Just (in the beginning of the third century b.c.), one of the last links in that somewhat mysterious chain of personages, to which tradition has given the name of the Great Assemblage,' or Great Synagogue.' [6331] Jewish legend has much that is miraculous to tell of Simon the Just, and connects him alike with events both long anterior and long posterior to his Pontificate. Many of these traditions read like the outcome of loving, longing remembrance of a happy past which was never to return. Such a venerable form would never again be seen in the Sanctuary (Ecclus.1.1-4), nor would such miraculous attestation be given to any other ministrations [6332] (Yoma 39 a and b; Jer. Yoma v.2; vi.3). All this seems to point to the close of a period when the High-Priesthood was purely Jewish in spirit, just as the hints about dissensions among his sons (Jer. Yoma 43 d, at top) sound like faint reminiscences of the family - and public troubles which followed. In point of fact he was succeeded not by his Onias [6333] who was under age, but by his brother Eleazar, and he, after a Ponficate of twenty years, by his brother Manasseh. It was only twenty-seven years later, after the death of Manasseh, that Onias II. became High-Priest. If Eleazar, and especially Manasseh, owned their position, or at least strengthened it, by courting the favour of the ruler of Egypt, it was almost natural that Onias should have taken the opposite or Syrian part. His refusal to pay the High-Priestly tribute to Egypt could scarcely have been wholly due to avarice, as Josephus suggests. The anger and threats of the king were appeased by the High-Priest's nephew Joseph, who claimed descent from the line of David. He knew how to ingratiate himself at the court of Alexandria, and obtained the lease of the taxes of Coele-Syria (which included Judæa), by offering for it double sum previously paid. The removal of the foreign tax-gatherer was very grateful to the Jews, but the authority obtained by Joseph became a new source of danger, especially in the hands of his ambitious son, Hyrcanus. Thus we already mark the existence of three parties: the Egyptian, the Syrian, and that of the sons of Tobias' (Ant. xii.5.1), as the adherents of Joseph were called, after his father. If the Egyptian party ceased when Palestine passed under Syrian rule in the reign of Antiochis III. the Great (223-187 b.c.), and ultimately became wholly subject to it under Seleucus IV. (187-173), the Syrian, and especially the Tobias-party, had already become Grecianised. In truth, the contest now became one for power and wealth in which each sought to outbid the other by bribery and subserviency to the foreigner. As the submission of the people could only be secured by the virtual extinction of Judaism, this aim was steadily kept in view by the degenerate priesthood. The storm did not, indeed, break under the Pontificate of Simon II., the son and successor of Onias II., but the times were becoming more and more troublous. Although the Syrian rulers occasionally showed favour to the Jews, Palestine was now covered with a network of Syrian officials, into whose hands the temporal power mainly passed. The taxation also sensibly increased, and, besides crown-money, consisted of a poll-tax, the third of the field-crops, the half of the produce of trees, a royal monopoly of salt and of the forests, and even a tax on the Levitical tithes and on all revenues of the Temple. [6334] Matters became much more worse under the Pontificate of Onias II., the son and successor of Simon II. A dispute between him and one Simon, a priest, and captain of the temple-guard, [6335] apparently provoked by the unprincipled covetousness of the latter, induced Simon to appeal to the cupidity of the Syrians by referring to the untold treasures which he described as deposited in the Temple. His motive may have been partly a desire for revenge, partly the hope of attaining the office of Onias. It was ascribed to a super-natural

apparition, but probably it was only superstition which arrested the Syrian general at that time. But a dangerous lesson had been learned alike by Jew and Gentile. Seleucus IV. was succeeded by his brother Antiochus IV., Epiphanes (175-164). Whatever psychological explanation may be offered of his bearing - whether his conduct was that of a madman, or of a despot intoxicated to absolute forgetfulness of every consideration beyond his own caprice by the fancied possession of power uncontrolled and unlimited - cruelty and recklessness of tyranny were as prominently his characterisitics as revengefulness and unbounded devotion to superstition. Under such a reign the precedent which Simon, the Captain of the Temple, had set, was successfully followed up by no less a person than the brother of the High-Priest himself. The promise of a yearly increase of 360 talents in the taxes of the country, besides a payment of 80 talents from another revenue (2 Macc. iv.8, 9), purchased the deposition of Onias III. - the first event of that kind recorded in Jewish history - and the substitution of his brother Joshua, Jesus, or Jason (as he loved to Grecianise his name), in the Pontificate. [6336] But this was not all. The necessities, if not the inclinations, of the new High-Priest, and his relations to the Syrian king, prescribed a Grecian policy at home. It seems almost incredible, and yet it is quite in accordance with the circumstances, that Jason should have actually paid to Antiochus a sum of 150 talents for permission to erect a Gymnasium in Jerusalem, that he entered citizens of Antioch on the registers of Jerusalem, and that on one occasion he went so far as to send a deputation to attend the games at Tyre, with money for purchasing offerings to Heracles! And in Jerusalem, and throughout the land, there was a strong and increasing party to support Jason in his plans, and to follow his lead (2 Macc. iv.9, 19). Thus far had Grecianism already swept over the country, as not only to threaten the introduction of views, manners, and institutions wholly incompatible with the religion of the Old Testament, but even the abolition of the bodily mark which distinguished its professors (1 Macc. i.15; Jos. Ant. xii.5.1). But the favor which Antiochus showed Jason was not of long duration. One even more unscrupulous than he, Menelaus (or, according to his Jewish name, Onias), the brother of that Simon who had first excited the Syrian cupidity about the Temple treasure, outbade Jason with Antichus by a promise of 300 talents in addition tho the tribute which Jason had paid. Accordingly, Menelaus was appointed High-Priest. In the expressive language of the time: he came, bringing nothing worthy of the High-Priesthood, but having the fury of a cruel tyrant and the rage of a savage beast' (2 Macc. iv.25). In the conflict for the Pontificate, which now ensued, Menelaus conquered by the help of the Syrians. A terrible period of internal misrule and external troubles followed. Menelaus and his associates cast off every restraint, and even plundered the Temple of some of its precious vessels. Antiochus, who had regarded the resistance to his nominee as rebellion against himself, took fearful vengeance by slaughter of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and pillage of the Temple. But this was not all. When checked in his advance against Egypt, by the peremptory mandate of Rome, Antiochus made up for his disappointment by an expedition against Judæa, of which the avowed object was to crush the people and to sweep away Judaism. The horrors which now ensued are equally recorded in the Books of the Maccabees, by Josephus, and in Jewish tradition. [6337] All sacrifices, the service of the Temple, and the observance of the Sabbath and of feast-days were prohibited; the Temple at Jerusalem was dedicated to Jupiter Olympius; the Holy Scriptures were searched for and destroyed; the Jews forced to take part in heathen rites; a small heathen altar was reared on the great altar of burnt-offering - in short, every insult was heaped on the religion of the Jews, and its every trace was to be swept away. The date of the final profanation of the Temple was the 25th Chislev (corresponding to our December) - the

same on which, after its purification by Judas Maccabee, [6338] its services were restored, the same on which the Christian Church celebrates the dedication of a better Temple, that of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. But the relentless persecution, which searched for its victims in every part of the land, also called forth a deliverer in the person of Mattathias. The story of the glorious rising and final deliverance of the country under the Maccabees or Asmonæans, as they are always called in Jewish writings, [6339] is sufficiently known. Only the briefest outline of it can here be attempted. Mattathias died before it came to any actual engagement with the Syrians, but victory after victory attended the arms of his son, Judas the Maccabee, till at last the Temple could be purified and its services restored, exactly three years after its desecration (25 Chislev, 165 b.c). The rule of the Jewish hero lasted other five years, which can scarcely be described as equally successful with the beginning of his administration. The first two years were occupied in fortifying strong positions and chastising those hostile heathen border-tribes which harassed Judæa. Towards the close of the year 164 Antiochus Epiphanes died. But his successor, or rather Lysias, who administered the kingdom during his minority, was not content to surrender Palestine without a further contest. No deeds of heroism, however great, could compensate for the inferiority of the forces under Judas' command. [6340] The prospect was becoming hopeless, when troubles at home recalled the Syrian army, and led to a treaty of peace in which the Jews acknowledged Syrian supremacy, but were secured liberty of conscience and worship. But the truce was of short duration. As we have seen there were already in Palestine two parties - that which, from its character and aims, may generally be designated as the Grecian, and the Chasidim (Assideans). There can be little doubt that the latter name originally in the designation Chasidim, applied to the pious in Israel in such passages as Ps. xxx.5 (4 in our A.V.); xxxi.23 (A.V.24; xxxvii.28). Jewish tradition distinguishes between the earlier' and the later' Chasidim (Ber. v.1 and 32 b; Men.40 b). The descriptions of the former are of so late a date, that the characteristics of the party are given in accordance with views and practices which belong to a much further development of Rabbinical piety. Their fundamental views may, however, be gathered from the four opening sentences of the Mishnic Tractate Abhoth,' [6341] of which the last are ascribed to Jose the son of Joezer, and Jose the son of Jochanan, who, as we know, still belonged to the earlier Chasidim.' These flourished about 140 b.c., and later. This date throws considerable light upon the relation between the earlier' and later' Chasidim, and the origin of the sects of the Pharisees and Saducees. Comparing the sentences of the earlier Chasidim (Ab. i.2-4) with those which follow, we notice a marked simplicity about them, while the others either indicate a rapid development of Rabbinism, or are echoes of the political relations subsisting, or else seems to allude to present difficulties or controversies. We infer that the earlier' Chasidim represented the pious' in Israel - of course, according to the then standpoint - who, in opposition to the Grecian party, rallied around Judas Maccabee and his successor, Jonathan. The assumption of the High-Priestly dignity by Jonathan the Maccabee, on the nomination of the Syrian king (about 152), was a step which the ultraorthodox party never forgave the Asmonæans. From that period, therefore, we date the alienation of the Chasidim - or rather the cessation of the earlier' Chasidim. Henceforth, the party, as such, degenerated, or, to speak more correctly, ran into extreme religious views, which made them the most advanced section of the Pharisees. [6342] The latter and the Saducees henceforth represented the people in its twofold religious direction. With this view agrees the statement of Josephus (Ant. xiii.5.9), who first mentions the existence of Pharisees and Saducees in the time of Jonathan, and even the confused notice in Aboth de Rabbi Nathan 5, which ascribes the origin of the Saducees to the first

or second generation of Zadok's disciples, himself a disciple of Antigonus of Socho, which would bring the date to nearly the same time as Josephus. From this digression, necessary for the proper understanding of the internal relations in Judæa, we return to the political history. There was another change on the throne of Syria. Demetrius, the new king readily listened to the complaints of a Jewish deputation, and appointed their leader, Alcimus (Jakim or Eljakim) High-Priest. At first the Chasidin were disposed to support him, as having formerly filled a high post in the priesthood, and as the nephew of José the son of Jazer, one of their leaders. But they suffered terribly for their rashness. Aided by the Syrians, Alcimus seized the Pontificate. But Judas once more raised the national standard against the intruder and the allies. At first victory seemed to incline to the national side, and the day of the final defeat and slaughter of the Syrian army and of Nicanor their general was enrolled in the Jewish Calendar as one on which fasting and mourning were prohibited (the 13th Adar, or March). Still, the prospect was far from reassuring, the more so as division had already appeared in the ranks of the Jews. In these circumstances Judas directed his eyes towards the new Western power which was beginning to overshadow the East. It was a fatal step - the beginning of all future troubles - and, even politically, a grave mistake, to enter into a defensive and offensive alliance with Rome. But before even more temporary advantage could be derived from this measure, Judas the Maccabee had already succumbed to superior numbers, and heroically fallen in battle against the Syrians. The war of liberation had lasted seven years, and yet when the small remnant of the Asmonæan party chose Jonathan, the youngest brother of Judas, as his successor, their cause seemed more hopeless than almost at any previous period. The Grecian party were dominant in Judæa, the Syrian host occupied the land and Jonathan and his adherents were obliged to retire to the other side Jordan. The only hope, if such it may be called, lay in the circumstances that after the death of Alcimus the Pontificate was not filled by another Syrian nominee, but remained vacant for two years. During this time the nationalists must have gained strength, since the Grecian party now once more sought and obtained Syrian help against them. But the almost passive resistance which Jonathan successfully offered wearied out the Syrian general and led to a treaty of peace (1 Macc. ix.58-73).In the period which followed, the Asmonæan party steadily increased, so that when a rival king claimed the Syrian crown, both pretenders bade for the support of Jonathan. He took the side of the new monarch, Alexander Balas, who sent him a crown of gold and a purple mantle, and appointed him High-Priest, a dignity which Jonathan at once accepted. [6343] The Jewish Pontiff was faithful to his patron even against a new claimant to the crown of Syria. [6344] And such was his influence, that the latter, on gaining possession of the throne, not only forgave the resistance of Jonathan, but confirmed him in the Pontificate, and even remitted the taxation of Palestine on a tribute (probably annual) of 300 talents. But the faithlessness and ingratitude of the Syrian king led Jonathan soon afterwards to take the side of another Syrian pretender, an infant, whose claims were ostensibly defended by his general Trypho. In the end, however, Jonathan's resistance to Trypho's schemes for obtaining the crown for himself led to the murder of the Jewish High-Priest by treachery.The government of Judæa could not, in these difficult times, have developed upon one more fitted for it than Simon, an elder brother of Judas Maccabee. His father had, when making his dying disposition, already designated him as the man of counsel' among his sons (1 Macc. ii.65). Simon's policy lay chiefly in turning to good account the disputes in Syria, and in consolidating such rule as he had acquired (143-135 b.c). After the murder of his brother by Trypho, he took part of the Syrian claimant (Demetrius) to whom Trypho was opposed. Demetrius was glad to purchase his support by a

remission of all taxation for all time to come. This was the first great success, and the Jews perpetuated its memory by enrolling its anniversary (the 27th Iyar, or May) in their Calendar. An even more important date, alike in the Calendar' (Meg. Taan. Per.2) and in Jewish history (1 Macc. xiii.51), was the 23rd Iyar, when the work of clearing the country of the foreigner was completed by the Syrian party. The next measures of Simon were directed to the suppression of the Grecian party in Judæa, and the establishments of peace and security to his own adherents. To the popular mind this Golden Age' described in glowing language in 1 Macc. xiv.8-14, seemed to culimnate in an event by which the national vanity was gratified and the future safety of their country apparently ensured. This was the arrival of a Roman embassy in Judæa to renew the league which had already been made both by Judas Maccabee and by Jonathan. Simon replied by sending a Jewish embassy to Rome, which brought a valuable shield of gold in token of gratitude. In their intoxication the Jews passed a decree, and engraved it on tables of brass, making Simon their High-Priest and a Governor forever, until there should arise a faithful prophet;' in other words, appointing him to the twofold office of spiritual and secular chief, and declaring it hereditary (1 Macc. xiv.41-45). The fact that he should have been appointed to dignities which both he and his predecessor had already held, and that offices which in themselves were hereditary should now be declared such in the family of Simon, as well as the significant limitation: until there should arise a faithful prophet,' sufficiently indicate that there were dissensions among the people and opposition to the Asmonæans. In truth, as the Chasidim had already had been alienated, so there was a growing party among the Pharisees, their successors, whose hostility to the Asmonæans increased till it developed into positive hatred. This antagonism was, however, not grounded on their possession of the secular power, but on their occupancy of the Pontificate, perhaps on their combination of the two offices. How far their enmity went, will appear in the sequel. For a time it was repressed by the critical state of affairs. For, the contest with the Syrians had to be once more renewed, and although Simon, or rather his sons, obtained the victory, the aged High-Priest and two of his sons, Mattathias and Judas, fell by the treachery of Ptolomæus, Simon's son-in-law.The Pontificate and the government now developed upon the only one of Simon's sons still left, known as John Hyranus I. (Jochanan Horkenos, [6345] Jannai [6346]), 135-105 b.c. His first desire naturally was to set free his mother, who was still in the power of Ptolomæus, and to chastise him for his crimes. But in this he failed. Ptolemy purchased immunity by threatening to kill his captive, and afterwards treacherously slew her. Soon after this a Syrian army besieged Jerusalem. The City was reduced to great straits. But when at the Feast of Tabernacles the Syrian king not only granted a truce to the besieged, but actually provided them with what was needed for the services of the Temple, Hyrcanus sought and obtained peace, although the Syrian councillors urged their king to use the opportunity for exterminating Jerusalem. The conditions, though hard, were not unreasonable in the circumstances. But fresh troubles in Syria gave a more favourable turn to affairs in Judæa. First, Hyrcanus subjected Samaria, and then conquered Idumæa, whose inhabitants he made proselytes by giving them the alternative of circumcision or exile. Next, the treaty with the Romans was renewed, and finally Hyrcanus availed himself of the rapid decay of the Syrian monarchy to throw off his allegiance to the foreigner. Jewish exclusiveness was further gratified by the utter destruction of Samaria, of which the memorial-day (the 25th Marcheshvan, November) was inserted in the festive Calendar' (Meg. Taan. Per.8). [6347] Nor was this the only date which his successors added to the calendar of national feasts. [6348] But his reign is of the deepest importance in our history as marking the first

public contest between the great parties, the Pharisees and the Saducees, and also as the turning-point in the history of the Maccabees. Even the coins of that period are instructive. They bear the inscription: Jochanan, the High-Priest, and the Chebher of the Jews; or else, Jochanan the High-Priest, Chief, and the Chebher of the Jews.' [6349] The term Chebher, which on the coins occurs only in connection with High-Priest,' unquestionably refers, not to the Jewish people generally, but to them in their ecclesiastical organisation, and points therefore to the acknowledgment of an Eldership,' or representative body, which presided over affairs along with and under the High-Priest' as Chief.' [6350] In this respect the presence or absence of the word Chebher,' or even mention of the Jews, might afford hints as to the relationship of a Maccabee chief to the ecclesiastical leaders of the people. It has already been explained that the Chasidim, viewed as the National party, had ceased, and that the leaders were now divided into Pharisees and Sadducees. By tradition and necessity Hyrcanus belonged to the former, by tendency and. probably, inclination to the later. His interference in religious affairs was by no means to the liking of the Pharisees, still less to that of their extreme sectaries, the Chasidim. Tradition ascribes to Hyrcanus no less than nine innovations, of which only five were afterwards continued as legal ordinances. First, the payment of tithes (both of the Levitical and the so-called poor's tithe') was declared no longer obligatory on a seller, if he were one of the Am ha-Arets, or country people, but on the buyer. [6351] Complaints had long been made that this heavy impost was not paid by the majority of the common people, and it was deemed better to devote the responsibility on the buyer, unless the seller were what was called neeman,' trusted; i.e., one who had solemnly bound himself to pay tithes. In connection with this, secondly, the declaration ordered in Deut. xxvi.3-10 was abrogated as no longer applicable. Thirdly, all work that caused noise was forbidden during the days intermediate between the first and the last great festive days of the Passover and of the Feast of Tabernacles. Fourthly, the formula: Awake, why sleepest Thou, O Lord' (Ps. xliv.23), with which, since the Syrian persecution, the morning service in the Temple had commenced, was abolished. Fifthly, the cruel custom of wounding the sacrificial animals on the head was prohibited and rings fastened in the pavement to which the animals were attached (Jer. Maas. Sh. v.9; Jer. Sot. ix.11; Tos. Sot.13; Sotah 48 a). The four ordinances of Hyrcanus which were abolished referred to the introduction in official documents, after the title of the High-Priest, of the expression El Elyon' - the Most High God; to the attempt to declare the Syrian and Samaritan towns liable to tithes (implying their virtual incorporation) while according to an old principle, this obligation only applied when a place could be reached from Judea without passing over heathen soil; to the abrogation by Hyrcanus of a former enactment by Jose ben Joezer, which discouraged emigration by declaring all heathen soil defiled, and which rendered social intercourse with Gentiles impossible by declaring vessels of glass capable of contracting Levitical defilement (Jer. Shabb.1.4; Shabb.14 b) - and which was re-enacted; and, lastly, to the easy terms on which the King had admitted the Idumæans into the Jewish community.From all this it is not difficult to from an idea of the relations between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees. If Hyrcanus had not otherwise known of the growing aversion of the Pharisees, a Sadducean friend and councillor kept him informed, and turned it to account for his party. The story of the public breach between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees is told by Josephus (Ant. xiii.10.5, 6), and in the Talmud (Kidd.66 a), with only variations of names and details. Whether from a challenge thrown out to the Pharisees (according to the Talmud), or in answer to a somewhat strange request by Hyrcanus, to point out any part of his conduct which was not in accordance with the law (so Josephus), one of the extreme section of

the Pharisees, [6352] at a feast given to the party, called upon Hyrcanus to be content with secular power, and to resign the Pontificate, on the ground that he was disqualified for it, because his mother had been a captive of war. Even the Talmud admits that this report was calumnious, while it offered a gratuitous insult to the memory of a really noble heroic woman, all the more unwarrantable that the Pontificate had, by public decree, been made the case if the charge now brought had been other than a pretext to cover the hostility of the Chasidim. The rash avowal was avenged on the whole party. In the opinion of Hyrcanus they all proved themselves accomplishes, when, on being questioned, they declared the offender only guilty of stripes and bonds.' Hyrcanus now joined the Sadducees, and although the statement of the Talmud about the slaughter of the leading Pharisees is incorrect, there can be no doubt that they were removed from power and exposed to persecution. The Talmud adds this, which, although chronologically incorrect, is significant, Jochanan the High-Priest served in the Pontificate eighty years, and at the end of them he became a Sadducee.' But this was only the beginning of troubles to the Pharisaic party, which revenged itself by most bitter hatred - the beginning, also of the decline of the Maccabbes. Hycranus left five sons. To the oldest of them, Aristobulus (in Hebew Jehudah),he bequeathed the Pontificate, but appointed his own widow to succeed him in the secular government. But Aristobulus cast his mother into prison, where she soon afterwards perished - as the story went, by hunger. The only one of his brothers whom he had left at large, and who, indeed, was his favourite, soon fell also a victim to his jealous suspicions. Happily his reign lasted only one year (105-104 b.c.). He is described as openly favouring the Grecian party, although, on conquering Ituræa, a district east of Lake of Galilee, [6353] he obliged its inhabitants to submit to circumcision.On the death of Aristobulus. I., his widow, Alexandra Salome, released his brothers from prison, and apparently married the eldest of them, Alexander Jannæus (or in Hebrew Jonathan), who succeeded both to the Pontificate and the secular government. The three periods of his reign (104-78 b.c.) seem indicated in the varying inscriptions on his coins. [6354] The first period, which lasted eight or ten years, was that in which Jannai was engaged in those wars of conquest, which added the cities on the maritime coast to his possessions. [6355] During the time Salome seems to have managed internal affairs. As she was devoted to the Pharisaic party - indeed one of their leaders, Simeon ben Shetach, is said to have been her brother (Ber.18 a) - this was the time of their ascendency. Accordingly, the coins of that period bear the inscription, Jonathan the High-Priest and the Chebher of the Jews.' But on his return to Jerusalem he found the arrogance of the Pharisaic party ill accordant with his own views and tastes. The king now joined the Sadducees, and Simeon ben Shetach had to seek safety in flight (Jer. Ber. vii.2 p.11 b). But others of his party met a worse fate. A terrible tragedy was enacted in the Temple itself. At the Feast of Tabernacles Jannai, officiating as High-Priest, set the Pharisaic custom at open defiance by pouring the water out of the sacred vessel on the ground instead of upon the altar. Such a high-handed breach of what was regarded as most sacred, excited the feelings of the worshippers to the highest pitch of frenzy. They pelted him with the festive Ethrogs (citrons), which they carried in their hands, and loudly reproached him with his descent from a captive.' The king called in his foreign mercenaries, and no fewer than 6,000 of the people fell under their swords. This was an injury which could neither be forgiven nor atoned for by conquests. One insurrection followed after the other, and 5,000 of the people are said to have fallen in these contests. Weary of the strife, Jannai asked the Pharisaic party to name their conditions of peace, to which they caustically replied, Thy death' (Jos. Ant. xiii.13.5). Indeed, such was the embitterment that they actually called

in, and joined the Syrians against him. But the success of the foreigner produced a popular revulsion in his favour, of which Jannai profited to take terrible vengeance of his opponents. No fewer than 800 of them were nailed to the cross, their sufferings being intensified by seeing their wives and children butchered before their eyes, while the degenerate Pontiff lay feasting with abandoned women. A general flight of the Pharisees ensued. This closes the second period of his reign, marked on the coin by the significant absence of the words Chebher of the Jews.' the words being on one side in Hebrew, Jonathan the king,' and on the other in Greek, Alexander the King.'The third period is marked by coins which bear the inscription Jehonathan the High-Priest and the Jews.' It was a period of outward military success, and of reconciliation with the Pharisees, or at least of their recall - notable of Simeon ben Shetach, and then of his friends - probably at the instigation of the queen (Ber.48 a; Jer. vii.2). Jannai died in his fiftieth year, after a reign of twenty-seven years, bequeathing the government to his wife Salome. On his death-bed he is said to have advised her to promote the Pharisees, or rather such of them as made not their religiousness a mere pretext intrigue: Be not afraid of the Pharisees, nor of those of Zimri, and seek the reward of Phinehas' (Sot.22 b). But of chief interest to us is, that this period of the recall of the Pharisees marks a great internal change, indicated even in the coins. For the first time we now meet the designation Sanhedrin.' The Chebher, or eldership, had ceased as a ruling power, and become transformed into a Sanhedrin, or ecclesiastical authority although the latter endeavoured, with more or less success, to arrogate to itself civil jurisdiction, at least in ecclesiastical matters. [6356]The nine years of Queen Alexandra's (in Hebrew Salome) reign were the Golden Age of the Pharisees, when heaven itself smiled on a land that was wholly subject to their religious sway. In the extravagant language of the Talmud (Tann.23 a, second line from top): In the days of Simeon ben Shetach, the rains came down in the nights of fourth days, [6357] and on those of the Sabbaths, so that the grains of corn became like kidneys, those of barley the stones of olives, and lentils like gold dinars, and they preserved a specimen (dogma) of them for future generations to show them what disastrous result may follow upon sin.' That period of miraculous blessing was compared to the equally miraculous dispensation of heaven during the time that the Temple of Herod was building, when rain only fell at night, while the morning wind and heat dried all, so that the builders could continue their work without delay. [6358] Queen Salome had appointed her eldest son, Hyrcanus II., a weak prince, to the Poltificate. But, as Josephus puts it (Am. xiii.16.2), although Salome had the title, the Pharisees held the real rule of the country, and they administered it with the harshness, insolence, and recklessness of a fanatical religious party which suddenly obtains unlimited power. The lead was, of course, taken by Simeon ben Shetach, whom even the Talmud characterises as having hot hands' (Jer. Sanh. vi.5, [6359] p.23 b). First, all who were suspected of Sadducean leaning were removed by intrigue or violence form the Sanhedrin. Next, previous ordinances differing from Pharisaical views were abrogated, and others breathing their spirit substituted. So sweeping and thorough was the change wrought, that the Sadducees never recovered the blow, and whatever they might teach, yet those in office were obligated in all time coming to conform to Pharisaic practice (Jos. Ant. xviii.1.4; Tos Yoma i.8). But the Pharisaic party were not content with dogmatical victories, even though they celebrated each of them by the insertion in the Calendar of a commemorative feast-day. Partly, to discourage the Sadducees,' partly from the supposed necessities of the time, and to teach others' (to make an example; Siphré on Deut.), they carried their principles even beyond their utmost inferences, and were guilty of such injustice and cruelty, that, according to

tradition, Simeon even condemned his own innocent son to death, for the sake of logical consistency. [6360] On the other hand, the Pharisaic party knew how to flatter the queen, by introducing a series of ordinances which protected the rights of married women and rendered divorce more difficult. [6361] The only ordinance of Simeon ben Shetach, which deserves permanent record, is that which enjoined regular school attendance by all children, although it may have been primarily intended to place the education of the country in the hands of the Pharisees. The general discontent caused by the tyranny of the Pharisees must have rallied most of the higher classes to the party of the Sadducees. It led at last to remonstrance with the queen, and was probably the first occasion of that revolt of Aristobulus, the younger son of Salome, which darkened the last days of her reign.Salome died (in the beginning of 69 b.c.) before the measures proposed against Aristobulus could be carried out. Although Hyrcanus II. now united the royal office with the Pontificate, his claims were disputed by his brother Aristobulus II., who conquered, and obliged his brother to abdicate in his favour his twofold dignity. To cement their reconciliation, Alexander the son of Arisobulus married Alexandra the daughter of Hycranus. They little thought how ill-fated that union would prove. For already another power was intriguing to interpose in Jewish affairs, with which it was henceforth to be identified. Alexander Hannai had appointed one Antipas, or Antipater - of whose origin the most divergent accounts are given [6362] - to the governorship of Idumæa. He was succeeded by a son of the same name. The dissension between the two Asmonæans seemed to offer the opportunity for realising his ambitious schemes. Of course, he took the part of the weak Hyrcanus as against the warlike Aristobulus, and persuaded the former that he was in danger of his life. Ultimately he prevailed on him to fly to Aretas, King of Arabia, who, in consideration of liberal promises, undertook to reinstate Hycranus in the government. The Arab army proved successful, and was joined by a large proportion of the troops of Aristobulus, who was not shut up within the fortified Temple-buildings. To add to the horrors of war, a long famine desolated the land. It was during its prevalence that Onias, reputed for his omnipotence in prayer, achieved what procured for him the designation hammeaggel' - the circle drawer.' [6363] When his prayer for rain remained unanswered, he drew a circle around him, declaring his determination not to leave it till the Almighty had granted rain, and that not in drops, nor yet in desolating floods (which successively happened), but in copious, refreshing showers. It could serve no good purpose to reproduce the realistic manner in which this supposed power of the Rabbi with God is described (Taan.23 a). But it were difficult to say whether this is more repugnant to feelings of reverence, or the reported reproof of Simeon ben Shetach, who forbore to pronounce the ban upon him because he was like a spoilt child who might ask anything of his father, and would obtain it. But this supposed power ultimately proved fatal to Onias during the siege of Jerusalem by Hyrcanus and Aretas. [6364] Refusing to intercede either for one or the other of the rival brothers, he was stoned to death (Ant. xiv.2.1).But already another power had appeared on the scene. Pompey was on his victorious march through Asia when both parties appeal to him for help. Scaurus, whom Pompey detached to Syria, was, indeed, bought by Aristobulus, and Aretas was ordered to raise the siege of Jerusalem. But Pompey quickly discovered that Hycranus might, under the tutelage of the cunning Idumæan, Antipater, prove an instrument more likely to serve his ulterior purposes than Aristobulus. Three deputations appeared before Pompey at Damascus - those of the two brothers, and one independent of both, which craved the abolition of the Asmonæan rule and the restoration of the former mode of government, as we understand it, by the Chebher' or Eldership under the presidency of the High-Priest. It need

scarcely be said that such a demand would find no response. The consideration of the rival claims of the Asmonæans Pompey postponed. The conduct of Aristobulus not only confirmed the unfavourable impression which the insolent bearing of his deputies had made on Pompey, but sealed his own fate and that of the Jewish people. Pompey laid siege to Jerusalem. The adherents of Hyrcanus surrendered the City, but those of Aristobulus retired into the Temple. At last the sacred precincts were taken by storm amidst fearful carnage. The priests, who were engaged in their sacred functions, [6365] and who continued them during this terrible scene, were cut down at the altar. No fewer than 12,000 Jews are said to have perished. With the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey (63 b.c.) the history of the Maccabees as a reigning family, and, indeed, that of the real independence of Palestine, came to an end. So truly did Jewish tradition realise this, that it has left us not a single notice either of this capture of Jerusalem or of all the subsequent sad events to the time of Herod. It is as if their silence meant that for them Judæa, in its then state, had no further history. Still, the Roman conquerer had as yet dealt gently with his prostrate victim. Pompey had, indeed, penetrated into the most Holy Place in contemptuous outrage of the most sacred feelings of Israel; but he left the treasure of the Temple untouched, and even made provision for the continuance of its services. Those who had caused the resistance of Jerusalem were executed, and the country made tributary to Rome. But Judæa not only became subject to the Roman Governor of Syria, its boundaries were also narrowed. All the Grecian cities had their independence restored; Samaria was freed from Jewish supremacy; and the districts comprised within the so-called Decapolis (or ten cities') again obtained self-government. It was a sadly curtailed land over which Hyrcanus II., as High-Priest, was left Governor, without being allowed to wear the diadem (Ant. xx.10). Aristobulus II. had to adorn as captive the triumphal entry of the conquerer into Rome. [6366]The civil rule of Hycranus as Ethnarch must from the first have been very limited. It was still more contracted when, during the Proconsulate of Ganinius (57-55 b.c.), [6367] Alexander, a son of Aristobulus, who had escaped from captivity, tried to possess himself of the government of Judæa (Ant. xiv.5.2-4). The office of Hyrcanus was now limited to the Temple, and the Jewish territory, divided into five districts, was apportioned among five principal cities, ruled by a council of local notables (ristoi). Thus, for a short time, monarchical gave place to aristocratic government in Palestine. The renewed attempts of Aristobulus or of his family to recover power only led to fresh troubles, which were sadly diversified by the rapacity and severity of the Romans. The Triumvir Crassus, who succeeded Gabinius (55-53 b.c.), plundered the Temple not only of its treasures but of its precious vessels. A new but not much happier era began with Julius Cæsar. If Aristobulus and his son Alexander had not fallen victims to the party of Pompey, the prospects of Hyrcanus and Antipater might now have been very unpromising. But their death and that of Pompey (whom they had supported) changed the aspect of matters. Antipater not only espoused the cause of the victor of Pharsalus, but made himself eminently useful to Cæsar. In reward, Hyrcanus was confirmed as Pontiff and Ethnarch of Judæa, while Antipater was made a Roman citizen and nominated Epitrophos, or (Roman) administrator of the country. Of course, the real power was in the hands of the Idumæan, who continued to hold it, despite the attempts of Antigonus, the only surviving son of Aristobulus. And from henceforth Cæsar made it part of his policy to favour the Jews (comp. the decrees in their favour, Ant. xiv.10).Meantime Antipater had, in pursuance of his ambitious plans, appointed his son Phasael Governor of Jerusalem, and Herod Governor of Galilee. The latter, although only twenty-five years of age, soon displayed the vigour and sternness which characterised his after-career. He quelled

what probably was a nationalist' rising in Galilee, in the blood of Ezekias, its leader, and of his chief associates. This indeed secured him the favour of Sextus Cæsar, the Governor of Syria, a relative of the great Imperator. But in Jerusalem, and among the extreme Pharisaic party, it excited the utmost indignation. They foresaw the advent of a foe most dangerous to their interests and liberty, and vainly sought to rid themselves of him. It was argued that the government of the country was in the hands of the High-Priest, and that Herod, as Governor of Galilee, appointed by a foreign administrator, had no right to pronounce capital punishment without a sentence of the Sanhedrin. Hycranus yielded to the clamour; but Herod appeared before the Sanhedrin, not as a criminal, but arrayed in purple, surrounded by a body-guard, and supported by the express command of Sextus Cæsar to acquit him. The story which is related, though in different version, and with different names, in the Talmud (Sanh.19 a), and by Josephus (Ant. xiv.9.3-5), presents a vivid picture of what passed in the Sanhedrin. The appearance of Herod had so terrified that learned body that none ventured to speak, till their president, Shemajah (Sameas), by his bold speech, rallied their courage. Most truly did he foretell the fate which overtook them ten years later, when Herod ruled in the Holy City. But Hyrcanus adjourned the meeting of the Sanhedrin, and persuaded Herod to withdraw from Jerusalem. His was, however, only a temporary humiliation. Sextus Cæsar named Herod Governor of Coele-Syria, and he soon appeared with an army before Jerusalem, to take vengeance on Hycranus and the Sanhedrin. The entreaties of his father and brother induced him, indeed, to desist for the time, but ten years later alike Hyrcanus and the members of the Sanhedrin fell victims to his revenge. Another turn of affairs seemed imminent when Cæsar fell under the daggers of the conspirators (15 March, 44), and Cassius occupied Syria. But Antipater and Herod proved as willing and able to serve him as formerly Cæsar. Antipater, indeed, perished through a court - or perhaps a Nationalist' plot, but his murderers soon experienced the same fate at the hands of those whom Herod had hired for the purpose. And still the star of Herod seemed in the ascendant. Not only did he repel attempted inroads by Antigonus, but when Antonius and Octavianus (in 42 b.c.) took the place of Brutus and Cassius, he succeeded once more in ingratiating himself with the former, on whom the government of Asis devolved. The accusations made by Jewish deputation had no influence on Antony. Indeed, he went beyond his predecessors in appointing Phasael and Herod tetrarchs of Judæa. Thus the civil power was now nominally as well as really in their hands. But the restless Antigonus was determined not to forego his claim. When the power of Antony was fast waning, in consequence of his reckless indulgences, Antigonus seized the opportunity of the incursion of the Parthians into Asia Minor to attend the great object of his ambition. In Jerusalem the adherents of the two parties were engaged in daily conflicts, when a Parthian division appeared. By treachery Phasael and Hycranus were lured into the Parthian camp, and finally handed over to Antigonus. Herod, warned in time, had escaped from Jerusalem with his family and armed adherents. Of his other opponents Antigonus made sure. To unfit Hyrcanus for the Pontificate his ears were cut off, while Phasael destroyed himself in prison. Antigonus was now undisputed High-Priest and king. His brief reign of three years (40-37 b.c.) is marked by coins which bear in Hebrew the device: Matthatjah the High-Priest, and in Greek: King Antigonus.The only hope of Herod lay in Roman help. He found Antony in Rome. What difficulties there were, were removed by gold, and when Octavian gave his consent, a decree of the Senate declared Antigonus the enemy of Rome, and at the same time appointed Herod King of Judæa (40 b.c.). Early in the year 39 b.c. Herod was in Palestine to conquer his new kingdom by help of the Romans. But their aid was at first tardy and

reluctant, and it was 38, or more probably 37, before Herod could gain possession of Jerusalem itself. Before that he had wedded the beautiful and unhappy Mariamme, the daughter of Alexander and granddaughter of Hyrcanus, to whom he had been betrothed five years before. His conquered capital was desolate indeed, and its people impoverished by exactions. But Herod had reached the goal of his ambition. All opposition was put down, all rivalry rendered impossible. Antigonus was beheaded, as Herod had wished; the feeble and aged Hyrcanus was permanently disqualified for the Pontificate; and any youthful descendants of the Maccabees left were absolutely in the conqueror's power. The long struggle for power had ended, and the Asmonæan family was virtually destroyed. Their sway had lasted about 130 years.Looking back on the rapid rise and decline of the Maccabees, on their speedy degeneration, on the deeds of cruelty with which their history soon became stained, on the selfishness and reckless ambition which characterized them, and especially on the profoundly anti-nationalist and anti-Pharisaic, we had almost said anti-Jewish, tendency which marked their sway, we can understand the bitter hatred with which Jewish tradition had followed their memory. The mention of them is of the scantiest. No universal acclamation glorifies even the deeds of Judas the Maccabee; no Talmudic tractate is devoted to that feast of the dedication' which celebrated the purging of the Temple and the restoration of Jewish worship. In fact such was the feeling, that the priestly course of Joiarib - to which the Asmonæans belonged - is said to have been on service when the first and the second Temple were destroyed, because guilt was to be punished on the guilty.' More than that, R. Levi saith: Yehoyaribh ["Jehovah will contend"], the man [the name of the man or family]; Meron ["rebellion," evidently a play upon Modin, the birthplace of the Maccabees], the town; Mesarbey ["the rebels," evidently a play upon Makkabey] - (masar beitha) He hath given up the Temple to the enemies.' Rabbi Berachjah saith: Yah heribh [Jehoiarib], God contended with His children, because they revolted and rebelled against Him' (Jer. Taan. iv.8, p.68 d, line 35 from bottom). [6368] Indeed, the opprobrious designation of rebellion, and Sarbaney El, rebels against God, became in course of time so identified with the Maccabees. that it was used when its meaning was no longer understood. Thus Origen (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi.25) speaks of the (Apocryphal) books of the Maccabees as inscribed Sarbeth Sarbane El' (={hebrew}), the disobedience, or rebellion (resistance) of the disobedient, or rebels, against God. [6369] So thoroughly had these terms become identified in popular parlance, that even the tyranny and cruelty of a Herod could not procure a milder judgment on the sway of the Asmonæans.

Chapter 112

APPENDIX V. RABBINIC THEOLOGY AND LITERATURE

(Vol. i. Book I. ch. viii.) 1. The Traditional Law. - The brief account given in vol. i. p.100, of the character and authority claimed for the traditional law may here be supplemented by a chronological arrangement of the Halakhoth in the order of their supposed introduction or promulgation. In the first class, or Halakhoth of Moses from Sinai,' tradition enumerates fifty-five, [6370] which may be thus designated: religio-agrarian, four; [6371] ritual, including questions about clean and unclean,' twenty-three; [6372] concerning women and intercourse between the sexes, three; [6373] concerning formalities to be observed in the copying, fastening, &c., of the Law and the phylacteries, eighteen; [6374] exegetical, four; [6375] purely superstitious, one; [6376] not otherwise included, two. [6377] Eighteen ordinances are ascribed to Joshua, of which only one is ritual, the other seventeen being agrarian and police regulations. [6378] The other traditions can only be briefly noted. Boaz, or else the tribunal of Samuel,' fixed, that Deut. xxiii.3 did not apply to alliances with Ammonite and Moabite women. Two ordinances are ascribed to David, two to Solomon, one to Jehoshaphat, and one to Jehoida. The period of Isaiah and of Hezekiah is described as of immense Rabbinic activity. To the prophets at Jerusalem three ritual ordinances are ascribed. Daniel is represented as having prohibited the bread, wine and oil of the heathen (Dan. i.5). Two ritual determinations are ascribed to the prophets of the Exile. After the return from Babylon traditionalism rapidly expanded, and its peculiar character more and more clearly developed. No fewer than twelve traditions are traced back to the three prophets who flourished at that period, while four other important legal determinations are attributed to the prophet Haggai individually. It will readily be understood that Ezra occupied a high place in tradition. Fifteen ordinances are ascribed to him, of which some are titual. Three of his supposed ordinances have a general interest. They enjoin the general education of children, and the exclusion of Samaritans from admission into the Synagogue and from social intercourse. If only one legal determination is assigned to Nehemiah, the men of the great Synagogue' are credited with fifteen, of which six bear on important critical and exegetical points connected with the text of the Scriptures, the others chiefly on questions connected with ritual and worship. Among the pairs' (Zugoth) which succeeded the Great Synagogue,' three alleviating' ordinances (of a very punctilious character) are ascribed to Jose, the son of Joezer, [6379] and two, intended render all contact with heathens impossible, to him and his colleague. Under the Maccabees the feast of the dedication of the Temple was introduced. To Joshua the son of Perachya, one punctilious legal determination is ascribed. Of the decrees of the Maccabean High-Priest Jochanan we have already spoken in another place; similarly, of those of Simon the son of Shetach and of his learned colleague. Four legal determinations of their successors Shemayah and Abhtalion are mentioned. Next in order comes the prohibition of Greek during the war between the Maccabean brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. This brings us to the time of Hillel and Shammai, that is, to the period of Jesus, to which further reference will have to be made in another place. 2. The Canon of Scripture. - Reference has been made in the text (vol. i. p.107) to the position taken by Traditionalism in reference to the written as compared with what was regarded as the oral Revelation. Still, nominally, the Scriptures were appealed to by the Palestinians as of supreme authority. The views

which Josephus expresses in this respect, although in a popular and Grecianised form, were substantially those entertained by the Rabbis and by his countrymen generally (comp. Ag. Apion, i.7, 8). [6380] A sharp distinction was made between canonical and non-canonical books. The test of the former was inspiration, which had ceased in the time of Artaxerxes, that is, with the prophet Malachi. Accordingly, the work of the elder Jesus the son of Sirach (Jeshua ben Sira, ben Eliezer) was excluded from the Canon, although it is not unfrequently referred to by Rabbinic authorities in terms with which ordinarily only Biblical quotations are introduced. [6381] According to the view propounded by Josephus, not only were the very words inspired in which a prediction was uttered, but the prophets were unconscious and passive vehicles of the Divine message (Ant. iv.6.5, comp generally, Ant ii.8.1; vi.8, 2; viii.13, 3; ix.3, 2, 8, 6; x.2, 2; 4, 3). Although pre-eminence in this respect was assigned to Moses (Ant. iv.8, 49), yet Divine authority equally attached to the sayings of the prophets, and even, though perhaps in a still inferior degree, to the Hymns,' as the Hagiographa generally were called from the circumstance that the Psalter stood at the head of them (comp. Philo, De Vita contempl., ed. Mangey, voi. ii. p.475; St. Luke xxiv.44). Thus the division of the Bible into three sections - the Law, the Prophets, and the other Writings' - which already occurs in the prologue to the work of Jesus the son of Sirach, [6382] seems to have been current at the time. And here it is of great interest, in connection with modern controversies, that Josephus seems to attach special importance to the prophecies of Daniel as still awaiting fulfilment (Ant. x 10.4; 11.7). That the Rabbis entertained the same views of inspiration, appears not only from the distinctive name of Holy Writings' given to the Scriptures, but also from the directions that their touch defiled the hands, [6383] and that it was duty on the Sabbath to save them from conflagration, and to gather them up if accidentally scattered, and that it was not lawful for heirs to make division of a sacred roll (Comp. Shabb. xvi.1; Erub. x.3; Kel. xv.6; Yad. iii.2-5; iv.5 [where special reference is made to Daniel 6]). From what we know of the state of feeling, we might have inferred, even if direct evidence had not existed that a distinctive and superior place would be ascribed to the Books of Moses. In point of fact, the other books of Scripture, alike the Prophets and the Hagiographa, [6384] are only designated as Qabbalah (received,' handed down, tradition), which is also the name given to oral tradition. [6385] It was said that the Torah was given to Moses (Jer. Sheq. vi.1) in (letters of) white fire graven upon black fire,' although it was matter of despute whether he received it volume by volume or complete as a whole (Gitt.60 a). But on the question of its inspiration not the smallest doubt could be tolerated. Thus, to admit generally, that the Torah as a whole was from heaven, except this (one) verse, which the Holy One, blessed be He, did not speak, but Moses of himself' was to become an infidel and a blasphemer (Sanh.99 a). [6386] Even the concluding verses in Deuteronomy had been dictated by God to Moses, and he wrote them down - not repeating them, however, as before, but weeping as he wrote. It will readily be understood in what extravagant terms Moses himself was spoken of. It is not only that the expression man of God' was supposed to imply, that while as regarded the lower part of his nature Moses was man, as regarded the higher he was Divine, but that his glorification and exaltation amount to blasphemy. [6387] So far as inspiration or revelation' is concerned, it was said that Moses saw in a clear glass, the prophets in a dark one' - or, to put it otherwise: he saw through one glass, they through seven.' Indeed, although the opening words of Ps. lxxv. showed, that the Psalms were as much revelation as the Law, yet, if Israel had not sinned, they would have only received the Pentateuch, and the Book of Joshua,' and, in the time to come, of all Scripture the Pentateuch alone would retain its place. It was somewhat

contemptuously remarked, that the Prophets uttered nothing as regarded practice that had not already been told in the Pentateuch (Taan.9 a). It was but natural for Rabbinism to declare that the Law alone fully explained its meaning (at least according to their interpretation of it), while the Prophets left much in obscurity. [6388] To mark the distinction, it was forbidden to put the Law in the same wrapper with the Prophets, so as not to place perhaps the latter on the top of the former (Tos. Meg. iv.20). Among the Prophets themselves there was a considerable difference, not only in style and training but even in substance (Sanh.89 a), although all of them had certain common qualifications (comp. Ab. de R. Nathan, 37). Of all the prophets Isaiah was greatest, and stood next to Moses. Ezekiel saw all that Isaiah saw - but the former was like a villager, the latter like a townsman who saw the king (Chag.13 b). Jeremiah and Amos were, so to speak, scolding, owing to the violence of their temperament, while Isaiah's was the book of consolation, especially in response to Jeremiah. The Hagiographa or Kethubhim' also bear in the Talmud the general designation of Chokhmah,' wisdom. It has been asserted that, as the Prophetic Books, so the Hagiographa, were distinguished into anterior' (Psalms, Proverbs, Job) and posterior,' or else into great' and small.' But the statement rests on quite insufficient evidence. [6389] Certain, however, it is , that the Hagiographa, as we possess them, formed part of the Canon in the time of Jesus the son of Sirach - that is, even of the latest computation of his authorship, [6390] about the year 130 b.c. [6391] Even so, it would not be easy to vindicate, on historical grounds, the so-called Maccabean authorship of the Book of Daniel, which would fix its date about 105 b.c. For, if other considerations did not interfere, few students of Jewish history would be disposed to assert that a book, which dated from 104 b.c., could have found a place in the Jewish Canon. [6392] But, as explained in vol. i. p.26, we would assign a much earlier date to the Book of Sirach. The whole question in its bearing on the New Testament is so important, that one or two further remarks may be allowed. Leaving aside most serious critical objections, and the unquestionable fact, that no amount of ingenuity can conciliate the Maccabean application of Dan. ix.24-27 with the chronology of that period, [6393] while the Messianic interpretation fits in with it, [6394] other, and seemingly insuperable difficulties are in the way of the theory impugned. It implies, that the Book of Daniel was not an Appocryphal, but a Pseudepigraphic work; that of all such works it alone has come down to us in its Hebrew or Chaldee original; that a Pseudepigraphic work, nearly contemporary with the oldest portion of the Book of Enoch, should not only be so different from it, but that it should find admission into the Canon, while Enoch was excluded; that a Pseudepigraphon younger that Jesus the Son of Sirach should have been on the Khethubhim; and, finally, that it should have passed the repeated revision of different Rabbinic Colleges' - and that at times of considerable theological activity - without the suspicion being even raised that its authorship dated fromso late a period as a century an a half before Christ. And we have evidence that since the Babylonish exile, at least four revisions of the Canon took place within periods sufficiently distant from each other. The question hitherto treated has been exclusively of the date of the composition of the Book of Daniel, without reference to who may have been its author, whether its present is exactly the same as its original form, and finally, whether it ever belonged to those books whose right to canonicity, though nor their age,was in controversy, that is, whether it belonged, so to speak, to the Old Testament ntilegmena. As this is not the place for a detailed discussion of the canonicity of the Book of Daniel - or, indeed, of any other in the Old Testament canon - we shall only add, to prevent misunderstanding, that no opinion is here expressed as to possible, greater or less, interpolations on the Book of Daniel, or in any other part of the Old Testament. We must here

bear in mind that the moral view taken of such interpolations, as we would call them, was entirely different in those times from ours; and it may perhaps be an historically and critically no unwarranted proposition, that such interpolations were, to speak moderately, not all unusual in ancient documents. In each case the question must be separately critically examined in the light of internal and (if possible) external evidence. But it would be a very different thing to suggest that there may be an interpolation, or, it may be, a re-arrangement in a document (although at present we make no assertions on the subject, one way or the other), and to pronounce a whole document a fabrication dating from a much later period. The one would, at any rate, be quite in the spirit of those times; the other implies, beside insuperable critical difficulties, a deliberate religious fraud, to which no unprejudiced student could seriously regard the so-called Pseudepigrapha as forming any real analogon. But as regards the Book of Daniel, it is an important fact that the right of the Book of Daniel to canonicity was never called in question in the ancient Synagogue. The fact that it was distinguish as visions' (Chezyonoth) from the other prophecies' has, of course, no bearing on the question, any more than the circumstance that later Rabbinism, which, naturally enough, could not find its way through the Messianic prophecies of the book, declare that even Daniel was mistaken in, and could not make anything of the predictions concerning the latter days' (Ber. R.98). [6395] On the other hand, Daniel was elevated to almost the same pinnacle as Moses, while it was said that, as compared with heathen sages, if they were all placed in one scale, and Daniel in the other, he would outweigh them all. We can readily understand that, in times of national sorrow or excitement, these prophecies would be eagerly resorted to, as pointing to a glorious future. But although the Book of Daniel was not among the Antilegomena, doubts were raised, not indeed about the age, but about the right to canonicity of certain other portions of the Bible. Thus, certain expressions in the prophecies of Ezekiel were questioned as apparently incompatible with statements in the Pentateuch [6396] (Men.45 a), and although a celebrated Rabbi, Chananyah, the son of Chizkuyah, the son of Garon (about the time of Christ), with immense labour, sought to conncilate them, and thus preserved the Book of Ezekiel (or, at least, part of it) from being relegated among the Appocrypha, it was deemed safest to leave the final exposition of the meaning of Ezekiel, till Elijah come,' as the restorer of all things. The other objections to canonicity apply exculsively to the third division of the Old Testament, the Kethubhim or Hagiorgrapha. Here even the Book of Proverbs seems at one time to have been called in question (Ab. R. Nathan 1), partly on the ground of its secular contents, and partly as containing supposed contradictory statements' [6397] (Shabb.30 b). Very strong doubts were raised on the Book of Ecclesiastes (Yad. iii.5; Eduy. v.3), first, on that ground of its contradiction to some of the Psalms [6398] (Shabb.30 a); secondly, on that of its inconsistencies [6399] (Shabb.30 b); and thirdly, because ot seemed to countenance the denial of another life, and, as in Eccl. xi 1, 3, 9, other heretical views (Vayyikra R.28, at the beginning). [6400] But these objections were finally answered by great ingenuity, while an appeal to Eccl. xii.12, 13, was regarded as removing the difficulty about another life and future rewards and punishments. And as the contradictions in Ecclesiastes had been conciliated, it hopefully argued deeper study would equally remove those in the Book of Proverbs (Shabb.30 b). [6401] Still, the controversy about the canonicity of Ecclesiastes continue so late as the second century of our era (comp. Yad. iii.5). That grave doubts also existed about the Song of Solomon, appears even from the terms in which its canonicity is insisted upon (Yad. u. s.), not to speak of express statements in opposition to it (Ab. de. R. Nathan 1). Even when by an allegorical interpretation it was shown to be the wisdom of all

wisdom,' the most precious gem, the holy of holies, tradition still ascribed its composition to to the early years of Solomon (Shir haSh. R.1). It had been his first work, and was followed by Proverbs, and finally by Ecclesiastes. [6402] But perhaps the greatest objections were those taken to the Book of Esther (Meg.7 a). It excited the enmity of other nations against Israel, and it was outside the canon. Grave doubts prevailed whether it was canonical or inspired by the Holy Spirit (Meg. u. s.; Yoma 29 a). The books of Ezra and Nehemiah were anciently regarded as one - the name of the latter author being kept back on account of his tendency to self-exaltation (Sanh.93 b). Lastly, the genealogical parts of the Book of Chronicles were made the subject of very elaborate secret commentation (Pes.62 b). Two points still require brief mention. Even from a comparison of the LXX. Version with our Hebrew text, it is evident that there were not only many variations, but that spurious additions (as Daniel) were eliminated. This critical activity, which commenced with Ezra, whose copy of the Pentateuch was, according to tradition, placed in the Temple, that the people might correct their copies by it, must have continued for many centuries. [6403] There is abundant evidence of frequent divergences - though perhaps minute - and although later Rabbinsim laid down the most painfully minute directions about the mode of writing and copying the rolls of the Law, there is such discrepancy, even where least it might be expected, [6404] as to show that the purification of the text was by no means settled. Considering the want of exegetical knowledge and historical conscientiousness, and keeping in view how often the Rabbis, for Haggadic puroposes, alter letters, and thus change the meaning of words, we may well doubt the satisfactory character of their critical labours. Lastly, as certain omissions were made, and as the Canon underwent (as will be shown) repeated revision, it may have been certain portions were added as well as left out, and words changed as well as restored.For, ancient tradition ascribes a peculiar activity to certain Colleges' - as they are termed - in regard to the Canon. In general, the well-known Baraita (Baba B.14 b, 15 a) bears, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, the book (Prophecies?) of Balaam, and Job; Joshua the work that bears his name, and the last eight verses of Deuteronomy; [6405] Samuel the corresponding books, Judges and Ruth; David with the ten Elders,' Adam, Melchisedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Korah, the Psalter; Jeremiah wrote his prophecies, Lamentations, and Kings; King Hezekiah and his Sanhedrin compiled, or edited, the Prophecies of Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song, and Ecclesiastes; and the men of the Great Synagogue' the Prophecies of Ezekiel, of the twelve Minor Prophets, and the books of Daniel and Esther; Ezra wrote his own book and Chronicles, the work being completed by Nehemiah, the son of Chakaliah. The last verse of Joshua were written by Eleazar and Phinehas; the last chapters of Samuel by Gad and Nathan. [6406]Loose and uncritical as these statements may appear, they so far help our investigations as to show that, according to tradition, certain portions of Scripture were compiled or edited by one or another Rabbinic College,' and that there were several Colleges' which successively busied themselves with the codification and revision of the Canon. By these Colleges,' we are not to understand gatherings of certain members, who discussed and decided a question at one or more of their meetings. They rather indicate the learned activity of the authorities during a certain period, which are respectively designed by the generic names of the Sanhedrin of Hezekiah,' The men of the Synagogue,' the Legal Court of the Maccabees,' and finally, Chananayah and his College,' We have thus somewhat firmer historical ground. If in Prov. xxv.1, we read of the activity about the Canon of the Men of Hezekiah,' and bear in mind the Scriptural account of the religious revival of that reign (for ex.2 Chron. xxix.25-30; 2 Chron. xxx.1), we scarely required the frequent and elaborate

glorification of tradition to lead us to infer that, if the collection of the Book of Proverbs was due to their activity, they must have equally collated the other portions of Scripture then existing, and fixed the Canon as their time. Again, if we are to credit the statement that they equally collected and edited the Prophecies of Isaiah, we are obliged to infer that the continuance of that College was not limited to the life of Hazekiah, since the latter died before Isaiah (Tos. Baba Bathra; Yeb.49 b).What has just been indicated is fully confirmated by what we know of the activity of Ezra (Ezra vii.6, 10), and of his successors in the great Synagogue. If we are to attach credit to the notice in 2 Macc. ii.13, [6407] it points to such literary activity as tradition indicates. That the revision and determination of the Canon must have been among the main occupations of Ezra and his successors of the Great Synagogue' - whatever precise meaning may be attached to that institution - seems scarcely to requre proof. The same remark applies to another period of religious reformation, that of the so-called Asmonæan College. Even if we had not the evidence of their exclusion of such works as those of Ben Sirach and others, there could be no rational doubt that in their time the Canon, as presently existing, was firmly fixed, and that no work of comparatively late date could have found admission into it. The period of their activity is sufficiently known, and too near what may be called the historical times of Rabbinism, for any attempt in that direction, without leaving traces of it. Lastly, we come to the indications of a critical revision of the text by Chananyah and his College,' [6408] shortly before the time of our Lord. Thus we have, in all, a record of four critical revisions of the Canon up to time of Christ. 3. Any attempt to set forth in this place a detailed exposition of the Exegetical Canon of the Rabbis, or of their application, would manifestly be impossible. It would require almost a treatise of its own; and a cursory survey would neither be satisfactory to the writer nor instructive to the general reader. Besides, on all subjects connected with Rabbinic exagesis, a sufficient number of learned treatises exists, which are easily accessible to students, while the general reader can only be interested in such general results as have been frequently indicated throughout these volumes. Lastly, the treatment of certain branches of the subject, such as a criticism of the Targumim, really belongs to what is known as the science of Introduction,' either to the Old Testament, in manuals of which, as well as in special treaties, all such subjects are fully discussed. Besides these the student may be referred, for a general summary, to the labours of Dr. Hamburger (Real-Encycl.). Special works on various branches of the subject cannot here be named, since this would involve an analysis and critical disquisition. But for aknowledge of the Rabbinic statements in regard to the Codices and the text of the Old Testement, reference may here be made to the short but masterly analysis of Professor Strack (Prolegomena Critica), in which, first, the various codices of the Old Testament, and then the text as existing in Talmudical times, are discussed, and the literature of the subject fully and cirtically given. The various passage are also mentioned in which the Biblical quotations in the Mishanah and Gemara differ from our present text. [6409] Most of them are, however, of no exegetical importance. On the exegesis of the Rabbis generally, I would take leave to refer to sketch of it given in the History of the Jewish Nation,' ch. xi., and especially in App. V., on Rabbinical Exegesis,' where all its canons are enumerated. Some brief notices connected with Rabbinic Commentaries quoted in this work will be found at the beginning of vol. i.4 Somewhat similar observations must be made in regard to the mystical Theology of the Synagogue, or the so-called Kabbalah. Its commencement must certainly be traced to, and before, the times described in these volumes. For a discussion of its origin and doctrines I must once more take leave to refer to the account given in the History of the Jewish Nation' (pp.435, &c.). The whole

modern literature of the subject, besides much illustrative matter, is given in the Italian text annexed to David Castelli's edition of Sabbatai Donnolo's Hebrew Commentary on the Book Yetsirah, or the Book of Creation. For, the Kabbalah busies itself with these two subjects: the History of the Creation (Yetsirah, perhaps rather formation' than Creation), and the Merkabhah,' or the Divine apparition as described by Ezekiel. Both refer to the great question, underlying all theosophic speculation: that of God's connection with His creature. They treat of the mystery of Nature and of Providence, with especial bearing on Revelation; and the question, how the Infinite God can have any connection or intercourse with finite creatures, is attempted to be answered. Of the two points raised, that of Creation is of course the first in the order of thinking as well as of time - and the book Yetsirah is the oldest Kabbalistic document.The Sepher Yetsirah is properly a monologue on the part of Abraham, in which, by the contemplation of all that is around him, he ultimately arrives at the conviction of the Unity of God.We distinguish the substance and the fom of creation; that which is, and the mode in which it is. We have already indicated that the original of all that exists is Divine.1st, We have God; 2nd, God manifest, or the Divine entering into form; 3rd, That Divine in its form, from which in turn all original realities are afterwards derived. In the Sepher Yetsirah, these Divine realities (the substance) are represented by the ten numerals, and their form by the twenty-two letters which constitute the Hebrew alphabet - language being viewed as the medium of connection between the spiritual and the material; as the form in which the spiritual appears. At the same time, number and language indicate also the arrangement and the mode of creation, and, in general, its boundaries. "By thirty-two wounderful paths," so begins the Sepher Yetsirah, "the Eternal, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, the Living God, the King of the World, the merciful and gracious God, the glorious One, He that inhabiteth eternity, Whose Name is high and holy, has created the world." But these ten numerals are in reality the ten Sephiroth, or Divine emanations, arranged in triads, each tirad consisting of two opposites (flowing or emanating from a superior triad until the Divine Unity is reached), and being reconciled in a middle point of connection. These ten Sephiroth, in the above arrangement, recur everywhere, and the sacred number ten is that of prefection. Each of these Sephiroth flows from its predecessor, and in this manner the Divine gradually evolves. This emanation of the ten Sephiroth then constitutes the substance of word; we may add, it constitutes everything else. In God, in the world, in man, everywhere we meet these ten Sephiroth, at the head of which is God manifest, or the Memra (Logos, the Word). If the ten Sephiroth give the Substance, the twenty-two letters are the form of creation and of revelation. "By giving them form and shape,. and by interchanging them, God has made the soul ofeverything that has been made, or shall be made." "Upon those letters, also, has the Holy One, Whose Name be praised, founded His holy and glorious Name." These letters are next subdivided, and their application in all the departments of nature is shown. In the unit creation, the triad; world, time and man are found. Above all these is the Lord. Such is a very brief outline of the rational exposition of theCreation, attempted by the Sepher Yetsirah.' [6410] We subjoin a translation of the book Yetsirah, only adding that much, not only as regards the meaning of the expressions but even their translation, is in controversy. Hence, not unfrequently, our rendering must be regarded rather as our interpertation of the mysterious original.THE BOOK YETSIRAHPereq. I.Mishnah 1. In thirty-two wonderful paths of wisdom, Jah, Jehovah Tsebhaoth, the God of Israel, the Living God, and King of the World, God merciful and gracious, High and Exalted, Who dwelleth to Eternity, high and holy is His Name, hath ordered [established, created?] (the world) by three Sepharim [books]: by Sepher [the written Word], Sephar [number, numeral]

and Sippur [spoken word]. Others, pointing the worlds differently, render these mysterious terms: Number, Word, Writing; others Number, Numberer, Numbered; while still other see in it a reference to the threefold division of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, of which more afterwards.Mishnah 2. Ten Sephiroth [emanations] belimah [6411] [without anything, i.e. before these, the sole elements out of which all else evolved], twenty-two letters of foundation (these constitute the Hebrew Alphabet, and the meaning seems that the Sephiroth manifest themselves in that which is uttered): three mothers (Aleph, the first letter of Avveyr, air; Mem, the first letter of Mayim, water; and Shin, the last letter of Esh, fire - although this may represent only one mystical aspect of themeaning of the term mothers,' as applied to these letters), seven duplex [6412] (Prounced soft' or hard,' viz. Beth, Gimel, Daleth, Kaph, Pe, Resh, Tau, which are, or where in Hebrew capable of modification by a Dagesh - but this also must be mystically understood) and twelve simple ones [6413] (the simple letters of the Hebrew Alphabet).Mishnah 3. Ten Sephiorth belimah (the analogy is now further traced in God and in man), the number of the ten fingers, five against five, and the covenant of the One Only (God) placed between them (the coventant relationship between God and man in the midst, even as it is symbolised in the person of man which is between the twice five fingers) by the word of the tongue (this, the relation Godward) and by the word of sexualness [nuditas] (the relation earthwards - the one has become dual.)Mishnah 4. Ten Sephiroth belimah - ten and not nine, ten and not eleven - be informed in wisdom, and be wise in information; examine in them, search out from them, and put the thing in its reality (certitude, proper state?), and place again the Creator in His place.Mishnah 5. Ten Sephiroth belimah - their measurement ten, which have no end (limitation): depth of beginning (past) and depth of ending (future), depth of good and depth of evil, depth of height and depth of profundity (or, above and beneath), depth of east and depth of west, depth of north and depth of south - One only Lord, God, the true (approved) King, Who reigneth over all from His holy dwelling and unto all eternity.Mishnah 6. Ten Sephiroth belimah - their appearance like the sheen of lightning (reference here to Ezek. i.14), and their outgoings (goal) that they have no end, His word is in them (the Logos manifest in the Sephiroth), in running and in returning, and at His word like storm-wind they pursue (follow), and before His throne they bend (in worship).Mishnah 7. Ten Sephiroth belimah - their end is joined to their beginning, like the flame that is bound up with the coal, for the Lord is One only, and there is no second to Him, and before him what countest thou?Mishnah 8. Ten Sephiroth belimah - shut thy mouth, that is speak not, and thy heart, that it think not, and if thy heart run away, bring it back to its place, for on this account is it said (Ezek. i.14) they run and return,' and on this condition has the Covenant been made.Mishnah 9 and 10. Ten Sephiroth belimah - One: the Spirit of the living God, blessed and again blessed be the Name of Him Who liveth for ever - Voice and Spirit and Word, and this is the Holy Ghost.Two: Wind (air, spirit?) from (out of) Spirit - thereby ordered and hewed He the twenty-two letters of foundation, three mothers, and 7 duplicate, and 12 simple ones, and one Spirit from (among) them. Three: Water from beneath (wind), He designed and hewed in them tohu vavohu, slime and dung - designed them like a bed (a garden bed), hewed them like a wall, covered them like pavement. Four: Fire from water, He designed it and hewed in it the throne of glory, the Ophanim and Seraphim, the sacred living creatures, and the angels of service, and of these three He founded His dwelling place, as it is said, He maketh His angels breaths (winds), and His ministers a flaming fire.Mishnah 11. Five: Three letters from out the simple ones: He sealed spirit on the three, and fastened them in His Great Name {hebrew} (Jehovah, of which these three letters are the abbreviation; what follows

shows how the permutation of these three letters makes the varied relationship of God to creation in time and space, and at the same time, so to speak, the immance of His manifestation in it). And He sealed with them six outgoings (ends, terminations): He turned upwards, and He sealed it with {hebrew}. Six: He sealed below, turned downwards, and sealed it with {hebrew}. Seven: He sealed eastward, He turned in front of Him, and sealed it with {hebrew}. Eight: He sealed westward, and turned behind, and sealed it with {hebrew}. Nine: He sealed southward, and turned to His right, and sealed it with {hebrew}. Ten: He sealed northward, and turned to His left, and sealed it with {hebrew}. Mishnah 12. These are the Sephiroth belimah - one: Spirit of the living God, and wind (air, spirit? the word ruach means all these), water, and fire; and height above and below, east and west, north and south.Pereq II.Mishnah 1. Twenty-and-two letters of foundation: three mothers, seven duplex, and twelve simple ones - three mothers {hebrew}, their foundation the scale of merit and the scale of guilt, and the tongue of statute trembling (deciding) between them. (This, to be mystically carried out, in its development, and application to all things: the elements, man, &c.)Mishnah 2. Twenty-two letters of foundation: He drew them, hewed them, weighed them, and interchanged them, melted them together (showing how in the permutation of letters all words - viewed mystically as the designation of things - arose), He formed by them the nephesh of all that is formed (created), and the nephesh of everything that is to be formed (created).Mishnah 3. Two-and-twenty letters of foundation: drawn in the voice, hewn in the wind (air, spirit?) fastened on the mouth in five places: {hebrew} (the gutturals among the Hebrew letters), {hebrew} (the labials), {hebrew} (the palatals),{hebrew} (the linguals), {hebrew} (the dentals).Mishnah 4. Twenty-two letters of foundation, fastened in a circle in 231 gates (marking how these letters are capbale of forming, by the permutation of two of them, in all 231 permutations); and the circle turns forwards and backwards, and this is the indication of the matter: as regards what is good, there is nothing higher than {hebrew} (oneg), delight,' and nothing lower than {hebrew} (negah), plague' (stroke). In such manner He weighed them and combined them, with them all, and them all with {hebrew} with them all, and them all with {hebrew}, and thus the rest, so that it is found that all that is formed and all that is spoken proceeds from one Name (the name of God being, as it were, the fundamental origin of everything).Mishnah 5. He formed from Tohu that which has substance, and made that which is not into being, and hewed great pillars from the air, which cannot be handled; and this is the indication: beholding and speaking He made all that is formed and all words by one Name - and the indication of the matter: twenty-two numbers and one body.Pereq III.Mishnah 1. Three mothers - {hebrew}: their foundation, the scale of guilt and the scale of merit, and the tongue of the statue trembling (deciding) between them.Mishnah 2. Three mothers - {hebrew} - a great mystery, marvellous and hidden, and sealed with six signets, and from them go forth fire and water, and divide themselves into male and female. Three mothers, {hebrew} their foundation, and from them were born the fathers (rerum naturæ semina), from which everything is created (fire is regarded as the male principle, water as the female principle, and air as combining the two: {hebrew} is the first letter of the Hebrew word for air, {hebrew} for that of water, {hebrew} the last for that of fire).Mishnah 3. Three letters, {hebrew} - in the world: air, water, fire; the heavens were created in the beginning from fire, and the earth was created from water, and the air trembles (the same word as that in regard to the tongue between the scales of the balance, indicating the intermediate, inclining to the one or the other) between the fire and the water.Mishnah 4. Three mothers, {hebrew} - in the year: fire, and water, and wind. Heat is created from fire, cold from water, and moderate from the wind (air) that is intermediate between them. Three mothers, {hebrew} - in the

nephesh: fire, water, and wind. The head was created from fire, and the belly from water, and the body from wind that is intermediate between them.Mishnah 5. Three mothers, {hebrew} - He drew them, and hewed them, and melted them together, and sealed with them the three mothers in the world, the three mothers in the year, and three mothers in the nephesh - male and female.(Now follows a further mystical development and application.) The letter {hebrew} He made King in the Spirit, and bound upon him the crown (this refers to farther mystical signs indicated in the Kabbalistic figure drawn on p.438 of the History of the Jewish Nation'), and melted them one with the other, and sealed with them: in the world the air, in the soul life, and in the nephesh (living thing) body - the male with {hebrew}, the female with {hebrew}. {hebrew} He made King in the waters, and bound on it the crown, and melted them one with the other, and sealed: in the world earth, and in the year cold, and in the nephesh the belly - male and feamle, male in {hebrew}, and female in {hebrew}. {hebrew} He made King in the fire, and bound on it the crown, and melted them one with the other, and sealed with it: in the upper world the heavens, in the year heat, in the nephesh the head - male and female.Pereq IV.Mishnah 1. Seven duplex letters, {hebrew} (it will here be noticed that we now proceed from the numeral 3 to the further mystic numeral 7), accustomed (habituated, adapted, fitted) for two languages (correlate ideas); life, and peace, and wisdom, and riches, grace, and seed, and government (the mystic number 7 will here he noted), and accustomed (fitted) for two tongues (modes of pronunciation) {hebrew}, - the formation of soft and hard, the formation of strong and weak (the dual principle will here be observed); duplicate, because they are opposites: the opposites - life and death; the opposites - peace and evil; the opposites - wisdom and folly; the opposites - riches and poverty; the opposites - grace and ugliness; the opposites - fertility and desolation; the opposites - rule and servitude. Mishnah 2. Seven duplex letters, {hebrew}; corresponding to the seven out goings; from them seven outgoings: above and below, east and west, north and south, and the holy Temple in the middle, and it upbears the whole.Mishnah 3. Seven duplex, {hebrew}; He drew them, and hewed them, and melted them, and from them, in the world the stars (the planets), in the year the days, in the nephesh the issues, and with them He drew seven firmaments, and seven earths, and seven Sabbaths, therefore He loves the seventh under all heavens.Mishnah 4. Two letters build two houses (here the number of possible permutations are indicated). Three letters build six houses, four build twenty-four houses, five build 120 houses, six build 720 houses, and from thence go onward and think what the mouth is not able to speak, and the ear not able to hear. And these are the in the world - seven: the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars. And these are the days in the year; the seven days of creation; and the seven gates of issue in the nephesh: two eyes, two ears, and a mouth, and the two nostrils. And with them were drawn the seven above all that is delight under the heavens.Pereq V.Mishnah 1. The properties of the twelve simple letters (or their attributes) - {hebrew} - their foundation: sight, hearing, smell, speech, eating, concubitus, working, walking, anger, laughter, thinking, sleep. Their measurement twelve boundaries in the hypothenuse (points in transverse lines), the boundary N. E., the boundary S. E., the boundary E. upwards, the boundary E. downwards; the boundary N. upwards, the boundary N. downwards, the boundary S. W., the boundary N. W., the boundary W. upwards, the boundary W. downwards, the boundary S. upwards, the boundary S. downwards, and they extended and go on into the eternal (boundless space), and they are the arms of the world.Mishnah 2. Twelve simple letters, {hebrew}. He drew them, and melted them, and formed of them the twelve constellations in the world (sign of the Zodiac): Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagattarius,Capricornus,

Aquarius, Pisces (these are expressed in the original in an abbreviated, contracted form). These are the twelve months of the year: Nisan, Iyar, Sivan, Tammuz, Abh, Elul, Tishri, Marcheshvan, Kislev, Tebheth, Shebhat, Adar (thus the number twelve is marked, first in the functions of man, then in the points of the compass, then in the starry skies, and then in the year). And these are the twelve leaders in nephesh (living beings): two hands, and two feet, and two kidneys, the spleen, the liver, the gall, the intestine, the upper stomach, the lower stomach (perhaps gullet, stomach, and intestine - at any rate, three organs connected with deglutition and digestion). He made them like a land (province), and set them in order like war, and also - this as against that, ordered God. Three mothers, which are three fathers, because from them issue fire, wind, and water. Three mothers, and seven duplicate, and twelve simple ones.Mishnah 3. These are the twenty-two letters with which the Holy One has founded (all), blessed be He, Jah, Jehovah Tsebhaoth, the living God of Israel, high and lifted up, dwelling eternally, and holy is His Name, exalted and holy is He.Pereq VI.Mishnah 1. Three fathers and their generations, seven subduers and their hosts (planets?), seven boundaries of hypothenuse - and the proof of matter: faithful witnesses are the world, the year, and the nephesh. The law (statute, settled order) of the twelve, and of the seven, and of the three, and they are appointed over the heavenly dragon, and the cycle, and the heart. Three: fire, and water, and wind (air); the fire above, the water below, and the wind (air) the statute intermediate between them. And the demonstration of the matter: the fire bears the water, {hebrew} is silent, {hebrew} hisses, and {hebrew} is the statute intermediate between them (all these have further mystic meaning and application in connection with words and ideas).Mishnah 2. The dragon is in the world like a king on his throne; the cycle is in the year like a king in his land; the heart is in the nephesh like a king in war. Also in all that is pursued God has made the one against the other (opposite poles and their reconciliation): the good against the evil; good from good, and evil from evil; the good trying the evil, and the evil trying the good the good is kept for the good, and the evil is kept for the evil.Mishnah 3. Three are one, that standeth alone; seven are divided, there as against three, and the statute intermediate between them. Twelve are in war: three loving, three hating, three giving life, three giving death. The three loving ones: the heart, the ears, and the mouth; the three hating ones: the liver, the gall, and the tongue - and God a faithful king reigning over all: one (is) over three, three over seven, seven over twelve, and they are all joined together, the one with the other.Mishnah 4. And when Abraham our father had beheld, and considered, and seen, and drawn, and hewn, and obtained it, then the Lord of all revealed Himself to him, and called him His friend, and made a covenant with him and with his seed: and he believed in Jehovah, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. He made with him a covenant between the ten toes, and that is circumcision; between the ten fingers of his hand, and that is the tongue; and He bound two-and-twenty letters on his tongue, and showed him their foundation. He drew them with water, He kindled them with fire, He breathed them with (air); He burnt them in seven; He poured them forth in the twelve constellations. The views expressed in the Book Yetsirah are repeatedly referred to in the Mishnah and in other of the most ancient Jewish writings. They represent, as stated at the outset, a direction long anterior to the Mishnah, and of which the first beginnings and ultimate principles are of deepest interest to the Christian student. The reader who wishes to see the application to Christian metaphysics and theology of the Kabbalah, of which Yetsirah is but the first word, is referred to a deeply interesting and profound work, strangely unknown to English scholars: Molitor, Philosophie d. Gesch. oder uber d. Tradition, 4 vols. English readers will find much to interest them in the now somewhat rare work of the Rev. John Oxley: The

Christian Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation (London, 1815, 2 vols.)The principles laid down in the Book Yetsirah are further carried out and receive their fullest (often most remarkable) development and application in thebook Zohar (Splendour' - the edition used by us is the 8vo. edition, Amsterdam, 1805, in 3 vols, with the Amsterdam edition of the Tikkune Zohar; other Kabbalistic books used by us need not here be mentioned). The main portion of the Zohar is in the form of a Commentary on the Pentateuch, but other tractates are interspersed throughout the volumes.5. Dogmatic Theology. - This is fully treated of in the text of these volumes.6. Historic Theology. - To describe and criticise the various works which come under this designation would require the expansion of this Appendix into a Tractate. Some of these compositions have been referred to in the text of these volumes. For a general account and criticism of them I must again refer to the History of the Jewish Nation' (see especially the chapters on The Progress of Arts and Sciences among the Jews,' and Theological Science and Religious Belief in Palestine'). For the historical and critical account of Rabbinic historical works the student is referred to Zunz, Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden, ch. viii. The only thing which we shall here attempt is a translation of the so-called Megillath Taanith, or Roll of Fast;' rather, a Calendar of the days on which fasting and mourning was prohibited. The oldest part of the document (referred to in the Mishnah, Taan. ii.8) dates from the beginning of the second century of our era, and contains elements of even much greater antiquity. That which has come down of it is here given in translation: [6414] -MEGILLATH TAANITH, OR ROLL OF FASTS.These are the days on which it is not lawful to fast, and during some of them mourning must also be intermitted.I. Nisan.1. From the 1st day of the month Nisan, and to the 8th of it, it was settled about the daily sacrifice (that it should be paid out of the Temple-treasury) - mourning is prohibited.2. And from the 8th to the end of the Feast (the 27th) the Feast of Weeks was re-established - mourning is interdicted.II. Iyar.1. On the 7th Iyar the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem - mourning is prohibited.2. On the 14th is the day of the little (the second) Passover - mourning is prohibited.3. On the 23rd the sons of Acra [6415] issued from Jerusalem.4. On the 27th the imposts were removed from Judæa and Jerusalem.III. Sivan.1. On the 17th Sivan the tower of Zur was taken.2. On the15th and 16th men of Bethshean and of the plain were exiled.3. On the 25th the tax-gatherers were withdrawn from Judah and Jerusalem.IV. Tammuz.1. On the 14th Tammuz the Book of Decisions (aggravating ordinances') was abrogated - mourning is prohibited.V. Abh.1. On the 15th Abh the season of wood-offerings (for the Temple use) of priests (comp. Jos. War ii.17.6) - mourning is prohibited.2. On the 24th we returned to our Law.VI. Elul.1. On the 7th of Elul the day of the Dedication of Jerusalem - mourning prohibited.2. On the 17th the Romans withdrew from Judæa and Jerusalem.3. On the 22nd we returned to kill the apostates.VII. Tisri.1. ON the 3rd Tishri the mention of the Divine Name was removed from public deeds.VIII. Marcheshvan.1. On the 23rd Marcheshvan the Sorigah (a partition-wall in the Temple, supposed to have been erected by the heathen, comp.1 Macc. iv.43-46) was removed from the Temple-court.2. On the 25th the wall of Samaria was taken.3. On the 27th the meat offering was again brought on the altar.IX. Kislev.1. On the 3rd the Simavatha (another heathen structure) was removed from the court or the Temple,2. On the 7th is a feast day.3. On the 21st is the day of Mount Garizim - mourning is prohibited.4. On the 25th the eight days of the Feast of Lights (Chanukah) begin - mourning is prohibited.X. Tebheth.1. On the 28th the congregation was re-established according to the Law. (This seems to refer to the restoration of the Sanhedrin after the Sadducean members were removed, under the rule of Queen Salome. See the historical notes in Appendix IV.)XI. Shebhat.1. On the 2nd a feast day [6416] - mourning is prohibited.2. On the

22nd the work, of which the enemy said that it was to be in the Temple, was destroyed - mourning is interdicted. (This seems to refer to the time of Caligula, when, on the resistance of the Jews, the statute of the Emperor was at last not allowed to be in the Temple.) 3. On the 28th King Antiochus was removed from Jerusalem (supposed to refer to the day of the death of Antiochus, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, in his expedition against the Parthians).XII. Adar.1. On the 8th and the 9th, days of joy on account of rain-fall.2. On the 12th is the day of Trajan.3. On the 13th is the day of Nicanor (his defeat).4. On the 14th and on the 15th are the days of Purim (Feast of Esther) - mourning is prohibited.5. On the 16th was begun the building the wall of Jerusalem - mourning is prohibited.6. On the 17th rose the heathens against the remnant of the Scribes in the country of Chalcis and of the Zabedaeans, and Israel was delivered.7. On the 20th the people fasted for rain, and it was granted to them.8. On the 28th the Jews received good tidings that they would no longer be hindered from the sayings of the Law - mourning is prohibited.On these days every one who has before made a vow of fasting is to give himself to prayer.(In extenuation of the apparent harshness and literality of our renderings, it should be stated, that both the Sepher Yetsirah and the Megillath Taanith are here for the first time translated into English.)

Chapter 113

APPENDIX VI. List of the Maccabees, of the Family of Herod, of the High-Priests, the Roman Procurators of Judæa, and Roman Govenors of Syria

figure 6 Figure A6a. figure 6b Figure A6b. figure 6c Figure A6c. figure 6d Figure A6d. figure 6e Figure A6e.

APPENDIX VII. ON THE DATE OF THE NATIVITY OF OUR LORD

(Vol. i. Book II. ch. iii. and other passages). So much, that is generally accessible, has of late been written on this subject, and such accord exists on the general question, that only the briefest statement seems requisite in this place, the space at our command being necessarily reserved for subjects which have either not been treated of by previous writers, or in a manner or form that seemed to make a fresh investigation desirable. At the outset it must be admitted, that absolute certainty is impossible as to the exact date of Christ's Nativity - the precise year even, and still more the month and the day. But in regard to the year, we possess such data as to invest it with such probability, as almost to amount to certainty. 1. The first and most certain date is that of the death of Herod the Great. Our Lord was born before the death of Herod, and, as we judge from the Gospel-history, very shortly before that event. Now the year of Herod's death has been ascertained with, we may say, absolute certainty, as shortly before the Passover of the year 750 A.U.C., which corresponds to about the 12th of April of the year 4 before Christ, according to our common reckoning. More particularly, shortly before the death of Herod there was a lunar eclipse (Jos. Ant. xvii.6.4), which, it is astronomically ascertained, occurred on the night from the 12th to the 13th of March of the year 4 before Christ. Thus the death of Herod must have taken place between the 12th of March and the 12th of April - or, say, about the end of March (comp. Ant. xvii.8.1). Again, the Gospel-history necessitates an interval of, at the least, seven or eight weeks before that date for the birth of Christ (we have to insert the purification of the Virgin - at the earliest, six weeks after the Birth - The Visit of the Magi, and the murder of the children at Bethlehem, and, at any rate, some days more before the death of Herod). Thus the Birth of Christ could not have possibly occurred after the beginning of February 4 b.c., and most likely several weeks earlier. This brings us close to the ecclesiastical date, the 25th of December, in confirmation of which we refer to what has been stated in vol. i. p.187, see especially note 3. At any rate, the often repeated, but very superficial objection, as to the impossibility of shepherds tending flocks in the open at that season, must now be dismissed as utterly untenable, not only for the reasons stated in vol. i. p.187, but even for this, that if the question is to be decided on the ground of rain-fall, the probabilities are in favour of December as compared with February - later than which it is impossible to place the birth of Christ. 2. No certain inference can, of course, be drawn from the appearance of the star' that guided the Magi. That, and on what grounds, our investigations have pointed to a confirmation of the date of the Nativity, as given above, has been fully explained in vol. i. ch. vi... (see specially p.213). 3. On the taxing of Quirinius, see vol. i. pp.181, 182. 4. The next historical datum furnished by the Gospels is that of the beginning of St. John the Baptist's ministry, which, according to St. Luke, was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and when Jesus was about thirty years old' (St. Luke iii.23). The accord of this with our reckoning of the date of the Nativity has been shown in vol. i. p.264. 5. A similar conclusion would be reached by following the somewhat vague and general indication furnished in St. John ii.20. 6. Lastly, we reach the same goal if we follow the historically somewhat uncertain guidance of the date of the Birth of the Baptist, as furnished in this notice (St. Luke i.5) of his annunication to his father, that Zacharias officiated in the Temple as on of the course of Abia' (see here vol. i. p.135). In Taan.29

a we have the notice, with which that of Josephus agrees (War vi.4.1.5), that at the time of the destruction of the Temple the course of Jehoiarib,' which was the first of the priestly courses, was on duty. That was on the 9-10 Ab of the year 823 A.U.C., or the 5th August of the year 70 of our era. If this calculation be correct (of which, however, we cannot feel quite sure), then counting the courses' of priests backwards, the course of Abia would, in the year 748 A.U.C. (the year before the birth of Christ) have been on duty from the 2nd to the 9th of October. This also would place the birth of Christ in the end of December of the following year (749), taking the expression sixth month' in St. Luke i.26, 36, in the sense of the running month (from the 5th to the 6th month, comp. St. Luke i.24). But we repeat that absolute reliance cannot be placed on such calculations, at least so far as regards month and day. (Comp. here generally Wieseler, Synopse, and his Beiträge.)

APPENDIX VIII. RABBINIC TRADITIONS ABOUT ELIJAH, THE FORERUNNER OF THE MESSIAH

(Vol. i. Book II. ch. iii. p.143.) To complete the evidence, presented in the text, as to the essential difference between the teaching of the ancient Synagogue about the Forerunner of the Messiah' and the history and mission of John the Baptist, as described in the New Testaments, we subjoin a full, though condensed, account of the earlier Rabbinic traditions about Elijah. Opinions differ as to the descent and birthplace of Elijah. According to some, he was from the land of Gilead (Bemid. R.14), and of the tribe of Gad (Tanch. on Gen. xlix.19). Others describe him as a Benjamite, from Jerusalem, one of those who sat in the Hall of Hewn Stones' (Tanch. on Ex. xxxi.2), or else as paternally descended from Gad and maternally from Benjamin. [6417] Yet a third opinion, and to which apparently most weight attaches, represents him as a Levite, and a Priest - nay, as the great High-Priest of Messianic days. This is expressly stated in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. on Ex. xl.10, where it also seems implied that he was to anoint the Messiah with the sacred oil, the composition of which was among the things unknown in the second Temple, but to be restored by Elijah (Tanch. on Ex. xxiii.20, ed. Warsh. p.91 a, lines 4 and 5 from the top). Another curious tradition identifies Elijah with Phinehas (Targum Pseudo-Jon. on Ex. vi.18). The same expression as in the Targum (Phinehas - that is Elijah') occurs in that great storehouse of Rabbinic tradition, Yalkut (vol. i. p.245 b, last two lines, and col. c). From the pointed manner in which reference is made to the parallelism between the zeal of Phinehas and that of Elijah, and between their work in reconciling God and Israel, and bringing the latter to repentance, we may gather alike the origin of this tradition and its deeper meaning. [6418] For (as fully explained in Book II. ch. v.) it is one of the principles frequently expressed by the ancient Synagogue, in its deeper perception of the unity and import of the Old Testament, that the miraculous events and Divine interpositions of Israel's earlier history would be re-enacted, only with wider application, in Messianic days. If this idea underlay the parallelism between Phinehas and Elijah, it is still more fully carried out in that between Elijah and Moses. On comparing the Scriptural account of these two messengers of God we are struck with the close correspondence between the details of their history. The Synagogue is careful to trace this analogy step by step (Yalkut, vol. ii. p.32 d) the final deliverance of Israel of Egypt, so would the final deliverance by Elijah for ever break the yoke of all foreign rule. The allusion here is to the part which Elijah was expected to take in the furture wars of Gog and Magog' (Seder Olam R. c. xvii.) Indeed, this parallelism is carried so far, that tradition has it, that, when Moses was commissioned by God to go to Pharoah, he pleaded that God should rather send by him whom He designed to send for the far greater deliverance in the latter days. On this it was told him that Elijah's mission would be to Israel, while he(Moses) was sent to Pharaoh (Pirqé de R. Eliez.40). [6419] Similarly, it is asserted that the cave from which Moses beheld the Divine Presence passing before him (Ex. xxxiii.22) was the same as that in which Elijah stood under similar circumstances - that cave having been created with the rest of the world, but specially on the eve of the world's first Sabbath (Siphré on Deut. ed. Friedmann, p.147 a, last line). Considering this paralelism between them, the occurrence of the somewhat difficult expression will

scarcely surprise us, that in the days of the Messiah Moses and Elijah would come together - as one' (Debar. R.3, at the end). [6420] It has been noted in the text that the activity of Elijah, from the time of his appearance in the days of Ahab to that of his return as the forerunner of the Messiah, is represented in Jewish tradition as continuous, and that he is almost constantly introduced on the scene, either as in converse with some Rabbi, or else as busy about Israel's welfare, and connected with it. Thus Elijah chronicles in heaven the deeds of man (Seder Olam R. xvii.), or else writes down the observances of the commandments by men, and then the Messiah and God seal it (Midrast on Ruth ii.14, last line, ed. Warsh. p.43 b). In general, he is ever interested in all that concerns Israel's present state or their future deliverance (Sanh.98 a). Indeed, he is connected with the initiatory rite of the covenant, in acknowledgement of his zeal [6421] in the restoration of circumcision, when, according to tradition, it had been abrogated by the ten tribes after their separation from Judah. God accordingly had declared: Israel shall not make the covenant of circumcision, but thou shalt see it,' and the sages decreed that (at circumcision) a seat of honour shall be placed for the Angel of the Covenant (Mal. iii.2; Pirqé de R. Eliez.29, end). Tradition goes even further. Not only was he the only ambassador to whom God had delegated His three special keys:' of birth, of the rainfall, and of waking the dead (Yalkut, vol. ii.32 c), but his working was almost Divine (Tanch. Bereshith 7; ed. Warsh. p.6 b, last line, and 7 a). We purposely pass over the activity of Elijah in connection with Israel, and especially its Rabbis and saints, during the interval between the Prophet's death and his return as the Forerunner of the Messiah, such as Jewish legend describes it. No good purpose could be served by repeating what so frequently sounds not only utterly foolish and superstitious, but profane. In Jewish legend Elijah is always introduced as the guardian of the interests of Israel, whether theologically or personally - as it were the constant living medium between God and his people, the link that binds the Israel of the present - with its pursuits, wants, difficulties and interests - to the bright Messianic future of which he is the harbinger. This probably is the idea underlying the many, often grotesque, legends about his sayings and doings. Sometimes he is represented as, in his well-meant zeal, going so far as to bear false witness in order to free Rabbis from danger and difficulty (Berach.58 a). In general, he is always ready to instruct, to comfort, or to heal, condescending even to so slight a malady as the toothache (Ber. R.96, end). But most frequently is he the adviser an friend of the Rabbis, in whose meetings and studies he delighteth. Thus he was a frequent attendant in Rabh's Academy - and his indiscretion in divulging to his friends the secrets of heaven had once procured for him in heaven the punishment of fiery stripes (Babha Mets.85 b). But it is usesless to do more than indicate all this. Our object is to describe the activity of Elijah in connection with the coming of the Messiah. When, at length, the time of Israel's redemption arrived - then would Elijah return. Of two things only are we sure in connection with it. Elijah will not come yesterday' - that is, he will be revealed the same day that he comes - and he will not come on the eve of either a Sabbath or feast-day, in order not to interrupt the festive rest, nor to break the festive laws (Erub.43 b, Shabb.33 a). Whether he came one day (Er.43 b) or three days before the Messiah (Yalkut, vol. ii. p.53 c, about the middle) his advent would be close to that of that Messiah (Yalkut, vol. i. p.310 a, line 21 from bottom). [6422] The account given of the three days between the advent of Elijah and of the Messiah is peculiar (Yalkut, vol. ii. p.53 c). Commenting on Is. lii.7, it is explained, that on the first of those three days Elijah would stand on the mountains of Israel, lamenting the desolateness of the land, his voice being heard from one end of the world to the other, after which he would proclaim: Peace' cometh to the world; peace' cometh to the world! Similarly on the

second day he would proclaim, Good' cometh to the world; good' cometh to the world! Lastly, on the third day, he would, in the same manner as the two previous days, make proclamation: Jeshuah [6423] (salvation) cometh to the world; Jeshuah (salvation) cometh to the world,' which, in order to mark the difference between Israel and the Gentiles, would be further explained by this addition: Saying unto Zion - Thy King cometh!' The period of Elijah's advent would, according to one opinion (Pirqé de R. Eliez.43), be a time of genuine repentance by Israel, although it is not stated that this change would be brought about by his ministry. On the other hand, his peculiar activity would consist in settling ceremonial and ritual questions, doubts, and difficulties, in making peace, in restoring those who by violence had been wrongfully excluded from the congregation and excluding those who by violence had been wrongfully introduced (Bab. Mets. i.8; ii.8; iii.4, 5; Eduy. vii.7). He would also restore to Israel these three things which had been lost: the golden pot of Manna (Ex. xvi.33), the vessel containing the anointing oil, and that with the waters of purification - according to some, also Aaron's rod that budded and bore fruit. [6424] Again, his activity is likened to that of the Angel whom God had sent before Israel to drive out and to vanquish the hostile nations (Tanch. on Ex. xxiii.20, § 18 at the close; ed. Warsh. p.106 b). For. Elijah was to appear, then to disappear, and to appear again in the wars of Gog and Magog [6425] (Seder Olam R. xvii.). But after that time general peace and happiness would prevail, when Elijah would discharge his peculiar functions. Finally, to the ministry of Elijah some also ascribed the office of raising the dead (Sotah ix.15, closing words). [6426] Such is a summary of ancient Jewish tradition concerning Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah. Comparing it with the New Testament description of John the Baptist, it will at least be admitted that, from whatever source the sketch of the activity and mission of the Baptist be derived, it cannot have been from the ideal of the ancient Synagogue, nor yet from popularly current Jewish views. And, indeed - could there be a greater contrast than between the Jewish forerunner of the Messiah and him of the New Testament?

Chapter 116

APPENDIX IX. LIST OF OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED IN ANCIENT RABBINIC WRITINGS

(Vol. i. Book II. ch. v.) THE following list contains the passages in the Old Testament applied to the Messiah or to Messianic times in the most ancient Jewish writings. They amount in all to 456, thus distributed: 75 from the Pentateuch, 243 from the Prophets, and 138 from the Hagiorgrapha, and supported by more than 558 separate quotations from Rabbinic writings. Despite all labour care, it can scarcely be hoped that the list is quite complete, although, it is hoped, no important passage has been omitted. The Rabbinic references might have been considerably increased, but it seemed useless to quote the same application of a passage in many different books. Similarly, for the sake of space, only the most important Rabbinic quotations have been translated in extenso. The Rabbinic works from which quotations have been made are: the Targumim, the two Talmuds, and the most ancient Midrashim, but neither the Zohar (as the date of its composition is in dispute), nor any other Kabbalistic work, nor yet the younger Midrashim, nor, of course, the writings of later Rabbis. I have, however, frequently quoted from the well-known work Yalkut, because, although of comparatively late date, it is really, as its name implies, a collection and selection from more than fifty older and accredited writings, and adduces passages now not otherwise accessible to us. And I have the more readily availed myself of it, as I have been reluctantly forced to the conclusion that even the Midrashim preserved to us have occassionally been tampered with for controversial purposes. I have quoted from the best edition of Yalkut (Frankfort a. M., 1687), but in the case of the other Midrashim I have been obliged to content myself with such more recent reprints as I possessed, instead of the older and more expensive editions. In quoting from the Midrashim, not only the Parashah, but mostly also the folio, the page, and frequently even the lines are referred to. Lastly, it only remains to acknowledge in general that, so far as possible, I have availed myself of the labours of my predecessors - specially of those of Schöttgen. Yet, even so, I may, in a sense, claim these references also as the result of my own labours, since I have not availed myself of quotations without comparing them with the works from which they were adduced - a process in which not a few passages quoted had to be rejected. And if any student should arrive at a different conclusion from mine in regard to any of the passages hereafter quoted, I can at least assure him that mine is the result of the most careful and candid study I could give to the consideration of each passage. With these prefatory remarks I proceed to give the list of Old Testament passages Messianically applied in ancient Rabbinic writings. In Gen. i.2, the expression, Spirit of God,' is explained of the Spirit of the King Messiah,' with reference to Is. xi.2, and the moving on the face of the deep' of repentance,' according to Lam. ii.19. So in Ber. R.2, and in regard to the first point also in Ber. R.8, in Vayyik. R.14, and in other places. Gen. ii.4: These are the generations - {hebrew} - of the heavens and of the earth,' taken in connection with Gen. iii.15 and Ruth iv.18. Here we note one of the most curious Messianic interperations in Ber. R.12 (ed. Warsh. p.24 b). It is noted that the word generations' ({hebrew}) is always written in the Bible without the {hebrew} which is the equivalent for the numeral 6, except in Gen. ii.4 and Ruth iv.18. This to indicate that subsequent to Gen. ii.4 the Fall

took place, in which Adam lost {hebrew} - six - things: his glorious sheen (Job xiv.20); life (Gen. iii.19)); his stature (Gen. iii.8 - either by 100, by 200, by 300, or even by 900 cubits); the fruit of the ground; the fruits of the trees (Gen. iii.17); and the heavenly lights. We have now seen why in Gen. ii.4 - that is, previous to the Fall - the {hebrew} is still in {hebrew}, since at that time these six things were not yet lost. But the {hebrew} reappears in the word {hebrew} in Ruth iv.18, because these six things are to be rstored to man by the son of Pharez' - or the Messiah (comp. for each of these six things: Judg. v.31 b; Is. lxviii.22; Lev. xxvi.13; Zech. viii.12; Is. xxx.26). It is added that although - according to the literal rendering of Ps. xlix.12 (in Heb. ver.13) - man did not remain unfallen one single night, yet, for the sake of the Sabbath, the heavely lights were not extinguished till after the close of the Sabbath. When Adam saw the darknes, it is added, he was greatly afraid, saying: Perhaps he, of whom it is written, he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,' cometh to molest and attack me, and he said, Surely the darkness shall cover me.' This courious extract at least shown in what context the Synagogue applied Gen. iii.15. The same occurs substantially in Shem. R.30. Gen iii.15. This well-known passage is paraphrased, with express reference to the Messiah, in the Targum Pseudo Jonathan and the so-called Jerusalem Targum. Schöttgen conjectures that the Talmudic designation of heels of the Messiah' (Sot.49 b, line 2 from top) in reference to the near Advent of the Messiah in the description of the troubles of those days (comp. St. Matt. x.35, 36) may have been chosen partly with a view to this passage. Gen. iv.25. The language of Eve at the birth of Seth: another seed,' is explained as meaning seed which comes from another place,' and referred to the Messiah in Ber. R.23 (ed. Warsh. p.45 b, lines 8, 7 from the bottom). The same explanation occurs twice in the Midrash on Ruth iv.19 (in the genealogy of David, ed. Warsh. p.46 b), the second time in connection with Ps. xl.8 (in the volume of the book it is written of me' - bim'gillath sepher - Ruth belonging to the class {hebrew}). In connection with Gen. v.1 it is noted in Ber. R.24, that King Messiah will not come till all souls predestined for it have appeared in human bodies on earth. In Gen. viii.11 the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan notes that the olive-leaf, brought by the dove, was taken from the Mount of the Messiah. Gen. ix.27. The promise, that Japhet shall dwell in the tents of Shem, is paraphrased in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. as meaning, that his descendants should become proselytes, and dwell in the school of Shem - which seems to refer to Messianic times. In connection with Gen. xiv.1, we are reminded in Ber. R.42, that when we see the nations warring together, we may expect the coming of the Messiah. The promise in Gen. xv.18 is expected to be finally fulfilled in the time of Messiah, in Ber. R.44. In connection with Gen. xviii.4, 5 it is noted (Ber. R.48, ed. Warsh. p.87 b) that the words of Abraham to his Angelic guests were to be returned in blessing to Abraham's descendants, in the wilderness, in the land of Canaan, and in the latter (Messianic) days. Referring only to this last point, the words let a little water be fetched,' is paralleled with the living waters' in Zech. xiv.8; wash your feet,' with Is.iv.4 (the washing away of the filth of the daughters of Zion); rest under the tree,' with Is. iv.6: there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the daytime from the heat;' I will fetch a morsel of bread,' with the provision, Ps. lxxii.16: there shall be a handful of corn in the earth,' &c. So also the words: Abraham ran unto the herd,' are paralleled with Is. vii.21 (which is most significantly here applied to Messianic times); and lastly, the words, he stood by them,' with Mic. ii.13: the breaker is come up before them.' [6427] The same interpretation occurs in Bemid. R.14 (ed. Warsh. p.55 a), the references to Messianic days there being to Is. xiv.2; xxx.25; xli.18; vi.4; and iv.6.The last clause of Gen. xix.32 is interperted (Ber. R.51, ed. Warsh. p.95 a), as referring, like the words of Eve about Seth, to the Messiah - the sin of the daughters of Lot being explained on the ground of

their believing that all mankind had been destroyed in the judgment that overthrew Sodom.The promise in Gen. xxii.18 is also explained Messianically in Bemid. R.2 (ed. W. P.5 b), in connection with Num. ii.32 where it is somewhat curiously shown in what sense Israel is to be like the sand of the sea.Gen. xxxiii.1. The Midrash conjoins this with Is. lxvi.7, and notes that, before the first oppressor was born, the last Redeemer was already born.In Gen. xxxv.21 the Targum Pseudo-Jon. paraphrases the tower of Eder' (at Bethlehem) as the place whence the Messiah would be revealed.On Gen. xxxviii.1, 2 there are very remarkable Messianic comments in Ber. R.85.Gen. xlix.1. The Targum Pseudo-Jon. notes, that the end for which the Messhah would come was not revealed to Jacob. A similar statement is found in the Midrash on the passage (Ber. R.98, ed. Warsh. p.173 a), where it is said of Jacob and Daniel that they saw the end, and yet it was afterwards hid from them. The passage quoted in the case of Daniel is Dan. xii.4.Gen. xlix.9. The expression lion's whelp,' is explained of the Messiah in Yalkut 160 (vol. i. p.49 c), no less than five times; while the term he couched,' is referred to the Messiah in Ber. R.98.Gen. xlix.10. This well-known prediction (on which see the full and intersting disciussion in Raym. Martini, Pugio Fidei) is in Yalkut, u. s., applied to the Messiah, with a quotation of Ps. ii.9. This expression Shiloh' is also applied to the Messiah, with the curious addition, that in the latter days all nations would bring gifts to Him. Alike the Targum Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Jerusalem Targum, as well as Sanh.98 b, the Midrash on the passage, and that on Prov. xix.21, and on Lam. i.16, where it is rendered shelo, whose it is,' refer the expression Shiloh,' and, indeed, the whole passage, to the Messiah; the Midrah Ber. R. (99, ed. Warsh. p.178 b) with special reference to Is. xi.10, while the promise with reference to the ass's colt is brought into connection with Zech. ix.9, the fulfilment of this prophecy being expected along with that in Ezek. xxxvi.25 (I will sprinkle clean water'). Another remarkable statement occurs in the Midrash on the passage (Ber. R.98, ed. Warsh. p.174 b), which applies the verse to the coming of Him of Whom it is written, Zech. ix.9. Then He would wash his garment in wine (Gen. xlix.11), which is explained as meaning the teaching of the Law to Israel, and His clothes in the blood of grapes, which is explained as meaning that He would bring them back from their errors. One of the Rabbis, however, remarks that Israel would not require to be taught by the King Messiah in the latter days, since it was written (Is. xi.10), to it shall the Gentiles seek.' If so, then why should the Messiah. come, and what will He do to the congregation of Israel? He will redeem Israel, and give them thirty commandments, according to Zech. xi.12. The Targum Pseudo-Jon. and the Jer. Targum also apply verse 11 to the Messiah. Indeed, so general was this interpretation, that, according popular opinion, to see a palm-tree in one's dreams was to see the days of the Messiah (Berach.57 a).Gen. xlix.12 is also applied to the Messiah in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. and the Jerusalem Targum. So also is verse 18, although not in express words.In Gen. xlix.17, last clause, in its connection with ver.18, the Midrash (Ber. R.98) sees a reference to the disappointment of Jacob in mistaking Samson for the Messiah.In the prophecy of Gad in Gen. xlix.19 there is an allusion to Messianic days, as Elijah was to be of the tribe of Gad (Ber. R.99, ed. Warsh. p.179 a). There is, however, in Ber. R.71, towards the close, a dispute whether he was of the tribe of Gad, or of the tribe of Benjamin, at the close of which Elijah appears, and settles the dispute in a rather summary manner. On Gen. l.10 the Midrash, at the close of Ber. R., remarks that as they had mourned, so in Messianic days God would turn their mourning into joy, quoting Jer. xxxi.13 and Is. li 3.Ex. iv.22 is reffered to the Messiah in the Midr. on Ps. ii.7.On Exod. xii.2, let this be the beginning of months,' it is remarked in Shem.R.15 (ed. Warsh. p.24 b) that God would make new ten things in the latter days, these being marked by the

following passages: Is lx.19; Ezek. xlvii.9; xlvii.12; Ezek. xvi.55; Is liv.11; Is. xi.7; Hos. ii.20; Is. lxv.19; Is. xxxv.8; Is. xxxv.10. Similarly on Num. xii.1 we have, in Shem. R.51, a parallelism between Old Testament times and their institutions and those of the latter days, to which Is. xlix.12 and lx.8 are suppose to apply.On Exod. xii.42 the Jerus. Targum notes that there were 4 remarkable nights: those of creation, of the covenant with Abraham, of the first Passover, and of the redemption of the world; and that as Moses came out of the desert, so would the Messiah come out of Rome.On Exod. xv.1. It is noted in Mekhilta (ed. Weiss, p.41 a) that this song would be taken up in Messianic days, only with far wide reach, as explained in Is. lx 5; lviii.8; xxxv.5, 6; Jer. xxxi.13; and Ps.cxxvi.2.Ex. xvi.25 is applied to the Messiah, it being said that, if Israel only kept one sabbath according to the commandment, the Messiah would immediately come (Jer. Taan.64 a).Ex. xvi.33. This manna, it is noted in Mechil. ed. Weiss, p.59 b, was to be preserved for the days of the Messiah. Is. xxx.15 is similarly explained in Jer. Taan. i.1.Ex. xvii.16 the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan refers to Messianic times.Exod. xxi.1. Shem. R.30, ed Warsh. p.44. b, 45 a, notes on the word judgments' a number of things connected with judgment, showing how Balaam could not have wished the advent of the future deliverance (Numb. xxiv.17), since he was to perish in it; but that Israel should cleave to the great hope pressed in Gen. xlix.18; Is. lvi.1; lix.16; and especially Zech. ix.9, of which a different redering is proposed.On Exod. xl.9, 11 there is in the Targum Pesudo-Jon. distinct reference to the King Messiah, on whose account the anointing oil was to be used.The promise (Lev. xxvi.12) is also referred to the latter, or Messianic,days in Yalkut 62 (vol. i. p.17 b).Lev. xxvi.13 is applied to Messianic times. See our remarks on Gen. ii.4.The promise of peace in the Aaronic benediction Num. vi.26 is referred to the peace of the Kingdom of David, in accordance with Is. ix.7 (Siphré on Num. par.42, ed. Friedmann, p.12 b).Num. vii.12. In connection with this it is marked that the six blessings which were lost by the Fall are to be restored by the son of Nahshon, i.e. the Messiah (Bem. R.13, ed. W. p.51 a).In the Jerusalem Targum on Num. xi.26 the prophecy of Eldad and Medad is supposed to have been with regard to the war of the later days against Jerusalem and to the defeat of Gog and Magog by the Messiah.In Num. xxiii.21 the term King' is expressly referred to the Messiah in Targum Pseudo-Jon. So also Num. xxiv .7 in the Jer. Targum.In Num. xxiv.17 Balaam's prediction of the Star and Sceptre is referred to theMessiah in the Targum Onkelos and the Targum Pessudo-Jonathan, as well as in Jer. Taan. iv.8; Deb. R.1; Midr. on Lament. ii.2. Similarly verses 20 and 24 of that prophecy are ascribed in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. to the Messiah.Num. xxvii.16. In connection with this verse it is noticed that His one Spirit is worth as much as all other spirits, according to Is. xi.1 (Yalkut, vol. i. p.247 a).Deut. i.8 is applied to the days of the Messiah in Sphré, 67 a.In the comments of Tanchuma on Deut. viii.1. (ed. Warsh. p.104 b, 105 a) there are several allusions to Mesianic days.Deut. xi.21 is applied in Siphré Par.47 (ed. Friedmann, p.83 a) to the days of the Messiah.In Deut. xvi.3 the record of the deliverance from Egypt is supposed to be carried on to the days of the Messiah, in Spihré, Par.130 (ed. Friedmann, p.101 a). See, also, Ber. i.5.On Deut. xix.8, 9 it is noted, in Siphré on Deut., Par.185 (ed. Friedm. p.108 b), that as three of these cities were in terrtiory never possessed by Israel, this was to be fulfilled in Messianic times. See also Jer. Macc. ii.7.In Tanchuma on Deut. xx.10 (Par.19, ed. Warsh. p.114 b) the offer of peace to a hostile city is applied to the future action of Messiah to the Gentiles, in accordance with Zech. ix, 10; Is. ii.4; and Ps lxviii.32; while, on the other hand, the resistance of a city to the offer of peace is likened to rebellion against the Messiah, and consequent judgment, according to Is. xi.4.Deut. xxiii.11 is typically applied to the evening of time, when God would wash away the filth of the daughters of

Zion (Is. iv.4); and the words: when the sun is down' to when King Messiah would come (Tanchuma on Par. Ki Thetse 3, ed. Warsh. p.115 b).Deut. xxv.19 and Deut. xxx.4 are referred by the Targum Pesudo-Jon. the Messianic times. In the latter passage the gathering of dispersed Israel by Elijah, and their being brought back by Messiah, are spoken of. Comp. also Bem. R., last three lines. On Deut. xxxii.7 Siphré (Par.210, ed. Friedm. p.134 a) makes the beautiful observation, that in all Israel's afflictions they were to remember the good and comfortable things which God had promised them for the furture world, and in connection with this there is special reference to the time of the Messiah.On Deut. xxxii.30 Siphré (p.138 a) marks its fulfilment in the days of the Messiah.On Deut. xxxiii.5 the Jer. Targum speaks of a king whom the tribes of Israel shall obey, this being evidently the King Messiah.Deut. xxxiii.17. Tanchuma on Gen. i. Par.1 (ed. Warsh. p.4 a) applies this to the Messiah. So also in Benidb. R.14.Deut. xxxiii.12. The expression, he shall cover him,' is referred to this world; all the day long,' to the days of the Messiah; and he shall dwell between his shoulders,' to the world to come (Sebach.118 b).Judg. v.31: let them that love Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might,' is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R.12. See our remarks on Gen. ii.4.On Ruth ii.14: come hither at the time of meat,' the Midr. R. Ruth 5 (ed. Warsh. p.43 a and b), has a very remarkable interpretation. Besides the application of the word eat,' as beyond this present time, to the days of the Messiah, and again to the world to come, which is to follow these days, the Midrash applies the whole of it mystically to the Messiah, viz. Come hither,' that is, draw near to the kingdom, and eat of the bread,' that is, the bread of royalty, and dip thy morsel in vinegar' - these are the sufferings, as it is written in Is. liii.5, He was wounded for our transgression.' And she sat beside the reapers' - because His Kingdom would in the further be put aside from Him for a short time, according to Zech. xiv.2; and he reached her parched corn' - because He will restore it to Him, according to Is. xi.4. R. Berachiah, in the name of R. Levi, adds, that the second Redeemer should be like the first. As the firrst Redeemer (Moses) appeared, and disappeared, and reappeared after three months, so the second Redeemer would also appear, and disappear, and again become manifest, Dan. xii.11, 12 being brought into connection with it. Comp. Midr. on Cant. ii.9; Pesik.49 a, b. Again, the words, she ate, and was sufficed, and left,' are thus interpreted in Shabb.113 b: she ate - in this world; and was sufficed - in the days of the Messiah; and left - for the world to come.Again, the Targum on Ruth i.1 speaks of the Messiah; and again on Ruth iii.15 paraphrases the six measures of barley as referring to six righteous ones, of which the last was the Messiah, and who were each to have six special blessings.Ruth iv.18. The Messiah is called the son of Pharez,' who restores what had been lost to humanity through the fall of Adam. See our remarks on Gen. ii.4.The Messianic interpretation of Ruth iv.20 has already been given under Gen. iv.25.1 Sam. ii.10. The latter clause of this promise is understood by the Targum (and also is some of the Medrashim) as applying to the Kingdom of the Messiah.2 Sam. xxii.28. In a Talmudic passage (Sanh.98 a, line 19, &c., from the bottom), which contains many references to the coming of the Messiah, His advent is predicted in connection with this passage.2 Sam. xxiii.1 is applied by the Targum to the prophecy of David concerning the latter Messianic days.2 Sam. xxiii.3. The ruling in the fear of God' is referred in the Targum to the future raising up of the Messiah.In 2 Sam. xxiii.4 the morning light at sunrise is explained in the Midrash on the passage (par.29, ed. Lemberg, p, 56 b, lines 7-9 from the top), as applying to the appearance of the Messiah.The expression, 1 Kings iv.33, that Solomon spoke of trees, is referred in theTargum to his prophecy concerning kings that were to reign in this age, and in that of the Messiah.On the name Anani,' in 1 Chr. iii.24, the Targum remarks that this is the

Messiah, the interpretation being that the word anani is connected with the word similarly written (not punctuated) in Deut. vii.13, and there translated clouds,' of which the explanation is given in Tanchuma (Par. Toledoth 14, p.27 b).Ps. ii. as might be expected, is treated as full of Messianic references. To begin with, Ps. ii.1 is applied to the wars of Gog and Magog in the Talmud (Berach.7 b and Abhod. Zarah 3 b), and also in the Midrash on Ps. ii. Similarly, verse 2 is applied to the Messiah in Abhod. Zach, u. s., in the Midrash on Ps. xcii.11 (ed. Warsh. p.70 b, line 8 from the top); in Pirqué de R. Eliez. c.28 (ed. Lemberg, p.33 b, line 9 from top). In Yalkut (vol. ii. par.620, p.90 a, line 12 from the bottom), we have the following remarkable simile on the words, against God, and His Messiah,' likening them to a robber who stands defiantly behind the palace of the king, and says, If I shall find the son of the king, I shall lay hold on him, and crucify him, and kill him with a cruel death. But the Holy Spirit mocks at him, He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh.' On the same verse the Midrashon Ps. ii. has a curious conceit, intended to show that each who rose against God and His people thought he was wiser than he who had preceded him. If Cain had killed his brother while his father was alive, forgetful that there would be other sons, Esau proposed to wait till after his father's death. Pharaoh, again, blamed Esau for his folly in forgetting that in the meantime Jacob would have children, and hence proposed to kill all the male children, while Haman, ridiculing Pharaoh's folly in forgetting that there were daughters set himself to destroy the whole people; and, in turn, Gog and Magog, ridiculing the shortsightedness of all, who had preceded them, in taking counsel against Israel so long as they had a Patron in heaven, resolved first to attack their heavenly Patron, and after that Israel. To which apply the words, against the Lord, and against His Anointed.' But to return Ps. ii.4 is Messianically applied in the Talmud (Abhod. Z. u. s.). Ps. ii.6 is applied to the Messiah in the Midrash on 1 Samuel xvi.1 (Par.19, ed, Lemberg, p.45 a and b), where it is said that of the three measures of sufferings [6428] one goes to the King Messiah, of whom it is written (Is. liii.) He was wounded for our trangression.' They say to the King Messiah: Where dost Thou seek to dwell? He answers: Is this question also necessary? In Sion My holy hill (Ps. ii.6). (Comp. also Yalkut ii. p.53 c.)Ps. ii.7 is quoted as Messianic in the Talmud, among a number of other Messianic quotations (Sukk.52 a). There is a very remarkable passage in the Midrash on Ps. ii.7 (ed. Warsh p.5 a), in which the unity of Israel and the Messiah in prophetic vision seems clearly indicated. Tracing the decree' through the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiograph, the first passage quoted in Exod. iv 22: Israel is My first-born son;' the second, from the Prophets, Is. lii.13: Behold My servants shall deal prudently,' and Is. xlii.1: Behold My My servant, whom I uphold;' the third, from the Hagiographa, Ps. cx.1: The Lord said unto my Lord,' and again, Ps. ii.7: The Lord said unto Me, Thou art My Son,' and yet this other saying (Dan. vii.13): Behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven.' Five lines further down, the same Midrash, in reference to the words Thou art My Son,' observes that, when that hour comes, God speaks to Him to make a new convenant, and thus He speaks: This day have I begotten Thee' - this is the hour in which He become His Son.Ps. ii.8 is applied in Ber. R.44 (ed. Warsh. p.80 a) and in the Midrash on the passage, to the Messiah, with the curious remark that there were three of whom it was said Ask of Me' - Solomon, Ahaz, [6429] and the Messiah. In the Talmud (Shukk.52 a) the same passage is very curiously applied, it being suggested that, when the Messiah, the Son of David, saw that the Messiah, the Son of Joseph, [6430] would be killed, He said to the Almighty, I seek nothing of Thee except life. To which the reply was: Life before Thou hadst spoken, as David Thy father prophesied of Thee, Ps. xxi.4.Ps. ii.9 will be referred to in our remarks on Ps. cxx.Ps. xvi.5 is discussed in Ber. R.88, in connection

with the cup which Pharaoh's butler saw in his dream. From this the Midrash proceeds to speak of the four cups appointed for the Passover night, and to explain their meaning in various manners, among others, contrasting the four cups of fury, which God would make the nations drink, with the four cups of salvation which He would give Israel in the latter days, viz. Ps. xvi.5; Ps. cxvi.13; Ps. xxiii.5. The expression, Ps. cxvi.13, rendered in our A. V. the cup of salvation,' is in the orginal, the cup of salvations' - and is explained as implying on one for the days of the Messiah, and the other for the days of Gog.On verse 9, the Midrash on the passage says: My glory shall rejoice in the King Messiah, Who in the furture shall come forth from me, as it is written in Is. iv.5: "upon all the glory a covering.'" And the Midrash continues my flesh also shall dwell in safety' - i.e. after death, to teach us that corruption and the worm shall not rule over it.Ps. xviii.31 (in the Heb. verse 32). The Targum explains this in reference to the works and miracles of the Messiah.Ps. xviii.50 is referred in Jer. Talmud (Ber. ii.4, p.5 a, line 11 from the top), and in the Midr. on Lam. i.16, to the Messiah, with this curious remark, implying the doubt whether He was alive or dead: The king Messiah, whether He belong to the living or the dead, His Name is to be David, according to Ps. xviii.50.'Ps. xxi.1 (2 in the Hebrew) - the King there spoken of is explained by the Targum to be King Messiah. The Midrash on the passage idenfies him with Is. xi.10, on which Rabbi Chanina adds that the object of the Messiah is to give certain commandments to the Gentiles (not to Israel, who are to learn from God Himself), according to the passage in Isaiah above qutoed, adding that the words his rest shall be glorious' mean that God gives to the King Messiah from the glory above, as it is said: In Thy strength shall the king rejoice,' which strength is a little afterwards explained as the Kingdom (ed. Warsh. p.30 a and b).Verse 3 is Messianically applied in the Midrash on the passage.Ps. xxi.3 (4 in the Hebrew). Only a few lines farther down in the same Midrash, among remarkable Messianic applications, is that of this vese to the Messiah, where also the expression Jehovah is a man of war,' and Jehovah Zidkenu,' are applied to the Messiah. [6431] Comp. also Shemoth R.8, where it is noted that God will crown Him with His own crown.Verse 4 is Messianically applied in Sukk.52 a.Ps. xxi.5 (6 in the Hebrew). The first clause of this verse. Yalkut on Num. xxvii.20 (vol. i. p.248 a, line 10 from the bottom) applies to the glory of the King Messiah, immediately quoting the second clause in proof of its Messianic application. This is also done in the Midrash on the passage. But perhaps one of the most remarkable applications of it is in Bemidbar R.15, p.63 b, where the passage is applied to the Messiah. Finally in Ps. xxi.7 (8 in the Hebrew), the expression king' is applied in the Targum to the Messiah.On the whole, then, it may be remarked that Ps. xxi. was throughout regarded as Messianic.On Ps. xxii.7 (8 in the Hebrew) a remarkable comment appears in Yalkut on Is. lx., applying this passage to the Messiah (the second, or son of Ephraim), and using almost the same words in which the Evangelists describe the mocking behaviour of the Jews at the Cross.Ps. xxii.15 (16 in the Hebrew). There is a similarly remarkable application to the Messiah of this verse in Yalkut.The promise in Ps. xxiii.5 is referred in Benid. R.21 to the spreading of the great feast before Israel in the latter days.Ps. xxxi.19 (20 in the Hebrew) is in the Midrash applied to the reward that in the latter days Israel would receive for their faithfulness. Also in Pesiqta, p.149 b, to the joy of Israel in the presence of the Messiah.The expression in Ps. xxxvi.9, In Thy light shall we see light,' is applied to the Messiah in Yalkut on Isaiah lx. (vol. ii. p.56 c, line 22 from the bottom).The application of Ps. xl.7 to the Messiah has already been noted in our remarks on Gen. iv.25.Ps. xlv. is throughout regarded as Messianic. To begin with; the Targum renders verse 2 (3 in the Hebrew): Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is greater than that of the sons of men.'Verse 3 (4 in the

Hebrew) is applied in the Talmud (Shabb 63 a) to the Messiah, although other interpretations of that verse immediately follow.The application of verse 6 (7 in the Hebrew), to the Messiah in a MS. copy of the Targum has already been referred to in another part of his book, while the words, Thy throne is for ever and ever' are brought into connection with the promise that the sceptre would not depart from Judah in Ber. R.99, ed. Warsh. p.178 b, line 9 from the bottom.On verse 7 the Targum though not in the Venice edition (1568), has: Thou O King Messiah because Thou lovest righteousness,' &c. Comp. Levy, Targum. Wörterb. vol. ii. p.41 a.The Midrash on the Psalm deals exclusively with the inscription (of which it has several and significant interpretations) with the opening words of the Psalm, and with the words (ver.16), Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children,' but at the same time it clearly indicates that the Psalm applies to the latter, or Messianic, days.On Ps. l.2 Siphré (p.143 a) notes that four times God would appear, the last being in the days of King Messiah.Ps. lx.7. Bemidbar R. on Num. vii.48, Parash.14 (ed. Warsh p.54 a) contains some very curious Haggadic discussion on this verse. But it also broaches the opinion of its reference to the Messiah.Ps. lxi.6 (7 in the Hebrew). Thou shalt add days to the days of the king,' is rendered by the Targum: Thou shalt add days to the days of King Messiah.' There is a curious gloss on this in Pirqé d. R. Eliez. c.19 (ed. Lemberg, p.24 b), in which Adam is supposed to have taken 70 of his years, and added them to those of King David. According to another tradition, this accounts for Adam living 930 years, this is, 70 less than 1,000, which constitute before God one day, and so the threatening had been literally fulfilled: In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die.Ps. lxi.8 (9 in the Hebrew). The expression, that I may daily perform my vows,' is applied in the Targum to the day in which the Messiah is anointed King.Ps. lxviii.31 (32 in the Hebrew). On the words Princes shall come out of Egypt,' there is a very remarkable comment in the Talmud (Pes.118 b) and in Shemoth R. on Ex. xxvi.15, &c. (ed. Warsh. p.50 b), in which we are told that in the latter days all nations would bring gifts to the King Messiah, beginning with Egypt. And lest it be thought that He (Messiah) would not accept it from them, the Holy One says to the Messiah: Accept from them hospitable entertainment,' or it might be rendered, Accept it from them; they have given hospitable entertainment to My son.'Ps. lxxii. This Psalm also was viewed by the ancient Synagogue as throughout Messianic, as indicated by the fact that the Targum renders the very first verse: Give the sentence of Thy judgment to the King Messiah, and Thy justice to the Son of David the King,' which is re-echoed by the Midrash on the passage (ed. Warsh. p.55 b) which applies it explicitly to the Messiah, with reference to Is. xi.1. Similarly, the Talmud applies ver.16 to Messianic times (in a very hyperbolical passage, Shabb.30 b, line 4 from the bottom). The last clause of verse 16 is applied, in Keth.111 b, line 21 from top, and again in the Midr. on Eccl. i.9, to the Messiah sending down manna like Moses. [6432]Verse 17. In Sanh.98 b; Pes.54 a; Ned.39 b, the various names of the Messiah are discussed, and also in Ber. R.1; in Midr. on Lam. i.16, and in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.3. One of these is stated to be Jinnon, according to Ps. lxxii.17.Verse 8 is applied in Pirqé de R. El. c.11, to the Messiah. Yalkut (vol. ii.).on Is. lv.8 (p.54 c), speaks of the other Redeemer' as the Messiah, applying to him Ps. lxxii.8. In commenting on the meeting of Jacob and Esau, the Midr. Ber. R. (78, ed. Warsh. p.141 b) remarks that all the gifts which Jacob gave to Esau, the nations of the world would return to the King Messiah - proving it by a reference to Ps. lxxii.10; while in Midrash Bemidbar R.13 it is remarked that as the nations brought gifts to Solomon, so they would bring them to the King Messiah.In the same place, a little higher up, Solomon and the Messiah are likened as reigning over the whole world, the proof passages being, besides others, Ps. lxxii.8, Daniel vii.13, and ii.35.On the application to the

Messiah of verse 16 we have already spoken, as also on that of verse 17.Ps. lxxx.17 (in the Hebrew 18). The Targum paraphrases the Son of Man' by King Messiah.'Ps. lxxxix.22-25 (23-26 in the Hebrew). In Yalkut on Is. lx.1 (vol. ii. p.56 c) this promise is referred to the future deliverance of Israel by the Messiah.Again, verse 27 (28 in the Hebrew) is applied in Shemoth R.19, towards the end, to the Messiah, special reference being made to Ex. iv.22, Israel is My first-born son.'Verse 51 (52 in the Hebrew). There is a remarkable comment on this in the Midrash on the inscription of Ps. xviii. (ed. Warsh. p.24 a, line 2 from the bottom), in which it is set forth that as Israel and David did not sing till the hour of persecution and reproach, so when the Messiah shall come - speedily, in our days' - the song will not be raised until the Messiah is put to reproach, according to Ps. lxxxix.52 (51), and till there shall fall before Him the wicked idolaters referred to in Dan. ii.42, and the four kingdoms referred to in Zech. xiv.2. In that hour shall the song be raised, as it is written Ps. xcviii.1.In the Midr. on Cant. ii.13 it is said: If you see one generation after another blaspheming, expect the feet of the King Messiah, as it is written, Ps. lxxxix.53.Ps. xc.15. The Midr. (ed. Warsh. p.67 b) remarks: The days wherein Thou hast afflicted us - that is, the days of the Messiah. Upon which follows a discussion upon the length of days of the Messiah, R. Eliezer holding that they are 1,000 years, quoting the words as yesterday,' one day being 1,000 years. R. Joshua holds that they were 2,000 years, the words the days' implying that there were two days. R. Berachiah holds that they were 600 years, appealing to Is. lxv.22,because the root of the tree perishes in the earth in 600 years. R. José thinks that they are 60 years, according to Ps. lxxii.5, the words throughout all generations' (dor dorim) being interpreted: Dor = 20 years; Dorim = 40 years: 20 + 40 = 60. R. Akiba says: 40 years, according to the years in the wilderness. The Rabbis say: 354 years, according to the days in the lunar year. R. Abahu thinks 7,000 years, reckoning the 7 according to the days of the bridegroom.On Ps. xc. the Midrash concludes by drawing a contrast between the Temple which men built, and which was destroyed, and the Temple of the latter or Messianic days, which God would build, and which would not be destroyed.Ps. xcii., verses 8, 11, and 13 (7, 10, and 12 in our A. V.), are Messianically interpreted in Pirqé de R. El. c.19. In the Midrash on verse 13 (12 in our A. V.), among other beautiful applications of the figure of the Psalm, is that to the Messiah the Son of David. The note of the Midrash on the expression like a cedar of Lebanon,' as applied to Israel, is very beautiful, likening it to the cedar, which, although driven and bent by all the winds of heaven, cannot be rooted up from its place.Ps. xcv.7, last clause. In Shem. R.25 and in the Midrash on Cant. v.2 (ed. Warsh. p.26 a), it is noted that, if Israel did penitence only one day [or else properly observed even one Sabbath], the Messiah the Son of David would immediately come. [The whole passage from which this reference is taken is exceedingly interesting. It introduces God as saying to Israel: My son, open to Me a door of penitence only as small as a needle's eye, and I will open to you doors through which carriages and wagons shall come in. It almost seems a counterpart to the Saviour's words (Rev. iii.20): Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to Him.'] Substantially the same view is taken in Sanh.98 a, where the tokens of the coming of the Messiah are described - and also in Jer. Taan.64 a.Ps. cii.16 (17 in the Hebrew) is applied in Bereshith R.56 (ed. Warsh. p.104 b) to Messianic times.Ps. cvi.44. On this there is in the Midrash a long Messianic discussion, setting forth the five grounds on which Israel is redeemed: through the sorrows of Israel through prayer, through the merits of the patriarchs, through repentance towards God, and in the time of the end.'Ps. cx. is throughout applied to the Messiah. To begin with, it evidently underlies the Targumic of ver.4. Similarly, it is propounded in the Midr. on Ps. ii.

(although there the chief application of it is to Abraham). But in the Midrash on Ps. xviii.36 (35 in our A. V.), Ps. cx. verse 1, Sit thou at My right hand' is specially applied to the Messiah, while Abraham is said to be seated at the left. Verse 2, The rod of Thy strength.' In a very curious mystic interpretation of the pledges which Tamar had, by the Holy Ghost, asked of Judah, the seal is interpreted as signifying the Kingdom, the bracelet as the Sanhedrin, and the staff as the King Messiah, with special reference to Is. xi. and Ps. cx.2 (Beresh. R.85, ed. Warsh. p.153 a) Similarly in Bemid. R.18, last line, the staff of Aaron, which is said to have been in the hands of every king till the Temple was destroyed, and since then to have been hid, is to be restored to King Messiah, according to this verse; and in Yalkut on this Psalm (vol. ii. Par.869, p.124 c) this staff is supposed to be the same as that of Jacob with which he crossed Jordan, and of Judah, and of Moses, and of Aaron, and the same which David had in his hand when he slew Goliath, it being also the same which will be restored to the Messiah.Verse 7 is also applied in Yalkut (u. s. col. d) to Messianic times, when streams of the blood of the wicked should flow out, and birds come to drink of that flood.Ps. cxvi.9 is in Ber. R.96 supposed to indicate that the dead of Palestine would live first in the days of the Messiah.Ps. cxvi.13 has been already commented upon.On Ps. cxix.33 the Midrash remarks that there were three who asked wisdom of God: David, Solomon, and the King Messiah, the latter according to Ps. lxxii.1.Ps. cxx.7 is applied to the Messiah in the Midrash (p.91 a, ed. Warsh.), the first clause being brought into connection with Is. lvii.19, with reference to the Messiah's dealings with the Gentiles, the resistance being described in the second clause, and the result in Ps. ii.9.Ps. cxxi.1 is applied in Tanchuma (Par. Toledoth 14, ed. Warsh. p.37 b. See also Yalkut, vol. ii.878, p.127 c) to the Messiah, with special reference to Zech. iv.7 and Is. lii.7.Ps. cxxvi.2. In Tanchuma on Ex. xv. i. (ed. Warsh. p.87 a) this verse is applied to Messianic times in a rapt description, in which successively Is. lx.5, Is. lviii.8, Is. xxxv.5, 6, Jer. xxxi.13, and Ps. cxxvi.2, are grouped together as all applying to these latter days.The promise in Ps. cxxxii.18 is applied in Pirké de R. El. c.28 to Messianic times, and verse 14 in Ber. R.56.So is Ps. cxxxiii.3 in Ber. R.65 (p.122 a), closing lines.The words in Ps. cxlii.5 are applied in Ber. R.74 to the resurrection of Israel in Palestine in the days of Messiah.The words, When thou awakest,' in Prov. vi.22 are Messianically applied in Siphré on Deut. (ed. Friedmann, p.74 b).In Midr. on Eccl. i.9 it is shown at great length that the Messiah would re-enact all the miracles of the past.The last clause of Eccl. i.11 is applied to the days of the Messiah in the Targum.Eccl. vii.24 is thus paraphrased in the Targum: Behold, it is remote from the sons of men that they should know what was done from the beginning of the world, but a mystery is the day of death - and the day when shall come King Messiah, who can find it out by his wisdom?'In the Midr. on Eccl. xi.8 it is noted that, however many years a man might study, his learning would be empty before the teaching of Messiah. In the Midr. on Eccl. xii.1 it is noted that the evil days are those of the woes of Messiah.Canticles. Here we have first the Talmudic passage (Sheb.35 b) in which the principle is laid down, that whenever throughout that book Solomon is named, except in chap. viii.12, it applies, not to Solomon, but to Him Who was His peace (there is here a play on these words, and on the name Solomon).To Cant. i.8 the Targum makes this addition: They shall be nourished in the captivity, until the time that I shall send to them the King Messiah, Who will feed them in quietness.'So also on verse 17 the Targum contrasts the Temple built by Solomon with the far superior Temple to be built in the days of the Messiah, of which the beams were to be made of the cedars of Paradise.Cant. ii.8, although applied by most authorities to Moses, is by others referred to the Messiah (Shir haShirim R., ed. Warsh., p.15 a, about the middle; Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p.47 b). Cant. ii.9 is Messianically

applied in Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p.49, a and b.The same may be said of verse 10; while in connection with verse 12, in similar application, Is. lii.7 is quoted.In connection with verse 13, in the same Midrash (p.17 a), Rabbi Chija bar Abba speaks of a great matter as happening close to the days of the Messiah, viz., that the wicked should be destroyed, quoting in regard to it Is. iv.3.Cant. iii.11, the day of his espousals.' In Yalkut on the passage (vol. ii. p.178 d) this is explained: the day of the Messiah, because the Holy One, blessed be His name, is likened to a bridegroom; "as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride"' - and the day of the gladness of his heart,' as the day when the Sanctuary is rebuilt, and Jerusalem is redeemed.On Cant. iv.5 the Targum again introduces the twofold Messiah, the one the son of David, and the other the son of Ephraim.Cant. iv.16. According to one opinion in the Midrash (p.25 b, line 13 from the bottom) this applies to the Messiah, Who comes from the north, and builds the Temple, which is in the south. See also Bemidbar R.13, p.48 b. On Cant. v.10 Yalkut remarks that He is white to Israel, and red to the Gentiles, according to Isaiah lxiii.2.On Cant. vi.10 Yalkut (vol. ii. p.184 b) has some beautiful observations, first, likening Israel in the wilderness, and God's mighty deeds there, to the morning;and then adding that, according to another view, this morning-light is the redemption of the Messiah: For as, when the morning rises, the darkness flees before it, so shall darkness fall upon the kingdoms of this world when the Messiah comes. And yet again, as the sun and moon appear, so will the Kingdom of the Messaih also appear - the commentation going on to trace farther illustrations.Cant. vii.6. The Midrash thus comments on it (among other explanations): How fair in the world to come, how pleasant in the days of the Messiah!On Cant. vii.13, the Targum has it: When it shall please God to deliver His people from capitivity, then shall it be said to the Messiah: The time of captivity is past, and the merit of the just shall be sweet before Me like the odour of balsam.'Similarly on Cant. viii.1, the Targum has it: And at that shall the King Messiah be revealed to the congragation of Israel, and the children of Israel shall say to Him, Come and be a brother to us, and let us go up to Jerusalem, and there suck with thee the meaning of the Law, as an infant its mother's breast.'On Cant. viii.2 the Targum has it : I will take Thee, O King Messiah, and make thee go up into my Temple, there Thou shalt teach me to tremble before the Lord, and to walk in His ways. There we shall hold the feast of leviathan, and drink the old wine, which has been kept in its grapes from the day the world was created, and of the pomegranates and of the fruits which are prepared for the just in the Garden of Eden.'On verse 4 the Targum says: The King Messiah shall say: I adjure you, My people, house of Israel, why should you rise against the Gentiles, to go out of captivity, and why should you rebel against the might of Gog and Magog? Wait a little, till those nations are consumed which go up to fight against Jerusalem, and then shall the Lord of the world remember you, and it shall be His good will to set you free.'Chap. viii.11 is applied Messianically in the Talmud (Shebhu.35 b), and so is verse 12 in the Targum.(It should, however, be remarked that there are many other Messianic references in the comments on the Song of Solomon.)Is. i.25, 26, is thus explained in the Talmud (Sanh.98 a): The Son of David shall not come till all the judges and rulers in Israel shall have ceased.'Similarly Is. ii.4 is Messianically interpreted in Shabb.63 a.Is. iv.2 the Targum distinctly applies to the times of the Messiah.Is. iv.4 has been already commented upon in our remarks on Gen. xviii.4, 5, and again on Deut. xxiii.11.Verses 5 and 6 are brought into connection with Israel's former service in contributing to, and making the Tabernacle in the wilderness, and it is remarked that in the latter days God would return it to them by covering them with a cloud of glory. This, in Yalkut (vol. i. p.99 c), and in the Midrash on Ps. xiii., as also in that on Ps. xvi.9.Is. vi.13 is referred in the Talmud (Keth.112 b) to

Messianic times.The reference of Is. vii.21 to Messianic times has already been discussed in our notes on Gen. xviii.7.Is. viii.14 is also Messianically applied in the Talmud (Sanh.38 a).Is. ix.6 is expressly applied to the Messiah in the Targum, and there is a very curious comment in Debarim R.1 (ed. Warsh., p.4 a) in connection with a Haggadic discussion of Gen. xliii.14, which, however fanciful, makes a Messianic application of this passage - also in Bemidbar R.11.Verse 7, Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end,' has already been referred to in our comments on Num. vi.26.Is. x.27 is in the Targum applied to the destruction of the Gentiles before the Messiah. Is. x.34, is quoted in the Midrash on Lam. i.16, in evidence that somehow the birth of the Messiah was to be connected with the destruction of the Temple.Is. xi., as will readily be believed, is Messianically interpreted in Jewish writings. Thus, to begin with in the Targum on verses 1 and 6; in the Talmud (Jer. Berach.5 a and Sanh.93 b); and in a number of passages in the Midrashim. Thus, verse 1 in Bereshith R.85 on Gen. xxxviii.18, where also Ps. cx.2 is quoted, and in Ber. R.99, ed. Warsh., p, 178 b. In Yalkut (vol. i. p.247 d, near the top), where it is described how God had shown Moses all the spirits of the rulers and prophets in Israel, from that time forward to the Resurrection, it is said that all these had one knowledge and one spirit, but that the Messiah had one spirit which was equal to all the others put together, according to Is. xi.1.On the 2nd verse see our remarks on Gen. i.2, while in Yalkut on Prov. iii.19, 20 (vol. ii. p.133 a) the verse is quoted in connection with Messianic times, when by wisdom, understanding, and knowledge the Temple will be built again. On that verse see also pirq. d. R. El.3. On Is. xi.3 the Talmud (Sanh.93 b, lines 21 &c. from the top) has a curious explanation. After quoting ch. xi.2 as Messianic, it makes a play on the words, of quick understanding,' or scent,' as it might be rendered, and suggest that this word {hebrew} is intended to teach us that God has laden Him with commandments and sufferings like millstones ({hebrew}). Immediately afterwards, from the expression He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, but reprove with equity for the meek of the earth,' it is inferred that the Messiah knew the thoughts of the heart, and it is added that, as Bar Kokhabh was unable to do this, he was killed.Verse 4, he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth,' is Messianically applied in the Midrash on Ps. ii.2, and in that on Ruth ii.14 - also in Yalkut on Is. lx.Verse 7 has been already noticed in connection with Ex. xii.2.On verse 10 see our remarks on Gen. xlix.10 and Ps. xxi.1.Verse 11 is Messianically applied in Yalkut (vlo. i. p.31 b and vol. ii.38 a), as also in the Midrash on Ps. cvii.2.Verse 12 is Messianically applied in that curious passage in the Midrash on Lamentations i.2, where it is indicated that, as the children of Israel sinned from {hebrew} to {hebrew}, so God would in the latter days comfort them from {hebrew} to {hebrew} (i.e. through the whole alphabet), Scripture passages being in each case quoted.The Messianic application of Is. xii.3 is sufficiently established by the ancient symbolic practice of pouring out the water on the Feast of Tabernacles.In connection with Is. xi.5 the Midrash on Ps. cxviii.23 first speak of the wonderment of the Egyptians when they saw the change in Israel from servitude to glory of their Exdous, and then adds, that the words were intended by his Holy Ghost to apply to the wonders of the latter days (ed. Warsh. p.85 b).On Is. xiv.2, see our comments on Gen. xviii.4, 5.Is. xiv.29, xv.2, xvi.1, and xvi.5 are Messianically applied in the Targum.Is. xviii.5 is similarly applied in the Talmud (Sanh.98 a); and Is. xxiii.15 in Sanh.99 a.Is. xxi.11, 12 is in Jer. Taan.64 a, and in Shem. R.18, applied to the manifestation of Messiah.Is. xxiii.8 the Midr. on Eccl. i.7 sees a curious reference to the return of this world's wealth to Israel in Messianic days.Is. xxiii.15 is Messianically applied in the Talmud (Sanh 99 a) where the expression a king' is explained as referring to the Messiah.Is. xxiv.23 is Messianically applied in the curious passage in

Bemidbar R. quoted under Gen. xxii.18; also in Bemidbar R.13 (ed. Warsh. p.51 a).The remarkable promise in Is. xxv.8 is applied to the times of the Messiah in the Talmud (Moed Q.28 b), and in that most ancient commentary Siphra, (Yalkut i. p.190 d applies the passage to the world to come). But the most remarkable interpretation is that which occurs in connection with Is. lx.1 (Yalkut ii.56 c, line 16 from the bottom), where the passage (Is. xxv.8) is after an expostulation on the part of Satan with regard to the Messiah, applied to the casting into Gehenna of Satan and of the Gentiles. See also our remarks on Ex. xii.2. In Debar. R.2, Isaiah xxv.8 is applied to the destruction of the Jetser ha-Ra and the abolishing of death in Messianic days; in Shem. R.30 to the time of the Messiah.Verse 9. Tanchuma on Deuteronomy opens with a record of how God would work all the miracles, which He had shown in the wilderness, in a fuller manner for Zion in the latter days, the last passage quoted in that section being Is. xxv.9. (Tanchuma on Deut. ed. Warsh. p.99 a, line 5 from the bottom).Of Is. xxvi.19 there is Messianic application in the Midrash on Ecclesiates i.7.Of Is. xxvii.10 Shem. R.1, and Tanchuma on Exod. ii.5 (ed. Warsh. p.64 b) remark that, like Moses, the Messiah, Who would deliver His own from the worshippers of false gods, should be brought up with the latter in the land.Verse 13 is quoted in the Talmud (Rosh. haSh.11 b) in connection with the future deliverance. So also in Yalkut, i. p.217 d, and Pirqé de R. El. c.31.Is. xxviii.5 is thus paraphrased in the Targum: At that time shall the Messiah of the Lord of hosts be a crown of joy.'Is. xxviii.16 the Targum apparently applies to the Messiah. At least, so Rashi (on the passage) understands it.Is. xxx.18 is Messianically applied in Sanh 97 b; verse 15 Jer. Taan. i.1.The expression in Is. xxx.19, he shall be very gracious unto thee,' is applied to the merits of the Messiah in Yalkut on Zeph. iii.8 (p.84 c).On verse 25 see our remarks on Gen. xviii.4.Verse 26 is applied to Messianic times in the Talmud (Pes.68 a, and Sanh.91 b), and similarly in Pirqé de R. El.51, and Shemoth R.50. So also in Ber. R.12. see our remarkes on Gen. ii.4.Is. xxxii.14, 15. On this passage the Midrash of Lam. iii.49 significantly remarks that it is one of the three passage in which mention of the Holy Ghost follows upon mention of redemption, the other two passages being Is.22, followed by lxi.1, and Lam. iii.49.Is. xxxii.20. The first clause is explained by Tanchuma (Par.1. ed. Warsh. p.4 a, first three lines) to apply to the study of the Law, and the second to the two Messiahs, the son of Joseph being likened to the ox, and the son of David to the ass, accordingly to Zech. ix.9; and similary the verse is Messianically referred to in Deb. R.6 (ed. Warsh. Vol. iii. p.15 b), in a very curious play on the words in Deut. xxii.6, 7, where the observance of that commandment is supposed to hasten the coming of King Messiah. Is. xxxv.1. This is one of the passages quoted in Tanchuma on Deut. i.1. (ed.Warsh. p.99 a) as among the miracles which God would do to redeem Zion in the latter days. So also is verse 2 in this chapter.Is. xxxv.5, 6 is repeatedly applied to Messianic times. Thus, in Yalkut i.78 c, and 157 a; in Ber. R.95; and in Midrash on Ps. cxlvi.8.Verse 10 is equally applied to Messianic times in the Midrash on Ps. cvii.1, while at the same time it is noted that this deliverance will be accomplished by God Himself, and not either by Elijah, nor by the King Messiah. [6433] A similar reference occurs in Yalkut (vol. ii. p.162 d), at the close of the Commentary on the Book of Chronicles, where it is remarked that in this world the deliverance of Israel was accomplished by man, and was followed by fresh captivities, but in the latter or Messianic days their deliverance would be accomplished by God, and would no more be followed by captivity. See also Shemoth R.15 and 23.Is. xl.1 is one of the passages referred to in our note on Is. xi.12, and also on Is. xxxv.1.The same remark applies to verses 2 and 3.Verse 5 is also Messianically applied in Vayyikra R.1; Yalk. ii.77 b about the middle.On verse 10 Yalkut, in discussing Ex. xxxii.6 (vol. i. p.108 c) broaches the

opinion, that in the days of the Messiah Israel would have a double reward, on account of the calamities which they had suffered, quoting Is. xl.10.Is. xli.18 has been already noted in our remarks on Gen. xviii.4, 5.Verse 25 is Messianically applied in Bem. R.13, p.48 b.The expression The first,' in ch. xli.27, is generally applied to the Messiah; in the Targum, according to Rashi; in Bereshith R.63; in Vayyikra R.30; and in the Talmud (Pes.5 a); so also in Pesiqta (ed. Buber) p.185 b.Is. xlii.1 is applied in the Targum to the Messiah, as also in the Midrash or Ps. ii.; and in Yalkut ii. p.104 d. See also our comments on Ps. ii.7.On Is. xliii.10, the Targum renders My servant' by My servant the Messiah.'The promise in Is. xlv.22 is also among the future things mentioned in the Midrash on Lamentations, to which we have referred in our remarks on Is. xi.12.Is. xlix.8. There is a remarkable comment on this in Yalkut on the passage, to the effect that the Messiah suffers in every age for the sins of that generation, but that God would in the day of redemption repair it all (Yalk. ii. p.52 b).Is. xlix.9 is quoted as the words of the Messiah in Yalkut (vol. ii. p.52 b).Verse 10 is one of the passages referred to in the Midrash on Lamentations, quoted in connection with Is. xi.12.Verse 12 has already been noticed in our remarked on Ex. xii.2.From the expression comfort' in verse 13, the Messianic title Menachem' is derived. Comp. the Midrash on Prov. xix.21.Verse 14 is Messianically applied in Yalkut ii. p.52 c.Verse 21 is also one of the passages referred to in the Midrash of Lamentations, quoted under Ps. xi.12.On verse 23 it is remarked in Vayyikra R.27 (ed. Warsh. p.42 a), that Messianic blessings were generally prefigured by similar events, as for example, the passage here quoted in the case of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel.A Messianic application of the same passsage also occurs in Par.33 and 36, as a contrast to the contempt that Israel experiences in this world.The second clause of verse 23 is applied to the Messiah in the Midrash on Ps. ii.2, as to be fulfilled when the Gentiles shall see the terrible judgements.Verse 26 is similarly applied to the destruction of the Gentiles in Vayyikra R.33 (end).Is. li.12 is one of the passages referred to in the Midrash of Lamentations, quoted in our comments in Is. xi.12.Is. li.12 and 17 are among the passages referred to in our remarks on Is. xxv.9Is. lii.3 is Messianically applied in the Talmud (Sanh.97 b), while the last clause of verse 2 is one of the passages quoted in the Midrash on Lamentations (see Is. xi.12).The well-known Evangelic declaration in Is. lii.7 is thus commented upon in Yalkut (vol. ii. p.53 c): In the hour when the Holy One, blessed be His Name, redeems Israel, three days before Messiah comes Elijah, and stands upon the mountains of Israel, and weeps and mourns for them, and says to them: Behold the land of Israel, how long shall you stand in a dry and desolate land? And his voice is heard from the world's end to the world's end, and after that it is said to them: Peace has come to the world, peace has come to the world, as it is said: How beautiful upon the mountains, &c. And when the wicked hear it, they rejoice,and they say one to the other: Peace has come to us. On the second day he shall stand upon the mountains of Israel, and shall say: Good has come to the world, good has come to the world, as it is written: That bringeth good tidings of good. On the third day he shall come and stand upon the mountains of Israel, and say: Salvation has come to the world, salvation has come to the world, as it is written: That publisheth salvation.Similarly, this passage is quoted in Yalkut on Ps. cxxi.1. See also our remarks on Cant. ii.13. Verse 8 is one of the passages referred to in the Midrash on Lamentations quoted above, and frequently in other places as Messianic.Verse 12 is Messianically applied in Shemoth R.15 and 19.Verse 13 is applied in the Targum expressly to the Messiah. On the words He shall be exalted and extolled' we read in Yalkut ii. (Par.338, p.53 c, lines 7 &c. from the bottom): He shall be higher than Abraham, to whom applies Gen. xiv.22; higher than Moses, of whom Num. xi.12 is predicated; higher than the

ministering angels, of whom Ezek. i.18 is said. But to Him there applies this in Zech. iv.7: Who art thou, O great mountain?' And He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, and the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed.' R. Huma says, in the name of R. Acha: All sufferings are divided into three parts; one part goes to David and the Patriarchs, another to the generation of the rebellion (rebellious Israel), and the third to the King Messiah, as it is written (Ps. ii.7), Yet have I set My King upon My holy hill of Zion.' Then follows a curious quotation from the Midrash on Samuel, in which the Messiah indicates that His dwelling is on Mount Zion, and that guilt is connected with the destruction of its walls.In regard to Is. liii. we remember, that the Messianic name of Leprous' (Sanh.98 b) is expressly based upon it. Is. liii.10 is applied in the Targum on the passage to the Kingdom of the Messiah.Verse 5 is Messianically interpreted in the Midrash on Samuel (ed. Lemberg, p.45 a, last line), where it is said that all sufferings are divided into three parts, one of which the Messiah bore - a remark which is brought into connection with Ruth ii.14. (See our comments on that passage.)Is. liv.2 is expected to be fulfulled in Messianic times (Vayyikra R.10).Is. liv.5. In Shemoth R.15 this is expressly applied to Messianic days.Is. liv.11 is repeatedly applied to the Messianic glory, as, for example, in Shemoth R.15. (See our comments on Ex. xii.2.)So is verse 13, as in Yalkut (vol. i.78 c); in the Midrash on Ps. xxi.1; and in other passages.Is. lv.12 is referred to Messianic times, as in the Midrash on Ps. xiii.Is. lvi.1. See our comments on Exod. xxi.1.Verse 7 is one of the passages in the Midrash on Lamentations which we have quoted under Is. xi.12.On Is. lvii.14 Bemidhar R.15 (ed. Warsh. p.64 a) expresses a curious idea about the stumbling-block, as mystically the evil inclination, and adds that the promise applies to God's removal of it in the world to come, or else it may be in Messianic days.Verse 16 receives in the Talmud (Yeb.62 a and 63 b) and in the Midr. on Exxl. i.6 the following curious comment: The Son of David shall not come till all the souls are completed which are in the Guph' - (i.e. the pre-existence of souls is taught, and that they are kept in heaven till one after another appears in human form, and that the Messiah is kept back till all these shall have appeared), proof of this being derived from Is. lvii.16.Similarly chap. lix.15 is applied to Messianic times in Sanh.97 a, and Midr. on Cant. ii.13; and verse 19 in Sanh.98 a.Verse 17 is applied to Messianic times in Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p.149 a.Verse 20 is one of the passages mentioned in the Midrash on Lamentations quoted above. (See Is. xi.12.)Is. lix.19, 20, is applied to Messianic times in Sanh.98 a. In Pesiqta 166 b it is similarly applied, the peculiar form (plene) in which the word Goel (Redeemer) is written being taken to indicate the Messiah as the Redeemer in the full sense.Is. lx.1. This is applied in the Targum to Messianic times. Similarly, it is explained in Ber. R. i. with reference to Dan. ii.2; in Ber. R.2; and also in Bemidbar R.15 and 21. In Yalkut we have some very interesting remarks on the subject. Thus (vol. i. Par.363, p.99 c), commenting on Exod xxv.3 &c., in a very curious description of how God would in the world to come return to Israel the various things which they had offered for the Tabernacle, the oil is brought into connection with the Messiah, with reference to Ps. cxxxii.17 and Is. lx.1. Again, on p.215 c (at the commencement of the Parashah Behaalothekha) we have, first, a very curious comparison between the work of the Tabernacle and that of the six days of Creation, after which the question is put: Why Moses made seven lights, and Solomon seventy? To this the reply is given, that Moses rooted up seven nations before Israel, while Solomon reigned over all the seventy nations which, according to Jewish ideas, constitute the world. Upon this it is added, that God had promised, that as Israel had lighted for His glory the lights in theSanctuary, so would He in the latter days fill Jerusalem with His glory, according to the promise in Is. lx.1, and also set up in the

midst of it lights, according to Zeph. i.12. Still more clearly is the Messianic interpretation of Is. lx. brought out in the comments in Yalkut on that chapter. One part of it is so curious that it may here find a place. After explaining that this light for which Israel is looking is the light of the Messiah, and that Gen. i.4 really referred to it, it is added that this is intended to teach us that God looked forward to the age of the Messiah and His works before the Creation of the world, and that He hid that light for the Messiah and His generation under His throne of glory. On Satan's questioning Him for whom that light was destined, the answer is: For Him Who in the latter days will conquer thee, and cover thy face with shame. On which Satan requests to see Him, and when he is shown Him, falls on his face and says: I confess that this is the Messiah Who will in the latter days be able to cast me, and all the Gentiles, into Gehenna, according to Is. xxv.8. In that hour all the nations will tremble, and say befire God: Who is this into Whose hand we fall, what is His Name, and what is His purpose? On which God replies: This is Ephraim, the Messiah [the second Messiah, the son of Joseph]; My Righteousness is His Name.' And so the commentation goes on to touch on Ps. lxxxix.23, 24, and 26, in a manner most deeply interesting, but which it would be impossible here fully to give (Yalkut, vol. ii. Par.359, p.56 c). In col. d there are farther remarkable discussions about the Messiah, in connection with the wars in the days when Messiah should be revealed, and about Israel's final safety. But the most remarkable passage of all, reminding us almost of the history of the Temptation, is that which reads as follows (line 22 &c. from the top): It is a tradition from our Rabbis that, in the hour when King Messiah comes, He stands on the roof of the Temple, and proclaims to them, that the hour of their deliverance has come, and that if they believed they would rejoice in the light that had risen upon them, as it is written (Is. lx.1), Arise, shine, for thy light is come.' This light would be for them alone, as it is written (ver.2), For darkness shall cover the earth.' In that hour also would God take the light of the Messiah and of Israel, and all should walk in the light of Messiah and of Israel, as it is written (ver.3), The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.' And the kings of the nations should lick the dust from under the feet of the Messiah, and should all fall on their faces before Him and before Israel, and say: Let us be servants to Thee and to Israel. And so the passage goes on to describe the glory of the latter days. Indeed, the whole of this chapter may be said to be full of Messianic interpretations. After this it will scarecely be necessary to say that verses 2, 3, and 4 are similarly applied in the Midrashim. But it is interesting to notice that verse 2 is specifically applied to Messianic times in the Talmud (Sanh.99 a), in answer to the question when the Messiah should come.On verse 4 the Midrash on Cant. i.4, on the words we will be glad and rejoice in thee,' has the following beautiful illustration. A Queen is introduced whose husband and sons and sons-in-law go to a distant country. Tidings are brought to her: Thy sons are come back. On which she says: Cause for gladness have I, my daughters-in-law will rejoice. Next, tidings are brought her that her sons-in-law are coming, and she is glad that her daughters will rejoice. Lastly, tidings are brought: The king, thy husband, comes. On which she replies: This is indeed perfect joy, joy unpon joy. So in the latter days would the prophets come, and say to Jerusalem: Thy sons shall come from far' (verse 4), and she will say: What gladness is this to me! - and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side,' and again she will say: What gladness is this to me! But when they shall say to her (Zech. ix.9): Behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation,' then shall Zion say: This indeed is perfect joy, as it is written (Zech. ix.9), Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion,' and again (Zech. ii.10), Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion.' In that hour she will say (Is. lxi.10): I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God.'Verse 7 is Messianically applied in the

Talmud (Abod. Sar.24 a).Verse 8 is Messianically applied in the Midrash on Ps. xlvii.13.In connection with verse 19 we read in Yalkut (vol. i. p.103 b) that God said to Israel: In this world you are engaged (or busied) with the light for the Sanctuary, but in the world to come, for the merit of this light, I send you the King Messiah, Who is likened to a light, according to Ps. cxxxii.17 and Is. lx.19, the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light.'Verse 21 is thus alluded to in the Talmud (Sanh.98 a): Rabbi Jochanan said, The Son of David shall not come, until all be either just or all be unjust:' the former according to Is. lx.21, the latter according to Is. lix.16.Verse 22 is also Messianically applied in the Talmudic passage above cited.Is. lxi.1 has already been mentioned in our remarks on Is. xxxii.14, 15.On verse 5 there is a curious story related (Yalkut, vol. i. Par.212, p.64 a, lines 23-17 from the bottom) in which, in answer to a question, what was to become of the nations in the days of the Messiah, the reply is given that every nation and kingdom that had persecuted and mocked Israel would see, and be confounded, and have no share in life; but that every nation and kingdom which had not so dealt with Israel would come and be husbandmen and vinedressers to Israel in the days of the Messiah. A similar statement to this is found in the Midrash on Eccl. ii.7.Verse 9 is also applied to Messianic times.Verse 10 is one of the passages referred to in Tanchuma on Deut. i.1 quoted under Is. xxv.9. In Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p.149 a, the verse is explained as applying to the glory of Messiah's appearance.Is. lxii.10 has already been referred to in our remarks on Is. lvii.14.Is. lxiii. is applied to the Messiah, Who comes to the land after having seen the destruction of the Gentiles, in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.30.Verse 2 has been referred to in our comments on Cant. v.10. It is also quoted in reference to Messianic days in Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p.149 a.Verse 4 is explained as pointing to the days of the Messiah, which are supposed to be 365 years, according to the number of the solar days (Sanh.99 a); while in other passages of the Midrashim, the destruction of Rome and the coming of the Messiah are conjoined with the day of vengeance. See also the Midr. on Eccl. xii.10.Is. lxiv.4 (3 in the Hebrew). In Yalkut on Is. lx. (vol. ii. p.56 d, line 6, &c., from the bottom) Messianic application is made of this passage in a legendary account of the seven tabernacles which God would make for the Messiah, out of each of which proceed four streams of wine, milk, honey, and pure balsam. Then God is represented as speaking of the sufferings which Messiah was to undergo, after which the verse in question is quoted.Is. lxv.17 is quouted in the Midrash on Lamentations, referred to in our remarks on Is. xi.12.Verse 19 is one of the passages referred to in Tanchuma on Deut. i.1. See Isaiah xxv.9.To verse 25 we have the following curious illustrative reference in Ber. R.20 (ed. Warsh. p.38 b, line 6 from the bottom) in connection with the Fall: In the latter days everything shall be healed again (restored again) except the serpent (Is. lxv.25) and the Gibeonites (Ezek. xlviii.19). But a still more strange application of the verse occurs in the same Midrash (Par.95, ed. Warsh. p.170 a), where the opening clauses of it are quoted with this remark: Come and see all that the Holy One, blessed be His Name, has smitten in this world, He will heal in the latter days. Upon which a curious disquisition follows, to prove that every man would appear after death exactly as he had been in life, whether blind, dumb, or halting, nay, even in the same dress, as in the case of Samuel when Saul saw him - but that afterwards God would heal the diseased. Is. lxvi.7 is applied to Messianic times in Vayyikra R.14 (last line), and so are some of the following verses in the Midrashim, notably on Gen. xxxiii.1.Is. lxviii.22 is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R.12. See our remarks on Gen. ii.4.Jer. iii.17 is applied to Messianic days in Yalkut on Joshua iii.9 &c. (vol. ii. p.3 c, line 17 from the top),and so is verse 18 in the commentation on the words in Cant. i.16 our bed is green,' the expression being understood of the ten tribes, who had been led captive beyond the

river Sabbayon; but when Judah's deliverance came, Judah and Benjamin would go to them and bring them back, that they might be worthly of the days of the Messiah (vol. ii. p., 176 d, line 9 &c. from the bottom).Jer. v.19 is mentioned in the Introd. to Echa R. as one of three passages by which to infer from the apostasy of Israel the near advent of Messiah.The expression speckled bird' in Jer. xii.9 is applied to the Messiah in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.28.The last word in Jer. xvi.13 is made the basis of the name Chaninah, given to the Messiah in the Talmud (Sanh.98 b), and in the Midr. on Lam. i.16.On verse 14 Mechilta has it, that in the latter days the Exodus would no more be mentioned on account of the greater wonders then experienced.On Jer. xxiii.5, 6, the Targum has it: And I will raise up for David the Messiah the Just.' This is one of the passages from which according to Rabbinic views, one of the Names of the Messiah is derived, viz: Jehovah our Righteousness. So in the Talmud (Babba Bathra 75 b), in the Midrash on Ps. xxi.1, Prov. xix.21, and in that on Lamentations i.16.On verse 7 see our remarks on Jer. xvi 14. In the Talmud (Ber.12 b) this verse is distinctly applied to Messianic days. Jer. xxx.9 is Messianically applied in the Targum on the passage.Jer. xxx.21 is applied to the Messiah in the Targum, and also in the Midrash on Ps. xxi.7.On Jer. xxxi.8, 3rd clause, Yalkut has a Messianic interpretation, although extremely far-fetched. In general, the following verses are Messianically interpreted in the Midrashim.Verse 20 is Messianically applied in Yalkut (ii. p.66 c, end), where it is supposed to refer to the Messiah when imprisoned, when all the nations mock and shake their heads at Him. A more remarkable interpretation still occurs in the passage on Is. lx.1, to which we have already referred. Some farther extracts from it may be interesting. Thus, when the enemies of the Messiah flee before Him. God is supposed to make an agreement with the Messiah to this effect: The sins of those who are hidden with Thee will cause Thee to be put under an iron yoke, and they will do with Thee as with this calf, whose eyes are covered, and they will choke Thy spirit under the yoke, and on account of their sins Thy tongue shall cleave to Thy mouth. On which the Messiah inquires whether these troubles are to last for many years, and the Holy replies that He has decreed a week, but that if His soul were in sorrow, He would immediately dispel these sorrows. On this the Messiah says: Lord of the world, with gladness and joy of heart I take it upon Me, on condition that not one of Israel should perish, and that not only those alone should be saved who are in My days, but also those who are hid in the dust; and that not only the dead should be saved who are in My days, but also those who have died from the days of the first Adam till now; and not those, but also those who have been prematurely born. And only these, but also those who have come into Thy knowledge to create them, but have not yet been created. Thus I agree, and thus I take all upon Me. In the hebdomad when the Son of David comes, they shall bring beams of iron, and shall make them a yoke to His neck, until His stature is bent down. But He cries and weeps, and lifts up His voice on high, and says before Him: Lord of the world, what is My strength, My spirit, and My soul, and My members? Am I not flesh and blood? In that honor David (the Son of David) weeps, and says: My strength is dried up like a potsherd.' In that hour the Holy One, blessed be His Name, says: Ephraim the Messiah, My righteous one, Thou hast already taken this upon Thee before the six days of the world, now Thy anguish shall be like My anguish; for from the time that Nebuchadnezzar, the wicked one, has come up and destroyed My house, and burned My Sancturary, and I have sent into captivity My children among the children of the Gentiles, by My life, and by the life of Thy head, I have not sat down on My throne. And if Thou wilt not believe Me, see the dew which is on My head, as it is said (Cant. v.2) My head is filled with dew.' In that hour the Messiah answers Him: Lord of the world, now I am quieted, for it is enough for the servant that

he is as his Master (his reminding us of our Lord's saying, St. Matt. x.25). R. Isaac then remarks that in the year when the King Messiah shall be revealed, all nations shall rise up against each other (we have already quoted this passage in another place, as also that about the Messiah standing upon the roof of the Temple). Then follows this as a tradition of the Rabbis: In the latter days the Fathers shall stand up in the month of Nisan, and say to Him: Ephraim, the Messiah, our Righteousness, though we are Thy Fathers, yet Thou art better than we, because Thou hast borne all the sins of our sons, and hard and evil measure has passed upon Thee, such as has not been passed either upon those before or upon those after. And Thou hast been for laughter and derision to the nations for the sake of Israel, and Thou hast dwelt in darkness and in mist, and Thine eyes have not seen light, and Thy light clung to Thee alone, and Thy body was dried up like wood, and Thine eyes were darkened through fasting, and Thy strength was dried up like a postsherd. And all this on account of the sins of our children. Is it Thy pleasure that our sons should enjoy the good thing which Godhad displayed to Israel? Or perhaps on account of the anguish which Thou hast suffered for them, because they have bound Thee in the prison-house, wilt Thou not give unto them thereof? He says to them: Fathers of the world, whatever I have done I have done for your sakes, and for the sake of your children, that they may enjoy that goodness which the Holy One, blessed be He, has displayed to Israel. Then say to Him the Fathers of the world: Ephraim, Messiah, our Righteousness, be Thou reconciled to us, because Thou hast reconciled They Maker and us. R. Simeon, the son of Pasi, In that hour the Holy One, blessed be His Name, exalts the Messiah to the heaven of heavens, and spreads over Him the splendour of His glory, because of the nations of the world, and becauseof the wicked Persians. Then the Fathers of the world say to Him: Ephraim, Messiah, our Righteousness, be Thou their judge, and do to them what Thy soul desireth. For unless mercies had been multipled on Thee, they would long ago have exterminated Thee suddenly from the world, as it is written (Jer. xxxi.20) Is Ephraim my dear son?' And why is the expression: I will surely have mercy' [in the Hebrew reduplicated: having mercy I will have mercy'], but that the first expression mercy' refers to the hour when He was bound in prison, when day by day they gnashed with their teeth, and winked with their eyes, and nodded with their heads, and wide-opened their mouths, as it is written in Ps. xxii.7 [8 in Hebrew]; while the second expression I will have mercy' refers to the hour when He came out of the prison-house, when not only one kingdom, not two, came against Him, but 140 kingdoms came round about Him, and the Holy One, blessed be His Name, says to Him: Ephraim, Messiah, My righteous one, be not afraid, for all these shall perish by the breath of Thy mouth, as it is written (Is. xi.4). Long as this quotation may be, its interest seems sufficient to warrant its insertion. Jer. xxxi.31, 33, and 34 are applied to Messianic times in Yalkut (vol. i. p.196 c; 78 c; and in vol. ii. p.54 b, and p.66 d).Jer. xxxiii.13. The close of the verse is thus paraphrased in the Targum: The people shall yet learn by the hands of the Messiah,' while in Yalkut (vol. i. p.105 d) mention is made of a tenfold gathering of Israel, the last - in connection with this verse - in the latter days.On Lam. i.16 there is in the Midrash R. (ed. Warsh. p.64 b) the curious story about the birth of the Messiah in the royal palace of Bethlehem, which also occurs in the Jer. Talmud.Lam. ii.22, first clause. The Targum here remarks: Thou wilt proclaim liberty to Thy people, the house of Israel, by the hand of the Messiah.Lam. iv.22, first clause. The Targum here remarks: And after these things thy iniquity shall cease, and thou shalt be set free by the hands of the Messiah and by the hands of Elijah the PriestEzek xi.19 is applied to the great spiritual change that was to take place in Messianic days, when the evil desire would be taken out of the heart (Deb. R.6, at the end; and also in other Midrashic passages).Ezek. xvi.55

is referred to among the ten things which God would renew in Messianic days - the rebuilding of ruined cities, inclusive of Sodom and Gomorrah, being the fourth (Shem. R.15, ed. Warsh. p.24 b).Ezek xvii.22 and 23 is distinctly and very beautifully referred to the Messiah in the Targum.Ezek. xxv.14 is applied to the destruction of all the nations by Israel in the days of the Messiah in Bemidbar R. on Num. ii.32 (Par.2, ed. Warsh. p.5 b).Ezek. xxix.21 is among the passages applied to the time when the Messiah should come, in Sanh.98 a.So is Ezek. xxxii.14.Ezek xxxvi.25 is applied to Messianic times alike in the Targum and in Yalkut (vol. i. p.235 a), as our in the Talmud (Kidd.72 b).On verse 27 see our remarks on chap. xi.19.Ezek. xxxix.2 is Messianically applied in Bemidbar R.13, Warsh. p.48 b.Ezek. xlvii.9 and 12 are quoted as the second and the third things which God would renew in the latter days (Shem. R.15) - the second being, that living waters should go forth out of Jerusalem, and the third, that trees should bear fruit every month, and the sick be healed by them.On Ezek. xlviii.19 the Talmud (Baba B.122 a) has the following curious comment, that the land of Israel would be divided into thirteenth tribes, the thirteenth belonging to the Prince, and this verse is quoted as proof.Dan. ii.22 is Messianically applied in Ber. R.1, and in the Midr. on Lament. i.16, where it gives rise to another name of the Messiah: the Lightgiver.Verse 35 is similarly applied in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.11, and verse 44 in c.30.Dan. vii.9. This passage was interpreted by R. Akiba as implying that one throne was set for God, and the other for the Messiah (Chag.14 a).Dan. vii.13 is curiously explained in the Talmud (Sanh.98 a), where it is said that, if Israel behaved worthily, the Messiah would come in the clouds of heaven; if otherwise, humble, and riding upon an ass.Dan. vii.27 is applied to Messianic times in Bem. R.11.Dan. viii.13, 14. By a very curious combination these verses are brought into connection with Gen. iii.22 (man has become like one of us'), and it is argued, that in Messianic days man's primeval innocence and glory would be restored to him, and he become like one of the heavenly beings, Ber. R.21 (ed. Warsh. p.41 a).Dan. ix.24. In Naz.32 b it is noted as that referred to the time when the second Temple was to be destroyed. So also in Yalkut, vol. ii. p.79 d, lines 16&c. from the bottom.Dan. xii.3 is applied to Messianic times in a beautiful passage in Shem. R.15 (at the end).Dan. xii.11, 12. These two verses receive a peculiar Messianic interpretation,and that by the authority of the Rabbis. For it is argued that, as Moses, the first Redeemer, appeared, and was withdrawn for a time, and then reappeared, so would the second Redeemer; and the interval between His disappearance and reappearance is calculated at 45 days, arrived at by deducting the 1,290 days of the cessation of the sacrifice (Dan. xii.11) from the 1,335 days of Dan. xii.12 (Midr. on Ruth ii.14, ed. Warsh. p.43 b).Hos. ii.2 is explained in the Midr. on Ps. xlv.1 as implying that Israel's redemption would be when they were at the lowest.Hos. ii.13 is one of the three passages referred to on Jer. v.19.Hos. ii.18 is quoted in Shem. R.15 (on Ex. xii.2) as the seventh of the ten things which God would make new in Messianic days.Hos. iii.5 is applied to the Messiah in the Targum, and from it the Jer. Talm.(Ber.5 a) derives the name David as one of those given to the Messiah.Hos. vi.2 is Messianically applied in the Targum.Hos. xiii.14 is applied to the deliverance by the Messiah of those of Israel who are in Gehinnom, whom He sets free; - the term Zion being understood of Paradise. See Yalk. on Is. Par.269, comp. Maas. de R. Joshua in Jellinek's Beth ha-Midr. ii. p.50.Hos. xiv.7 is Messianically applied in the Targum. Joel ii.28 is explained in the Midrashim as referring to the latter days, when all Israel will be prophets (Bemidbar R.15; Yalkut i. p.220 c, and other places).Joel iii.18 is similarly applied in the Midrashim, as in that on Ps. xiii. and in others. The last clause of this verse is explained in the Midr. on Eccl. i.9 to imply that the Messiah would cause a fountain miraculously to spring up, as Moses did in the wilderness.Amos

iv.7 is in Midr. on Cant. ii.13 applied to the first of the seven years before Messiah come.Amos v.18 is one of the passages adduced in the Talmud (Sanh.98 b) to explain why certain Rabbis did not wish to see the day of the Messiah.Amos viii.11 is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R.25.Amos ix.11 is a notable Messianic passage. Thus, in the Talmud (Sanh.96 b) where the Messiah is called the Son of the Fallen,' the name is explained by a reference to this passage. Again, in Ber. R.88, last three lines (ed. Warsh. p.157 a) after enumerating the unexpected deliverances which Israel had formerly experienced, it is added: Who could have expected that the fallen tabernacle of David should be raised up by God, as it is written (Amos ix.11) and who should have expected that the whole world should become one bundle (be gathered into one Church)? Yet it is written Zeph. iii.9. Comp. also the long discussion in Yalkut on this passage (vol. ii. p.80 a and b).Obadiah verses 18 and 21 are applied to the Kingdom and time of the Messiah in Deb. R.1.Micah ii.13. See our remarks on Gen. xviii.4, 5. The passage is also Messianically quoted in the Midrash on Prov. vi. (ed. Lemberg, p.5 a, first two lines).The promise in Micah iv.3 is applied to the times of the Messiah in the Talmud (Shabb.63 a).So is the prediction in verse 5 in Shemoth R.15; while verse 8 is thus commented upon in the Targum: And thou Messiah of Israel, Who shalt be hidden on account of the sins of Zion, to thee shall the Kingdom come.'The well-know passage, Micah v.2, is admittedly Messianic. So in the Targum, in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.3, and by later Rabbis.Verse 3 is applied in the Talmud to the fact that the Messiah was not to come till the hostile kingdom had spread for nine months over the whole world (Yoma 10 a), or else, over the whole land of Israel (Sanh.98 b).Similarly Micah vii.6 is applied to Messianic times in Sanh.97 a, and in Sotah 49 b; also in the Midr. on Cant. ii.13. And so is verse 15 in Yalkut (vol. ii. p.112 b.)In Micah vii.8, the expression, Jehovah shall be light to me, is referred to the days of the Messiah in Deb. R.11, ed. Warsh. vol. v. p.22 a.Nahum ii.1. See our remarks on Is. lii.7.Habakkuk ii.3. This is applied to Messianic times in a remarkable passage in Sanh.97 b, which will be quoted in full at the close of this Appendix; also in Yalkut, vol. ii. p.83 b.Habakkuk iii.18 is applied to Messianic times in the Targum.Zephaniah iii.8. The words rendered in our A.V. the day that I rise up to the prey' are translated for testimony' and applied to God's bearing testimony for the Messiah (Yalkut, vol. ii. p.84 c, line 6 from the top).Verse 9 is applied to the voluntary conversion of the Gentiles in the days of the Messiah in the Talmud (Abhod. Zarah, 24 a); and in Ber. R.88; and verse 11 in Sanh.98 a.Haggai ii.6 is expressly applied to the coming redemption in Deb. R.1 (ed. Warsh. p.4 b, line 15 from the top).Zech. i.20. The four carpenters there spoken of are variously interpreted in the Talmud (Sukk.52 b), and in the Midrash (Bemidbar R.14). But both agree that one of them refers to the Messiah.Zech. ii.10 is one of the Messianic passages to which we have referred in our remarks on Is. lx.4. It has also a Messianic cast in the Targum.Zech. iii.8. The designation Branch' is expressly applied to King Messiah in the Targum. Indeed, this is one of the Messiah's peculiar names.Verse 10 is quoted in the Midrash on Ps. lxxii. (ed. Warsh. p.56 a, at the top) in a description of the future time of universal peace.Zech. iv.7 is generally applied to the Messiah, expressly in the Targum, and also in several of the Midrashim. Thus, as regards both clauses of it, in Tanchuma (Par. Toledoth 14, ed. Warsh. p.37 b and 38 a).Verse 10 is Messianically explained in Tanchuma (u. s.).Zech. vi.12 is universally admitted to be Messianic. So in the Targum, the Jerusalem Talmud (Ber.5 a), in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.48, and in the Midrashim.Zech. vii.13 is one of the three passages supposed to mark the near advent of Messiah. See our remarks on Jer. v.19.Zech. viii.12 is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R.12. See our remarks on Gen. ii.4.Zech. viii.23 is one of the predictions expected to be fulfilled in Messianic days, it being however noted

that it refers to instruction in the Law in that remarkable passage on Is. lx.1 in Yalkut ii. p.56 d, to which we have already referred.In Zech. ix.1 the name Chadrakh' is mystically separated into Chad,' sharp, and rakh,' gentle, the Messiah being the one to the Gentiles and the other to the Jews (Siphré on Deut. p.65 a, Yalkut i. p.258 b). Verse 9. The Messianic application of this verse in all its parts has already repeatedly been indicated. We may here add that there are many traditions about this ass on which the Messiah is to ride; and so firm was the belief in it, that, according to the Talmud, if anyone saw an ass in his dreams, he will see salvation' (Ber.56 b). The verse is also Messianically quoted in Sanh.98 a, in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.31, and in several of the Midrashim.On verse 10 see our remarks on Deut. xx.10.Zech. x.4 is Messianically applied in the Targum.Zech. xi.12 is Messianically explained in Ber. R.98, but with this remark, that the 30 pieces of silver apply to 30 percepts, which the Messiah is to give to Israel.Zech. xii.10 is applied to the Messiah the Son of Joseph in the Talmud (Sukk.52 a), and so is verse 12, there being, however, a difference of opinion whetherthe mouring is caused by the death of the Messiah the Son of Joseph, or else on account of the evil concupiscence (Yetser haRa).Zech. xiv.2 will be readily understood to have been applied to the wars of Messianic times, and this in many passages of the Midrashim, as, indeed, are verses 3, 4, 5, and 6.Verse 7. The following interesting remark occurs in Yalkut on Ps. cxxxix.16, 17 (vol. ii. p.129 d) on the words none of them.' This world is to last 6,000 years; 2,000 years it was waste and desolate, 2,000 years mark the period under the Law, 2,000 years that under the Messiah. And because our sins are increased,they are prolonged. As they are prolonged, and as we make one year in seven a Sabbatic year, so will God in the latter days make one day a Sabbatic year, which day is 1,000 years - to which applies the verse in Zechariah just quoted. See also Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.28.Verse 8 is Messianically applied in Ber. R.48. See our remarks on Gen. xviii 4, 5.Verse 9 is, of course, applied to Messianic times, as in Yalkut i. p.76 c, 266 a, and vol. ii. p.33 c, Midr. on Cant. ii.13, and in other passages.Malachi iii.1 is applied to Elijah as forerunner of the Messiah in Pirqé de R.Eliez. c.29.Verse 4. In Bemidbar R.17, a little before the close (ed. Warsh. p.69 a), this verse seems to be applied to acceptable sacrifices in Messianic days.On verse 16 Vayyikra R.34 (ed. Warsh. p.51 b, line 4 from the bottom) has the following curious remark: If any one in former times did the Commandment, the prophets wrote it down. But now when a man observes the Commandment, who writes it down? Elijah and the King Messiah and the Holy One, blessed be His Name, seal it at their hands, and a memorial book is written, as it is written Mal. iii.16.The promise in verse 17 is extended to Messianic days in Shemoth R.18.On Mal. iv.1 (in Hebrew iii.19) the following curious comment occurs in Bereshith R.6 (p.14 b, lines 15 &c. from the bottom): The globe of the sun is encased, as it is said, He maketh a tabernacle for the sun (Ps. xix.). And a pool of water is before it. When the sun comes out, God cools its heat in the water lest it should burn up the world. But in the latter days the Holy One takes it out of its sheath, and with it burns up the wicked, as it is written Mal. iv.1.'Verse 2 (iii.20 in Hebrew) is in Shemoth R.31 quoted in connection with Ex. xxii.26, and explained till the Messiah comes.'Verse 5 is, of course, applied to the forerunner of the Messiah. So in many places, as in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.40; Debarm R.3; in the Midrash on Cant. i.1; in the Talmud, and in Yalkut repeatedly. [6434]To the above passages we add some from the Apocryphal Books, partly as indicating the views concerning the Messiah which the Jews had derived from the Old Testament, and partly because of their agreement with Jewish traditionalism as already expounded by us. These passages must therefore be judged in connection with the Rabbinical ideas of the Messiah and of Messianic days. It is in this sense that we read, for example, the

address to Jerusalem, Tobit xiii.9 to the end. Comp. here, for example, our quotations on Amos ix.11.Similarly Tobit xiv.5-7 may be compared with our quotations on Ps. xc, Is. lx.3, and especially on Zech. viii.23, also on Gen. xlix.11.Wisdom of Solomon iii.7, 8 may be compared with our remarks on Is. lxi.1.Ecclus. xliv.21 &c. and xlvii.11 may be compared with our quotations on Ps. lxxxix.22-25; Ps. cxxxii.18; Ezek. xxix.21.Ecclus. xlviii.10, 11. See the comments on Is. lii.7, also our references on Mal. iii.1; Mal. iv.5; Deut. xxv.19 and xxx.4; Lam. ii.22. In Sotah ix.15 Elijah is represented as raising the dead.Baruch ii.34, 35; iv.29 &c.; and ch. v. are so thoroughly in accordance with Rabbinic, and, indeed, with Scriptual views, that it is almost impossible to enumerate special references.The same may be said of 1 Macc. ii.57; while such passages as iv.46 and xiv.41 point forward to the ministry of Elijah as resolving doubts, as this is frequently described in the Talmud (Shekalim ii.5; Men.45 a, Pes.13 a; and in other places).Lastly, 2 Macc. ii.18 is fully enlarged on in the Rabbinic descriptions of the gathering of Israel. Perhaps it may be as well here to add the Messianic discussion in the Talmud, to which such frequent reference has been made (Sanhedrin, beginning at the two last lines of p.96 b, and ending at p.99 a). The first question is that asked by one Rabbi of the other, whether he knew when the Son of the Fallen would come? Upon which follows an explanation of that designation, based on Amos ix.11, after which it is added that it would be a generation in which the disciples of the sages would be diminished, and the rest of men consume their eyes for sorrow, and terrible sorrows so follow each other, that one had not ceased before the other began. Then a description is given of what was to happen during the hebdomad when the Son of David would come. In the first year it would be according to Amos iv.7; in the second year there would be darts of famine; in the third year great famine and terrible mortality, in consequence of which the Law would be forgotten by those who studied it. In the fourth year there would be abundance, and yet no abundance; in the fifth year great abundance and great joy, and return to the study of the Law; in the sixth year voices (announcements); in the seventh wars, and at the end of the seventh the Son of David would come. Then follows some discussion about the order of the sixth and seventh year, when Ps. lxxxix.51 is referred to. Next we have a description of the general state during those days. Sacred places (Academies) would be used for the vilest purposes, Galilee be desolated, Gablan laid waste, and the men of Gebul wander from city to city, and not find mercy. And the wisdom of the scribes would be corrupted, and they who fear sin be abhorred, and the face of that generation would be like that of a dog, and truth should fail, according to Is. lix.15. (Here a side issue is raised.) The Talmud then continues in much the same terms to describe the Messianic age as one, in which children would rebel against their parents, and as one of general lawlessness, when Sadduceeism should universally prevail, apostasy increase, study of the Law decrease; and, generally, universal poverty and despair of redemption prevail, the growing disregard of the Law being pointed out as specially characterising the last days. R. Kattina said: The world is to last 6,000 years, and during one millennium it is to lie desolate, according to Is. ii.17. R. Abayi held that this state would last 2,000 years, according to Hosea vi.2. The opinion of R. Kattian was however, regarded as supported by this, that in each period of seven there is a Sabbatic year, the day here = 1,000 years of desolateness and rest - the appeal being to Is. ii.17; Ps. xcii.1, and xc.4. According to another tradition the world was to last 6,000 years: 2,000 in a state of chaos, 2,000 under the Law, and 2,000 being the Messianic age. But on account of Israel's sins those years were to be deducted which had already passed. On the authority of Elijah it was stated that the world would not last less than eighty-five jubilees, and that in the last jubilee the Son of David

would come. When Elijah was asked whether at the beginning or at the end of it, he replied that he did not know. Being further asked whether the whole of that period would first elapse or not, he similarly replied, his meaning being supposed to be that until that term people were not to hope for the Advent of Messiah, but after that term they were to look for it. A story is related of a man being met who had in his hands a writing in square Hebrew characters, and in Hebrew, which he professed to have got from the Persian archives, and in which it was written that after 4,290 years from the Creation the world would come to an end. And then would be the wars of the great sea-monsters, and those of Gog and Magog, and the rest of the time would be the time of the Messiah, and that the Holy One, blessed be His Name, would only renew His world after the 7,000 years; to which, however, one Rabbi objects, making it 5,000 years. Rabbi Nathan speaks of Habakkuk ii.3 as a passage so deep as to go down to the abyss, reproving the opinion of the Rabbis who sought out the meaning of Daniel vii.25, and of Rabbi Samlai, who similarly busied himself with Ps. lxxx.5, and of Rabbi Akiba, who dwelt upon Haggai ii.6. But the first kingdom (Babylonian?) was to last seventy years; the second (Asmonæan?) fifty-two years; and the rule of the son of Kozebhah (Bar Kakhabh, the false Messiah) two and a half years. According to Rabbi Samuel, speaking in the name of Rabbi Jonathan: Let the bones of those be broken who calculate the end, because they say, The end has come, and the Messiah has not come, therefore He will not come at all. But still expect Him, as it is said (Hab. ii.3), Though it tarry,wait for it.' Perhaps thou wilt say: We wait for Him, but He does not wait for it. On this point read Is. xxx.18. But if so, what hinders it? The quality of judgment. But in that case, why should we wait? In order to receive the reward, according to the last clause of Is. xxx.18. On which follows a further discussion. Again, Rabh maintains that all the limits of time as regards the Messiah are past, and that it now only depends on repentance and good works when He shall come. To this Rabbi Samuel objected, but Rabh's view was supported by Rabbi Eliezer, who said that if Israel repented they would be redeemed, but if not they would not be redeemed. To which Rabbi Joshua added, that in the latter case God would raise over them a King whose decrees would be hard like those of Haman, when Israel would repent. The opinion of Rabbi Eliezer was further supported by Jer. iii.22, to which Rabbi Joshua objected by quoting Is. lii.3, which seemed to imply that Israel's redemption was not dependent on their repentance and good works. On this Rabbi Joshua retorted by quoting Mal. iii.7, to which again Rabbi Joshua replied by by quoting Jer. iii.14, and Rabbi Eleizer by quoting Is. xxx.15. To this Rabbi Joshua replied from Is. xlix.7. Rabbi Eliezer then urged Jer. iv.1, upon which Rabbi Joshua retorted from Dan. xii.7, and so effectually silenced Rabbi Eliezer. On this Rabbi Abba propounded that there was not a clearer mark of the Messianic term than that in Is. xxxvi.8. To which Rabbi Eliezer added Zech. viii.10. On this the question is raised as to the meaning of the words neither was there any peace to him that went out or came in.' To this Rabh gave answer that it applied to the disciples of the sages, according to Ps. cxix.165. On which Rabbi Samuel replied that at that time all the entrances would be equal (i.e. that all should be on the same footing of danger). Rabbi Chanina remarked that the Son of David would not come till after fish had been sought for for the sick and not found, according to Ezek. xxxii.14 in connection with Ezek. xxix.21. Rabbi Chamma, the son of Rabbi Chaina, said that the Son of David would not come until the vile dominion over Israel had ceased, appealing to Is. xviii.5, 7. R. Seira said that Rabbi Chanina said: The Son of David would not come till the proud had ceased in Israel, according to Zeph. iii.11, 12. Rabbi Samlai, in the name of Rabbi Eliezer the son of Rabbi Simeon, said that the Son of David would not come till all judges and rulers had ceased in Israel, according to Is. i.26. Ula said

Jerusalem is not to be redeemed, except by righteousness, according to Is. i.27. We pass over the remarks of Rabbi Papa, as not adding to the subject. Rabbi Jochanan said: If thou seest a generation that increasingly diminishes, expect Him, according to 2 Sam. xxii.28. He also added: If thou seest a generation upon which many sorrows come like a stream, expect Him, according to Is. lix.19, 20. He also added: The son of David does not come except in a generation where all are either righteous, or all guilty - the former idea being based on Is. lx.21, the latter on Is. lix.16 and xlviii.11. Rabbi Alexander said, that Rabbi Joshua the son of Levi referred to the contradiction in Is. lx.22 between the words in his time' and again I will hasten it,' and explained it thus: If they are worthy, I will hasten it, and if not, in His time. Another similar contradiction between Dan. vii.13 and Zech. ix.9 is thus reconciled: if Israel deserve it, He will come in the clouds of heaven; if they are not deserving, He will come poor, and riding upon an ass. Upon this it is remarked that Sabor the King sneered at Samuel, saying: You say that the Messiah is to come upon an ass: I will send Him my splendid horse. To which the Rabbi replied: Is it of a hundred colours, like His ass? Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, saw Elijah, who stood at the door of Paradise. He said to him: When shall the Messiah come? He replied: When that Lord shall come (meaning God). Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, said: I saw two (himself and Elijah), and I heard the voice of three (besides the former two the Voice of the son of Jochai, and said to him: Shall I attain the world to come? Elijah replied: If it pleaseth the Lord. Upon which follows the same remark: I have seen the Messiah come? To which the answer is: Go and ask Him thyself. And where does He abide? At the gate of the city (Rome). And what is His sign? He abides among the poor, the sick and stricken. And all unbind, and bind up again the wounds at the same time, but He undoes (viz. the bandage) and rebinds each separately, so that if they call for Him they may not find him engaged. [6435] He went to meet Him and said: peace be to Thee, my Rabbi and my Lord. He replied to him: Peace be to thee, thou son of Levi. he said to Him: When wilt Thou come, my Lord? He replied to him: To-day. Then he turned to Elijah, who said to him: What has He said to thee? He said to me: Son of Levi, peace be to thee. Elijah said to him: He has assured thee and thy Father of the world to come. He said to him: But He has deceived me in that He said: I come to-day, and he has not come. He said to him that by the words to-day' He meant: To-day if ye will hear My voice (Ps. xcv.7). Rabbi José was asked by his disciples: When will the Son of David come? To this he replied: I am afraid you will ask me also for a sign. Upon which they assured him they would not. On this he replied: When this gate (viz. of Rome) shall fall, and be built, and again fall, and they shall not have time to rebuild it till the Son of David comes. They said to him: Rabbi, give us a sign. He said to them: Have ye not promised me that ye would not seek a sign? They said to him: Notwithstanding do it. He said to them: If so, the waters from the cave of Pamias (one of the sources of the Jordan) shall be changed into blood. In that moment they were changed into blood. Then the Rabbi goes on to predict that the land would be overrun by enemies, every stable being filled with their horses. Rabh said that the son of David would not come till the kingdom (i.e foreign domination) should extend over Israel for nine months, according to Micah v.3. Ula said: Let Him come, but may I not see Him, and so said Raba. Rabbi Joseph said: Let Him come, and may I be found worthy to stand in the shadow of the dung of His ass (according to some: the tail of his ass). Abayi said to Raba: Why has this been the bearing of your words? If on account of the sorrows of the Messiah, we have the tradition that Rabbi Eliezer was asked by his disciples, what a man should do to be freed from the sorrows of the Messiah; on which they were told: By busying yourselves with the Torah, and with good works. And you are a master of the Torah, and you have good works. He answered: Perhaps sin might lead to occasion

of danger. To this comforting replies are given from Scripture, such as Gen. xxviii.15, and other passages, some of them being subjected to detailed commentation. Rabbi Jochanan expressed a similar dislike of seeing the days of the Messiah, on which Resh Lakish suggested that it might be on the ground of Amos v.19, or rather on that of Jer. xxx.6. Upon this, such fear before God is accounted for by the consideration that what is called service above is not like what is called service below (the family above is not like the family below), so that one kind may outweigh the other. Rabbi Giddel said, that Rabh said, that Israel would rejoice in the years of the Messiah. Rabbi Joseph said: Surely, who else would rejoice in them? Chillak and Billak? (two imaginary names, meaning no one). This, to exclude the words of Rabbi Hillel, who said: There is no Messiah for Israel, seeing they have had Him in the time of Hezikiah. Rabh said: The world was only created for David; Samuel, for Moses; and Rabbi Jochanan, for the Messiah. What is His Name? The school of Rabbi Shila said: Shiloh is His Name, according to Gen. xlix.10. The school of Rabbi Jannai said: Jinnon, according to Ps. lxxii.17. The school of Rabbi Chanina said: Chaninah, according to Jer. xvi.13. And some say Menachem, the son of Hezikah, according to Lam. i.16. And our Rabbis say: The Leprous One of the house of Rabbi, is His Name, as it is written Is liii.4. Rabbi Nachman said: If He is among the living, He is like me, according to Jer. xxx.21. Rabh said: If He is among the living, He is like Rabbi Jehudah the Holy, and if among the dead he is like Daniel, the man greatly beloved. Rabbi Jehudah said, Rabh said: God will raise up to them another David, according to Jer. xxx.9, a passage which evidently points to the future. Rabbi Papa said to Abaji: But we have this other Scripture Ezek. xxxvii.25, and the two terms (Messiah and David) stand related like Augustus and Cæsar. Rabbi Samlai illustrated Amos v.18, by a parable of the cock and the bat which were looking for the light. The cock said to the bat: I look for the light, but of what use is the light to thee? So it happened to a Sadducee who said to Rabbi Abahu: When will the Messiah come? He answered him: When darkness covers this people. He said to him: Dost thou intend to curse me? He replied: It is said in Scripture Is. lx.2. Rabbi Eliezer taught: The days of the Messiah are forty years according to Ps. xcv.10. Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Asariah, said: Seventy years, according to Is. xxiii.15, according to the days of a King,' the King there spoken of being the unique king, the Messiah. Rabbi said: Three generations, according to Ps. lxxii.5. Rabbi Hillel said: Israel shall have no more Messiah, for they had him in the days of Hezekiah. Rabbi Joseph said: May god forgive Rabbi Hillel: when did Hezekiah live? During the first Temple. And Zechariah prophesied during the second Temple, and said Zech. xi.9. We have the tradition that Rabbi Eliezer said: The days of the Messiah are forty years. it is written Deut. viii.3, 4, and again in Ps xc.15 (showing that the days of rejoicing must be like those of affliction in the wilderness). Rabbi Dosa said: Four hundred years quoting Gen. xv.13 in connection with the same Psalm. Rabbi thought it was 365 years, according to the solar year, quoting Is. lxiii.4. He asked the meaning of the words: The day of vengeance is in My heart,' Rabbi Jochanan explained them: I have manifested it to My heart, but not to My members, and Rabbi Simon benLakish: To My heart, and not to the ministering angels. Abimi taught that the days of the Messiah were to last for Israel 7,000 years (a Divine marriage-week), according to Is. lxii.5. Rabbi Jehudah said, that Rabbi Samuel said, that the days of the Messiah were to be as from the day that the world was created until now, according to Deut. xi.21. Rabbi Nacham said: As from the days of Noah till now, according to Is. liv.9. Rabbi Chija said, that Rabbi Jochanan said: All the prophets have only prophesied in regard of the days of the Messiah; but in regard to the world to come, eye has not seen, O God, beside Thee, what He hath prepared for him that waiteth for Him

(Is. lxiv.4). And this is opposed to what Rabbi Samuel said, that there was no differences between this world and the days of the Messiah, except that foreign domination would cease. Upon which the Talmud goes off to discourse upon repentance, and its relation to perfect righteousness.Lengthy as this extract may be, it will at least show the infinite differences between the Rabbinic expectation of the Messiah, and the picture of him presented in the New Testament. Surely the Messianic idea, as realised in Christ, could not have been derived from the views current in those times!

APPENDIX X. ON THE SUPPOSED TEMPLE-SYNAGOGUE.

(Vol. i. Book 11. ch. x.p.246). PUTTING aside, as quite untenable, the idea of a regular Beth ha-Midrash in the Temple (though advocated even by Wünche), we have to inquire whether any historical evidence can be adduced for the existence of a Synagogue within the bounds of the Temple-buildings. The notice (Sot. vii.8) that on every Sabbatic year lection of certain portions was made to the people in the Court,' and that a service was conducted there during public fasts on account of dry weather (Taan. ii.5), can, of course, not be adduced as proving the existence of a regular Temple-Synagogue. On the other hand, it is expressly said in Sanh.88 b, lines 19, 20 from top, that on the Sabbaths and feast-days the members of the Sanhedrin went out upon the Chel of Terrace of the temple, when questions were asked of them and answered. It is quite true that in Tos. Sanh. vii. (p.158, col. d) we have an inaccurate statement about the second of the Temple-Sanhedrin as sitting on the Chel (instead of at the entrance of the Preists' Court, as in Sanh.88 b), and that there the Sabbath and festive discourses are loosely designated as a Beth haMidrash' which was on the Temple-Mount.' [6436] But since exactly the same description - indeed, in the same words - of what took place is given in the Tosephta as in Talmud itself, the former must be corrected by the latter, or rather the term Beth ha-Midrahs' must be taken in the wider and more general sense as the place of Rabbinic exposition,' and not as indicating any permanent Academy. But even if the words in the Tosephta were to be taken in preference to those in the Talmud itself, they contain no mention of any Temple-Synagogue. Equally inappropriate are the other arguments in favor of this supposed Temple-Synagogue. The first of them is derived from a notice in Tos. Sukkah. iv.4, in which R. Joshua explains how, during the first night of the Feast of Tabernacles, the pious never saw sleep' since they went, first to the Morning Sacrifice, thence of the Synagogue, thence the Beth ha-Midrash, thence to the Evening Sacrifice, and thence to the "joy of the house of water drawing"' (the night-feast and services in the Temple-Courts). The only other argument is that from Yoma vii.1,2 where we read that while the bullock and the goat were burned the High-Priest read to the people certain portions of the Law, the roll of which was handed by the Chazzan of the Synagogue (it is not said which Synagogue) to the head of the Synagogue, by him to the Sagan, and by the Sagan to the High-Priest. [6437] How utterly inconclusive inference from these notices are, need not be pointed out. More than this - the existence of a Temple-Synagogue seems entirely incompatible with the remark in Yoma vii.2, that it was impossible for anyone present at the reading of the High-Priest to witness the burning of the bullock and goat - and that, not because the former took place in a regular Temple-Synagogue, but because the way was far and the two services were exactly at the same time.' Such, so far as I know, are all the Talmudical passages from which the existence of a regular Temple-Synagogue has been inferred, and with what reason, the reader may judge for himself. It is indeed easy to understand that Rabbinism and later Judaism should have wished to locate a Synagogue and a Beth ha-Midrash within the sacred precincts of the Temple itself. But it is difficult to account for the circumstance that such Christian scholars as Reland, Carpzov, and Lightfoot should have been content to repeat the statement without subjecting its grounds to personal examination. Vitringa (Synag. p.30) almost grows indignant at the possibility of any doubt - and that, although he himself

quotes passages from Maimonides to the effect that the reading of the Law by the High-Priest on the Day of Atonement took place in the Court of the Women, and hence not in any supposed Synagogue. Yet commentators generally, and writers on the Life of Christ have located the sitting of our Lord among the Doctors in the Temple in this supposed Temple-Synagogue. [6438]

APPENDIX XI. ON THE PROPHECY, IS. XL. 3

(See vol. i. Book II. ch. xi. p.260, Note 2.) ACCORDING to the Synoptic Gospels, the public appearance and preaching of John was the fulfilment of the prediction with which the second part of the prophecies of Isaiah opens, called by the Rabbis, the book of consolations.' After a brief general preface (Is. xl.1, 2), the words occur which are quoted by St. Matthew and St. Mark (Is. xl.3), and more fully by St. Luke (Is. xl.3-5). A more appropriate beginning of the book of consolations' could scarcely be conceived. The quotation of Is. xl.3 is made according to the LXX., the only difference being the change of paths of our God' into His paths.' The divergences between the LXX. and our Hebrew text of Is. xl.4, 5 are somewhat more numerous, but equally unimportant - the main difference from the Hebrew original lying in this, that, instead of rendering all flesh shall see it together,' we have in the LXX. and the New Testament, all flesh shall see the salvation of God.' As it can scarcely be supposed that the LXX. read {hebrew} for {hebrew}, we must regard their rendering as Targumic. Lastly, although according to the accents in the Hebrew Bible we should read, The Voice of one crying: In the wilderness prepare,' &c., yet, as alike the LXX., the Targum, and the synoptists render, The Voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare,' their testimony must be regarded as outweighing the authority of the accents, which are of so much later date. But the main question is, whether Is. xl.3, &c., refers to Messianic times or not. Most modern interpreters regard it as applying to the return of the exiles from Babylon. This is not the place to enter on a critical discussion of the passage; but it may be remarked that the insertion of the word salvation' in v.5 by the LXX. seems to imply that they had viewed it as Messianic. It is, at any rate, certain that the Synopists so understood the rendering of the LXX. But this is not all. The quotation from Is. xl. was regarded by the Evangelists as fulfiled, when John the Baptist announced the coming Kingdom of God. We have proof positive that, on the supposition of the correctness of the announcement made by John, they only took the view of their contemporaries in applying Is. lx.3, &c., to the preaching of the Baptist. The evidence here seems to be indisputable, for the Targum renders the close of v.9 (say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!') by the words: Say to the cities of the House of Judah, the Kingdom of your God shall be manifested.' In fact, according to the Targum, the good tidings' are not brought by Zion nor by Jerusalem, but to Zion and to Jerusalem.

APPENDIX XII. THE BAPTISM OF PROSELYTES

(See vol. i. Book II. ch. xi. p.273.) ONLY those who have made study of it can have any idea how large, and sometimes bewildering, is the literature on the subject of Jewish Proselytes and their Baptism. Our present remarks will be confined to the Baptism of Proselytes. 1. Generally, as regards proselytes (Gerim) we have to distinguish between the Ger ha-Shaar (proselyte of the gate) and Ger Toshabh (sojourner,' settled among Israel), and again the Ger hatstsedeq (proselyte of righteousness) and Ger habberith (proselyte of the covenant). The former are referred to by Josephus (Ant. xiv.7.2), and frequently in the New Testament, in the Authorised Version under the designation of those who fear God,' Acts xiii.16, 26; are religious,' Acts xiii.43; devout,' Acts xiii.50; xvii.4, 17; worship God,' Acts xvi.14; xviii.7. Whether the expression devout' and feared God' in Acts x.2, 7 refers to proselytes of the gates is doubtful. As the proselytes of the gate' only professed their faith in the God of Israel, and merely bound themselves to the observance of the so-called seven Noachic commandments (on which in another place), the question of baptism' need not be discussed in connection with them, since they did not even undergo circumcision. 2. It was otherwise with the proselytes of righteousness,' who became children of the covenant,' perfect Israelites,' Israelites in every respect, both as regarded duties and privileges. All writers are agreed that three things were required for the admission of such proselytes: Circumcision (Milah), Baptism (Tebhilah), and a Sacrifice (Qorban, in the case of women: baptism and sacrifice) - the latter consisting of a burnt-offering of a heifer, or of a pair of turtle doves or of young doves (Maimonides, Hilkh. Iss. Biah xiii.5). After the destruction of the Temple promise had to be made of such a sacrifice when the services of the Sanctuary were restored. On this and the ordinances about circumcision it is not necessary to enter further. That baptism was absolutely necessary to make a proselyte is so frequently stated as not to be disputed (See Maimonides, u. s.; the tractate Massekheth Gerim in Kirchheim's Septem Libri Talm. Parvi, pp.38-44 [which, however, adds little to our knowledge]; Targum on Ex. xii.44; Ber.47 b; Kerith.9 a; Jer. Yebam. p.8 d; Yebam.45 b, 46 a and b, 48 b, 76 a; Ab. Sar.57 a, 59 a, and other passages). There was, indeed a difference between Rabbis Joshua and Eliezer, the former maintaining that baptism alone without circumcision, the latter that circumcision alone without baptism, sufficed to make a proselyte, but the sages decided in favour of the necessity of both rites (Yebam.46 a and b). The baptism was to be performed in the presence of three witnesses, ordinarily Sanhedrists (Yebam.47 b), but in case of necessity others might act. The person to be baptized, having cut his hair and nails, undressed completely, made fresh profession of his faith before what were the fathers of the baptism' (our Godfathers, Kethub.11 a; Erub.15 a), and then immersed completely, so that every part of the body was touched by the water. The rite would, of course, be accompanied by exhortations and benedictions (Maimonides, Hilkh. Milah iii.4; Hilkh. Iss. Biah xiv.6). Baptism was not to be administered at night, nor on a Sabbath or feast-day (Yebam.46 b). Women were attended by those of their own sex, the Rabbis standing at the door outside. Yet unborn children of proselytes did not require to be baptized, because they were born in holiness' (Yebam.78 a). In regard to the little children of preselytes opinions differed. A person under age was indeed received, but not regarded as properly an Isaelite till he had attained majority. Secret baptism, or where only the

mother brought a child, was not acknowledged. In general, the statements of a proselyte about his baptism required attestation by witnesses. But the children of a Jewess or of a proselyte were regarded as Jews, even if the baptism of the father was doubtful. It was indeed a great thing when, in the words of Maimonides, a stranger sought shelter under the wings of the Shekhinah, and the change of condition which he underwent was regarded as complete. The waters of baptism were to him in very truth, though in a far different from the Christian sense, the bath of regeneration' (Titus iii.5). As he stepped out of these waters he was considered as born anew' - in the language of the Rabbis, as if he were a little child just born' (Yeb.22 a; 48 b; 97 b), as a child of one day' (Mass. Ger. c. ii.). But this new birth was not a birth from above' in the sense of moral or spiritual renovation, but only as implying a new relationship to God, to Israel, and to his own past, present, and future. It was expressly enjoined that all the difficulties of his new citizenship should first be set before him, and if, after that, he took upon himself the yoke of the law, he should be told how all those sorrows and persecutions were intended to convey a greater blessing, and all those commandments to redound to greater merit. More especially was he to regard himself as a new man in reference to his past. Country, home, habits, friends, and relation were all changed. The past, with all that had belonged to it, was past, and he was a new man - the old, with its defilements, was buried in the waters of baptism. This was carried outwith such pitiless logic as not only to determine such questions as those of inheritance, but that it was declared that, except, for the sake of not bringing proselytism into contempt, a proselyte might have wedded his own mother or sister (comp. Yeb.22 a; Sanh.58 b). It is a curious circumstances that marriage with a female proselyte was apparently very popular (Horay.13 a, line 5 from bottom; see also Shem. R.27), and the Talmud names at least three celebrated doctors who were the offspring of such unions (comp. Derenbourg, Hist. de la Palest., p.223, note 2). The praises of proselytism are also sung in Vayy. R.1. If anything could have further enhanced the value of such proselytism, it would have been its supposed anitquity. Tradition traced it up to Abraham and Sarah, and the expression (Gen. xii.5) the souls that they had gotten' was explained as referring to their proselytes, since every one that makes a proselyte is as if he made (created) him' (Ber. R.39, comp also the Targums Pseudo-Jon. and Jerus. and Midr. on Cant. i.3). The Talmud, differing in this from the Targumim, finds in Exod. ii.5 a reference to the baptism of Pharoah's daughter (Sotah 12 b, line 3; Megill.13 a, line 11). In Shem. R.27 Jethro is proved to have been a convert, from the circumstances that his original name had been Jether (Exod. iv.18), an additional letter (Jethro). as in the case of Abraham, having been added to his name when became a proselyte (comp. also Zebhach.116 a and Targum Ps.-Jon. on Exod. xviii.6, 27, Numb. xxiv.21. To pass over other instances, we are pointed to Ruth (Targum on Ruth i.10, 15). and to Nebuzaradan, who is also described as a proselyte (Sanh.96 b, line 19 form the bottom). But is is said that in the days of David and Solomon proselytes were not admitted by the Sanhedrin because their motives were suspected (Yeb.76 a), or that at least they were closely, watched. But although the baptism of proselytes seems thus far beyond doubt, Christian theologians have discussed the question, whether the rite was practised at the time of Christ, or only introduced after the destruction of the Temple and its Services, to take the place of the Sacrifice previously offered. The conversy, which owed its origin chiefly to dogmatic prejudices on the part of Lutherans, Calvinists, and Baptists, has since been continued on historical or quasi-historical grounds. The silence of Josephus and Philo can scarcely be quoted in favour of the later origin of the rite. On the other hand, it may be urged that, as Baptism did not take the place of sacrifices in any other instance, it would be difficult

account for the origin of such a rite in connection with the admission of proselytes. Again, if a Jew who had become Levitically defiled, required imersion, it is difficult to suppose that a heathen would have been admittd to all the services of the Sanctuary without a similar purification. But we have also positive testimony (which the objections of Winer, Keil, and Leyrer, in my opinion do not invalidate), that the baptism of proselytes existed in the time of Hillel and Shammai. For, whereas the school of Shammai is said to have allowed a proselyte who was circumcised on the eve of the Passover, to partake after baptism of the Passover, [6439] the school of Hillel forbade it. This controversy must be regarded as providing that at that time (previous to Christ) the baptism of proselytes was customary [6440] (Pes. viii.8, Eduy. v.2). APENDIX XIII JEWISH ANGELOLOGY AND DEMONOLOGY. THE FALL OF THE ANGELS. (See vol. i. Book III. ch. i. p.306.) WITHOUT here entering on a discussion of the doctrine of Angels and devils as presented in Holy Scripture, the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha, it will be admitted that considerable progression may be marked as we advance from even the latest Canonical to Apocryphal, and again from these to the Pseudepigraphic Writings. The same remark applies even more strongly to a comparison of the later with Rabbinic literature. There we have comparitively little of the Bibical in its purity. But, added to it, we now find much that is the outcome of Eastern or of prurient imagination, of national conceit, of ignorant superstition, and of foreign, especailly Persian, elements. In this latter respect it is true - not, indeed, as regards the doctrine of good and evil Angels, but much of its Rabbinic elaboration - that the names of the Angels (and of the months) were brought form Babylon (Jer. Rosh. haSh.56 d; Ber. r.48), and with the names,' not a few of the notions regarding them. At the same time, it would be unjust to deny that mush of the symbolism which it is evidently intended to convey is s singularly beautiful.I. ANGELOLOGY.1. Creation, Number, Duration and Location of the Angels. We are now considering, not the Angel-Princes but that vast unnumbered Host' generally designated as the ministering Angels' ({hebrew}). Opinions differ (Ber. R.3) whether they were created on the second day as being spirit,' winds' (Ps. civ.4), or on the fifth day (Is. vi.2) in accordance with the words of Creation on those days. Viewed in reference to God's Service and Praise, they are a flaming fire:' in regard to their office, winged messengers (Pirqé de R. El.4). But not only so: every day ministering Angels are created, whose apparent destiny is only to raise the praise of God, after which they pass away into the fiery stream (Nahar deNur) whence they originally issued [6441] (Chag.14 a; Ber. R.78). More than this - a new Angel is created to execute to every behest of God, and then passeth away (Chag. u. s.). This continual new creation of Angels, which is partly a beautiful allegory, partly savours of the doctrine of emanation,' is Biblical supported by an appeal to Lament. iii.23. Thus it may be said that daily a Kath, or company, of Angels is created for daily sevice of God, and that every word which proceedeth from His mouth becomes an Angel' [Messenger - mark here the ideal unity of Word and Deed], (Chang.14 a).The vast number of that Angelic Host, and the consequent safety of Israel as against its enemies, was described in the most hyperbolic language. There were 12 Mazzaloth (signs of the Zodiac), each having 30 chiefs of armies, each chief with 30 legions, each legion with 30 leaders, each leader with 30 captains, each captain with 30 under him, and each of these things with 365,000 stars - and all were created for the sake of Israel! (Ber.32. b.) Similarly, when Nebuchadnezzar proposed to ascend into heaven, and to exalt his throne above the stars, and be like the Most High, the Bath Qol replied to this grandson of Nimrod that man's age was 70, or at most 80 years, while the way from earth to the firmament occupied 500 years, [6442] a thickness of the firmament was 500 years, the feet of the living creatures were equal to all that had preceded, and the joints of their

feet to as many as had preceded them,and so on increasingly through all their members up to their horns, after which came the Throne of Glory, the feet of which again equalled all that had preceded, and so on (Chag.13 a [6443]). [6444] In connection with this we read in Chag.12 b that there are seven heavens: the Vdon, in which there is the sun; Riqia, in which the sun shines, and the moon, stars, and planets are fixed; Shechaqim, in which are the millstones to make the manna for the pious; Zebhul, in which the Upper Jerusalem, and the Temple and the Altar, and in which Michael, the chief Angel-Prince, offers sacrifices; Maon, in which the Angels of the Ministry are, who sing by night and are silent by day for the sake of the honour of Israel (who now have their services); Machon, in which are the treasuries of snow, hail, the chambers of noxious dews, and of the receptacles of water, the chamber of wind, and the cave of mist, and their doors are of fire; lastly, Araboth, wherein Justice, Judgment and Righteousness are, the treasures of Life, of Peace and of Blessing, the soul of the righteous, and the spirtis and souls of those who are to be born in the future, and the dew by which the dead are to be raised. There also are the Ophanim, and the Seraphim, and the living creatures and the ministering Angels, and the Throne of Glory and over them is enthroned the Great King. [For a description of this Throne and of the Appearance of its King, see Pirqé de R. Eliez.4.] On the other hand, sometimes every power and phenomeon in Nature is hypostatised into an Angel - such as hail, rain, wind, sea &c.; similarly, every occurence, such as life, death, nourishment, poverty, nay, as it is expressed: there is not stalk of grass upon earth but it has its Angels in heaven (Ber R.10). This seems to approximate the views of Alexandrian Mysticism. So also, prehaps, the idea that certain Bibical heroes became after death Angels. But as this may be regarded as implying their service as messengers of God. we leave it for the present. 2. The Angel-Princes, their location, names, and offices. Any limitation, as toduration or otherwise, of the Ministering Angels does not apply either to the Ophanim (or wheel-angels), the Seraphim, the Cayoth (or living creatures), nor to the Angel-Princes (Ber. R.78). [6445] In Chag.13 a, b the name Chashamal is given to the living creatures.' The word is explained as composed of two others which mean silence and speech - it being beautifully explained, that they keep silence when the Word proceeds out of the mouth of God, and speak when He has ceased. It would be difficult exactly to state the number of the Angel-Princes. The 70 nations, of which the world is composed, had each their Angel-Prince (Targ. Jer. on Gen xi.7, 8; comp. Ber. R.56; Shem. R.21; Vayyi. R.29; Ruth R. ed. Warsh. p.36 b), who plead their cause with God. Hence these Angels are really hostile to Israel, and may be regarded as not quite good Angels, and are cast down when the nationality which they represent is destroyed. It may have been as a reflection on Christian teaching that Israel was described as not requiring any representative with God, like the Gentiles. For, as will soon appear, this was not the general view entertained. Besides these Gentile Angel-Princes there were other chiefs, whose office will be explained in the sequel. Of these 5 are specially mentioned, of whom four surrounded the Throne of God: Michael, Gabriel, Rephael,and Uriel. But the greatest of all is Metatron, who is under the Throne, and before it. These Angels are privileged to be within the Pargod, or cloudy veil, while the others only hear the Divine commands or councels outside this curtain (Chag.16 a, Pirqé d. R. El. iv.). It is a slight variation when the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Deut. xxxiv.6 enumerates the following as the 6 principal Angels: Michael, Gabriel, Metatron, Yopheil, Uriel, and Yophyophyah. The Book of Enoch (ch. xx.) speaks also of 6 principal Angels, while Pirqé d. R. Eliez. iv. mentions seven. In that very curious passage (Berakhoth 51 a) we read of three directions given by Suriel, Prince of the Face, to preserve the Rabbis from the Techaspith (company of Evil Angels), or

according to others, form Istalganith (another company of Evil Angels). In Chag.13 b we read of an Angel called Sandalpon, who stands upon the earth, while his head reaches 500 years' way beyond the living creatures. He is supposed to stand behind the Merkabah (the throne-charriot), and make crowns for the Creator, which rise of their own accord. We also read of Sagsagel, who taught Moses the sacred Name of God, and was present at his death. But, confining ourselves to the five pricipal Angel-chiefs, we have,a. Metaron, [6446] who appears most closely to correspond to the Angel of the Face, or the Logos. He is the representative of God. In the Talmud (Sanh.38 b) a Christian is introduced as clumsily starting a controvesy on this point, that, according to the Jewish contention, Exod. xxiv.1 should have read, Come up to Me.' On this R. Idith explained that the expression referred to the Metatron (Exod. xxxiii.21), but denied the inference that Metatron was either to be adored, or had power to forgive sins, or that he was to be regarded as a Mediator. In continuation of this conversy we are told (Chang.15 a, b) that, when an apostate Rabbi had seen Metatron sitting in heaven, and would have interferred from it that there were two supreme powers, Metatron received from another Angel 60 fiery stripes so as to prove his inferiority! In Targ. Ps.-Jon. on Gen. v.24 he is called the Great Scribe, and also the Prince of this world. He is also designated as the Youth,' and in the Kabbalah as the Little God,' who had 7 names like the Almighty, and shared His Majesty. he is also called the Prince of the Face,' and described as the Angel who sits in the innermost chamber (Chag.5 b), while the other Angels hear their commands outside the Veil (Chag.16 a). He is represented as showing the unseen to Moses (Siphré, p.141 a), and as instructing infants who have died without receiving knowledge (Abhod. Zar.3 b). In the Introduction to the Midrash on Lamentations there is a revolting story in which Metatron is represented as proposing to shed tears in order that God might not have to weep over the destruction of Jerusalem, to which, however, the Almighty is made to refuse His assent. We hestitate to quote further from the passage. In Siphré on Deut. (ed. Freidm. p.141 a) Metatron is said to have shown Moses the whole of Palestine. He is also said to have gone before Israel in the Wilderness.b. Michael (who is like God?'), or the Great Prince (Chag.12 b). He stands at the right hand of the throne of God. According to Targ. Ps.-Jon. on Exod. xxiv.1, he is the Prince of Wisdom. According to the Targum on Ps. cxxxvii.7, 8, the Prince of Jerusalem, the representative of Israel. According to Sebach.62 a he offers upon the heavenly Altar; according to some, the soul of the pious; according to others, lambs of fire. But, although Michael is the Prince of Israel, he is not to be invoked by them (Jer. Ber. ix.13 a). In Yoma 77 a we have an instance of his inefectual advocacy for Israel before the destruction of Jerusalem. The origin of his name as connected with the Song of Moses at the Red Sea is explained in Bemidb. R.2. Many instances of his activity are related. Thus, he delivered Abraham from the fiery oven of Nimrod, and afterwards, also, the Three Children out of the fiery furnace. He was the principal or middle Angel of the three who came to announce to Abraham the birth of Isaac, Gabriel being at his right, and Rephael at his left. Michael also saved Lot. Michael and Gabriel wrote down that the primogeniture belonged to Jacob, and God comfirmed it. Michael and Gabriel acted as friends of the bridegroom' in the nuptials of Adam. Yet they could not bear to look upon the glory of Moses. Michael is also supposed to have been the Angel in the bush (according to others, Gabriel). At the death of Moses, Michael prepared his bier, Gabriel spread a cloth over the head of Moses, and Sagsagel over his feet. In the world to come Micheal would pronounce the blessing over the fruits of Eden, then hand them to Gabriel, who would give them to the patriarchs, and so on to David. The superiority of Michael over Gabriel is asserted in Ber.4 b, where, by an ingenious combination with

Dan. x.13, it is shown that Is. vi.6 applies to him (both having the word {hebrew}, one). It is added that Michael flies in one fight, Gabriel in two, Elijah in four, and the Angel of Death in eight flights (no doubt to give time for repentance). c. Gabriel (the Hero of God') represents rather judgment, while Michael represents mercy. Thus he destroyed Sodom (Bab. Mez.86 b, and other places). He restored to Tamar the pledges of Judah, which Sammael had taken away (Sot.10 b). He struck the servants of the Egyptian princess, who would have kept their mistress from taking Moses out of the water (Sot.12 b); also Moses, that he might cry and so awaken pity. According to some, it was he who delivered the Three Children; but all are agreed that he killed the men that were standing outside the furnace. He also smote the army of Sennacherib. The passage in Ezek. x.2, 7 was applied to Gabriel, who had received from the Cherub two coals, which, however, he retained for six years, in the hope that Israel might repent. [6447] He is supposed to be referred to in Ezek. ix.4 as affixing the mark on the forehead which is a {hebrew}, drawn, in the wicked, in blood (Shabb.55 a). We are also told that he had instructed Moses about making the Candlestick, on which occasion he had put on an apron, like a goldsmith; and that he had disputed with Michael about the meaning of a word. To his activity the bringing of fruits to maturity is ascribed - perhaps because he was regarded as made of fire, while Michael was made of snow (Deb. R.5). These Angels are supposed to stand beside each other, without the fire of the one injuring the snow of the other. The curious legend is connected with him (Shabb.56 b, Sanh.21 b), that, when Solomon maried the daughter of Pharaoh, Gabriel descended into the sea, and fixed a reed in it, around which a mudbank gathered, on which a forest sprang up. On this site imperal Rome was built. The meaning of the legend - or perhaps rather allegory - seems (as explained in other parts of this book) that, when Israel began to decline from God, the punishment through its enemies was prepared, which culminated in the dominion of Rome. In the future age Gabriel would hunt and slay Leviathan. This also may be a parabolic representation of the destruction of Israel's enemies.d. Of Uriel (God is my light') and Rephael (God heals') it need only be said, that the one stands at the left side of the Throne of glory, the other behind it. [6448]3. The Ministering Angels and their Ministry. The ministry of the Angels may be divided into two parts, that of praising God, and that of executing His behests. In regard to the former, there are 684,000 myriads who daily praise the Name of God. From sunrise to sundown they say: Holy, holy, holy, and from sundown to sunrise: Blessed be the Glory of God from its place. In connection with this we may mention the beautiful allegory (Shem. R.21) that the Angel of prayer weaves crowns for God out of the prayer of Israel. As to the execution of the Divine commands by the Angels, it is suggested (Aboth d. R. Nathan 8) that their general designation as ministering Angels might have led to jealousy among them. Accordingly, their names were always a composition of that of God with the special commission entrused to them (Shem. r.29), so that the name of each Angel depended in Yalkut (vol. ii. Par.797), where we are told that each Angel has a tablet on his heart, in which the Name of God and that of the Angel is combined. This change of names explained the answer of the Angel to Manoah (Bemidb. R.10). It is impossible to enumerate all the instances of Angelic activity recorded in Talmudic writings. Angels had performed the music at the first sacrifice of Adam; they had announced the consequences of his punishment; they had cut off the hands and feet of the serpent; they had appeared to Abraham in the form of a baker, a sailor, and an Arab.120,000 of them had danced before Jacob when he left Laban; 4,000 myriads of them were ready to fight for him against Esau; 22,000 of them descended on Sinai and stood beside Israel when, in their terror at the Voice of God, they fled for twelve miles. Angels were directed to close the gates of heaven

when the prayer of Moses with the All-powerful, Ineffable Name in it, which he had learn from Sagsagel, would have prevented his death. Finally, as they were pledged to help Israel, so would they also punish every apostate Israelite. Especially would they execute that most terrible punishment of throwing souls to each other from one world to another. By the side of these debasing superstitions we come upon beautiful allegories, such as that a good and an evil Angel always accompanied man, but especially on the eve of the Sabbath when he returned from the Synagouge, and that for every precept he observed God sent him a protecting Angel. This is realistically developed in Pirké d. R. El.15, where the various modes and time which the good Angels keep man from destruction are set forth.It is quite in accordance with what we know of the system of Rabbinsim, that the heavenly host should be represented as forming a sort of consultative Sanhedrin. Since God never did anything without first taking counsel with the family above (Sanh.38 b), [6449] it had been so when He resolved to create man. Afterward the Angels had interceded for Adam, and, when God pointed to his disobedience, they had urged that thus death would also come upon Moses and Aaron, who were sinless, since one fate must come to the just and the unjust. Similarly, they had interceded for Isaac, when Abraham was about to offer him and finally dropped three tears on the sacrificial knife, by which its edge became blunted. And so through the rest of Israel's history, where on all critical occasions Jewish legend introduces the Angels on the scene. 4. Limitation of the power of the Angels. According to Jewish ideas, the faculties, the powers, and even the knowledge of Angels were limited. They are, indeed, pure spiritual beings (Vayyikra R.24), without sensuous requirements (Yoma 75 b), without hatred, envy, or jealousy (Chag.14), and without sin (Pirqé d. R. El.46). They know much, notably the future (Ab. d. R. Nath.37), and have part in the Divine Light. They live on the beams of the Divine Glory (Bem. R.21), are not subject to our limitatious as to movement, see but are not seen (A b. d. R. Nath. u. s.), can turn their face to any side (Ab. d. R. Nath.37), and only appear to share in our ways, such as in eating (Bar. R.48). Still, in many respects they are inferior to Israel, and had been employed in ministry (Ber. R.75). They were unable to give names to the animals, which Adam did (Priqé d. R. El.13). Jacob had wrestled with the Angel and prevailed over him when the Angel wept (Chull.92 a). Thus it was rather their nature than their powers or dignity which distinguished them from man. No angel could do two messaages at the same time (Ber. R.50). In general they are merely instruments blindly to do a certain work, not even beholding the Throne of Glory (Bemidb. R.14), but needed mutual assistance (Vayyikia R.31). They are also liable to punishments (Chag.16 a). Thus, they were banished from their station for 138 years, because they had told Lot that God would destroy Sodom, while the Angel-Princes of the Gentiles were kept in chains till the days of Jeremiah. As regards their limited knowledge, with the exception of Gabriel, they do not understand Chaldee or Syriac (Sot.33 a). The realistic application of their supposed ignorance on this score need not here be repeated (see Shabb.12 b). As the Angels are inferior to the righteous, it follows that they are so to Israel. God had informed the Angels that the creation of man was superior to theirs, and it had excited their envy. Adam attained a place much nearer to God than they, and God loved Israel more than the Angels. And God had left all the ministerng Angels in order to come to Moses, and when He communicated with him it was directly, and the Angels standing between them did not hear what passed. In connection with this ministry of the Angels on behalf of Biblical heroes a curious legend may here find its place. From a combination of Ex. xviii.4 with Ex. ii.15 the strange inference was made that Moses had actually been seized by Pharaoh. Two different accounts of how he escaped from his power are given. According to the one, the

sword with which he was to be executed rebounded from the neck of Moses, and was broken, to which Cant. vii.5 was supposed to refer, it being added that the rebound killed the would-be executioner. According to another account, an Angel took the place of Moses, and thus enabled him to fly, his flight being facilitated by the circumstances that all the attendants of the king were miraculously rendered either dumb, deaf, or blind, so that they could not execute the behest of their master. Of this miraculous interposition Moses is supposed to have been reminded in Ex. iv.11, for his encouragement in undertaking his mission to Pharaoh. In the exaggeration of Jewish boastfulness in the Law, it was said that the Angels had wished to receive the Law, but that they had not been granted this privilege (Job xxviii.21). And sixty myriads of Angels had crowned with two crowns every Israelite who at Mount Sinai had taken upon himself the Law (Shabb.88 a). In view of all this we need scarcely mention the Rabbinic prohibition to address to the Angels prayers, even although they bore them to heaven (Jer. Ber. ix.1), or to make pictorial representations of them (Targ. Ps-Jon. on Ex. xx.23; Mechilta on the passage, ed. Weiss, p.80 a).5. The Angels are not absolutely good. Strange as it may seem, this is really the view expressed by the Rabbis. Thus it is said that, when God consulted the Angels, they opposed the creation of man, and that, for this reason, God had concealed from them that man would sin. But more than this - the Angels had actually conspired for the fall of man (the whole of this is also related in Pirqé d. R. El.13). Nor had their jealous and envy been confined to that occasion. They had accused Abraham, that, when he gave a great feast at the weanng of Issac, he did not even offer to God a bullock or a goat. Similarly, they had laid charges against Ishmael, in the hope that he might be left to perish of thirst. They had expostulated with Jacob, because he went to sleep at Bethel. But especially had they, from envy, opposed Moses' ascension into heaven; they had objected to his being allowed to write down the Law, falsely urging that Moses would claim the glory of it for himself, and they are represented, in a strangely blasphemous manner, as having been with difficulty appeased by God. In Shabb.88 b we have an account of how Mosses pacified the Angels, by showing that the Law was not suitable for them, since they were not subjeect to sinful desires, upon which they became the friends of Moses, and each taught him some secret, among others the Angel of death how to arrest the pestilence. Again, it is said, that the Angels were wont to bring charges against Israel, and that, when Manasseh wished to repent, the Angels shut the entrance to heaven , so that his prayer might not penetrate into the presence of God. Equally profane, though in another direction, is the notion that Angels might be employed for magical purposes. This had happened at the siege of Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar, when, after the death of that mighty hero Abika, the son of Gaphteri, Chananeel, the uncle of Jeremiah, had conjured up ministering Angels, who affrighted the Chaldees into flight. On this God had changed their names, when Chananee, unable any longer to command their services, had summoned up the Prince of the World by using the Ineffable Name, and lifted Jerusalem into the air, but God had trodden it down again, to all which Lam. ii.1 referred (Yalk. vol. ii. p.166 c and d, Par.1001). The same story is repeated in another place (p.167, last line of col. c, and col. d), with the addition that the leading inhabitants of Jerusalem had proposed to defend the city by conjuring up the Angels of Water and Fire, and surrounding their city with walls of water, of fire, or of iron; but their hopes were disappointed when God assigned to the Angel names different from those which they had previously possessed, so that when called upon they were unable to do what was expected of them.6. The Names of the Angels. Besides those already enumerated, we may here mention, [6450] the Sar ha-Olam, or Prince of the World' (Yeb.16 b); the Prince of the Sea, whose

name is supposed to have been Rahab, and whom God destroyed because he had refused to receive the waters which had covered the world, and the smell of whose dead body would kill every one if it were not covered by water. Dumah is the Angel of the realm of the dead (Ber.18 b). When the soul of the righteous leaves the body, the ministering Angels announce it before God, Who deputes them to meet it. Three hosts of Angels then proceed on this errand, each quoting successively one clause of Is. lvii.2. On the other hand, when the wicked leave the body, they are met by three hosts of destroying Angels, one of which repeats Is. xlviii.22, another Is.1.11, and the third Ezek. xxxii.19 (Keth.104 a). Then the souls of all the dead, good or bad, are handed over to Dunah. Yorqemi is the Prince of hail. He had proposed to cool the fiery furnace into which the Three Children were cast, but Gabriel had objected that this might seem a deliverance by natural means, and being himself the Prince of the fire, had proposed, instead of this, to make the furnace cold within and hot without, in order both to deliver the Three Children and to destroy those who watched outside (Pes.118 a and b) [6451] Ridya, or Rayda is the Angel of rain. One of the Rabbis professed to describe him from actual vision as like a calf whose lips were open, standing between the Upper and the Lower Deep, and saying to the Upper Deep, Let your waters run down, and to the Lower, Let your waters spring up. The representation of this Angel as a calf may be due to the connection between rain and ploughing, and in connection with this may it be noticed that Ryda means both a plough and ploughing (Taan.25 b). Of other Angels we will only name the Ruach Pisqonith, or Spirit of decision, who is supposed to have made most daring objection to what God had said, Ezek. xvi.3, in which he is defended by the Rabbis, since his activity had been on behalf of Israel (Sanh.44 b); Naqid, the Angel of Food; Nabhel, the Angel of Poverty; the two Angels of Healing; the Angel of Dreams, Lailah; and even the Angel of Lust. [6452]It is, of course, not asserted that all these grossly materialistic superstitious and profane views were entertained in Palestine, or at the time of our Lord, still less that they are shared by educated Jews in the West. But they certainly date from Talmudic times; they embody the only teaching of Rabbic writings about the Angels which we possess, and hence, whencesoever introduced, or however developed, their roots must be traced back to far earlier times than those when they were propounded in Rabbic Academies. All the more that modern Judaism would indignantly repudiate them, do they bear testimony against Rabbic teaching. And one thing at least must be evident, for the sake of which we have undertaken the task of recording at such length views and statements repugnant to all reverent feeling. The contention of certain modern writers that the teaching about Angels in the New Testament is derived from, and represents Jewish notions must be preceived to be absolutely groundless and contrary to fact. In truth, the teaching of the New Testament on the subject of Angels represents, as compared with that of the Rabbis, not only a return to the purity of Old Testament teaching, but, we might almost say, a new revelation.II. SATANOLOGY AND FALL OF THE ANGELS.The difference between the Santanology of the Rabbis and of the New Testament is, if possible, even more marked than that in their Angelology. In general we note that, with the exception of the word Satan, none of the names given to the great enemy in the New Testament occurs in Rabbinic writing. More important still, the latter contain no mention of a Kingdom of Satan. In other words, the power of the evil is not contrasted with that of good, nor Satan with God. The devil is presented rather as the enemy of man, than of God and of good. This marks a fundamental difference. The New Testament sets before us two opposing kingdoms, or principles, which excerise absolute sway over man. Christ is the Stronger one' who overcometh the strong man armed,' and taken from him not only his spoils, but his armour (St. Luke xi.21, 22).

It is a moral contest in which Satan is vanquished, and the liberation of his subjects is the consequence of his own subdual. This implies the deliverance of man from the power of the enemy, not only externally but internally, and substitution of a new principle of spiritual life for the old one. It introduces a moral element, both as the ground and as the result of the contest. From this point of view the difference between the New Testament and Rabbinism cannot be too much emphasised, and it is no exaggeration to say that this alone - the question here being one of principle not of details - would mark the doctrine of Christ as fundamentally divergent from, and incomparably superior to, that of Rabbinsim. Whence hath this Man this wisdom?'Assuredly, it may be answered, not from His contemporaries. Since Rabbinism viewed the great enemy' only as the envious and malicious opponent of man, the spiritual element was entirely eliminated. [6453] Instead of the personified principle of Evil, to which there is response in us, and of which all have some experience, we have only a clumsy and - to speak plainly - often a stupid hater. This holds equally true in regard to the threefold aspect under which Rabbinism presents the devil: as Satan (also called Sammael); as the Yetser haRa, or evil impluse personified; and as the Angel of Death - in other words, as the Accuser, Tempter, and Punisher. Before explaining the Rabbinic views on each of these points, it is necessary to indicate them in regard to -1. The Fall of Satan and of his Angels. This took place, not antecedently, but subsequently to the creation of man. As related in Pirqé de R. Eliezer, ch 13, the primary cause of it was jealously and envy on the part of the Angels. [6454] Their opposition to man's creation is also described in Ber. R.8, although there the fall of man is not traced to Satanic agency. But we have (as before stated) a somewhat blasphemous account of the discussions in the heavenly Sanhedrin, whether or not man should be created. While the dispute was still proceeding God actually created man, and addressed the ministering Angels: Why dispute any longer? Man is already created.' In the Pirqé de R. Eliezer, we are only told that the Angels had in vain attempted to oppose the creation of man. The circumstance that his superiority was evidenced by his ability to give names to all creatures, induced them to lay a plot against Adam,' so that by his fall they might obtain supermacy. Now of all Angel-Princes in heaven Sammael was the first - distinguished above. Taking the company of Angels subject to him, he came down upon earth, and selected as the only fit instrument for his designs the serpent, which at that time had not only speech, but hands and feet, and was in stature and appearance like the camel. In the language of the Pirqé de R. Eliezer, Sammael took complete possession of the serpent, even as demoniacs act under the absolute control of evil spirits. Then Sammael, in the serpent, first deceived the woman, and next imposed on her by touching the tree of life (although the tree cried out), saying, that he had actually touched' the tree, of which he pretended the touch had been forbidden on pain of death (Gen. iii.3) [6455] - and yet he had not died! Upon this Eve followed his example, and touched the tree when she immediately saw the Angel of Death coming against her. Afraid that she would die and God give another wife to Adam, she led her husband into sin of disobedience. The story of the Fall is somewhat differently related in Ber. R.18, 19. No mention is there earlier of Sammael or of his agency, and the serpent is represented as beguiling Eve from a wish to marry her, and for that purpose to compass the death of Adam.Critical ingenuity may attempt to find a symbolic meaning in many of the details of the Jewish legend of the Fall, although, to use moderate language, they seem equally profane and repulsive. But this will surely be admitted by all, that the Rabbinic account of the fall of the Angels, as connected with fall of man, equally contrasts with the reverent reticence of the Old Testament narrative and the sublime teaching of the New Testament about sin and evil.2. Satan, or Sammael,

as the accuser of man. And clumsy, indeed, are his accusations. Thus the statement (Gen. xxii.1) that God tempted Abraham' is, in Jewish legend, transformed (Sanh.89 b) into a scene, where, in the great upper Sanhedrin (Ber. R.56), Satan brings accusation against the Patriarch. [6456] All his previous piety had been merely interested; and now when, at the age of one hundred, God had given him a son, he had made a great feast and not offered aught to the Almighty. On this God is represented as answering, that Abraham was ready to sacrifice not only an animal but his own son; and this had been the occasion of the temptation of Abraham. That this legend is very ancient, indeed pre-Christian (a circumstance of considerable importance to the student of this history) appears from its occurrence, though in more general form, in the Book of Jubilees, ch. xvii. In Ber.R.55 and in Tacchuma (ed. Warsh p.29 a and b), the legend is connected with a dispute between Isaac and Ishmael as to their respective merits, when former declares himself ready to offer up his life unto God. In Tanchuma (u. s.) we are told that this was one of the great merits of man, to which the Almighty and pointed when the Angels made objection to his creation.3. Satan, or Sammael, as the seducer of man. This statement in Baba B.16 a which identifies Satan with the Yetser haRa, or evil impluse in man, must be regarded are a rationalistic attempt to gloss over the older teaching about Sammael, by representing him as a personification of the evil inclination within us. For, the Talmud not only distinguishes between a personal Satan without, and evil inclination within man, but expressly ascribes to God the creation of the Yetser haRa in man as he was before the Fall, the occurrence of two {hebrew} in the word {hebrew} (and He formed,' Gen. ii.7) being supposed to indicate the existence of two impulses in us - the Yetser Tobh and the Yetser haRa (Ber.61 a). And it is stated that this existence of evil in man's original nature was infinite comfort in the fear which would otherwise beset us in trouble (Ber. R.14). More than this (as will presently be shown), the existence of this evil principle within us was declared to be absolutely necessary for the continuance of the world (Yoma 69 b, Sanh.64 a) Satan, or Sammael, is introduced as the seducer of man in all the great events of Israel's history. With varying legendary additions the story of Satan's attempts to prevent the obedience of Abraham and the sacrifice of Isaac is told in Sanh.89 b, Ber. R.56, and Tanchuma, p.30 a and b. Yet there is nothing even astute,only a coarse realism, about the description of the clumsy attempts of Satan to turn Abraham from, or to hinder him in, his purpose; to influence Isaac; or to frighten Sarah. Nor are the other personages in the legend more successfully sketched. There is a want of all higher conception in the references to the Almighty, a painful amount of downright untruthfulness about Abraham, lamentable boastfulness and petty spite about Isaac, while the Sarah of the Jewish legend is rather a weak old Eastern woman than the mother in Israel. To hold perversions of the Old Testament by the side of the New Testament conception of the motives of lives of the heros of old, or the doctrinal inferences and teaching of the Rabbis by those of Christ and His Aspostles, were to compare darkness with light.The same remarks apply to the other legends in which Satan is introduced as seducer. Anything more childish could scarcely be invented than this, that, when Sammael could not otherwise persuade Israel that Moses would not return from Mount Sinai, he at last made his bier appear before them in the clouds (Shab.89 a), unless it be this story, that when Satan would seduce David he assumed the form of a bird, and that, when David shot at it, Bath-Sheba suddenly looked up, thus gaining the king by her beauty (Sanh.107 a). In both these instances the obvious purpose is to palliate the guilt whether of Israel or of David, which, indeed, is in other places entirely explained away as not due to disobedience or to lust (Comp. Ab. Zar.4 b, 5 a).4. As the Enemy of man, Satan seeks to hurt and destory him; and he is the Angel of Death.

Thus, when Satan had failed in shaking the constancy of Abraham and Isaac, he attacked Sarah (Yalkut, i. Par. last lines p.28 b). To his suggestions, or rather false reports, her death had been due, either from fright at being told that Isaac had been offered (Pirqé de R. El.32, and Targum Ps.- Jon.), or else fron the shock, when after all she learned that Isaac was not dead (Ber. R.58). Similarly, Satan had sought to take from Tamar the pledges which Judah had given her. He appeared as an old man to show Nimrod how to have Abraham cast into the fiery oven, at the same time persuading Abraham not to resist it, &c. Equally puerile are the representations of Satan as the Angel of Death. According to Abod. Zar.20 b, the dying sees his enemy with a drawn sword, on the point of which a drop of gall trembles. In his fright he opens his mouth and swallows this drop, which accounts for the pallor of the face and the corruption that follows. According to another Rabbi, the Angel of Death really uses his sword, although, on account of the dignity of humanity, the wound which he inflicts is not allowed to be visible. It is difficult to imagine a narrative more repulsive than that of the death of Moses according to Deb. R.11. Beginning with the triumph of Sammael over Michael at the expected event, it tells how Moses had entreated rather to be changed into a beast or a bird than to die; how Gabriel and Michael had successively refused to bring the soul of Moses; how Moses, knowing that Sammael was coming for the purpose, had armed himself with the Ineffable Name; how Moses had in boastfulness recounted to Sammael all his achievements, real and legendary; and how at last Moses had pursued the Enemy with the Ineffable Name, and in his anger taken off one of his horns of glory and blinded Satan in one eye. We must be excused from following this story through its revolting details.But, whether as the Angel of Death or as the seducer of man, Sammael has not absolute power. When Israel took the Law upon themselves at Mount Sinai, they became entirely free from his sway, and would have remained so, but for the sin of the Golden Calf. Similarly, in the time of Ezra, the object of Israel's prayer (Neh. vii.) was to have Satan delivered to them. After a three day's fast it was granted, and the Yetser haRa of idolatry, in the shape of a young lion, was delivered up to them. It would serve no good purpose to repeat the story of what was done with the bound enemy, or how his cries were rendered inaudible in heaven. Suffice it that, in view of the requirements of the present world, Israel liberated him from the ephah covered with lead (Zech. v.8), under which, by advice of the prophet Zechariah, they had confined him, although for precaution they first put out his eyes (Yoam, 69 b). And yet, in view, or probably, rather, in ignorance, of such teaching, modern criticism would derive the Satanology of the New Testament and the history of the Temptation from Jewish sources!Over these six persons - Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, with whom some apparently rank Benjamin - the Angel of Death, had no power (Baba. B.17 a). Benjamin, Amram, Jesse, and Chileb (the son of David) are said to have died (only) through the sin of the serpent.' In other cases, also, Sammael may not be able to exercise his sway till, for example, he has by some ruse diverted a theologian from his sacred study. Thus he interrupted the pious meditations of David by going up into a tree and shaking it, when, as David went to examine it, a rung of the ladder, on which he stood, broke, and so interrupted David's holy thoughts. Similarly, Rabbi Chasda, by occupation with sacred study, warded off the Angel of Death till the crackling of a beam diverted his attention. Instances of the awkwardness of the Enemy are related (Kethub.77 b), and one rabbi - Joshua, actually took away his sword, only returning it by direct command of God. Where such views of Satan could even find temporary expression, supersititous fears may have been excited; but the thought of moral evil and of a moral combat with it could never have found lodgment. III. Evil Spirits (Shedim, Ruchin, Rucoth, Lilin).Here also,

as throughout, we mark the presence of Parsee elements of superstition. In general, these spirits resemble the gnomes, hobglobins, elves, and sprites of our fairy tales. They are cunning and malicious, and contact with them is dangerous; but they can scarcely be described as absolutley evil. Indeed, they often prove kind and useful; and may at all times be rendered innocuous, and even made serviceable.1. Their origin, nature, and numbers. Opinions differ as to their origin, in fact, they variously originated. According to Ab.12 b, Ber. R.7, they were created on the eve of the first Sabbath. But since that time their numbers have greatly increased. For, according to Erub.18 b, Ber. R.20 (ed Warsh. p.40 b), multitudes of them were the offspring of Eve and of male spirits, and of Adam with female spirits, or with Lillith (the queen of the female spirits), during the 130 years that Adam had been under the ban, and before Seth was born (Gen. v.3): [6457] comp. Erub.18 b. Again, their number can scarcely be limited, since they propogate themselves (Chag.16 a), resembling men in this as well as in their taking of nourishment and dying. On the other hand, like the Angels they have wings, pass unhindered through space, and know the future. Still further, they are produced by a process of transformation from vipers, which, in the course of four times seven years, successively pass through the forms of vampires, thistles and thorns, into Shedim (Bab. K.16 a) - perhaps a parabolic form of indicating the origination of Shedim through the fall of man. Another parabolic idea may be implied in the saying that Shedim spring from the backbone of those who have not bent in worship (u.s.).Although Shedim bear, when they appear, the form of human beings, they may assume any other form. Those of their number who are identified wth dirty places are represented as themselves black (Kidd.72 a). But the reflection of their likeness is not the same as that of man. When conjured up, their position (whether with the head or the feet uppermost) depends on the mode of conjuring. Some of the Shedim have defects. Thus, those of them who lodge in the caper bushes are blind, and an instance is related when one of their number, in pursuit of a Rabbi, fell over the root of a tree and perished (Pes.111 b). Trees, gardens, vineyards, and also ruined and desolate houses, but especially dirty places, were their favourite habitation, and the night-time, or before cock-crowing, their special time of appearance. [6458] Hence the danger of going alone into such places (Ber.3 a, b; 62 a). A company of two escaped the danger, while before three the Shed did not even appear (Ber.43 b). For the same reason it was dnagerous to sleep alone in a house (Shabb.151 b), while the man who went out before cock-crow, without at least carrying for protection a burning torch (though moonlight was far safer) had his blood on his own head. If you greeted anyone in the dark you might unawares bid Godspeed to a Shed (Sanh.44 a). Nor was the danger of this inconsiderable, since one of the worst of these Shedim, especially hurtful to Rabbis, was like a dragon with seven heads, each of which dropped off with every successive lowly bending during Rabbi Acha's devotions (Kidd.29 b). Specially dangerous times were the days of Wednesday and of the Sabbath. But it was a comfort to know that the Shedim could not create or produce anything; nor had they power over that which had been counted, measured, tied up and sealed (Chull.105 b); they could be conquered by the Ineffable Name;' and they might be banished by the use of certain formulas, which, when written and worn, served as amulets.The number of these spirits was like the earth that is thrown up around a bed that is sown. Indeed, no one would survive it, if he saw their number. A thousand at your right hand and ten thousand at your left, such crowding in the Academy or by the side of a bride; such weariness and faintness through their malignant touch, which rent the very dress of the wearers! (Ber.6 a) The queen of the female spirits had no less a folllowing than 180,000 (Pes.112 b). Little as we imagine it, these spirits lurk everywhere around us: in the crumbs on the floor, in

the oil in the vessels, in the water which we would drink, in the diseases which attack us, in the even-numbered cups of our drinking, in the air in the room, by day and by night.2. Their arrangement. Generally, they may be arranged into male and female spirits, the former under their king Ashmedai, the latter under their queen Lilith probably the same as Agrath bath Machlath - only that the latter may more fully present hurtful aspect of the demoness. The hurtful spirits are specially designated as Ruchin, Mazziqin (harmers), Malakhey Chabbalath (angels of damage), &c. From another aspect they are arranged into four classes (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. Numb. vi.24): the Tsaphriré, or morning spirits (Targ. on Ps. cxxi.6; Targ. Cant. iv.6); the Tiharé, or midday spirits (Targ. Pesudo-Jon. Deut. xxxii 24; Targ. Cant. iv.6); the Telané, or evening spirits (Targ. Cant. iii.8; iv.6; Targ. Eccles. ii.5); and the Lilin, or night spirits (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. on Deut. xxxii.34; Targ. Is. xxxiv.14). (According to 2 Targ. Esther ii.1, 3, Solomon had such power over them, that at his biding they executed dances before him.) a. Ashmedai (perhaps a Parsee name), Ashmodi, Ashmedon, or Shamdon, the king of the demons (Gitt.68 a, b; Pes.110 a). It deserves notice, that this name does not occur in the Jerusalem Talmud nor in older Palestinian sources. [6459] He is represented as of immense size and strength, as cunning, malignant, and dissolute. At times, however, he is known also to do works of kindness - such as lead the blind, or to show the road to a drunken man. Of course, he foreknows the future, can do magic, but may be rendered serviceable by the use of the Ineffable Name,' and especially by the signet of King Solomon, on which it was graven. The story of Solomon's power over him is well known and can here only be referred to in briefest outline. It is said, that as no iron was to be used in the construction of the Temple, Solomon was anxious to secure the services of the worm Shamir, which possessed the power of cutting stones (see about him Ab. z.12 a; Sot.48 b; Gitt.68 a, b). By advice of the Sanhedrin, Solomon conjured up for this purpose a male and a female Shed, who directed him to Ashmedai. The latter lived at the bottom of a deep cistern on a high mountain. Every morning on leaving it to go into heaven and hear the decrees of the Upper Sanhedrin, he covered the cistern with a stone, and sealed it. On this Benayah, armed with a chain, and Solomon's signet with the Ineffable Name, went and filled the cistern with wine, which Ashmedai, as all other spirits, hated. But as he could not otherwise quench his thirst, Ashmedai became drunk, when it was easy, by means of the magical signet, to secure the chain around him. Without entering on the story of his exploits, or how he indicated the custody of Shamir, and how ultimately the worm (which was in the custody of the moor-cock [6460]) was secured, it appears that, by his cunning, Ashmedai finally got released, when he immediately hurled Solomon to a great distance, assumed his form, and reigned in his stead; till at last, after a series of adventures, Solomon recovered his signet, which Ashmedai had flung away, and a fish swallowed. Solomon was recognised by the Sanhedrin and Ashmedai fled at sight of the signet. [Possibly the whole of this is only a parabolic form for the story of Solomon's spiritual declension, and final repentance.]b. Lilith, the queen of female spirits - to be distinguished from the Lilin or night-spirits, and from Lela or Laila, an Angel who accompanied Abraham on his expedition against Chedorlaomer (Sanh.96 a). Here we recognise still more distinctly the Parsee elements. Lillith is the queen of Zemargad' (Targ. on Job i.15) - Zemargad' representing all green crystals, malachite, and emerald - and the land of Zemargad being Sheba.' Lillith is described as the mother of Hormiz or Hormuz [6461] (Baba B.73 a). Sometimes she is represented as a very fair woman, but mostly with long, wild-flowing hair, and winged (Nidd.24 b; Erub.100 b). In Pes.111 a we have a formula for exorcising Lillith. In Pes 112 b (towards the end) we are told how Agrath bath Machlath (probably the Zend word Agra -

smiting, very wicked' - bath Machlath the dancer') threatened Rabbi Chanina with serious mischief, had it not been that his greatness had been proclaimed in heaven, on which the Rabi would have shown his power by banning her from all inhabited places, but finally gave her liberty on the eve of the fourth day and of the Sabbath, which nights accordingly are the most dangerous seasons.3. Character and habits of the Shedim. As many of the Angels, so many of the Shedim, are only personifications. Thus, as diseases were often ascribed to thir agency, there were Shedim of certain diseases, as of asthma, croup, canine rabies, madness, stomachic diseases, &c. Again, there were local Shedim, as of Samaria, Tiberias, &c. On the other hand, Shedim might be employed in the magic cure of diseases (Shabb.67 a). In fact, to conjure up and make use of demons was considered lawful although dangerous (Sanh.101 a), while a little knowledge of of the subject would enable a person to avoid any danger from them. Thus, although Chamath, the demon of oil, brings eruptions on the face, yet the danger is avoided if the oil is used out of the hollow of the hand, and not out of a vessel. Similarly, there are formulas by which the power of the demons can be counteracted. In these formulas, where they are not Biblical verses, the names of the demons are inserted. This subject will be further treated in another Appendix.In general, we may expect to find demons on water, oil, or anything else that has stood uncovered all night; on the hands before they have been washed for religious purposes, and on the water in which they have been washed; and on the breadcrumbs on the floor. Demons may imitate or perform all that the prophets or great men of old had wrought. The magicians of Egypt had imitated the miracles of Moses by demoniacal power (Shem. R.9). So general at the time of our Lord was the belief in demons and in the power of employing them, that even Josephus (Ant. viii.2.5) contended that the power of conjuring up, and driving out demons, and of magical cures had been derived from King Hezekiah, to whom God had given it. Josephus declares himself to have been an eye-witness of such a wonderful cure by the repetition of a magical formula. This illustrates the contention of the Scribes that the miraculous cures of our Lord were due to demoniac agency. Legions of demons lay in waiting for any error or falling on the part of man. Their power extended over all even numbers. [6462] Hence, care must be had not to drink an even number of cups (Ber.51 b), except on the Passover night, when the demons have no power over Israel (Pes.109 b). On the other hand, there are demons who might almost be designated as familiar spirits, who taught the Rabbis, Shed Joseph (Pes.110 a) and the Shed Jonathan (Yeb.122 a). Rabbi Papa had a young Shed to wait upon him (Chull.105 b). There can, however, be no difficulty in making sure of their real existence. As Shedim have cock's feet, nothing more is required than to strew ashes by the side of one's bed, when in the morning their marks will be perceived (Ber.6 a; Gitt.68 b). It was by the shape of his feet that the Sanhedrin hoped to recognise, whether Ashmedai was really Solomon, or not, but it was found that he never appeared with his feet uncovered. The Talmud (Ber.6 a) describes the following as an infallible means for actually seeing these spirits: Take the afterbirth of a black cat which is the daughter of a black cat - both mother and daughter being firstborn - burn it in the fire, and put some of the ashes in your eyes. Before using them, the ashes must be put into an iron tube, and sealed with an iron signet. It is added, that Rabbi Bibi successfully tried this experiment, but was hurt by the demons, on which he was restored to health by the prayers of the Rabbis. [6463]Other and kindred questions, such as those of amulets, &c., will be treated under demoniac possessions. But may we not here once more and confidently appeal to impartial students whether, in view of this sketch of Jewish Angelology and Satanology, the contention can be sustained that the teaching of Christ on this subject has been derived from

Jewish sources?

APPENDIX XIV. THE LAW IN MESSIANIC TIMES.

(See Vol. i. Book III. ch. iii. p.341.) THE question as to the Rabbinic views in regard to the binding character of the Law, and its imposition on the Gentiles, in Messianic times, although, strictly speaking, not forming part of this history, is of such vital importance in connection with recent controversies as to demand special consideration. In the text to which this Appendix refers it has been indicated, that a new legislation was expected in Messianic days. The ultimate basis of this expectancy must be sought in the Old Testament itself - not merely in such allusions as to the intrinsic worthlessness of sacrifices, but in such passages as Deut. xviii.15, 18, and its prophetic commentary in Jer. xxxi.31, &c. It was with a view to this that the Jewish deputation inquired whether John the Baptist was that Prophet.' For, as has been shown, Rabbinism associated certain reformatory and legislative functions with the appearance of the Forerunner of the Messiah (Eduy. viii.7). There were, indeed, in this, as in most respects, diverging opinions according to the different standpoints of the Rabbis, and, as we infer, not without controversial bearing on the teaching of Christianity. The strictest tendency may be characterised as that which denied the possibilty of any change in the ceremonial Law, as well as the abrogation of festivals in the future. Even the destruction of the Temple. and with it the necessary cessation of sacrifices - if, indeed, which is a moot question, all sacrifices did at once and absolutely cease - only caused a gap; just as exile from the land could only free from such laws as attached to the soil of Israel. [6464] The reading of the sacrificial sections in the Law (Meg.31 b; Ber. R.44) - at any rate, in conjunction with prayers (Ber.2 b), but especially study of the Law (Men.110 a), took in the meantime the place of the sacrifices. And as regarded the most sacred of all sacrifices, that of the Day of Atonement, it was explained that the day rather than the sacrifices brought reconciliation (Sifra c.8). This party held the principle that not only those Divine, but even those Rabbinic, ordinances, which apparently had been intended only for a certain time or for a certain purpose, were of eternal duration (Bezah 5 b). The law is never to cease; there are the commandments - since there is no prophet who may change a word in them.' [6465] So far were these views carried, that it was asserted: Israel needs not the teaching of the King Messiah,' but that He only comes to gather the dispersed, and to give to the Gentiles thirty commandments, as it is written (Zechar. xi.12), "they weighed me my price, thirty pieces of silver"' (Ber. R.98). But even these extreme statements seem to imply that keen controversy had raged on the subject. Besides, the most zealous defenders of the Law admitted that the Gentiles were to receive laws in Messianic times. The smallest and most extreme section held that, the laws, as Israel observed them, would be imposed on the Gentiles (Chull.92 a); others that only thirty commandments, the original Noachic ordinances supposed to be enumerated in Lev. xix., would become obligatory, [6466] while some held, that only three ordinances would be binding on the new converts: two connected with the Feast of Tabernacles, the third, that of the phylacteries (Midr. on Ps. xxxi.1, ed. Warsh, p.30 b). On the other hand, we have the most clear testimony that the prevailing tendency of teaching was in a different direction. In a very curious passage (Yalkut ii.296, p.46 a), in which the final restitution of the sinners of Israel and of the righteous of the Gentiles' who are all in Gehinnom, is taught in very figurative language, we are told of a new Law which God will give by the Messiah' in the age to

come - thanksgiving for which calls forth that universal Amen, not only on earth but in Gehinnon, which leads to the deliverance of those who are in the latter. But as this may refer to the time of the final consummation, we turn to other passages. The Midrash on Song ii.13, applying the passage in conjunction with Jer. xxxi.31, expressly states that the Messiah would give Israel a new law, and the Targum, on Is. xii., 3, although perhaps not quite so clearly, also speaks of a new instruction.' It is needless to multiply proofs (such as Vayyikra R.13). But the Talmud goes even further, and lays down the two principles, that in the age to come' the whole ceremonial Law and all the feasts were to cease. [6467] And although this may be regarded as merely a general statement, it is definitely applied to the effect, that all sacrifices except the thank-offering, and all fasts and feasts except the Day of Atonement, or else the Feast of Esther, were to come to an end - nay (in the Midr. on the words the Lord looseth the bound,' Ps. cxlvi.7), that what had formerly been bound' or forbidden would be loosed' or allowed, notably that the distinctions between clean and unclean animals would be removed. There is the less need for apology for any digression here, that, besides the intrinsic interest of the question, it casts light on two most important subjects, For, first, it illustrates the attempt of the narrowest Judaic party in the Church to force on Gentile believers the yoke of the whole Law; the bearing of St. Paul in this respect; his relation to St. Peter; the conduct of the latter; and the proceedings of the Apostolic Synod in Jerusalem (Acts xv.). St. Paul, in his opposition to that party, stood even on Orthodox Jewish ground. But when he asserted, not only a new law of liberty,' but the typical and preparatory character of the whole Law, and its fulfillment in Christ, he went far beyond the Jewish standpoint. Further, the favorite modern theory as to fundamental opposition in principle between Pauline and Petrine theology in this respect, has, like many kindred theories, no support in the Jewish views on that subject, unless we suppose that Peter had belonged to the narrowest Jewish school, which his whole history seems to forbid. We can also understand, how the Divinely granted vision of the abrogation of the distinction between clean and unclean animals (Acts x.9-16) may, though coming as a surprise, have had a natural basis in Jewish expectancy, [6468] and it explains how the Apostolic Synod, when settling the question, [6469] ultimately fell back on the so-called Noachic commandments, though with very wider-reaching principles underlying their decision (Acts xv.13-21). Lastly, it seems to cast even some light on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel; for, the question about that prophet' evidently referring to the possible alteration of the Law in Messianic times, which is reported only in the Fourth Gospel, shows such close acquaintance with the details of Jewish ideas on this subject, as seems to us utterly incompatible with its supposed origination as The Ephesian Gospel' towards the end of the second century, the outcome of Ephesian Church-teaching - an esoteric and eclectic' book, designed to modify the impressions produced by the tradition previously recorded by the Synoptists.'

Chapter 121

APPENDIX XV. THE LOCATION OF SYCHAR, AND THE DATE OF OUR LORD'S VISIT TO SAMARIA.

(See vol. i. Book III ch. viii.) 1. The Location of Sychar. Although modern writers are now mostly agreed on this subject, it may be well briefly to put before our readers the facts of the case. Till comparitively lately, the Sychar of St. John iv. was generally as representing the ancient Shechem. The first difficulty here was the name, since Shechem, or even Sichem, could scarcely be identified with Sychar, which is undoubtedly the correct reading. Accordingly, the latter term was represented as one of oppobrium, and derived from Shekhar' (in Aramæan Shikhra). as it were, drunken town,' or else from Sheqer' (in Aramæan Shiqra), lying town.' But, not to mention other objections, there is no trace of such as alteration of the name Sychar in Jewish writings, while its employment would seem wholly incongruous in such a narrative as St.John iv. Moreover, all the earliest writers distinguished Sychar from Shechem. Lastly, in the Talmud the name of Sokher, also written Sikhra, frequently occurs, and that not only as distinct from Schechem, but in a connection which renders the hypothesis of an opprobrious by-name impossible. Professor Delitzch (Zeitschrift für Luther. Theol. for 1856, ii pp.242, 243) has collected seven passages from the Babylon Talmud to that effect, in five of which Sichra, is mentioned as the birthplace of celebrated Rabbis - the town having at a later period apparently been left by the Samaritans, and occupied by Jews (Baba Mez.42 a, 83 a, Pes.31 b, Nidd.36 a, Chull.18 b, and, without mention of Rabbis, Baba K 82 b Menach.64 b. See also Men. x.2, and Jer. Sheq. p.48 d). If further proof were required, it would be sufficient to say that a woman would scarcely have gone a mile and a half from Shechem to Jacob's well to fetch water, when there are so many springs about the former city. In these circumstances, later writers have generally fixed upon the village of 'Askar, half a mile from Jacob's Well, and within sight of it, as the Sychar of the New Testament, one of the earliest to advocate this view having been the late learned Canon Williams. Little more than a third of a mile from 'Askar is the reputed tomb of Joseph. The transformation of the name Sychar into 'Askar is explained, either by a contraction of 'Ain 'Askar the well of Sychar,' or else by the fact that in the Samaritan Chronicle the place is called Iskar, which seems to have been the vulgar pronunciation of Sychar. A full description of the place is given by Captain Conder (Tent-Worker in Palestine, vol. i. pp.71 &c., especially pp.75 and 76), and by M. Guérin, La Samarie,' vol. i. p.371, although the later writer, who almost always absolutely follows tradition, denies the identity of Sychar and Askar (pp.401, 402). II. Time of our Lord's Visit to Sychar. This question, which is of such importance not only for the chronology of this period, but in regard to the unnamed Feast at Jerusalem to which went up (St. John v.1), has been discussed most fully and satisfactorily by Canon Westcott (Speaker's Commentary, vol. ii. of the New Testament, p.93) The following data will assist our inquires. 1. Jesus spent some time after the Feast of Passover (St. John ii.23) in the province of Judæa. But it can scarcely be supposed that this was a long period, for - 2ndly, in St. John iv.45 the Galileans have evidently a fresh remembrance of what had taken place at the Passover in Jerusalem, which would scarcely have been the case if a long period and other festivals had intervened. Similarly, the King's Offer' (St. John iv.47) seems also to act upon a

recent report. 3rdly, the unnamed Feast of St. John v.1 forms an important element in our computations. Some months of Galilean ministry must have intervened between it and the return of Jesus to Galilee. Hence it could not have been Pentecost. Nor could it have been the Feast of Tabernacles, which was in autumn, nor yet the feast of the Dedication, which took place in winter, since both are expressly mentioned by their names (St. John vii.2, x.22). The only other feasts were: the Feast of Wood-Offering (comp. The Temple,' &c., p.295), the Feast of Trumpets, or New Year's Day, the Day of Atonement, and the feast of Esther, or Purim. To begin with the latter, since of late it has found most favor. The reasons against Christ's attendance in Jerusalem at Purim seem to me irrestible. Canon Westcott urges that the discourse of Christ at the unnamed Feast has not, as is generally the case, any connection with the thoughts of that festival. To this I would add, that I can scarcely conceive our Lord going up to a feast observed with such boisterous merriment as Purim was, while the season of the year in which it falls would scarcely tally with the statement of St. John v.3, that a great multitude of sick people were laid down in the porches of Bethesda. [6470] But if the unnamed Feast was not Purim, it must have been one of these three, the Feast of the Ingathering of Wood, the Feast of Trumpets, or Day of Atonement. In other words, it must have taken place late in summer, or in the very begining of autumn. But if so, then the Galilean ministry intervening between the visit to Samaria and this Feast leads to the necessary inferences that the visit to Sychar had taken palce in early summer, probably about the middle or end of May. This would allow ample time for Christ's stay in Jerusalem during the Passover and for His Judæan ministry. As we are discussing the date of the unnamed Feast, it may be as well to bring the subject here to a close. We have seen that the only three Feasts to which reference could have been are to the Feast of Wood Offering, the Feast of Trumphets, and the Day of Atonement. But the last of those could not be meant, since it is disignated, not only by Philo, but in Acts xxvii.9, as the fast,' not the feast nestea, not ort (comp. LXX., Lev. xiv.29 &c., xxiii.27 &c). As between the Feast of the Wood Offering and that of Trumphets I feel at considerable loss. Canon Westcott has urged on behalf on the latter reasons which I confess are very weighty. On the other hand, the Feast of Trumphets was not one of those on which people generally resorted to Jerusalem, and as it took place on the 1st of Tishri (about the middle of September), it is difficult to believe that anyone going up to it would not rather have chosen, or at least remained over, the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles, which followed respectively, on the 10th and 15th days of that month. Lastly, the Feast of Wood Offering, which took place on the 15th Ab (in August), was a popular and joyus festival, when the wood needed for the altar was brought up from all parts of the country (comp. on that feast The Temple and its Services,' &c., pp.295, 296) As between these two feasts, we must leave the question undecided, only noticing that barely six weeks intervened between the one and the other feast.

Chapter 122

APPENDIX XVI. ON THE JEWISH VIEWS ABOUT DEMONS' AND THE DEMONISED,' TOGETHER WITH SOME NOTES ON THE INTERCOURSE BETWEEN JEWS AND JEWISH CHRISTIANS IN THE FIRST CENTURIES.

(See vol. i. Book III. ch. xiv.) IT is not, of course, our purpose here to attempt an exhaustive account of the Jewish views on demons' and the demonised.' A few preliminary strictures were, however, necessary on a work upon which writers on this subject have too implictly relied. I refer to Gfrörer's Jahrhundert des Heils (especially vol. i. pp.378-424). Gfrörer sets out by quoting a passage in the Book of Enoch on which he lays great stress, but which critical inquiries of Dillmann and other scholars have shown to be of no value on the argument. This disposes of many pages of negative criticism on the New Testament which Gfrörer founds on this quotation. Similarly, 4 Esdras would not in our days be adduced in evidence of pre-Christian teaching. As regards Rabbinic passages, Gfrörer uncritically quotes from Kabalistic works which he mixes with quotations from the Talmud and from writings of a later date. Again, as regards the two quotations of Gfrörer from the Mishah (Erub. iv.1; Gitt. vii.1), it has already been stated (vol. i. p.481, note 4) that neither of these passages bears any refernece to demoniac possesions. Further, Gfrörer appeals to two passages in Sifré which may here be given in extenso. The first of these (ed. Friedmann, p.107 b) is on Duet. xviii.12, and reads thus: He who joins himself (cleaves) to uncleanness, on him rests the spirit of uncleaness; but he who cleaves to the Shechinah, it is meet that the Holy Spirit should rest on him.' The second occurs in explanation of Deut. xxxii.16, and reads as follows (u. s. p.136 b): What is the way of a "demon" (Shed)? He enters into a man and subjects him.' It will be observed that in both these quotations reference is made to certian moral, not to a physical effects, such as in the case of the demonised. Lastly, although one passage from the Talmud which Gfrörer adduces (though not quite exactly) applies, indeed, to demonical possessions, but is given in an exaggerated and embellished form. If from these incorrect references we turn to what Jewish authorities really state on the subject, we have: - 1. To deal with the Writings of Josephus. in Aniq. vi.8.2, Josephus ascribes Saul's disorder to demonic influence, which brought upon him such suffocations as were ready to choke him. In Antiq. viii.2.5, Josephus describes the wisdom, learning, and achievements of Solomon, referring specially to his skill in expelling demons who caused various diseases. According to Josephus Solomon had exercised this power by incantations, his formulae and words of exorcism being still known in Josephus's days. In such manner a certain Eleazar had healed a demoniac' in the presence of Vespasian, his officers, and troops, by putting to his nostrils a ring that held a root of one of those mentioned by Solomon,' by which the demon was drawn out amidst convulsions of the demoniac, when the demon was further adjured not to return by frequent mention of the name of Solomon, and by incantations which he [Solomon] had composed.' To show the reality of this, a vessel with water had been placed at a little distance, and the demon had, in coming out, overturned it. It is probably to this root' that Josephus refers in War. vii.6.3, where he names it Baaras, which I conjecture to

be the equivalent of the form {hebrew}, boara, the burning,' since he describes it as of colour like a flame, and as emitting at even a ray like lightning, and which it would cost a man's life to take up otherwise than by certain magical means which Josephus specifies. From all this we infer that Josephus occupied the later Talmudical standpoint, alike as regards exorcism, magical cures, and magical preventions. This is of great importance as showing that these views prevailed in New Testament times. But when Josephus adds, that the demons expelled by Baaras were the spirits of the wicked,' he represents a superstition which is not shared by the earlier Rabbis, and may possibly be due to a rationalising attempt to account for the phenomenon. It is, indeed, true that the same view occurs in comparatively late Jewish writings, and that in Yalkuat on Is.46 b there appears to be a reference to it, at least in connection with the spirits of those who had perished in the flood; but this seems to belong to a different cycle of legends. 2. Rabbinic views. [6471] Probably the nearest approach to the idea of Josephus that demons' were the souls of the wicked, is the (perhaps allegorical) statement that the backbone of a person who did not bow down to worship God became a Shed, or demon (Baba K.16 a; Jer. Shabb.3 b). The ordinary names for demons are evil spirits,' or unclean spirits' (ruach raah, [6472] ruach tumeah), Seirim (lit. goats). Shedim (Sheyda, a demon, male or female, either because their chief habitation is in desolate places, or from the word to fly about,' or else from to rebel'), and Mazzikin (the hurtful ones). A demoniac is called Gebher Shediyin (Ber. R.65). Even this, that demons are supposed to eat and drink, to propagate themselves, and to die, distinguishes them from the demons' of the New Testament. The food of demons consists of certain elements in fire and water, and of certain odours. Hence the mode of incantation by incense made of certain ingredients. Of their origin, number, habitation, and general influence, sufficient has been said in the Appendix on Demonology. It is more important here to notice these two Jewish ideas: that demons entered into, or took possession of, men; and that many diseases were due to their agency. The former is frequently expressed. The evil spirit' constrains a man to do certain things, such as to pass beyond the Sabbath-boundary (Erub.41 b), to eat the Passover-bread, &c. (Rosh ha-Sh.28 a). But it reads more like a caustic than a serious remark when we are informed that these three thing deprive a man of his free will and make him transgress: the Cuthæans, an evil spirit, and poverty (Erub. u.s). Diseases - such as rabies, angina, asthma, or accidents - such as an encounter with a wild bull, are due to their agency, which, happily, is not unlimited. As stated in App. XIII. the most dangerous demons are those of dirty (secret) places (Shabb.67 a). Even numbers (2, 4, 6, &c.) are always dangerous, so is anything that comes from unwashen hands. For such, or similar oversights, a whole legion of demons is on the watch (Ber.51 a). On the evening of the Passover the demons are bound, and, in general, their power has now been restricted, chiefly to the eves of Wednesday and of the Sabbath (Pes.109 b to 112 b, passim). Yet there are, as we shall see, circumstances in which it would be foolhardiness to risk their encounter. Without here entering on the views expressed in the Talmud about prophecy, visions, and dreams, we turn to the questions germane to our subject. A. Magic and Magicians. We must here bear in mind that the practice of magic was strictly prohibited to Israelites, and that - as a matter of principle at least - witchcraft, or magic, was supposed to have no power over Israel, if they owned and served their God (Chull.7 b; Nedar.32 a). But in this matter also - as will presently appear - theory and practice did not accord. Thus, under certain circumstances, the repetition of magical formulas was declared lawful even on the Sabbath (Sanh.101 a). Egypt was regarded as the home of magic (Kidd.49 b; Shabb.75 a). In connection with this, it deserves notice that the Talmud ascribes the miracles of Jesus to magic,

which He had learned during His stay in Eqypt having taken care, when He left, to insert under His skin its rules and formulas, since every traveller, on quitting the country, was searched, lest he should take to other lands the mysteries of magic (Shabb.104 b). Here it may be interesting to refer to some of the strange ideas which Rabbinism attached to the early Christians, as showing both the intercourse between the two parties, and that the Jews did not deny the gift of miracles in the Church, only ascribing its exercise to magic. Of the existence of such intercourse with Jewish Christians there is abundant evidence. Thus, R. Joshua, the son of Levi (at the end of the second century), was so hard pressed by their quotations from the Bible that, unable to answer, he pronounced a curse on them, which, however, did not come. We gather, that in the first century Christianity had widely spread among the Jews, and R. Ishmael, the son of Elisha, the grandson of that High-Priest who was executed by the Romans (Josephus, War. i.2.2), seems in vain to have contended against the advance of Christianity. At last he agreed with R. Tarphon that nothing else remained but to burn their writings. It was this R. Ishmael who prevented his nephew Ben Dama from being cured of the bite of a serpent by a Christian, preferring that he should die rather than be healed by such means (Abod. Zar.27 b, about the middle). Similarly, the great R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, also in the first century, was so suspected of the prevailing heresy that he was actually taken up as a Christian in the persecution of the later. Though he cleared himself of the suspicion, yet his contemporaries regarded him for a time doubtfully, and all agreed that the troubles which befell him were in punishment for having listened with pleasure to the teaching of the heretics (Ab. Z.16 b, 17 a.) [6473] The following may be mentioned as instances of the magic practiced by these heretics. In Jer. Sanh.25 d, we are told about two great Rabbis who were banned by a heretic to the beam of a bath. In return the Rabbis, by similar means, fastened the heretic to the door of the bath. Having mutually agreed to set each other free, the same parties next met on board a ship. Here the heretic by magical means clave the sea, by way of imitating Moses. On this the Rabbis called upon him to walk through the sea, like Moses, when he was immediately overwhelmed through the ban of R. Joshua! Other stories of a similar and even more absurd character might be quoted. But if such opinions were entertained of Jewish Christians, we can scarcely wonder that all their books were ordered to be burnt (Bemid. R.9), that even a roll of the Law written by a heretic was to be destroyed (Gitt.45 b), and that Jewish Christians were consigned to eternal punishment in Gehinnon (Rosh. haSh.17 a), from which even the token of circumcision should not deliver them since an Angel would convert it into uncircumcision (Shem R.19 [6474]). But to return. Talmudic writings distinguishing several classes of magicians. The Baal Obh, or conjuror of the dead, evoked a voice from under the armpit, or from other members of the dead body, the arms or other members being struck together, for the purpose of eliciting the sound. Necromancy might be practised in two different ways. The dead might be called up (by a method which scarcely bears description), in which case they would appear with the feet upwards. But this must not be practised on the Sabbath. Or again, a skull might, by magical means, be made to answer. This might be done on the Sabbath also (Sanh.65 a and b). Or a demon might be conjured up by a certain kind of incense, and then employed in magic. A second class of magicians (called Yideoni) uttered oracles by putting a certain bone into their mouth. Thirdly, there was the Chabar, or serpent charmer, a distinction being made between a great and small Chabar, according as larger or smaller serpents were charmed. Fourthly, we have the Meonen, who could indicate what days or hours were lucky and unlucky. Fifthly, there was the searcher after the dead,' who remained fasting on graves in order to communicate with an unclean spirit; and, lastly, the Menachesh, who

knew what omens were lucky and what unlucky (Sanh.66 a). And if they were treated only as signs and not as omens, the practice was declared lawful (Chull.95 b). In general the black art might be practised either through demons, or else by the employment of magical means. Among the latter we reckon, not only incantations, but magic by means of the thumb, by a knife with a black handle, or by a glass cup (Sanh.67 b), or by a cup of incantation (Baba Mets.29 b). But there was danger here, since, if all proper rules and cautions were not observed the magician might be hurt by the demon. Such an instance is related, although the Rabbi in question was mercifully perserved by being swallowed by a cedar, which afterwards burst and set him free (Sanh.101 a). Women were specially suspected of witchcraft (Jer. Sanh. vii.25 d), and great caution was accordingly enjoined. Thus, it might even be dangerous to lift up loaves of bread (though not broken pieces) lest they should be bewitched (Erub.64 b). A number of instances are related in which persons were in imminent danger from magic, in some of which they suffered not only damage but death, while in others the Rabbis knew how to turn the impending danger against their would-be assailants. (Comp. for examples Pes.110 b; Sot.22 a; Gitt.45 a; Sanh.67 b). A very peculiar idea is that about the Teraphim of Scripture. It occurs already in the Targum Ps.-Jon. on Gen. xxxi.19, and is found also in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c.36. It is stated that the Teraphim were made in the following manner: a first-born was killed, his head cut off, and prepared with salt and spices, after which a gold plate, upon which magical formulas had been graven, was placed under his tongue, when the head was supposed to give answer to whatever questions might be addressed to it. B. After this we can scarcely wonder, that so many diseases should have been imputed to magical or else demoniac influences, and cured either by magical means or by exorcism. For our present purpose we leave aside not only the question, whether and what diseases were regarded as the punishment of certain sins, but also all questions as to their magical causes and means of cure. We confine our remarks to the supposed power of evil spirits in the production of diseases. Four things are mentioned as dangerous on account of demons, of which we shall only mention three: To walk between two palm-trees, [6475] if the space is wider than four cubits; to borrow drinking-water; and to walk over water that has been poured out, unless it have been covered with earth, or spat upon, or you have taken off your shoes (Pes.111 a). Similarly, the shadow of the moon, of certain trees, and of other objects, is dangerous, because demons love to hide there. Much caution must also be observed in regard to the water with which the hands are washed in the morning, as well as in regard to oil for anointing, which must never be taken from a strange vessel which might have been bewitched. Many diseases are caused by direct demoniac agency. Thus, leprosy (Horay.10 a), rabies (Yoma 83 b), heart-disease (Gitt.67 b), madness, asthma (Bechor.44 b), croup (Yoma 77 b; Taan.20 b), and other diseases, are ascribed to special demons. And although I cannot find any notices of demoniac possession in the sense of permanent indwelling, yet an evil spirit may seize and influence a person. The nearest approach to demoniac possession is in a legend of two Rabbis who went to Rome to procure the repeal of a persecuting edict, when they were met on board ship by a demon, Ben Temalion, whose offer of company they accepted, in hope of being able to do some miracle through him. Arrival in Rome, the demon took possession of the daughter of Cæsar. On this he was exorcised by the Rabbis (Ben Temalion, come out! Ben Temalion, come out'), when they were rewarded by the offer of anything they might choose from the Imperial Treasury, on which they removed from it the hostile decree (Meilah 17 b, about the middle). As against this one instance, many are related of cures by magical means. By the latter we mean the superstitious and irrational application of

means which could in no way affect any disease, although they might sometimes be combined with what might be called domestic remedies. Thus, for a bad cold in the head this remedy is proposed: Pour slowly a quart of the milk of a white goat over three cabbage stalks, keep the pot boiling and stir with a piece of Marmehon-wood' (Gitt.69 a, b). The other remedy proposed is the excrement of a white dog mixed with balsam. It need scarcely be said, that the more intractable the disease, the more irrational are the remedies proposed. Thus against blindness by day it is proposed to take of the spleen of seven calves and put it on the basin used by surgeons for bleeding. Next, some one outside the door is to ask the blind man to give him something to eat, when he is to reply: How can I open the door - come in and eat - on which the latter obeys, taking care, however, to break the basin, as else the blindness might strike him. We have here an indication of one of the favourite modes of healing disease - that by its transference to another. But if the loss of the power of vision is greater at night than by day, a cord is to be made of the hair of some animal, one end of which is to be tied to the foot of the patient the other to that of a dog. The children are to strike together pieces of crockery behind the dog, while the patient repeats these words: The dog is old and the cock is foolish.' Next seven pieces of meat are to be taken from seven different houses, and hung up on the doorposts, and the dog must afterwards eat the meat on a dunghill in an open place. Lastly, the cord is to be untied when one is to repeat: Let the blindness of M. the son of N. leave M. the son of N. and pierce the eyeballs of the dog!' (Gitt, 69 a).We have next to refer to strictly magical cures. These were performed by amulets - either preventive, or curative or disease - or else by exorcism. An amulet was regarded as probate, if three cures had been performed by it. In such case it might be put on even on the Sabbath. It consisted either of a piece of parchment (the Pithqa, Sanh.78 b), on which certain magical words were written, or of small bundles of certain plants or herbs (also designated as Qemia, an amulet, Shabb.61 a; Kidd.73 b). However, even probate amulets might fail, owing to the adverse constellation under which a person was. In any case the names and numbers of the demons, whose power it was wished to counteract, required to be expressly stated. Sometimes the amulet contained also a verse from the Bible. It need scarcely be said, that the other words written on the amulet had - at least, in their connection - little if any sensible meaning. But those learned in these arts and the Rabbis had the secret of discovering them, so that there was at least no mystery about them, and the formulas used were well known. If the mischief to be counteracted was due to demoniac agency, it might be prevented or removed by a kind of incantation, or by incantation along with other means, or in difficult cases by exorcism. As instances of the first we may quote the following. To ward off any danger from drinking water on a Wednesday or Sabbath-Evening, when evil spirits may rest on it, it is advised either to repeat a passage of Scripture in which the world Qol (Voice') occurs seven times (Ps. xxix.3-9), or else to say this: Lul, Shaphan, Anigron, Anirdaphin - between the stars I sit, betwixt the lean and the fat I walk!' (Pes.112 a). Against flatulence, certain remedies are recommended (such as drinking warm water), but they are to be accompanied by the following formula: Qapa, Qapa, I think of thee, and of thy seven daughters, and eight daughters-in-law!' (Pes.116 a). Many similar prescriptions might be quoted. As the remedy against blindness has been adduced to point the contrast to the Savior's mode of treatment, it may be mentioned that quite a number of remedies are suggested for the cure of a bloody flux - of which perhaps wine in which Persian onions, or anise and saffron, or other plants have been boiled, seem the most rational - the medicament being, however, in each case accompanied by this formula: Be cured of thy flux!'Lastly, as regards incanation and exorcism, the

formulas to be used for the purpose are enumerated. These mostly consist of words which have little if any meaning (so far as we know), but which form a rhyme or alliteration when a syllable is either omitted or added in successive words. The following, for example, is the formula of incantation against boils: Baz, Baziyah, Mas, Masiya, Kas, Kasiyah, Sharlai and Amarlai - ye Angels that come from the land of Sodom to heal painful boils! Let the colour not become more red, let it not farther spread, let its seed be absorbed in the belly. As a mule does not propagate itself, so let not this evil propagate itself in the body of M. the son of M.' (Shabb, 67 a). In other formulas the demons are not invoked for the cure, but threatened. We have the following as against another cutaneous disease: A sword drawn, and a sling outstretched! His name is not Yokhabh, and the disease stand still!' Against danger from the demon of foul places we have the following: On the head of the cast him into a bed of cresses, and beat him with the jawbone of an ass' (Shabb 67 a). On the other hand, it is recommended as a precaution against the evil eye to put one's right thumb into the left hand and one's left thumb into the right hand, and to say: I, M. N. belong to the house of Joseph over whom the evil eye has no power' (Ber.55 b). A certain Rabbi gave this as information derived from one of the chief of the witches, by which witchcraft might be rendered harmless. The person in danger should thus address the witches: Hot filth into your mouths from baskets with holes, ye witching women! Let your head become bald, and the wind scatter your breadcrumbs. Let it carry away your spices, let the fresh saffron which you carry in your hands be scattered. Ye witches, so long as I had grace and was careful, I did not come among you, and now I have come, and you are not favorable to me' (Pes.110 a, b). To avoid the danger of two or more persons being separated by a dog, a palm-tree, a woman, or a pig, we are advised to repeat a verse from the Bible which begins and ends with the word El (Almighty)). Or in passing between women suspected of witchcraft it may be well to repeat this formula: Agrath, Azelath, Asiya, Belusiya are already killed by arrows.' Lastly, the following may be quoted as a form of exorcism of demons:'Burst, curst, dashed, banned be Bar-Tit, Bar-Tema, Bar-Tena, Chashmagoz, Merigoz, and Isteaham!' It has been a weary and unpleasant task to record such abject superstitions, mostly the outcome of contact with Parsee or other heathen elements. Brief though our sketch has been, we have felt as if it should have been even more curtailed. But it seemed necessary to furnish these unwelcome details in order to remove the possibility of comparing what is reported in the New Testament about the demonised' and demons' with Jewish notions on such subjects. Greater contrast could scarcely be conceived than between what we read in the New Testament and the views and practices mentioned in Rabbinic writings - and if this, as it is hoped, has been firmly established, even the ungrateful labor bestowed on collecting these unsavory notices will have been sufficiently repaid.

Chapter 123

APPENDIX XVII. THE ORDINANCES AND LAW OF THE SABBATH AS LAID DOWN IN THE MISHNAH AND THE JERUSALEM TALMUD.

(See Book III. ch. xxxv. in vol. ii. p.52.) The terribly exaggerated views of the Rabbis, and their endless, burdensome rules about the Sabbath may best be learned from a brief analysis of the Mishnah, as further explained and enlarged in the Jerusalem Talmud. [6476] For this purpose a brief analysis of what is, confessedly, one of the most difficult tractates may here be given. The Mishnic tractate Sabbath stands at the head of twelve tractates which together from the second of the six sections into which the Mishnah is divided, and which treats of Festive Seasons (Seder Moed). Properly to understand the Sabbath regulations, it is, however, necessary also to take into account the second tractate in that section, which treats of what are called commixtures' or connections' (Erubin). Its object is to make the Sabbath Laws more bearable. For this purpose, it is explained how places, beyond which it would otherwise have been unlawful to carry things, may be connected together, so as, by a legal fiction, to convert them into a sort of private dwelling. Thus, supposing a number of small private houses to open into a common court, it would have been unlawful on the Sabbath to carry anthing from one of these houses into the other. This difficulty is removed if all the families deposit before the Sabbath some food in the common court, when a connection' is established between the various house, which makes them one dwelling. This was called the Erubh of Courts.' Similarly, an extension of what was allowed as a Sabbath journey' might be secured by another commixture,' the Erubh' or connection of boundaries.' An ordinary Sabbath day's journey extended 2,000 cubits beyond one's dwelling. [6477] But if at the boundary of that journey' a man deposited on the Friday food for two meals, he thereby constituted it his dwelling, and hence might go on for other 2,000 cubits. Lastly, there was another Erubh,' when narrow streets or blind alleys were connected into a private dwelling' by laying a beam over the entrance, or extending a wire or rope along such streets and alleyways. This, by a legal fiction, made them a private dwelling,' so that everything was lawful there which a man might do on the Sabbath in his own house. Without discussing the possible and impossible questions about these Erubin raised by the most ingenious casuistry, let us see how Rabbinism taught Israel to observe its Sabbath. In not less than twenty-four chapters, [6478] matters are seriously discussed as of vital religious importance, which one would scarcely imagine a sane intellect would seriously entertain. Through 64½ folio columns in the Jerusalem, and 156 double pages of folio in the Babylon Talmud does the enumeration and discussion of possible cases, drag on, almost unrelieved even by Haggadah. [6479] The Talmud itself bears witness to this, when it speaks(no doubt exaggeratedly) of a certain Rabbi who had spent no less than two and a half years in the study of only one of those twenty-four chapters! And it further bears testimony to the unprofitableness of these endless discussions and determinations. The occasion of this is so curious and characteristic, that it might here find mention. The discussion was concerning a beast of burden. An ass might not be led out on the road with its covering on, unless such had been put on the animal previous to the Sabbath, but it was lawful to lead the animal about in this fashion in one's courtyard. [6480] The same rule applied to a packsaddle, provided it were not fastened on

by girth and back-strap. Upon this one of the Rabbis is reported as bursting into the declaration that this formed part of those Sabbath Laws (comp. Chag. i.8) which were like mountains suspended by a hair! (Jer. Shabb. p.7, col. b, last lines). And yet in all these wearisome details there is not a single trace of anything spiritual - not a word even to suggest higher thoughts of God's holy day and its observance. The tractate on the Sabbath begins with regulations extending its provisions to the close of the Friday afternoon, so as to prevent the possiblity of infringing the Sabbath itself, which commenced on the Friday evening. As the most common kind of labour would be that of carrying, this is the first point discussed. The Biblical Law forbade such labour in simple terms (Ex. xxxvi.6; comp. Jer. xvii.22). But Rabbinism developed the prohibition into eight special ordinances, by first dividing the bearing of a burden' into two separate acts - lifting it up and putting it down - and than arguing, that it might be lifted up or put down from two different places, from a public into a private, or from a private into a public place. Here, of course, there are discussions as to what constituted a private place' ({hebrew}); a public place' ({hebrew}); a wide space,' which belongs neither to a special individual or to a community, such as the sea, a deep wide valley, or else the corner of a property leading out on the road or fields, and, lastly, a legally free place.' [6481] Again, a burden' meant, as the lowest standard of it, the weight of a dried fig.' But if half a fig' were carried at two different times - lifted or deposited from a private into a public place, or vice versâ - were these two actions to be combined into one so as to constitute the sin of Sabbath desecration? And if so, under what conditions as to state of mind, locality, &c. ? And, lastly, how many different sins might one such act involve? To give an instance of the kind of questions that were generally discussed. the standard measure for forbidden food was the size of an olive, just as that for carrying burdens was the weight of a fig. If a man swallowed forbidden food of the size of half an olive, rejected it, and again eaten of the size of half an olive, he would be guilty, because the palate had altogether tasted food to the size of a whole olive; but if one had deposited in another locality a burden of the weight of a half a fig, and removed it again, it involved no guilt, because the burden was altogether only of half a fig, nor even if the first half fig's burden had been burnt and then a second half fig introduced. Similarly, if an object that was intended to be worn or carried in front had slipped behind it involved no guilt, but if it had been intended to be worn or carried behind, and it slipped forward, this involved guilt, as involving labor. Similar difficulties were discussed as to the reverse. Whether, if an object were thrown from a private into a public place, or the reverse. Whether, if an object was thrown into the air with the left, and caught again in the right hand, this involved sin, was a nice question, though there could be no doubt a man incurred guilt if he caught it with the same hand which it had been thrown, but he was not guilty if he caught it in his mouth, since, after being eaten, the object no longer existed, and hence catching with the mouth was as if it had been done by a second person. Again, if it rained, and the water which fell from the sky were carried, there was no sin in it; but if the rain had run down from a wall it would involve sin. If a person were in one place, and his hand filled with fruit stretched into another, and the Sabbath overtook him in this attitude, he would have to drop the fruit, since if he withdrew his full hand from one locality into another, he would be carrying a burden on the Sabbath. It is needless to continue to analysis of this casuistry. All discussions to which we have referred turn only on the first of the legal canons in the tractate Sabbath.' They will show what a complicated machinery of merely external ordinances traditionalism set in motion; how utterly unspiritual the whole system was, and how it required no small amount of learning and ingenuity to avoid commiting grevious sin. In what follows we shall only attempt to indicate the leading points in

the Sabbath-legislation of the Rabbis. Shortly before the commencement of the Sabbath (late on Friday afternoon) nothing new was to be begun; [6482] the tailor might no longer go out with his needle, nor the scribe with his pen; nor were clothes to be examined by lamp-light. A teacher might not allow his pupils to read, if he himself looked on the book. All these are pracautionary measures. The tailor or scribe carrying his ordinary means of employment, might forget the advent of the holy day; the person examining a dress might kill insects, [6483] which is strictly forbidden on the Sabbath, and the teacher might move the lamp to see better, while the pupils were supposed to be so zealous as to do this. These latter rules, we are reminded, were passed at a certain celebrated discussion between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, when the latter were in the majority. On that occasion also opposition to the Gentiles was carried to its farthest length, and their food, their language, their testimony, their presence, their intercourse, in short, all connection with them denounced. The school of Shammai also forbade to make any mixture, the ingredients of which would not be wholly dissolved and assimilated before the Sabbath. Nay, the Sabbath law was declared to apply even to lifeless objects. Thus, wool might not be dyed if the process was not completed before the Sabbath. Nor was it even lawful to sell anything to a heathen unless the object would reach its destination before the Sabbath, nor to give to a heathen workman anything to do which might involve him in Sabbath work. Thus, Rabbi Gamialiel was careful to send his linen to be washed three days before Sabbath. But it was lawful to leave olives or grapes in the olive or wine-press. Both schools were agreed that, in roasting or baking, a crust must have been formed before the Sabbath, except in case of the Passover lamb. The Jerusalem Talmud, however, modifies certain of these rules. Thus the prohibition of work to a heathen only implies, if they work in the house of the Jew, or at least in the same town with him. The school of Shammai, however, went so far as to forbid sending a letter by a heathen, not only a Friday or on a Thursday, but even sending on a Wednesday, or to embark on the sea on these days. It being assumed that the lighting of the Sabbath lamp was a law given to Moses on Mount Sinai, the Mishnah proceeds, in the second chapter of the tractate on the Sabbath, to discuss the substances of which respectively the wick and the oil may be composed, provided always that oil which feeds the wick is not put in a seperate vessel, since the removal of that vessel would cause the extinction of the lamp, which would involve a breach of the Sabbath law. But if the light were extinguished from fear of the Gentiles, of robbers, or of an evil spirit, or in order that one dangerously ill might go to sleep, it involved no guilt. Here, many points in casuistry are discussed, such as whether twofold guilt is incurred if in blowing out a candle its flame lights another. The Mishnah here diverges to discuss the other commandments, which, like that of lighting the Sabbath lamp, specially devolve on women, on which occasion the Talmud broaches some curious statements about the heavenly Sanhedrin and Satan, such as that it is in moments of danger that the Great Enemy brings accusations against us, in order to ensure our ruin; or this, that on three occasions he specially lies in ambush: when one travels alone, when one sleeps alone in a dark house, and when one crosses the sea. In regard to the latter we may note as illustrative of St. Paul's warning not to travel after the fast (Day of Atonement), that the Jewish proverb had it: When you bind your Lulabh [6484] (at the Feast of Tabernacles) bind also your feet' - as regards a sea-voyage (Jer. Shabb.5 b, Ber. R.6). The next two chapters in the tractate on the Sabbath discuss the manner in which food may be kept warm for the Sabbath, since no fire might be lighted. If the food had been partially cooked, or was such as would improve by increased heat, there would be temptation to attened to the fire, and this must be avoided. Hence the oven was immediately before the Sabbath

only to be heated with straw or chaff; if otherwise, the coals were to be removed or covered with ashes. Clothes ought not to be dried by the hot air of a stove. At any rate, care must be taken that neighbours do not see it. An egg may not be boiled by putting it near a hot kettle, nor in a cloth, nor sand heated by the sun. Cold water might be poured on warm, but not the reverse (at least such was the opinion of the school of Shammai), nor was it lawful to prepare either cold or warm compresses. Nay, a Rabbi went so far as to forbid throwing hot water over one's self, for fear of spreading the vapour, or of cleaning the floor thereby! A vessel might be put under a lamp to catch the falling sparks, but no water might be put into it, because it was not lawful to extinguish a light. Nor would it have been allowed on the Sabbath to put a vessel to receive the drops of oil that might fall from the lamp. Among many other questions raised was this: whether a parent might take his child in his arms. Happily Rabbinic literally went so far as not only to allow this, but even in the supposed case that the child might happen to have a stone in its hands, although this would involve the labour of carrying that stone! Similarly, it was declared lawful to lift seats, provided they had not, as it were, four steps, when they must be considered as ladders. But it was not allowed to draw along chairs, as this might produce a rut of cavity, although a little carriage might be moved, since the wheels would only compress the soil but not produce a cavity (comp. on the Bab. Talmud, Shabb.22 a; 46; and Bets.23 b). Again, the question is discussed, whether it is lawful to keep the food warm by wrapping around a vessel certain substances. Here the general canon is, that all must be avoided which would increase the heat: since this would be to produce some outward effect, which would be equivalent to work.In the fifth chapter of the tractate we are supposed to begin the Sabbath morning. Ordinarily, the first business of the morning would, of course, have been to take out the cattle. Accordingly, the laws are now laid down for ensuring Sabbath rest to the animals. The principle underlying these is, that only what serves as ornament, or is absolutely necessary for leading out or bringing back animals, or for safety, may be worn by them; all else is regarded as a burden. Even such things as might be put on to prevent the rubbing of a wound, or other possible harm, or to distinguish an animal, must be left aside on the day of rest.Next, certain regulations are laid down to guide the Jew when dressing on the Sabbath morning, so as to prevent his breaking its rest. Hence he must be careful not to put on any dress which might become burdensome, nor to wear any ornament which be might put off and carry in his hand, for this would be a burden.' A woman must not wear such headgear as would require unloosing before taking a bath, nor go out with such ornaments as could be taken off in the street, such as a frontlet, unless it is attached to the cap, nor with a gold crown, nor with a necklace or nose-ring, nor with rings, nor have a pin [6485] in her dress. The reason for this prohibition of ornaments was, that in their vanity women might take them off to show them to their companions, and then, forgetful to the day, carry them, which would be a burden.' Women are also forbidden to look in the glass on the Sabbath, because they might discover a white hair and attempt to pull it out, which would be a grievous sin; but men ought not to use looking-glasses even on weekdays, because this was undignified. A woman may walk about her own court, but not in the streets, with false hair. Similarly, a man was forbidden to wear on the Sabbath wooden shoes studded with nails, or only one shoe, as this would involve labour; nor was he to wear phylacteries nor amulets, unless, indeed, they had been made by competent persons (since they might lift them off in order to show the novelty). Similarly, it was forbidden to wear any part of a suit of armour. It was not lawful to scrape shoes, except perhaps with the back of a knife, but they might be touched with oil or water. Nor should sandals be softened with oil, because that would improve them. It was a very

serious question, which led to much discussion, what should be done if the tie of a sandal had broken on the Sabbath. A plaster might be worn, provided its object was to prevent the wound from getting worse, not to heal it, for that would have been a work. Ornaments which could not easily be taken off might be worn in one's courtyard. Similarly, a person might go about with wadding in his ear, but not with false teeth nor with a gold plug in the tooth. If the wadding fell out of the ear, it could not be replaced. Some indeed, thought that its healing virtues lay in the oil in which it had been soaked, and which had dried up, but others ascribed them to the warmth of the wadding itself. In either case there was danger of healing - of doing anything for the purpose of a cure - and hence wadding might not be put into the ear on the Sabbath, although if worn before it might be contiinued. Again, as regarded false teeth: they might fall out, and the wearee might then lift and carry them, which would be sinful on the Sabbath. But anything which formed part of the ordinary dress of a person might be worn also on the Sabbath, and children whose ears were being bored might have a plug put into the hole. It was also allowed to go about on crutches, or with a wooden leg, and children might have bells on their dresses; but it was prohibited to walk on stilts, or to carry any heathen amulet.The seventh chapter of the tractate contains the most important part of the whole. It opens by laying down the principle that, if a person has either not known, or forgotten, the whole Sabbath law, all the breaches of it which he has committed during ever so many weeks are to be considered as only one error or one sin. If he has broken the Sabbath law by mistaking the day, every Sabbath thus profaned must be atoned for; but he has broken the law because he thought that what he did was permissible, then every seperate infirngment constitutes a seperate sin, although labors which stand related as species to the genus are regarded as only one work. It follows, that guilt attaches to the state of mind rather than to the outward deed. Next, forty less one chief or fathers' of work (Aboth) are enumerated, all of which are supposed to be forbidden in the Bible. They are: sowing, ploughing reaping, binding sheaves, threshing, winnowing, sifting (selecting), grinding, sifting in a sieve, kneading, baking; shearing the wool, washing it, beating it, dyeing it, spinning, putting it on the weaver's beam, making a knot,undoing a knot, sewing two stitches, tearing in order to sew two stitches; catching deer, killing; skinning, salting it, preparing its skin, scraping off its hair, cutting it up, writing two letters, scraping in order to write two letters; building, pulling down, extinguishing fire, lighting fire, beating with the hammer, and carrying from one possession into the other. The number thirty-nine is said to represent the number of times that the word labour' occurs in the Bibical text, and all these Aboth or fathers' of work are supposed to be connected with some work that had been done about the Tabernacle, or to be kindred to such work. Again, each of these principal works involved the prohibition of a number of others which were derived from them, and hence called their descendants' (toledoth). The thirty-nine principal works have been arranged in four groups: the first (1-11) referring to the preparation of bread; the second (12-24) to all connected with dress; the third (25-33) to all connected with writing; and the last (34-39) to all the work necessary for a private house. Another Rabbi derives the number thirty-nine (of these Aboth) from the numerical value of the initial word in Exod. xxxv.1, although in so doing he has to change the last letter ({hebrew}, the {hebrew} must be changed into a {hebrew} to make thirty-nine). [6486] Further explanations must here be added. If you scatter two seeds, you have been sowing. In general, the principle is laid down, that anything by which the ground may be benefited is to be considered a work' or labour,' even if it were to sweep away or to break up a cold of earth. Nay, to pluck a blade of grass was a sin. Similarly, it was sinful labour to do anything that would promote the repening of

fruits, such as to water, or even to remove a withered leaf. To pick fruit, or even to lift it from the ground, would be like reaping. If for example, a mushroom were cut, there would be twofold sin, since by the act of cutting, a new one would spring in its place. According to the Rabbis of Cæsarea, fishing, and all that put an end to life, must be ranked with harvesting. In connection with the conduct of the disciples in rubbing the ears of corn on the Sabbath, it is interesting to know that all work conected with food would be classed as one of the toledoth, of binding into sheaves. If a woman were to roll wheat to take away this husks, she would be guilty of sifting with a sieve. If she were rubbing the ends of the stalks, she would be guilty of threshing. If she were cleaning what adheres to the side of a stalk, she would be guilty of sifting. If she were brushing the stalk, she would be guilty fo grinding. If she were throwing it up in her hands, she would be guilty of winnowing. Distinctions like the following are made: A radish may be dipped into salt, but not left in it too long, since this would be to make pickle. A new dress might be put on, irrespective of the danger that in so doing it might be torn. Mud on the dress might be crushed in the hand and shaken off, but the dress must not be rubbed (for fear of affecting the material). If a person took a bath, opinions are divided, whether the whole body should be dried at once, or limb after limb. If water had fallen on the dress, some allowed the dress to be shaken but not wrung; other, to be wrung but not shaken. One Rabbi allowed to spit into the handkerchief, and that although it may necessitate the compressing of what had been wetted; but there is a grave discussion whether it was lawful to spit on the ground, and then to rub it with the foot, because thereby the earth may be scratched. It may, however, be done on stones. In the labour of grinding would be included such an act as crushing salt. To sweep, or to water the ground, would involve the same sin as beating out the corn. To lay on a plaster would be a grievous sin; to scratch out a big letter, leaving room for two small ones, would be a sin, but to write one big letter occupying the room of two small letters was no sin. To change one letter into another might imply a double sin. And so on through endles details!The Mishnah continues to explain that, in order to involve guilt, the thing carried from one locality to another must be sufficient to be entrusted for safekeeping. The quantity is regulated: as regards the food of animals, to the capacity of their mouth; as regards man, a dried fig is the standard. As regards fluids, the measure is as much wine as is used for one cup, that is, the measure of the cup being a quarter of a log, and wine being mixed with water in the poportion of three parts water to one of wine - one-sixteenth of a log. [6487] As regards milk, a mouthful; of honey, sufficient to lay on a wound; of oil, sufficient to anoint the smallest member; of water, sufficient to wet eyesalve; and of all other fluids, a quarter of a log.As regarded other substances, the standard as to what constituted a burden was whether the thing could be turned to any practical use, however trifling. Thus, two horse's hairs might be made into a birdtrap; a scrap of clean paper into a custom-house notice; a small piece of paper written upon might be converted into a wrapper for a small flagon. In all these cases, therefore, transport would involve sin. Similarly, ink sufficient to write two letters, wax enough to fill up a small hole, even a pebble with which you might aim at a little bird, or a small piece of broken earthenware with which you might stir the coals, would be burdens!' Passing to another aspect of the subject, the Mishanah lays it down that, in order to constitute sin, a thing must have been carried from one locality into another entirely and immediately, and that it must have been done in the way in which things are ordinarily carried. If an object which one person could carry is caried by two, they are not guilty. Finally, like all labour on the Sabbath, that of cutting one's nails or hair involves moral sin, but only if it is done in the ordinary way, otherwise only the lesser sin of the breach of the Sabbath rest. A very

intersting notice in connection with St. John v., is that in which it is explained how it would not involve sin to carry a living person on a pallet, the pallet being regarded only as an accessory to the man; while to carry a dead body in such manner, or even the smallest part of a dead body, would involve guilt.From this the Mishnah proceeds to discuss what is analogous to carrying, such as drawing or throwing. Other labours' are similarly made the subject of inquiry, and it is shown how any approach to them involves guilt. The rule here is, that anything that might prove of lasting character must not be done on the Sabbath. The same rule applies to what might prove the beginning of work, such as letting the hammer fall on the anvil; or to anything that might contribute to improve a place, to gathering as much wood as would boil an egg, to uprooting weeds, to writing two letters of a word - in short, to anything that might be helpful in, or contribute towards, some future work.The Mishnah next passes to such work in which not quantity, but quality, is in question - such as catching deer. Here it is explained that anything by which an animal might be caught is included in the prohibition. So far is this carried that, if a deer had run into a house, and the door were shut upon it, it would involve guilt, and this, even if, without closing the door, persons seated themselves at the entry to prevent the exit of the animal.Passing over the other chapters, which similarly illustrate what are supposed to be Biblical prohibitions of labour as defined in the thirty-nine Aboth and their toledoth, we come, in the sixteenth chapter of the tractate, to one of the most interesting parts, containing such Sabbath laws as, by their own admission, were imposed only by the Rabbis. These embrace: 1. Things forbidden, because they might lead to a transgression of the Biblical command; 2. such as are like the kind of labour supposed to be forbidden in the Bible; 3. Such as are regarded a sin compatible with the honour due to the Sabbath. In the first class are included a number of regulations in case of a fire. All portions of Holy Scripture, whether in the original or translated, and the case in which they are laid; the phylacteries and their case, might be rescued from the flames. Of food or drink only what was needful for the Sabbath might be resuced; but if the food were in a cupbord or basket the whole might be carried out. Similarly, all utensils needed for the Sabbath meal, but of dress only what was absolutely necessary, might be saved, it being, however, provided, that a person might put on a dress, save it, to go back and put on another, and so on. Again, anything in the house might be covered with skin so as to save it from the flames, or the spread of the flames might be areested by piling up vessels. It was not lawful to ask a Gentile to extinguish the flame, but not duty to hinder him, if he did so. It was lawful to put a vessel over a lamp, to prevent the ceiling from catching fire; similarly, to throw a vessel over a scorpion, although on that point there is doubt. On the other hand, it is allowed, if a Gentile has lighted a lamp on the Sabbath, to make use of it, the fiction being, however, kept up that he did it for himself, and not for the Jew. By the same fiction the cattle may be watered, or, in fact, any other use made of his services.Before passing from this, we should point out that it was directed that the Hagiographa should not be read except in the evening, since the daytime was to be devoted to more doctrinal studies. In the same connection it is added, that the study of the Mishnah is more important than that of the Bible, that of the Talmud being considered the most meritorious of all, as enabling one to understand all questions of right and wrong. Liturgical pieces, though containing the Name of God, might not be rescued from the flames. The Gospels, and the writings of Christians, or of hertics, might not be rescued. If it be asked what should be done with them on weekdays, the answer is, that the Names of God which they contain ought to be cut out, and then the books themselves burned. One of the Rabbis, however, would have had them burnt at once, indeed, he would rather have fled into an

indolatrous temple than into a Christain church: for the idolators deny God because they have not known Him, but the apostates are worse.' To them applied Ps. cxxxix.21, and, if it was lawful to wash out in the waters of jealousy the Divine Name in order to restore peace, much more would it be lawful to burn such books, even though they contained the Divine Name, because they led to enmity between Israel and their Heavenly Father. Another chapter of the tractate deals with the question of the various pieces of furniture - how far they may be moved and used. Thus, curtains, or a lid, may beregarded as furniture, and hence used. More interesting is the next chapter (xviii.), which deals with things forbidden by the Rabbis because they resemble those kinds of labour supposed to be interdicted in the Bible. Here it is declared lawful, for example, to remove quantities of straw or corn in order to make room for guests, or for an assembly of students, but the whole barn must not be emptied, because in so doing the floor might be injured. Again, as regards animals, some assistance might be given if an animal was about to have its young, though not to the same amount as to a woman in childbrith, for whose sake the Sabbath might be desecrated. Lastly, all might be done on the holy day needful for circumcision. At the same time, every preparation possible for the service should be made the day before. The Mishnah proceeds to enter here on details not necessarily connected with the Sabbath law.In the following chapter (xx.) the tractate goes on to indicate such things as are only allowed on the Sabbath on condition that they are done differently from ordinary days. Thus, for example, certain solutions ordinarily made in water should be made in vinegar. The food for horses or cattle must not be taken out of the manger, unles it is immediately given to some other animal. The bedding straw must not be turned with hand, but with other part of the body. A press in which linen is smoothed may be opened to take out napkins, but must not be screwed down again, &c.The next chapter proceeds upon the principle that, although everything is to be avoided which resembles the labours referred to in the Bible, the same prohibition does not apply to such labours as resemble those inderdicted by the Rabbis. The application of this principle is not, however, of interst to general readers.In the twenty-second chapter the Mishnah proceeds to show that all the precautions of the Rabbis had only this object: to prevent an ultimate breach of a Biblical prohibition. Hence, where such was not to be feared, an act might be done. For example, a person might bathe in mineral waters, but not carry home the linen with which he had dried himself. He might anoint and rub the body, but not to the degree of making himself tired; but he might not use any artifical remedial measures, such as taking a shower-bath. Bones might not be set, nor emetics given, nor any medical or surgical operation performed.In the last two chapters the Mishnah points out those things which are unlawful as derogatory to the dignity of the Sabbath. Certain things are here of interest as bearing on the quesion of purchasing things for the feast-day. Thus, it is expressly allowed to borrow wine, or oil, or bread on the Sabbath, and to leave one's upper garment in pledge, though one should not express it in such manner as to imply it was a loan. Moreover, it is expressly added that if the day before the Passover falls on a Sabbath, one may in this manner purchase a Paschal lamb, and, presumably, all else that is needful for the feast. This shows how Judas might have been sent on the eve of the Passover to purchase what was needful, for the law applying to a feast-day was much less strict than that of the Sabbath. Again, to avoid the possibility of effacing anything written, it was forbidden to read from a tablet the names of one's guests, or the menu. It was lawful for children to cast lots for their portions at table, but not with strangers, for this might lead to a breach of the Sabbath, and to games of chance. Similarly, it was improper on the Sabbath to engage workmen for the following week, nor should one be on the watch for the close of that day

to begin one's ordinary work. It was otherwise if religious obligations awaited one at the close of the Sabbath such as attending to a bride, or making preparation for a funeral. [6488] On the Sabbath itself it was lawful to do all that was absolutely necessary connected with the dead, such as to anoint or wash the body, although without moving the limbs, nor might the eyes of the dying be closed - a practice which, indeed, was generally denounced.In the last chapter of the tractate the Mishnah returns to the discussion of punctilious details. Supposing a traveller to arrive in a place just as the Sabbath commenced, he must only take from his beast of burden such objects are are allowed to be handled on the Sabbath . As for the rest, he may loosen the ropes and let them fall down of themselves. Further, it is declared lawful to unloose bundles of straw, or to rub up what can only be eaten in that condition; but care must be taken that nothing is done which is not absolutely necessary. On the other hand, cooking would not be allowed - in short, nothing must be done but what was absolutely necessary to satisfy the cravings of hunger or thist. Finally, it was declared lawful on the Sabbath to absolve from vows, and to attend to similiar religious calls. Detailed as this analysis of the Sabbath law is, we have not by any means exhusted the subject. Thus, one of the most curious provisions of the Sabbath law was, that on the Sabbath only such things were to be touched or eaten as had been expressly prepared on a weekday with a view to the Sabbath (Bez.2 b). [6489] Anything not so destined was forbidden, as the expression is on account of Muqtsah' ({hebrew}), i. e. as not having been the intention.' Jewish dogmatists enumerate nearly fifty cases in which that theological term finds its application. Thus, if a hen had laid on the Sabbath, the egg was forbidden, because, evidently, it could not have been destined on a weekday for eating, since it was not yet laid, and did not exist; while if the hen had been kept, not for laying but for fattening, the egg might be eaten as forming a part of the hen that had fallen off! But when the principle of Muqtsah is applied to the touching of things which are not used because they have become ugly (and hence are not in one's mind), so that, for example, an old lamp may not be touched, or raisins during the process of drying them (because they are not eatable then), it will be seen how complicated such a law must have been.Chiefly from other tractates of the Talmud the following may here be added. It would break the Sabbath rest to climb a tree, to ride, to swim, to clap one's hands, to strike one's side, or to dance. All judicial acts, vows, and tilling were also prohibited on that day (Bez. v.2). It has already been noted that aid might be given or promised for a woman in her bed. But the Law went further. While it prohibited the application or use on the Sabbath of any remedies that would bring improvement or cure to the sick, all actual danger to life,' ({hebrew}, Yoma vii.6) superseded the Sabbath law, but nothing short of that. Thus, to state an extreme case, if on the Sabbath a wall had fallen on a person, and it were doubtful whether he was under the ruins or not, whether he was alive or dead, a Jew or Gentile, it would be duty to clear away the rubbish sufficiently to find the body. If life were not extinct the labour would have to be continued; but if the person were dead nothing further should be done to extricate the body. Similarly, a Rabbi allowed the use of remedies on the Sabbath in throat diseases, on the express ground that he regarded them as endangering life. On a similar principle a woman with child or a sick person was allowed to break even the fast of the Day of Atonement, while one who had a maniacal attack of morbid craving for food ({hebrew}) = bolimos might on that sacred day have even unlawful food (Yoma viii.5, 6).Such are the leading provisions by which Rabbinism enlarged the simple Sabbath-law as expressed in the Bible, [6490] and, in its anxiety to ensure its most exact observance, changed the spiritual import of its rest into a complicated code of external and burdensome ordinances. Shall we then wonder at Christ's opposition to the

Sabbath-ordinances of the Synagogue, or, on the other hand, at the teaching of Christ on this subject, and that of his most learned and most advanced contemporaries? And whence this difference unless Christ was the Teacher come from God,' Who spake as never before man had spoken?

Chapter 124

APPENDIX XVIII. HAGGADAH ABOUT SIMEON KEPHA (LEGEND OF SIMON PETER.)

({hebrew}) (Vol. ii. Book III. ch. xxxviii.) THIS Haggadah exists in four different Recensions (comp. Jellinek, Beth ha-Midrash, Pt. V. and Pt. VI., pp. ix. x). The first of these, reproduce by Jellinek (u. s. Pt. V. p. xxvi. &c., and pp.60-62) was first published by Wagenseil in his collection of Antichristian writings, the Tela Ignea Satanæ, at the close that blasphemous production, the Sepher Toledoth Jeshu (pp.19-24). The second Recension is that by Huldrich (Leyden 1705); the third has been printed, as is inferred, at Breslau in 1824; while the fourth exists only in MS. Dr. Jellinek has substantially reproduced (without the closing sentences) the text of Wagenseil's (u. s. Pt. V.), and also Recensions III. and IV. (u. s. Pt. VI.). He regards Recension IV. as the oldest; but we infer from its plea against the abduction of Jewish children by Christians and against forced baptisms, as well as from the use of certain expressions, that Recension IV. is younger than the text of Waggenseil, which seems to present the legend in its most primitive form. Even this, however, appears a mixture of several legends; or perhaps the original may afterwards have been interpolated. It were impossible to fix even approximately the age of this Christianity in Rome, and that of the Papacy, though it seems to contain older elements. It may be regarded as embodying certain ancient legends among the Jews about St. Peter, but adapted to later times, and cast in an apologetic form. A brief criticism of the document will best follow an abstract of the text, according to the first or earlier Recension. The text begins by a notice that the strife between the Nazarenes and the Jews had grown to such proportions that they separated, since any Nazarene who saw a Jew would kill him. Such became the misery for thirty years, that the Nazarenes increased to thousands and myriads, and prevented the Jew from going up to the feast of Jerusalem. And distress was as great as at the time of the Golden Calf. And still the opposing faith increased, and twelve wicked men went out, who traversed the twelve kingdoms. And they prophesied false phophecies in the camp, and they misled Israel, and they were men of reputation, and strengthened the faith of Jesus, for they said that they were the Apostles of the Crucified. And they drew to themselves a large number from among the children of Israel. On this the text describes, how the sages in Israel were afflicted and humbled themselves, each confessing to his neighbour the sins which had brought this evil, and earnestly asking of God to give them direction how to arrest the advance of Nazarene doctrine and persecution. As they finished their prayer, up rose an elder from their midst, whose name was Simeon Kepha, who had formerly put into requisition the Bath Kol and said: Hearken to me, my brethren and my people! If my words are good in your sight, I will separate those sinners from the congregation of the children of Israel, and they shall have neither part nor inheritance in the midst of Israel, if only you take upon you the sin. And they all answered and said: We will take upon us the sin, if only thou wilt do what thou hast said.' Upon this,the narrative proceeds, Peter went into the Sanctuary, wrote the Ineffable Name, and inserted it in his flesh. Having learnt the Ineffable Name, he went to the metropolis (metroplin') of the Nazarenes, and proclaimed that every believer in Christ should come to him, since he was an Apostle. The multitudes required thathe should prove his claim by a sign (oth') such as Jesus had

done while He was alive, when Peter, through the power of the Ineffable Name, restored a leper, by laying on of hands, and raised the dead. When the Nazarenes saw this, they fell on their faces, and acknowledged his Apostolate. Then Peter delivered this as his message, first bidding them swear to do as he would command: know (said he) that the Crucified hated Israel and their law, as Isaiah prophesied: "Your new moons and your feasts my soul hateth;" know also, that he delighteth not in Israel, as Hosea prophesied, "You are not my people." And although it is in His power to extripate them from the world in a moment, from out of every place, yet He does not purpose to destroy them, but intends to leave them, in order that they be in memory of His Crucifixion and lapidation to all generations. Besides, know that He bore all those great sufferings and afflictions to redeem you from Gehemma. And now He admonishes and commands you, that you should do no evil to the Jews: and if a Jews says to a Nazarene, "Go with me one parasang" (Persian mile about three English miles), let him go with him two parasangs. And if a Jew smites him on the left check, let him present to him also the right cheek, in order that they may have their reward in this world, while in the next they will be punished in Gehenna. And if you do thus, you will deserve to sit with Him in Feast of the Passover, but observe the day of His death. And instead of the Feast of Pentecost observe the forty days from the time that He was slain to when He went up into heaven. And instead of the Feast of Tabernacles observe the day of His birth, and on the eighth day after His birth observe that on which He was circumcised.' To these commands all agreed, on condition that Peter should remain with them. This he consented to do, on the understanding that he would not eat anything except bread of misery and water of affliction - presumably not only to avoid forbidden food, but in expiatory suffering for his sin - and that they should build him a tower in the midst of the city, in which he would remain unto the day of his death, all which provisions were duly carried out. It is added, that in this tower he served the God of his fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. What is still stranger, it is added, that he wrote many Piutim, a certain class of liturgical poems which form apart of the Synagogue service - and that he sent these throughout all Israel to be in perpetual memory of him, and especially that he despatched them to the Rabbis. The remark is the more noteworthy, as other Jewish writers also describe the Apostle Peter as the author of several liturgical poems, of which one is still repeated in the Synagogue on Sabbaths and Feast-days (comp. Jellinek, Beth ha-Midr., part v., p.61, note). But to return. Peter is said to have remained in that tower for six years, when he died, and by his direction was buried within the tower. But the Nazarenes raised there a great fabric, and this tower may be seen in Rome, and they call it Peter, which is the word for a stone, because he sat on a stone till the day of his death. But after his death another person named Elijah came, in the wickedness and cunning of his heart to mislead them. And he said to them Simon had deceived them, for that Jesus had commanded him to tell them: it had not come into His heart to despise the Law of Moses; that if any one wished to circumcise, he should circumcise; but if any one did not wish to be circumcised, let him be immersed in foul waters. And even if he were not immersed, he would not thereby be in danger in the world. And he commanded that they should not observe the seventh day, but only the first day, because on it were created the heavens and the earth. And he made to them many statutes which were not good. But the people asked him: Give us a true sign that Jesus hath sent thee. And he said to them: What is the sign that you seek? And the word had not been out of his own mouth when a great stone of immense weight fell and crushed his head. So perish all Thine enemies, O God, but let them that love Thee be as the sun when he goeth forth in his strength!' Thus far what we regard as the oldest Recension. The chief variations between

this and the others are, that in the third Recension the opponent of Peter is called Abba Shaul (St. John also is mentioned; Jellinek, u. s. part vi., p.156), while in the fourth Recension (in MS.), which consists of nineteen chapters, this opponent is called Elijah. In the latter Recension there is mention of Antioch and Tiberias, and other places connected with the lives of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the early history of the Church. But the occurence of certain Romanic words, such as Papa, Vescova, &c., shows its later date. Again, we mark that, according to Recensions III. and IV., Peter sent his liturgical pieces to Babylon, which may either indicate that at the time of the document Babylon' was the centre of the Jewish population, or else be a legendary reminiscence of St. Peter's labours in the Church that is in Babylon' (1 Pet. v.13). In view of modern controversies it is of special interest that, according to the Jewish legend, Peter, secretly a Jew, advised the Christians to throw off completely the law of Moses, while Paul, in opposition to him, stands up for Israel and the Law, and insists that either circumcision or baptism may be practised. It will be further noted, that the object of the document seems to be: 1st, to serve as an apology' for Judaism, by explaining how it came that so many Jews, under the leadership of Apostles, embraced the new faith. This seems to be traced to the continued observance of Jewish legal practices by the Christians. Simon Peter is supposed to have arrested the progress of Christianity by separating the Church from the Synagogue, which he did by proclaiming that Israel were rejected, and the Law of Moses abolished. On the other hand, St. Paul is represented as the friend of the Jews, and as proclaiming that the question of circumcision or baptism, of legal observances or Christian practices, was a matter of influences. This attempt to heal the breach between the Church and the Synagogue had been the cause of Divine judgment on him.2ndly, The legend is intended as an apology for the Jews, with a view to ward off persecution.3rdly, It is intended to show that the leaders of the Christians remained in heart Jews. It will perhaps not be difficult - at least, hypothetically - to separate the various legends mixed up, or perhaps interpolated in the tractate. From the mention of the Piutim and the ignorance as to their origin, we might be disposed to assign the composition of the legend in its present form to about the eighth century of our era.

Chapter 125

APPENDIX XIX. ON ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, ACCORDING TO THE RABBIS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

(See vol. ii. Book V. ch. vi.) THE Parables of the Ten Virgins' and of the Unfaithful Servant' close with a Discourse on the Last Things,' the final Judgment, and the fate of those Christ's Righ Hand and at His Left (St. Matt. xxv.31-46). This final Judgment by our Lord forms a fundamental article in the Creed of the Church. It is the Christ Who comes, accompanied by the Angelic Host, and sits down on the throne of His Glory, when all nations are gathered before Him. Then the final separation is made, and joy or sorrow awarded in accordance with the past of each man's history. And that past, as in relationship to the Christ - whether it have been with' Him or not with' Him, which latter is now shown to be equivalent to an against' Him. And while, in the deep sense of a love to Christ which is utterly self-forgetful in its service and utterly humble in its realisation to Him to Whom no real service can be done by man, to their blessed surprise, those on the Right' find work and acknowledgement where they had never thought of its possibility, every ministry of their life, however small, is now owned of Him as rendered to Himself - partly, because the new direction, from which all such ministry sprang, was of Christ in' them, and partly, because of the indentification of Christ with His people. On the other hand, as the lowest service of him who has the new inner direction if Christward, so does ignorance, or else ignoration, of Christ (When saw we Thee. . . .?') issue in neglect of service and labour of love, and neglect of service proceed from neglect and rejection of Christ. And so is life either to' Christ or not to' Christ, and necessarily ends in the Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world' or in the eternal fire which is prepared for the Devil and his angels.' Thus far the meaning of the Lord's Words, which could only be impaired by any attempt at commentation. But they also raise questions of the deepest importance, in which not only the head, but perhaps much more the heart, is interested, as regards the precise meaning of the term everlasting' and eternal' in this and other connections, so far as those on the Left Hand of Christ are concerned. The subject has of late attracted renewed attention. The doctrine of the Eternity of Punishments, with the proper explanations and limitations given to it in the teaching of the Church, has been set forth by Dr. Pusey in his Treatise: What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?' Before adverting, however briefly, to the New Testament teaching, it seems desirable with some fulness to set forth the Jewish views on this subject. For the views held at the time of Christ, whatever they were must have been those which the hearers of Christ entertained; and whatever views, Christ did not at least directly, contradict or, so far as we can infer, intend to correct them. [6491] And here we have happily sufficient materials for a history of Jewish opinions at different periods on the Eternity Punishment; and it seems the more desirable carefully to set it forth, as statements both inaccurate and incomplete have been put forward on the subject. Leaving aside the teaching of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphic Writing (to which Dr. Pusey has sufficiently referred), the first Rabbinic utterances come to us from the time immediately before that of Christ, from the Schools of Shammai and Hillel (Rosh haSh.16 b last four lines, and 17 a). [6492] The former arranged all mankind into three classes: the perfectly righteous, who are immediately written and sealed to eternal life;' the perfectly wicked, who are

immediately written and sealed to Gehenna;' and an intermediate class. who go down to Gehinnom, and moan, and come up again,' according to Zech. xiii.9, and which seemed also indicated in certain words in the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii.6). The careful reader will notice that this statement implies belief in Eternal Punishment on the partof the School of Shammai. For (1) The perfectly wicked are spoken of as written and sealed unto Gehenna;' (2) The school of Shammai expressly quotes, in support of what it teaches about these wicked, Dan xii.2, a passage which undoubtedly refers to the final judgment after the Resurrection; (3) The perfectly wicked, so punished, are expressly distinguished from the third, or intermediate class, who merely go down to Gehinnom,' but are not written and sealed,' and come up again.' Substantially the same, as regards Eternity of Punishment, is the view of the School of Hillel (u. s.17 a). In regard to sinners of Israel and of the Gentiles it teaches, indeed, that they are tormented in Gehenna for twelve months, after which their bodies and souls are burnt up and scattered as dust under the feet of the righteous; but it significantly excepts from this number certain classes of transgressors who go down to Gehinnom and are punished there to ages of ages.' That the Niphal form of the verb used, {hebrew}; must mean punished' and not judged,' appears, not only from the context, but from the use of the same word and form in the same tractate (Rosh haSh.12 a, lines 7 &c. from top), when it is said of the generation of the Flood that they were punished' surely not judged' - by hot water.' However, therefore the School of Hillel might accentuate the mercy of God, or limit the number of those who would suffer Eternal Punishment, it did teach Eternal Punishment in the case of some. And this is the point in question. But, since the Schools of Shammai and Hillel represented the theological teaching in the time of Christ and His Apostles, it follows, that the doctrine of Eternal Punishment was that held in the days of our Lord, however it may afterwards have been modified. Here, so far as this book is concerned, we might rest the case. But for completeness' sake it will be better to follow the historical development of Jewish theological teaching, at least a certain distance. The doctrine of the Eternity of Punishments seems to have been held by the Synagogue throuthout the whole first century of our era. This will appear from the sayings of the Teachers who florished during its course. The Jewish Parable of the fate of those who had not kept their festive garments in readiness or apeared in such as were not clean (Shabb.152 b, 153 a) has been already quoted in our exposition of the Parables of the Man without the Wedding-garment and of the TenVirgins. But we have more than this. We are told (Ber.28 b) that, when that great Rabbinic authority of the first century, Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai - the light of Israel, the right hand pillar, the mighty hammer' - lay a dying and wept, he accounted for his tears by fear as to his fate in judgment, illustrating the danger by the contrast of punishment by an earthly king whose bonds are not eternal bonds nor his death eternal death,' while as regarded God and His judgment: if He is angry with me, His Wrath is an Eternal Wrath, if He binds me in fetters, His fetters are Eternal fetters, and if He kills me, His death is an Eternal Death.' In the same direction is this saying of another great Rabbi of the first century, Elieser (Shabb, 152 b, about the middle), to the effect that the souls of the righteous are hidden under the throne of glory,' while those of the wicked were to be bound and in unrest ({hebrew}), one Angel hurling them to another from one end of the world to the other - of which latter strange idea he saw confirmation in 1 Sam. xxv.29. To the fate of the righteous applied, among other beautiful passages, Is. lvii.2, to that of the wicked Is. lvii.21. Evidently, the views of the Rabbis of the first century were in strict accordance with those Shammai and Hillel. In the second century of our era, we mark a decided difference in Rabbinic opinion. Although it was said that, after the death of Rabbi Meir, the ascent of smoke from the

grave of his apostate teacher had indicated that the Rabbi's prayers for the deliverance of his matter from Gehenna had been answered (Chag.15 b), most of the eminent teachers of that period propounded the idea, that in the last day the sheath would be removed which now covered the sun, when its fiery heat would burn up the wicked (Ber. R.6). Nay, one Rabbi maintained that there was no hell at all, but that that day would consume the wicked, and yet another, that even this was not so, but that the wicked would be consumed by a sort of internal conflaragation. In the third century of our era we have once more a reaction, and a return to the former views. Thus (Kethub.104 a, about the middle) Rabbi Eleasar speaks of the three bands of Angels, which successively go forth to meet the righteousness, each with a welcome of their own, and of the three bands of Angels of sorrow, which similarly receive the wicked in their death - and this, in terms which leave no doubt as to the expected fate of the wicked. And here Rabbi José informs us (Tor. Ber. vi.15), that the fire of Gehenna which was created on the second day is not extinguished for ever.' With this view accord the seven designations which according to Rabbi Joshua ben Levi, attach to Gehenna (Erub.19 a, line 11, &c., from bottom - but the whole page bears on the subject). This doctrine was only modified, when Ben Lakish maintained, that the fire of Gehenna did not hurt sinners from among the Jews (Kethub. u. s.). Nor does even this other saying of his (Nedar.8 b, last four lines) necessarily imply that he denied the eternity of punishment: There is no Gehinnom in the world to come' - since it is qualified by the expectation that the wicked would be punished ({hebrew}), not annihilated, by the heat of the sun, which would be felt as healing by the righteous. Lastly, if not universal beatification, yet a kind of universal moral restoration seems implies in the teaching of Rabbi Jehudah to the effect that in the soeculum futurum God would destroy the Yetser haRa. Tempting as the subject is, we must here break off this historial review, for want to space, not of material. Dr. Pusey has shown that the Targumim also teach the doctrine of Eternal Punishment - though their date is matter of discussion - and to the passage quoted by him in evidence others might be added. And if on the other side the saying of Rabbi Akiba should be quoted (Eduy. ii.10) to the effect that the judgment of the wicked in Gehenna was one of the five things that lasted for twelve months, it must be remembered that, even if this be taken seriously (for it is really only a jeu d' esprit), it does not necessarily imply more than the teaching of Hillel concerning that intermediate class of sinners who were in Gehenna for a year - while there was another class the duration of whose punishment would be for ages of ages. Even more palpably inapt is the quotation from Baba Mez.58 b (lines 5, &c., from the bottom). For, if that passage declares that all are destined to come up again from Gehenna, it expressly excepts from this these three classes of persons: adulterers, those who put their fellow-men publicly to shame, and those who apply an evil name to their neighbors. But there can at least be no question, that the passage which has been quoted at the outset of these remarks (Rosh haSh.16 b, 17 a), proves beyond the possibility of gainsaying that both the Great Schools, in which Rabbinic teaching at the time of Christ was divided, held the doctrine of Eternal Punishments. This, of course, entirely apart from the question who - how many, or rather, how few - were to suffer this terrible fate. And here the cautions and limitations, with which Dr. Pusey has shown that the Church has surrounded her teaching, cannot be too often or earnestly repeated. It does, indeed, seem painfully strange that, if the meaning of it be all realised, some should seem so anxious to contend for the extension to so many of a misery from which our thoughts shrink in awe. Yet of this we are well assured, that the Judge of all the Earth will judge, not only righteously, but mercifully. He alone knows all the secrets of heart and life, and He alone can apportion to each the due need.

And in this assured conviction may the mind trustfully rest as regards those who have been dear to us. But if on such grounds we shrink from narrow and harsh dogmatism, there are certain questions which we cannot quite evade, even although we may answer them generally rather than specifically. We put aside, as an unhealthy and threatening sign of certain religious movements, the theory, lately broached, of a so-called Conditional Immortality.' So far as the readings of the present writer extends, it is based on bad philosophy and even worse exegesis. But the question itself, to which this rough-and-ready' kind of answer has been attempted, is one of the most serious. In our view, an impartial study of the Words of the Lord, recorded in the Gospels - as repeatedly indicated in the text of these volumes - leads to the impression that His teaching in regard to reward and punishment should be taken in the ordinary and obvious sense, and not in that suggested by some. And this is confirmed by what is now quite clear to us, that the Jews, to whom He spoke, believed in Eternal Punishment, however few they might consign to it. And yet we feel that this line of argument is not quite convincing. For might nor our Lord, as in regard to the period of His Second Coming, in this also have intended to leave His hearers in incertitude? And, indeed, is it really necessary to be quite sure of this aspect of eternity?And here the question arises about the precise meaning of the words which Christ used. It is, indeed, maintained that the terms anios and kindred expression always refer to eternity in the strict sense. But of this I cannot express myself convinced (see ad voc. Schleusner, Lex., who, however, goes a little too far; Wahl, Clavis N.T.; and Grimm, Clavis N.T.), although the balance of evidence is in favour of such meaning. But it is at least conceivable that the expressions might refer to the end of all time, and the merging of the mediatorial regency' (1 Cor. xv.24) in the absolute kingship of God.In further thinking on this most solemn subject, it seems to the present writer that exaggerations have been made in the argument. It has been said that, the hypothesis of annihilation being set aside, we are practially shut up to what is called Universalism. And again, that Universalism implies, not only the final restoration of all the wicked, but even of Satan and his angels. And further, it has been argued that the metaphysical difficultties of the question ultimately resolve themselves into this: why the God of all foreknowledge had created beings - be they men or fallen angels - who, as He foreknew, would ultimately sin? Now this argument has evidently no force as against absolute Universalism. But even otherwise, it is rather specious than convincing. For we only possess data for reasoning in regard to the sphere which falls within our cognition, which the absolutely Divine - the pre-human and the pre-created - does not, except so far as it has been the subject of Revelation. This limitation excludes from the sphere of our possible comprehension all questions connected with the Divine foreknowledgeand its compatibility with that which we know to be the fundamental law of created intelligences, and the very condition of their moral being: personal freedom and choice. To quarrel with this limitation of our sphere of reasoning, were to rebel against the conditions of human existence. But if so, then the question of Divine foreknowledge must not be raised at all, and the question of the fall of angels and of the sin of man must be left on the (to us) alone intelligible basis: that of personal choice and absolute moral freedom.Again - it seems least an exaggeration to put the alternatives thus: absolute eternity of punishment - and, with it, of the state of rebellion which it implies, since it is unthinkable that rebellion should absolutely cease, and yet punishment continue; annihilation; or else universal restoration. Something else is at least thinkable, that may not lie within these hard and fast lines of demarcation. It is at least conceivable that there may be a quartum quid - that there may be a purification or transformation (sit venia verbis) of all who are capable of such - or, if it is preferred,

an unfolding of the germ of grace, present before death, invisible though it may have been to other men, and that in the end of what we call time or dispensation,' only that which is morally incapable of transformation - be it men or devils - shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone (Rev. xx.10, 14, 15; xxi.8). And here, if, perhaps just, exception is taken to the terms purification' or transformation' (perhaps spiritual development), I would refer in explanation to what Dr. Pusey has so beautifully written - although my reference is only to this point, not to others on which he touches (Pusey, What is of Faith, &c., pp.116-122). And, in connection with this, we note that there is quite a series of Scripture-statements, which teach alike the final reign of God (that God may be all in all'), and the final putting of all things under Christ - and all this in connection with blessed fact that Christ has tasted death for every man,' that the world through Him might be saved,' and, in consequence, to draw all' unto Himself, comp. Col. i.19, 20 (comp. St. John iii.17 ; xii.32; Rom. v.18-24; 1 Cor. xv.20-28; Eph. i.10; Col. i.19, 20; 1 Tim. ii.4, 6; iv.10; Heb. ii.9; 1 John ii.2; iv.14 - all which passages must, however, be studied in their connection). Thus far it has been the sole aim of the present writer to set before the reader, so far as he can, all the elements to be taken into consideration. He has pronounced no definite conclusion, and he neither wishes nor purposes to do so. This only he will repeat, that to his mind the Words of our Lord, as recorded in theGospels, convey this impression, that there is an eternity of punishement; and further, that this was the accepted belief of the Jewish schools in the time of Christ. But of these things does he feel fully assured: that we may absolutely trust in the loving-kindness of our God; that the word of Christ is for all and of infinite value, and that its outcome must correspond to its character; and lastly, for practical purposes, that in regard to those who have departed (whether or not we know of grace in them) our views and our hopes should be the widest (consistent with Scripture teaching), and that as regards ourselves, personally and individually, our views as to the need of absolute and immediate faith in Christ as the Saviour, of holiness of life, and of service of the Lord Jesus, should be the closest and most rigidly fixed.EXPLANATORY NOTES AND CORRECTIONS To The Second Volume.Page 15^d: The Targum is quoted from the Venice edition.Page 16^g: However, the word has also been translated in the wider sense of garment.' But see Rosh haSh., and compare also what is said about the Tephillin, which cannot be otherwise interpreted than in the text.Page 21^a: But the passage is a somewhat difficult one, and it has received different interpretations. See Levy as in note 1, and Lightfoot ad loc. Line 10, read: by a vow from anything by which he migh be profited (or rather have enjoyment) form his son.' And so as regards note 2, various interpretations and comments are given. But the principle that a vow would exclude parents from being profited' is clearly established in Ned. ix.1.Page 116^a: Simon b. Shetach compares him to a son who sins against his father, and yet he does what the child pleases, so Chony, although he was sinning against God, yet He answered that very prayer.Page 162^cde: Of course, these were only the extreme inferences from their principles, and not intended literatim.Page 156, note 1: On the Octave of the Feast probably Ps. xii. was chanted (see Sopher. xix. beg.).Page 182^d: One of the prohibitions there would be exactly parallel to the making of clay.Page 290, note 2, end: I refer here especially to Bemid. R.2. It would be difficult to find anything more realistically extravagant in its exaltation of Israel over all the nations (delete 28). The note sets forth the general impression left on the mind, and is, of course, not intended as a citation.Page 297^d: The reference is to one who hesitates to forgive injury to his name when asked to do so by the offender. At the same time I gladly admit how beauttifully Rabbinism speaks about mercy and forgiveness. In this respect also are the Gospels historically true, since the

teaching of Christ here sprang from, and was kindred to the highest teaching of the Rabbis. But, to my mind, it is just where Rabbinism comes nearest to Christ that the essential difference most appears. And from even the highest Rabbinic sayings to the forgiveness of Christ in its freeness, absolutenes, internalness, and universality (to Jew and Gentile) there is an immeasurable distance.Page 388, note 1: In Vayy. R.3, there is another beautiful stroy of a poor man who offered every day half his living, and whose sacrifice was presented before that of King Agrippa.Page 409^d: As regards the view given of Jer. Ber.9 a, I refer to Levy, Neuhebr. Wörterb. II., p.10 a.Page 411^h: Comp. also Vayy. R.1.Page 431^a: It was described as more beautiful than the waves of the sea.Page 437^a: The quotation of the Midrash on Cant. is again form the unmutilated citation in R. Martini, Pugio Fidei (ed. Carpz), pp.782, 783.Page note 1: The citations refer to the Jerusalem from heaven. For the rest see Weber, Altsynag. Theol., p.386. but probably the last clause had best be omitted.Page 479, line 9: What is the Pascha,' &c.; rather: What is "on the Pesach?" On the 14 Nisan' - in the original: BaPesach, i.e. the beginning of the Passover.Page 556, line 7: for on public Feast-days' read at the great public Feasts.'Page 609: The reference ^d applies to the end of the sentence. On the thirteen Veils comp. Maimonides (Kel. haMiqd. vii.17).

INDEX I. OF SUBJECTS

(The Roman Numeral refers to the Volume, the ordinary Numeral to the page. The Index does not extend either to the Notes or to the Appendix.)

Abraham, transcending merits of, i.271, 272. See Gehenna
Abtalion, saying of, i.128
Academics, subjects of study in, i.232; classes of lectures in, and students, 247
Acco or Ptolemais, fair at, i.117
Acher, See Elisha ben Abuyah
Acra, Fort, i.113
Adam, Fall of, to what ascribed. i.165; things lost through it 166
Aegina, Jewish inscriptions at, i.70
Aenon, near Salim, site of, i.393, 657, 658
Agrippa I., money dealings with Alexandrian Jews i.63
Agrippeion, built, i.120
Akiba, R., i.15; vindicates canonicity of Canticles, 35
Akylas, or Aquilla, version of, i.30
Alexandra, the Asmonæan, sends portraits to Antony, i.89, 90;a devotee to Pharisaism, 97,descent, and children of, 124,her intrigues, 125,murder of, 126
Alexandar, the Great, division of his empire, i.121
Alexander, son of Herod, history of, i.126,127
Alexandreion, built, i.120
Alexandria, Jewish students in, i.24;Sanhedrin of 26, 61;position, harbour and buildings of, 58, 59;trade and luxury in, 60, 61;Canobus, 61;Lake Mareotis, 61;privileges enjoyed by Jews in, 61;their Synagogue, 61;ethnarch and alabarch, 65;rich Jewish firms in, 63,gifts to the Temple, 63, 64;hatred of Alexandrians towards the Jews, 64;Jewish homes in 250
Alexandrianism, See HellenistsAm ha-arets, contempt for, i.85;who reckoned such, 230
Ananias, high-priest, Palace of, i.112
Ananos, or Annas, appointed high priest, i.242;character of his house, 263;president of the Sanhedrin, 264;bazaars of his sons, 371, 372;their conduct, 372, ii.547,Christ before him, ii.546-548
Andrew, first call of, i.345, 346;calls Peter, 347, 348;final call of, 474-477;tells Christ about the inquiring Greeks, ii.390
Angels, one appears to Zacharias, i.138-140;their names, whence derived, 141, 142;N. T. angelology not from Jewish sources, 142;Fall of man ascribed to their envy, 165, 292;appear to shepherds of Bethlehem, 187, 188;minister to Christ after Temptation 306;Essene intercourse with, 330,reference to in Pseudepigrapha, 330, 331;derivation of doctrine of, 331, 332;Christ's teaching about the Angels in heaven, ii.122;Christ strengthened by one in Gethsemane, 540
Anna, meets Holy Family in Temple, i.200, 201
Annius Rufus, the Procurator, i.242
Antigonus, of Socho, sayings of, i.95, 315
Antigonus, the Maccabee, made high-priest by Parthians, i.124;executed, 124
Antigonus, the Syrian, conquers Samaria, i.397
Antioch, Jews in their rights and Synagogue, controversies with Christians in, i.74
Antiochus III (Great), ruler of Samaria, i.397
Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), persecutions of, i.4, 5, 95, 121
Antipater, history of, i.122, 123
Antipater, son of Herod, history of i.126, 127, 219;executed, 218
Antipatris, built, i.119
Antonia, ancient Baris, i.112, 113, 118, 244
Antony, gives Judæa to Herod, i.124;summons him, 125
Anxur, Synagogue at, i.70
Apion, incites Alexandrians against the Jews, i.64, 65
Apocryphal Literature, origin of, i.31;influence of, 33
Apostles, the Twelve, calling of, i.521-523;mission of, 640;Christ's discourse to them on it, 640-653;eat the ears of corn on the Sabbath, ii.53-56;their question about feeding the 4000, 66;the miraculous always new to them, 66, 67;the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, 70, 71;effect on them of the challenge of a sign, 76, 77;Christ's question to them at Cæsarea Philippi, 78-80;His teaching as to His death, 86, 92, 110, 111, 345;the high point in their faith, 91, 92;fail to cure the lunatic, 106, 109;dispute on the way to Capernaum, and Christ's teaching thereon, 115-125;the betrayal would not finally break up their circle, 504;the question as to the betrayer, 505;persecutions predicted, 524;perplexity about

Christ's departure and coming again, 526-528;Christ's prayer for them, 529-532;breaking up and reforming of their circle, 534, 535;they flee on Christ's arrest, 544;power delegated to them, 645;Christ's last commission, 651;they witness the Ascension, 651, 652Arabia, Jews in, i.13Aramæan, language spoken, i.10, 130Archelaus, son of Herod, i.126;accession of, 219;mission to Rome, 220;made ethnarch, 220;banished to Gaul, 220, 236;wealth confiscated, 236;changes high?priests, 240Archisynagogos, i.63Aristeas, letter of, i.25; symbolism in, 34, 36Aristobulus, of Alexandria, commentary of, i.36Atistobulus II., disputes of, with Hyrcanus, i.123Aristobulus, brother of Mariamme, i.124;made high?priest, and murdered, 125Aristobulus, son of Herod, history of, i.126, 127Artapanus, i.36Arzareth, i.14Ascension of Christ, ii.651, 652Asia Minor, privileges of Jews in, i.73Astrology, among the Jews, i.209-211Athens, Jewish inscriptions at, i.70Atonement, Day of, i.229Amora. See Emora.Baba ben Buta, advises Herod, i.120;brings sacrificial animals into the Temple, 370, 372Babas, sons of, murdered, i.126Babylonian Jews, how esteemed, i.7,9;seats of, 7, 8;genealogies, 9;relations to Palestinians, 10-12;academies of, 12;trade and commerce of, 13-14Bankers, Jewish and Roman, ii.463;interest charged by, 463, 464Baptism, difference between the Baptist's and Christian, i.272;Levitical and proselyte baptism, 273;the Baptist's rite, 274;the Baptism of Christ, 283, 284;not expected for Messiah in Rabbinic writings, 285Bar-Abbas, released, ii.576, 577, 579Bar?Kokhabh, coinage of, ii.385Bar?Timaeus, healing of, ii.355, 356Baruch, Apocalypse of, i.31;age and contents of, 81, 82;the Messiah in, 175Bath?Qol, declares for Hillel, i.128; was such at Christ's Baptism? 285, 286;declares for Eliezer, ii.69Batlanim. See SynagoguesBeelzebul and Beelzibbul, i.648Bel and the Dragon, i.31Ben Dama, i.22Ben?Lakish, saying of, i.141, 142Bethabara or Bethany, i.264;John the Baptist at, 278Bethany, Christ at, ii.144-147;journeys to raise Lazarus, 314, 315;leaves it, 326;the journey and supper there, 357, 358;Mary anoints Christ, 358-360;Christ leaves it for Jerusalem, 364;returns at night, 373;leaves it next morning, 374;ecclesiastically included in Jerusalem, 480;place of Christ's Ascension, 651Bethesda, Pool of, name, i.462;the troubling of the water, 463, 464;the miracle there, 467-469Beth ha Midrash, i.23Bethlehem, Messiah's birthplace, i.181, 206;description of place, 184;the Birth in the stable, 185;the shepherds in the plains, 186, 187;the adoration of the shepherds, 189Bethphage, identification of, ii.364;the colt loosed at, 365;ecclesiastically included in Jerusalem, 480Bethsaida, of Galilee, probable situation of, ii.3,house of Peter and Andrew, 4;Christ there, 6;woe on, 138, 139Bethsaida?Julias, built, i.88, 262, 676;the feeding of the 5000 there, 677-685;the multitude sent away, 687;healing of one blind at, ii.47, 48Betrothal. See Marriage.Bikkurim, i.9Binding and Loosing, power of, ii.84, 85;Church's power of, 645Boraithas, i.103;in the Babylon Talmud, 104, 105Botnah, fair at, i.117Brethren of the Lord, question concerning the, i.251, 364;live in Capernaum, 364;their visit to Christ, 576, 577;challenge Him to show Himself, ii.129, 130Burial, orations at, i.555;the mourners, 555; ii.317, 318;coffins and biers, i.555, 556; ii.317;procession to the grave, i.556, 557;duties connected with, ii.133;time of burying, ii.315;cemeteries and tombs, 316-320;mourning of relatives, 320, 321;visiting the grave, 323;Jewish ideas about corruption, 324;Christ's woe on hypocrisy in whitening tombs, 413;burial and grave of Christ, 617, 618Cæsar, tribute to, the question of, ii.383-386Cæsarea, i.88, 119;residence of Roman Procurator, 236Cæsarea Philippi, built, i.88, 262;Christ journeys to, ii.70-74;description of locality, 74;Christ's question and Peter's confession there, 78-85;the teaching and temptation by Peter there, 86-88;Christ leaves it, 110.Caiaphas, appointed high priest, i.242;character and policy of, 262, 263, ii.546;his unconscious prophecy, ii.325;Christ before him: the private interview, 549?553;the

trial before the Sanhedrists, 557?561;the condemnation, 561Calirrhoe, baths of, i.217Cana of Galilee, marriage in, 344;site of town, 355, 356;home of Nathanael, 356, 423;the first miracle in, 357-363;the second miracle in, 423-429Canon, Old Testament, i.27, 35Capernaum, home of Christ, His mother, and brethren, i.364, 457;site of town, 365, 366;Synagogue at, 366;cure of court officer's son at, 424-429;centre for preaching, 468, 460;cure of the demonised in the Synagogue at, 479-485;cure of Peters wife's mother and of sick at, 485-488;Christ heals the paralytic at, 502-506;cure of centurion's servant there, 544-549;raising of Jairus' daughter at, 616-634;healing of the woman with the bloody flux, 620;Christ leaves it, 635;teaches near it, 654;His discourses on His return there, ii.4-26;His teaching in the Synagogue there, 27-36;deserted by some disciples there, 36;He leaves Capernaum, 37, 75;teaching on his return to Capernaum, 115-125;Christ's woe on.139Capua, Jewish tombstones at, i.70Carmel, view of, i.146Census, that of Cyrenius, i.181-183;excitement consequent on, 236, 237, 241Chaber, See PhariseesChanina ben Dosa, cure by, i.424, 425; ii.116Chasidim, rule of, i.96,distinguished from Pharisees, 323Chazzan, generally also teacher, i.123;his part in the Synagogue services, 438, 443Cheber, under the Maccabees, i.97Chija, R., restores the Law, i.12Children, how regarded by the Jews, i.227, 252;what they see before being born, ii.325Chitsonim, their Sepharim, or outside books, i.33;probably the Essenes, 331-333;books denounced by Rabbis, 333,334Chol ha Moed, ii.148, 156Chorazin, Christ's woe on, ii.138, 139Church, the, disputes in early, i.7;foundation laid on the Petrine' ii.82-85,discipline to offenders in, 123, 124;authority bestowed by Christ on, 140-142;its union, communion, and disunion, 519-524;rule and ordination in the early Church, 555;its commission and power given by the Risen Christ, 644, 645Clement of Alexandria, on Aristobulus, i.36Coponius, Procurator of Syria, i.242Costobarus, Governor of Idumæa, murdered, i.126Crasius, spoils Temple Treasury, i.369Crucifixion of Christ, preparations for, and procession to, ii.582-586;Simon the Cyrenian bears the Cross, 587;Christ and the women of Jerusalem, 588, 589;the crucifying, 589; the draught refused, 590;the titulus, 590, 591;the lots for the garments, 591-593;the Utterances of Christ, and the mocking, 593-609;his death, 609, 610;the rending of the veil and the earthquake, &c., 610-612;the crurifragium 613;Christ's side pierced, 614, 615 Cyrene, Jews in, i.62, 63, 119;Simon of, ii.5-7Cyrenius, notices of, in St. Luke, i.181, 182;orders a census, 236;Governor of Syria, 242Dalmanutha, probable derivation of name, ii.67, 68;its site, 72;the challenge of the sign from heaven at, 68-70;its effect on the disciples, 71, 79Darshan, studies of, i.11Dead, the offices for, i.554, 555.See Death and BurialDeath, Jewish ideas of its cause, i.166;the Gan Eden and Gehinnom after, ii.280-281;invocation of Abraham after, ii.280, 281, 282Debtors, bonds or writings of, ii.268, 271, 272;various kinds of such legal documents, 272, 273Decapolis, cities of the, i.87;Christ heals one deaf and dumb there, ii.44-47;Sabbath controversies in, 53-62;feeding of 4000 in, 63-67;Christ journeys through it towards Jerusalem, 132;certain there who would follow Him, 132-134Dedication of the Temple, Feast of, i.121;how celebrated, 229, ii.227, 228;names for it, 226, 227;Christ's teaching at, 229-232Defilement, Rabbinic, degrees of, i.493, 494;from entering a heathen house, ii.566, 567Demetrius, Hellenist historian, i.36Demetrius Phalereus, i.24, 25Demonised, in N.T., i.479;views of Christ and of His contemporaries on, 480;character and probable rationale of the phenomenon, 480-485, 607-612;Jewish remedies for, 482;cure of the demonised at Capernaum, 484-485;at Gerasa, 607-614.Demonology of N.T., whence derived? i.142;Jewish idea of Beelzebul, ii.201Derush, i.21Dispersion, the, union with Jerusalem in worship and hope, i.5, 6, 77, 78, 82, 83;in all lands, 70;persecutions suffered by them of the, 75;places of worship, 76;Palestinian views of their

present and future, 78-82Dispersion, Eastern, or Trans?Euphratic, nations of, i.6;political and religious standing, 7-12Dispersion, Western. See HellenistsDivorce, Christ's teaching to the Pharisees on, ii.331, 332, 334-336;Rabbinic views on the subject, 332-334Dorshé Reshumoth, allegoric interpretations of the, i.35Dreams, how regarded, i.155Dress, etiquette in, i.620;articles of clothing, 621-623;probable dress of Christ, 624-626;byssus and purple, ii.278Eden, Gan, ii.280, 281.See DeathEgypt, Holy Family in, i.214, 215, 217Eleazar, high?priest, letter to, i.25;Aristeas' account of, 34, 35Eleazar, son of Boethos, High Priest, i.241Eleazar, son of Judas the Nationalist, i.241, 242Eleazar, the Mede, i.12Eliezerben Hyrcanos, R., i.15; his stone, 107;signs in confirmation of his teaching, ii.69;questioned as to the shepherd and sheep, 193, 194Elijah, Jewish ideas concerning, i.142, 143;at the Transfiguration, ii.97, 98;the disciples' question about his coming, 104, 105Elisabeth, character and home of, i.135-137;her retirement, 143;greets the Virgin, 152, 153;gives the name John, 158Elisha ben Abuyah, R., the apostate, i.22, 23Emmaus, Moza, or Colonia, ii.157;the walk to Emmaus on Easter Day, 637-642Eraora, part of, in Synagogue services, i.445, 449, 450Enoch, Book of, date and character, i.38;restoration of Israel according to, 79;presentation of Messiah in, 173;angelology of, 330En?Soph. See Kabbalah.Ephraim, city of, ii.127;Christ there, 326, 327Esdras, Fourth, age and character of, i.80, 81;Messiah in, 175Esebonitis, built, i.88, 120Essenes, dress of, i.119;manner of life, 237;number and separation of, 324, 325, 328, 329;was John the Baptist one? 325, 334;customs and grades in the order, 326-328;angelology of, 330;derivation of the name Essene, 332-333;Rabbinic views of the sect, 334Eupolemus, i.36Excommunication, Jewish kinds of, ii.183, 184;what involved in, 184Execution, Jewish modes of, ii.584Ezekias, rising of, i.238, 241Ezekiel, Hellenist poet, i.36Ezra, return under i.8;activity of, 9, 10, 12Fasting, Jewish views on, i.662, 663;days of, ii.291Fathers, Jewish, duties of, i.230Feasts, attendance at, when obligatory, i.235Fig?tree, value of, ii.246, 247;parable of, 246-248;Christ curses the barren tree, 374-377Flocks at Bethlehem, for what purpose there, i.187Gaba, i.88Gabinius, rebuilds Samaria, i.398Gabriel, angel, how regarded by the Jews, i.142;sent to Nazareth, 150, &c.Galileans, character and dialect of, i.225;despised by Rabbis, 225, 226;slaughter of some by Pilate, ii.221Galilee, country of, exports and character of, i.117, 223, 224;the stronghold of the Nationalists, 238;Christ withdraws there, 393;His first ministry there, 422, 423, 458, 459;His second journey through Galilee, 490;once more there: heals two blind men, ii.49, 50;returns there from Cæsarea Philippi, 110;last commission to apostles there, 651Galilee, Lake of, i.225;the call of disciples by, 472-476;fishing in the Lake, 473, 474;calming the storm on it, ii.599-605;walking on the waters of, 687-695;Christ's appearance after the Resurrection by it, ii.647-651Gamaliel I., i.22;healing of his son, i.424Gamaliel II., knowledge of Greek of, i.22;his arguments about the Resurrection, i.315, 316, ii.402, 403Gaza, fair at, i.117Gehenna, Jewish ideas of, i.271, 550, ii.280, 281, 440;children of, i.551, ii.440 Gennesaret, Land of, beauty of, ii.5Gentiles, how regarded by Jews, i.90-92, 547, ii.15;their future according to the Rabbis, i.271, ii.440, 441Genusim, Sepharim, i.33.See ApocryphaGerasa, i.606, 607;healing of the demonised at, 607-615Gethsemane, site and name of, ii.533, 534;Christ's agony in, 538-541Golah. See DispersionGolgotha, site and name of, ii.585, 586Gospels, order of, and presentation of Christ in, i.54, 55Grecian philosophy, influence on Jews of, i.22, 23, 31;views on immortality by, 257Greek language, influence on Palestinian, i.22;price of Greek MSS., 24;not the language of Christ, 130;understood by Him, 253Haggadah, character of, i.11, 12, 35, 94, 102;occurrence of in Mishnah, 103;authority of, and contrast to Christ's teaching, 105, 106Halakhah, authority of, i.11, 94, 99-102;growth and object of, 97, &c.;contrast to the teaching

of Christ and of Scripture, 105, 106, ii.17Hallel, the, i.230;at Feast of Tabernacles, ii.159;after Paschal Supper, 533Hebrew, by whom spoken, i.10, 130;price of MSS., 23, 24;spoken by Christ, 252Hellenic cities of Palestine, i.87-89Hellenism, character of, i.31-34;modes on interpreting Scripture of, 34-36;Philo's exposition of these methods, 40, &c.;completion of Hellenism in him, 57Hellenists, or Grecian Jews, character of, i.6, 7, 18-22;origin of name, 17;religious views of, 18, 19;studies of, 20-23;those in Egypt, 62Heretics, how regarded, i.91Hermon, distant view of, i.146;description of ascent to, ii.93-95;the Transfiguration on, 96-98;the descent from, 102-104;healing of the lunatic below, 106-109Herod I. (Great), orders genealogies to be burnt, i.9;architectural works of, 88, 90, 118-120,127;conduct towards the priesthood and Sanhedrim 120, 123, 238, 240;political history of, 123-125;murders by and family troubles of, 124-127;his death, 127, 217, 218;hatred of the people for him, 127;his attitude towards Judaism, 127;conduct towards the Magi, 204-207;murder of the Innocents by, 214;will of Herod, 219;his opposition to Nationalism, 240Herod II. (Antipas), political history of, i.126, 219, 220, 673;his character, 261, 393, 394;builds Tiberias, 261;probable alliance with the Pharisees of, 393, 658;residence in Peræa, 657;imprisons and murders the Baptist, 656-674;his marriage with Herodias, 673;desires to see Christ, 675, ii.75;his threat to kill Christ, ii.301, 302, 384;Christ before him in Jerusalem, 572Herod Philip, i.219;marries Herodias, 672, 673Herodeion, built, i.120;burial of Herod I. at, 218Herodias, her hatred of the Baptist, i.658, 672;history of, 673Herodians, or Boethusians, character and views of, i.237-240, ii.384;seek a sign from Christ, ii.67-70;their question about tribute, 384High?priests, at the time of Christ, character of, i.263Hillel, activity of, i.12, 95;life of, 116, 128, 129;how he attained authority, 248, ii.381;character and tendency of his school, i.238-240;many of his school murdered by Shammaites, 239, ii.13, 14;the eighteen decrees, ii.14;his teaching on divorce, 333, 334;character of ordinances imposed by his school, 407Holy Spirit, the, descent of, at Christ's Baptism, i.284-287;blasphemy against, ii.199;the promised Paraclete, 515-518, 525, 526Homeros, Siphré, i.23Homes, Jewish, character of, i.227, 252Houses, Jewish, large and small, i.501, 502Hyrcania, built, i.120Hyrcanus I., breaks with Pharisees, i.97;conquers Idumæa, 122;destroys Samaritan Temple, 398Hyrcanus II., history of, i.122-126Idumæa (S. Palestine), conquered, i.122Incensing, ceremonial of, i.137, 138India, Jews in, i.13Inheritance, Jewish law of, ii.243, 259;gifts, and testaments, 259Innocents, murder of the, i.214-216Ishmael, son of Elisha, vision by, i.138Israel, unity of, i.3;merits of, 84, 86;their sufferings, to what ascribed, 167, 168;conditions of their deliverance by Messiah, 169, 170;future of, 271Italy, Jewish settlements in, i.70Jairus, raising of his daughter by Christ, i.617-634James, son of Alphæus, call of, i.521;a cousin of Christ, ii.603James, brother of Christ, character of, i.251, 254;Christ's appearance to him after the Resurrection, ii.651James, son of Zebedee, first call of, i.347, 348;final call of, 474-477;witnesses raising of Jairus' daughter, 629;sees the Transfiguration, ii.93-98;his request to Christ, 346, 347;taken into Gethsemane, 538Jason, or Joshua, the high?priest, unJewish conduct of, i.118, 121Jehudab the Holy, R., collates the Mishnah, i.102;views on the Samaritans of, 401Jehudab ben Tabbai, i.96Jericho, imprisonment of principal Jews by Herod in, i.218, 219;site, history, and commerce of, ii.349, 351;Christ stays with Zacchæus in, 352-355;heals two blind men at, 355, 356Jerusalem, description of, in time of Herod, i.111-113;shops and markets in, 115, 117, 118;cost of living and population in 116;Synagogues and academies of, 119;magistrates in, 129;Grecianism in, 129;character and morals of the people in; 130-132;the dialect, 130;houses, letters, and newspapers in, 131; Christ's last three visits to Jerusalem, ii.126, 127;His entry into the city, 363-373;Jewish ideas as to the

Jerusalem of the future, 437Jesus Christ, annunciation of, i.150-152;His Name, 155;His Nativity, 185-189;His Divinity, why kept a mystery, 192;His circumcision and redemption, 193-197;Simeon and Anna, 198-200;adored by Magi, 207, 213;the flight into Egypt, 214, 215;home at Nazareth, 221;the Nazarene' 222, 223;His child life, 226-234;first attendance in the Temple 236-249;His youth and early manhood, 252-254;His Baptism, 278-287;Temptation, 291-307;Christ the Lamb of God, 342-344,first week of His Ministry, 344, 345;first call of disciples and return to Galilee, 345-350;the first Miracle at Cana, 356-363;His home at Capernaum, 366;the first Passover in His Ministry, 366;purification of the Temple, 372-374;the sign asked, 374-378;the signs done at the Passover, 378-380;Christ's teachlng to Nicodemus, 381-389;Christ's teaching and His disciples' baptism in Judæa, 390, 393;Christ at Jacob's Well at Sychar: the teaching of the woman, 395-420;the two days in Samaria, 420-422;the cure of the court officer's son at Capernaum, 424-429;Christ at Nazareth, 430, 431, 451-459;at the Unknown Feast, 460-471;end of first stage of Christ's Ministry, final call of disciples, and miraculous draught of fishes, 472-477;heals the demonised at Capernaum, 484, 485;cures Peter's wife's mother and other sick, 485-488;second Galilean journey, 490-491;heals the leper, 491-498;tracked by Scribes and Pharisees, 498, 499,574, ii.51;heals the paralytic at Capernaum, i.502-506;calls Matthew, 513-521,calls the twelve, 522, 523;the Sermon on the Mount, 524-541;in Capernaum: visit of His friends, 542, 543,the charge that He had a devil and Satanic power, 543, 575, 576, 609, ii.8, 197, 198;heals the centurion's servant, 544-551;raises the young man at Nain, 552-562;chronology of this period, 561, 562, 570;pardons the woman which was a sinner, 563-569;the women who ministered to Him, 570-573;heals two blind men and one demonised dumb on way to Capernaum, 573;the visit of His mother and brethren, 576, 577;His teaching by parables, 578-586;the first series, 585-598;stills the storm on the Lake of Galilee, 599-605;heals the demonised at Gerasa, 606-615;raises Jairus' daughter, and heals the woman who touched Him, 616-634;Christ's personal appearance, 620-626;His second visit to Nazareth, 635, 640;sends forth the twelve, 640-653;withdraws from Galilee, 654, 655;answers the Baptist's disciples as to prayer and fasting, 662-665;answers the Baptist's message, 668, 669;Christ's testimony to the Baptist, 669-671;feeds 5000 at Bethsaida, 677-685;will not be made King, 686;walks on the sea and stills the storm on the lake, 687-695;at Gennesaret, ii.5;returns to Capernaum, 4-7;discourses by the way, 9-24;the crisis in popular feeling concerning Christ, 25, 26, 35, 36;the teaching in the Synagogue at Capernaum, 27-35;defection among His disciples, and answer of Peter, 36;heals the Syro?Phoenician's daughter in the borders of Tyre and Sidon, 37-43;cures one deaf and dumb in the Decapolis, 44-47;heals one blind at Bethsaida?Julias, 47, 48;heals two blind men, 48-50;Christ's teaching as to the Sabbath, 52-58, 303;heals the man with the withered hand, 59-62;feeds 4000 in the Decapolis, 63-67;Christ in the parts of Dalmanutha: the sign asked, 67-70;teaches His disciples concerning the leaven of the Pharisees, 70, 71;end of Christ's Galilean ministry, 75, 76;effect of the challenge of a sign on the disciples and Judas, 76-78;Peter's confusion and Christ's declaration and teaching thereon, 78-86;Peter's temptation of Christ, 86, 87;Christ's teaching about His death, 86, &c., 110, 111, 345, 391, 392, 469, 471;the Transfiguration, 93-103;He heals the lunatic, 105-109;Peter and the tribute-money, 112-114;discourse to the disciples, 117-125;chronology of last part of Gospel narratives, 126-129;Christ journeys to the Feast of Tabernacles, the challenge of His brethren, 129, 130;the Samaritans will not receive Him, 131, 132;those who were hindered from following Him, 132-134;the mission and return of the Seventy, 135-142;the woes on Chorazin and Bethsaida,

138, 139;Christ's yoke, 142-144;the inquiry of the lawyer; 144;Christ at Bethany, 144-147;teaches in the Temple at Feast of Tabernacles, 150-155;plots of His enemies, 155;teaches on the great day of the Feast, 160-162;discourse in the Treasury, 164, 166-176;Christ as Shomroni, 174-176;heals the man born blind, 178-187;the allegory of the Good Shepherd, 188-193;in Peræa, teaches the disciples to pray, 195-197;discourses in Peræa to disciples and people, 199-203;the teaching at the morning meal in the Pharisee's house, 205-213;His discourses to the disciples and multitude, 214-221;teaching concerning the slaughtered Galileans, 221, 222;heals a woman in a Peræan Synagogue, 223-225;teaches in the Temple at the Feast of Dedication, 228-232;the Peræan parables, 234-297;the Peræan discourses, 298-307;Christ's answer to Herod's message, 301, 302; the raising of Lazarus, 308-326;the plots of the Sanhedrists, 326;Christ at Ephraim, 326, 327;He prepares for His last journey to Jerusalem, 327, 328;heals ten lepers, 328, 331;His teaching on divorce, 331-336;He blesses little children, 336, 337;His answer to the young ruler, and teaching on riches, 338-343;answers the request of the mother of Zebedee's children, 346-348;at Jericho with Zaccheus, 349-355;He heals two blind men there, 355, 356;the supper at Bethany and the anointing there, 357-360;Christ's entry into Jerusalem, 363-373;He returns to Bethany, 373;the cursing of the barren figtree; 374-377;the final cleansing of the Temple, 377, 378;the children's Hosanna, 378, 379;He teaches on the third day in Passion Week, 380-383;tribute to Cæsar, 383-386;the widow's two mites, 387-389;teaches the Greeks who would see Him, 389-391;the voice from Heaven, 392;Christ's last appeal in the Temple, 393-395;controversy with the Sadducees about the Resurrection, 396-403;the Scribes' question of the greatest commandment, 403-405;David's Son and Lord, 405-406;final woes against Pharisaism, 406-414;Christ finally quits the Temple, 414;the last parables, 415-430, 453-467;Christ's discourse on the Last Things, 431-452;He rests before His Passion, 468, 469;He is sold by Judas, 475-477;He sends His disciples to prepare for the Passover, 480-485;His probable host, 485;Christ enters Jerusalem, 488, 489;the Sacraments which opened and closed His ministry, 491, 492;the Paschal Supper, 492-507;Judas goes out, 507, 508;the institution of the Lord's Supper, 509-512;Christ's last Discourses, 513-528;the Lord's own prayer, 528-532;on the way to Gethsemane, 533-534;Christ's supplication for, and warning to Peter, 535-538;His agony in Gethsemane, 538-541;His betrayal and arrest, 541-545;Christ before Annas, 546-548;before Caiaphas, and before the Sanhedrists, 549-561;Christ is condemned and insulted, 561-563;He looks on Peter, 564;the morning meeting of the Sanhedrists, 565;Christ before Pilate, 565-578;Christ sent to Herod, 572;He is scourged, 579;He is sentenced by Pilate, 580, 581;Christ is crucified, 582-609;He dies and descends into Hades, 610;the rent veil and earthquake, 610-612;the centurion's testimony, 612;His side is pierced, 613-615;His entombment, 615-618;the guard set, 619, 620;His Resurrection, 630, &c.;appearances after, 634-651;His Ascension, 651, 652Jesus, son of Sië, high priest, i.241Jews, their resistance to Rome, i.257;their condition under Augustus and Tiberius, 262;history of their progressive resistance to Christ, ii.393-395Jezreel, Plain of, i.145Joanna, wife of Chuza, ministers to Christ, i.572, 573Joazar, high priest, quiets the people as to the census, i.237, 241;political history and views of, 240-242Jochanan ben Zakkai, R., saying of, i.168;his conduct during the last war, 238, 239restoration of his child, ii.116;parable spoken by 425, 426John the Baptist, annunciation of, i.139;his birth and circumcision, 157,158;parallelism with Elijah, 255, 264;his early years, 260;first public appearance and preaching, 264-276;his personal appearance, 277;he baptizes Christ, 278-284;his testimony to the deputation from Jerusalem, 308-310, 338-341;character of his preaching, 336-338;his temptation,

339, 340;his testimony to the Lamb of God, 342-345;his two disciples follow Christ, 345, 346;the disputes at Ænon between his disciples and a Jew, 391-393;he is imprisoned by Antipas, 656-666;the questions of the Baptist's disciples as to fasting and prayer, 662-665;his embassy to Christ, 661, 667-669;Christ's testimony to the Baptist, 669-671;the beheading of John, 671-674John the Evangelist, object and style of his Gospel, i.55, 56;his view of the Logos, 56;first call of the Apostle, 345-348;his retrospect on the visit of Nicodemus, 389;arrangement of his Gospel in cycles, 407, 408;final call of John, 474-477;internal evidences of his Gospel, 499;witnesses the raising of Jairus's daughter, 629;sees the Transfiguration, ii.93-98;forbids a man who did not follow Christ, 117-120;the parts of Christ's History which are viewed in his Gospel, 126-129;his request, with his mother and brother, 346-347;his question at the Paschal Supper, 506;with Christ in Gethsemane, 538;in the Palace of Caiaphas, 550, 551;under the Cross, 601-603;at the Sepulchre on Easter Day, 633, 634;by the Lake of Galilee: why he recorded this narrative, 647-651Jonathan, the Maccabee, history of, i.96, 113Joppa, harbour of, i.117Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary, his genealogy, i.149;the dream and vision of, 154, 155;marries Mary, 155, 156;journeys to Bethlehem, 183, &c.;flees into Egypt, 214;returns to Nazareth, 221;his search for Jesus at Christ's first visit to Jerusalem, 248Joseph of Arimathea, the request of, ii.615, 617Joseph, uncle of Herod, murdered by him, i.125Joseph, brother of Herod, i.124Josephus, Grecian thought in, i.32Joses, brother of Christ, i.251Joshua, R., anecdote of i.107Joshua, son of Gamla, establishes schools, i.231 Jubilees, Book of, its language and character, i.38;the restoration of the Jews in, 80;angelology of, 330, 331Judæa, home of Rabbinism, i.148, 223, 224;the Roman rule of, 260Judan, R., discovered the Messiah, i.175Judas, R., executed by Herod, i.217, 218Judas, son of Ezekias, revolt of, i.241Judas Iscariot, a Judæan, i.522;beginning of his apostasy, ii.36;history of his gradual alienation, 77, 78, 471-475;murmurs at Mary's anointing of Christ, 359, 360;sells Christ to the Sanhedrists, 475-477;his bearing at the Paschal Supper, 495-507;he leaves the table, 507;his character, 535, 536;he betrays Christ, 541-543;his change of mind, 477, 478, 573, 574;brings back the money and hangs himself, 478, 574, 575,the potter's field, 575, 576Judas Lebbæus, why so called, i.522;his question after the Paschal Supper, ii.417;a cousin of Christ, 603Jude, brother of Christ, character of, i.251, 254Judges, in Jerusalem, classes of, ii.286, 287Julias, city in Peræa, built, i.88;palace of Antipas there, 657Kabbalah, the, i.44;En?Soph in, 45;Sephiroth in, 45;what so called, 102Kal va Chomer, argument by, ii.285, 286Khan, or caravansary, i.117Kingdom of God, its history and meaning in O. and N.T., i.160, 161, 265, 266, 269, 270, 275, 276;announced by John the Baptist, 265, 291;Rabbinic views of the Kingdom, 266-268;the yoke of the Kingdom, 267, 268, ii.142-144;it was the common hope of Israel, i.275, 276;the Baptist's position in regard to the Kingdom, 283;Christ's consecration to it, 300;He teaches concerning entrance into it, 385-388, ii.299, 300;the Kingdom portrayed in the Sermon on the Mount, i.529-531;who are worthy of it, 549;its mysteries in parables, 583-586, 592-596;the new and old as regards the Kingdom, 665;Christ's teaching as to greatness and service in it, ii.120, 141, 410;forgiveness in the Kingdom, 123-125;inauguration feast in it, 300;the Kingdom compatible with state rule, 386;the great paradox concerning it, 391Kypros, built, i.119Lamps, of the Ten Virgins, ii.455-458Last Things, Christ's Discourse on, ii.455-458;the views of the disciples on, 432, 433;Jewish views on the sorrows of, at Advent of Messiah, 433, 440;on final judgment, eternal punishment, and the world to come, 440-442;the Pseudepigrapha and Philo on the last things, 442-445;Christ's warnings to individuals and to the Church, 446-450;what is to be the Church's attitude, 450-452Latin, possibly understood by Christ, i.253Lazarus of Bethany,

sickness, death, and raising of, ii.312-325;is present at the feast of Bethany, 358Leases and contracts, terms and modes of, ii.272, 273, 423Leontopolis, temple of, i.62Leper, healed by Christ, i.491-497;Rabbinic precautions regarding, 492-494;how morally viewed by Jews, 494, 495;Christ heals ten lepers, ii.329-331Lord's Supper, the accounts of its institution, ii.509, 510;the words, 510;probable time of the Paschal Supper, 511Luke, St., Gospel by, its character, i.54, 55;the Prologue, 202,narrative peculiar to it, ii.126-128;was he one who went to Emmaus? 638Lysanias, governor of Abilene, i.261Maccabee, Judas, political history of, i.5, 121, 122Maccabees, or Asmonæans, the rising and government of, i.96, 97, 121-123;the Palace of the Maccabees, 112, 118;supposed derivation of their name, 237;the coinage of, ii.385Maccabees, Fourth Book of, i.32Machærus, built, i.120;description of the site, 658-661Magadan, borders of. See DalmanuthaMagi, the meaning of the designation, i.203;their home, 203, 204;their mission, 204-207;their adoration and gifts, 207-214Magdala, i.571, ii.5;its dyeworks, i.571Malchus, smitten in Gethsemane, ii.544Mamon, ii.266, 269Manahem, son of Judas the Nationalist, fate of, i.241Manasseh, priest at Samaria, i.396Manna, to be brought down by Messiah, i.176Marcus Ambivius, Procurator, i.242Mark, St., character of his Gospel, i.54, 499, 500;presentation of Christ in it, ii.127, 128;probably was the young man in Gethsemane, 545Mariamme I. wife of Herod, history of, i.124-126Mamage and betrothal, in Judæa and in Galilee, i.148;groomsmen, 148, 663, 664;betrothal of Joseph and Mary, 148-150;Jewish views on betrothal, 352-354;the marriage ceremony, 354, 355;marriage processions, ii.455Martha, of Bethany, Christ in her house, ii.145-147;her bearing at the time of the death and raising of Lazarus, 312, 313, 321, 322-324;serves at the feast in Bethany, 358Mary of Bethany, sits at Christ's feet, ii.145-147;her bearing at the time of the death and raising of Lazarus, 312, 313, 322-323;she anoints Christ's feet, 358-360Mary, wife of Clopas, ii.602, 603, 618Mary Magdalene, i.570, 571;under the Cross, ii.602;watches the burying, 618;at the empty tomb on Easter Day, i.572, ii.631;tells Peter and John, ii.633;sees the Angels and Christ, 634, 636Mary the Virgin, her descent, i.149;betrothal, 149, 150;the annunciation to, 150-152;visits Elizabeth, 152;Mary's hymn, 153;is married to Joseph, 154-156;journeys to Bethlehem, 183, 184;birth of Christ there, 185; her inner history and development, 191-193, 249-250;her Purification, 197;flees into Egypt, 214;returns to Nazareth, 221;her conduct at Christ's first visit to Jerusalem, 236, 248;her request at the marriage of Cana, 359-362;lives at Capernaum, 364;her visit to Christ, 576, 577;under the Cross is entrusted to St. John, ii.601-603Masada, i.120, 124;last siege of, 242Matthew, St., character of his Gospel, i.54;presentation of Messiah in it, 54, ii.127, 128;Old Testament quotations in i.206, 458, 459;Christ calls him, 514-519;he makes a feast for Christ, 519-521, 663Matthias, R., executed by Herod, i.217, 218Meals, among the Jews, attitude at, i.564;the principal meal, ii.205, 206;food of the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, 206;the benedictions, 206;the morning meal, 206, 207;position of guests at, 207, 208;wines and articles of diet at, 208, 209;etiquette at, 209, 210Measures, kinds of, i.593, 594, ii.268;dry measure, ii.269Meir, R., treatment of lepers by, i.495Memra, the, in the Targumim, i.47, 48Menelaus, High?Priest, i.121Messiah, the, fiction of the two Messiahs, i.78-80, ii.434, 435;names of the Messiah, i.151, 154, 155, 175;0. and N.T. view of Him, 160-162,O.T. passages Messianically applied by the Synagogue, 163;Rabbinic ideal of Him, 164, 165;the sufferings and woes of Messiah, 165, 205; ii.433, 434;no room for His priestly office in Rabbinism, i.167;the signs, time, and expectation of His coming, 168-171, 293, 308; ii.68, 69, 154, 433, 434;Jewish views of the nature, premundane existence, power, and position of Messiah, i.171, 172, 175-179;views of Messiah, in the Pseudepigrapha and Targumim, 172-175;Jewish

views as to His birth and birthplace; 175, 178, 180, 181;the star of Messiah, 211, 212;Messiah abides forever, ii.393;His descent, 405, 406;the days of Messiah, wars and conquests in, i.292, 293; ii.436, 437;meaning of the term Kingdom of the Messiah' as distinguished from the future age' and age to come' i.267; ii .435, 441;the feast in Messianic days, i.549, 550;the teaching, law and ritual then, ii.33, 437, 438;the Resurrection by Him, 436;Jerusalem and Palestine in His days, 437-439;the Gentiles in the days of Messiah, 439, 440;death then abolished, 439Mesusah, the, i.76, 228Metatron, the, i.47Methurgeman, duties of the, i.10, 11, 436, 444, 445Michael, the angel, how regarded, i.142Midrash, the, origin of, i.11, 21;subject of, 94, 102Migdal Eder, prophecy concerning, i.186, 187Minim, Siphrey, i.23, 33Miracles of Christ, the wine at Cana, i.351, 363;cure of nobleman's son at Capernaum, 422-429;the impotent man at Bethesda, 462-471;the draught of fishes, 476, 477;the demonised in Synagogue at Capernaum, 484, 485;Peter's wife's mother and many sick, 485-488;the leper, 491-498;the paralytic, 499-506;the centurion's servant, 544-551;raises the young man at Nain, 552-560;heals two blind men and one demonised dumb, 573;stills the storm on the Lake, 599-605;heals the demonised at Gerasa, 606, 615;heals the woman who touched Him and raises Jairus's daughter, 617-634;feeds 5000 at Bethsaida, 676-685;walks on the Lake and stills the storm, 687-695;heals the Syrophoenician's daughter, ii.38-43;one deaf and dumb, 45-47;one blind at Bethsalda Julias, 47, 48;two blind men, 48-50;the man with the withered hand, 59-62;He feeds 4000, 63-67;heals the lunatic, 166-169;the stater for the tribute-money, 113-115;He heals the man born blind, 117-187;heals one blind, dumb, and demonised, in Peræa, 197;the woman with the spirit of infirmity, 224-225;He raises Lazarus, 308-325;heals ten lepers, 328-331;two blind men at Jericho, 355, 356;curses the fig?tree, and it withers, 374, 377;the last draught of fishes, 648, 649;grounds for rejecting the miraculous, i.558-560;evidences for the miraculous, 602-605; ii.308-312;the miracles of Christ, how viewed by the Jewish authorities, i.575, 576;when not expected by the disciples, 689, 690, ii.66, 67Mishnah, the, origin of, i.11;contents and order of, 101, 102;its language, 102, 103Money, drachm, ii.257;stater, 114;sela, 258;talent, 294, 459;perutah, 388;mina, 466Morning Sacrifice, i.133, 134Moses, at the Transfiguration, ii.97, 98Mothers in Israel, i.229, 230Noeoeman. See Pharisees.Nain, description of locality, i.553;Christ raises the young man at, 554-556Nard, price of, ii.358Nathanael, or Bartholomew, call of, i.348-350Nationalists. See Zealots.Nazareth, description of, i.144-148;the Holy Family return there, 221;no learned Rabbis there, 233;can any good come out of Nazareth? 349, 350;Christ's first visit there, 430, 456;He is cast out of the city, 456, 457;Christ's second visit to the place, 635-640;He leaves it for ever, 640Nehardaa, Jews of, i.7, 8, 14Nestorians, the, i.15New Year's Day, i.229Nicodemus, Christ's teaching to, 381-388;St. John's retrospect on the interview, 389;Nicodemus remonstrates with the Sanhedrists at the Feast of Tabernacles, ii.162, 163;brings spices to embalm Christ, 617Nisibis, i.8Oil, value of, ii.268, 269 Olives, Mount of, Christ's last discourse on, ii.431, 432Onkelos, the proselyte, repelled by Shammaltes, i.239Ophel, i.111, ii.157Ordination among the Rabbis, ii.381, 382Orpheus, spurious citations from, i.36Palestine, the land' i.7;its boundaries, and gradations of sanctity, 84-86, 87;Hellenic and Herodian cities in, 87, 88;political government of, at time of Christ, 87, 88, 236, 237;the ideal state in Messianic days, ii.438, 439Parables of Christ, characteristics of, and reasons for, i.579-586;meaning of the term, 580;the sower, 586-588, 594, 595;the seed growing secretly, 588, 589;the tares, 589-592;the mustard?seed and leaven, 592-594;the treasure hid and pearl of great price, 595, 596;the drawnet, 596, 597;the watching servants, ii.218, 219;the good Samaritan, 234-239;the importunate neighbor, 239-242;the foolish rich man, 243-246,the barren fig tree,

246-248;the great supper, 248-252;the lost sheep, 254-256;the lost drachm, 256, 257;the lost son, 257-263;the unjust steward, 266-274;Dives and Lazarus, 275-283;the unjust judge, 284-289;the Pharisee and the Publican, 289-293;the unmerciful servant, 293-297;the laborers in the vineyard, 415-421;the two sons, 421, 422;the evil husbandmen, 422-425;the marriage feast and wedding?garment, 425-430;the ten virgins, 453-459;the talents, 459-465;the minas, 465-467;the three series of Parables, i.579-580;character of first and second series, ii.233, 234Paracletes, the two, ii.515-518.See also Holy SpiritParashah, i.29Passover, Feast of, pilgrims at, i.229, 242-243;the two first days of the Feast, 246;the first Passover in Christ's Ministry, 366, 367, 378;Christ's last Passover, ii.479;the preparations for the Feast, 479, 480;the Paschal meal, the benedictions, 496, 497;the first cup and the hand washing, 497;the first cup and the hand washing, 497;the ritual at table, 504, 505;the sop, 506, 507;time of the Paschal Supper, 507;the midnight preparation in the Temple, 508;end of the Paschal meal, 511-513;what rendered unfit to eat the Passover, 566-568;the Chagigah as Pesach, 568;the ceremony of the wavesheaf and second Paschal day, 613, 618, 619Patræ, Jewish inscriptions at, i.70Paul, St., in Arabia, i.14;his journey to Rome, 69, 70Peræa, seat of Herod's government, i.395;Christ's Ministry there, ii.127, 128;time and character of it, 195, 196;Christ's miraculous power there, 197, 223-225;He is warned to leave Peræa, 301;Christ's final journey through it, 328Peshat, i.21, 41Peter, Simon, in Babylonia, i.14;first call of, 347, 348;final call of, 474-477;Christ cures his wife's mother, 485, 486;Peter sees the raising of Jairus's daughter, 629;he walks on the water, 693, 694;is taught concerning clean and unclean, ii.23, 34;his dispute with St. Paul, 24;his testimony at Capernaum, 36;his confession at Cæsarea Philippi, and its import, 80-86, 91, 92;he tempts Christ, 86, 87;witnesses the Transfiguration, 92-98;his conduct as to the tribute money, 111-114;he asks about forgiving his brother, 115-117, 124, 125;what reward should they have? 343;refuses to let Christ wash his feet at table, 499, 500;questions about the betrayer, 506;asks about Christ's going away, 509;Christ warns him of his denial, and has interceded for him, 535-537;resemblance between Judas and Peter, 535, 536;is taken into Gethsemane, 538;smites the ear of Malchus, 544;denies Christ, 550-564;his repentance, 564;Peter goes to the sepulchre on Easter Day, 633, 634;Christ appears to him, 642;Christ's three questions and commission to him by the Lake of Galilee, 647-650Pharisees, contempt of, for Hellenists, i.7;their origin and political history, 96, 97, 310;not a sect, 310;number, degrees, and admission into the fraternity, 311, 312;how described in Talmud, and viewed by Sadducees, 312;their characteristics, 312, 313; ii.276, 277, 290, 291;their dogmatic, ceremonial, and juridical differences from Sadducees, i.314-321;derivation of the name, 323;their deputation to John the Baptist, 340-342,they unite with Herod to imprison the Baptist, 658;they track Christ, ii.51, 52;the controversies about handwashing, 9-15;about Sabbath observance, 52-62;they seek a sign from heaven, 68-70;their leaven, 70, 71;their treatment of the man born blind, 185-187;their interpretation of Christ's power, 197, 198;the morning meal in the Pharisee's house in Peræa; Christ's exposure of their hypocrisy, 204-215;Christ teaches concerning their giving, 248, 249;their view of the future blessedness; 249;the sinners and the righteous, 256;their hypocrisy in hospitality, and self?seeking, 303, 304;they question Christ about divorce, 331, 332;their anger at Christ's welcome in Jerusalem, 368;the question of tribute, 384;their arguments with the Sadducees as to the Resurrection, 397-399;their views on Levirate marriage, 400;Christ's last denunciations and woes on them, 407-414Pharos, LXX., translated there, i.25;feast celebrated there, 30Phasaelis, built, i.119Phasaelus, brother of Herod I., history of, i.123, 124 Pheroras, brother of Herod I., history of, i.126, 127Philip, the Apostle, call of,

i.348-350;the Greek proselytes come to him, ii.390;his question after the Paschal Supper, 515Philip, son of Herod I., political history of, i.219, 220;his character and works, 262;marries Salome, 673Philo of Alexandria, i.36, 39;his personal history, 40, 77;Greek learning and philosophy in his works, 40, 44;his mode of interpreting Scripture, 41-43;his theology, 43, 44;his potencies' and words,' 44-46;the Logos in his works, 48-50;differences as compared with the Epistle to the Hebrews, 49, 50;cosmology and ethics of Philo, 50-53;comparison of his works and St. John's Gospel, 56;his views on the restoration of the Dispersion, 82Phylacteries, or Tephillin, i.76;women dispensed from, i.228;the compartments in, 315;ostentation in wearing them, ii.408Pilate, Pontius, cruelty and harshness of, i.242, 251, 272;slaughters the Galileans, ii.221;gave the band of soldiers, 541, 542;Christ brought before him, 565-581;he is made to condemn Christ, 580, 581;allows the crurifragium, 612, 613;gives Joseph Christ's body, 615, 616Pollio, i.128Pompeii, Jewish tombstones at, i.70Pompey, captures Jerusalem, i.122;settles disputes, 123Prætorium, in Jerusalem, ii.566Prayer, Rabbinic injunctions as to attitude in, i.438;as to interruptions in, ii.137, 138Priesthood, genealogies of, kept, i.9Prophecy and Assumption of Moses, age and contents off i.81Proselytes, some Greek proselytes desire to see Jesus, ii.389-392;Jewish views on the making of proselytes, 411, 412;would the Gentiles in Messianic days be such? 439, 440Proseuche, i.76Psalter of Solomon, date and character of, i.38;description of Messiah and Messianic times in, 79, 80, 174Pseudepigraphic Writings, general character and number of, i.37Pseudo?Philo, i.36Ptolemy I. (Lagi), projects the Museum in Alexandria, i.24;rules Samaria, 379Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), his love of books, i.24;has O.T. translated, 25Ptolemy III. (Euergetes), i.25, 27Ptolemy (Philometor), i.36Publicans, classes of, i.515-517;character of, 516, 517;the call and feast of Matthew, 518-520Purification after childbirth, ceremonial and sacrifices for, i.195-197Purifications. Talmudic tractates on, i.357, 358;dispute about, between the Baptist's disciples and a Jew, 391;Christ's woe on Pharisaic hypocrisy, concerning, ii.413.See also Washing of handsPurim, Feast of, how celebrated, i.229Puteoli, Jewish settlement in, i.70Rabbis, subject of study of, i.11,roles of etiquette for, ii.209, 210;their authority and place, 381, 407;manner of ordination of, 382;Christ's charges against them, 407-409;their position in both worlds, 408, 410;their power of binding and loosing, 85, 645Rabbinic Theology, avoidance of anthropomorphisms in, i.28, 29, 43;the allegorical method in, 35, 36;compared with that of Philo, 42-45;Jehovah and Elohim in, 45, 46;Rabbinic views on creation, 50-51;on the heavenly Academy, 85; ii.15, 16;Rabbinic hatred of Gentiles and idolatry, i.85, 89-92;essential contrariety of Rabbinism to the teaching of Christ, 84, 145;views of Israel's receiving the Law, 90, ii.142-144;place given to Scripture by Rabbinism, i.105-108, ii.17;the conception of good in, i.144; ii.339;contempt of Rabbinism for Galileans and the ignorant, i.144, 145, 508;no doctrine of original sin, 165;views on death, 166;the two inclinations in man, 167;Rabbinic accounts of trials of O.T. heroes, 292;views of sin and the sinner, 507-511;Rabbinic teaching about penitence and penitents, 509-513; ii.245, 246, 253, 258;fasting, i.512, 513;the children of God and of Gehinnom in, 551;the Rabbinic ordinance of handwashing, ii.9-15;decisions as to canonicity of certain books, 12,the 18 decrees, 13, 14;Rabbinic views of God's doings in heaven, 15, 16;the ordinance of vows, 18-21;the Sabbath laws, 52-62, 153, 154;signs from heaven to confirm certain Rabbis, 68, 69;signification of salt in Rabbinism, 121;teaching as to angels, 122;views on praying, 137, 138;prayers of certain Rabbis, 291;their authority, whence derived, 151;their views on the sudden appearance of Messiah, 154;their laws about testimony, 169;the doctrine of sin before birth, 178, 179;the spiritual leaders Parnasin, 188, 189;Rabbinic teaching about nourishment and

redemption, 196;how to inherit eternal life, 235, 236;separation of Israel according to, 237;the merits of the fathers, 290;Rabbinic teaching about forgiveness, 296, 297;about divorce, 332-335;the renovation of the world, 343;Rabbinic teaching about the Resurrection, 397-399, 402, 403;teaching about the light and heavy commandments, 404, 405, 407;the abodes of the blessed according to the Rabbis, 513, 514.See also Mishna, Midrash, Halakkah, Haggadah, TalmudRedemption of the firstborn, i.194, 195Resurrection, Christ's teaching to Martha concerning it, ii.321, 322;Sadducean attacks on the doctrine, 397-399;Jewish and Pharisaic views on it, 398, 399, 402, 403;Christ's teaching concerning it, 401-403; the Messiah's part in it, 436;the Resurrection of Christ: the narrators of it, 621, 622;the disciples' expectation concerning the event, 623-625;St. Paul's statements concerning it, 625, 626;hypotheses concerning it, 626-629;the women at the sepulchre, 630, 633;Mary Magdalene there, 631-636;the guard see the angel, 631, 632;Peter and John at the sepulchre, 633, 634;the report of the body having been stolen, 636, 637;Christ appears to the two who went to Emmaus, 638-642;appears to Peter, 642;to the disciples on Easter evening, 642-646;appears the next Sunday, 646, 647;is seen by the Lake of Galilee, 647-651;other manifestations of Christ, 651;our Resurrection?body, what will it be? 635, 636Revelation, Christ's teaching as to its unity, ii.404, 406Roads in Palestine, the three great caravan ones, i.147Rome, views there entertained about the Jews, i.65-67;political history and standing of the Jews there, 67, 68, 70-72;Jewish slaves and freedmen in Rome, 67, 68;their quarters, Synagogues, and inscriptions, 68-70;Romans proselytes, 71;Jewish legend of Messiah at the gate of Rome, 175;political, social, and religious history of the Roman Empire under Augustus, 256-260;Jewish legend of the origin of Rome, ii.439Sabbath, the, Jewish modes of making it a delight, i.437, ii.52, 114, 115;Christ's controversy on the second first' Sabbath, ii.53-56;Rabbinic views of labour on the Sabbath, 56-58;as to danger to life on it, 59-61;the O. and N.T. teaching concerning the Sabbath, 56?59;Christ heals the man with the withered hand on it, 61, 62;is accused of breaking the Sabbath again, 181, 182;His Peræan teaching concerning healing on it, 224, 225, 303Sabbatyon, river, i.15Sadducees, origin of, i.96, 238, 310;characteristics of their system, 313;dogmatic, ritual, and juridical views differing from the Pharisees of, 314-321;they were a minority, 322;origin of the name, 322-324;had no sympathy with the Baptist, 334, 335;identified with the Herodians by St. Matthew, ii.67;they seek a sign from heaven, 68-70;their leaven, 70, 71;their attitude towards Christ, 396, 397;their arguments with the Pharisees and with Christ as to the Resurrection, 397-399, 401, 402;their views on the Levirate marriage, 400Sadduk, a Shammaite, joins Judas the Nationalist, i.241Safed, i.146Saliva, mode of healing by, ii.45, 48, 180, 182Salorne, wife of Zebedee. See ZebedeeSalome, daughter of Herodias, dances before Herod, i.672;her end, 673Salome, sister of Herod I., compasses murder of her husband, of Mariamme, Soemus, and Costobarus, i.125, 126;releases the Jews shut up at Jericho, 219Salt, Christ's teaching about its meaning, ii.121Samaria, province of, Biblical history of, i.394-396;its temple, 396;later political history of, 397, 398;how viewed by Jews, and attitude of Samaria towards Judæa, 398-402;beauty of the Plain of Samaria, 404, 405Samaria, or Sebaste, built, i.88, 119;heathen temple at, 88;fate of, 397, 398Samaritans, meaning of the designation in Jewish writings, i.399, 400;doctrines held by the Samaritans, 402, 403;they refuse to receive Christ, ii.131;the healed Samaritan leper, 329-331Sanhedrin, the, of Jerusalem, signals of the new month by, i.9;of supreme authority, 12;actual power of, at the time of Christ, 120, 128, 238, ii.556;origin of, i.97;places of, meeting, 114, 371;rank in it, and privileges thereby conferred, 96, 131, ii.555;character of decisions made by Sanhedrin, i.129, ii.557, 584,teaching by members of it

on the Temple?terrace, i.247;sent no official deputation to the Baptist, 309, 310;did not sit on Sabbaths, ii.182;the Sanhedrist council against Christ, 326;mode of ordination, 381, 382, 553-555;Christ's trial illegal according to their laws, 553;the three tribunals, 554;regular mode of procedure in trial by the Sanhedrin, 555, 556.See Trial of ChristSatan or Sammael, compasses the Fall of Man, i.165;his assaults upon Abraham, 292;his conquest by Messiah, 292, 293;Christ sees his fa!l, ii.140;also named Shomron, 174Schools in Palestine, i.230, 231;teachers in, 231;subjects of study in, 232Scribes or Sopherim, studies of, i.11;their position and dignity, 93,origin, growth, and decay in power of, the institution, 94-96Seleucidæ, troubles of Palestine under, i.96, 121Seleucus I. (Nicator) grants the Jews of Asia Minor citizenship, i.71Seleucus IV. (Philopator) conquers Samaria, i.397Sephiroth. See Kabbalah.Sepphoris, seized by Judas, the Nationalist, i.241Septuagint, i.23;legend of its origin and name, 24-26;its age, 26;its characteristics, 27, 28;how regarded and used by Hellenists and Rabbis, 29, 30Sermon on the Mount, the, contrasted and compared with Rabbinic writings, i.524-526, 531-541;its arrangement and divisions, 527, 528;the Beatitudes, 529, 530;alms, prayer and fasting in it 530, 531;analysis of the third part, 531;its effect on the hearers, 541Seventy, mission of the, ii.135;differences between it and the sending of the Twelve, 135, 136;their commission and return, 137-142Shammai, his life and teaching, i.95, 128, 129; character of his school, 239, 240;the eighteen decrees, how passed, 239, ii.13, 14;views of the school on hand-washing, ii.13;on divorce, 333;the burdens bound by them, 407Shaul, Abba, curse pronounced by, i.372Shechem, real capital of Samaria, i.397, 398;the city of fools,' 400;the valley of Shechem, 404, 405Shekkinah, the, removed from earth at the Fall of man, i.166;lingers over the wall of the Temple, 168Sheliach Tsibbur, Christ acts as, in the Nazareth Synagogue, i.439Shema, the, reason of its order, i.268Shemayah, or Sameas, saying of, i.128Sibylline Oracles, lament of i.6;Jewish personation in, 36;date and country of, 38;passed for Erythræan and Cumæan, 38;the restoration of Israel referred to in them; their presentation of Messiah, 172, 173Sickness, Jewish views concerning, i.554Siloam, Pool of, i.111;the procession thither on the Feast of Tabernacles, ii.157, 158;the man born blind sent to wash there, 180;lessons of the fall of the tower there, 222, 223Simeon, meets the Holy Family in the Temple, i.198;his song and prophecy, 199, 200Simeon, grandson of Hillel, interferes concerning Temple traffic, i.370, 371Simon I. (Jus), described in Ecclus., i.26, 121saying of, 95;sees a vision of an angel every year, 138Simon, the Cyrenian, ii.582, 587Simon, son of Gamaliel, views on Samaritans of, i.400Simon, ben Jochai, saying of, i.540, ii.291Simon, the Pharisee, the meal given to Christ in his house, and the woman which was a sinner there, i.563-569Simon, ben Shetach, i.96Simon Zelotes, a cousin of Christ, i.251, 522, ii.603Sirach, Son of, translates his grandfather's work, i.26;Grecian thought in it, 32Sod, i.21Soemus, murdered, i.126Sowing, modes of, i.586Star of the Magi, i.204, 205;probable explanation of it, 211-213;Jewish expectation of a star, 211, 212Stoning, Place of, ii.585Sagoth, or couples, the, i.95-97Susanna, ministers to Christ, i.573Swine, keeping them prohibited to Jews, ii.260Sychar, i.405;roads to the place, 405;its well, 409;Christ at Jacob's Well there, 405-420Synagogue, the Great, duration of, i.94, 95Synagogues, Hellenist, i.19, 29, 30, 77;the batlanim of, 76, 433, 434;their tendency in the Dispersion and in Palestine, 77, 433, 434;the Jerusalem Synagogues, 119, 432;origin of Synagogues, 431, 432;plan and structure of Synagogues, according to that at Capernaum, 434-436;regulations as to conduct in, going to, and returning from, a Synagogue, 437;the officials, 438, 439;the service, 439-445;Jewish preachers and sermons in, 445-450;Christ in the Synagogue of Nazareth, 452-456Syracuse, Jewish colony at, i.69Syria, reckoned part of the land' i.7Syrophoenician Woman, healing of her daughter by

Christ, ii.38-43Tabernacles, Feast of, how kept, i.229;pilgrims at it, and how treated, ii.129, 148, 149;Christ goes up to it privately, 131;the booths, 145, 146;Chol ha Moed of, 148;symbolism of the Feast, 149, 150;the illuminations, 150-165;the services of the great day of the Feast, 156-160;the Lulabh and Ethrog, 157Tabor, distant view of, i.146Talmud, or Gemara, Metatron in, i.47;age and contents of the Jerusalem Talmud, 103, 104;of the Babylon Talmud, 104;number of tractates and pages in the Babylon, 104, 105;its Boraithas, 104;the birth of Messiah in the Talmud, 175Tanchuma, R., saying of, i.178Targumim, origin of, i.10, 11, 29;to write them forbidden at first, 10, 11;Memra in, 47, 48;the Messiah in, 175Targum Jonathan, when sanctioned, i.11;Metatron in, 47Targum Onkelos, i.11;absence of anthropomorphisms in, 28;Memra in, see Memra, also Appendix II. pp.659-662Tarichæa, battle of, ii.68, 72;the disciples there, 76Temple, the, how regarded by the Jews, i.3, 4, 235;Gentile gifts and worshippers in it, 73, 74;its porches, 112, 244, 245, ii.151;bridge, i.112;its gates, 244;the courts, 245, 246;the Sanctuary and Most Holy Place, 245, 246;the veils, ii.610;the shops and Temple market, i.114, 244, 369-372;the moneychangers, 114, 369;the Temple rebuilt by Herod, 111-120;its beauty, 243;the Sanhedrin in it, 114;no Synagogue or Academy there, 246, 247;beggars in the Temple, i.114, ii.177;charity to poor offerers in it, i.130;the morning sacrifice in the Temple, 133;the courses of priests in it, 135; its services a superfluity to Rabbinism, 144;the teaching on the Temple terrace, 247;the Temple?guard: cannot seize Christ, ii.155, 161, 162;the Treasury, 165;the Trumpets, 165, 387;private prayer in the Temple, 289;its second cleansing; 377, 378;the children's Hosanna in it, 378, 379;the widow's two mites: gifts to the Treasury, 387-389;Christ's last view of the Temple, 431;the disciples' question as to its destruction, 431, 432;the midnight service in it on 15th Nisan, 508;the renting of the Veil: Jewish legends of such a portent, 610-612Temptation of Christ, i.291-307Ten Tribes, seat of, i.14, 15;their return expected, 15Testament, New, quotations from Old in, i.206Testament, Old, grand unity of, i.160, 161;copies of, possessed by the people, 232, 233Theodotus, i.36 Therapeutæ, i.61Therumoth, from what countries due, i.9, 86;once kept close to the roll of the Law, ii.12Thomas, Didymus, call of, i.521;his conduct when leaving Peræa, ii.315;question of, after the Paschal Supper, 514;his disbelief and confession after the Resurrection.645, 646Tiberias, built, i.88, 261, 657;its site, 261, 262;scenes in the last war at, ii.72Tithes, due from Babylonians, i.9;Christ's teaching concerning the Rabbinic law of tithing, ii.212;His woe on the Pharisaic ordinances of, 412, 413Torah, or Law, dignity and age of, i.35, 85Tosephtoth, i.103Towel, with which Christ girded Himself, ii.501, 502Transfiguration of Christ, ii.94-101Trial of Christ, not in regular Sanhedrin, nor according to Jewish law, ii.553, 556-558;the false witnesses, 558;the charge of the sign' 558-560;Caiaphas' adjuration and Christ's answer, 560, 561;the condemnation, 561;the Sanhedrists' morning meeting, 565;Christ before Pilate, 565-569;the dream of Pilate's wife, 569;the scruples and charges of the Sanhedrists, 565, 566, 569, 570;Pilate questions Christ 570, 571;He is sent to Antipas, 572;Pilate seeks to save Him, 577;Barabbas, chosen, 577;Pilate washes his hands, 577, 578;Christ scourged, derided and sentenced, 579-581Tribute to Cæsar. See CæsarTribute, Temple, amount of, i.367, 368;money changers for, 367-371;its obligation, ii.111;privileges accorded to some in paying it, 111;time of year for so doing, 111;how applied by Vespasian, 112;Peter and the tribute money: the miracle of the stater, 112-114Tsitsith, the, i.76, 277, 623, 626Tyre, fair at, 82?83.Tyre and Sidon, borders of, Christ's stay there, ii.37, 38Tyropoeon Valley, i.112Unknown Feast, Christ alone there, i.461, 462;the miracle at Bethesda, 462-469;His teaching at the Feast, 465, 466, 469-471Valerius Gratus, Procurator, i.242Venusia, Jewish tombstones at, i.70Vows, Rabbinic ordinances

concerning, ii.17-21;the hand on the Qorban,' 19;distinctions between vows, oaths, and ban, 19, 20;Christ's woe on vows contrary to the fifth commandment, 412Wages in Palestine, ii.417Washing of hands, Rabbinic ordinances of, ii.9, 10;the ceremony, 10-12;Rabbinic teaching on the subject, 13, 15, 210;Christ's attitude towards this tradition, and his teaching concerning it, 15, 205-211Watches, night, how many, i.687, 688Weeks, Feast of, how kept, i.229Wheat, price of, ii.269Wines, various kinds of, ii.208Wisdom of Solomon, character of, i.31-33;allegorical interpretations in, 34Woes of Christ, on Chorazin and Bethsaida, ii.138, 139;on the Pharisees, 212, 410-414;on the Scribes, 213Writing materials, ii.270;inks, 270, 271;pens, &c., 271;the tablet, 271, 272Xystos, in Jerusalem, i.118Yemen, kings of, professed the Jewish faith, i.203Yetser ha Ra, i.52, 167;final destruction of, ii.441Yetser tobh, i.52, 53, 167Yoke of the Kingdom, ii.142-144Zacchæus, ii.352-355Zacharias, home, wife, and character of, i.135-137;the annunciation of John the Baptist to, 137-140,is dumb till the naming of his son, 140-158;an idiot' priest, 141;his hymn, 158, 159Zadok, disciple of Antigonus of Socho, i.322Zadok, High?Priest, did not give their name to Sadducees, i.322, 323Zealots, Nationalists, or Cananæans, rise and political history of, i.237, 238-242;the Sicarii, 241, 242;their presence in Christ's family, 242;how described by Josephus, 243;their principles, ii.383, 385Zebedee, sons of, probably Christ's cousins, i.251;meaning of the name, 474;request of the mother of his children, ii.116, 346, 347,she is under the cross, 602, 603Zechariah, the murdered prophet, legend of, ii.413, 414Zeqenim, i.96;Christ denounces their traditionalism, ii.213;the question of one of them about the greatest commandment, 403-405Zugoth. See Sugoth.

Chapter 127

INDEX II. of passages from the four gospels referred to in these volumes.

St. Matt. ch. Ver i.

i.144 24 i.251 25 i.180 ii.

i.212 1-18 i.202 4 i. 93 6 i.206 7 i.205 11 i.207 15 i.16216 i.20519-23 i.21722 i.183, 22122, 23 i.221iii. 1-12

i.2552 i.270; ii.4214 i.2647 i.309, 310, 33512 i.27313-17 i.27514 i.279, 28217 ii.101iv.

ii.551-11 i.2914 i.4812 i.42213 i.364, 39413-16 i.42313-17 i.423, 451, 45817 i.42217, 23 i.27018, &c i.47313-22 i.394, 423, 472, ii.5518, 22 i.45720, 22 i.47423 i.489v.

i.529v.-vii.

i.524, 5291-2 i.5243,10 i.2703-12 i.5296 i.53713 ii.11913-16 i.52915 i.537; ii.20216 ii.45617 i.53717-20 i.53118 i.234, 53719, 20 i.27020 ii.29321 i.53821-48 i.53022 i.53825 i.53725, 26 ii.22126 i.53829 i.53731 i.53735 i.53842-48 i.53646 i.53747 i.537vi.

i.5301-4 i.5302 i.196, 5395-15 i.5308 i.5379-13 i.53610 i.26912 i.53713 i.296, 53914, 15 i.53916-18 i.53018 i.53719-21 i.530; ii.21822 i.53722, 23 i.530; ii.20222-24 i.53024 i.53725 i.53925-33 ii.21625-34 i.53028-30 i.57832 i.53733 i.269, 27034 i.539vii. 1-5

i.5312 i.5393, 4 i.5396 i.531, 539 7-12 i.5318 i.5379 i.53710 i.473, 53711 i.53912 i.535, ii.23613, 14 i.531, ii.29814 i.54015 i.53715, 16 i.53116-20 i.57817-19 i.53717-20 i.53121 i.27021, 22 ii.30021-23 i.541, ii.29822 i.53722, 23 i.52823 i.537, ii.30124-27 i.53125 i.57826 i.54028 i.478viii. 1, 5-15 i.5422-4 i.489; ii.3284 i.6195 i.365, 426, 5486 i.5487 i.54811 i.279; ii.30111, 12 ii.298, 32912 i.550, 55114 i.366, 54914-17 i.47817 i.342, 464, 48818 ii.13218, 23-27 i.59919-22 ii.126, 13228 i.607, 60928-34 i.60629 ii.132ix.

ii.491 i.364, 423, 4571-8 i.4992 i.5049-13 i.50710, 11 ii.25411 i.57614 i.57614-17 i.520, 654, 66215 i.355, ii.46916, 17 i.66518-26 i.61620 i.76, 27727-31 i.573; ii.44, 4830 i.61932-35 i.570, 573; ii.4833, 34 i.57634 i.573, 57435 i.27036 i.64036-38 i.640; ii.135, 13738 ii.536x.

ii.214, 2161, 5-42 i.6351-15 i.6442-4 i.507, 5215 i.394; ii.1355-15 i.640, 6415-42 i.6407 i.2707, 8 ii.1378 i.48010 i.621, 62213 ii.13815 i.64116-18 i.64416-23 i.640, 644 17 i.64518 i.64518-20 ii.214, 21621, 22 i.64521-25 ii.21623 i.64424-33 i.64024-34 i.64826 i.640, 64926-33 ii.21432 i.65034 i.65034-36 ii.22034-39 i.64037, 38 ii.30438 ii.46940-42 i.640, 651xi. 1

i.6542 i.3372-14 i.6542-19 i.6665 i.6697-19 ii.13611 i.27012 i.270; ii.277, 29912-14 i.67013-17 i.58414 i.338, 341; ii.10414-19 i.67016-19 i.562, 57416-42 ii.13817, 18 i.57620-24 ii.135, 136, 13820-30 i.561, 56221 ii.425-27 ii.52825-30 ii.13527 i.50028-30 i.562; ii.142xii.

i.573, ii.551-21 ii.51, 2237 i.5209-13 ii.22311 ii.22512 ii.6014 ii.197, 22416 i.61918 i.5422 i.296, 576, ii.19722-32 i.57322-45 i.580; ii.19523 ii.4924, &c i.57925 ii.19825-28 i.29527-30 ii.19828 i.27030 ii.11831, 32 ii.214, 21633-37 ii.19938 ii.20038-40 i.37539 ii.20039-42 ii.20040 ii.46943 i.48043-45 ii.20046 i.251, 57746, 47 ii.20246-50 i.361, 570xiii.

i.579, 583, 5861, 2 i.5791-9, 24-33 i.5841-52 i.5783 i.5833-9 i.2699-13 i.64610 i.583, 59411-15 i.37511, 19, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52 i.270 12 i.59713-15 i.58416 i.594, 597; ii.135, 142, 14417 i.59718 i.58619 i.59719, 25, 39 i.29622 i.59733 i.58334 i.58336 i.590, 59436, 55-52 i.58338 i.27039 i.591, 59740 i.59141 i.27042 i.59743 i.27044 i.59745, 46 i.58346 i.59747 i.473, 59747, 48 i.26954 i.47854-58 i.457, 63555 i.25255, 56 i.251xiv. 1

i.6571-12 i.6543, 4 i.6575 i.6578 i.67412, 13 i.65413-21 i.676, 67814 i.464, 67915 i.60617 i.68119 i.683; ii.6520 ii.6522 i.606, 690, 69422-36 i.68623 i.696, 687; ii.37424 i.690, 69226 i.68933 ii.8034-36 ii.636 i.76, 277xv. 1

ii.71-9 ii.2111-20 ii.32 i.3143, 6 ii.1710 ii.7, 2210, 11 ii.21111, 18 i.10612 ii.36, 7712-14 ii.715 i.58215-20 ii.717 ii.2419 ii.2321 ii.3, 3721-28 ii.3722 ii.4923 ii.3828 ii.4229-31 ii.44, 4532-xiv.12 ii.6336 i.473, 68339 ii.67xvi. 1

ii.3961-4 ii.2002, 3 ii.69, 2203 ii.3426, 7 i.4199, 10 ii.6514-28 ii.7216 ii.53619 i.270; ii.64521 ii.344, 470 22 ii.50023 ii.34624-27 ii.8728 i.647; ii.88xvii. 1

ii.5381-8 ii.919-21 ii.10212 i.34014 ii.10520 i.593, ii.30621 i.480; ii.10622 ii.47022, 23 ii.34422-xviii.22 ii.11023 ii.11525 ii.112xviii.

i.5801 i.270; ii.1151-6&c ii.3061-14 ii.2933 i.270, 382; ii.3376-35 ii.30610 ii.25711 ii.25712-14 ii.25615 ii.52515, 21 ii.11515-22 ii.29317 ii.8418 ii.64519 ii.12419, 20 ii.124, 52121 ii.11521, 22 ii.306, 37723 i.270, 56823-35 ii.284, 29326 ii.29529 ii.29535 ii.296xix. 1

ii.127, 2931, 2 ii.327, 3313 ii.3323-12 ii.3314 ii.3348 i.61210-12 ii.33512 i.26913-15 ii.33616 ii.33816-22 ii.235, 33820 ii.34021 ii.21723-30 ii.33824 i.27025 i.47828 ii.34329 ii.34330 ii.300, 416, 42030-xx.16 ii.415xx.

i.5801 i.270, ii.247, 4172 ii.2396 ii.41815 ii.41616 ii.300, 34417 ii.12617-19 ii.338, 344, 47018 i.9320 ii.116, 34620-28 ii.338, 34624 ii.337, 34728 ii.248, 60629-34 ii.349, 35530, 31 ii.49xxi.

i.5801-11 ii.3639, 15 ii.4912 i.244, 372, 37312-22 ii.37415 i.93; ii.337 18-22 ii.37522-32 ii.42123-27 ii.380, 38325 i.281, 28728-32 ii.41529, 32 ii.57331 i.27033 ii.247, 42233-46 i.646, ii.41536 ii.42238 ii.46940, 41 ii.42343 i.270; ii.42244 ii.42245 ii.423xxii.

i.5801-9 ii.4261-14 ii.415, 4252 i.27010 ii.42910-14 ii.42612 ii.40315-22 ii.380, 38417 ii.11223-33 ii.39629-30 ii.40132 i.31633 i.47834 ii.403, 42934-40 ii.235, 39635 i.93; ii.23441-46 ii.380, 396, 56042-45 i.24846 ii.406xxiii.

ii.204, 211, 396, 4062 i.4363, 4 i.101; ii.4075 i.76, 94, 277, 6245-7 ii.4076 i.4368-12 ii.40711 ii.41013 i.27013-33 ii.41014 ii.41123 i.31225, 26 i.312, 35827 ii.32034-36 ii.413, 42437-39 ii.302, 414, 43138, 39 ii.44939 ii.432xxiv.

i.580, 647; ii.328, 331, 389, 4311 ii.415, 4313 ii.432, 448, 4493-29 i.2054 ii.4464, 5 ii.4484-8 ii.4464-35 ii.445, 4466 ii.4466-8 ii.4478 ii.4469-14 ii.446, 44710-13 ii.44814 ii.448, 449, 45015-28

ii.446, 44822 ii.44928 ii.44929 ii.45029-31 ii.449, 45030 ii.45031 ii.45032 i.582, 58332, 33 ii.45034 i.647; ii.44936 ii.45136-51 ii.445, 451, 453 37-40 ii.45140, 41 ii.45142 ii.45242-51 ii.45243, 44 ii.218, 45244 ii.45245-51 ii.219, 452xxv.

i.5801 ii.455, 4561-13 ii.4531, 14 i.2701-30 i.6472 ii.4563 ii.4564 ii.4566 ii.4557 ii.45614-30 ii.453, 45931-46 App. xix.34 i.27046 ii.380xxvi. 1

ii.380, 4811-5 ii.4683-6 ii.3716&c i.563; ii.3116-13 ii.349, 3648 ii.33713 ii.35914-16 ii.46817-19 ii.479, 49017-20 ii.48120 ii.49021 ii.50421-24 ii.49024 ii.50625 ii.490, 49426 ii.51126-29 ii.49029 i.27030 ii.51330, 36 ii.48030-56 ii.53332 ii.53433 ii.64936 ii.53839, 42 ii.53940 ii.54041 i.29643 ii.9645 ii.54149 ii.54350 ii.54457 i.9357,58 ii.54658 ii.55059 ii.56559-68 ii.54660, 61 i.45166 ii.55769 ii.55169, 70 ii.54671, 72 ii.54673-75 ii.546xxvii. 1, 2, 11-14 ii.5653 ii.4213-10 ii.565, 5735 ii.111, 5747 ii.316, 57612 ii.55715-18 ii.56517 ii.57318 ii.56919 ii.56520-31 ii.56524, 25 ii.57731-43 ii.58239-43 ii.59140-42 i.45141 i.9342 ii.596 44 ii.58245-56 ii.58248, 49 ii.60851 ii.604, 61052, 53 ii.61255 i.692; ii.60256 i.572; ii.34657-61 ii.58260 ii.61761 i.57262-66 ii.582, 623xxviii. 1

i.692; ii.6311-10 ii.6309 ii.63311-15 ii.63016 ii.535, 630, 633, 64717 ii.64717-20 ii.63018-20 ii.53519 i.643St. Mark.i. 2-8

i.2557-11 i.27510 i.28412 i.29113 i.29114 i.270, 394, 422, 423, 45115 i.270, 422, 423, 45116 i.473, 47416-20 i.394, 47220 i.47221-34 i.47822 i.47823 i.48425 ii.40327 i.485, 60229 ii.435 i.490; ii.37425-45 i.48935-39 i.48938 i.49040 ii.5040-45 ii.32841 ii.5043 ii.4944 i.61945 ii.50ii. 1

i.3641-12 i.4996 i.5007 i.5009 i.50010 i.50013 i.51413-17 i.50715 i.36616 i.51818 i.66318-22 i.65423 ii.5523-iii.6 ii.51iii. 4

ii.606 ii.38411 i.69212 i.61913-15 i.52413-19 i.507, 52118 i.25119-21 i.54220 i.366, 54221 i.54222 i.570, 574, 575; ii.19722-30 i.58023 i.573, 58223-30 i.57331 i.251, 366, 543, 576iv. 1-34 i.57810 i.59411 i.270, 375, 58012 i.375 26 i.27026-29 i.583, 586, 58830 i.27032 i.59333 i.58334 i.58335-41 i.59936 i.59937 i.60038 i.60239 i.484; ii.403v. 1-16 i.6781-20 i.606, 6073-5 i.6096 i.61013 i.61215 i.69221-43 i.61622 i.438, 45727 i.7631 i.61737 ii.53838 i.69241 ii.48443 i.619vi. 1-6

i.4571-13 i.6352 i.478, 6393 i.251, 252, 364, 637, 6385 i.4647 i.641; ii.1357-11 i.64112 i.65413 i.464, 65414-29 i.65417 i.65718 i.65720 i.66630-44 i.654, 67631-33 i.67832 i.67833 i.678; ii.15034 i.679, 68035 i.68138 i.68139 i.677, 683; ii.6540 i.68345 i.676; ii.345-56 i.68648 i.69349 i.68953 ii.553-56 ii.656 i.464; ii.6vii. 1

ii.71-4 i.3571-23 ii.32-5 i.3583 ii.119 ii.1713 ii.1714 ii.7, 2215 ii.716 ii.2217-23 ii.719 ii.2321 ii.2324 i.655; ii.3824-30 ii.3725 ii.38, 3931 ii.4431-37 ii.44, 4634 i.48936 i.61937 i.378, 631viii. 1-21

ii.636 i.683; ii.657 ii.6511 ii.67 12 ii.69, 7022 ii.4722-26 ii.44, 4723 ii.45, 4724 ii.4826 i.619; ii.47, 4827 ii.4726-ix.1 ii.72ix. 2-8

ii.913 ii.969-29 ii.10213 i.34016 ii.10621 i.48025 i.60230 ii.9230-50 ii.11031 ii.11534 ii.11535 ii.41038 ii.115, 117, 34642-50 ii.11543 i.273; ii.4644 ii.12045 i.273; ii.12046 ii.12047 i.27048 ii.12050 ii.119x. 1

ii.127, 327, 3312-12 ii.327, 3314 i.61210 ii.33513-16 ii.327, 33614 i.27015 i.27017-22 ii.33818 ii.48421 ii.34123 i.27023-31 ii.33824 i.270, 485; ii.34225 i.27026 i.47829 ii.34330 ii.34331 ii.34432 i.485; ii.126, 34532-34 ii.33835 ii.34635-45 ii.338, 34641 ii.337, 34745 ii.34846-52 ii.349, 35547 ii.4948 ii.4949 ii.356xi. 1-11

ii.3633 ii.36510 i.27011 i.37315-26 ii.37418 i.47820 ii.375, 38025 ii.37726 ii.37727-33 ii.380, 383xii. 1-12

ii.41513-17 ii.380, 38414 ii.11217 ii.38618-27 ii.39628-34 ii.39634 i.27035-40 ii.39640 ii.41141 i.69241-44 ii.387xiii.

i.640; ii.328, 4311 ii.432 3 ii.4328 ii.4469 ii.44830 i.64735 i.49037 ii.380xiv. 1

i.93; ii.280, 4682 ii.371, 4683 ii.3113-9 ii.349, 358, 3644 ii.3375 ii.498 ii.35910 ii.46811 ii.46812-16 ii.479, 49012-17 ii.48114 i.185; ii.48317 ii.49018 ii.50418-21 ii.49021 ii.50622 ii.51122-25 ii.49025 i.27026 ii.480, 51326-52 ii.53328 ii.53432 ii.48036 ii.53940 ii.9641 ii.360, 54143 i.9345 ii.54346 ii.54451 ii.54553 ii.54654 ii.546, 55055 ii.56555-65 ii.54664 ii.55766 i.118; ii.55166-68 ii.54669 ii.54670 ii.54670-72 ii.546xv. 1

ii.5651-5 ii.5656-10 ii.56511 ii.57711-20 ii.56520-32 ii.58221 ii.58722 ii.58723 ii.20825 ii.582, 58729 ii.59732 ii.58233-41 ii.58236 ii.60839 ii.60940 i.251, 692; ii.327, 346, 60241 ii.327, 60242-47 ii.58243 ii.61547 i.692xvi. 1

ii.6311-11 ii.6304 i.6929 ii.6339-20 ii.62210 ii.62411 ii.63812 ii.630, 63513 ii.63015-18 ii.63018 i.46419 i.557; ii.630 20 ii.630St. Luke.i. 2

i.544 i.1855-25 i.13317 i.34020 ii.24826-80 i.14433 i.27063 ii.27065 i.25068 i.56080 i.260ii. 1-20

i.1802 i.1827 i.189, 251; ii.354, 48312 i.18915 i.25019 i.193, 25021-38 i.19127 ii.28929-32 i.19932 ii.16636 i.1637 ii.28939, 40 i.21740 i.221, 22641-52 i.23543 i.24648 i.47849 i.64451 i.193, 25052 i.250iii. 1-18

i.2553 i.26415 i.309, 34017 i.27318 i.27019 ii.52521 i.282, 28321-23 i.275iv. 1

ii.1261-13 i.29114, 15 i.42215, 16 i.42315-32 i.45116 i.234, 430, 43116-30 i.42316-31 i.63518, 19 i.45220 i.43822 i.43123 i.424, 582, 58331, 32 i.42332 i.47833-41 i.47835 ii.40336 i.48542-44 i.48943 i.270, 490v.

ii.6491-11 i.394, 472; ii.6482 i.4735 i.47312-16 i.48914 i.61916 ii.126, 37417 i.9317-26 i.49921 i.478, 49727-32 i.50730 i.49731 i.52032 i.50733 i.49733-39 i.65436 i.582, 58339 i.66544 i.9446 i.94vi.

i.5261-11 ii.512 i.478 4 ii.586 ii.617 i.478, 49711 ii.6212 i.524; ii.37412-19 i.507, 52113 i.52415 i.251, 52217-19 i.52420 i.27038 i.53539 i.583vii. 1

i.4261-10 i.5425 i.433, 4576 i.5488 i.54711-17 i.55212 i.35317 i.57418-35 i.654, 66621 i.66924 ii.12626 ii.42428 i.270, 27429, 30 i.67030 i.93, 94, 27731-33 i.57636 i.56236-50 i.56139 i.56640 i.56443 i.567viii. 1

i.2701-3 i.5703 i.4294-18 i.5785 i.58710 i.27014 i.58717 i.64919 i.360, 57622-25 i.59926-39 i.60627 i.60928 i.61029 ii.12640-56 i.61644 i.7645 i.61747 i.62856 i.619ix. 1

ii.1351-5 i.6411-6 i.6351-56 ii.1262 i.2706 i.6547-9 i.654; ii.5729 i.675; ii.30110-17 i.67611 i.270, 68013 i.68114 i.68318 ii.78, 8118-27 ii.7228 ii.37428-36 ii.9131 ii.12834 ii.9837 ii.9337-43 ii.10243 i.47843-50 ii.11049 ii.11750 ii.118, 19951 ii.96, 127, 13151-xviii.14 ii.126, 12752-56 ii.37753 ii.174 54 ii.34654-56 ii.13157-62 ii.12659 ii.13362 i.270x.-xvi.

i.579x. 1-16 ii.1352 i.640; ii.1376 ii.1387 ii.1388 ii.1389 i.270; ii.13711 i.27012-16 ii.13613 ii.413-16 ii.13813-22 i.56115 i.54217 i.480; ii.13917-20 i.48917-24 ii.13518 i.296, 480, 69222 i.500; ii.14123 ii.14224 ii.14225 i.93; ii.135, 14425-37 ii.233, 23431 i.56033 ii.23838 ii.145, 146, 311, 31338-42 ii.135xi.-xiv. i.579xi. 1

ii.196, 2405 ii.240, 2845-13 ii.233, 2398 ii.240, 28814 i.576; ii.48, 19714-26 i.57314-36 i.580; ii.19514-xvii.11 ii.19517 i.29519 i.48020 i.27021 ii.19822 ii.19824 i.48027 i.594; ii.132, 20130 ii.20033-36 ii.20237-54 ii.204, 40638 i.35839 i.312, 588; ii.21139-52 ii.20440 ii.21141 i.312; ii.21142 i.312; ii.21243 i.94; ii.21244 ii.21245 i.93; ii.205, 21346 i.101; ii.21352 ii.38253 ii.205, 21354 ii.205, 213xii.

ii.2181 i.640; ii.2121-xiii.17 ii.2141-12 ii.2142 i.640, 649; ii.2152-9 ii.2144 ii.2156 ii.2157 ii.2158-10 ii.21510 ii.214, 215, 21611 ii.214, 21512 ii.214, 21513-21 ii.243 16-21 ii.21622-34 ii.21629 ii.21731 i.27032 i.270; ii.21633 ii.21734 ii.21735-38 ii.21835-48 ii.431, 45239 ii.21940 ii.21942-46 ii.219, 26747 ii.22048 ii.220, 60949 ii.22049-53 ii.22050 ii.22051-53 ii.22054 ii.22057 ii.22058 ii.22159 ii.221xiii. 1

i.2621-5 ii.2212 ii.2603 ii.2604 ii.2226-9 ii.223, 243, 246, 37510-17 ii.22314 i.439; ii.33715 ii.22416 ii.22418 i.270, 59319 i.59320 i.27022 ii.127, 22623 ii.29823-30 ii.29824 ii.29825-27 ii.29827 ii.30128 i.270; ii.29829 i.270; ii.29830 ii.41831 i.393; ii.298, 30231-33 i.65831-35 ii.298, 301, 30432 i.393; ii.301, 30233 ii.30234 ii.30235 ii.302xiv. 1-11 ii.249, 298, 3033 i.93, 94; ii.3034 ii.3035 ii.2557-11 ii.30310 ii.30411 ii.41012 ii.205, 24912-14 ii.30413 ii.249, 25114 ii.24915 i.27016 ii.250, 42716-24 ii.243, 24817 ii.42721 ii.30321-24 ii.42825 ii.30425-35 ii.298, 30426 ii.30528-30 ii.30529 i.69231-35 ii.305xv.

ii.2531 ii.2642 ii.264 3-7 ii.1234 ii.2548 ii.2548-10 i.58113 ii.26721 ii.26223 ii.26132 ii.263xvi.

ii.2641 ii.2641-8 ii.2662 ii.2673 ii.2677 ii.2728 ii.2669 ii.266, 27310 ii.27510-13 ii.26611 ii.15413 ii.27514 ii.33114-31 ii.27515 ii.26416 i.270; ii.264, 27716-22 ii.27817 i.234; ii.264, 277, 33218 ii.264, 277, 33220 ii.27923-26 ii.28026 ii.28227-31 ii.28228 ii.28230 ii.283xvii.

ii.283, 2841 ii.3061-4 ii.3061-7 ii.1191-10 ii.298, 3062 ii.3063 ii.3064 ii.3066 ii.3067-10 ii.30610 i.50911 ii.126, 284, 32712-19 ii.327, 32814 ii.32916 i.39518 i.40020 i.270; ii.284, 33120-37 ii.328, 33121 i.270; ii.28422-37 ii.28435 ii.120xviii.

i.5791 ii.2841-14 ii.2844 ii.2877 ii.284, 2888 ii.284, 2889-14 ii.28912 i.312, 66214 ii.41015-17 ii.293, 327, 33616 i.27017 i.270; ii.9618-23 ii.235, 33824 i.27024-30 ii.33825 i.27029 i.270; ii.34330 ii.34331 ii.12731-34 ii.33835-43 ii.349, 35538 ii.4939 ii.49xix.

i.5801-10 ii.349 10 ii.12211-28 ii.453, 46512 i.27012-27 i.22015 i.27029-44 ii.36337 ii.36738 ii.36739 ii.36541 i.243; ii.32441-44 ii.7045 i.37345-48 ii.374xx. 1-8

ii.380, 3839 ii.4239-19 ii.41519-26 ii.38420-26 ii.38027-39 ii.39640-47 ii.39645-47 ii.20447 ii.411xxi.

i.6401-4 ii.380, 3875-38 ii.4316 i.69212 ii.44824 ii.43329-31 i.64631 ii.45032 i.64736-38 ii.38037 ii.415xxii. 1

ii.3801-6 ii.4682 i.933 i.296; ii.4714 ii.4757 ii.4817-13 ii.479, 4908 ii.364, 48211 i.185; ii.48313 ii.48114 ii.48114-16 ii.49615 ii.48117 ii.490, 49618 ii.490, 49619 ii.49020 ii.49021-23 ii.49024-30 ii.49025 ii.49526 ii.49528 i.29629 i.27030 ii.34331 i.296; ii.53531-53 ii.53335, 38 ii.53737 i.34239 ii.48041 ii.53948 ii.54354 ii.55054-58 ii.54655 ii.55059-62 ii.54663-65 ii.54666 i.93, 97; ii.54966-68 ii.56067-71 ii.546xxiii. 1-5

ii.5652 ii.384, 557, 565, 5703 ii.5706 i.1186-12 ii.565, 5727 i.118; ii.38310 i.9313 ii.573 13-17 ii.56518-25 ii.56526 i.6326-38 ii.58227-31 ii.588, 59534 ii.59535 i.692; ii.59736 ii.59537 ii.59539-43 ii.58244-49 ii.58245 ii.60446 ii.59548 i.69249 ii.60850-56 ii.58251 ii.61554 ii.61655 i.57256 i.572xxiv. 1-12 ii.63010 ii.63013-35 ii.63017 ii.64019 ii.64021 ii.62333 ii.64236-43 ii.63037 i.69238-43 ii.627, 62839 i.692; ii.64344-48 ii.64744-53 ii.63047 i.270St. John.i. 9

ii.15410 i.4711-13 i.67113 i.38414 ii.9915-51 i.33619-24 i.30819-28 i.30920 i.34022-28 i.34124 i.32228 i.264, 27829 i.48832 i.28432-34 i.27533 i.279, 336; ii.64434 i.28537 i.47440 i.34541 i.34742 ii.8243 i.34544 ii.445-51 ii.64647 i.34848 i.41448, 49 i.41449 i.41450-51 i.42650 i.35051 i.349, 350, 351ii. 1

i.3451-11 i.4231-12 i.3513 i.3596 ii.1112 i.39413 ii.54, 49113-17 i.35713-iii.21 i.65513-23 ii.37813-25 i.36413-iv.54 i.40714 i.24414, 15 i.374 18, 19 ii.55818-23 i.357, 37819 i.80; ii.46920 i.37523 i.378, 692iii. 1-21

i.3773 i.270, 384; ii.333-5 i.269, 3834 i.3865 i.270, 3827 i.3848 i.38314 ii.46916 i.38916-21 i.382, 389, 65620 ii.52522 i.390; ii.5422-iv.3 i.65524 i.65725 i.391, 65525-30 i.65426 i.66129 i.663, 66431 i.38431-36 i.382iv.

i.542; ii.3291 i.390, 3931, 2 i.6581-4 i.3901-42 i.4042 i.3904 i.3948 i.4099 i.40111-15 i.41315 i.41419 i.414, 69220 i.7720-24 ii.18723, 37 ii.15429 i.41430 i.41831 i.41833 i.40735 i.594; ii.55, 13736 i.42039 i.41840 i.408, 41842 i.42143-54 i.422, 42344 i.45545 i.42246-53 i.54746-54 i.57249 i.42550 i.426, 42952 i.42853 i.426, 428, 429v.

i.460, 461, 499, 677; ii.54, 55, 129v.-vi.3 i.4071 i.423, 4601-3 ii.547 i.463, 4688 i.5009 ii.5313, 14 i.46815, 16 i.30916 ii.5316, 17 ii.22317 i.465, 47018 i.50018 ii.15319 i.471; ii.52619-32 i.46624 i.46927 i.50030-38 i.46636 i.50037 i.465 39 i.46540-43 i.46544 i.46545-47 i.465vi.

ii.1291 i.655, 6571-14 i.6762 i.6923 i.6794 i.677, 679; ii.1286 i.414, 6809 i.68110 i.683; ii.6515 i.68715-21 i.68617 ii.319 i.606, 69221 i.606, 693, 69422 i.678, 690; ii.2622-24 ii.422-25 ii.622-71 ii.2524 ii.2625 ii.2625-29 ii.2825-36 ii.2625-65 ii.2626 ii.2727 ii.3529 i.46930 i.46930-36 ii.2931 ii.59332 ii.15433 ii.3037 ii.3537-40 ii.3140 i.692; ii.2641 ii.3141-51 ii.3241-52 ii.2642 ii.3544 ii.3548 ii.3448-58 i.68349 i.36651 ii.26, 46952-58 ii.2753-58 ii.26, 3455 ii.3556 ii.3559 i.366; ii.4, 6, 7, 2660-66 ii.7, 7761-65 ii.2762 i.692; ii.3565 ii.3566 i.590; ii.3667 ii.7768 ii.36, 152, 53669 ii.36, 81, 15270 i.59071 ii.36vii.

ii.70, 129vii.-x. ii.1261-5 ii.771-16 ii.1262 ii.1293 i.306, 6924 ii.5275 i.30611 ii.13111-36 ii.14813 ii.52714 ii.131, 14515 i.30917 ii.16218 ii.52620 i.479 26 ii.52727 ii.43628 ii.15429 ii.15535 i.737-viii.11 ii.15637-viii.59 ii.16438 ii.59339 ii.64440-42 i.42350 ii.61750-52 i.26352 ii.17453 ii.16453-viii.11 ii.163viii. 3

i.3099 ii.52512 ii.164, 18012-19 ii.16412-59 ii.16413 ii.164, 16914 ii.16915 ii.16916 ii.154, 16920 ii.164, 16521 ii.16422 ii.17023, 24 ii.17125-28 ii.17128 ii.18029 ii.18030 i.46030-32 ii.17231 i.46933 i.27134 ii.17335 ii.17337-40 ii.17339 i.27141 ii.17342 ii.17343-47 ii.17346 ii.52548 i.395, 479; ii.19749 i.47950 ii.17551 i.692; ii.17552 i.479; ii.88, 17553 i.27156 i.161, 19359 ii.164ix.

ii.1773 i.4684 ii.1805 ii.1806 ii.457 ii.1588 i.69211 ii.18012 ii.18114 ii.17715 ii.18216 ii.818 i.30922 i.309; ii.18124 ii.832 ii.32435 ii.17739 ii.18741 ii.187x.

i.583; ii.177, 2171-21 ii.18811 ii.194, 46912 i.69213-15 ii.22915 ii.46917 ii.19218 ii.19219 ii.195 19-21 ii.12620 i.479; ii.19721 i.47922 ii.177, 22622-39 ii.19522-42 ii.126, 195, 22623 ii.15124 ii.52726 ii.22927 ii.22928 ii.22935 ii.23137 ii.23239 ii.12639-43 ii.126xi.

ii.126, 145, 284; ii.3061-45 ii.1951-54 ii.3082 ii.3114 ii.322, 3256 i.6298 ii.301, 34514 ii.52716 ii.34520 ii.31533, 38 ii.4935-44 ii.37541 ii.32445 ii.31146-54 ii.19547 ii.47547-50 i.205, 26348 ii.47549 i.26450 ii.54651 ii.52654 ii.126, 127, 135, 52755 i.36755-57 ii.35755-xii.1 ii.34957 ii.475xii.

ii.3781 ii.357, 3582-11 ii.3495 ii.4726 ii.47210 ii.35711 ii.35712 ii.36512-19 ii.36316 ii.36617 ii.36718 ii.36719 i.692; ii.36520 ii.18720-50 ii.380, 38821 i.676; ii.323 ii.39124-26 ii.39125 ii.40427 ii.391, 39228 ii.39128-33 ii.39231 i.296; ii.14032 ii.33, 17134-36 ii.39236 ii.39337-43 ii.39342 ii.18344 ii.39445 i.69245-48 ii.39449 ii.39450 ii.394xiii.

ii.348, 4971 ii.479, 4902 ii.471, 493, 4972-20 ii.4903 ii.498 4 i.5686 ii.49911 ii.50112-16 ii.49712-17 ii.50117-19 ii.50220 ii.50421 ii.50521-26 ii.49022 ii.50623 ii.50624 ii.495, 50626 ii.49426-38 ii.49027 i.296; ii.471, 47728 ii.50630 ii.50731-35 ii.50932 ii.50933 ii.51336 ii.52436-38 i.35037 ii.649xiv.

ii.513, 5281 ii.5281-4 ii.513, 5145 ii.514, 5245-14 ii.5137-14 ii.5158 i.6809 i.68012-14 ii.52115-17 ii.51615-24 ii.51317 i.69219 i.692; ii.51620-22 ii.51722 i.52224 ii.51724-31 ii.51326 i.5627, 28 ii.51829 ii.51930 i.296; ii.51931 ii.519xv.

i.583; ii.513, 5281 ii.1541-8 ii.5194 ii.5267 ii.5218 ii.5219-17 ii.51911 ii.522, 53012-14 ii.52216 ii.52116-18 ii.52318-27 ii.51919-21 ii.52322-24 ii.523xvi.

ii.513, 524, 5281-4 ii.5242 ii.1835 ii.5245-7 ii.5267 ii.5258-15 ii.52610 i.69211 i.29616 i.692; ii.52617 i.69219 i.692; ii.52723 ii.52725 ii.52729 ii.52730 ii.52831-32 i.35032 ii.52833 ii.528xvii.

ii.513, 5281-5 ii.528 3 ii.1543-5 ii.5296-10 ii.5296-19 ii.5289-12 ii.53012 ii.531, 54312-17 ii.53113 ii.53015 ii.53620-26 ii.52824 i.692, 69324-26 ii.531xviii. 1

ii.480, 485, 5131-11 ii.5332 ii.4853 ii.5424-9 ii.5435 ii.54312 i.309; ii.54212-14 ii.54613 i.264; ii.54814 ii.54615 ii.55015-18 ii.546, 548, 55015-23 ii.54817 ii.54618 ii.54619 ii.54819-23 ii.546, 548, 54920 ii.527, 54924 ii.546, 54825 ii.54626-27 ii.54628 ii.482, 55628-38 ii.56529 ii.557, 56530 ii.557, 56531 i.309; ii.541, 55732 ii.56933 i.40633-37 i.26636 i.383; ii.29937 ii.57139 ii.56540 ii.565xix. 1

ii.5791-16 ii.5652-16 ii.6014 ii.5796 ii.5827 ii.54111 i.38414 i.40815 ii.58216 ii.58216-24 ii.58217-24 ii.60119 ii.59120 ii.58521 ii.59122 ii.59123 i.384, 622, 624, 62525 i.251, 521; ii.60225-27 ii.582, 60226 i.360, 36127 i.38328 ii.603, 60728-30 ii.58231 ii.61231-37 ii.582, 59535

ii.15438-42 ii.58239 i.38141 ii.61742 ii.617xx. 1

ii.6301-18 ii.6302 ii.635 6 i.6939 ii.62311-17 ii.63312 i.69313 ii.63514 i.69316 i.9319-25 ii.63020 ii.64323 ii.8526-29 ii.63027 ii.61430 i.394, 466; ii.64731 i.185, 394, 467; ii.647xxi. 1-24 ii.6302 i.350; ii.535, 6333 ii.6479 i.683; ii.64910 i.68313 i.683; ii.62715-17 ii.53625 i.394; ii.139

sermon index

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net