

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah

Alfred Edersheim

1883

Book III

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

'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. lxxviii. 4, followed by verse 5].' - Megill 31 *a*.

Chapter 1

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

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

The proclamation and inauguration of the 'Kingdom of Heaven' at such a time, and under such circumstances, was one of the great *antitheses* of history. With reverence be it said, it is only God Who would thus begin His Kingdom. A similar, even greater antithesis, was the commencement of the Ministry of Christ. From the Jordan to the wilderness with its wild Beasts; from the devout acknowledgment of the Baptist, the consecration and filial prayer of Jesus, the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the heard testimony of Heaven, to the utter 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 Critics¹ 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.² 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.'³

1. No other terms would correctly describe the book of Keim to which I specially refer. How widely it differs, not only from the superficial trivialities of a Renan, but from the stale arguments of Strauss, or the picturesque inaccuracies of a Hausrath, no serious student need be told. Perhaps on that ground it is only the more dangerous.

2. On the temptations of Abraham see Book of Jubilees, ch. xvii.; Sanh. 89 *b* (and differently but not less blasphemously in Pirké de R. Elies. 31); Pirké de R. Elies. 26, 31, 32 (where also about Satan's temptation of Sarah, who dies in consequence of his tidings); Ab. de R. N. 33; Ber. R. 32, 56; Yalkut, i. c. 98, p. 28 *b*; and Tanchuma, where the story is related with most repulsive details. As to Moses, see for example Shabb. 89 *a*; and especially the truly horrible story of the death of Moses in Debar R. 11 (ed. Warsh. iii. p. 22 *a* and *b*). But I am not aware of any *temptation* of Moses by Satan.

3. Bemidb. R. 15, ed. Warsh. vol. iv. p. 63 *a*, lines 5 and 4 from bottom.

Thus far as regards man. But in reference to the Messiah there is not a hint of any temptation or assault by Satan. It is of such importance to mark this clearly at the outset of this wonderful history, that proof must be offered even at this stage. In whatever manner negative critics may seek to account for the introduction of Christ's Temptation at the commencement of His Ministry, it cannot have been derived from Jewish legend. The 'mythical' interpretation of the Gospel-narratives breaks down in this almost more manifestly than in any other instance.⁴ So far from any idea obtaining that Satan was to assault the Messiah, in a well-known passage, which has been previously quoted,⁵ the Arch-enemy is represented as overwhelmed and falling on his face at sight of Him, and owning his complete defeat.⁶ On another point in this history we find the same inversion of thought current in Jewish legend. In the Commentary just referred to,⁷ 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,⁸ as it is written, Zech. viii. 23.' One

more quotation from the same Commentary:⁹ '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.'

4. Thus *Gfrörer* can only hope that some Jewish parallelism may yet be discovered (!); while *Keim* suggests, of course without a title of evidence, additions by the early Jewish Christians. But *whence* and *why* these imaginary additions?

5. Yalkut on Is. ix. 1, vol. ii. p. 56.

6. *Keim* (Jesu von Naz. i. b, p. 564) seems not to have perused the whole passage, and, quoting it at second-hand, has misapplied it. The passage (Yalkut on Is. ix. 1) has been given before.

7. u. s. col. d.

8. The number is thus reached: as there are *seventy* nations, and *ten* of each are to take hold on each of the *four* corners of a Jew's garment, we have $70 \times 10 \times 4 = 2,800$.

9. u.s. 11 lines further down.

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;¹⁰ 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.

10. The Rabbis have it, that a man must accommodate himself to the ways of the place where he is. When Moses was on the Mount he lived of 'the bread of the Torah' (Shem. R. 47).

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.'¹¹ ¹²

11. Ps. lxxviii. 18.

12. The quotation in Eph. iv. 8 resembles the rendering of the Targum (see *Delitzsch* Comm. ü. d. Psalter, vol. i. p. 503).

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.¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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?

13. We refrain from naming the individual writers who have broached these and other equally untenable hypotheses.

14. The former notably in St. Matt. xii. 25-28; St. Luke xi. 17 &c. The import of this, as looking back upon the history of the Temptation, has not always been sufficiently recognised. In regard to Satan and his power many passages will occur to the reader, such as St. Matt. vi. 13; xii. 22; xiii. 19, 25, 39; xxvi. 41; St. Luke x. 18; xxii. 3, 28, 31; St. John viii. 44; xii. 31; xiii. 27; xiv. 30; xvi. 11.

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.¹⁵ On the other hand it must be admitted that the narrative, if naturally interpreted, suggests an outward and real event, not an inward transaction;¹⁶ 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),¹⁷ the special expressions used are all in accordance with the natural view. To this we add, that some of the objections raised - notably that of the impossibility of showing from one spot all the kingdoms of the world - cannot bear close investigation. For no rational interpretation would insist on the absolute literality of this statement, any more than on that of the survey of the *whole* extent of the land of Israel by Moses from Pisgah.¹⁸ ¹⁹ 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.

15. So Bishop *Ellicott*, *Histor. Lectures*, p. 111.

16. Professor *Godet's* views on this subject are very far from satisfactory, whether exegetically or dogmatically. Happily, they fall far short of the notion of any internal solicitation to sin in the case of Jesus, which Bishop Ellicott so justly denounces in strongest language.

17. U.s. p. 110, note 2. 18. Deut. xxxiv. 1-3.

19. According to Siphre (ed. *Friedmann* p. 149 *a* and *b*), God showed to Moses Israel in its happiness, wars, and misfortunes; the whole world from the Day of Creation to that of the Resurrection; Paradise, and Gehenna.

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

A still more difficult and solemn question is this: In what respect could Jesus Christ, the Perfect Sinless Man, the Son of God, have been tempted of the Devil? That He was so tempted is of the very essence of this narrative, confirmed throughout His after-life, and laid down as a fundamental principle in the teaching and faith of the Church.²⁰ On the other hand, temptation without the inward correspondence of existent sin is not only unthinkable, so far as man is concerned,²¹ but temptation without the possibility of sin seems unreal - a kind of Docetism.²² 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*,²³ not only in the sense that Christ actually did not sin, nor merely in this, that 'our concupiscence'²⁴ 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.²⁵

20. Heb. iv. 15. 21. St. James i. 14.

22. The heresy which represents the Body of Christ as only apparent, not real.

23. Hebr. iv. 15. 24. St. James i. 14.

25. Comp. *Riehm*, Lehrbegr. d. Hebr. Br. P. 364. But I cannot agree with the views which this learned theologian expresses. Indeed, it seems to me that he does not meet the real difficulties of the question; on the contrary, rather aggravates them. They lie in this: How could One Who (according to *Riehm*) stood on the same level with us in regard to all temptations have been exempt from sin?

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.²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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.'

26. The latter was already sin. Yet 'temptation' means more than mere 'assault.' There may be conditional mental *assensus* without moral *consensus* - and so temptation without sin. See p. 301, *note*.

27. The heresy which unduly separated the two Natures.

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,²⁸ 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.

28. This is evident even from the terms used by St. Matthew (ἀνιχθῆ) and St. Luke (ἠγέτο). I cannot agree with *Godet*, that Jesus would have been inclined to return to Galilee and begin teaching. Jesus had no inclination save this - to do the Will of His Father. And yet the expression 'driven' used by St. Mark seems to imply some human shrinking on His part - at least at the outset.

Again - banishing from our minds all thought of sin in connection with Christ's Temptation,²⁹ 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.³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.

29. Heb. iv. 15.

30. The place of the Temptation could not, of course, have been the traditional 'Quarantania,' but must have been near Bethabara. See also *Stanley's Sinai and Palestine*, p. 308.

31. It was this which would make the 'assault' a 'temptation' by vividly setting before the mind the reality and rationality of these considerations - a mental *assensus* - without implying any inward *consensus* to the manner in which the Enemy proposed to have them set aside.

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,³² 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:³³ 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.

32. All the assaults of Satan were really directed against Christ's absolute submission to the Will of God, which was His Perfectness. Hence, by every one of these temptations, as Weiss says in regard to the first, '*rüttelt er an Seiner Vollkommenheit.*'

33. I regard the memory as affording the basis for the Temptation. What was so vividly in Christ's memory at that moment, that was flashed before Him as in a mirror under the dazzling light of temptation.

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 reality³⁴ - 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.^{35 36} And Jesus absolutely submitted to that Will of God by continuing in His present circumstances. To have set himself free from what they implied, would have been *despair* of God, and rebellion. He does more than not succumb: He conquers. The Scriptural reference to a better life upon the Word of God marks more than the end of the contest; it marks the *conquest* of Satan. He emerges

on the other side triumphant, with this expression of His assured conviction of the sufficiency of God.

34. Satan's 'if' was rather a taunt than a doubt. Nor could it have been intended to call in question His ability to do miracles. Doubt on that point would already have been a fall.

35. Deut. viii 3.

36. The supply of the manna was only an exemplification and application of the general principle, that man really lives by the Word 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,³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ And thus once more Jesus not only is not overcome, but He overcomes by absolute submission to the Will of God.

37. It cannot be regarded as certain, that the πτερυγιον του ιερου was, as commentators generally suppose, the Tower at the southeastern angle of the Temple Cloisters, where the Royal (southern) and Solomon's (the eastern) Porch met, and whence the view into the Kedron Valley beneath was to the stupendous depth of 450 feet. Would this angle be called 'a wing' (πτερυγιον)? Nor can I agree with Delitzsch, that it was the 'roof' of the Sanctuary, where indeed there would scarcely have been standing-room. It certainly formed the watch-post of the Priest. Possibly it may have been the extreme corner of the 'wing-like' porch, or *ulam*, which led into the Sanctuary. Thence a Priest could easily have communicated with his brethren in the court beneath. To this there is, however, the objection that in that case it should have been τουνοου. At p. 244, the ordinary view of this locality has been taken.

38. Comp. [The Temple, its Ministry and Services.](#) p. 132.

39. *Bengel*: 'Scriptura per Scripturam interpretanda et concilianda.' This is also a Rabbinic canon. The Rabbis frequently insist on the duty of not exposing oneself to danger, in presumptuous expectation of miraculous deliverance. It is a curious saying: Do not stand over against an ox when he comes from the fodder; Satan jumps out from between his horns. (Pes. 112 *b.*) David had been presumptuous in Ps. xxvi. 2 - and failed. (Sanh. 107 *a.*) But the most apt illustration is this: On one occasion the child of a Rabbi was asked by R. Jochanan to quote a verse. The child quoted Deut. xiv. 22, at the same time propounding the question, why the second clause virtually repeated the first. The Rabbi replied, 'To teach us that the giving of tithes maketh rich.' 'How do you know it?' asked the child. 'By experience,' answered the Rabbi. 'But,' said the child, 'such experiment is not lawful, since we are not to tempt the Lord our God.' (See the very curious book of Rabbi *So oweyczsk*, Die Bibel, d. Talm. u. d. Evang. p. 132.).

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,⁴⁰ 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.

40. Sin always intensifies in the coarseness of its assaults.

Foiled, defeated, the Enemy has spread his dark pinions towards that far-off world of his, and covered it with their shadow. The sun no longer glows with melting heat; the mists have gathered on the edge of the horizon, and enwrapped the scene which has faded from view. And in the cool and shade that followed have the Angels⁴¹ 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.

41. For the Jewish views on Angelology and Demonology, see Appendix XIII.: 'Jewish Angelology and Demonology.'

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;⁴² of the second, in the popular attempt to make Him a king, and perhaps also in what constituted the final

idea of Judas Iscariot; of the third, as being most plainly Satanic, in the question of Pilate: 'Art Thou then a King?'

42. St. John vii. 3-5.

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!'⁴³

43. This quotation of the Doxology leaves, of course, the critical question undetermined, whether the words were part of the 'Lord's Prayer' in its original form.

Chapter 2
THE DEPUTATION FROM JERUSALEM
THE THREE SECTS OF THE PHARISEES, SADDUCEES, AND ESSENES
EXAMINATION OF THEIR DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES.¹
(St. John 1:19-24)

1 This chapter contains, among other matter, a detailed and critical examination of the great Jewish Sects, such as was necessary in a work on 'The Times.' as well as 'The Life,' of Christ.

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;² on others only suggestions can be ventured.

2. i. 19-28.

That the interview referred to occurred *after* the Baptism of Jesus, appears from the whole context.³ 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.⁴ On the other hand, although the term 'scribes and elders' does not occur in the Gospel of St. John,⁵ 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;⁶ 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.⁷ 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.

3. This point is fully discussed by *Lücke*, *Evang. Joh.*, vol. i. pp. 396-398.

4. *Comp. St. John* v. 15, 16; ix. 18, 22; xviii. 12, 31.

5. So Professor *Westcott*, in his Commentary on the passage (Speaker's Comment., N.T., vol. ii. p. 18), where he notes that the expression in St. John viii. 3 is unauthentic.

6. Sanh. i. 5.

7. Of this the Sanhedrin must have been perfectly aware. Comp. St. Matt. iii. 7; St. Luke iii. 15 &c.

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,'⁸ 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.⁹ 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 John¹⁰ must have convinced them that his views and aims lay entirely beyond their horizon.

8. For ex. Yoma 1. 5.

9. Comp. ['The Temple, its Ministry and Services.'](#) p. 75. Dr. *Geiger* (Urschr. u. Uebersetz. d. Bibel, pp. 113, 114) ascribes to them, however, a much wider jurisdiction. Some of his inferences (such as at pp. 115, 116) seem to me historically unsupported.

10. St. Matt. iii. 7 &c.

The origin of the two great parties of Pharisees and Sadducees has already been traced.¹¹ They mark, not sects, but mental directions, such as in their principles are natural and universal, and, indeed, appear in connection with all metaphysical¹² questions. They are the different modes in which the human mind views supersensuous problems, and which afterwards, when one-sidedly followed out, harden into diverging schools of thought. If Pharisees and Sadducees were not 'sects' in the sense of separation from the unity of the Jewish ecclesiastical community, neither were theirs 'heresies' in the conventional, but only in the original sense of tendency, direction, or, at most, views, differing from those commonly entertained.¹³ 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 regarded¹⁴ as the most trustworthy authority on the matter. The inferences which we derive from the statements of Josephus,¹⁵ though always to be qualified by our general estimate of his *animus*,¹⁶ 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.

11. Comp. Book I. ch. viii.

12. I use the term metaphysical here in the sense of all that is above the natural, not merely the speculative, but the supersensuous generally.

13. The word *αἰρεσις* has received its present meaning chiefly from the adjective attaching to it in 2 Pet. ii. 1. In Acts xxiv. 5, 14, xxviii. 22, it is vituperatively applied to Christians; in 1 Cor. xi. 19, Gal. v. 20, it seems to apply to diverging practices of a sinful kind; in Titus iii. 10, the 'heretic' seems one who held or taught diverging opinions or practices. Besides, it occurs in the N.T. once to mark the Sadducees, and twice the Pharisees (Acts v. 17; xv. 5, and xxvi. 5).

14. I mean on historical, not theological grounds.

15. I here refer to the following passages: Jewish War ii. 8. 14; Ant. xiii. 5. 9; 10. 5, 6; xvii. 2. 4; xviii. 1, 2, 3, 4.

16. For a full discussion of the character and writings of Josephus, I would refer to the article in Dr. *Smith's* Dict. of Chr. Biogr. vol. iii.

Without entering on the principles and supposed practices of 'the fraternity' or 'association' (*Chabher*, *Chabhurah*, *Chabhurta*) of Pharisees, which was comparatively small, numbering only about 6,000 members,¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹ The family of a *Chabher* belonged, as a matter of course, to the community;²² but this ordinance was afterwards altered.²³ 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*.²⁴ 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.²⁵

17. *Jos. Ant.* xvii. 2. 4. 18. *Chag.* ii. 5, 7; comp. *Tohor.* vii. 5. 19. For ex. *Kidd.* 33 *b.*

20. *Bekh.* 30. 21. Abba Saul would also have freed all students from that formality.

22. *Bekhor.* 30.

23. Comp. the suggestion as to the significant time when this alteration was introduced, in ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'](#) pp. 228, 229.

24. *Dem.* ii. 2. 25. *Demai* ii.3.

These two great obligations of the 'official' Pharisee, or 'Associate' are pointedly referred to by Christ - both that in regard to *tithing* (the vow of the *Neeman*);²⁶ and that in regard to Levitical purity (the special vow of the *Chabher*).²⁷ 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.'²⁸ 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.'²⁹ '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.³⁰ 'It is as a tradition among the pharisees³¹ 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,'³² 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,³³ 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.³⁴

26. In *St. Luke* xi.42; xviii. 12; *St. Matt.* xxiii. 23. 27. In *St. Luke* xi. 39, 41; *St. Matt.* xxiii. 25, 26.

28. *Sot.* 22 *b*; *Jer. Ber.* ix. 7. 29. *Sot.* iii. 4. 30. *Pes.* 70 *b.* 31. *Abhoth de R. Nathan* 5.

32. Jer. Chag. 79 *d*; Tos. Chag. iii.

33. Erub. 54 *a*. I give the latter clause, not as in our edition of the Talmud, but according to a more correct reading (*Levy*, Neuhebr. Wörterb. vol. ii. p. 102).

34. It could serve no good purpose to give instances. They are readily accessible to those who have taste or curiosity in that direction.

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,³⁵ 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.^{36 37} 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.³⁸ Lastly, there were certain traditional ordinances on which both parties were at one.³⁹ 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.

35. So, erroneously, *Wellhausen*, in his treatise 'Pharisäer u. Sadduc.'; and partially, as it seems to me, even *Schürer* (Neutest. Zeitgesch.). In other respects also these two learned men seem too much under the influence of *Geiger* and *Kuenen*.

36. Megill. Taan. Per. iv. ed. Warsh. p. 8 *a*.

37. *Wellhausen* has carried his criticisms and doubts of the Hebrew *Scholion* on the Megill. Taan. (or 'Roll of Fasts') too far.

38. Even such a book as the Meg. Taan. does not accuse them of absolute ignorance, but only of being unable to prove their *dicta* from Scripture (comp. Perek x. p. 15 *b*, which may well mark the extreme of Anti-Sadduceeism).

39. Sanh. 33 *t* Horay 4 *a*.

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.⁴⁰ A careful examination of the statements of Josephus on this subject will show that they convey no more than this.⁴¹ 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.⁴² 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,'^{43 44} imposed on themselves the necessity of much self-denial, especially in regard to food,⁴⁵ 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 authority⁴⁶ 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.'^{47 48}

40. Some traditional explanation of the Law of Moses was absolutely necessary, if it was to be applied to existing circumstances. It would be a great historical inaccuracy to imagine that the Sadducees rejected the whole παραδοσις των πρεσβυτερων (St. Matt. xv. 2) from Ezra downwards.

41. This is the meaning of Ant. xiii. 10. 6, and clearly implied in xviii. 1,3,4, and War ii. 8. 14.

42. Ab. iii. 11; v 8. 43. *Jos.* War i. 5. 2.

44. M. *Derenbourg* (Hist. de la Palest., p. 122, note) rightly remarks, that the Rabbinic equivalent for Josephus' ακριβεια is ραφμ:ωΞξ heaviness, and that the Pharisees were the Νηρημξμ or 'makers heavy.' What a commentary this on the charge of Jesus about 'the heavy burdens' of the Pharisees! St. Paul uses the same term as Josephus to describe the Pharisaic system, where our A.V. renders 'the perfect manner' (Acts xxii. 3). Comp. also Acts xxvi. 5: κατα την ακριβεστατην αιρεσιν.

45. Ant. xviii. 1. 3. 46. Ant. xviii. 1. 3. 47. Sanh. xi. 3.

48. The subject is discussed at length in Jer. Ber. i. 7 (p. 3 *b*), where the superiority of the Scribe over the Prophet is shown (1) from Mic. ii. 6 (without the words in *italics*), the one class being *the Prophets* ('prophesy not'), the other the Scribes ('prophesy'); (2) from the fact that the Prophets needed the attestation of miracles. (Duet. xiii. 2), but not the Scribes (Deut. xvii. 11).

The second doctrinal difference between Pharisees and Sadducees concerned the 'after death.' According to the New Testament,⁴⁹ the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, while Josephus, going further, imputes to them denial of reward or punishment after death,⁵⁰ and even the doctrine that the soul perishes with the body.⁵¹ 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,⁵² 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 states⁵³ 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 Sadducees⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶

49. St. Matt xxii. 23, and parallel passages; Acts iv. 1, 2; xxiii. 8.

50. War ii. 8. 14. 51. Ant. xviii. 1. 4. 52. Ab. d. R. Nath. 5. 53. Ber ix. 5.

54. This is admitted even by *Geiger* (Urschr. u. Uebers. p. 130, note), though in the passage above referred to he would emendate: 'Scribes of the Samaritans.' The passage, however, implies that these were *Sadducean Scribes*, and that they were both willing and able to enter into theological controversy with their opponents.

55. Rabbi Gamaliel's proof was taken from Deut. i. 8: 'Which Jehovah sware unto your fathers to give unto them.' It is not said 'unto you,' but unto '*them*,' which implies the resurrection of the dead. The argument is kindred in character, but far inferior in

solemnity and weight, to that employed by our Lord, St. Matt. xxii. 32, from which it is evidently taken. (See book v. ch. iv., the remarks on that passage.)

56. It is a curious circumstance in connection with the question of the Sadducees, that it raised another point in controversy between the Pharisees and the 'Samaritans,' or, as I would read it, the Sadducees, since 'the Samaritans' (Sadducees?) only allowed marriage with the *betrothed*, not the actually *wedded* wife of a deceased childless brother (Jer Yebam. i. 6, p. 3 a). The Sadducees in the Gospel argue on the Pharisaic theory, apparently for the twofold object of casting ridicule on the doctrine of the Resurrection, and on the Pharisaic practice of marriage with the *espoused* wife of a deceased brother.

Connected with this was the equally Rationalistic opposition to belief in Angels and Spirits. It is only mentioned in the New Testament,⁵⁷ 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.

57. Acts xxiii.

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' (εἰμαρμενη)⁵⁸ 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. Although⁵⁹ 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 place⁶⁰ 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,⁶¹ 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.

58. The expression is used in the heathen (philosophical) sense of *fate* by *Philo*, De Incompact. Mundi. section 10. ed. Mangey, vol. ii. p. 496 (ed. Fref. p. 947).

59. In Jewish War ii. 8. 14. 60. Ant. xviii. 1. 3. 61. Ant. xiii. 5. 9.

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.⁶² Even if a man inflicted a cut on his finger, he might be sure that this also had been preordered.⁶³ Nay, 'wheresoever a man was destined to die, thither would his feet carry him.'⁶⁴ 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,⁶⁵ that neither the New Testament, nor Rabbinic writings, bring the charge of the denial of God's prevision against the Sadducees.

62. Sanh. 29 *a*. 63. Chull. 7 *b*.

64. The following curious instance of this is given. On one occasion King Solomon, when attended by his two Scribes, Elihoreph and Ahiah (both supposed to have been Ethiopians), suddenly perceived the Angel of Death. As he looked so sad, Solomon ascertained as its reason, that the two Scribes had been demanded at his hands. On this Solomon transported them by magic into the land of *Luz*, where, according to legend, no man ever died. Next morning Solomon again perceived the Angel of Death, but this time laughing, because, as he said, Solomon had sent these men to the very place whence he had been ordered to fetch them (Sukk, 53 *a*).

65. Those who understand the character of Josephus' writings will be at no loss for his reasons in this. It would suit his purpose to speak often of the fatalism of the Pharisees, and to represent them as a philosophical sect like the Stoics. The latter, indeed, he does in so many words.

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.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ It was, indeed, true that God had created the evil impulse in us; but He had also given the remedy in the Law.⁶⁸ 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).⁶⁹ Or, to put it in the language of the great Akiba:⁷⁰ 'Everything is foreseen; free determination is accorded to man; and the world is judged in goodness.' With this simple juxtaposition of two propositions equally true, but incapable of metaphysical combination, as are most things in which the empirically cognisable and uncognisable are joined together, we are content to leave the matter.

66. For details comp. *Hamburger*, Real-Encykl. ii. pp. 103-106 - though there is some tendency to 'colouring' in this as in other articles of the work.

67. Yoma 38 *b.* 68. Baba B. 16 *a.*

69. Siphre on Deut. xi. 26, § 53, ed. Friedmann, p. 86 *a.* 70. Ab. iii. 15.

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.⁷¹ Two other similar instances are mentioned.⁷² 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.⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ What seem the original ordinances,⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ ⁷⁸ 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.⁷⁹

71. Jer. Chag. iii. 8; Tos. Chag. iii., where the reader will find sufficient proof that the Sadducees were not in the wrong.

72. In Yad. iv. 6, 7.

73. The Pharisees replied by asking on what ground the bones of a High-Priest 'defiled,' but not those of a donkey. And when the Sadducees ascribed it to the great value of the former, lest a man should profane the bones of his parents by making spoons of them, the Pharisees pointed out that the same argument applied to defilement by the Holy Scriptures. In general, it seems that the Pharisees were afraid of the satirical comments of the Sadducees on their doings (comp. Parah iii. 3).

74. *Wellhausen* rightly denounces the strained interpretation of *Geiger*, who would find here - as in other points - hidden political allusions.

75. Comp. ['The Temple, its Ministry and Services.'](#) pp. 309, 312. The rubrics are in the Mishnic tractate Parah, and in Tos. Par.

76. Parah iii.; Tos. Par. 3. 77. Parah iii. 7.

78. The Mishnic passage is difficult, but I believe I have given the sense correctly.

79. Shabb. 108 *a*.

These may seem trifling distinctions, but they sufficed to kindle the passions. Even greater importance attached to differences on *ritual* questions, although the controversy here was purely theoretical. For, the Sadducees, when in office, always conformed to the prevailing Pharisaic practices. Thus the Sadducees would have interpreted 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 Pentecost always on a Sunday;⁸⁰ while the Pharisees understood the term 'Sabbath' of the festive Paschal day.^{81 82} 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.⁸³

80. Vv. 15, 16. 81. Men. x. 3; 65 *a*; Chag. ii. 4.

82. This difference, which is more intricate than appears at first sight, requires a longer discussion than can be given in this place.

83. Rosh haSh. i. 7; ii. 1; Tos. Rosh haSh. ed. Z. i. 15.

The Sadducean objection to pouring the water of libation upon the altar on the Feast of Tabernacles, led to riot and bloody reprisals on the only occasion on which it seems to have been carried into practice.^{84 85} 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.⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷ 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.

84. Sukk. 48 *b*; comp. *Jos. Ant.* xiii 13. 5.

85. For details about the observances on this festival I must refer to ['The Temple, its Ministry and Services.'](#)

86. Sukk. 43 *b*; and in the *Jerus. Talm.* and *Tos. Sukk.* iii. 1. 87. *Jer. Yoma* i. 5; *Yoma* 19 *b*; 53 *a*.

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;⁸⁸ 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,⁸⁹ 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 punishment⁹⁰ against false witnesses was only to be executed if the innocent person, condemned on their testimony, had actually suffered punishment, while the Pharisees held that this was to be done if the sentence had been actually pronounced, although not carried out.⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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.^{93 94}

88. Specially *Ant.* xx. 9.

89. Other differences, which rest merely on the authority of the Hebrew Commentary on 'The Roll of Fasts,' I have discarded as unsupported by historical evidence. I am sorry to have in this respect, and on some other aspect of the question, to differ from the learned Article on 'The Sadducees,' in *Kitto's Bibl. Encycl.*

90. Decreed in *Deut.* xix. 21. 91. *Makk.* i. 6.

92. Baba B. 115 b; Tos. Yad. ii. 20. 93. Yad. iv. 7 and Tos. Yad.

94. *Geiger*, and even *Derenbourg*, see in these things deep political allusions - which, as it seems to me, have no other existence than in the ingenuity of these writers.

For the sake of completeness it has been necessary to enter into details, which may not possess a general interest. This, however, will be marked, that, with the exception of dogmatic differences, the controversy turned on questions of 'canon-law.' Josephus tells us that the Pharisees commanded the masses,⁹⁵ and especially the female world,⁹⁶ 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.⁹⁷ But to conclude from this,⁹⁸ 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,⁹⁹ 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,¹⁰⁰ while the Pharisaic ordinances make more than ample recognition of the privileges and rights of the Priesthood. This would certainly not have been the case if, as some have maintained, Sadducean and priest-party had been convertible terms. Even as regards the deputation to the Baptist of 'Priests and Levites' from Jerusalem, we are expressly told that they 'were of the Pharisees.'¹⁰¹

95. Ant. xiii. 10. 6. 96. Ant. xvii. 2. 4. 97. Acts v. 17; Ant. xx. 9. 1. 98. So *Wellhausen*, u. s.

99. So *Geiger*, u. s. 100. Sheqal. iv. 4; vi. 1; Eduy. viii. 2; Ab. ii. B &c. 101. St. John i. 24.

This bold hypothesis seems, indeed, to have been invented chiefly for the sake of another, still more unhistorical. The derivation of the name 'Sadducee' has always been in dispute. According to a Jewish legend of about the seventh century of our era,¹⁰² the name was derived from one *Tsadoq* (*Zadok*),¹⁰³ a disciple of Antigonus of Socho, whose principle of not serving God for reward had been gradually misinterpreted into Sadduceism. 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.¹⁰⁴ But the objections to this are insuperable. Not to speak of the linguistic difficulty of deriving *Tsadduqim* (*Zaddukim*, Sadducees) from *Tsadoq* (*Zadok*),¹⁰⁵ 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.

102. In the Ab. de R. Nath. c. 5.

103. Tseduqim and Tsadduqim mark different transliterations of the name Sadducees.

104. This theory, defended with ingenuity by *Geiger*, had been of late adopted by most writers, and even by *Schürer*. But not a few of the statements hazarded by Dr. *Geiger* seem to me to have no historical foundation, and the passages quoted in support either do not convey such meaning, or else are of no authority.

105. So Dr. *Löw*, as quoted in Dr. *Ginsburg's* article.

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.^{106 107} 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.'¹⁰⁸ This, no doubt, on the ground that they were truly those who, according to the directions of Ezra,¹⁰⁹ had separated themselves (become *nibhdalim*) 'from the filthiness of the heathen' (all heathen defilement) by carrying out the traditional ordinances.¹¹⁰ In fact, Ezra marked the beginning of the 'later,' in contradistinction to the 'earlier,' or Scripture-*Chasidim*.¹¹¹ 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*,¹¹² 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.¹¹³ Some wit might have suggested: Read not *Tsaddiqim*, the 'righteous,' but *Tsadduqim* (from *Tsadu*, ωΞδχαφ), 'desolation,' 'destruction.' Whether or not this suggestion approve itself to critics, the derivation of Sadducees from *Tsaddiqim* is certainly that which offers most probability.¹¹⁴

106. Yad. iv. 6 &c.

107. The argument as against the derivation of the term *Sadducee* would, of course, hold equally good, even if each party had assumed, not received from the other, its characteristic name.

108. Ps. xxx. 4; xxxi. 23; xxxvii. 28. 109. vi. 21; ix. 1; x. 11; Neh. ix. 2.

110. Comp. generally, ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'](#) pp. 230, 231.

111. Ber. v. 1; comp. with Vayyikra R. 2, ed. Warsh. t. iii. p. 5 a.

112. Here it deserves special notice that the Old Testament term *Chasid*, which the Pharisees arrogated to themselves, is rendered in the Peshito by *Zaddiq*. Thus, as it were, the opponents of Pharisaism would play off the equivalent *Tsaddiq* against the Pharisaic arrogation of *Chasid*.

113. Such by-names, by a play on a word, are not unfrequent. Thus, in Shem. R. 5 (ed. *Warsh.* p. 14 a, lines 7 and 8 from top), Pharaoh's charge that the Israelites were ΜψπΞιρ:νι 'idle,' is, by a transposition of letters made to mean that they were πορνοι .

114. It seems strange, that so accurate a scholar as *Schürer* should have regarded the 'national party' as merely an offshoot from the Pharisees (*Neutest. Zeitgesch.* p. 431), and appealed in proof to a passage in *Josephus* (*Ant.* xviii. 1.6), which expressly calls the Nationalists a *fourth* party, by the side of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. That in practice they would carry out the strict Judaism of the Pharisees, does not make them Pharisees.

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 (Ἐσσανοι or Ἐσσαιοι - 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 4,000.¹¹⁵ They are not mentioned in the New Testament, and only very indirectly referred to in Rabbinic writings, perhaps without clear knowledge on the part of the Rabbis. If the conclusion concerning them, which we shall by-and-by indicate, be correct, we can scarcely wonder at this. Indeed, their entire separation from all who did not belong to their sect, the terrible oaths by which they bound themselves to secrecy about their doctrines, and which would prevent any free religious discussion, as well as the character of what is known of their views, would account for the scanty notices about them. Josephus and Philo,¹¹⁶ 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.¹¹⁷ 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.¹¹⁸

115. *Philo*, Quod omnis probus liber, 12, ed, Mang. ii. p. 457; *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 1.5.

116. They are also mentioned by *Pliny* (*Hist. Natur.* v. 16).

117. This may be inferred from *Josephus' Life*, c. 2.

118. This point is conclusively disposed of by [Bishop Lightfoot](#) in the third Dissertation appended to his Commentary on the Colossians (pp. 397-419). In general, the masterly discussion of the whole subject by Bishop *Lightfoot*, alike in the body of the Commentary and in the three Dissertations appended, may be said to form a new era in the treatment of the whole question, the points on which we would venture to express dissent being few and unimportant. The reader who wishes to see a statement of the supposed analogy between Essenism and the teaching of Christ will find it in Dr. *Ginsburg's* Article 'Essenes,' in *Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography*. The same line of argument has been followed by *Frankel* and *Gärtz*. The reasons for the opposite view are set forth in the text.

We possess no *data* for the history of the origin and development (if such there was) of Essenism. We may admit a certain connection between Pharisaism and Essenism, though it has been greatly exaggerated by modern Jewish writers. Both directions originated from a desire after 'purity,' though there seems a fundamental difference between them, alike in the idea of what constituted purity, and in the means for attaining it. To the Pharisee it was Levitical and legal purity, secured by the 'hedge' of ordinances which they drew around themselves. To the Essene it was absolute purity in separation from the 'material,' which in itself was defiling. The Pharisee attained in this manner the distinctive merit of a saint; the Essene obtained a higher fellowship with the Divine, 'inward' purity, and not only freedom from the detracting, degrading influence of matter, but command over matter and nature. As the result of this higher fellowship with the Divine, the adept possessed the power of prediction; as the result of his freedom from, and command over matter, the power of miraculous cures. That their purifications, strictest Sabbath observance, and other practices, would form points of contact with Pharisaism, follows as a matter of course; and a little reflection will show, that such observances would naturally be adopted by the Essenes, since they were within the lines of Judaism, although separatists from its body ecclesiastic. On the other hand, their fundamental tendency was quite other than that of Pharisaism, and strongly tinged with Eastern (Parsee) elements. After this the inquiry as to the precise date of its origin, and whether Essenism was an offshoot from the original (ancient) Assideans or *Chasidim*, seems needless. Certain it is that we find its first mention about 150 b.c.,¹¹⁹ and that we meet the first Essene in the reign of Aristobulus I.¹²⁰

119. *Jos. Ant.* xiii. 5. 9. 120. 105-104 b.c.; *Ant.* xiii. 11. 2; *War* i. 3. 5.

Before stating our conclusions as to its relation to Judaism and the meaning of the name, we shall put together what information may be derived of the sect from the writings of Josephus, Philo, and Pliny.¹²¹ 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,¹²² they chose for their settlements chiefly villages, one of their largest colonies being by the shore of the Dead Sea.¹²³ At the same time they had also 'houses' inmost, if not all the cities of Palestine,¹²⁴ notably in Jerusalem,¹²⁵ where, indeed, one of the gates was named after them.¹²⁶ In these 'houses' they lived in common,¹²⁷ under officials of their own. The affairs of 'the order' were administered by a tribunal of at least a hundred members,¹²⁸ 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.¹²⁹ 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.¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹ 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.¹³² The sacrificial 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.

121. Compare *Josephus*, Ant. xiii. 5, 9; xv. 10. 4, 5; xviii. 1. 5; Jewish War, ii. 8, 2-13; *Philo*, Quod omnis probus liber, 12, 13 (ed. Mangey, ii. 457-459; ed. Par. and Frcf. pp. 876-879; ed. Richter, vol. v. pp. 285-288); *Pliny*, N.H. v. 16, 17. For references in the Fathers see Bp. *Lightfoot* on Colossians, pp. 83, 84 (note). Comp. the literature there and in *Schürer* (Neutest. Zeitgesch. p. 599), to which I would add Dr. *Ginburg's* Art. 'Essenes' in *Smith's* and *Wace's* Dict. of Chr. Biogr., vol. ii.

122. *Philo*, ii.p. 457. 123. *Pliny*, Hist. Nat. v. 16, 17.

124. *Philo*, u.s. p. 632; *Jos.* Jewish War ii. 8. 4. 125. Ant. xiii. 11.2; xv. 10. 5; xvii. 13.3.

126. War v. 4. 2. 127. *Philo*, u. s. p. 632. 128. War ii. 8. 9.

129. War ii. 8. 6. 130. u. s. § 4.

131. The distinction is *Schürer's*, although he is disposed to minimise this point. More on this in the sequel.

132. *Jos.* War ii. 8. 5; Ant. xviii. 1. 5.

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,¹³³ 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,¹³⁴ 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;¹³⁵ and to guard the books belonging to their sect, and the names of the Angels.

133. *Schürer* regards these children as forming the first of the four 'classes' or 'grades' into which the Essenes were arranged. But this is contrary to the express statement of *Philo*, that only adults were admitted into the order, and hence only such could have formed a 'grade' or 'class' of the community. (Comp. ed. *Mangey*, ii. p. 632, from *Eusebius'* *Præpar. Evang. lib. viii. cap. 8.*) I have adopted the view of Bishop *Lightfoot* on the subject. Even the marrying order of the Essenes, however, only admitted of wedlock under great restrictions, and as a necessary evil (*War*, u. s. sections 13). Bishop *Lightfoot* suggests, that these were not Essenes in the strict sense, but only 'like the third order of a Benedictine or Franciscan brotherhood.'

134. *War* ii. 8.7.

135. Can this possibly have any connection in the mind of Josephus with the later Nationalist movement? This would agree with his insistence on their respect for those in authority. Otherwise the emphasis laid on abstinence from robbery seems strange in such a sect.

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.¹³⁶ 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.¹³⁷ 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.'

136. I venture to think that even Bishop *Lightfoot* lays too much stress on the affinity to Pharisaism. I can discover few, if any, traces of Pharisaism in the distinctive sense of the term. Even their frequent washings had a different object from those of the Pharisees.

137. For a similar reason, and in order 'not to affront the Divine rays of light' - the light as symbol, if not outcome, of the Deity - they covered themselves, in such circumstances, with the mantle which was their ordinary dress in winter.

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.¹³⁸

138. Ed. *Mang* ii. p. 458.

We can scarcely wonder that such Jews as Josephus and Philo, and such heathens as Pliny, were attracted by such an unworldly and lofty sect. Here were about 4,000 men, who deliberately separated themselves, not only from all that made life pleasant, but from

all around; who, after passing a long and strict novitiate, were content to live under the most rigid rule, obedient to their superiors; who gave up all their possessions, as well as the earnings of their daily toil in the fields, or of their simple trades; who held all things for the common benefit, entertained strangers, nursed their sick, and tended their aged as if their own parents, and were charitable to all men; who renounced all animal passions, eschewed anger, ate and drank in strictest moderation, accumulated neither wealth nor possessions, wore the simplest white dress till it was no longer fit for use; repudiated slavery, oaths, marriage; abstained from meat and wine, even from the common Eastern anointing with oil; used mystic lustrations, had mystic rites and mystic prayers, an esoteric literature and doctrines; whose every meal was a sacrifice, and every act one of self-denial; who, besides, were strictly truthful, honest, upright, virtuous, chaste, and charitable, in short, whose life meant, positively and negatively, a continual purification of the soul by mortification of the body. To the astonished onlookers this mode of life was rendered even more sacred by doctrines, a literature, and magic power known only to the initiated. Their mysterious conditions made them 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;¹³⁹ the same mystic writings revealed the secret remedies of plants and stones for the healing of the body,¹⁴⁰ as well as what was needed for the cure of souls.

139. *Jos.* War ii. 8. 12; comp. *Ant.* xiii. 11. 2; xv. 10. 5; xvii. 13. 3.

140. There can be no question that these Essene cures were magical, and their knowledge of remedies esoteric.

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,¹⁴¹ we know what development the doctrine of Angels received both in the Book of Enoch (alike in its earlier and in its later portion¹⁴²) and in the Book of Jubilees,¹⁴³ 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.¹⁴⁴ Here we would only specially notice that in the Book of Jubilees¹⁴⁵ Angels are represented as teaching Noah all 'herbal remedies' for diseases,¹⁴⁶ while in the later *Pirqé de R. Eliezer*¹⁴⁷ this instruction is said to have been given to Moses. These two points (relation to the Angels, and knowledge of the remedial power of plants - not to speak of visions and prophecies) seem to connect the secret writings of the Essenes with that 'outside' literature which in Rabbinic writings is known as *Sepharim haChitsonim*, 'outside writings.'¹⁴⁸ The point is of greatest importance, as will presently appear.

141. Bishop *Lightfoot* refers to a part of the Sibylline books which seems of Christian authorship.

142. ch. xxxi. - lxxi.

143. Comp. *Lucius*, *Essenismus*, p. 109. This brochure, the latest on the subject, (though interesting, adds little to our knowledge.)

144. See Appendix XIII. on the Angelology, Satanology, and Demonology of the Jews.

145. Ch. x.

146. Comp. also the *Sepher Noach* in *Jellinek's* *Beth haMidr.* part iii. pp. 155, 156.

147. c. 48.

148. Only after writing the above I have noticed, that *Jellinek* arrives at the same conclusion as to the Essene character of the *Book of Jubilees* (*Beth ha-Midr.* iii. p. xxxiv., xxxv.), and of the *Book of Enoch* (u.s. ii. p. xxx.).

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,¹⁴⁹ the other to Persian sources,¹⁵⁰ 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,¹⁵¹ 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.^{152 153}

149. So *Zeller*, *Philosophie d. Griechen*, ed. 1881, iii. pp. 277-337.

150. So *Bishop Lightfoot*, in his masterly treatment of the whole subject in his *Commentary on the Ep. to the Colossians*.

151. By *Bishop Lightfoot*, u.s. pp. 382-396 In general, I prefer on many points - such as the connection between Essenism and Gnosticism &c., simply to refer readers to the classic work of *Bishop Lightfoot*.

152. *Sepher Noach* ap. *Jellinek* iii. p. 156.

153. As regards any connection between the Essenes and the *Therapeutai*, *Lucius* has denied the existence of such a sect and the Philonic authorship of *de V. cont.* The latter

we have sought to defend in the *Art. Philo* (*Smith and Wace's Dict. of Chr. Biogr. iv.*), and to show that the Therapeutes were not a 'sect' but an esoteric circle of Alexandrian Jews.

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* ('Εσσηνοί, 'Εσσαιοί) seems the Greek equivalent for *Chitsonim* (Μψνωχψξ), 'the outsiders.' Even the circumstance that the axe, or rather spade (αξιναριον), 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* (Μψδιψσιζα) and *Asidaioi* ('Ασιδαιοί). For, in rendering Hebrew into Greek, the *ch* (ξ) 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.'¹⁵⁴ Instances of a change of the Hebrew *i* into the Greek *e* are frequent, and of the Hebrew *o* into the Greek *e* 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* (Μωνοψγιβ:)α for the Greek (ευγενης) *Eugenes* ('well-born').¹⁵⁵

154. *Deutsch*, *Remains*, pp. 359, 360.

155. As other instances may be quoted such as *Istagiath* (τωπογ:σ)ι = στεγη, roof; *Istuli* (ψλιωε:σ:)ι = στηλη, a pillar; *Dikhsumini* (ψνιψμιωε:σκδε) = δεξαμενη, cistern.

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 passage¹⁵⁶ 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.¹⁵⁷ 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.¹⁵⁸ 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,¹⁵⁹ 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 allusion¹⁶⁰ to Essene practices, similar to that which has already been noticed.¹⁶¹ For, immediately after consigning to destruction all who denied that there was proof in the Pentateuch for the Resurrection (evidently the Sadducees), those who denied that the Law was from heaven (the *Minim*, or heretics - probably the Jewish Christians), and all 'Epicureans'¹⁶² (materialists), the same punishment is assigned to those 'who read *externe writings*' (*Sepharim haChitsonim*) and 'who whispered' (a magical formula) 'over a wound.'¹⁶³ Both the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmud¹⁶⁴ 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.¹⁶⁵ 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.

156. Megill. 24 *b*, lines 4 and 5 from bottom.

157. The practice of beginning prayers before, and ending them as the sun had just risen, seems to have passed from the Essenes to a party in the Synagogue itself, and is pointedly alluded to as a characteristic of the so-called *Vethikin*, Ber. 9 *b*; 25 *b*; 26 *a*. But another peculiarity about them, noticed in Rosh haSh. 32 *b* (the repetition of all the verses in the Pentateuch containing the record of God in the so-called *Malkhiyoth*, *Zikhronoth*, and *Shophroth*), shows that they were not Essenes, since such Rabbinic practices must have been alien to their system.

158. Sanh. x 1.

159. In Sanh. 100 *b* they are explained as 'the writings of the Sadducees,' and by another Rabbi as 'the Book of Sirach' (Ecclus. in the Apocrypha). *Hamburger*, as sometimes, makes assertions on this point which cannot be supported (Real-Wörterb. ii. p. 70). Jer. Sanh. 28 *a* explains, 'Such as the books of Ben Sirach and of Ben La'nah' - the latter apparently also an Apocryphal book, for which the Midr. Kohel. (ed. *Warsh*. iii. p. 106 *b*) has 'the book of Ben Tagla' 'La'nah' and 'Tagla' could scarcely be symbolic names. On the other hand, I cannot agree with *Fürst* (Kanon d. A.T. p. 99), who identifies them with Apollonius of Tyana and Empedocles. Dr. *Neubauer* suggests that Ben La'nah may be a corruption of *Sibyline* Oracles.

160. In Sanh. x. 1. 161. Meg. 24 *b*.

162. The 'Epicureans,' or 'freethinkers,' are explained to be such as speak contemptuously of the Scriptures, or of the Rabbis (Jer. Sanh. 27 *d*). In Sanh. 38 *b* a distinction is made between 'stranger' (heathen) Epicureans, and Israelitish Epicureans. With the latter it is unwise to enter into argument.

163. Both in the Jer. and Bab. Talm. it is conjoined with 'spitting,' which was a mode of healing, usual at the time. The Talmud forbids the magical formula, only in connection with this 'spitting' - and then for the curious reason that the Divine Name is not to be recorded while 'spitting.' But, while in the Bab. Talm. the prohibition bears against such 'spitting' *before* pronouncing the formula, in the Jer. Talm. it is *after* uttering it.

164. Sanh. 101 *a*; Jer. Sanh. p. 28 *b*.

165. Bishop *Lightfoot* has shown that the Essene cures were magical (u. s. pp. 91 &c. and p. 377).

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 John¹⁶⁶ 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.

166. St. Matt. iii. 7.

Chapter 3
THE TWOFOLD TESTIMONY OF JOHN
THE FIRST SABBATH OF JESUS' MINISTRY
THE FIRST SUNDAY
THE FIRST DISCIPLES.
(St. John 1:15-51)

THE forty days, which had passed since Jesus had first come to him, must have been to the Baptist a time of soul-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.¹ 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.

1. St. John i. 33.

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.² 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.

2. This is insisted upon by *Keim*, in his beautiful sketch of the Baptist. Would that he had known the Master in the glory of His Divinity, as he understood the Forerunner in the beauty of his humanity! To show how the whole teaching of the Baptist was, so to speak, saturated with Isaiah-language and thoughts, comp. not only Is. xl. 3, as the burden of his mission, but as to his imagery (after *Keim*): *Generation of vipers*, Is. lix. 5; *planting of the Lord*, Is. v. 7; *trees*, vi. 13; x. 15, 18, 33; xl. 24; *fire*, i. 31; ix. 18; x. 17; v. 24; xlvii. 14; *floor and fan*, xxi. 10; xxvii. 27 &c.; xxx. 24; xl. 24; xli. 15 &c.; *bread and coat to the poor*, lviii. 7; *the garner*, xxi. 10. Besides these, the Isaiah reference in his Baptism (Is. lii. 15; i. 16), and that to the Lamb of God - indeed many others of a more indirect character, will readily occur to the reader. Similarly, when our Lord would afterwards instruct him in his hour of darkness (St. Matt. xi. 2), He points for the solution of his doubts to the well-remembered prophecies of Isaiah (Is. xxxv. 5, 6; lxi. 1; lviii. 14, 15).

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,³ in Whom the institution and sacramental meaning of the Priesthood, and of Sacrifices, found their fulfilment.⁴ 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'^{5 6} - 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-forgotten. 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;⁷ 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.

3. Is. ix. 6 &c.; xi.; xlii.; lii. 13 &c. [iii.]; lxi. 4. Is. liii. 5. Is. xxxiii. 17.

6. I cannot agree with Mr. *Cheyne* (*Prophecies of Is.* vol. i. p. 183), that there is no Messianic reference here. It may not be in the most literal sense '*personally* Messianic;' but surely this ideal presentation of Israel in the perfectness of its kingdom, and the glory of its happiness, is one of the fullest Messianic picture (comp. vv. 17 to end).

7. This is well pointed out by *Keim*.

And all this must have ripened during the forty days of probably comparative solitude,⁸ 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.

8. We have in a previous chapter suggested that the baptism of Jesus had taken place at Bethabara, that is, the furthest northern point of his activity, and probably at the close of his *baptismal* ministry. It is not possible in this place to detail the reasons for this view. But the learned reader will find remarks on it in *Keim*, i. 2, p. 524.

And now, on the last of those forty days, simultaneously with the final great Temptation of Jesus⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.

9. This, of course, on the supposition that the Baptism of Jesus took place at Bethabara, and hence that the 'wilderness' into which He was driven, was close by. It is difficult to see why, on any other supposition, Jesus returned to Bethabara, since evidently it was not for the sake of any personal intercourse with John.

10. This is most beautifully suggested by Canon *Westcott* in his Commentary on the passage.

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. John¹¹ 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,¹² 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,¹³ 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.'¹⁴ 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.'¹⁵

11. 'He confessed, and denied not' (St. John i. 20). Canon *Westcott* points out, that 'the combination of a positive and negative' is intended to 'express the fulness of truth,' and that 'the first term marks the readiness of his testimony, the second its completeness.'

12. See Appendix VIII: 'Rabbinic Traditions about Elijah, the Forerunner of the Messiah.'

13. St. Luke i. 17. 14. St. Mark ix. 13; St. Matt. xvii. 12. 15. St. Matt. xi. 14.

More natural still - indeed, almost quite truthful, seems the third question of the Pharisees, whether the Baptist was 'that prophet.' The reference here is undoubtedly to 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 promise¹⁶ 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.'¹⁷ Even the various opinions broached in the Mishnah,¹⁸ 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.

16. Jer. xxxi. 31 &c.

17. Can the reference in St. Stephen's speech (Acts vii. 37) apply to this expected alteration of the Law? At any rate St. Stephen is on his defence for teaching the abolition by Jesus of the Old Testament economy. It is remarkable that he does not deny the charge, and that his contention is, that the Jews wickedly resisted the authority of Jesus (vv. 51-53).

18. Eduy. viii. 7.

But whatever views the Jewish embassy might have entertained concerning the abrogation, renewal, or renovation of the Law¹⁹ 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.²⁰ '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.'²¹

19. For the Jewish views on the Law in Messianic times, see Appendix XIV.: 'The Law in Messianic Days.'

20. St. John i. 22-28.

21. The words within quotations are those of Archdeacon *Watkins*, in his Commentary on St. John.

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,'²² 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,²³ and the halo of His glory shone around the well-remembered prophecy. It must always have been Messianically understood;²⁴ it formed the groundwork of Messianic thought to the New Testament writers²⁵ - 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.²⁶ 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.

22. Is. lii. 13. 23. Is. viii. 20. 24. Is. lii. 13 - liii.

25. Comp. St. Matt. viii. 17; St. Luke xxii. 37; Acts viii. 32; 1 Pet. ii. 22.

26. Manifestly, whatever interpretation is made of Is. lii. 13 - liii., it applies to Messianic *times*, even if the sufferer were, as the Synagogue now contends, Israel. On the whole subject comp. the most learned and exhaustive discussions by Dr. *Pusey* in his introduction to the catena of Jewish Interpretations of Is. liii.

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,'²⁷ 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.²⁸ Without further following this remarkable Rabbinic commentation,²⁹ 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).'³⁰ Still more strong is the statement of the school of Hillel, to the effect that the sacrificial lambs

were termed *Kebhasim* (from *kabhas*, 'to wash'), 'because they wash away the sins of Israel.'³¹ 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.

27. To those persons who deny to the people of God under the Old Testament the designation *Church*, we commend the use of that term by St. Stephen in Acts vii. 38.

28. Pesiqta, ed. *Buber*, p. 61 *b*; comp. more fully in *Yalkut* p. 248 *d*. 29. In i. p. 249 *a*.

30. This appears more clearly in the Hebrew, where both words ('lambs' and 'suppressors') are written exactly the same, מִשְׁבִּיכִים. In Hillel's derivation it is identified with the root שִׁבַּח = שִׁבְּחָה.

31. And this with special reference to Is. i. 18.

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.³² That he understood the application of His ministry to the whole world, is only what might have been expected of one taught by Isaiah; and what, indeed, in one or another form, the Synagogue has always believed of the Messiah. What was distinctive in the words of the Baptist, seems his view of *sin* as a totality, rather than sins: implying the removal of that great barrier between God and man, and the triumph in that great contest indicated in 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.

32. This meets the objection of *Keim* (i. 2, p.552), which proceeds on the assumption that the words of the Baptist imply that he knew not merely *that*, but *how*, Jesus would take away the sin of the world. But his words certainly do not oblige us to think, that he had the Cross in view. But, surely, it is a most strange idea of *Godet*, that at His Baptism Jesus, like all others, made confession of sins; that, as He had none of His own, He set before the Baptist the picture of the sin of Israel and of the world; and that this had led to the designation: 'The Lamb of God. Which taketh away the sin of the world.'

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.³³ 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*,³⁴ that Jesus returned to Galilee,³⁵ calling others by the way. 'And the third day' after it³⁶ - that is, on the *Wednesday* - was the marriage in Cana.³⁷

33. For the reasons of this, comp. ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life,'](#) p. 151. 34. St. John 1. 43.

35. This may be regarded as another of the undesigned evidences of the Hebraic origin of the fourth Gospel. Indeed, it might also be almost called an evidence of the truth of the whole narrative.

36. St. John ii. 1.

37. Yet *Renan* speaks of the first chapters of St. John's Gospel as scattered notices, without chronological order!

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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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 gaze⁴⁰ 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;'⁴¹ their unspoken, but half-conscious longing by what the invitation implied (according to the most probable reading, 'Come and ye shall see'⁴²

38. This reticence seems another undesigned evidence of Johannine authorship.

39. The Greek has it: 'John was standing, and from among his disciples two.'

40. The word implies earnest, penetrating gaze.

41. The precise date of the origin of this designation is not quite clear. We find it in threefold development: *Rab*, *Rabbi*, and *Rabban* - 'amplitudo,' 'amplitudo mea,' 'amplitudo nostra,' which mark successive stages. As the *last* of these titles was borne by the grandson of Hillel (a.d. 30-50), it is only reasonable to suppose that the two preceding ones were current a generation and more before that. Again, we have to distinguish the original and earlier use of the title when it only applied to *teachers*, and the later usage when, like the word '*Doctor*,' it was given indiscriminately to men of supposed learning. When Jesus is so addressed it is in the sense of 'my Teacher.' Nor can there be any reasonable doubt, that thus it was generally current in and before the time noted in the Gospels. A still higher title than any of these three seems to have been *Beribbi*, or *Berabbi*, by which Rabban Gamaliel is designated in Shabb. 115 *a*. It literally means 'belonging to the house of a Rabbi' - as we would say, a Rabbi of Rabbis. On the other hand, the expression 'Come and see' is among the most common Rabbinic formulas, although generally connected with the acquisition of special and important information.

42. Comp. Canon *Westcott's* note.

It was but early morning - ten o'clock.⁴³ 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 intensesness of John:⁴⁴ 'He (Andrew) first findeth his own brother.'⁴⁵ 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 Messiah.'⁴⁶ 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.

43. The common supposition is, that the time must be computed according to the Jewish method, in which case the tenth hour would represent 4 p.m. But remembering that the Jewish day ended with sunset, it could, in that case, have been scarcely marked, that 'they abode with Him that day.' The correct interpretation would therefore point in this, as in the other passages of St. John, to the Asiatic numeration of hours, corresponding to our own. Comp. J. B. McLellan's New Testament, pp. 740-742.

44. v. 41.

45. This appears from the word 'first,' used as an adjective here, v. 41 (although the reading is doubtful), and from the implied reference to some one else later on.

46. On the reading of the Aramaic *Meshicha* by Messiah, see *Delitzsch* in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* for 1876, p. 603 Of course, both Messiah and Christ mean 'the Anointed.'

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 glance⁴⁷ of the Saviour now read in Peter's inmost character his future call and work: 'Thou art Simon, the son of John⁴⁸ - thou shalt be called⁴⁹ Cephas, which is interpreted (Grecianised) Peter.'⁵⁰

47. The same word as that used in regard to the Baptist looking upon Jesus.

48. So according to the best text, and not *Jona*.

49. 'Hereafter thou shalt win the name.' - *Westcott*.

50. So in the Greek, of which the English interpretation is 'a stone' - *Keyph*, or *Keypha*, 'a rock.'

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.⁵¹

51. The evidence for the great historic difference between this call to personal attachment, and that to the Apostolate, is shown - I should think beyond the power of cavil - by *Godet*, and especially by *Canon Westcott*. To these and other commentators the reader must be referred on this and many points, which it would be out of place to discuss at length in this book.

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

The call to Philip from the lips of the 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'⁵² - 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,⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ *Nathanael* (Theodore, 'the gift of God,') had, as we often read of Rabbis,⁵⁵ rested for prayer, meditation, or study, in the shadow of that wide-spreading tree so common in Palestine, the fig-tree.⁵⁶ 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';⁵⁷ all the more, perhaps, from the

painful contrast in the present. Such a verse as that with which, in a well-known Rabbinic work,⁵⁸ the meditation for the New Moon of Nisan, the Passover month, closes: 'Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help,⁵⁹ would recur, and so lead back the mind to the suggestive symbol of Jacob's vision, and its realisation in 'the age to come.'⁶⁰

52. v. 47. 53. v. 51. 54. Tanchuma on the passage, ed. Warsh. p. 38 *a, b*.

55. Corroborative and illustrative passages are here too numerous, perhaps also not sufficiently important, to be quoted in detail.

56. *Ewald* imagines that this 'fig-tree' had been in the garden of Nathanael's house at Cana, and Archdeacon *Watkins* seems to adopt this view, but, as it seems to me, without historical ground.

57. So in Tanchuma. 58. Pesiqta.

59. Ps. cxlvi 5; Pesiqta, ed. *Buber*, p. 62 *a*. 60. Tanchuma, u. s.

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 with the freshness of new and joyous conviction: 'We have found Him of Whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write.' But this addition about the Man of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph,⁶¹ 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.

61. This, as it would seem, needless addition (if the narrative were fictitious) is of the highest evidential value. In an Ephesian Gospel of the end of the second century it would have been well-nigh impossible.

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,⁶² 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.⁶³

62. v. 50 comp. the words to Peter in St. John xiii. 36-38; and to the disciples, St. John xvi. 31, 32.

63. v. 51.

And so Nathanael, 'the God-given' - or, as we know him in after-history, Bartholomew, 'the son of Telamyon'⁶⁴ - 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.

64. So, at least, most probably. Comp. St. John xxi. 2, and the various commentaries.

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah

Alfred Edersheim

1883

Book III

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

Chapter 4

THE MARRIAGE FEAST IN CANA OF GALILEE, THE MIRACLE THAT IS 'A SIGN.'

(St. John 2:1-12.)

At the close of His Discourse to Nathanael - His first sermon - Jesus had made use of an expression which received its symbolic fulfilment in His first deed. His first testimony about Himself had been to call Himself the 'Son of Man.'^{1 2} 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 forgotten, that such teaching of His exaltation and Kingship through humiliation and representation of humanity was needful. It was the teaching which was the outcome of the Temptation and of its victory, the very teaching of the whole Evangelic history. Any other real learning of Christ would, as we see it, have been impossible to the disciples - alike mentally, as regards foundation and progression, and spiritually. A Christ: God, King, and not primarily 'the Son of Man,' would not have been the Christ of Prophecy, nor the Christ of Humanity, nor the Christ of salvation, nor yet the Christ of sympathy, help, and example. A Christ, God and King, Who had suddenly risen like the fierce Eastern sun in midday brightness, would have blinded by his dazzling rays (as it did Saul on the way to Damascus), not risen 'with kindly light' to chase away darkness and mists, and with genial growing warmth to woo life and beauty into our barren world. And so, as 'it became Him,' for the carrying out of the work, 'to make the Captain of Salvation perfect through sufferings,'³ 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.'

1. St. John i 51.

2. For a full discussion of that most important and significant appellation 'Son of Man,' comp. *Lücke*, u. s. pp. 459-466; *Godet* (German transl.) pp. 104-108; and especially *Westcott*, pp. 33-35. The main point is here first to ascertain the Old Testament import of the title, and then to view it as present to later Jewish thinking in the Pseudepigraphic writings (Book of Enoch). Finally, its full realisation must be studied in the Gospel-history.

3. Hebr. ii. 10.

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.⁴ And so in regard to the other meaning, also, which this history carries to our minds.

4. We may, however, here again notice that, if this narrative had been fictitious, it would seem most clumsily put together. To introduce the Forerunner with fasting, and as an ascetic, and Him to Whom he pointed with a marriage-feast, is an incongruity which no writer of a legend would have perpetrated. But the writer of the fourth Gospel does not seem conscious of any incongruity, and this because he has no ideal story nor characters to introduce. In this sense it may be said, that the introduction of the story of the marriage-feast of Cana is in itself the best proof of its truthfulness, and of the miracle which it records.

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.^{5 6} 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.⁷ Hence, though it may in part have been national pride, which considered the birth of every Israelite as almost outweighing the rest of the world, it scarcely wholly accounts for the ardent insistence on marriage, from the first prayer at the circumcision of a child, onwards through the many and varied admonitions to the same effect. Similarly, it may have been the deep feeling of brotherhood in Israel, leading to sympathy with all that most touched the heart, which invested with such sacredness participation in the gladness of marriage,⁸ 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,⁹ and the Angelic choir sang the wedding hymn.¹⁰ 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).¹¹ 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,¹² 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.¹³ 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.'¹⁴

5. Yalkut on 1 Sam. xiii. 1 vol ii. p. 16 *d*.

6. The Biblical proofs adduced for attaching this benefit to a sage, a bridegroom, and a prince on entering on their new state, are certainly peculiar. In the case of a bridegroom it is based on the name of Esau's bride, Machalath (Gen. xxviii. 9), a name which is derived from the Rabbinic 'Machal,' to forgive. In Jer. Biccure. iii. p. 65 *d*, where this is also related, it is pointed out that the original name of Esau's wife had been Basemath (Gen. xxxvi. 3), the name Machalath, therefore, having been given when Esau married.

7. In Yalkut on Is. lxi. 10 (vol. ii. p. 57 *d* Israel is said to have been ten times called in Scripture 'bride' (six times in Canticles, three times in Isaiah, and once in Jeremiah). Attention is also called to the 'ten garments' with which successively the Holy One arrayed Himself; to the symbolic priestly dignity of the bridegroom, &c.

8. Everything, even a funeral, had to give way to a marriage-procession.

9. Ber. R. 8. 10. Ab. de R. Nath. iv. 11. Sot. 14 *a*. 12. 2 Kings. ix. 35.

13. Yalkut on 2 Kings ix 35, vol. ii. p. 36 *a* and *b*. 14. St. Luke vii. 12.

In such circumstances, we would naturally expect that all connected with marriage was planned with care, so as to bear the impress of sanctity, and also to wear the aspect of gladness.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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.

15. For details I must refer to the Encyclopædias, to the article in *Cassell's 'Bible Educator'*, and to the corresponding chapter in ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'](#)

16. Pesiq. R. 15 applies the first clause of Prov. xiii. 12 to a long engagement, the second to a short one.

17. The reader who is curious to see these and other legal documents *in extenso*, is referred to Dr. *Sampter's* ed. of the tractate *Baba Metsia* (notes at the end, fol. pp. 144-148).

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,'¹⁸ would be spoken, and the bride and bridegroom crowned with garlands.¹⁹ Then a formal legal instrument, called the *Kethubah*, was signed,²⁰ which set forth that the bridegroom undertook to work for her, to honour, keep, and care for her,²¹ as is the manner of the men of Israel; that he promised to give his maiden-wife at least two hundred *Zuz*²² (or

more it might be),²³ 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.²⁴ 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,²⁵ sometimes wisely, to the general enjoyment,²⁶ 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,²⁷ did not obtain,²⁸ though all the invited guests bore the general name of 'children of the bridechamber' (*bené Chuppah*).²⁹

18. Jer. Yeb. Md.

19. Some of these joyous demonstrations, such as the wearing of crowns, and even the bridal music, were for a time prohibited after the destruction of Jerusalem, in token of national mourning (Sot. ix. 14). On these crowns comp. *Wagenseil*, Sota, pp. 965-967.

20. Comp. Tob. vii. 14.

21. I quote the very words of the formula, which, it will be noticed, closely agree with those in our own Marriage Service.

22. If the *Zuz* be reckoned at *7d.*, about *5l. 16s. 8d.*

23. This, of course, represents only the *minimum*. In the case of a priest's daughter the ordinary legal minimum was doubled.

24. The Talmud (Tos. Kethub.) here puts the not inapt question, 'How if the bridegroom has no goods and chattels?' but ultimately comforts itself with the thought that every man has some property, if it were only the six feet of ground in which he is to be buried.

25. Not a few such instances of riotous merriment, and even dubious jokes, on the part of the greatest Rabbis are mentioned, to check which some were wont to adopt the curious device of breaking valuable vases, &c.

26. Comp. Ber. 6 *b.* 27. Comp. Kethub. 12 *a.*; Jer. Kethub, i. p. 25 *a.*

28. This, and the other great differences in favour of morality and decency which distinguished the customs of Galilee from those of the rest of Palestine, are enumerated in Jer. Kethub. i. 1, p. 25 *a.*, about the middle.

29. Comp. St. Matt. ix. 15.

It was the marriage in Cana of Galilee. All connected with the account of it is strictly Jewish - the feast, the guests, the invitation of the stranger Rabbi, and its acceptance by Jesus. Any Jewish Rabbi would have gone, but how differently from Him would he have spoken and acted! Let us first think of the scenic details of the narrative. Strangely, we are not able to fix with certainty the site of the little town of Cana.³⁰ But if we adopt the most probable identification of it with the modern pleasant village of *Kefr Kenna*,³¹ 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.'

30. Two such sites have been proposed, that by Dr. Robinson being very unlikely to represent the ancient 'Cana of Galilee.'

31. Comp. the memoir on the subject by *Zeller* in the Quarterly Report of the Palestine Explor. Fund (for 1869, No. iii., and for April 1878, by Mr. *Hepworth Dixon*); and Lieut. *Conder*, *Tent-Work in Palestine*, vol. i. pp. 150-155. *Zeller* makes it five miles from Nazareth, *Conder* only three and three-quarters.

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-examination 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 Jerusalem³² meant just the same. For, there is ever deepest unity and harmony in that truest Life, the Life of Life.

32. St. John ii. 13-17, and vv. 18-23.

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.³³ 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 elaborate³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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).³⁶ And the mass of the people would have regarded neglect of the ordinances of purification as betokening either gross ignorance, or daring impiety.

33. Comp. St. Mark vii. 1-4.

34. The whole Mishnah is divided into six *Sedarim* (Orders), of which the last is the *Seder Tohoroth*, treating of 'purifications.' It consists of twelve tractates (*Massikhtoth*), 126 chapters (*Peraqim*), and contains no fewer than 1001 separate *Mishnayoth* (the next largest *Seder* - *Neziqin* - contains 689 *Mishnayoth*). The first tractate in this 'Order of Purifications' treats of the purification of vessels (*Kelim*), and contains no fewer than thirty chapters; *Yadayim* ('hands') is the eleventh tractate, and contains four chapters.

35. Comp. St. Mark vii. 2-5; St. Matt. xxiii. 25, 26; St. Luke xi. 38, 39. 36. Sanh. 17
a.

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,³⁷ 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*,³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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,⁴⁰ it seems to have been the practice to set apart some of these vessels exclusively for the use of the bride and of the more distinguished guests, while the rest were used by the general company.

37. These 'stone-vessels' (*Keley Abhanim*) are often spoken of (for example, Chel. x. 1). In Yaday. i. 2 they are expressly mentioned for the purification of the hands.

38. *Jos. Ant.* viii. 2. 9.

39. For further details we refer to the *excursus* on Palestinian money, weights, and measures, in *Herzfeld's* *Handelsgesch. d. Juden*, pp. 171-185.

40. *Shabb. 77 b.* So Lightfoot *in loc.*

Entering the spacious, lofty dining-room,⁴¹ 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,⁴² 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,⁴³ 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.'⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵

41. The *Teraqlin*, from which the other side-rooms opened (Jer. Rosh haSh. 59 *b*; Yoma 15 *b*). From Baba B. vi. 4 we learn, that such an apartment was at least 15 feet square and 15 feet high. Height of ceiling was characteristic of Palestinian houses. It was always half the breadth and length put together. Thus, in a small house consisting of one room: length, 12 feet, breadth, 9 feet, the height would be 10 ½ feet. In a large house: length, 15 feet, breadth, 12 feet, the height would be 13 ½ feet. From Jer. Kethub. p. 28 *d* we learn, that the bride was considered as actually married the moment she had entered the *Teraqlin*, before she had actually gone to the *Chuppah*.

42. Pas. 18 *b*.

43. Thus it was customary, and deemed meritorious, to sing and perform a kind of play with myrtle branches (Jer. Peah 15 *d*); although one Rabbi was visited with sudden death for excess in this respect.

44. St. John ii. 3, A.V.: 'when they wanted wine.' 45. Baba B ix.

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.⁴⁶ 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,⁴⁷ 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?

46. This is the view of many commentators, ancient and modern.

47. *Tholuck* and *Lücke*, however, hold the opposite view.

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;⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰ There was, in truth, a twofold relationship in that Life, of which none other but the Christ could have preserved the harmony.

48. *Luthardt* rightly calls it the commencement of a very painful education, of which the next stage is marked in St. Luke viii. 19, and the last in St. John xix. 26.

49. This meets the objection of *Strauss* and others, that Mary could not have expected a miracle. It is scarcely conceivable, how *Calvin* could have imagined that Mary had intended Jesus to deliver an address with the view of turning away thought from the want of wine; or *Bengel*, that she intended to give a hint that the company should break up.

50. *Godet* aptly says. 'His motto henceforth is: My Father and I.'

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,⁵¹ or remembers that, when commending her to John on the Cross, He used the same mode of expression,⁵² 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!⁵³

51. Comp. the passages from the classics quoted by *Wetstein* in his Commentary.

52. St. John xix. 26. 53. St. Matt xii. 46-50.

And Mary did not, and yet she did, understand Him, when she turned to the servants with the direction, implicitly to follow His behests. What happened is well known: how, in the excess of their zeal, they filled the water-pots to the brim - an accidental circumstance, yet useful, as much that seems accidental, to show that there could be neither delusion nor collusion; how, probably in the drawing of it, the water became best wine - 'the conscious water saw its God, and blushed;' then the coarse proverbial joke of what was probably the master of ceremonies and purveyor of the feast,⁵⁴ 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,⁵⁵ of the first of His miracles as a 'sign,'⁵⁶ pointing to the deeper and higher that was to be revealed, and of the first forth-manifesting of 'His glory.'⁵⁷ 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.'

54. Ecclus. xxxii. 1 2.

55. On the omission of certain parts of St. John's narrative by the Synoptists, and *vice versa*, and on the supposed differences, I can do no better than refer the reader to the admirable remarks of Canon *Westcott*, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, pp. 280 &c.

56. According to the best reading, and literally, 'This did - beginning of signs - Jesus in Cana.' Upon a careful review the Rabbinic expression *Simana* (taken from the Greek word here used) would seem to me more fully to render the idea than the Hebrew *Oth*. But the significant use of the word *sign* should be well marked. See Canon *Westcott* on the passage.

57. In this, the first of his miracles, it was all the more necessary that He should manifest his glory.

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,⁵⁸ for which there assuredly exists no legendary basis, either in Old Testament history, or in contemporary Jewish expectation;⁵⁹ which cannot be sublimated into nineteenth-century idealism;⁶⁰ least of all can be conceived as an after-thought of His disciples, invented by an Ephesian writer of the second century.⁶¹ 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,⁶² and will ever remain; not, indeed, magic,⁶³ nor arbitrary power, but power with a moral purpose, and that the highest.⁶⁴ 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.

58. Thus *Schenkel* regards Christ's answer to Mary as a proof that He was not on good terms with His family; *Paulus* suggests, that Jesus had brought the wine, and that it was afterwards mixed with the water in the stone-vessels; *Gfrörer*, that Mary had brought it as a present, and at the feast given Jesus the appropriate hint when to have it set on. The gloss of Renan seems to me even more untenable and repulsive.

59. Against this view of *Strauss*, see *Lücke*, u. s. p. 477.

60. So *Lange*, in his 'Life of Christ,' imagining that converse with Jesus had put all in that higher ecstasy in which He gave them to drink from the fulness of Himself. Similar spiritualisation - though by each in his own manner - has been attempted by *Baur*, *Keim*, *Ewald*, *Hilgenfeld*, and others. But it seems more rational, with *Schweizer* and *Weisse*, to deny the historical accuracy of the whole, than to resort to such expedients.

61. *Hilgenfeld*, however, sees in this miracle an evidence that the Christ of the fourth Gospel proclaimed another and a higher than the God of the Old Testament - in short, evidence of the Gnostic taint of the fourth Gospel.

62. *Meyer* well reminds us that 'physical incomprehensibility is not identical with absolute impossibility.'

63. *Godet* has scarcely rightly marked the difference.

64. If I rightly understand the meaning of Dr. *Abbott's* remarks on the miracles in the fourth Gospel (Encycl. Britan. vol. x. p. 825 *b*), they imply that the change of the water into wine was an emblematic reference to the Eucharistic wine, this view being supported by a reference to 1 John v. 8. But could this be considered sufficient ground for the inference, that no historic reality attaches to the whole history? In that case it would have to be seriously maintained, that an Ephesian writer at the end of the second century had invented the fiction of the miraculous change of water into wine, for the purpose of certain Eucharistic teaching!

Chapter 5
THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE
'THE SIGN,' WHICH IS NOT A SIGN.
(St. John 2:13-25.)

It has been said that Mary understood, and yet did not understand Jesus. And of this there seems fresh evidence in the circumstance that, immediately after the marriage of Cana, she and the 'brethren of Jesus' went with Him, or followed Him, to Capernaum, which henceforth became 'His own city,'¹ during His stay by the Lake of Galilee. The question, whether He had first returned to Nazareth, seems almost trifling. It may have been so, and it may be that His brothers had joined Him there, while His 'sisters,' being married, remained at Nazareth.² 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.

1. St. Matt. iv. 13; ix. 1; St. Mark ii. 1. 2. St. Mark vi. 3.

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.³ 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.

3. In support of the natural interpretation of these terms (which I frankly own to be my view) not only St. Matt. i. 25 and St. Luke ii. 7 may be urged, but these two questions may be put, suggested by Archdeacon *Norris* (who himself holds them to have been the children of Joseph by a former marriage): How could our Lord have been, through Joseph, the heir of David's throne (according to the genealogies), if Joseph had elder sons? And again, What became of the six young motherless children when Joseph and the Virgin went first to Bethlehem, and then into Egypt, and why are the elder sons not mentioned on the occasion of the visit to the Temple? (Commentary on the New Testament, vol. i. p. 117.)

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.⁴ We know it from New Testament history, and from the writings of Josephus.⁵ A rancorous notice and certain vile insinuations⁶ of the Rabbis,⁷ 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.⁸ 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;⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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,¹¹ that of Simon Peter,¹² 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 there¹³ - 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.¹⁴

4. *Robinson, Sepp*, and, if I understand him aright, Lieut. *Conder*, regard *Khan Minyeh* (Tent-Work in Palest. vol. ii. pp. 182 &c.) as the site of Capernaum; but most modern writers are agreed in fixing it at *Tell Hâm*.

5. Jewish War iii. 10. 8; Life 72.

6. The stories are too foolish, and the insinuations too vile, to be here repeated. The second of the two notices evidently refers to the first. The 'heretic' Jacob spoken of, is the *bete noire* of the Rabbis. The implied charges against the Christians remind one of the description, Rev. ii. 20-24.

7. Midr. on Eccl. i. 8. and vii 26. ed. Warsh. vol. iii. p. 80 *a* and 97 *a*. 8. St. Matt. viii. 5, &c.

9. The comparison is Canon *Tristram's* (Land of Israel, p. 427.)

10. This is another Rabbinic interpretation of the term Gennesaret.

11. St. Mark ii. 15; comp. iii. 20, 31. 12. St. Matt. viii. 14. 13. St. John vi. 49, 59.

14. Comp. especially *Warren's* Recovery of Jerusalem, pp. 337-351.

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,^{15 16} then this Passover must have taken place in the spring (about April) of the same year.¹⁷ 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'¹⁸ - 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 1*s.* 2*d.* of our money. From this tax many of the priests - to the chagrin of the Rabbis - claimed exemption, on the ingenious plea that in 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!

15. a.d. 27.

16. *Wieseler* and most modern writers place the Baptism of Jesus in the *summer* of 27 a.d., and, accordingly, the first Passover in spring, 28 a.d. But it seems to me highly improbable, that so long an interval as nine or ten months should have elapsed between

John's first preaching and the Baptism of Jesus. Besides, in that case, how are we to account for the eight or nine months between the Baptism and the Passover? So far as I know, the only reason for this strange hypothesis is St. John ii. 20, which will be explained in its proper place.

17. 780 a.u.c. or 27 a.d. 18. St. John xi. 55.

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,¹⁹ Persian, Tyrian, Syrian, Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman money circulated in the country, it will be understood what work these 'money-changers' must have had. From the 15th to the 25th Adar they had stalls in every country-town. On the latter date, which must therefore be considered as marking the first arrivals of festive pilgrims in the city, the stalls in the country were closed, and the money-changers henceforth sat within the precincts of the Temple. All who refused to pay the Temple-tribute (except priests) were liable to distraint of their goods. The 'money-changers' made a statutory fixed charge of a *Maah*, or from 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ l. to 2d.²⁰ (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.²¹

19. Simon Maccabee had copper money coined; the so-called copper shekel, a little more than a penny, and also half and quarter shekels (about a half-penny, and a farthing). His successors coined even smaller copper money. During the whole period from the death of Simon to the last Jewish war no Jewish silver coins issued from the Palestinian mint, but only copper coins. *Herzfeld* (*Handelsgesch.* pp. 178, 179) suggests that there was sufficient foreign silver coinage circulating in the country, while naturally only a very small amount of foreign copper coin would be brought to Palestine.

20. It is extremely difficult to fix the *exact* equivalent. *Cassel* computes it at one-fifth, *Herzfeld* at one-sixth, *Zunz* at one-third, and *Winer* at one-fourth of a denar.

21. Comp. *Winer's* *Real-Wörterb.* I have taken a low estimate, so as to be well within bounds. All the regulations about the *Tribute* and *Qolbon* are enumerated in *Sheqal. i.* I have not given references for each of the statements advanced, not because they are not to hand in regard to almost every detail, but to avoid needless quotations.

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 Crassus²² 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.

22. 54-53 b.c.

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.²³ 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.^{24 25} 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.²⁶ Now, as we are informed that a certain *mumcheh* of firstlings had been authorised to charge for his inspection from four to six *Isar* (1¼*d.* to about 2*d.*), according to the animal inspected,²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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,²⁹ 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 controversial zeal for the peculiar teaching of his master Shammai, but a motive similar to that of Simeon, which on another occasion induced Baba ben Buta (well known as giving Herod the advice of rebuilding the Temple), when he found the Temple-court empty of sacrificial animals, through the greed of those who had 'thus desolated the House of God,' to bring in no less than three thousand sheep, so that the people might offer sacrifices.^{30 31}

23. Comp. ['The Temple and its Services, &c.'](#) pp. 118, 119. 24. Jer. Taan iv. 8.

25. M. *Derenbourg* (Histoire de Palest., p. 467) holds that these shops were kept by priests, or at any rate that the profits went to them. But I cannot agree with him that these were the *Chanuyoth*, or shops, of the family of Annas, to which the Sanhedrin migrated forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem. See farther on.

26. Sanh. 5 b. 27. Bekhor. iv. 5.

28. It is certain that this Temple-market could not have been 'on both sides of the Eastern Gate - the gate Shushan - as far as Solomon's Porch' (Dr. *Farrar*). If it had been on both sides of this gate, it must have been in Solomon's Porch. But this supposition is out of the question. There would have been no room there for a market, and it formed the principal access into the Sanctuary. The Temple-market was undoubtedly somewhere in the 'Court of the Gentiles.'

29. Ker. i. 7. 30. Jerus. Chag. 78 a.

31. It is, however, quite certain that Baba ben Buta had not 'been the first to introduce' (Dr. *Farrar*) this traffic. A perusal of Jer. Chag. 78 a shows this sufficiently.

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 Talmud³² 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,³³ 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.

32. Jer. Sheq. i. 7, last 4 lines, p. 46 *b*. 33. Rosh haSh. 31 *a, b*.

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,³⁴ 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.'³⁵ 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.³⁶ 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.'³⁷ 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!'³⁸ 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.

34. Siphre on Deut. § 105, end. ed. *Friedmann*, p. 95 *b*; Jer. Peah i. 6.

35. St. Matt. xxi. 12. 36. Ant. xx. 9. 2-4. 37. Pes. 57 *a*. 38. Pes. u. s.

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.^{39 40} Indeed, on comparison, these are so obvious, that every reader can mark them. Nor does it seem difficult to understand, rather does it seem not only fitting, but almost logically necessary, that, if any such event had occurred, it should have taken place both at the beginning and at the close of His public ministry in the Temple. Nor yet is there anything either 'abrupt' or 'tactless' in such a commencement of his Ministry. It is not only profane, but unhistorical, to look for calculation and policy in the Life of Jesus. Had there been such, He would not have died on the Cross. And 'abrupt' it certainly was not. Jesus took up the thread where he had dropped it on His first recorded appearance in the Temple, when he had spoken His wonder, that those who knew Him should have been ignorant, that He must be about His Father's business. He was now about His Father's business, and, as we may so say, in the most elementary manner. To put an end to this desecration of His Father's House, which, by a nefarious traffic, had been made a place of mart, nay, 'a den of robbers,' was, what all who knew His Mission must have felt, a most suitable and almost necessary beginning of His Messianic Work.

39. St. Matt. xxi. 12, &c.; St. Mark xi 11, &c.; St. Luke xix. 45 &c.

40. It must, however, be admitted, that even *Luther* had grave doubts whether the narrative of the Synoptists and that of the fourth Gospel did not refer to one and the same event. Comp. *Meyer*, *Komment.* (on St. John), p. 142, notes.

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.⁴¹ There was not a hand lifted, not a word spoken to arrest Him, as He made the scourge of small cords (even this not without significance) and with it drove out of the Temple both the sheep and the oxen; not a word said, nor a hand raised, as He poured into their receptacles the changers' money, and overthrew their tables.⁴² 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.⁴³

41. And so He ever does, beginning His Ministry by purifying, whether as regards the individual or the Church.

42. Canon *Westcott* calls attention to the use of two different terms for money-changers in vv. 14, 15. In the latter only it is κολληβιστης of which the Aramaic form is *qolbon*. It is this *qolbon*-taking against which the Hand of Christ is specially directed.

43. Yet *Renan* ventures to characterise this as a sudden, ill-advised outburst of ill-humour.

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.⁴⁴ 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.

44. Acts xxi. 31, 32.

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.⁴⁵ 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,⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ 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.

45. St. Matt. xiii. 11-15; St. Mark iv. 11, 12. 46. St. Matt. xii. 38-40.

47. I cannot see in the words of Jesus any direct reference to the abrogation of the material Temple and its services, and the substitution of the Church for it. Of course, such was the case, and implied in His Crucifixion and Resurrection, though not alluded to here.

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,⁴⁸ but of whose spiritual character and upbuilding they have no knowledge nor thought. And thus, as to that generation, so to all which have followed, this is still the 'sign,' if they understand it - the only sign, the Great Miracle, which, as they only calculate from the visible and to them ascertained, these 'despiser behold, and wonder, and perish,' for He worketh 'a work in their days, a work which they shall in no wise believe.'⁴⁹

48. From the expression (St. John ii. 20) 'Forty and six years was this Temple in building,' it has been inferred by most writers that this Passover was of the year 791 a.u.c., or 28 a.d., and not, as we have argued, of the year 780 a.u.c., or 27 a.d. But their calculation rests on an oversight. Admittedly the rebuilding of the Temple began in the autumn of the eighteenth year of Herod's reign (*Jos. Ant.* xv. 11. 1-6). As Herod's reign dates from 717 a.u.c., the Temple-building must have commenced in the autumn of the year 734-35. But it has already been explained that, in Jewish reckoning, the beginning of a new year was reckoned as a year. Thus if, according to universal opinion (comp. *Wieseler*, *Chronolog. Synopse*, pp. 165, 166), the Temple-building began in Kislev 734, forty-nine years after it would bring us to the autumn 779, and the Passover of 780, or 27 a.d., would be regarded and spoken of as 'forty and six years.' If a Jew had calculated the time at the Passover 781, he would *not* have said 'forty-six' but 'forty-seven years' 'was this Temple in building.' The mistake of writers lies in forgetting that a fresh year had begun after the autumn - or at any rate at the Passover. It may here be added, that the Temple was not finally completed till 63 a.d.

49. Acts xiii. 41.

Chapter 6
THE TEACHER COME FROM GOD AND THE TEACHER FROM
JERUSALEM
JESUS AND NICODEMUS
(St. John 3:1-21.)

But there were those who beheld, and heard His words, and did in some measure understand them. Even before Jesus had spoken to the Temple-officials, His disciples, as silently they watched Him, saw an old Scripture-saying kindled into light by the halo of His glory. It was that of the suffering, self-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.'¹ 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 the m; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.'

1. Ps. lxxix. 9.

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'² 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.'

2. Although our A.V. translates in ver. 18 'sign' and in ver. 23 'miracles,' the Greek word is the same in both cases, and means a 'sign.'

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.³ 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?

3. We reserve a detailed account of the Paschal celebration for our account of the last Passover of Jesus.

We can only suggest the question. But the 'cleansing of the Temple' undoubtedly preceded the actual festive Paschal week.⁴ 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.

4. St. John ii.

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,⁵ or the repulsive, and in part blasphemous, account of a series of prodigies in testimony of the subtleties of some great Rabbi⁶ - 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.'

5. Sanh. 65 b. 6. Baba Mez. 59 b.

Such an observer was Nicodemus (*Naqdimon*),⁷ one of the Pharisees and a member of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. And, as we gather from his mode of expression,⁸ 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.⁹ And this in itself would show the real character of his inquiry, and the effect of what Jesus had first taught him. It is, at any rate, altogether rash to speak of the manner of his first approach to Christ as most commentators have done. We can scarcely 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.

7. A Nicodemus is spoken of in the Talmud as one of the richest and most distinguished citizens of Jerusalem (Taan. 20 *a*: Kethub. 66 *b*: Gitt. 56 *a*; Ab. de R. Nath. 6 comp. Ber. R. 42. Midr. on Eccles. vii. 12, and on Lament. i. 5). But this name was only given him on account of a miracle which happened at his request, his real name being *Bunai*, the son of Gorion. A *Bunai* is mentioned in the Talmud among the disciples of Jesus, and a story is related how his daughter, after immense wealth, came to most abject poverty. But there can scarcely be a doubt that this somewhat legendary *Naqdimon* was not the Nicodemus of the Gospel.

8. 'We know that Thou art a Teacher come from God.' 9. St. John xix. 39.

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.¹⁰

10. This, of course, is not the view of the Tübingen School, which regards the whole of this narrative as representing a later development. Dr. *Abbott* (Encycl. Brit., Art. 'Gospels,' p. 821) regards the expression, 'born of water and of the Spirit,' as a reference to Christian Baptism, and this again as evidence for the late authorship of the fourth Gospel. His reasoning is, that the *earliest* reference to regeneration is contained in St. Matt. xviii. 3. Then he supposes a reference in *Justin's Apologia* (i. 61) to be a *further* development of this doctrine, and he denies what is generally regarded as Justin's quotation from St. John iii. 5 to be such, because it omits the word 'water.' A *third* stage

he supposes to be implied in 1 Pet. i. 3, 23; with which he connects 1 Pet. iii. 21. The *fourth* stage of development he regards as embodied in the words of St. John iii. 5. All these hypotheses - for they are no more than such - are built on Justin's omission of the word 'water,' which, as Dr. Abbott argues, proves that Justin must have been unacquainted with the fourth Gospel, since otherwise it were impossible that, when expressly treating of Baptism, he should have omitted it. To us, on the other hand, the opposite seems the legitimate inference. Treating confessedly of Baptism, it was only necessary for his argument, which identified regeneration with Baptism, to introduce the reference to the Spirit. Otherwise the quotation is so exactly that from the fourth Gospel, including even the objection of Nicodemus, that it is almost impossible to imagine that so literal a transcription could have originated otherwise than from the fourth Gospel itself, and that it is the result of a supposed series of developments in which Justin would represent the second, and the fourth Gospel the fourth stage. But besides, the attentive reader of the chapter in *Justin's Apology* cannot fail to remark that Justin represents a *later*, and not an *earlier*, stage than the fourth Gospel. For, with Justin, Baptism and regeneration are manifestly identified, not with renovation of our nature, but with the forgiveness of sins.

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.¹¹

11. For detailed examination and proof I must here refer the reader to Canon *Westcott's* Commentary.

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,¹²¹³ 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,'¹⁴ so connected with that Teacher come from God, that Nicodemus would inquire.

12. St. John iii. 8.

13. I cannot agree with Archdeacon *Watkins*, who would render it, 'The Spirit breathes' - an opinion, so far as I know, unsupported, and which seems to me ill-accordant with the whole context.

14. The expression, 'Kingdom of God,' occurs only in iii. 3 and iii. 5 of the fourth Gospel. Otherwise the expression 'My Kingdom' is used in xviii. 36. This exceptional use of the Synoptic term, 'Kingdom of God,' is noteworthy in this connection, and not without its important bearing on the question of the authorship of the fourth Gospel.

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,'¹⁵ 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 penitent¹⁶ - was likened to a child just born.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.

15. Notwithstanding the high authority of Professor *Westcott*, I must still hold that this, and now 'anew,' is the right rendering. The word $\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ has always the meaning 'above' in the fourth Gospel (ch. iii. 3, 7, 31; xix. 11, 23); and otherwise also St. John always speaks of 'a birth' from God (St. John i. 13; 1 John ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18).

16. This is at least implied by *Wünsche*, and taken for granted by others. But ancient Jewish tradition and the Talmud do not speak of it. Comp. Yebam. 22 a, 62 a; 97 a and b; Bekhor 47 a. Proselytes are always spoken of as 'new creatures,' Ber. R. 39, ed. Warsh. p. 72 a; Bemidb. R. 11. In Vayyikra R. 30, Ps. cii. 18, 'the people that shall be created' is explained: 'For the Holy One, blessed be His Name, will create them a new creature.' In Yalkut on Judg. vi. 1 (vol. ii. p. 10 c, about the middle) this new creation is connected with the forgiveness of sins, it being maintained that whoever has a miracle done, and praises God for it, his sins are forgiven, and he is made a new creature. This is illustrated by the history of Israel at the Red Sea, by that of Deborah and Barak, and by that of David. In Shem. R. 3 (ed. Warsh. ii. p. 11 a) the words Ex. iv. 12, 'teach thee what thou shalt say,' are explained as equivalent to 'I will create thee a new creation.'

17. Yebam. 62 a. 18. Yalkut on 1 Sam. xiii. 19. As in Yalkut.

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.²⁰ 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.

20. ver. 4.

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,²¹ 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?²² 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,²³ 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,²⁴ '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.'²⁵

21. The clause 'Who is in heaven' is regarded, on critical grounds, as a *gloss*. But, even so, it seems almost a necessary gloss, in view of the Jewish notions about the ascent of Moses into heaven. Strange to say, the passage referred to forced Socinus to the curious dogma that before the commencement of His ministry Jesus had been rapt in spirit to heaven. (Comp. 'The History and Development of Socinianism,' in the North. Brit. Rev. May 1859.)

22. This in many places. Comp., for ex., Jer. Targ. on Deut. xxx. 12, and the shocking notice in Bemid. R. 19. Another view, however, Sukk. 5 *a*.

23. So already in Wisdom of Solomon xvi. 7; still more clearly in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Numb. xxi. 8, 9: 'He who lifted up his heart to the name of the Memra of Jehovah, lived;' and in the Jerusalem Targum on the passage: 'And Moses made a serpent of brass, and set it on a place aloft [of uplifting] (*talé* - the same term, curiously, which is applied by the Jews to Christ as the 'Uplifted' or 'Crucified' One). And it was that every one that was bitten with the serpent, and lifted his face in prayer (the word implies humbled prayer) unto His Father Who is in heaven, and looked unto the brazen serpent, he was healed.' Similarly Rosh haSh iii. 8. *Buxtorf's* learned tractate on the Brazen Serpent (Exercitationes, pp. 458-492) adds little to our knowledge.

24. Yalkut, vol. i. p. 240.

25. This seems the correct reading. Comp. Canon *Westcott's* note on the passage, and in general his most full and thorough criticism of the various readings in this chapter.

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 follows²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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.'

26. St. John iii. 16-21. 27. ver. 16.

But to all time, through the gusty night of our world's early spring, flashes, as the lamp in that *Aliyah* through the darkened streets of silent Jerusalem, that light; sounds through its stillness, like the Voice of the Teacher come from God, this eternal Gospel-message to us and to all men: 'God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'

Chapter 7
IN JUDEA AND THROUGH SAMARIA
A SKETCH OF SAMARITAN HISTORY AND THEOLOGY
JEWS AND SAMARITANS.
(St. John 4:1-4.)

We have no means of determining how long Jesus may have tarried in Jerusalem after the events recorded in the previous two chapters. The Evangelic narrative¹ 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.^{2 3} 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:⁴ 'Jesus maketh and baptizeth more disciples than John.'⁵ 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.

1. St. John iii. 22. 2. St. John vi. 2.

3. The Baptism of preparation for the Kingdom could not have been administered by Him Who *opened* the Kingdom of Heaven.

4. The Evangelist reports the message which was brought to the Pharisees in the very words in which it was delivered.

5. St. John iv. 1.

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,⁶ 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.

6. Rom. iv. 3.

Such was actually the case when, on one occasion, a discussion arose 'on the part of John's disciples with a Jew,'⁷ on the subject of purification.⁸ 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 opponent⁹ 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 usurped the one distinctive function still left to their master, humble as it was. It was evident that, hated and watched by the Pharisees; watched, also, by the ruthless jealousy of a Herod; overlooked, if not supplanted, by Jesus, the mission of their master was nearing its close. It had been a life and work of suffering and self-denial; it was about to end in loneliness and sorrow. They said nothing expressly to complain of Him to Whom John had borne witness, but they told of what He did, and how all men came to Him.

7. This, and not 'the Jews,' is the better reading. 8. St. John iii. 25.

9. Probably the discussion originated with John's disciples - the objector being a Jew or a professing disciple of Christ, who deprecated their views. In the one case they would in his opinion be too low; in the other too high. In either case the subject in dispute would not be baptisms, but the general subject of *purifications* - a subject of such wide range in Jewish theology, that one of the six sections into which the Mishnah or traditional Law is divided, is specially devoted to it.

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,¹⁰ 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.

10. The next event was John's imprisonment by Herod.

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.¹¹ 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.

11. This strange suggestion is made by *Godet*.

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 Herod Antipas, into whose power the Baptist was so soon to be delivered.¹² 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,¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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,¹⁵ who attributes the imprisonment and death of the Baptist simply to Herod's suspicious fear of John's unbounded influence with the people.¹⁶

12. No fewer than four localities have been identified with Ænon and Salim. *Ewald*, *Hengstenberg*, *Wieseler*, and *Godet*, seek it on the southern border of Judæa (*En-rimmon*, Neh. xi. 29, comp. Josh. xv. 1, 32). This seems so improbable as scarcely to require discussion. Dr. *Barclay* (*City of the Great King*, pp. 558-571) finds it a few miles from Jerusalem in the *Wady Fâr'ah*, but admits (p. 565) that there are doubts about the Arab pronunciation of this *Salim*. Lieut. *Conder* (*Tent-Work in Palest.*, vol. i. pp. 91-93) finds it in the *Wady Fâr'ah*, which leads from Samaria to the Jordan. Here he describes most pictorially 'the springs' 'in the open valley surrounded by desolate and shapeless hills,' with the village of *Salim* three miles south of the valley, and the village of 'Ainân four miles north of the stream. Against this there are, however, two objections. First, both Ænon and Salim would have been in Samaria. Secondly, so far from being close to each other, Ænon would have been seven miles from Salim.

13. St. John iv. 1. 14. St. Luke xiii. 31, 32. 15. Ant. xviii 5. 2.

16. Ant. xviii. 5. 2: 'But to some of the Jews it appeared, that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and, indeed, as a righteous punishment on account of what had been done to John, who was surnamed the Baptist. For Herod ordered him to be killed, a good man, and who commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. For that the baptizing would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not for the putting away (remission) of some sins, but for the purification of the body, after that the soul had been previously cleansed by righteousness. And when others had come in crowds, for they were exceedingly moved by hearing these words, Herod, fearing lest such influence of his over the people might lead to some rebellion, for they seemed ready to do anything by his counsel, deemed it best, before anything new should happen through him, to put him to death, rather than that, when a change should arise in affairs, he might have to repent.', Comp. also *Krebs*. Observations in Nov. Test. e Fl. Jos. pp. 35, 36.

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,¹⁷ 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. Matthew¹⁸ reads rather like a brief summary;¹⁹ 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;²⁰ and he alone tells of that early Judæan ministry and the journey through Samaria, which preceded the Galilean work.

17. St. Mark i. 14; St. Mark iv. 12. 18. See specially St. Matt. iv. 13 to end.

19. I am so strongly impressed with this, that I do not feel sure about *Godet's* theory, that the calling of the four Apostles recorded by the Synoptists (St. Matt. iv. 18-22; St. Mark i. 16-20; St. Luke v. 1-11), had really taken place during our Lord's first stay in Capernaum (St. John ii. 12). On the whole, however, the circumstances recorded by the Synoptists seem to indicate a period in the Lord's Ministry beyond that early stay in Capernaum.

20. St. John xx. 30, 31; xxi. 25.

The shorter road from Judæa to Galilee led through Samaria;²¹ and this, if we may credit Josephus,²² 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,²³ and the expression, 'He must needs go through Samaria,'²⁴ can only refer to the advisability in the circumstances of taking the most direct road,²⁵ or else to the wish of avoiding Peræa as the seat of Herod's government.²⁶ 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.²⁷

21. *Jos. Life*, 52. 22. *Ant.* xx. 6. 1. 23. *St. Matt.* x. 5. 24. *St. John* iv. 4.

25. I cannot agree with Archdeacon *Watkins*, that the 'needs go' was in order 'to teach in Samaria, as in Judæa, the principles of true religion and worship.'

26. So *Bengel* and *Luthardt*.

27. Much as has been written about Samaria, the subject has not been quite satisfactorily treated. Some of the passages referred to by *Deutsch* (*Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii., Art. Samaritan Pentat. p. 1118) cannot be verified, probably owing to printer's mistakes.

The Biblical history of that part of Palestine which bore the name of Samaria need not here be repeated.²⁸ Before the final deportation of Israel by Shalmaneser, or rather Sargon,²⁹ 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.³⁰ 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,³¹ 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.³² 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.³³ 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,³⁴ to mark that they were of foreign race,^{35 36} 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.³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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.³⁹

28. *Comp.* 1 Kings xiii. 32; xvi. 24 &c.; Tiglath-Pileser, 2 Kings xv. 29; Shalmaneser, xvii. 3-5; xviii. 9-11; Sargon. xvii. 6, &c.

29. *Comp.* *Smith's Bible Dict.*, Art. Sargon; and *Schrader*, *Keil-Inschr. u. d. Alte Test.* p. 158 &c.

30. 2 Chron. xxx. 1-26; xxxiv. 6. 31. 2 Kings xvii. 6.

32. Of course, not *all* the ten tribes. *Comp.* previous remarks on their migrations.

33. 2 Kings xvii. 24-26; comp. Ezr. iv. 2, 10. 34. St. John viii. 48. 35. St. Luke xvii. 16.

36. The expression cannot, however, be pressed as implying that the Samaritans were of entirely Gentile blood.

37. Comp. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, 9 Jer. xii. 5; Amos v. 3. 38. *Jos. Ant.* xi. 8, 2, 6, 7.

39. Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.* ii. p. 120.

The first foreign colonists of Samaria brought their peculiar forms of idolatry with them.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ Although this state of matters resembled that which had obtained in the original kingdom of Israel, perhaps just because of this, Ezra and Nehemiah, when reconstructing the Jewish commonwealth, insisted on a strict separation between those who had returned from Babylon and the Samaritans, resisting equally their offers of co-operation and their attempts at hindrance. This embittered the national feeling of jealousy already existing, and led to that constant hostility between Jews and Samaritans which has continued to this day. The religious separation became final when (at a date which cannot be precisely fixed⁴²) the Samaritans built a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, and Manasseh,⁴³ 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,⁴⁴ 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.

40. 2 Kings xvii. 30, 31. 41. vv. 28-41.

42. *Jost* thinks it existed even before the time of Alexander. Comp. *Nutt*, *Samar. Hist.* p. 16, note 2.

43. The difficult question, whether this is the Sanballat of the Book of Nehemiah, is fully discussed by *Petermann* (*Herzog's Real-Enc.* vol. xiii. p. 366).

44. For a very full criticism of that Pentateuch, see Mr. *Deutsch's* Art. in *Smith's Bible-Dict.*

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,⁴⁵ the origin and meaning of many of them have been forgotten.⁴⁶ 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.

45. Comp. the sketch of it in *Nutt's Samar. Hist.*, and *Petermann's* Art.

46. As instances we may mention the names of the Angels and devils. One of the latter is called *Yatsara* ((ρχψ), which *Petermann* derives from Deut. xxxi. 21, and *Nutt* from Ex. xxiii. 28. I have little doubt, it is only a corruption of *Yetser haRa*. Indeed, the latter and Satan are expressly identified in Baba B. 16 *a*. Many of the Samaritan views seem only corruptions and adaptations of those current in Palestine, which, indeed, in the circumstances, might have been expected.

The political history of the people can be told in a few sentences. Their Temple,⁴⁷ 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,⁴⁸ 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 later⁴⁹ it again became Syrian (Antigonus). Only three years afterwards,⁵⁰ Ptolemy reconquered and held it for a very short time. On his retreat, he destroyed the walls of Samaria and of other towns. In 301 it passed again by treaty into the hands of Ptolemy, but in 298 it was once more ravaged by the son of 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),⁵¹ permanently under Syrian dominion. In the troublous times of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes,⁵² the Samaritans escaped the fate of the Jews by repudiating all connection with Israel, and dedicating their temple to Jupiter.⁵³ 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,⁵⁴ which was never rebuilt. The city of Samaria was taken several years afterwards^{55 56} 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,⁵⁷ and greatly enlarged and beautified by Herod, who called it *Sebaste* in honour of Augustus, to whom he reared a magnificent temple.⁵⁸ Under Roman rule the city enjoyed great privileges - had even a Senate of its own.⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰

47. The Jews termed it σψν+λπ (Ber. R. 81). *Frankel* ridicules the derivation of *Reland* (de Monte Garis iii., apud *Ugolini*, Thes. vol. vii. pp. 717, 718), who explains the name

as *πελεθου νοος*, *stercorem delubrum*, corresponding to the Samaritan designation of the Temple at Jerusalem as *τψβ)τλθλθ* *ædes stercorea*. Frankel himself (Palast. Ex. p. 248) derives the expression from *πλατανος* with reference to Gen. xxxv. 4. But this seems quite untenable. May not the term be a compound of *+λπ*, *to spit out*, and *νοος*?

48. Comp. *Herzfeld*, u. s. ii. p. 120.

49. In 314. 50. In 311. 51. 187-175. 52. 175-164.

53. According to *Jos. Ant.* xii. 5. 5, *ελλυνιος* according to 2 Macc. vi. 2, *ξενιος*

54. It is very probable that the date 25 Marcheshvan (Nov.) in the Megill. Taan. refers to the capture of Samaria. Both the Talmud (Jer. Sot. ix. 14; Sot. 33 a) and *Josephus* (Ant. xiii. 10. 7) refers to a *Bath Qol* announcing this victory to Hyrcanus while he ministered in the Sanctuary at Jerusalem.

55. Between 113 and 105.

56. Not a few of the events of Herod's life were connected with Samaria. There he married the beautiful and ill-fated Mariamme (Ant. xiv. 12. 1); and there, thirty years later, her two sons were strangled by order of the jealous tyrant (Ant. xvi. 11. 2-7).

57. Ant. xiv. 5. 3. 58. Ant. xx. 8. 5; Jewish War i. 21. 2. 59. Ant. xviii. 4. 2.

60. Comp. *Nutt*, Samar. Hist. p. 26, note, and the authorities there quoted.

Although not only in the New Testament, but in 1 Macc. x. 30, and in the writings of Josephus,⁶¹ 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.⁶² Samaria appears merely as a strip intervening between Judæa and Galilee, being 'the land of the Cuthæans.'⁶³ Nevertheless, it was not regarded like heathen lands, but pronounced clean. Both the Mishnah⁶⁴ and Josephus⁶⁵ mark *Anuath* (ρπκ ψ)ντωχ) 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 jealousy. On all public occasions the Samaritans took the part hostile to the Jews, while they seized every opportunity of injuring and insulting them. Thus, in the time of Antiochus III. they sold many Jews into slavery.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ We also read that they tried to desecrate the Temple on the eve of the Passover;⁶⁸ and that they waylaid and killed pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem.⁶⁹ 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.

61. See specially War iii. 3. 4, 5. 62. For ex. Baba B. iii. 2. 63. For ex. Jer. Chag. iii. 4.

64. Gitt. vii. 7. 65. War iii. 3. 4, 5. 66. Ant. xii. 4.1. 67. Rosh haSh. ii. 2.

68. Ant. xviii. 2. 2. 69. Ant. xx. 6. 1.

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*⁷⁰) has, to avoid the censorship of the press, been often purposely substituted for 'Sadducees,' or 'heretics,' *i.e.* Christians.⁷¹ Thus, when⁷² 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' (ψτωκ) for 'stranger' (ψρκν), the latter, and not strictly Samaritan descent being meant.⁷³ 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.

70. The more exact translation would, of course, be *Kuthim*, but I have written *Cuthim* on account of the reference to 2 Kings xxvii. 24. Indeed, for various reasons, it is impossible always to adopt a uniform or exact system of transliteration.

71. Thus in Ber. 57 *b* Cuthaan is evidently used for 'idolator.' An instance of the Jewish use of the term Cuthaan for Christian occurs in Ber. R. 64, where the Imperial permission to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem is said to have been frustrated by Cuthaan intrigue, the text here evidently referring by that expression not to Samaritans, but to Christians, however silly the charge against them. See *Joël*, Blicke in d. Relig. Gesch. P. 17. Comp. also *Frankel* u. s. p. 244; *Jost*, Gesch. d. Judenth. i. p. 49, note 2.

72. In Sanh. 90 *b*.

73. *Frankel* quotes as a notable instance of it, Ber. viii. 8, and refers in proof to the Jerus. Talmud on this Mishnah. But, for reasons soon to be explained, I am not prepared in this instance to adopt his view.

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.'⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ 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,⁷⁶ since they were neither in practice nor in theory regarded as co-religionists.⁷⁷⁷⁸ Yet they were not treated as heathens, and their land, their springs, baths, houses, and roads were declared clean.⁷⁹

74. Ecclus. 1. 25, 26. 75. Test. Levi. vii. 76. Ber. viii. 8. 77. Sheq. i. 5.

78. As in the case of heathens, neither Temple-tribute, nor any other than free-will and votive offerings were received from them.

79. Jer. Abhod. Z. v. 4, p. 44 *d*.

The question was discussed, whether or not they were to be considered 'lion-proselytes' (from fear of the lions), or as genuine converts;⁸⁰ and, again, whether or not they were to be regarded as heathens.⁸¹ 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,⁸² 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;⁸³ whilst later authority (Rabbi Jehuda the Holy) would have them considered and treated as heathens. Again, it is expressly stated in the Babylon Talmud,⁸⁴ 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.⁸⁵ 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,⁸⁶ 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 as⁸⁷ that he, whose hospitality receives a foreigner, has himself to blame if his children have to go into captivity.

80. Sanh. 85 *b*; Chull. 3 *b*; Kidd. 75 *b*. 81. Jer. Sheq. 46 *b*. 82. Jer. Demai iii. 4.

83. Comp. also Jer. Dem. vi. 11; Jer. Ber. vii. 1; and Jer. Keth. 27 *a*.

84. Ber. 47 *b*. 85. Comp. Chull. 4 *a*. 86. Chull. 6 *a*. 87. Chull. 104 *c*.

The expression, 'the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans,'⁸⁸ finds its exact counterpart⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰ Matters proceeded so

far, that they were entirely excluded from fellowship.⁹¹ The extreme limit of this direction,⁹² if, indeed, the statement applies to the Samaritans,⁹³ 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,⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ 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 Samaritans⁹⁶ 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;⁹⁷ their bread⁹⁸ 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.⁹⁹ There could, therefore, be no difficulty as regarded the purchase of victuals on the part of the disciples of Jesus.

88. St. John iv. 9. 89. Megill. 2. 90. Jer. Abhod. Zar. v. 4. 91. Chull. 6 a.

92. Shebhyith viii. 10. 93. The expression literally applies to idolaters. 94. Yalkut ii. p. 36 d.

95. In Jer. Kil. ix. 4, 9. 32 c (middle) the question of the Resurrection is discussed, when it is said that the Samaritan inhabitants of Palestine, far from enjoying the blessings of that period, would be made into sections (or, made like cloth [?]), and then burnt up.

96. Massecheth Kuthim, in *Kirchheim*, Septem Libri parvi Talmudici, pp. 31-36.

97. Chull. 3 b.

98. In Jer. Orlah ii. 7 the question is discussed, how long after the Passover it is not lawful to use bread baked by Samaritans, showing that ordinarily it was lawful.

99. Jer. Abhod. Zar. v. 4.

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.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, Samaritan 'sages' are referred to.¹⁰¹ 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,¹⁰² from whom the Fathers have copied the charge.¹⁰³ Certainly, they hold that doctrine at present. They strongly believed in the Unity of God; they held the doctrine of Angels and devils;¹⁰⁴ they received the Pentateuch as of sole Divine authority;¹⁰⁵ 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.^{106 107} 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.

100. The doctrinal views, the festive observances, and the literature of the Samaritans of a later period, cannot be discussed in this place. For further information we refer to the following: The Articles in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, in *Winer's Bibl. Real-Wörterb.*, and especially in *Herzog's Real-Encykl.* (by *Petermann*); to *Juynboll*, Comment. in Hist. Gentis Samarit.; *Jost*, Gesch. des Judenth.; *Herzfeld*, Gesh. des judisch. Volkes, *passim*; *Frankel*, Einfluss der Paläst. Exeg. pp. 237-254; *Nutt*, Sketch of Samaritan History, &c.

101. Gitt. 10 b; Nidd. 33 b. 102. Siphre on Num. xv. 31; Sanh. 90 b.

103. *Epiphanius*, Hæres. iv., xiv.; *Leontius*, De Sectis viii.; *Gregory the Great*, Moral. i. xv. *Grimm* (Die Samariter &c., pp. 91 &c.), not only strongly defends the position of the Fathers, but holds that the Samaritans did not even believe in the immortality of the soul, and maintained that the world was eternal. The 'Samaritan Chronicle' dates from the thirteenth century, but *Grimm* maintains that it embodies the earlier views of that people (u. s. p. 107).

104. This seems inconsistent with their disbelief of the Resurrection, and also casts doubt on the patristic testimony about them, since *Leontius* falsely accuses them of rejecting the doctrine of Angels. *Epiphanius*, on the other hand, attributes to them belief in Angels. *Reland* maintains, that they regarded the Angels as merely 'powers' - a sort of impersonal abstractions; *Grimm* thinks there were two sects of Samaritans - one believing, the other disbelieving, in Angels.

105. For their horrible distortion of later Jewish Biblical history, see *Grimm* (u. s.), p. 107.

106. Deut. xviii. 15, 18.

107. They expected that this Messiah would finally convert all nations to Samaritanism (*Grimm*, p. 99). But there is no historic ground for the view of Mr. *Nutt* (Sketch of Samar. Hist. pp. 40, 69) that the idea of a Messiah the Son of Joseph, which holds so large a place in later Rabbinic theology, was of Samaritan origin.

Chapter 8

JESUS AT THE WELL OF SYCHAR (St. John 4:1-42.)

THERE is not a district in 'the Land of Promise' which presents a scene more fair or rich than the plain of Samaria (the modern *El Mukhna*). As we stand on the summit of the ridge, on the way from Shiloh, the eye travels over the wide sweep, extending more than seven miles northward, till it rests on the twin heights of Gerizim and Ebal, which enclose the valley of Shechem. Following the straight olive-shaded road from the south, to where a spur of Gerizim, jutting south-east, forms the Vale of Shechem, we stand by that 'Well of Jacob' to which so many sacred memories attach. Here, in 'the parcel of ground' afterwards given to Joseph,¹ 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.² 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.³

1. The reference here is to Gen. xlviii. 22. *Wünsche*, indeed, objects that this application of the passage is inaccurate, and contrary to universal Rabbinic tradition. But in this, as in other instances, it is not the Gospel, but rather Dr. *Wünsche*, who is inaccurate. If the reader will refer to *Geiger's Urschr.* p. 80, he will find *proof* that the Evangelist's rendering of Gen. xlviii. 22 *was* in accordance with ancient Rabbinic tradition, which was only afterwards altered for anti-Samaritan purposes. On the other hand, this may be regarded as another undesigned proof of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

2. The present depth of the well is about seventy-five feet. Most travellers have given more or less pictorial accounts of Jacob's Well. We refer here especially to Mr. *King's* Report (Quarterly Stat. of the Pal. Explor. Fund, Ap. 1879), although it contains the strange mistake that Jesus had that day come from Jerusalem, and reached Jacob's Well by midday.

3. Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19.

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,⁴ when Jesus, accompanied by the small band which formed His disciples,⁵ 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.⁶ 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,⁷ which in the fourth century at least had so entirely ceased to be Samaritan, that it had become the home of some celebrated Rabbis;⁸ 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.

4. For 'the location of Sychar,' and the vindication of the view that the event took place at the beginning of the wheat harvest, or about the middle of May, see Appendix XV. The question is of considerable importance.

5. From the silence of the Synoptists, and the general designation of the disciples without naming them, Caspari concludes that only John, and perhaps Nathanael, but none of the other apostles, had accompanied Jesus on this journey (Chronol. Geogr. Einl. p. 104).

6. *Caspari* (u. s. p. 103) thinks that John only related that of which he himself was an eyewitness, except, perhaps, in ch. xviii. 33, &c.

7. It is very characteristic when *Schenkel*, in ignorance of the fact that Sychar is mentioned by the Rabbis, argues that the use of the name Sychar for Shechem affords evidence that the Fourth Gospel is of Gentile-Christian origin.

8. See Appendix XV.

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 unfailling 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 misapprehension⁹ and non-reception¹⁰ 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.

9. St. John iv. 33. 10. ii. 13-iv. 54.

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 cycle¹¹ 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,¹² 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.

11. ii. 13-iv. 54. 12. v.-vi. 3.

It was about six o'clock in the evening,¹³ when the travel-stained pilgrims reached that 'parcel of ground' which, according to ancient Jewish tradition, Jacob had given to his son Joseph.¹⁴ 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,¹⁵ that the glory of His Divine Personality suddenly shines through it. This time it was a poor, ignorant Samaritan woman,¹⁶ 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.

13. We have already expressed our belief, that in the Fourth Gospel time is reckoned not according to the Jewish mode, but according to the Roman civil day, from midnight to midnight. For a full discussion and proof of this, with notice of objections, see *McLellan's* New Test. vol. i. pp. 737-743. It must surely be a *lapsus* when at p. 288 (note *o*), the same author seems to assume the contrary. *Meyer* objects, that, if it had been 6 p.m., there would not have been time for the after-events recorded. But they could easily find a place in the delicious cool of a summer's evening, and both the coming up of the Samaritans (most unlikely at noon-time), and their invitation to Jesus 'to tarry' with them (v. 40), are in favour of our view. Indeed, St. John xix. 14 renders it impossible to adopt the Jewish mode of reckoning.

14. See a previous note on p. 404.

15. *Godet* rightly asks what, in view of this, becomes of the supposed Docetism which, according to the Tübingen school, is one of the characteristics of the Fourth Gospel?

16. By which we are to understand a woman from the *country*, not the town of Samaria, a Samaritaness. The suggestion, that she resorted to Jacob's Well on account of its sanctity, scarcely requires refutation.

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.¹⁷ Even if He had not spoken, the Samaritaness would have recognised the Jew by His appearance¹⁸ and dress, if, as seems likely, He wore the fringes on the border of His garment.¹⁹ His speech would, by its pronunciation, place His nationality beyond doubt.²⁰ 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,'²¹ 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?

17. ver. 8.

18. According to the testimony of travellers the Samaritans, with the exception of the High-Priestly family, have *not* the common, well-known type of Jewish face and feature.

19. The 'fringes' on the *Tallith* of the Samaritans are blue, while those worn by the Jews, whether on the *Arba Kanphoth* or the *Tallith*, are white. The Samaritans do not seem to have worn *phylacteries* (Menach. 42 b). But neither did many of the Jews of old - nor, I feel persuaded, our Lord (comp. *Jost*, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* vol. i. p. 60).

20. There were, undoubtedly, marked differences of pronunciation between the Jews and the Samaritans. Without entering into details, it may be said, that they chiefly concern the vowel-sounds; and among consonants the *gutturals* (which are generally not pronounced), the *aspirates*, and the letter # which is not, as in Hebrew, either #& (pronounced *s*), or #Ξ (pronounced *sh*), but is always pronounced as '*sh*.' In connection with this we may notice one of those instances, how a strange mistake comes 'by tradition' to be commonly received. It has been asserted that, if Jesus had said to the

woman: *Teni li lishtoth* ('Give me to drink'), a Samaritan would have pronounced it *listoth*, since the Samaritans pronounced the *sh* as *s*. But the reverse of this is the fact. The Samaritans pronounced the *s* ('*sin*') as *sh* ('*shin*') - and not the *sh* as *s*. The mistake arose from confounding the old Ephraimite (Judg. xii. 5, 6) with the Samaritan mode of pronouncing. The suggestion seems first to have been made - through *very doubtfully* - by *Stier* (Reden Jesu, iv. p. 134). *Stier*, however, at least rendered the words of Jesus: *Teni li lishtoth*. *Godet* (ad loc.) accepts *Stier*'s suggestions, but renders the words: *Teni li lishchoth*. Later writers have repeated this, only altering *lishchoth* into *lishkoth*.

21. The article is wanting in the original.

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,²² in significant contrast to water accumulated in a cistern.²³ 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.

22. Gen. xxvi. 19; Lev. xiv. 5. 23. Jer. ii. 13.

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*,²⁴ 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,'²⁵ 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.'²⁶ More closely related to the words of Christ is it, when we read²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.

24. Those who wish to see the well-worn Rabbinic references will find them in *Lightfoot* and *Schöttgen* ad loc.

25. Ab. ii. 9.

26. There is much spurious religious sentiment which, in contravention to our Lord's saving, delights in such expressions as that of *St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (followed by so many modern hymnologists): 'Qui Te gustant esuriunt, Qui bibunt adhuc sitiunt.' (Ap. Daniel, Thes. i p. 223.) The theology of this is not only sickly, but untrue and misleading.

27. in Bar. iii. 12. 28. See '[The Temple and its Ministry](#),' pp. 241-243.

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.²⁹ 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.

29. I cannot bring myself to see, as some commentators, any extraordinary mark of rising reverence in the use by her of the word 'Sir' in vv. 11 and 15. It seems only natural in the circumstances.

Surely, it is a strange mistake to find in her words³⁰ '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 reply³¹ and her after-reference to it³² 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.³³ 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.

30. ver. 15. 31. ver. 19. 32. ver. 29. 33. St. John i. 48, 49.

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.³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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.

34. Comp St. John vi. 6. 35. Comp. *Lücke*, *Evang. Joh.* vol. i. p. 588.

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,³⁶ 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*³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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?

36. 2 Kings xvii. 24 &c.

37. The references here are to *Strauss*, vol. i. pp. 510-519, and to *Keim* i. 1, p. 116.

38. Meyer, *Komment.* vol. ii. p. 208, rightly remarks on the theory of *Baur*, *Hilgenfeld*, &c. According to them, the whole of this history is only a type of heathenism as receptive to faith, in contrast to Nicodemus, the type of Judaism shutting itself up against faith. But in that case why make the principal person a Samaritan, and not a heathen, and why attribute to her belief in a Messiah, which was entirely foreign to heathenism?

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,³⁹ 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.

39. Curiously enough, several instances are related in Rabbinic writings in which Samaritans enter into dispute with Rabbis who pass by Mount Gerizim on their way to Jerusalem, to convince them that Gerizim was the proper place of worship. One instance may here be mentioned, when a Samaritan maintained that Gerizim was the mount of blessing, because it was not covered by the Flood, quoting in proof Ezek. xxii. 24. The Rabbi replied, that if such had been the case, God would have told Noah to flee there, instead of making an ark. The Samaritan retorted, that this was done to try him. The Rabbi was silenced, but his muleteer appealed to Gen. vii. 19, according to which all the high hills under the heavens were covered, and so silenced the Samaritan. (Deb. R. 3; comp. Ber. R. 32.) On the other hand, it ought to be added, that in Ber. R. 33 the Mount of Olives is said not to have been covered by the Flood, and that Ezek. xxii. 24 is applied to this.

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.'⁴⁰ 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'⁴¹ - for, of the Jews, 'as concerning the flesh,' was Christ to come.⁴² 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'⁴³ - and only worship in spirit and in truth could be acceptable to such a God.

40. He had formerly taught her the '*where*,' and now teaches her the '*what*,' of true worship.

41. Rom. i. 3. 42. Rom. ix. 5.

43. It is remarkable, that most of the alterations in the Samaritan Pentateuch are with the view of removing anthropomorphisms.

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.'⁴⁴ 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.'

44. The words 'which is called Christ' should be within brackets, and are the explanation of the writer.

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,⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ Under this impression 'they went out of the City, and came on their way towards Him.'^{47 48}

45. In the original, ver. 31 has it: 'Rabbi (not Master), eat.' Surely such an address to Christ is sufficiently anti-Ephesian. Readers know how thoroughly opposed to Jewish notions was any needless converse with a woman (comp. Ab. i. 5; Ber. 43 *b*; Kidd. 70 *a*; also Erub. 53 *b*). To instruct a woman in the Law was forbidden; comp. the story in Bemid. R. 9.

46. vv. 39, 40. 47. ver. 30.

48. Following the suggestion of Professor *Westcott*, I would thus give the real meaning of the original. It may save needless notes if I add, that where the rendering differs from the A.V. the change has been intentional, to bring out the meaning of the Greek; and that where words in the A.V. are omitted, it is because they are either spurious, or doubtful.

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.⁴⁹

49. St. Matt. xv i. 6, 7.

Yet with Divine patience He bore with them: 'My meat is, that I may do the Will of Him that sent Me, and that I may accomplish (bring to a perfect end) His work.' To the disciples that work appeared still in the far future. To them it seemed as yet little more

than seed-time; the green blade was only sprouting; the harvest of such a Messianic Kingdom as they expected was still months distant. To correct their mistake, the Divine Teacher, as so often, and as best adapted to His hearers, chose His illustration from what was visible around. To show their meaning more clearly, we venture to reverse the order of the sentences which Jesus spoke: 'Behold, I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look [observantly] at the fields, that they are white to the harvest. [But] do ye not say (viz. in your hearts⁵⁰) 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.

50. This is a Hebraism.

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,⁵¹ 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,⁵² that Christ returned from Judæa to Galilee in the early summer.

51. See them in Appendix XV. 52. Comp. Appendix XV.

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'⁵³ 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 equally⁵⁴ 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.

53. We follow Canon *Westcott*, who, for reasons explained by him, joins the word 'already' to ver. 36, omitting the particle 'and.'

54. It will be noticed that, in ver. 36 $\tau\upsilon\alpha$ has been translated 'so that,' the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ omitted, and $\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ rendered 'equally as.' Linguistically, no apology is required for these renderings. I, however, hesitate between this and the rendering: 'in order that the sower may rejoice along with the reaper.' But the translation in the text seems to agree better with what follows. The whole passage is perhaps one of the most difficult, from the curtness and rapid transition of the sentences. The only apology which I can offer for proposing a new rendering and a new interpretation is, that those with which I am acquainted have not conveyed any distinct or connected meaning to my own mind.

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 speaking⁵⁵ do we believe. For we ourselves have heard, and know, that this is truly the Saviour of the world.'⁵⁶

55. $\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$ speech, talking.

56. We have omitted the words 'the Christ', in ver. 42, as apparently spurious. In general, the text has been rendered as faithfully as possible, so as to bring out the real meaning.

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 9
THE SECOND VISIT TO CANA
CURE OF THE 'NOBLEMAN'S' SON AT CAPERNAUM.
(St. Matthew 4:12; St. Mark 1:14; St. Luke 4:14,15; St. John 4:43-54.)

THE brief harvest in Samaria was, as Jesus had indicated to His disciples, in another sense also the beginning of sowing-time, or at least that when the green blade first appeared above ground. It formed the introduction to that Galilean ministry, when 'the Galileans received Him, having seen all the things that He did at Jerusalem at the Feast.'¹ 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.² Accordingly,

this circumstance is specially marked by St. Matthew,³ and by St. Mark,⁴ 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.⁵ 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,⁶ 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.⁷

1. St. John iv. 45. 2. The history of the Baptist's imprisonment will be given in the sequel.

3. St. Matt. iv. 12. 4. St. Mark i. 14. 5. St. Luke iv. 11. 6. St. Matt. iv. 17.

7. St. Mark i. 15.

But here also - as Eusebius had already noted⁸ - 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.⁹ We therefore follow his guidance, simply noting that the various stages of this Galilean residence should be grouped as follows: Cana,¹⁰ Nazareth,¹¹ and Capernaum, with general itineration from that centre.¹² 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.'¹³ 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 Apostles¹⁴ only took place *after* the 'unnamed feast;' that, indeed, they had probably returned to their homes and ordinary occupations when Jesus went to Nazareth,¹⁵ 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,¹⁶ and also that He made a longer stay in Capernaum.¹⁷

8. The origin, authorship, and occasion of the Synoptic Gospels and of that by St. John, as well as their interrelation, is discussed in *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iii. 24*, the discussion being the more important that Eusebius throughout appeals for his statements to 'the testimony of the ancients.'

9. St. John iv. 43-54. 10. St. John iv. 45-54. 11. St. Luke iv. 16-30.

12. St. Matt. iv. 13-17; St. Mark i. 14, 15; St. Luke iv. 31, 32.

13. St. John v. 1. 14. St. Matt. iv. 18-22 &c. 15. St. Luke iv. 16. 16. St. Luke iv. 15.

17. St. Luke iv. 31; comp. St. Matt. iv. 13-16.

When Jesus returned to Galilee, it was in circumstances entirely different from those under which He had left it. As He Himself said,¹⁸ there had, perhaps naturally, been prejudices connected with the humbleness of His upbringing, and the familiarity engendered by knowledge¹⁹ 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,²⁰ 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 upbringing²¹

18. St. John iv. 44.

19. I cannot believe that the expression 'His own country,' refers to Judæa. Such an explanation is not only unnatural, but contrary to the usage of the expression ἰδιος ('his own'). Comp. St. Matt. ix. 1; also St. John vii. 40-42. *Strauss's* arguments (*Leben Jesu*, i. p. 659) seem here conclusive.

20. St. John ii. 1-11. 21. St. Luke iv. 23.

It appears that the son of one of Herod Antipas' officers, either civil or military,²² 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.²³ 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.

22. βασιλικός, used by Josephus in the general sense of officers in the service of Herod Antipas. Comp. *Krebs*, Obs. in N. Test. e Fl. Josepho, pp. 144, 145, who notes that the expression occurs 600 times in the writings of Josephus.

23. Ber. 34 *b*; Jer. Ber. 9 *d*.

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 saw²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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,'²⁶ presently to find his faith both crowned and perfected.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.

24. The emphasis must lie on the word 'see,' yet not exclusively. *Lücke's* objections to this (Ev. Joh. i. p. 622) are not well founded.

25. ver. 49. 26. ver. 50. 27. ver. 53. 28. St. John i. vi. 50, 51.

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.²⁹ Critics have noticed marked divergences in almost every detail of the two narratives,³⁰ which some - both orthodox and negative interpreters - have so strangely represented as only different presentations of one and the same event.³¹ 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,³² 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.

29. St. Matt. viii. 5 &c.; St. Luke vii. 1 &c.

30. These will readily occur on comparison of the two narratives. Archdeacon *Watkins* (*ad loc.*) has grouped these under eight distinct particulars. Comp. *Lücke* (Ev. Joh.) i. p. 626.

31. So partially and hesitatingly *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, and more decidedly *Theophilus*, *Euthymius*, *Irenæus*, and *Eusebius*. All modern negative critics hold this view; but *Gfrörer* regards the narrative of St. John, *Strauss* and *Weiss* that of St. Matthew, as the original account. And yet *Keim* ventures to assert: 'Ohne allen Zweifel (!) ist das die selbe Geschichte.'

32. Alike *Strauss* and *Keim* discuss this at some length from the point of view of seeming contradiction between the reception of the heathen Centurion and the first refusal of the Syro-Phoenician woman. *Keim's* treatment of the whole subject seems to me inconsistent with itself.

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 school³³ 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.³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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.

33. *Keim*, *Jesu v. Nazara*, II. i. pp. 179-185. I regret to say, that the language of *Keim* at p. 181 is among the most painful in his book.

34. So *Strauss*, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. pp. 121, 122 (1st ed.).

35. At least I so understand *Keim*, unless he means that the faith of the child alone brought about the cure, in which case there was no need for the father's journey. *Keim* naively asks, what objections there can be to this view, unless for the 'wording of St. John'? But the whole narrative is derived from that 'wording.'

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';^{36 37} and, lastly, that when the 'court-official' applied to Jesus. The two latter events were evidently contemporaneous.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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.'

36. ver. 52. 37. So literally; the A.V. has: 'began to amend.' 38. ver. 53.

39. The Jewish servants may have expressed the time according to Jewish notation, though in such a house in Galilee such might not have been the usual practice. However this be, we contend that St. John's notation of time was according to the Roman civil day, or rather according to that of Asia Minor.

40. ver. 52.

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,⁴¹ 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,⁴² and thence to absolute faith in Him,⁴³ 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*.

41. St. Luke viii. 3. 42. ver. 50. 43. ver. 53.

Chapter 10 **THE SYNAGOGUE AT NAZARETH** **SYNAGOGUE, WORSHIP AND ARRANGEMENTS.** **(St. Luke 4:16.)**

The stay in Cana, though we have no means of determining its length, was probably of only short duration. Perhaps the Sabbath of the same week already found Jesus in the Synagogue of Nazareth. We will not seek irreverently to lift the veil of sacred silence, which here, as elsewhere, the Gospel-narratives have laid over the Sanctuary of His inner Life. That silence is itself *theopneustic*, of Divine breathing and inspiration; it is more eloquent than any eloquence, a guarantee of the truthfulness of what is said. And against this silence, as the dark background, stands out as the Figure of Light the Person of the Christ. Yet, as we follow Jesus to the city of His Childhood and home of His humility, we can scarcely repress thoughts of what must have stirred His soul, as He once more entered the well-known valley, and beheld the scenes to each of which some early memory must have attached.

Only a few months since He had left Nazareth, but how much that was all-decisive to Him, to Israel, and to the world had passed! As the lengthening shadows of Friday's sun closed around the quiet valley, He would hear the well-remembered double blast of the trumpet from the roof of the Synagogue-minister's house, proclaiming the advent of the holy day.¹ Once more it sounded through the still summer-air, to tell all, that work must be laid aside.² 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.

1. Shabb. 35 *b*. 2. Jer. Shabb. xvii. p. 16 *a*.

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,³ so far as we know, that He taught in a Synagogue, and this Synagogue that of His own Nazareth.

3. The remark in the 'Speaker's Commentary' (St. Luke iv. 16), that Jesus had been in the habit of expounding the Scriptures in Nazareth, is not only groundless, but inconsistent with the narrative. See ver. 22. Still more strange is the supposition, that 'Jesus offered to read and to expound, and signified this intention by standing up. This might be done by any member of the congregation.' Most assuredly such would not be the case.

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,⁴ and the Rabbinic attempts to trace them even to patriarchal times⁵ 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.⁶ 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;⁷ 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*).

4. This seems at first sight inconsistent with Ps. lxxiv.8. But the term rendered 'Synagogues' in the A. V. has never been used in that sense. The solution of the difficulty here comes to us through the LXX. Their rendering, καταπαυσωμεν (let us make to cease), shows that in their Hebrew MSS. They read ωτβ#. If so, then the ω probably belonged to the next word, and the text would read: λ)ε ψδι(αωΞ:μ λκαφω: τβ≡αφ#α. 'Let us suppress altogether - the Sabbath and all the festive seasons in the land.' Comp. *Ehrt*, Abfass. Zeit. u. Abschl. d. Psalt. pp. 17-19.

5. The introduction of morning, midday, and afternoon prayers is respectively ascribed to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The Targum of Onkelos and the Targum Ps., Jon. on Gen. xxv. 27 imply their existence in the time of Jacob. In B. Kama 82 a, and Jer. Megill. 75 a, its services are traced to the time of Moses. According to Sanh. 94 b, Synagogues existed in the time of Hezekiah. It is needless to follow the subject further. We take the present opportunity of adding, that, as the Rabbinic quotations in this chapter would be so numerous, only those will be given which refer to points hitherto unnoticed, or of special importance.

6. The expressions 'Targum' and 'targuming' have been previously explained. The first indication of such paraphrasing in the vernacular is found in Neh. viii. 7, 8.

7. Baba K. 82 a.

In another place⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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,¹² but there is no evidence that it obtained in Palestine, or in early times.

8. See Book I. pp. 19, 77.

9. These numbers, however, seem to have been symbolical. The number 480 is, by *Gimatreya*, deduced from the word 'She that was full of' (meleathi) in Is. i. 21. Comp. *Yalkut*, vol. ii. p. 40 d, towards the end, or else 480 = 4 x 10 x 12.

10. Comp. Megill. 26. 11. St. Luke vii. 5. 12. *Maimonides*, Hilc. Tephill, xi 1.

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.'¹³ 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 doubtful¹⁴ passage in the Talmud,¹⁵ this seems to have been the case in Persia, while a later notice¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ Hence, the inference, that the Galilean Synagogues lately excavated cannot date from an early period, because they are not in prominent positions, is erroneous.¹⁸

13. Comp. Philem. 2. 14. See the notes in *Maimonides*, Hilc. Tephill. xi. 2; p. 75 b.

15. Shabb. 11 a. 16. Tos. Meg. ed. Z iv. 23. 17. *Maimonides*, Hilc. Tephill. xi. 2.

18. Comp. Lieut. *Kitchener's* article on the Synagogues of Galilee (P.E.F. Report, July 1878, pp. 126 &c.). The inference, that they date from the beginning of the third century, when the Jews were in high favour with the Emperor Alexander Severus, is all the more ungrounded, that at that time, if ever, the Jewish authorities would strictly adhere to Talmudic directions as to the structure of Synagogues.

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*,¹⁹ or men of leisure, who could devote their time to the Synagogue worship and administration.²⁰ This was proved by the consideration, that common worship implied a congregation, which, according to Jewish Law, must consist of at least ten men.²¹ 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. 16.²² 2ndly. The prevailing direction in Palestine was towards the west, as in the Temple. Thus, we read²³ 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,²⁴ 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.

19. From *'battel,'* which here seems to have the same meaning as the Latin *vacare rei,* to have leisure for a thing.

20. This is expressly stated in Jer. Megill. i. 6, p. 70 *b,* towards the end.

21. Comp. Megill. iv. 3; Sanh. i. 6. That ten constituted a congregation was derived from Numb. xiv. 27. Similarly, it was thought to be implied in the fact, that if ten righteous men had been in Sodom, the city would not have been destroyed. But in case of necessity the number ten might be made up by a male child under age (Ber. R. 91, pp. 160 *a* and *b*).

22. Comp. Jer. Ber. iv. 5; Baba B. 25 *a.* 23. Tos. Megill. iii. 3.

24. Baba B. 25 *a* and *b;* Jer. Ber. iv. 5.

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.²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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 Therapeutæ²⁷ but there is no indication that the practice prevailed in the Synagogues, or in Palestine.

25. On the next page we give a plan of the Synagogue excavated at Tell Hum (Capernaum). It is adapted from Capt. *Wilson's* plan in the P. E. F. Quarterly Statement, No. 2.

26. Tos. Meg. iii. 3. 27. De Vit. Contempl. 3 and 9, ed. Mang. ii. pp. 476, 482.

Figure 3a.

We can now, with the help given by recent excavations, form a conception of these ancient Synagogues. The Synagogue is built of the stone of the country. On the lintels over the doors there are various ornamentations - a seven-branched candlestick, an open flower between two Paschal lambs, or vine-leaves with bunches of grapes, or, as at Capernaum, a pot of manna between representations of Aaron's rod. Only glancing at the

internal decorations of 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 9 1/2 feet.²⁸ 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;²⁹ 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.

28. Comp. Palestine Exploration Fund Report, Quarterly Statement, ii. p. 42 &c.

29. Comp. Warren's 'Recovery of Jerusalem,' p. 343 &c.

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.³⁰ 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),³¹ but chiefly the *Tebhah*, Ark.³² It was made movable, so that it might be carried out, as on public fasts.³³ 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.³⁴ Right before the Ark, and facing the people, are the seats of honour, for the rulers of the Synagogue and the honourable.³⁵ 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.³⁶ In the middle of the Synagogue (so generally) is the *Bima*,³⁷ or elevation, on which there is the *Luach*, or desk,³⁸ from which the Law is read. This is also called the *Kurseya*, chair, or throne,³⁹ 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.

30. There is a curious passage in Ber. 8a, which states that although there were thirteen Synagogues in Tiberias, it was the practice of the Rabbis only to pray 'between the columns where they studied.' This seems to imply that the Academy consisted also of colonnades. For it would be difficult to believe that all the supposed Synagogues excavated in Galilee were Academies.

31. Shabb. 32a.

32. It was also called *Argas* and *Qomtar* (Megill. 26b), but more generally *Chest*.

33. Megill. 26 b; Taan. 15 a.

34. Exod. xxvii. 20. 35. St. Matt. xxiii. 6; Tos. Megill. ed. Z. iv. 21.

36. Hence the expression 'yored liphney hattebhah,' and 'obhed liphney hattebhah.'

37. Seems also to have been called 'Kathedrah,' just as by our Lord (St. Matt. xxiii. 2).
Comp. *Buxtorf's* Lexicon, p. 2164.

38. Megill. 32 *a.* 39. Megill. 26 *b.*

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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ However, the Synagogue must not be made a thoroughfare. We must not behave lightly in it.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴

40. Comp. Ber. 6 *a* and *b*; 8 *a.* 41. Ber. 63 *a.* 42. Tos. Megill. ed. Z. iii. 7.

43. Pes. 101 *a.* 44. Megill. 26 *a.*

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.⁴⁵ 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;⁴⁶ 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.

45. This, not for symbolical reasons, but probably on account of the strength of the wine. It is needless here to give the rules how the cup is to be held, or even the liturgical formula of the Qiddush. Comp. Jer. Ber. p. 3 *c, d*; vii. 6, p. 11 *c, d*.

46. As to all this, and the great liberty in prayer, comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. d. Jud. pp. 368, 369, and notes *a, b*, and *d*; and Ritus des Synag. Gottesd. pp. 2 and 3.

We are now in the Nazareth Synagogue. The officials are all assembled. The lowest of these is the *Chazzan*, or minister,⁴⁷ 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 (ἄρχοντες), whose chief is the *Archisynagogos*, or *Rosh ha-Keneseth*. These are the rulers (*Parnasim*) or shepherds (ποιμενες). There can be no question (from the inscriptions on the Jewish tombstones in Rome),⁴⁸ that the *Archisynagogos*⁴⁹ 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*.⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ Sometimes the office was held by regular teachers.⁵²

47. St. Luke iv. 20. 48. Comp. *Schürer*, Gemeind. Verfass. in Rom, pp. 27 &c.

49. In St. Mark v. 22, several *Archisynagogoi* seem to be spoken of. But the expression may only mean, as *Weiss* suggests, one of the order of the *Archisynagogoi*. The passage in Acts xiii. 15 is more difficult. Possibly it may depend upon local circumstances - the term *Archisynagogoi* including others beside the *Archisynagogoi* in the strictest sense, such as the *Gerousiarchs* of the Roman inscriptions.

50. *Schürer*, u.s., pp. 18-20. 51. Sanh. 92 *a*; Cag. 5 *b*. 52. Gitt. 60 *a*.

If, as in Rome, there was an apparently unordained eldership (*Gerousia*), it had probably only the charge of outward affairs, and acted rather as a committee of management. Indeed, in foreign Synagogues, the rulers seem to have been chosen, sometimes for a specified period, at others for life. But, although it may be admitted that the *Archisynagogos*, or chief ruler of the Synagogue, was only the first among his equals, there can be no doubt that the virtual rule of the Synagogue devolved upon him. He would have the superintendence of Divine service, and, as this was not conducted by regular officials, he would in each case determine who were to be called up to read from the Law and the Prophets, who was to conduct the prayers, and act as *Sheliach Tsibbur*, or messenger of the congregation, and who, if any, was to deliver an address. He would also see to it that nothing improper took place in the Synagogue,⁵³ 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.

53. St. Luke xiii. 14.

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,⁵⁴ the person who read in the Synagogue the portion from the Prophets, was also expected to conduct the devotions, at least in greater part.⁵⁵ 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: -

54. Megill. v. 5. 55. Part of the *Shema*, and the whole of the Eulogies.

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,⁵⁶ so arranged, as the Mishnah notes,⁵⁷ 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: -

56. Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 13-21; Numb. xv. 37-41. 57. Ber. ii. 2.

'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 fulfillst Thy faithful word to those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord of strength, and who can be compared to Thee, Who killest and makest alive, and causest salvation to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to give life to the dead. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah, Who quickenest the dead!'

III. 'Thou art Holy, and Thy name is Holy. Selah. Blessed art Thou Jehovah God, the Holy One.'

After this, such prayers were inserted as were suited to the day. And here it may be noticed that considerable latitude was allowed. For, although⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ But gradually, and especially after the insertion of the well-known prayer against the heretics or rather Christian converts (Eulogy XI.⁶¹), the present order of the eighteen Eulogies (*Amidah*) seems to have been established. Both the Jerusalem⁶² and the Babylon Talmud⁶³ contain much on this subject which is of very great interest.⁶⁴

58. According to Ber. 34 *a.* 59. Ber. 33 *a.*

60. There is even doubt, whether the exact words of at least some of the Benedictions were fixed at an early period. See *Zunz*, u. s.

61. Originally the eulogies were eighteen in number. The addition of that against the heretics would have made them nineteen. Accordingly, Eulogy xv., which prayed for the coming of the Branch of David, was joined to the previous one in order to preserve the number eighteen. *Comp. Jer. Ber. iv. 3.* It is sadly characteristic that, together with a curse upon Christian converts, the Messianic hope of Israel should thus have been pushed into the background.

62. *Jer. Ber. iv. 3 to end.* 63. *Ber. 33 a &c.*

64. For the sake of brevity, I can only here refer the reader to the passages.

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 shoulders⁶⁵ (in the Temple above the head). This was called the lifting up of hands.⁶⁶ In the Synagogue the priestly blessing was spoken in three sections, the people each time responding by an Amen.⁶⁷ Lastly, in the Synagogue, the word 'Adonai' was substituted for Jehovah.^{68 69} If no descendants of Aaron were present, the leader of the devotions repeated the usual priestly benediction.⁷⁰ After the benediction followed the last Eulogy, which, in its abbreviated form (as presently used in the Evening Service), is as follows:

65. Sot. vii. 6. 66. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 8. 67. Sot. 37 b 38 a.

68. Siphre on Numb. par. 39, p. 12 a.

69. Minor differences need not here be detailed, especially as they are by no means certain.

70. Numb. vi. 23-26.

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,⁷¹ 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.⁷² 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.⁷³ According to the Jerusalem Talmud,⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ 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.

71. Chag. 16 a.

72. It seems also to have been the rule, that they must wash their hands before pronouncing the benediction (Sot. 39 a).

73. Megill. 24.

74. Jer. Gitt. v. 9. p 47 b; comp *Duschak*. Jüd. Kultus, p. 270.

75. The question is discussed: first, who blessed the priests? and, secondly, what part God had in that benediction? The answer will readily be guessed (Chull. 49 a). In Siphre on Numbers, par. 43, the words are quoted (Numb. vi. 27) to show that the blessing came from God, and not from, although, through, the priests. In Bemidb. R. 11 ed. Warsh. iv. p. 40 a there is a beautiful prayer, in which Israel declares that it only needs the blessing of God, according to Deut. xxvi. 15, on which the answer comes, that although the priests bring the benediction, it is God Who stands and blesses His people. Accordingly, the benediction of the priests is only the symbol of God's blessing.

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.⁷⁶ No doubt, there was even in ancient times a lectionary, though certainly not that presently in use, which occupies exactly a year.⁷⁷ On the contrary, the Palestinian lectionary occupied three⁷⁸ or, according to some, three and a half years,⁷⁹ 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.^{80 81} According to the Talmud,⁸² a descendant of Aaron was always called up first to the reading;⁸³ then followed a Levite, and afterwards five ordinary Israelites. As this practice, as well as that of priestly benediction,⁸⁴ 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.

76. For these different numbers very curious symbolical reasons are assigned (Megill. 23 a.)

77. This division seems to have originated in Babylon. Comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. pp. 3, 4.

78. Meg. 29 b. 79. Jer. Shabb. xvi. 1; Sopher. xvi. 10. 80. Comp. Megill. 31 b.

81. Comp. *Duschak*, Gesch. des jüd. Cultus, pp. 251-258. 82. Gitt. 59 b.

83. Some of the leading Rabbis resisted this practice, and declared that a Rabbi who yielded to it deserved death (Megill. 28 a; comp. Megill. 22 a. See generally *Duschak*, u. s. p. 255.).

84. Every descendant of Aaron in the Synagogue is bound to join in the act of benediction, on pain of forfeiture of the blessing on himself, according to Gen. xii. 3. Otherwise he transgresses three commands, contained in Numb. vi. 27 (Sot. 38 b). The present mode of dividing the fingers when pronouncing the blessing is justified by an appeal to Cant. ii. 9 (Bemidb. R. 11), although no doubt the origin of the practice is mystical.

Upon the Law followed a section from the Prophets,⁸⁵ the so-called *Haphtarah*.⁸⁶ 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,⁸⁷ 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,⁸⁸ and translated into the Aramaean verse by verse, and in the section from the Prophets, or *Haphtarah*, after every three verses.⁸⁹ 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.

85. The reasons commonly assigned for it are unhistorical. Comp. '[Sketches of Jewish Life.](#)' p. 278. The term Haphtarah, or rather *Aphtarah* and *Aphtarta* is derived from *patar*, to dismiss - either, like the Latin *Missa*, because it ended the general service, or else because the valedictory discourse, called *Aphtarah*, was connected with it.

86. In a few places in Babylon (Shabb. 116 *b*), lessons from the Hagiographa were read at afternoon services. Besides, on Purim the whole Book of Esther was read.

87. Megill. iv. 4. 88. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 27, 28. 89. Megill. 24 *a*.

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.⁹⁰ That was reserved for the *rule* of the congregation, whether in legislation or administration, doctrine or discipline.

90. At a later period, however, ordination seems to have been required for preaching. By a curious Rabbinic exegesis, the first clause of Prov. vii. 26 was applied to those who preached without ordination, and the second clause to those who were ordained and did not preach (Sot. 22 *a*).

The only points required in the preacher were the necessary qualifications, both mental and moral.⁹¹ When a great Rabbi employed a *Methurgeman* to explain to the people his sermon, he would, of course, select him for the purpose. Such an interpreter was also called *Amora*, or speaker. Perhaps the Rabbi would whisper to him his remarks, while he would repeat them aloud; or else he would only condescend to give hints, which the *Amora* would amplify; or he would speak in Hebrew, and the *Amora* translate it into Aramaean, Greek, Latin, or whatever the language of the people might be, for the sermon must reach the people in the vulgar tongue. The *Amora* would also, at the close of the sermon, answer questions or meet objections. If the preacher was a *very* great man, he would, perhaps, not condescend to communicate with the *Amora* directly, but employ one

of his students as a middleman. This was also the practice when the preacher was in mourning for a very near relative - for so important was his office that it must not be interrupted, even by the sorrows or the religious obligations of 'mourning.'⁹²

91. Thus, we have a saying of the first century 'You preach beautifully, but you do not practice beautifully' (Chag. 14 *b*; Yebam. 63 *b*.)

92. Moed K 21 *a*.

Indeed, Jewish tradition uses the most extravagant terms to extol the institution of preaching. To say that it glorified God, and brought men back, or at least nearer to Him, or that it quenched the soul's thirst, was as nothing. The little city, weak and besieged, but delivered by the wise man in it,⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ The Targum Jonathan assumes the practice in the time of the Judges;⁹⁶ the men of the Great Synagogue are, of course, credited with it, and Shemayah and Abhtalyon are expressly designated as 'preachers.'⁹⁷ 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*⁹⁸ and *Philo*.⁹⁹ 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,¹⁰⁰ 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.

93. Eccl. ix. 15. 94. Ab. de R. Nath. 4. 95. Meg. 4 *a*.

96. Targum on Judg. v. 2, 9. 97. *Darshanin*, Pes. 70 *b*. 98. Ag. Ap. ii. 18.

99. In Flacc., ed. Fref., p. 972; de Vita Mos. p. 688; Leg. ad Caj. pp. 1014, 1035.

100. For ex. Pes. 53 *b*.

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.¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³ 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.'¹⁰⁴ However, more unworthy motives sometimes influenced some of the audience, and a Talmudic passage¹⁰⁵ traces the cause of many fasts to the meetings of the two sexes on such occasions.

101. In Sot. 40 *a* we have an account of how a popular preacher comforted his deserted brother theologian by the following parable: 'Two men met in a city, the one to sell jewels and precious things, the other toys, tinsel, and trifles. Then all the people ran to the latter shop, because they did not understand the wares of the former.' A curious instance of popular wit is the following: It was expected that a person lately ordained should deliver a discourse before the people. The time came, but the *Methurgeman* in vain bent his ear closer and closer. It was evident that the new preacher had nothing to say. On which the *Methurgeman* quoted Habak. ii. 19: 'Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise, it shall teach!' (Sanh. 7 *b*). It was probably on account of such scenes, that the Nasi was not allowed afterwards to ordain without the consent of the Sanhedrin.

102. Succ. 51 *b*. 103. Ber. 6 *b*. 104. Ber. 6 *b*. 105. Kidd. 81 *a*.

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,¹⁰⁶ 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.^{107 108} 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*.¹⁰⁹ 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.¹¹⁰ But this, or the full discussion of a single text¹¹¹ (ξροθ, 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,¹¹² but in illustration of Scripture.¹¹³ 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.¹¹⁴

106. Taan. 16 *a*. See *Duschak*, u. s. p. 285.

107. Yalkut ii. p. 43 *a*, beginning.

108. In connection with this the proverb quoted in the New Testament is thus used by Rabbi Tarphon: 'I wonder whether anyone at present would accept reproof. If you said, Remove the mote from thine eye, he would immediately reply, First remove the beam out of thine own eye' (*Arach. 16 b*). May this not indicate how very widely the sayings of Christ had spread among the people?

109. Even the celebrated R. Eliezer had the misfortune that, at a festival, his hearers one by one stole out during the sermon (*Bez. 15 b*). On the other hand, it is said of R. Akiba, although his success as a preacher was very varied, that his application to Israel of the sufferings of Job and of his final deliverance moved his hearers to tears (*Ber. R. 33*).

110. Comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. pp. 101-106, 351.

111. See *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. p. 352, Note *b*.

112. As in *Ber. R. 14*. 113. *Shem. R. 15*.

114. Thus, in Tanch. on Ex. xxii. 24 (ed. Wash. p. 105 *a* and *b*, sect. 15, towards the end), the expression in Deut. xv. 7, 'Meachikha,' from thy brother, is rendered 'מִן אַחִיקָה,' not thy brother. Similarly, in the *Pesiqta*, the statement in Gen. xxii. 7, 8, 'God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering,' is paraphrased. 'And if not a *Seh* (lamb) for a burnt-offering, my son, σὲ (thee) for a burnt offering.' It is added, 'se leolah is Greek, meaning, thou art the burnt-offering.' But the Greek in the former passage is also explained by rendering the 'achikha' as an Aramaic form of εοικα, in which case it would targumically mean 'Withhold not thy hand from the poor, who is like to thee.' Comp. the interesting tractate of *Brüll* (*Fremdspr. Redens.* p. 21). A play upon Greek words is also supposed to occur in the Midrash on Cant. ii. 9, where the word 'dodi,' by omitting the second *d*, and transposing the *yod* and the *vav*, is made into the Greek διος divine. But I confess I do not feel quite sure about this, although it has the countenance of *Levy*. In the Midrash on Cant. ii. 15, a whole Greek sentence is inserted, only Aramaically written. See also *Sachs*, Beitr. pp. 19 &c.

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.¹¹⁵

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.'

115. Thus, when on one occasion the hearers of Akiba were going to sleep during his sermon, he called out: 'Why was Esther Queen in Persia over 127 provinces? Answer: She was a descendant of Sarah, who lived 127 years' (Ber. R. 58). On a similar occasion R. Jehudah startled the sleepers by the question: 'One woman in Egypt bore 600,000 men in one birth.' One of his hearers immediately replied to the question, who she was: 'It was Jochebed, who bore Moses, who is reckoned equal to all the 600,000 of Israel' (Midr. Shir haSh. R., ed. Warsh., p. 11 *b*, towards the end, on Cant. i. 15).

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*^{116 117} who, as he stood beside the Rabbi, thought far more of attracting attention and applause to himself, than of benefitting his hearers. Hence some Rabbis would only employ special and trusted interpreters of their own, who were above fifty years of age.¹¹⁸ 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.

116. Midr. on Eccl. vii. 5; ix. 17 *b*.

117. In both these passages 'the fools' are explained to refer to the *Methurgeman*.

118. Chag. 14 *a*.

But it is certainly not the human aspect alone which here claims our attention. The perplexed inquiry: 'Whence hath this man this wisdom and this knowledge?' must find another answer than the men of Nazareth could suggest, although to those in our days also who deny His Divine character, this must ever seem an unanswered and unanswerable question.

Chapter 11
THE FIRST GALILEAN MINISTRY.
(St. Matthew 4:13-17; St. Mark 1:14,15; St. Luke 4:15-32.)

The visit to Nazareth was in many respects decisive. It presented by anticipation an epitome of the history of the Christ. He came to His own, and His own received Him not. The first time He taught in the Synagogue, as the first time He taught in the Temple, they cast Him out. On the one and the other occasion, they questioned His authority, and they asked for a 'sign.' In both instances, the power which they challenged was, indeed, claimed by Christ, but its display, in the manner which they expected, refused. The analogy seems to extend even farther - and if a misrepresentation of what Jesus had said when purifying the Temple formed the ground of the final false charge against Him,¹ 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.'²

1. St. Matt. xxvi. 60, 61. 2. St. Matt. xxvi. 40-42.

It is difficult to understand how, either on historical grounds, or after study of the character of Christ, the idea could have arisen³ 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.

3. And yet most commentators - following, I suppose, the lead of *Meyer* - hold that Christ had 'stood up' in the sense of offering or claiming to read.

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,⁴ and that it included the passage⁵ quoted by the Evangelist as read by the Lord Jesus.⁶ We know that the 'rolls' on which the Law was written were distinct from those of the Prophets;⁷ 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*,⁸ and that, 'when He had unrolled the book,' He 'found' the place from which the Evangelist makes quotation.

4. Although we cannot feel quite sure of this. 5. Is. lxi. 1, 2.

6. St. Luke iv. 18, 19. 7. Baba B. 13 b.

8. I infer this from the fact, that the Book of the Prophet Isaiah was *given* to Him by the Minister of the Synagogue. Since the time of *Bengel* it has been a kind of traditional idea that, if this was the *Haphtarah* for the day, the sermon of Christ in Nazareth must have taken place on the Day of Atonement, for which in the modern Jewish lectionary Is. lviii. 6 forms part of the *Haphtarah*. There are, however, two objections to this view: 1. Our modern lectionary of *Haphtarahs* is certainly *not* the same as that in the time of Christ. 2. Even in our modern lectionary, Is. lxi. 1, 2 forms *no* part of the *Haphtarah*, either for the Day of Atonement, nor for any other Sabbath or festive day. In the modern lectionary Is. lvii. 14 to Is. lviii. 14 is the *Haphtarah* for the Day of Atonement.

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,⁹ the *Haphtarah* ordinarily consisted of not less than twenty-one verses,¹⁰ 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. 6,¹¹ 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 alterations¹²) from the

rendering of the LXX. But, on investigation, it appears that one clause is omitted from Is. lxi. 1,¹³ 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. 6.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.

9. Massech. Soph. xii. 7.

10. This symbolically: 7 x 3, since each of the seven readers in the Law had to read at least three verses.

11. 'To set at liberty those that are bruised.' The words are taken, with but a slight necessary alteration in the verb, from the LXX. rendering of Is. lviii. 6. The clause from Is. lxi. 2 is: 'To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.'

12. *Preaching* instead of *proclaiming*, in Is. lxi. 2, and in the form of the verb in the clause from Is. lviii. 6. Besides, the insertion of the clause: 'to heal the broken-hearted,' is spurious.

13. All the best MSS. omit the words, 'To heal the broken-hearted.'

14. See above, Note 2.

15. See the remarks on this point in the previous chapter. If I rightly understand the somewhat obscure language of *Surenhusius* (*Biblos Katallages*, pp. 339-345), such is also the view of that learned writer. This peculiarly Jewish method of Scriptural quotation by 'stringing together' is employed by St. Paul in Rom. iii. 10-18.

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,¹⁶ in which mention of the Holy Ghost was connected with the promised redemption.¹⁷ 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.

16. The other two being Is. xxxii. 14, 15, and Lament. iii. 50.

17. See the Appendix on the Messianic passages.

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 awakened, only to be more than satisfied. It was another sphere, another life. Truly, the anointing of the Holy Ghost was on the Preacher, from Whose lips dropped these 'words of grace.' And if such was the announcement of the Year of God's Jubilee, what blessings must it bear in its bosom!

The discourse had been spoken, and the breathless silence with which, even according to Jewish custom, it had been listened to,¹⁸ 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 long 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.

18. See the previous chapter. It was the universal rule to listen to the sermon in perfect silence (Pes. 110 *a*; Moed K. *a*). The questions and objections commenced afterwards.

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.'¹⁹ 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;²⁰ 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.²¹

19. The proverb really is: 'Physician, heal thine own lameness' (Ber. R. 23, ed. Warsh. p. 45 b).

20. St. John iv. 44.

21. The statement that the famine in the time of Elijah lasted three and a half years is in accordance with universal Jewish tradition. Comp. Yalkut on 1 Kings xvi., vol. ii. p. 32 b.

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.²² This, with the unspoken intention of crowding Him over the cliff,²³ which there rises abruptly about forty feet out of the valley beneath.²⁴ If we are correct in indicating the locality, the road here bifurcates,²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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.²⁷

22. See Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 363. But surely it could not have been the south-western corner (Conder, Tent-Work, i. p. 140, and all later writers).

23. The provision, which awarded instant death without formal trial in case of open blasphemy or profanation (Sanh. 81 *b*), would not apply in this instance. Probably the purpose was, that the crowd around should, as it were accidentally, push Him over the cliff.

24. The spot is just above the Maronite Church.

25. See the plan of Nazareth in *Bädeker's (Socin's) Palästina*, p. 255. The road to the left goes westward, that through the northern part of the town, towards Capernaum. Our localisation gains in probability, if the ancient Synagogue stood where tradition places it. At present it is in the hands of the Maronites.

26. The circumstance that the Nazarenes did not avow the purpose of casting Him over the cliff, but intended accidentally to crowd Him over, explains how, when He turned sharply round to the right, and passed through the crowd, they did not follow Him.

27. Many, even orthodox commentators, hold that this history is the same as that related in St. Matt. xiii. 54-58, and St. Mark vi. 1-6. But, for the reasons about to be stated, I have come, although somewhat hesitatingly, to the conclusion, that the narrative of St. Luke and those of St. Matthew and St. Mark refer to different events. 1. The narrative in St. Luke (which we shall call A) refers to the commencement of Christ's Ministry, while those of St. Matthew and St. Mark (which we shall call B) are placed at a later period. Nor does it seem likely, that our Lord would have entirely abandoned Nazareth after one rejection. 2. In narrative A, Christ is without disciples; in narrative B He is accompanied by them. 3. In narrative A no miracles are recorded - in fact, His words about Elijah and Elisha preclude any idea of them; while in narrative B there are a few, though not many. 4. In narrative A He is thrust out of the city immediately after His sermon, while narrative B implies, that He continued for some time in Nazareth, only wondering at their unbelief.

If it be objected, that Jesus could scarcely have returned to Nazareth after the attempt on His life, we must bear in mind that this purpose had not been avowed, and that His growing fame during the intervening period may have rendered such a return not only possible, but even advisable.

The coincidences as regards our Lord's statement about the Prophet, and their objection as to His being the carpenter's son, are only natural in the circumstances.

Cast out of His own city, Jesus pursued His solitary way towards Capernaum.²⁸ 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.²⁹ Here He would, on the Sabbath-days, preach in that Synagogue, of which the good centurion was the builder,³⁰ and Jairus the chief ruler.³¹ 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.

28. Probably resting in the immediate neighbourhood of Nazareth, and pursuing His journey next day, when the Sabbath was past.

29. St. Matt. ix. 1. 30. St. Luke vii. 5. 31. St. Mark v. 22.

From the character of the narrative, and still more from the later call of these four,³² 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.

32. St. Matt. iv. 18, 22, and parallels.

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.³³ 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.

33. St. Matt. iv. 13-17.

There was a dim tradition in the Synagogue, that this prediction,³⁴ '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.'³⁵ Others³⁶ 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,³⁷ 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:³⁸ 'To them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up.'

34. Is. ix. 2. 35. Tanch. on Gen. vi. 9; ed. Warsh. p. 11 *b*.

36. See *Mikraoth Gedoloth* on the passage.

37. The words, 'That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias,' do not bear the meaning, that this was their primary and literal purpose. They represent a frequent mode of citation among Jewish writers, indicating a *real* fulfillment of the spirit, though not always of the letter, of a prophecy. On this subject see also *Surenhusius*, u. s., p. 218, and his admirable exposition of the Jewish formula ρμ)ν# ημ Μψψθλ ('that it might be fulfilled which was spoken'), u. s., pp. 2-4.

38. St. Matt. ix. 16.

Chapter 12

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

(St. John v.)

The shorter days of early autumn had come,¹ 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.² 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.

1. Both *Godet* and Prof. *Westcott* (the latter more fully) have pointed out the distinction between μετὰ ταῦτα (literally: 'after those things - as in St. John v. 1'), and μετὰ τοῦτο. The former does not indicate immediate succession of time.

2. For a full discussion of the question see vol. ii. App. XV. pp. 765, 766; for the 'Feast of Wood-offering,' ['The Temple and its Services, &c.'](#) pp. 295, 296.

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.^{3 4} Others⁵ 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.

3. *Wetstein.*

4. The reader will have no difficulty in finding not a few points in St. John v. utterly irreconcilable with the theory of a second century Ephesian Gospel. It would take too much space to particularise them.

5. So *Gess*, *Godet*, and others.

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.⁶

6. Even *Strauss* admits, that the discourse contains nothing which *might* not have been spoken by Christ. His objection to its authenticity, on the ground of the analogies to it in certain portions of the Fourth Gospel and of the Epistles of St. John, is a curious instance of critical argumentation (*Leben Jesu*, i. p. 646).

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.'⁷ 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.⁸ In that case, most probability would attach to the identification of the Pool Bethesda with a pool somewhat north of the so-called *Birket Israïl*. At present it is wholly filled with rubbish, but in the time of the Crusaders it seems to have borne the name of the Sheep-pond, and, it was thought, traces of the five porches could still be detected. Be this as it may, it certainly bore in the 'Hebrew' - or rather Aramaean - 'tongue,' the name *Bethesda*. No doubt this name was designative, though the common explanations - *Beth Chisda* (so most modern writers, and *Watkins*) 'House of Mercy' (?), *Beth Istebha* (ὀβελῶν:σ:)ι, *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 ἰασθαί - or something akin to the Rabbinic *Zit*⁹ (+ψζ=ζηθι). 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 ζεω, 'to boil' or 'bubble up' (subst. ζεσις); 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.

7. Neh. iii. 1, 32; xii. 39. 8. Comp. specially *Riehm's Handwörterb. ad voc.*

9. Said when people sneezed, like '*Prosit!*'

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,¹⁰ 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.¹¹ But the words in verse 4 of our Authorised Version, and perhaps, also, the last clause of verse 3, are admittedly an interpolation.¹²

10. Indeed, belief in 'holy wells' seems to have been very common in ancient times. From the cuneiform inscriptions it appears to have been even entertained by the ancient Babylonians.

11. St. John v. 7.

12. I must here refer to the critical discussion in Canon *Westcott's* Commentary on St. John. I only wish I could without unfairness transport to these pages the results of his masterly criticism of this chapter.

In another part of this book it is explained at length,¹³ 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' (*πληθος των ασθενουντων*), 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.¹⁴

13. See the Appendix on 'Angels.'

14. Another term for 'sick' in the N. T. is *αρρωστος* (St. Matt. xiv. 14; St. Mark vi. 5, 13; xvi. 18; (comp. Eccclus. vii. 35). This corresponds to the Hebrew *הלאפז*, Mal. i. 8. In 1 Cor. xi. 30 the two words are used together, *αρρωστος* and *ασθενης*.

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,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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?¹⁷ 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!¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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?²¹ 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.²² 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.

15. St. John v. 17-47.

16. Such a logical inversion seems necessary in passing from the objective to the subjective.

17. ver. 44. 18. vv. 45-47. 19. ver. 39.

20. vv. 40-43. 21. ver. 37. 22. vv. 30-38.

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.²³

23. vv. 19-32.

Translate this into deed, as all His teachings have been, are, and will be, and we have the miraculous cure of the impotent man, with its attendant circumstances. Or, conversely, translate that deed, with its attendant circumstances, into words, and we have the discourse of our Lord. Moreover, all this is fundamental to the highest understanding of our Lord's history. And, therefore, we understand how, many years afterwards, the beloved disciple gave a place to this miracle, when, in the full ripeness of spiritual discernment, he chose for record in his Gospel from among those 'many signs,' which Jesus truly did,²⁴ 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.'²⁵

24. St. John xx. 30. 25. St. John xx. 31.

And so, understanding from what He afterwards said to 'the Jews' what He thought and felt in going thither, we are better prepared to follow the Christ to Bethesda. Two pictures must have been here simultaneously present to His mind. On the one side, a multitude whose sufferings and false expectancies rose, like the wail of the starving for bread; and, on the other side, the 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 friend²⁶ 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,²⁷ and not merely in the sense which the Jews attached to it²⁸ - 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.²⁹ 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!

26. ver. 7. 27. ver. 14. 28. Comp. St. John ix. 3.

29. This characteristic is specially marked by Canon *Westcott*.

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.^{30 31} 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.

30. ver. 13. 31. The meaning of the expression is 'retired' or 'withdrawn' Himself.

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,³² and therefore trusted in Him, that He must be right; and so, trusting without questioning, be obeyed.

32. In connection with this see ver. 24, where the expression is 'believeth Him,' not 'on Him' as in the A.V., which occasionally obliterates the difference between the two, which is so important, the one implying credit, the other its outcoming trust (comp. St. John vi. 29, 30; viii. 30, 31; 1 John v. 10).

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,³³ 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.

33. The whole subject of the Sabbath-Law will be specially discussed in a later chapter. See also Appendix XVII. on 'The Law of the Sabbath' according to the Mishnah and Talmud.

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,'³⁴ a thing infinitely worse would come to him.

34. See *Westcott* ad loc.

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.³⁵ 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.

35. ver. 17.

Once more it was not His whole meaning, but only this one point, that He claimed to be equal with God, of which they took hold. As we understand it, the discourse beginning with verse 19 is not a continuation of that which had been begun in verse 17, but was delivered on another, though probably proximate occasion. By what He had said about the Father working hitherto and His working, He had silenced the multitude, who must have felt that God's rest was truly that of beneficence, not of inactivity. But He had raised another question, that of His equality with God, and for this He was taken to task by the Masters in Israel. To them it was that He addressed that discourse which, so to speak, preached His miracle at the Pool of Bethesda. Into its details we cannot enter further than has already been done. Some of its reasonings can be clearly traced, as starting from certain fundamental positions, held in common alike by the Sanhedrists and by Christ. Others, such as probably in answer to unreported objections, we may guess at. This may also account for what may seem occasional abruptness of transitions.

But what most impresses us, is the majestic grandeur of Christ's self-consciousness in presence of His enemies, and yet withal the tone of pitying sadness which pervades His discourse. The time of the judgment of silence had not yet come. And for the present the majesty of His bearing overawed them, even as it did His enemies to the end, and Christ could pass unharmed from among them. And so ended that day in Jerusalem. And this is all that is needful for us to know of His stay at the Unknown Feast. With this inward separation, and the gathering of hostile parties closes the first and begins the second, stage of Christ's Ministry.

Chapter 13
BY THE SEA OF GALILEE
THE FINAL CALL OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES, AND THE MIRACULOUS
DRAUGHT OF FISHES
(St. Matthew 4:18-22; St. Mark 1:16-20; St. Luke 5:1-11.)

We are once again out of the stifling spiritual atmosphere of the great City, and by the glorious Lake of Galilee. They were other men, these honest, simple, earnest, impulsive Galileans, than that self-seeking, 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,¹ 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,² and they stood by the shore, or in the boats drawn up on the beach, casting in their nets to 'wash' them³ 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.

1. The accounts in the three Synoptic Gospels must be carefully pieced together. It will be seen that only thus can they be understood. The narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark are almost literally the same, only adding in St. Mark i. 20 a notice about 'the hired servants,' which is evidential of the Petrine origin of the information. St. Luke seems to have made special inquiry, and, while adopting the narrative of the others, supplements it with what without them would be almost unintelligible.

2. St. Luke v. 5.

3. St. Matt. iv. 18 &c.; St. Mark i. 16 &c. as compared with St. Luke v. 2.

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.⁴ 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;⁵ a kind of 'relish' or sauce was made of them, and the roe also prepared.⁶ or twine,⁷ 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.^{8 9} It is one of their usual

exaggerations, when we read of 300 different kinds of fish at a dinner given to a great Rabbi,¹⁰ although the common proverb had it, to denote what was abundant, that it was like 'bringing fish to Acco.'¹¹ Besides, fish was also largely imported from abroad.¹² It indicates the importance of this traffic, that one of the gates of Jerusalem was called 'the fish-gate.'¹³ Indeed, there is a legend¹⁴ to the effect, that not less than 600,000 casks of sardines were every week supplied for the fig-dressers of King Jannaus. 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.¹⁵

4. In order not to impede navigation, it was forbidden to fix nets. For these two ordinances, see Baba K. 80 *b*, last line &c. The reference to the fishing in the lake is in 81 *b*. But see Tos. Baba K. viii. 17, 18.

5. St. Matt. vii. 10; xiii. 47; xv. 36. 6. Ab. Z. 39 *a*.

7. Bab. Mez ii. 1. 8. Moed K. 11 *a*, last line.

9. Three lines before that we read this saying of a fisherman: 'Roast fish with his brother (salt), lay it beside his father (water), eat it with his son (fish-juice), and drink upon it his father' (water).

10. Jer. Sheq. vi. 2, p. 50 *a*. 11. Shem. R. 9.

12. Specially from Egypt and Spain, Machsh. vi. 3.

13. Neh. iii. 3. 14. Ber. 44 *a*. 15. Jer. Ab. Z. ii. 10, p. 42 *a*.

These notices, which might be largely multiplied, are of more than antiquarian interest. They give a more vivid idea of life by the Lake of Galilee, and show that those engaged in that trade, like Zebedee and his sons (ἡψαφδ:βαζι; '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.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ 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.

16. So in Erub. 30 *a.* 17. Ab. i. 1; Sanh. 91 *b.* 18. St. John i. 37 &c.

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.¹⁹ 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, Simon²⁰ 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.

19. St. Matt. iv. 20, 22.

20. The name *Peter* occurs also among the Jews, but not that of *Paul*. Thus, in *Pesiqta* (ed. *Buber*, p. 158 *a*, line 8 from bottom, see also the Note there) we read of a R. José the son of Peytros, and similarly in the fragments from Tanchuma in *Jellinek's Beth ha-Midr.* vol. vi. p. 95, where, however, he is called *Ben Petio*. In *Menor. Hamm.* the name is changed into *Phinehas*. *Comp. Jellinek, Beth ha-Midr.* vol. vi. Pref. xi.

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.'²¹

21. We would call special attention to the arrangement of this narrative. The explanation given in the text will, it is hoped, be sufficient answer to the difficulties raised by some commentators. *Strauss'* attempt to indicate the mythic origin of this narrative forms one of the weakest parts of his book. *Keim* holds the genuineness of the account of the two first Evangelists, but rejects that of the third, on grounds which neither admit nor require detailed examination. The latest and most curious idea of the Tübingen school has been, to see in the account of St. Luke a reflection on Peter as Judaistically cramped, and to understand the beckoning to his partners as implying the calling in of Pauline teachers.

Chapter 14

A SABBATH IN CAPERNAUM

(St. Matthew 8:14-17; St. Mark 1:21-34; St. Luke 4:33-41.)

It was the Holy Sabbath - the first after He had called around Him His first permanent disciples; the first, also, after His return from the Feast at Jerusalem. Of both we can trace indications in the account of that morning, noon, and evening which the Evangelists furnish. The greater detail with which St. Mark, who wrote under the influence of St. Peter, tells these events, shows the freshness and vividness of impression on the mind of Peter of those early days of his new life. As indicating that what is here recorded took place immediately after the return of Jesus from Jerusalem, we mark, that as yet there were no watchful enemies in waiting to entrap Him in such breach of the Law, as might furnish ground for judicial procedure. But, from their presence and activity so soon afterwards,¹ we infer, that the authorities of Jerusalem had sent some of their familiars to track His steps in Galilee.

1. St. Luke v. 21; vi.2; vi. 7.

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.² 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*.³ And when we find the same word to describe the impression of the 'Sermon on the Mount,'⁴ 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.

2. The accounts of this given by St. Mark and St. Luke chronologically precede what is related in St. Matt. viii. 14-17. The reader is requested in each case to peruse the Biblical narratives before, or along with their commentation in the chapters of the present work.

3. The following are the passages in which the same term is used: St. Matt. vii. 28; xiii. 54; xix. 25; xxii. 33; St. Mark i. 22; vi. 2; vii. 37; x. 26; xi. 18; St. Luke ii. 48; iv. 32; ix. 43; Acts xiii. 12.

4. St. Matt. vii. 28.

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,⁵ 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.'⁶ 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, 21.⁷ 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.

5. Comp. *Delitzsch* in *Riehm's Hand-wörterbuch*.

6. The word 'spirit' or 'spirits' occurs *twice* in St. Matthew, *thrice* in St. Mark and *twice* in St. Luke; with the addition 'evil,' *twice* in St. Luke; with that of 'unclean,' *once* in St. Matthew, *eleven* times in St. Mark, and *four* times in St. Luke. The word δαίμων in singular or plural occurs once in each of the Synoptists; while δαίμονιον, in singular or plural, occurs nine times in St. Matthew, three times in St. Mark, fourteen times in St. Luke, and six times in St. John. The expression 'the spirit of an unclean demon' occurs once in the St. Luke, while the verb 'to be demonised' occurs, in one form or another, seven times in St. Matthew, four times in St. Mark, once in St. Luke, and once in St. John. Comp. also the careful *brochure* of Pastor Nanz, Die Besessenen im N.T., although we differ from his conclusions.

7. Comp. also *Weiss*, *Leben Jesu* i. p. 457.

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,'⁸ and that, when the disciples afterwards reported their success in this, Christ actually made it a matter of thanksgiving to God.⁹ The same view underlies His reproof to the disciples, when failing in this part of their work;¹⁰ 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.'¹¹

8. St. Matt. x. 8. 9. St. Luke x. 17, 18.

10. St. Matt. xvii. 21; comp. also xii. 43 &c., also spoken to the disciples.

11. This is also the conclusion arrived at by *Weiss*, u. s.

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.¹² 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,¹³ or in the Apocrypha,¹⁴ nor, for that matter in the Mishnah,¹⁵ 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*.¹⁶ The references in heathen or in Christian writings posterior to those of the New Testament lie beyond our present inquiry.¹⁷

12. The nearest approach to it, so far as I am aware, occurs in Pirqé de R. El. c. 13 (ed. Lemberg, p. 16 *b*, 17 *a*), where the influence of Satan over the serpent (in the history of the Fall) is likened to that of an evil spirit over a man, all whose deeds and words are done under the influence of the demon, so that he only acts at his bidding.

13. Surely *Strauss* (Leben Jesu, ii. 10) could not have remembered the expressions in 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15, &c., when he sees a parallel to demoniacal possessions in the case of Saul.

14. Tob. viii. 2, 3, is *not* a case in point.

15. *Gfrörer* (Jahrh. d. Heils, i. p. 410, 412) quotes Erub. iv. 1 and Gitt. vii. 1; but neither of these passages implies anything like demoniac possession.

16. See, for example, Ant vi. 8. 2; 11. 3; viii. 2. 5; War vii. 6. 3.

17. The reader will find full references in the Encyclopædias, in *Wetstein* (Nov. Test. i. pp. 279-284), and in *Nanz's* brochure.

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.¹⁸ 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 demonised were set free. This was always the same. It consisted neither in magical means formulas of exorcism, but always in the Word of Power which Jesus spake, or entrusted to His disciples, and which the demons always obeyed. There is here not only difference, but contrariety in comparison with the current Jewish notions, and it leads to the conclusion that there was the same contrast in His views, as in His treatment of the 'demonised.'

18. See Appendix XVI.: 'Jewish Views about Demons and 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 appportion, 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'¹⁹ 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?'²⁰ Thou art come to destroy us!²¹ 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.

19. In St. Mark i. 23.

20. I have omitted, on critical grounds, the clause, 'Let us alone.' The expression, 'What between us and Thee, Jesu Nazarene,' contains a well-known Hebraism.

21. This seems the more correct rendering.

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 gagged²² 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.

22. This is the real meaning of the expression rendered, 'Hold thy peace.' It stills the raging of the powers of evil just as, characteristically, it is again employed in the stilling of the storm, St. Mark iv. 39.

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.²³ 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.'²⁴ 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.

23. The Greek term implies this. Besides its use in this narrative (St. Mark i. 27; St. Luke iv. 36, in the latter in the substantive form), it occurs in St. Mark x. 24, 32; Acts ix. 6; and as a substantive in Acts iii. 10.

24. This seems the better rendering.

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,'²⁵ 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 ()τρψμχ)τ#, *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.²⁶ 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 rebuked²⁷ '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*²⁸ 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!

25. Such is the meaning of the Greek word. I cannot understand, why the corresponding term in St. Luke should have been interpreted in 'The Speaker's Commentary' as 'typhoid fever.'

26. Shabb. 37 a. 27. The word is the same in both cases.

28. The term is the same. See the remarks of *Volkmar* (Marcus, pp. 99, 100).

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.²⁹ 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 Restorer of what sin had blighted; the Joy in our world's deep sorrow. Never was prophecy more truly fulfilled than, on that evening, this of Isaiah: 'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.'³⁰ 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.³¹

29. Gen. xxii. 17, 18. 30. Is. liii.

31. I can scarcely find words strong enough to express my dissent from those who would limit Is. liii. 4, either on the one hand to spiritual, or on the other to physical 'sicknesses.' The promise is one of future deliverance from both, of a Restorer from all the woe which sin had brought. In the same way the expression 'taking upon Himself,' and 'bearing' refers to the Christ as our Deliverer, because our Substitute. Because He took upon Himself our infirmities, therefore He bore our sicknesses. That the view here given is that of the N.T., appears from a comparison of the application of the passage in St. Matt. viii. 17 with that in St. John i. 29 and 1 Pet. ii. 24. The words, as given by St. Matthew, are most truly a N.T. 'Targum' of the original. The LXX. renders, 'This man carries our sins and is pained for us;' *Symmachus*, 'Surely He took up our sins, and endured our labors;' the Targum Jon., 'Thus for our sins He will pray, and our iniquities will for His sake be forgiven.' (Comp. *Driver* and *Neubauer*, *The Jewish Interpreters on Isaiah liii.*, vol. ii.) Lastly, it is with reference to this passage that the Messiah bears in the Talmud the designation, 'The Leprous One,' and 'the Sick One' (*Sanh. 98 b*).

So ended that Sabbath in Capernaum: a Sabbath of healing, joy, and true rest. But far and wide, into every place of the country around, throughout all the region of Galilee, spread the tidings, and with them the fame of Him Whom demons must obey, though they dare not pronounce Him the Son of God. And on men's ears fell His Name with sweet softness of infinite promise, 'like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth.'

Chapter 15
SECOND JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE
THE HEALING OF THE LEPER
(St. Matthew 4:23, 8:2-4; St. Mark 1:35-45; St. Luke 4:42-44, 5:12-16.)

A DAY and an evening such as of that Sabbath of healing in Capernaum must, with reverence be it written, have been followed by what opens the next section.¹ 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,² and bade His Apostles look for higher and better things than power over all diseases or even over evil spirits.^{3 4} So would not the Messiah of Jewish legend have spoken or done; nor would they who invented such miracles have so referred to them.

1. So both in St. Mark (i. 35-39) and in St. Luke (iv. 42-44), and in substantial accord even in St. Matthew (iv. 23).

2. St. Mark vii. 34. 3. St. Luke x. 17-20. 4. So also St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 31:xiii. 1.

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,'⁵ Jesus rose up, and went into a solitary place to pray. The use of the same expression⁶ 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 Galilee⁷ - 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,⁸ 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!

5. St. Mark i. 35. 6. πρωτ. 7. The circumstances will be referred to in the sequel.

8. The expression in St. Luke iv. 43 shows, that the 'coming forth' (St. Mark i. 38) cannot be limited to His leaving Capernaum.

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.⁹ 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,¹⁰ 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,'¹¹ 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.

9. The following are, briefly, some of the considerations which determine the chronological order here adopted: (1.) This event could not have taken place *after* the Sermon on the Mount, since then the twelve Apostles were already called, nor yet after the call of St. Matthew. (2) From the similes employed (about the lilies of the field, &c.), the Sermon on the Mount seems to have taken place in spring; this event in early autumn. On the other hand, the order in St. Mark exactly fits in, and also in the main agrees, with that in St. Luke, while, lastly, it exhibits the growing persecutions from Jerusalem, of which we have here the first traces.

10. This is ingeniously indicated in Professor *Delitzsch's* *Entsteh. d. Kanon. Evang.*, although, in my view, the theory cannot be carried out in the full details attempted by the Professor. But such a general conception of the Gospel by St. Matthew is not only reasonable in itself, but explains his peculiar arrangement of events.

11. On the date of this feast comp. Appendix XV.

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,¹² and the lower part of his face and his upper lip covered,¹³ 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,¹⁴ and forebade their entering not only the Temple or Jerusalem, but any walled city,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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,¹⁷ since, evidently, infection would have been most likely to spread in such circumstances.¹⁸

12. From this women were excepted, Sot. iii. 8. 13. Lev. xiii. 45.

14. They were not allowed to hold intercourse with persons under other defilement than leprosy, Pes. 67 a.

15. These were considered as walled since the time of Joshua, Kel. i. 7, and their sanctity equal to that of the camp of Israel, and greater than that of unwalled towns.

16. Neg. iii. 1; vii. 1; xi. 1; xii 1. 17. Neg. iii. 2.

18. The following parts are declared in the Mishnah as untainted by leprosy: within the eye, ear, nose, and mouth; the folds of the skin, especially those of the neck; under the female breast; the armpit; the sole of the foot, the nails, the head, and the beard (Neg. vi. 8).

It has already been stated, that Rabbinism confessed itself powerless in presence of this living death. Although, as *Michaelis* rightly suggests,¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹ *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 refuted²² - that the poor sufferer only asked of Jesus to *declare*, not to *make*, him clean.²³ 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,²⁴ 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. 4.²⁵
26

19. Das Mos. Recht, vol. iv. p. 195.

20. *Michaelis* views the whole question chiefly from the standpoint of sanitary police.

21. It is, though I think hesitatingly, propounded by *Strauss* (vol. ii. pp. 56, 57). He has been satisfactorily answered by *Volkmar* (Marcus, p. 110).

22. u. s. pp. 53, 54.

23. Jesu von Naz. ii. p. 174. This is among the weakest portions of the book. *Keim* must have strongly felt 'the telling marks of the authenticity of this narrative,' when he was driven to an explanation which makes Jesus 'present Himself as a Scribe.'

24. Ant. iii. 11. 3. 25. Sanh. 98 b.

26. See the passage in full in the Appendix on Messianic Prophecies.

We need not here enumerate the various symptoms, by which the Rabbinic law teaches us to recognise true leprosy.²⁷ Any one capable of it might make the medical inspection, although only a descendant of Aaron could formally pronounce clean or unclean.²⁸ Once declared leprosy, the sufferer was soon made to feel the utter heartlessness of Rabbinism. To banish him outside walled towns²⁹ may have been a necessity, which, perhaps, required to be enforced by the threatened penalty of forty stripes save one.³⁰ 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.³¹ For, from the symbolism and connection between the physical and the psychical,³² 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,³³ 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' (η)μω+η ρλψ ρλω, ρλω). 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.³⁴

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.

27. These are detailed in Neg. i. 1-4; ii. 1; iii. 3-6; vii. 1; ix. 2, 3.

28. Neg. iii. 1. 29. Kel. i. 7. 30. Pes. 67. 31. Neg. xiii 12.

32. Undoubtedly the deepest and most philosophical treatment of this subject is that in the now somewhat rare, and unfortunately uncompleted, work of *Molitor*, Philosophie d. Gesch. (see vol. iii. pp. 126 &c., and 253 &c). The author is, however, perhaps too much imbued with the views of the Kabbalah.

33. According to Tos. Neg. vi. no case of leprosy of houses had ever occurred, but was only mentioned in Scripture, in order to give occasion to legal studies, so as to procure a Divine reward.

34. I have here followed, or rather summarised, *Maimonides*. It was, of course, impossible to give even the briefest details.

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,³⁵ and everything in it, to the beams of the roof.³⁶ 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;'³⁷ 'the sick is not healed, till all his sins are forgiven him.'³⁸ 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.'³⁹⁴⁰ But their real unspirituality appears most clearly, when we remember how special diseases were traced to particular sins. Thus,⁴¹ 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.⁴² And even such sentiments in regard to sufferings⁴³ are immediately followed by such cynical declarations on the part of Rabbis so afflicted, as that they loved neither the chastisement, nor its reward.⁴⁴ 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. 29.⁴⁵⁴⁶ Eleven sins are mentioned⁴⁷ which bring leprosy, among them pre-eminently those of which the tongue is the organ.⁴⁸

35. Kel. i. 1-4. 36. Neg. xiii. 11. 37. Shabb. 55 a. 38. Nedar. 41 a. 39. Ber. 33 a.

40. The story, of which this saying is the moral, is that of the crushing of a serpent by the great miracle-monger Chanina ben Dosa, without his being hurt. But I cannot help feeling that a *double entendre* is here intended - on the one hand, that even a serpent could not hurt one like Chanina, and, on the other, the wider bearing on the real cause of death: not our original state, but our actual sin.

41. Ber. 5 *b*.

42. The Midrash enumerates four as in that category: the poor, the blind, the childless, and the leprosy.

43. Ber. 5 *a*. 44. Ber. 5 *b*. 45. Bemidb. R. 13.

46. From Zech. xiv. 12 it was inferred, that this leprosy would smite the Gentiles even in the Messianic age (Tanchuma, Tazria, end).

47. Tanch. on Hammetsora 4; ed. Lemberg ii. p. 24 *a*.

48. u. s., 2, p.23 *a*; Arach. 15 *b*; and in many passages.

Still, if such had been the real views of Rabbinism one might have expected that Divine compassion would have been extended to those, who bore such heavy burden of their sins. Instead of this, their burdens were needlessly increased. True, as wrapped in mourner's garb the leper passed by, his cry 'Unclean!' was to incite others to pray for him - but also to avoid him.⁴⁹ No one was even to salute him; his bed was to be low, inclining towards the ground.⁵⁰ 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.^{51 52} 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.⁵³

49. Moed K. 50. u.s. 15 *a*.

51. Vayyik. R. 16. [Leprosy is there brought into connection with calumny].

52. And yet Jewish symbolism saw in the sufferings of Israel and the destruction of the Temple the real fulfilment of the punishment of leprosy with its attendant ordinances, while it also traced in the healing of that disease and the provisions for declaring the leper clean, a close analogy to what would happen in Israel's restoration (Vayyikra R. 15, 17; Yalkut i. par. 551, 563).

53. Moed. K 15 *a*.

We can now in some measure appreciate the contrast between Jesus and His contemporaries in His bearing towards the leper. Or, conversely, we can judge by the healing of this leper of the impression which the 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,⁵⁴ have sent the healed man away - as the term bears, 'cast him out.'⁵⁵ 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.'

54. On this term see the first note in this chapter.

55. This, however, as *Godet* has shown (Comm. on St. Luke, German transl., p. 137), does not imply that the event took place either in a house or in a town, as most commentators suppose. It is strange that the 'Speaker's Commentary,' following *Weiss*, should have located the incident in a Synagogue. It could not possibly have occurred there, unless all Jewish ordinances and customs had been reversed.

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.⁵⁶ 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.

56. The Rabbinic ordinances as to the ritual in such cases are in Neg. xiv. See ['The Temple and its Services'](#) pp. 315-317. Special attention was to be given, that the water with which the purified leper was sprinkled was from a pure, flowing spring (six different collections of water, suited to different kinds of impurity, being described in Miqv. i. 1-8). From Parah viii. 10 we gather, that among other rivers even the Jordan was not deemed sufficiently pure, because in its course other streams, which were not lawful for such purification, had mingled with it.

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.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ 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,⁵⁹ and by inciting against Him even the prejudices and doubts of the half-enlightened followers of His own Forerunner.⁶⁰ 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!

57. St. Luke v. 21. 58. St. Luke vi. 7. 59. St. Luke v. 30. 60. St. Luke v. 33.

Chapter 16
THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM
CONCERNING THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS
THE HEALING OF THE PARALYSED
(St. Matthew 9:1-8; St. Mark 2:1-12; St. Luke 5:17-26.)

It is a remarkable instance of the reserve of the Gospel-narratives, that of the second journey of Jesus in Galilee no other special event is recorded than the healing of the leper. And it seems also to indicate, that this one miracle had been so selected for a special purpose. But if, as we have suggested, after the 'Unknown Feast,' the activity of Jesus assumed a new and what, for want of a better name, may be called an anti-Judaic character, we can perceive the reason of it. The healing of leprosy was recorded as typical. With this agrees also what immediately follows. For, as Rabbinism stood confessedly powerless in face of the living death of leprosy, so it had no word of forgiveness to speak to the conscience burdened with sin, nor yet word of welcome to the sinner. But this was the inmost meaning of the two events which the Gospel-history places next to the healing of the leper: the forgiveness of sins in the case of the paralytic, and the welcome to the chief of sinners in the call of Levi-Matthew.

We are still mainly following the lead of St. Mark,¹ 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. John² 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,³ 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' (εξουσια) which the Father had given Him for Divine administration on earth,⁴ so the healing of the paralytic was to show the

Scribes that He had 'authority' (ἐξουσια)⁵ 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,'⁶ are to the very letter the same⁷ which are recorded⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.

1. The same order is followed by St. Luke. From the connection between St. Mark and St. Peter, we should naturally look for the fullest account of that early Capernaum Ministry in the Second Gospel.

2. St. John v. 3. St. Mark ii. 6, 7. 4. St. John v. 27.

5. The A. V. mars the meaning by rendering it: 'power.' 6. St. Mark ii. 9.

7. So according to the best readings. 8. In St. John v. 8.

9. St. John v. 36; comp. St. Mark ii. 10.

10. It is, of course, not pretended by negative critics that the Fourth Gospel borrowed from St. Mark. On the contrary, the supposed differences in form and spirit between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel form one of the main arguments against the authenticity of the latter. In regard to the 5th chap. of St. John, Dr. *Abbott* writes (Art. 'Gospels,' *Encycl. Brit.* p. 833 *b*): 'That part of the discourse in which Christ describes Himself in the presence of the multitude as having received all power to judge and to quicken the dead, does not resemble anything in the Synoptic narrative' - except St. Matt. xi. 27; St. Luke x. 22, and 'that was uttered privately to the disciples.' To complete the irony of criticism, Dr. *Abbott* contrasts the 'faith of the Synoptists,' such as 'that half-physical thrill of trust in the presence of Jesus. Which enables the limbs of a paralysed man to make the due physical response to the emotional shock consequent on the word "Arise," so that in the strength of that shock the paralytic is enabled to shake off the disease of many years,' with faith such as the Fourth Gospel presents it.

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,¹¹ 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 overflowing, and even to crowd out to the door and beyond it.

The general impression on our minds is, that this audience was rather in a state of indecision than of sympathy with Jesus. It included 'Pharisees and doctors of the Law,' who had come on purpose from the towns of Galilee, from 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.

11. Μψμψλ See *Wetstein* in loc.

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,¹² 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.¹³ But, on many grounds, such a *locale* seems utterly unsuited to the requirements of the narrative.¹⁴ Similar objections attach to the idea, that it was the front room of one of those low houses occupied by the poor.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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 read¹⁷ of a house as costing ten (of course, gold) dinars, which would make the price 250 silver dinars, or between 7*l.* and 8*l.* of our money. This must, however, have been 'a small house,' since the rental of such is stated to have been from 7*s.* to 28*s.* a year,¹⁸ while that of a large house is computed at about 9*l.* a year,¹⁹ and that of a courtyard at about 14*s.* a year.²⁰

12. [Sketches of Jewish Life.](#) pp. 93-96. 13. Shabb. i. 4; Jer. Sanh. 21 *b*; Jer. Pes. 30 *b*, and often.

14. Such a crowd could scarcely have assembled there - and where were those about and beyond the door?

15. This is the suggestion of Dr. *Thomson* ('The Land and the Book,' pp. 358, 359). But even he sees difficulties in it. Besides, was Christ inside the small room of such a house, and if so, how did the multitude see and hear Him? Nor can I see any reason for representing Peter as so poor. Professor *Delitzsch's* conception of the scene (in his 'Elin

Tag in Capern,) seems to me, so far as I follow it, though exceedingly beautiful, too imaginative.

16. Baba B. vi. 4. 17. In Jer. Keth. iv. 14, p. 29 *b*. 18. Tos. B. Mets. c. iv. 2.

19. u. s., c. viii. 31, ed. Z. 20. Baba Mets. v. 2.

All this is so far of present interest as it will help to show, that the house of Peter could not have been a 'small one.' We regard it as one of the better dwellings of the middle classes. In that case all the circumstances fully accord with the narrative in the Gospels. Jesus is speaking the Word, standing in the covered gallery that ran round the courtyard of such houses, and opened into the various apartments. Perhaps He was standing within the entrance of the guest-chamber, while the Scribes were sitting within that apartment, or beside Him in the gallery. The court before Him is thronged, out into the street. All are absorbedly listening to the Master, when of a sudden those appear who are bearing a paralytic on his pallet. It had of late become too common a scene to see the sick thus carried to Jesus to attract special attention. And yet one can scarcely conceive that, if the crowd had merely filled an apartment and gathered around its door, it would not have made way for the sick, or that somehow the bearers could not have come within sight, or been able to attract the attention of Christ. But with a courtyard crowded out into the street, all this would be, of course, out of the question. In such circumstances, what was to be done? Access to Jesus was simply impossible. Shall they wait till the multitude disperses, or for another and more convenient season? Only those would have acted thus who have never felt the preciousness of an opportunity, because they have never known what real need is. Inmost in the hearts of those who bore the 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,'²¹ 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.

21. *Jos*, Ant. xiii. 5. 3; Bab. Mez. 88 *a*.

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.'²² 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',²³ alike in connection with the salt which rendered the sacrifices meet for the altar,²⁴ and sufferings,²⁵ which did the like for the soul by cleansing away sin.²⁶ We can readily believe, as the recorded experience of the Rabbis shows,²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.'²⁹ 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.

22. St. Matt. ix. 2. 23. In our A. V. it is erroneously Deut. xxix. 1. 24. Lev. ii. 13.

25. Deut. xxviii. 69 *b*. 26. Ber. 5 *a*. 27. Ber. 5 *b*. 28. Nedar. 41 *a*.

29. So according to the greater number of MSS., which have the verb in the *perfect* tense.

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,³⁰ which was open and known to Him Who readeth all thoughts,³¹ 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'³² 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!

30. The expression, 'reasoning in their hearts,' corresponds *exactly* to the Rabbinic $\omega\beta\lambda\beta\ \rho\eta\rho\eta\mu$, Ber. 22 *a*. The word $\rho\eta\equiv\rho\eta$ is frequently used in contradistinction to speaking.

31. In Sanh. 93 *b* this reading of the thoughts is regarded as the fulfilment of Is. xi. 3, and as one of the marks of the Messiah, which Bar Kokhabh not possessing was killed.

32. That the expression 'Son of Man' (Mδ) vβ) was well understood as referring to the Messiah, appears from the following remarkable anti-Christian passage (Jer. Taan 65 *b*, at the bottom): 'If a man shall say to thee, I am God, he lies; if he says, I am the Son of Man, his end will be to repent it; if he says, I go up into heaven (to this applies Numb. xxiii. 19), hath he said and shall he not do it?' [or, hath he spoken, and shall he make it good?] Indeed, the whole passage, as will be seen, is an attempt to adapt. Numb. xxiii. 19 to the Christian controversy.

'And the remainder of wrath did he restrain.' As the healed man slowly rose, and, still silent, rolled up his pallet, a way was made for him between this multitude which followed him with wondering eyes. Then, as first mingled wonderment and fear fell on Israel on Mount Carmel, when the fire had leaped from heaven, devoured the sacrifice, licked up the water in the trench, and even consumed the stones of the altar, and then all fell prostrate, and the shout rose to heaven: 'Jehovah, He is the Elohim!' so now, in view of this manifestation of the Divine Presence among them. The amazement of fear fell on them in this Presence, and they glorified God, and they said: 'We have never seen it on this wise!'

Chapter 17
THE CALL OF MATTHEW
THE 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. Matthew 9:9-13; St. Mark 2:13-17; St. Luke 5:27-32; St. Matthew 10:2-4; St. Mark 3:13-19; St. Luke 6:12-19.)

In two things chiefly does the fundamental difference appear between Christianity and all other religious systems, notably Rabbinism. And in these two things, therefore, lies the main characteristic of Christ's work; or, taking a wider view, the fundamental idea of all religions. Subjectively, they concern *sin* and the *sinner*; or, to put it objectively, the forgiveness of sin and the welcome to the sinner. But Rabbinism, and every other system down to modern humanitarianism - if it rises so high in its idea of God as to reach that of sin, which is its shadow - can only generally point to God for the forgiveness of sin. What here is merely an abstraction, has become a concrete reality in Christ. He speaks forgiveness on earth, because He is its embodiment. As regards the second idea, that of the sinner, all other systems know of no welcome to him till, by some means (inward or outward), he have ceased to be a sinner and become a penitent. They would first make him a penitent, and then bid him welcome to God; Christ first welcomes him to God, and

so makes him a penitent. The one demands, the other imparts life. And so Christ is the Physician Whom they that are in health need not, but they that are sick. And so Christ came not to call the righteous but sinners - not to repentance, as our common text erroneously puts it in St. Matthew ix. 13, and St. Mark ii. 17,¹ but to Himself, to the Kingdom; and this is the beginning of repentance.

1. The words 'to repentance' are certainly spurious in St. Matt. and St. Mark. I regard theirs as the original and authentic report of the words of Christ. In St. Luke v. 32, the words 'unto repentance' do certainly occur. But, with *Godet*, I regard them as referring to 'the righteous,' and as used, in a sense ironically.

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.² 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?

2. So in all the three Gospels.

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;³ 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.'⁴ On this ground the punishment of infidelity or apostasy in the next world was endless, while that of actual transgressions was limited in duration.⁵

3. Yoma 29 a. 4. Sot. 3 a. 5. Rosh haSh. 17 a. 6. Comp. Sepher Iqqarim iv. 28.

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.⁷ 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.⁸ 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 meaning⁹ of the saying which conjoined the Law and repentance, and represented them as preceding the Creation.¹⁰ Another would seem derived from a kind of Manichaeian view of sin. According to it, God Himself was really the author of the *Yetser haRa*, or evil impulse¹¹ ('the law in our members'), for which, indeed, there was an absolute necessity, if the world was to continue.^{12 13} 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.¹⁴ Thus it came, that the true penitent really occupied a higher place, 'stood where the perfectly righteous could not stand.'¹⁵ 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,'¹⁶ 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,¹⁷ and, again, if all Israel repented for only one day;¹⁸ or, to put it otherwise - if Israel were all saints, or all sinners.¹⁹

7. Ber. 34 h. 8. Vayyik. R. 7.

9. It would be quite one-sided to represent this as the *only* meaning, as, it seems to me, Weber has done in his 'System d. altsynagog, palaest. Theol.' This, and a certain defectiveness in the treatment, are among the blemishes in this otherwise interesting and very able posthumous work.

10. Pes. 54 a; Ber. R. 1. 11. So in too many passages for enumeration.

12. Yoma 69 b; Ber. R. 9, and in many places.

13. Some of these points have already been stated. But it was necessary to repeat them so as to give a connected view.

14. Sanh. 99 a; *Maimon*. Hil. Tesh. Per. 7. 15. Sanh. 99 a; Ber. 34 b.

16. Yalkut on Ps. xxxii. p. 101 b. 17. Sanh. 98 a. 18. Sanh. 98 a; Jer. Taan. 64 a.

19. Sanh. 98 a.

We have already touched the point where, as regards repentance, as formerly in regard to forgiveness, the teaching of Christ is in absolute and fundamental contrariety to that of the Rabbis. According to Jesus Christ, when we have done all, we are to feel that we are but unprofitable servants.²⁰ 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;²¹ 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?

20. St. Luke xvii. 10.

21. So, according to Rabbinism, both in the Sepher Iqqar. and in Menor. Hammaor.

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* (ηβω#τ), 'return;' while, in the New Testament, it is 'change of mind' (μετανοια). It would not be fair here to argue, that the common expression for repenting was 'to do penitence' (ηβω#τ η#()), since by its side we frequently meet that other: 'to return in penitence' (ηβω#τβ βω#). Indeed, other terms for repentance also occur. Thus *Tohu* (ωητ) 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' ()βωψτ ηβω#τ ρ(#)) 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.²²

22. Yoma 86.

We are not now speaking of the forgiveness of sins. In truth, Rabbinism knew nothing of a forgiveness of sin, free and unconditional, unless in the case of those who had not the power of doing anything for their atonement. Even in the passage which extols most the freeness and the benefits of repentance (the last pages of the Tractate on the Day of Atonement), there is the most painful discussion about sins great and small, about repentance from fear or from love, about sins against commands or against prohibitions; and, in what cases repentance averted, or else only deferred, judgment, leaving final expiation to be wrought by other means. These were: personal sufferings,²³ death,²⁴ or the Day of Atonement.²⁵ Besides these, there were always the 'merits of the fathers';²⁶ or, perhaps, some one good work done;²⁷ or, at any rate, the brief period of purgatorial pain, which might open the gate of mercy. These are the so-called 'advocates' (Peraqlitin, Νψ+ψλθρπ) of the penitent sinner. In a classical passage on the subject,²⁸ repentance is viewed in its bearing on four different spiritual²⁹ 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.³⁰

23. Ber. 5 *a, b*; Kidd. 81 *b*. 24. Yoma u. s. 25. Yoma u. s., and many passages.

26. In almost innumerable passages. 27. Ab. Zar. 5 *a*. 28. Mechilta, 76 *a*.

29. In *Menorath Hammaor* (Ner v. 1. 1, 2) seven kinds of repentance in regard to seven different conditions are mentioned. They are repentance immediately after the commission of sin; after a course of sin, but while there is still the power of sinning; where there is no longer the occasion for sinning; where it is caused by admonition, or fear of danger; where it is caused by actual affliction; where a man is old, and unable to sin; and, lastly, repentance in prospect of death.

30. See also Yoma 86 and following.

But the nature of repentance has yet to be more fully explained. Its gate is sorrow and shame.³¹ In that sense repentance may be the work of a moment, 'as in the twinkling of an eye,³² and a life's sins may obtain mercy by the tears and prayers of a few minutes' repentance.^{33 34} 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.'³⁵ By the side of what may be called contrition, Jewish theology places *confession* (*Viddui*, ψωδψω). This was deemed so integral a part of repentance, that those about to be executed,³⁶ or to die,³⁷ were admonished to it. Achan of old had thus obtained pardon.³⁸ 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,³⁹ 'It is a good thing to confess⁴⁰ unto the Lord.'^{41 42} Manasseh, when in trouble, called upon God and was heard,⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ Similarly, even Pharaoh, who, according to Jewish tradition, made in the Red Sea confession of God,⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶

31. Ber. 12 *b*; Chag. 5 *a*. 32. Pesiqta ed. *Bub.* p. 163 *b*. 33. Ab. Zar. 17 *a*.

34. This is illustrated, among other things, by the history of a Rabbi who, at the close of a dissolute life, became a convert by repentance. The story of the occasion of his repentance is not at all nice in its realistic details, and the tears with which a self-righteous colleague saw the beatification of the penitent are painfully illustrative of the elder brother in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Ab. Z. 17 *a*).

35. Vayyik. R. 7. 36. Sanh. vi. 2. 37. Shabb. 32 *a*. 38. Sanh. u. s. 39. Ps. xcii.

40. So it would need to be rendered in this context. 41. Ber. R. 22.

42. Another beautiful allegory is that, in the fear of Adam, as the night closed in upon his guilt, God gave him two stones to rub against each other, which produced the spark of light - the rubbing of these two stones being emblematic of repentance (Pes. 54 *a*; Ber. R. 11, 12).

43. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 12, 13.

44. Debar. R. 2; ed. Warsh. p. 7 *a*; comp. Sanh. 102 *b*, last lines, and 103 *a*.

45. Ex. xv. 11. 46. Taan. 16 *a*.

But, after all, inward repentance only arrested the decrees of justice.⁴⁷ 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,⁴⁸ as an offering to God, similar to, but better than the fat of sacrifices on the altar,⁴⁹ and as preventing further sins by chastening and keeping under the body.⁵⁰ A similar view must be taken of self-inflicted penances.⁵¹ ⁵² 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.'⁵³ ⁵⁴ Nay, it must be of even more than was due in strict law.⁵⁵ 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,⁵⁶ but aim at doing all the more in the opposite direction, or of overcoming sin in the same circumstances of temptation.⁵⁷ Beyond all this were the really *good works*, whether occupation with the Law⁵⁸ or outward deeds, which constituted perfect repentance. Thus we read,⁵⁹ 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 told⁶⁰ 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.⁶¹ 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.

47. Rosh haSh. 17 *b.* 48. Baba. Mez. 85 *a.* 49. Ber. 17 *a.* 50. u. s. 51. Baba Mez. 85 *a.*

52. Baba Mez. 84 *b* (quoted by *Weber*) is scarcely an instance. The whole of that part of the Talmud is specially repugnant, from its unsavory character and grossly absurd stories. In one of the stories in Baba Mez. 85, a Rabbi tries by sitting over the fire in an oven, whether he has become impervious to the fire of Gehinnom. For thirty days he was successful, but after that it was noticed his thighs were singed, whence he was called 'the little one with the singed thighs.'

53. Tanch. Noach 4.

54. But such restitution was sometimes not insisted on, for the sake of encouraging penitents.

55. See the discussion in B. Mez. 37 *a.*

56. Rabbinism has an apt illustration of this in the saying, that all the baths of lustration would not cleanse a man, so long as he continued holding in his hand that which had polluted him (Taan. 16 *a*).

57. These statements are all so thoroughly Rabbinic that it is needless to make special references.

58. Vayyik. R. 3, towards the end. 59. In B. Bab. 10 *a.*

60. Vayyik. R. 25, beg. ed. Warsh. p. 38 *a.* 61. Tanch. on Gen. xlvi.

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.⁶²

62. Ab. Zar. 17 *a.*

It is in the light of what we have just learned concerning the Rabbinic views of forgiveness and repentance that the call of Levi-Matthew must be read, if we would

perceive its full meaning. There is no need to suppose that it took place immediately on the cure of the paralytic. On the contrary, the more circumstantial account of St. Mark implies, that some time had intervened.⁶³ 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.

63. St. Mark ii. 13.

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.⁶⁴ 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,⁶⁵ and of several Rabbis.⁶⁶ It is perhaps of more interest, that the Talmud⁶⁷ names five as the disciples of Jesus, and among them these two whom we can clearly identify: Matthew⁶⁸ and Thaddaus.⁶⁹

64. Gitt. 34 *b.* 65. Sheq. v. 1. 66. Eduy. ii. 5; Yoma 84 *a.*

67. Sanh. 43 *a.*, in the older editions; comp, Chesron. haShas, p. 22 *b.*

68. A ridiculous story is told that Matthew endeavored to avert sentence of death by a play on his name, quoting Ps. xlii. 2: '*Mathai* (in our version, 'When') I shall come and appear before God;' to which the judges replied by similarly adapting Ps. xli. 5: '*Mathai* (in our version, 'When') he shall die, and his name perish.'

69. The other three disciples are named: *Neqai, Netser*, and *Boni*, or *Buni*. In Taan. 20 *a* a miracle is related which gave to Boni the name of Nicodemus (Naqdimon). But I regard this as some confusion, of which there is much in connection with the name of Nicodemus in the Talmud. According to the Talmud, like Matthew, the other three tried to save their lives by punning appeals to Scripture, similar to that of St. Matthew. Thus, *Neqai* quotes Exod. xxiii. 7, '*Naqi* ('the innocent' in our version) and the righteous shalt thou not slay,' to which the judges replied by Ps. x. 8, 'in the secret places he shall slay *Naqi* ('the innocent' in our version)'. Again, *Netser* pleads Is. xi. 1: '*Netser* (a branch) shall grow out of his roots,' to which the judges reply, Is. xiv. 19: 'Thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable *Netser*' (branch), while *Boni* tries to save his life by a pun on Exod. iv. 22: 'My first-born *Beni* (in our version, 'my son') is Israel,' to which the judges reply by quoting the next verse, 'I will slay *Binkha* (in our version, 'thy son'), thy first-born!' If the Hebrew *Beni* was sometimes pronounced *Boni*, this may account for the Grecianised form *Boanerges* ('sons of thunder') for *Beney-Regosh*, or *Regasha*. In Hebrew the root scarcely means even 'noise' (see *Gesenius* sub #ןפ), but it has that meaning in the Aramaean. *Kautzsch* (Gram. d. Bibl.-Aram.) suggests the word *regaz* 'anger,' 'angry impetuosity.' But the suggestion does not commend itself.

Sitting before⁷⁰ 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.

70. ἐπὶ τὸ τελωνιον.

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.'⁷¹ Hence also it was said, that repentance was specially difficult for tax-gatherers and custom-house officers.^{72 73}

71. Sanh. 25 b. 72. Baba K. 94 b.

73. With them herdsmen were conjoined, on account of their frequent temptations to dishonesty, and their wild lives far from ordinances.

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.⁷⁴ 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.

74. *Wünsche* is mistaken in making the *Gabbai* the superior, and the *Mokhes* the subordinate, tax-collector. See *Levy*, Neuhebr. Wörterb., iii. p. 116 a.

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 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 5, and on articles of luxury to even 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But even this was as nothing, compared to the vexation of being constantly stopped on the journey, having to unload all one's pack-animals, when every bale and package was opened, and the contents tumbled about, private letters opened, and the *Mokhes* ruled supreme in his insolence and rapacity.

The very word *Mokhes* seems, in its root-meaning, associated with the idea of oppression and injustice. He was literally, as really, an oppressor. The Talmud charges them with gross partiality, remitting in the case of those to whom they wished to show 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.⁷⁵ That there was ground for such rigour, appears from such an occurrence,⁷⁶ 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,⁷⁷ or a person pass his slave as his son.⁷⁸

75. Jer. Dem. 23 a; comp. Bekhor. 31 a. 76. In B. Kamma x. 2.

77. Nedar. iii. 4. 78. Jer. Kidd. 66 b.

The *Mokhes* was called 'great'⁷⁹ 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.^{80 81} 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 forbids⁸² even the changing of money from the guilt-laden chest of a *Mokhes*, or *douanier*, the Gemara⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ On heathen

feast days toll was remitted to those who came to the festival.⁸⁵ Sometimes this was also done from kindness.⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷

79. Shabb. 78 *b.* 80. *Jos. Ant.* xiv. 10. 5.

81. Comp. *Wieseler's Beitr.* pp. 75-78. Hence the 'publicans' were not subordinates, but direct officials of the Government.

82. B. Kamma x. 1. 83. Baba K. 113 *a.* 84. Bekhor. 31 *a.*

85. Ab. Zar. 13 *a.* 86. Tos. B. Mets. viii. 25, ed. Zuck.

87. Jer. Chag. 77 *d.*; comp Jer. Sanh. 23 *c.*, and Sanh. 44 *b.*

What has been described in such detail, will cast a peculiar light on the call of Matthew by the 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.'⁸⁸ 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.

88. Ab. Zar. 10 *b.*

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,'⁸⁹ 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.

89. This is perhaps the better reading of St. Mark ii. 16.

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,⁹⁰ 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.

90. St. Matt. ix. 14-17.

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 health⁹¹ 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!'⁹² 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 sacrifice⁹³ - 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 prophet⁹⁴ to His own mode of viewing and treating the Sabbath-question.⁹⁵

91. The latter in St. Luke v. 31.

92. δμλω)χ, a very common formula, where further thought and instruction are required. So common, indeed, is it, that it is applied in the sense of 'let,' such or such thing 'come and teach' (δμψλω)χψ). Sometimes the formula is varied, as η)ρω)ωβ, 'come and see' (Baba Bath. 10 *a*), or ω)ρω ω)χ, 'go and see' (u. s., *b*).

93. Even in that beautiful page in the Talmud (Succ. 49 *b*) righteousness and sacrifices are compared, the former being declared the greater; and then righteousness is compared with works of kindness with alms, &c.

94. Hos. vi. 6. 95. St. Matt. xii. 7.

This was one aspect of it, as Jesus opened up anew the Old Testament, of which their key of knowledge had only locked the door. There was yet another and higher, quite explaining and applying alike this saying and the whole Old Testament, and thus His

Own Mission. And this was the fullest unfolding and highest vindication of it: 'For, I am not come to call righteous men, but sinners.'⁹⁶ 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 Gospel⁹⁷ 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.

96. Mark the absence of the Article. 97. See the note on p. 507.

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.⁹⁸ 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,⁹⁹ generally supposed the same as Nathanael), and of Matthew the publican. Yet, secondly, there is something which attaches to each of the others. Thomas, who is called Didymus (which means 'twin'), is closely connected with Matthew, both in St. Luke's Gospel and in that of St. Matthew himself. James is expressly named as the son of Alphaeus or Clopas.^{100 101} 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 Lebbeaus, 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*.'¹⁰² In that case both Lebbeaus 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.¹⁰³ Thus his real name would have been Judas Lebbeaus, and his surname Thaddæus. Closely connected with these two we have in all the Gospels, Simon, surnamed Zelotes or Canaanæan (not Canaanite), both terms indicating his original connection with the Galilean Zealot party, the 'Zealots for the Law.'¹⁰⁴ His position in the Apostolic Catalogue, and the testimony of Hegesippus,¹⁰⁵ seem to point him out as the son of Clopas, and brother of James, and of Judas Lebbeaus. 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.¹⁰⁶ Lastly, we have Judas Iscariot, or *Ish Keriioth*, 'a man of Keriioth,' a town in Judah.¹⁰⁷ 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.

98. St. Matt. x. 2-4; St. Mark iii. 13-19; St. Luke vi. 12-19.

99. Vayyik. R. 6; Pesiq. R. 22, ed. Friedm. p. 113 *a*. 100. St. John xix. 25.

101. Thus he would be the same as 'James the Less,' or rather 'the Little,' a son of Mary, the sister-in-law of the Virgin-Mother.

102. As is done in the Rabbinic story where Thaddæus appeals to Ps. c. 1 (superscription) to save his life, while the Rabbis reply by appealing to Ps. l. 23: 'Whoso offereth praise (*thodah*) glorifieth Me' (Sanh. 43 *a*, *Chesr. haSh.*).

103. St. Luke vi. 15; comp. St. John xiv. 22. 104. War. iv. 3, 9.

105. *Euseb.* H. E. iii. 11; iv. 22.

106. As to the identity of the names Alphaeus and Clopas, comp. *Wetzel* in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* for 1883, Heft iii. See also further remarks on the sons of Clopas, in the comment on St. John xix. 25 in Book V. ch. xv.

107. Josh. xv. 25.

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.'¹⁰⁸

108. As to the designation Boanerges (sons of thunder), see note 2, p. 514.

Chapter 18 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST AND RABBINIC TEACHING.¹ **(St. Matthew 5-7.)**

1. As it was impossible to quote separately the different verses in the Sermon on the Mount, the reader is requested to have the Bible before him, so as to compare the verses referred to with their commentation in this chapter.

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.^{2 3} 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,⁴ 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.

2. St. Luke vi. 13.

3. It is so that we group together St. Luke vi. 12, 13, 17-19, compared with St. Mark iii. 13-15 and St. Matthew v. 1, 2.

4. According to traditional view this mountain was the so-called 'Karn Hattin' (Horns of Hattin) on the road from Tiberias to Nazareth, about 1½ hours to the north-west of Tiberias. But the tradition dates only from late Crusading times, and the locality is, for many reasons, unsuitable.

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 awakened 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 Palestinian vessels. The new teaching, to be historically true, must have employed the old forms and spoken the old language. But the ideas underlying terms equally employed by Jesus and the teachers of Israel are, in everything that concerns the relation of souls to God, so absolutely different as not to bear comparison. Whence otherwise the enmity and opposition to Jesus from the first, and not only after His Divine claim had been pronounced? These two, starting from principles alien and hostile, follow opposite directions, and lead to other goals. He who has thirsted and quenched his thirst at the living fount of Christ's Teaching, can never again stoop to seek drink at the broken cisterns of Rabbinism.

We take here our standpoint on St. Matthew's account of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' to which we can scarcely doubt that by St. Luke⁵ 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.⁶ 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,⁷ while we also notice that His Galilean Ministry forms the main subject of the First Gospel.⁸ 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.'

5. St. Luke vi.

6. The reader will find these parallelisms in Dean *Plumptre's* Notes on St. Matthew v. 1 (in Bishop *Ellicott's* Commentary for English Readers, vol. i. of the N.T. p. 20).

7. Comp. *Euseb.* H. Eccl. iii. 39.

8. Thus St. Matthew passes over those earlier events in the Gospel-history of which Judæa was the scene, and even over the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem previous to the last Passover, while he devotes not less than fourteen chapters and a half to the half-year's activity in Galilee. If St. John's is the Judæan, St. Matthew's is the Galilean Gospel.

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,⁹ 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.

9. On this point there seems to me some confusion of language on the part of controversialists. Those who maintain that the Sermon on the Mount contains no doctrinal elements at all must mean systematic teaching - what are commonly called dogmas - since, besides St. Matt. vii. 22, 23, as Professor *Wace* has so well urged, love to God and to our neighbour mark both the starting-point and the final outcome of all theology.

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.¹⁰ 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.

10. To adopt the language of St. Thomas Aquinas - it is neither *meritum ex congruo*, nor yet is it *ex condigno*. The Reformers fully showed not only the error of Romanism in this respect, but the untenableness of the theological distinction.

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,¹¹ the Kingdom of God is presented *successively*, *progressively*, and *extensively*. Let us trace this with the help of the text itself.

11. chs. v.-vii.

In the first part of the Sermon on the Mount¹² 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.¹³

12. St. Matt. v. 13. St. Matt. v. 3-12.

These Ten Commandments in the Old Covenant were preceded by a Prologue.¹⁴ The ten Beatitudes have, characteristically, not a Prologue but an Epilogue,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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.

14. Ex. xix. 3-6. 15. St. Matt. v. 13-16. 16. vv. 21 to end of ch. v.

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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ It is, moreover, absolute and undivided self-dedication to God.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.

17. *Alms*, vi. 1-4; *Prayer*, vv. 5-15; *Fasting*, 16-18. 18. vv. 22, 23.

19. vv. 22-24. 20. vv. 25 to end of ch. vi.

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.²¹ *Secondly*, it cannot be *extended*, as you would do it, by external means,²² but cometh to us from God,²³ and is entered by personal determination and separation.²⁴ *Thirdly*, it is not *preached*, as too often is attempted, when thoughts of it are merely of the external.²⁵ *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.²⁶ 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.²⁷

21. vii. 1-5. 22. ver. 6. 23. vv. 7-12. 24. vv. 13, 14.

25. vv. 15, 16. 26. vv. 17-20. 27. vv. 24-27.

The infinite contrast, just set forth, between the Kingdom as presented by the Christ and Jewish contemporary teaching is the more striking, that it was expressed in a form, and clothed in words with which all His hearers were familiar; indeed, in modes of expression current at the time. It is this which has misled so many in their quotations of Rabbinic parallels to the 'Sermon on the Mount.' They perceive outward similarity, and they straightway set it down to identity of spirit, not understanding that often those things are most unlike in the spirit of them, which are most like in their form. No part of the New

Testament has had a larger array of Rabbinic parallels adduced than the 'Sermon on the Mount;' and this, as we might expect, because, in teaching addressed to His contemporaries, Jesus would naturally use the forms with which they were familiar. Many of these Rabbinic quotations are, however, entirely inapt, the similarity lying in an expression or turn of words.²⁸ 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.

28. So in the quotations of many writers on the subject, notably those of *Wünsche*.

To begin with the first Beatitude, to the poor in spirit, since theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven, this early Jewish saying²⁹ 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-righteousness³⁰ on the part of Rabbi Joshua, who compares the reward (ρκ#) formerly given to him who brought one or another offering to the Temple with that of him who is of a lowly mind (λπ# ωτ(ρ#η), to whom it is reckoned as if he had brought all the sacrifices. To this the saying of the great Hillel³¹ 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.

29. Ab. iv. 4. 30. Sanh. 43 b. 31. Vayyik. R. 1, ed. Warsh. p. 2 b.

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.³² 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!

32. Abhodah Zarah.

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. lxxvi. 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.³³ 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*.³⁴ Similarly, Rabbinism speaks of the perfectly righteous (ρωμγ θψδ) 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 (λψβ#β) my sons may live, and that I may merit the world to come, behold, this is the perfectly righteous.'³⁵ 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,³⁶ though it is only fair to add that one voice (that of Jochanan ben Zakkai) is raised in contradiction of such horrible teaching.

33. Erub. 41 *b.* 34. Baba B. 10 *a.*

35. Baba B. 10 *b.*; comp. Pes. 8 *a.*; Rosh haSh. 4 *a.* 36. B. Bath. u. s.

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,³⁷ but to atone for sins.^{38 39} 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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ A similar remark applies to the use of the expression 'Kingdom of Heaven' in the next Beatitude.

37. B. Bath. 9 *b.* 38. Chag. 27 *a.*

39. In Jer. B. Kamma 6 *c.*, we have this saying in the name of R. Gamaliel, and therefore near Christian times: 'Whosoever thou hast mercy, God will have mercy upon thee; if thou hast not mercy, neither will God have mercy upon thee;' to which, however, this saying of Rab must be put as a pendent, that if a man has in vain sought forgiveness from his neighbour, he is to get a whole row of men to try to assuage his wrath, to which Job xxxiii. 28 applies; the exception, however, being, according to R. Jose, that if one had brought an evil name upon his neighbour, he would never obtain forgiveness. See also Shabb. 151 *b.*

40. B. Mez. 43 *b.* and 44 *a.*; comp also Kidd. 42 *b.* 41. Ab. iii 14.

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:⁴² '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,⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ 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.

42. St. Matt. vii. 12. 43. Shabb. 31 a.

44. As already stated, it occurs in this negative and unspiritual form in Tob. iv. 15, and is also so quoted in the lately published *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* (ed. *Bryennios*) ch. i. It occurs in the same form in Clem. Strom. ii. c. 23.

The second instance, to which it seems desirable to advert, is the supposed similarity between petitions in the Lord's Prayer⁴⁵ 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,⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ Most painful, for example, is it⁴⁸ to find this interpretation of Hezekiah's prayer,⁴⁹ 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 shouldst 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 anecdote⁵⁰ 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 Rabbis⁵¹ 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.⁵²

45. St. Matt. vi. 9-13. 46. Berakhoth. 47. Ber. 34 *a b*; 32 *a*; 58 *b*. 48. Jer. Ber. 8 *b*.

49. Is. xxxviii. 2. Beautiful prayers in Ber. 16 *b*, 17 *a*; but most painful instances very frequently occur in the *Midrashim*, such as in Shem. R. 43.

50. Jer. Ber. 8 *c*. 51. Ber. 29 *b*.

52. For some interesting Rabbinic parallels to the Lord's Prayer, see Dr. *Taylor's* learned edition of the 'Sayings of the Jewish Fathers,' *Excursus V*. (pp. 138-145). The reader will also find much to interest him in *Excursus IV*.

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 passage⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.

53. Abhod. Zar. 17 *a* and 27 *b*.

54. Comp. the more full account of this Jacob's proposal to heal Eleazar ben Dama when bitten of a serpent in Jer. Shabb. xiv. end. Kefr Sekanya seems to have been the same as Kefr Simai, between Sepphoris and Acco (comp. *Neubauer*, Geogr. p. 234.)

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, when⁵⁵ we read that not one jot or tittle 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.^{56 57} 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,⁵⁸ adding, that if all men in the world were gathered together to abolish the least letter in the Law, they would not succeed.⁵⁹ Not a letter could be removed from the Law⁶⁰ - 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).⁶¹ Similarly,⁶² the guilt of changing those little hooks ('titles') which make the distinction between such Hebrew letters as δ and ρ, η and ξ, β and κ, is declared so great, that, if such were done, the world would be destroyed.⁶³ 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,'⁶⁴ 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 ignorant⁶⁵ - 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*,⁶⁶ with this additional remark, that on one such occasion the look of a Rabbi had immediately turned the unbeliever into a heap of bones!

55. In St. Matt. v. 18. 56. Shabb. 116 *b*.

57. *Delitzsch* accepts a different reading, which furnishes this meaning, 'but I am come to add.' The passage occurs in a very curious connection, and for the purpose of showing the utter dishonesty of Christians - a Christian philosopher first arguing from interested motives, that since the dispersion of the Jews the Law of Moses was abrogated, and a new Law given; and the next day, having received a larger bribe, reversing his decision, and appealing to this rendering of St. Matt. v. 17.

58. Jer. Sanh. p. 20 *c*. 59. Shir. haSh. R. on ch. v. 11, ed. Warsh. p. 27 *a*.

60. Shem. R. 6. 61. Sanh. 107 *a*, and other passages. 62. In Vayyik. R. 19.

63. The following are mentioned as instances: the change of δ into ρ in Deut. vi. 4; of ρ into δ in Exod. xxxiv. 14; of ξ into η Lev. xxii. 32; of η into ξ first verse of Ps. cl.; of β into κ in Jer. v. 12; κ into β 1 Sam. ii. 2. It ought to be marked, that *Wünsche's* quotations of these passages (Bibl. Rabb. on Shir haSh. R. v. 11) are not always correct.

64. St. Matt. v. 21. 65. B. Kamma 50 *b*. 66. Sanh. 100 *a*.

Again, the opprobrious term 'fool' was by no means of uncommon occurrence among the sages;⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ 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."⁶⁹ 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' (K:ψψξ). Lastly, as regards our Lord's admonition, it is mentioned⁷⁰ as characteristic of the pious, that their 'yea is yea,' and their 'nay nay.'

67. Sotah iii. 4; Shabb. 13 *b*. 68. Bab. Mez. 58 *b*, at bottom.

69. Pesiq. ed. *Bub.* 164 *a*. 70. In the Midrash on Ruth iii. 18.

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.⁷¹ 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,'⁷² 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:⁷³ '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,⁷⁴ 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.'

71. See ['The Temple, its Ministry and Services.'](#) &c., pp. 26, 27.

72. ver. 13. 73. In Sot. 48 *b*. 74. Sanh. 100 *b*.

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,⁷⁵ 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:⁷⁶ '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,⁷⁷ we conclude that this also was a proverbial expression. The same may be said of gathering 'grapes of thorns.'⁷⁸ Similarly, the designation of 'pearls' (verse 6) for the valuable sayings of sages is common. To verse 11 there is a realistic parallel,⁷⁹ 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 Talmud⁸⁰ 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!⁸¹ Yet we are asked by some to see in such Rabbinic passages parallels to the sublime teaching of Christ!

75. Sot. i. 7. 76. Arach. 16 *b*. 77. B. Bath. 15 *b*; Bekhor. 38 *b*; Yalk. on Ruth.

78. Pes. 49 *a*. 79. In Ber. R 33. 80. Jer. Ber. 13 *d*, towards the end.

81. In Sukk. 45 *b* he proposes to conjoin with himself his son, instead of Abraham.

The 'Sermon on the Mount' closes with a parabolic illustration, which in similar form occurs in Rabbinic writings. Thus,⁸² the man whose wisdom exceeds his works is compared to a tree whose branches are many, but its roots few, and which is thus easily upturned by the wind; while he whose works exceed his wisdom is likened to a tree, whose branches are few, and its roots many, against which all the winds in the world would strive in vain. A still more close parallel is that⁸³ 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.

82. In Ab. iii. 17. 83. Ab. de R. Nath. 24.

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.*'⁸⁴

84. I had collected a large number of supposed or real Rabbinic parallels to the 'Sermon on the Mount.' But as they would have occupied by far too large a space, I have been obliged to omit all but such as would illustrate the fundamental position taken in this chapter, and, indeed, in this book: the contrariety of spirit, by the side of similarity of form and expressions, between the teaching of Jesus and that of Rabbinism.

Chapter 19
THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM
HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT
(St. Matthew 8:1,5-15; St. Mark 3:20,21; St. Luke 7:1-10.)

We are once again in Capernaum. It is remarkable how much, connected not only with the Ministry of Jesus, but with His innermost Life, gathers around that little fishing town. In all probability its prosperity was chiefly due to the neighbouring Tiberias, which Herod Antipas¹ 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.²

1. For a discussion of the precise date of the building of Tiberias, see *Schürer*, Neutest. Zeitgesch. p. 234, note 2. For details, comp. *Jos.* Ant. xviii. 2. 3; 6. 2; xix. 8. 1; War ii. 9. 1; 21. 3, 6, 9; Life 9, 12, 17, 66, and many other places.

2. St. Luke x. 15.

But as yet Capernaum was still 'exalted up to heaven.' Here was the home of that believing Court-official, whose child Jesus had healed.³ 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.⁴ 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.

3. St. John iv. 4. St. Mark iii. 19-21.

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,⁵ with reiterated, growing, and perhaps Orientally exaggerating details, they hastened out of their house in a neighbouring street⁶ 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'⁷ seems rather opposed to the supposition. Still less does the objection deserve serious refutation,⁸ 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 psychological 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.

5. I take this as the general meaning, although the interpretation which paraphrases the *ελεγον γαρ* ('they said,' ver. 21) as referring to the report which reached the *οι παρ αυτου* seems to me strained. Those who are curious will find all kinds of proposed interpretations collected in *Meyer*, ad loc.

6. The idea that they were in Nazareth seems wholly unfounded.

7. St. Mark iii. 31. 8. Urged even by *Meyer*.

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.⁹ 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*).¹⁰

9. The difficulties which *Keim* raises seem to me little deserving of serious treatment. Sometimes they rest on assumptions which, to say the least, are not grounded on evidence.

10. *Godet* has some excellent remarks on this point.

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,¹¹ 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.

11. So notably *Keim*.

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.¹² And Rabbinic parallelism there was none. For, although a sudden cure, and at a distance, is related in connection with a Rabbi,¹³ 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.

12. The differences have been well marked by *Keim*. 13. Ber. 34 b.

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 Casarea.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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,¹⁶ 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.

14. *Jos. Ant.* xix. 9. 1, 2. 15. *Ohal* xxviii. 7.

16. *Comp. Warren, Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 385 &c.

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.¹⁷ The circumstances, the times, the place, the very position of the man, make such suppositions rational, even suggested them. In that case, his whole bearing would be consistent with itself, and with what we know of the views and feelings of the time. In the place where the son of his fellow official at the Court of Herod had been healed by the Word of Jesus, spoken at a distance,¹⁸ in the Capernaum which was the home of Jesus and the scene of so many miracles, it was only what we might expect, that in such case he should turn to Jesus and ask His help. Quiet consistent with his character is the straightforwardness of his expectancy, characteristically illustrated by his military experience - what *Bengel* designates as the wisdom of his faith beautifully shining out in the bluntness of the soldier. When he had learned to own Israel's God, and to believe in the absolute unlimited power of Jesus, no such difficulties would come to him, nor, assuredly, such cavils rise, as in the minds of the Scribes, or even of the Jewish laity. Nor is it even necessary to suppose that, in his unlimited faith in Jesus, the Centurion had distinct apprehension of His essential Divinity. In general, it holds true, that, throughout the Evangelic history, belief in the Divinity of our Lord was the outcome of experience of His Person and Work, not the condition and postulate of it, as is the case since the Pentecostal descent of the Holy Ghost and His indwelling in the Church.

17. *St. Luke* vii. 8, last clause. 18. *St. John* iv. 46-53.

In view of these facts, the question with the Centurion would be: not, *Could* Jesus heal his servant, but, *Would* He do so? And again, this other specifically: Since, so far as he knew, no application from any in Israel, be it even publican or sinner, had been doomed to disappointment, would he, as a Gentile, be barred from share in this blessing? was he 'unworthy,' or, rather, 'unfit' for it? Thus this history presents a crucial question, not only as regarded the character of Christ's work, but the relation to it of the Gentile world. Quiet consist with this - nay, its necessary outcome - were the scruples of the Centurion to make direct, personal application to Jesus. In measure as he revered Jesus, would these scruples, from his own standpoint, increase. As the houses of Gentiles were 'unclean,'¹⁹ 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 standpoint.

19. Ohal xviii. 7.

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.²⁰ 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.²¹ 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.²² 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 (Leviticallly speaking) that Thou shouldest enter under my roof;' Leviticallly, or Judaistically speaking, my house is not a fit place for Thy entrance; 'Wherefore neither did I judge myself worthy (spiritually, morally, religiously) [ἡξίωσα, Pondus habens, ejusdem ponderis cum aliquo, 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' (ἰκανός): '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.

20. St. Luke vii. 6. 21. St. Matt. viii. 5.

22. Without the article; perhaps only some of them went on this errand of mercy.

But in their grand leading features the two narratives entirely agree. There is earnest supplication for his sick, seemingly dying servant.²³ 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 the ir 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.

23. St. Matt. viii. 6, literally, 'my servant has been thrown down (by disease) in the house, paralytic.' The βεβληται corresponds to the Hebrew λ+ω+. The same word is used in ver. 14, when Peter's mother-in-law is described as 'thrown down and fever-burning.'

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,²⁴ 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. 5.²⁵ On this point, then, the words of Jesus in reference to the believing Centurion formed the most marked contrast to Jewish teaching.

24. One might say that all the species of animals are put in requisition of this great feast: Leviathan (B. Bath. 75 a); Behemoth (Pirké d. R. Eliez. 11); the gigantic bird Bar Jochani (B. Bath. 73 b; Bekhor. 57 b, and other passages). Similar, fabulous fatted geese are mentioned - probably for that feast (B. Bath. 73 b). The wine there dispensed had been kept in the grapes from the creation of the world (Sanh. 99 a; Targum, on Cant. viii. 2); while there is difficulty as to who is worthy to return thanks, when at last the duty is undertaken by David, according to Ps. cxvi. 13 (Pes. 119 b).

25. Bemid. R. 21, ed. Warsh. iv. p. 85 a 57 a.

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,²⁶ was in the valley of Hinnom, between two palm trees - lay beyond 'the mountains of darkness.'²⁷ It was a place of darkness,²⁸ to which in the day of the Lord,²⁹ the Gentiles would be consigned.³⁰ On the other hand, the merit of circumcision would in the day of the Messiah deliver Jewish sinners from Gehinnom.³¹ It seems a moot question, whether the expression 'outer darkness'^{32 33} 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'³⁴ and the gnashing of teeth.' In Rabbinic thought the former was connected with sorrow,³⁵ the latter almost always anger³⁶ - not, as generally supposed, with anguish.

26. Erub. 19 *a*. 27. Tamid 32 *b*. 28. Targ. on 1 Sam. ii. 9, Ps lxxxviii. 12.

29. Amos. v. 20. 30. Yakkut ii. p. 42 *c*. 31. u. s. nine lines higher up. 32. St. Matt. viii. 12.

33. All commentators regard this as a contrast to the light in the palace, but so far as I know the Messianic feast is not described as taking place in a palace.

34. The use of the article makes it emphatic - as Bengel has it: *In hac vita dolor nondum est dolor*.

35. In Succ. 52 *a* it is said that in the age to come (Athid labho) God would bring out the Yetser haRa (evil impulse), and slaughter it before the just before the wicked. To the one he would appear like a great mountain, to the other like a small thread. Both would weep - the righteous for joy, that they had been able to subdue so great so great a mountain; the wicked for sorrow, that they had not been able even to break so small a thread.

36. This is also the meaning of the expression in Ps. cxii. 10. The verb is used with this idea in Acts vii. 54, and in the LXX, Job. xvi. 9; Ps. xxxv. 16; xxxvii. 12; and in Rabbinical writings, for example, Jer. Keth. 35 *b*; Shem. R. 5, &c.

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,'³⁷ or, in strictly Rabbinic language, 'royal children,'³⁸ 'children of God,' 'of heaven,'³⁹ 'children of the upper chamber' (the *Aliyah*)⁴⁰ and 'of the world to come.'⁴¹ 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.⁴²

37. St. Matt. viii. 12. 38. Shabb. xiv. 4.

39. Μωθμλ Μψνβ Ab. iii. 14 comp. Jer. Kidd. 61 *c* middle.

Never, surely, could the Judaism of His hearers have received more rude shock than by this inversion of all their cherished beliefs. There was a feast of Messianic fellowship, a recognition on the part of the King of all His faithful subjects, a joyous festive gathering with the fathers of the faith. But this fellowship was not of outward, but of spiritual kinship. There were 'children of the Kingdom,' and there was an 'outer darkness' with its anguish and despair. But this childship was of the Kingdom, such as He had opened it to all believers; and that outer darkness theirs, who had only outward claims to present. And so this history of the believing Centurion is at the same time an application of the 'Sermon on the Mount' - in this also aptly following the order of its record - and a further carrying out of its teaching. Negatively, it differentiated the Kingdom from Israel; while, positively, it placed the hope of Israel, and fellowship with its promises, within reach of all faith, whether of Jew or Gentile. He Who taught such new and strange truth could never be called a mere reformer of Judaism. There cannot be 'reform,' where all the fundamental principles are different. Surely He was the Son of God, the Messiah of men, Who, in such surrounding, could so speak to Jew and Gentile of God and His Kingdom. And surely also, He, Who could so bring spiritual life to the dead, could have no difficulty by the same word, 'in the self-same hour,' to restore life and health to the servant of him, whose faith had inherited the Kingdom. The first grafted tree of heathendom that had so blossomed could not shake off unripe fruit. If the teaching of Christ was new and was true, so must His work have been. And in this lies the highest vindication of this miracle - that He is the Miracle.

Chapter 20
THE RAISING OF THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN
THE MEETING OF LIFE AND DEATH.
(St. Luke 7:11-17.)

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.¹ 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.

1. Cant. ii. 11-13.

For our present purpose it matters little, whether it was the very 'day after' the healing of the Centurion's servant, or 'shortly afterwards,'² 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;³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵ On the path leading to it the Lord of Life for the first time burst open the gates of death.

2. This depends on whether we adopt the reading εν τη or εν τω εξης

3. I cannot understand what Dean *Stanley* means, when he says (*Sinai and Palest.* p. 352): 'One entrance alone it could have had.' I have counted not fewer than six roads leading to Nain.

4. So Dean *Stanley*, and even Captain *Conder*. Canon *Farrar* regards this as one of 'the certain sites.' But, even according to his own description of the route taken from Capernaum, it is difficult to understand how Jesus could have issued upon the rock-hewn tombs.

5. 'Land of Israel,' pp. 129, 130.

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.⁶ 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,'⁷ which the Rabbis regarded as fulfilling that part of the promise to Issachar: 'he saw the land that it was pleasant.'⁸ 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.^{9 10} The popular idea, that the spirit of the dead hovered about the unburied remains, must have given intensity to such feelings.

6. Captain *Conder* (Tent-Work in Pal. i. pp. 121, 122) has failed to discover traces of a wall. But see the description of Canon *Tristram* (Land of Isr. p. 129) which I have followed in my account.

7. I cannot accept the rendering of *Nain* by '*pasuum*.'

8. Ber. R. 98, ed. Warsh. p. 175 *b*: ψκ Χρ)η τ)ω Μψ(ν ωζ ημ(ν .

9. Ber. 18 *a*.

10. For the sake of brevity I must here refer to '[Sketches of Jewish Social Life](#),' ch. x., and to the article in 'The Bible Educator,' vol. iv. pp. 330-333.

Putting aside later superstitions, so little has changed in the Jewish rites and observances about the dead,¹¹ that from Talmudic and even earlier sources,¹² 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;¹³ 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;¹⁴ 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.¹⁵

11. *Haneberg* (Relig. Alterth. pp. 502, 503) gives the apt reasons for this.

12. The Tractate *Ebhel Rabbathi* ('Great Mourning') euphemistically called *Masseketh Semachoth*, 'Tractate of Joys,' It is already quoted in the Talmud: comp *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. p. 90, note *d*. It is inserted in vol. ix. of the Bab. Talmud, pp. 28 *a* to 31 *b*.

13. Ber. 28 *b*. 14. Nedar. 40 *a*, lines 6 and 7 from bottom. 15. Ber. v. 5.

But all was in vain. And now the well-known blast of the horn has carried tidings, that once more the Angel of Death has done his dire behest.¹⁶ In passionate grief the mother has rent her upper garment.¹⁷ The last sad offices have been rendered to the dead. The body has been laid on the ground; hair and nails have been cut,¹⁸ 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*),¹⁹ 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.²⁰

16. Moed K. 27 *b*. 17. Jer. Moed. K. 83 *d*. 18. Moed K. 8 *b*.

19. Rosh haSh 17 *a* and other wise. 20. Shabb. 151 *b*; Semach. I.

And now the mother was left *Oneneth* (moaning, lamenting) - a term which distinguished the mourning before from that after burial.²¹ 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.²² 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,²³ 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,²⁴ while great Rabbis were 'wont to bespeak for themselves a warm funeral oration' (*Hesped*, or *Hespeda*).²⁵ For, from the funeral oration a man's fate in the other world might be inferred;²⁶ and, indeed, 'the honour of a sage was in his funeral oration.'²⁷ and in this sense the Talmud answers the question, whether a funeral oration is intended to honour the survivors or the dead.²⁸

21. The mourning up to the time of burial or during the first day was termed *Aninah* (widowed-mourning, moaning) Jer. Horay. 48 *a*. The following three, seven, or thirty days (as the case might be) were those of *Ebhel*, 'mourning.' Other forms of the same word need not be mentioned.

22. Jer. Ber. 5 *d*. 23. Kethub. iv. 4. 24. Mass. Semach. i. 9.

25. Of these a number of instances are given in the Talmud - though probably only of the prologue, or epilogue, or of the most striking thoughts.

26. Shabb. 153 *a*. 27. Moed K. 25 *a*. 28. Sanh. 46 *b*.

But in all this painful pageantry there was nothing for the heart of the widow, bereft of her only child. We can follow in spirit the mournful procession, as it started from the desolate home. As it issued, chairs and couches were reversed, and laid low. Outside, the funeral orator, if such was employed, preceded the bier, proclaiming the good deeds of the dead.²⁹ Immediately before the dead came the women, this being peculiar to Galilee,³⁰ the Midrash giving this reason of it, that woman had introduced death into the world.³¹ The body was not, as afterwards in preference,³² carried in an ordinary coffin of wood (*Aron*), if possible, cedarwood - on one occasion, at least, made with holes beneath,³³ 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.³⁴ 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.³⁵ Commonly, though not in later practice, the face of the dead body was uncovered.³⁶ 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.³⁷ In exceptional cases we read of the use of incense,³⁸ and even of a kind of libation.³⁹

29. Shabb. 153 *a.* 30. Shabb. 153 *a.* 31. Ber. R. 17 end. 32. Ber. 19 *a.*

33. Jer. Kil 32 *b.*; Ber. R. 100. 34. Par. xii. 9. 35. Moed K. 27 *a* and *b.* 36. Semach. c. 8.

37. Bez. 6 *a* Nidd. 37 *a.* 38. Moed K. 27 *b.*; Ber. 53 *a.* 39. Jer. Sheq. ii. 7.

We cannot, then, be mistaken in supposing that the body of the widow's son was laid on the 'bed' (*Mittah*), or in the 'willow basket,' already described (*Kelibha*, from *Kelubh*).⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ 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.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.'

40. It is evident the young man could not have been 'coffined,' or it would have been impossible for him to sit up at Christ's bidding. I must differ from the learned *Delitzsch*, who uses the word *Nōp*) in translating *σφοδρ*. Very remarkable also it seems to me, that those who advocate wicker-basket interments are without knowing it, resorting to the old Jewish practice.

41. Ber. iii. 1. 42. Ber. 18 *a.* 43. Jer. Sot. 17 *b.*, end.

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,⁴⁴ accompanied by flutes and the melancholy tinkle of cymbals, perhaps by trumpets,⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ 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 Lord⁴⁷ '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!'⁴⁸ It was not so that Jesus spoke to those around, nor to her, but characteristically: 'Be not weeping.'⁴⁹ 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,⁵⁰ 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.

44. Sometimes the lament was chaunted simply in chorus, at others one woman began and then the rest joined in chorus. The latter was distinctively termed the *Qinah*, see Moed K. iii. 9.

45. Keth. 17 *a*; Moed K. 27 *b*.

46. Apparently sometimes torches were used at funerals (Ber. 53 *a*).

47. The term *κυριος* for 'the Lord' is peculiar to St. Luke and St. John - a significant conjunction. It occurs only once in St. Mark (xvi. 19).

48. Moed K. 8 *a*, lines 7 and 8 from bottom.

49. So literally. We here recall the unfeeling threats by R. Huna of further bereavements to a mother who wept very much, and their fulfilment (Moed. K. 27 *b*).

50. Kei. i.

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'⁵¹ 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 beautiful 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?

51. So literally - and very significantly.

But, after all, may we regard this history as real - and, if so, what are its lessons?⁵² 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,⁵³ that the differences between this history and the raising of the dead by Elijah or Elisha are so numerous and great, that these narratives cannot be regarded as suggesting that of the raising of the young man of Nain. We ask again: Whence, then, this history, if it was not true? It is an ingenious historical suggestion - rather an admission by negative criticism⁵⁴ - 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.⁵⁵ 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?

52. Minor difficulties may be readily dismissed. Such is the question, why this miracle has not been recorded by St. Matthew. Possibly St. Matthew may have remained a day behind in Capernaum. In any case, the omission cannot be of real importance as regards the question of the credibility of such a miracle, since similar miracles are related in all the four Gospels.

53. So *Keim*, who finally arrives at the conclusion that the event is fictitious His account seems to me painfully unfair, as well as unsatisfactory in the extreme.

54. This is the admission of *Keim*. 55. *Euseb.* Hist. Eccl. iv. 3.

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,⁵⁶ but to expose them to the charge of cunningly devising fables.⁵⁷ 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 concurrence⁵⁸ (συγκυρια) *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.

56. Acts xvii. 32; xxvi. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 12-19. 57. 2 Pet. i. 16.

58. The term συγκυρια rendered in the A.V. 'chance' (St. Luke x. 31), means literally, the coming together, the meeting, A.V. 'chance' (St. Luke x. 31), means literally, the coming together, the meeting, or concurrence of events.

But on those who saw this miracle at Nain fell the fear⁵⁹ of the felt Divine Presence, and over their souls swept the hymn of Divine praise: fear, because⁶⁰ God had visited⁶¹ 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?⁶²

59. Lit. 'fear took all.' 60. οτι.

61. Significantly, the same expression as in St. Luke i. 68.

62. The embassy of the Baptist will be described in connection with the account of his martyrdom.

Chapter 21 **THE WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER** **(St. Luke 7:36-50.)**

The precise date and place of the next recorded event in this Galilean journey of the Christ are left undetermined. It can scarcely have occurred in the quiet little town of Nain, indeed, is scarcely congruous with the scene which had been there enacted. And yet it must have followed almost immediately upon it. We infer this, not only from the silence of St. Matthew, which in this instance might have been due, not to the temporary detention of that Evangelist in Capernaum, while the others had followed Christ to Nain, but to what may be called the sparingness of detail in the Gospel-narratives, each Evangelist relating mostly only one in a group of kindred events.¹ But other indications determine our inference. The embassy of the Baptist's disciples (which will be described in another connection)² 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 Gospel³ 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,⁴ 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,⁵ the full development of which, as already stated, prompted the Mission of the Seventy.

1. This is specially characteristic of the Gospel by St. Luke. 2. See note in previous chapter.

3. St. Matt. xi. 20-30. 4. St. Luke x. 13-22. 5. St. Matt. xi. 16-19

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,⁶ 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'⁷ 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 suitability to the 'forgiven sinner' in the Pharisee's house,⁸ and their inward, even if not outward, connection with her history.

6. St. Matt. xi. 28-30.

7. Made 'the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven' (Μψμ# τωκλμ λω()) equal to 'the yoke of the Law' (ηρωτ λω()) or to that 'of the commandments' (τω(μ λω()).

8. St. Luke vii. 36.

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.⁹ 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,¹⁰ 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:¹¹ 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.

9. The untenableness of this strange hypothesis has been shown in almost all commentaries. There is not a tittle of evidence for it.

10. St. Matt. xxvi. 6&c. and parallels.

11. The objections of *Keim*, though bulking largely when heaped together by him, seem not only unfair, but, when examined one by one, are seen to be groundless.

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.¹² 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.

12. St. Luke vii. 40

They were all sitting, or rather 'lying'¹³ - 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,¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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?¹⁶ It little matters - as little as whether she 'had been,' or 'was' up to that day, 'a sinner,'¹⁷ 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.

13. Ber. vi. 6 makes the following curious distinction: if they sit at the table, each says 'the grace' for himself; if they 'lie down' to table, one says it in the name of all. If wine is handed them during dinner, each says 'the grace' over it for himself; if after dinner, one says it for all.

14. Ab. iv.16.

15. The *Teraqlin* was sometimes entered by an *antechamber* (*Prosedor*), Ab. iv. 16, and opened into one (Jer. Rosh haSh. 59 *b*), or more (Yom. 15 *b*), side-or bed-rooms. The common measurement for such a hall was fifteen feet (ten cubits) breadth, length, and height (Baba B. vi. 4).

16. The strangeness of the circumstance suggests this, which is, alas! by no means inconsistent with what we know of the morality of some of these Rabbis, although this page must not be stained by detailed references.

17. The other and harsher reading, 'a woman which was in the city a sinner,' need scarcely be discussed.

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.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ and of the iris plant, but chiefly the mixture known in antiquity as *foliatum*, were largely manufactured and used in Palestine.²⁰ A flask with this perfume was worn by women round the neck, and hung down below the breast (the *Tselochith shel Palyeton*).²¹ So common was its use as to be allowed even on the Sabbath.²² 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.²³

18. I have so translated the word $\mu\upsilon\rho\rho\nu$, which the A.V. renders 'ointment.' The word is evidently the Hebrew and Rabbinic $\rho\omega\mu$ which, however, is not always the equivalent for myrrh, but seems also to mean *musk* and *mastic*. In short, I regard it as designating any fluid unguent or - generally speaking, 'perfume.' So common was the use of perfumes, that Ber. vi. 6 mentions a *mugmar*, or a kind of incense, which was commonly burnt after a feast. As regards the word '*alabastron*,' the name was given to perfume-phials in general, even if not made of alabaster, because the latter was so frequently used for such flasks.

19. Shebh. vii. 6. 20. Jer. Demai 22 *b*. 21. Ab. S. 35 *b*. 22. Shabb. vi. 3.

23. The derivation of the Rabbinic term in *Buxtorf's Lexicon* (p. 1724) is certainly incorrect. I have no doubt the $\text{N}\omega\text{+}\psi\psi\lambda\pi$ was the *foliatum* of *Pliny* (Hist. Nat. xiii. 1, 2). In Jew. War iv. 9, 10, *Josephus* seems to imply that women occasionally poured over themselves unguents. According to Kethub. vi. 4, a woman might apparently spend a tenth of her dowry on such things as unguents and perfumes. For, in Kethub. 66 *b* we have an exaggerated account of a woman spending upwards of 300*l*. on perfumes! This will at any rate prove their common and abundant use.

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'²⁴ His Feet. As if surprised, or else afraid to awaken His attention, or defile Him by her tears, she quickly²⁵ wiped them away with the long tresses of her hair that had fallen down and touched Him,²⁶ 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 continuing²⁷ 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.

24. This is the real meaning of the verb. 25. This is implied in the tense.

26. It is certainly not implied, that she had her hair dishevelled as in mourning, or as by women before drinking the waters of jealousy.

27. The tense implies this.

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,'²⁸ 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,'²⁹ 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,'³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.

28. ver. 39. 29. ver. 43. 30. In the A. V.

31. The Talmud, with its usual exaggeration, has this story when commenting on the reverence due by children to their parents, that R. Ishmael's mother had complained her son would not allow her, when he came from the Academy, to *wash his feet* and then drink the water - on which the sages made the Rabbi yield! (Jer. Peah 15 c). Again, some one came to *kiss R. Jonathan's* feet, because he had induced filial reverence in his son (u. s., col. d).

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,³² who would best love the creditor³³ who had freely³⁴ forgiven them?³⁵ 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,³⁶ were not, indeed, necessary attentions at a feast. All the more did they indicate special care, affection, and

respect.³⁷ 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,³⁸ 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'³⁹ - 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.'⁴⁰

32. The one sum="upwards" of 15l.; the other=upwards of 1l. 10s.

33. Money-lender - though perhaps not in the evil sense which we attach to the term. At the same time, the frequent allusion to such and to their harsh ways offers painful illustration of the social state at the time.

34. So rather than 'frankly' in the A. V.

35. The points of resemblance and of difference with St. Matt. xviii. 23 will readily appear on comparison.

36. Comp. for ex. St. John xiii. 4.

37. Washing: Gen. xviii. 4; xix. 2; xxiv. 32; Judg. xix. 21; 1 Sam. xxv. 41; kissing: Ex. xviii. 7; 2 Sam. xv. 5; xix. 39; anointing: Eccl. ix. 8; Amos vi. 6, as well as Ps. xxiii. 5.

38. Thou gavest me no water, she washed not with water but tears; no kiss, she kissed my feet; no oil, she unguent; not to the head, but to the feet. And yet: *emphatically* - into *thy* house I came, &c.

39. So literally. 40. Mark the tense.

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'⁴¹ - 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.'⁴² Our logical dogmatics would have had it: 'go *in* peace;' more truly He, '*into* peace.'⁴³ 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.

41. So, properly rendered. Romanism, in this also arrogating to man more than Christ Himself ever spoke, has it: *Absolvo te*, not 'thy sins have been forgiven,' but I absolve thee!

42. So literally.

43. This distinction between the two modes of expression is marked in Moed. K. 29 *a*: '*into* peace,' as said to the living; '*in* peace,' as referring to the dead.

Chapter 22
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 8:1-3; St. Matthew 9:32-35; St. Mark 3:22, &c.; St. Matthew 12:46-50 and
parallels.)

HOWEVER interesting and important to follow the steps of our Lord on His journey through Galilee, and to group in their order the notices of it in the Gospels, the task seems almost hopeless. In truth, since none of the Evangelists attempted - should we not say,

ventured - to write a 'Life' of the Christ, any strictly historical arrangement lay outside their purpose. Their point of view was that of the internal, rather than the external development of this history. And so events, kindred in purpose, discourses bearing on the same subject, or parables pointing to the same stretch of truth, were grouped together; or, as in the present instance, the unfolding teaching of Christ and the growing opposition of His enemies exhibited by joining together notices which, perhaps, belong to different periods. And the lesson to us is, that, just 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 journey¹ 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.² Her designation as Magdalene was probably derived from her native city, Magdala,³ just as several Rabbis are spoken of in the Talmud as 'Magdalene' (*Magdelaah*, or *Magdelaya*⁴). Magdala, which was a Sabbath-day's journey from Tiberias,⁵ was celebrated for its dyeworks,⁶ and its manufactories of fine woolen textures, of which eighty are mentioned.⁷ Indeed, all that district seems to have been engaged in this industry.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ But its moral corruption was also great, and to this the Rabbis attributed its final destruction.¹¹ Magdala had a Synagogue.¹² ¹³ 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,¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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 Mejdél. The ancient watch-tower which gave the place its name is still there, probably standing on the same site as that which looked down on Jesus and the Magdalene. To this day Magdala is celebrated for its springs and rivulets, which render it

especially suitable for dyeworks; while the shell-fish with which these waters and the Lake are said to abound,¹⁶ might supply some of the dye.¹⁷

1. St. Luke viii. 1-3; St. Matt. ix. 35.

2. 'Out of whom went seven devils.' Those who are curious to see one attempt at finding a 'rational' basis for some of the Talmudical legends about Mary Magdalene and others connected with the history of Christ, may consult the essay of *Rösch* in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1873, pp. 77-115 (Die Jesus-Mythen d. Judenth.)

3. The suggestion that the word meant 'curler of hair,' which is made by *Lightfoot*, and repeated by his modern followers, depends on entire misapprehension.

4. In *Baba Mets. 25 a*, middle, R. Isaac the Magdalene is introduced in a highly characteristic discussion about coins that are found. His remark about three coins laid on each other like a tower might, if it had not been connected with such a grave discussion, have almost seemed a pun on *Magdala*.

5. Jer. Erub. 22 *d*, end. 6. Ber. R. 79. 7. Jer. Taan. 69 *a*, line 15 from bottom.

8. Thus in regard to another village (not mentioned either by *Relandus* or *Neubauer*) in the Midr. on Lament. ii. 2, ed. Warsh. p. 67 *b*, line 13 from bottom.

9. Midr. on Lament. ii. 2. 10. Jer. Taan. 69 *a*.

11. Jer. Taan. u.s.; Midr. on Lament. ii. 2, ed. Warsh. p. 67 *b* middle.

12. Midr. on Eccl. x. 8, ed. Warsh p. 102 *b*.

13. This Synagogue is introduced in the almost blasphemous account of the miracles of Simon ben Jochai, when he declared Tiberias free from the defilement of dead bodies, buried there.

14. This has been well shown by *Neubauer*, *Géogr. de la Palestine*, pp. 217, 218.

15. Jewish War iii. 10. 16. Baedeker's *Palastina*, pp. 268, 269.

17. It is at any rate remarkable that the Talmud (*Megill. 6 a*) finds in the ancient territory of Zebulun the *Chilzon* (חילזון) so largely used in dyeing purple and scarlet, and so very precious. Spurious dyes of the same colour were also produced (comp. *Lewysohn*, *Zool. d. Talm.* pp. 281-283).

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,¹⁸ and then sat over against the new tomb of Joseph in which His Body was laid.¹⁹ And the terrible time which followed she spent with her like-minded friends, who in Galilee had ministered to Christ,²⁰ in preparing those 'spices and ointments'²¹ 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,²² 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*²³) must have been even more trying. She was the wife of *Chuza*, Herod's Steward²⁴ - possibly, though not likely, the Court-official whose son Jesus had healed by the word spoken in Cana.²⁵ 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 writings²⁶ the designation ()ζαφωεκε²⁷ seems rather used as a by-name ('little pitcher') for a small, insignificant person, than as a proper name.²⁸ 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.

18. St. Matt. xxvii. 56. 19. ver. 61. 20. St. Luke xxiii. 55.

21. ver. 56. 22. St. Luke xxiv. 10. 23. Seb. 62 *b*.

24. Curiously enough, the Greek term *επι τροπος* (steward) has passed into the Rabbinic *Aphiterophos*.

25. St. John iv. 46-54.

26. *Delitzsch* (*Zeitsch. für Luther Theol.* for 1876, p. 598), seems to regard *Kuzith* (τψζωκε) as the Jewish equivalent of *Chuza*. The word is mentioned in the *Aruch* (ed. *Landau*, p. 801 *b*, where the references, however, are misquoted) as occurring in Ber. R. 23 and 51. No existing copy of the Midrash has these references, which seem to have been purposely omitted. It is curious that both occur in connection with Messianic passages. In any case, however, *Kuzith* was not a proper name, but some mystic designation. *Lightfoot* (*HoræHebr.* on Luke viii. 3) reads in the genealogy of Haman (in *Sopher.* xiii. 6) *Bar Kuza*. But it is really *Bar Biza*, 'son of contempt' - all the names being intended as defamatory of Haman. Similarly, *Lightfoot* asserts that the designation does not occur in the genealogy of Haman in the Targum Esther. But in the Second Targum Esther (*Miqraoth Gedol.* Part vi. p. 5 *a*) the name does occur in the genealogy as '*Bar Buzah*.'

27. *Yebam.* 70 *a*.

28. Dr. *Neubauer* (*Studia Bibl.* p. 225) regards *Chuza* as an Idumaean name, connected with the Edomite god *Kos*.

It was on this return-journey to Capernaum, probably not far from the latter place, that the two blind men had their sight restored.²⁹ 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,³⁰ 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,³¹ to have been spoken at that later period.³²

29. St. Matt. ix. 27-31. 30. St. Matt. ix. 34. 31. St. Mark iii. 23-30.

32. I regard St. Mark iii. 23-30 as combining the event in St. Matt. ix. (see St. Mark iii. 23) with what is recorded in St. Matt. xii. and St. Luke xi., and I account for this combination by the circumstance that the latter is not related by St. Mark.

It was on this return-journey to Capernaum from the uttermost borders of Galilee, when for the first time He was not only followed by His twelve Apostles, but attended by the loving service of those who owed their all to His Ministry, that the demonized dumb was restored by the casting out of the demon. Even these circumstances show that a new stage in the Messianic course had begun. It is 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,³³ while its influence appears in the unspoken thoughts of Simon the Pharisee.

33. St. Matt. xi. 16-19.

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.³⁴ 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,³⁵ who are expressly described by St. Mark³⁶ as 'the Scribes which came down from Jerusalem.'

34. St. Luke vii. 17. 35. St. Matt. ix. 34. 36. St. Mark iii. 32.

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.³⁷ 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.

37. St. Mark iii. 22.

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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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.'^{40 41}

38. St. Matt. xii. 22 &c.; St. Luke xi. 14 &c. 39. St. Matt. xi. 17, 18; St. Luke vii. 31-32.

40. St. Matt. ix. 33, 34.

41. At the same time I have, with not a few authorities, strong doubts whether St. Matt. ix. 34 is not to be regarded as an interpolation (see *Westcott and Hort*, New Testament). *Substantially*, the charge was there; but it seems doubtful whether, *in so many words*, it was made till a later period.

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.⁴² Even this circumstance shows its decisive importance. It forms a parallel to the former attempts of the Pharisees to influence the disciples of Jesus,⁴³ and then to stir up the hostility of the disciples of John,⁴⁴ *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.

42. St. Matt. xii. 46 &c.; St. Mark iii. 31 &c. St. Luke viii. 19 &c.

43. St. Matt. ix. 11. 44. u. s. ver. 14.

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.^{45 46} 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,⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸ And this is ever the right relationship in the Kingdom of Heaven!

45. Jer. Peah i. 1.

46. An instance of this has been given in the previous chapter, p. 567, note. Other examples of filial reverence are mentioned, some painfully ludicrous, others touching, and accompanied by sayings which sometimes rise to the sublime.

47. *Bengel* remarks on St. Matt. xii. 46: 'Non plane hic congruebat sensus Mariæ cum sensu Filii.'

48. 'Non spernit Matrem, sed anteponit Patrem.'

Chapter 23
NEW TEACHING 'IN PARABLES'
THE PARABLES TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LAKE OF GALILEE, AND THOSE
TO THE DISCIPLES IN CAPERNAUM
(St. Matt. 13:1-52; St. Mark 4:1-34; St. Luke 8:4-18.)

We are once more with Jesus and His disciples by the Lake of Galilee. We love to think that it was in the early morning, when the light laid its golden shadows on the still waters, and the fresh air, untainted by man, was fragrant of earth's morning sacrifice, when no voice of human discord marred the restfulness of holy silence, nor broke the Psalm of Nature's praise. It was a spring morning too, and of such spring-time as only the East, and

chiefly the Galilean Lake, knows - nor of mingled sunshine and showers, of warmth and storm, clouds and brightness, when life seems to return slowly and feebly to the palsied limbs of our northern climes, but when at the warm touch it bounds and throbs with the vigour of youth. The imagery of the 'Sermon on the Mount' indicates that winter's rain and storms were just past.¹ 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 ranunculus² deck with wondrous richness the grass of the fields - alas! so soon to wither³ - while all trees put forth their fragrant promise of fruit.⁴ 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.

1. St. Matt. vii. 25.

2. It adds interest to these Solomon-like lilies that the Mishnah designates one class of them, growing in fields and vineyards, by the name 'royal lily' (Kil. v. 8, Bab. Talmud, p. 29 a). At the same time, the term used by our Lord need not be confined to 'lilies' in the strictest sense. It may represent the whole wild flora of spring, chiefly the anemones (comp. *Tristram*, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, pp. 462-465). A word with the same letters as κρινος (though of different meaning) is the Rabbinic *Narkes*, the narcissus - of course that)ρβδδδ (of fields), not)τψν≡ωνγδ (of gardens).

3. u.s. vi. 28-30. 4. vii. 16-20.

Other evidence of this is not wanting. From the opening verses⁵ 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,^{6 7} 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,⁸ 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.

5. St. Matt. xiii. 1, 2. 6. St. Matt. xii. 24 &c.

7. This seems to be the view of *Goebel* in his 'Parabeln Jesu,' a book to which I would here, in general, acknowledge my obligations. The latest work on the subject (*F. L. Steinmeyer*, d. Par. d. Herrn, Berlin 1884) is very disappointing.

8. St. Matt. xiii.

In the second series of Parables we mark a different stage. The fifteen Parables of which it consists⁹ 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*,¹⁰ 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,¹¹ 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.¹² This *was* the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. All the Parables spoken at that period bear more or less direct reference to it, though, as already stated, as yet in positive rather than negative form, the Evangelic element in them being primary, and the judicial only secondary.

9. St. Luke x.-xvi., xviii., passim.

10. Admonitory, hortatory - a term used in theology, of which it is not easy to give the exact equivalent.

11. St. Luke xi.-xiv. 12. St. Luke xi. 14-36; St. Matt. xii. 22-45; St. Mark iii. 22-30.

This order is reversed in the third series, consisting of eight Parables.¹³ Here the controversial has not only the ascendancy over the Evangelic element, but the tone has become judicial, and the Evangelic element appears chiefly in the form of certain predictions connected with the coming end. The Kingdom of God is presented in its final stage of ingathering, separation, reward and loss, as, indeed, we might expect in the teaching of the Lord immediately before His final rejection by Israel and betrayal into the hands of the Gentiles.

13. St. Matt. xviii., xx., xxi., xxii., xxiv., xxv.; St. Luke xix.

This internal connection between the Parables and the History of Christ best explains their meaning. Their artificial grouping (as by mostly all modern critics¹⁴) 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.'¹⁵ And this may lead up to such general remarks on the Parables as are necessary for their understanding.

14. Even *Goebel*, though rightly following the purely historical method, has, in the interest of so-called higher criticism, attempted such artificial grouping.

15. St. Mark iv. 11.

Little information is to be gained from discussing the etymology of the word *Parable*.¹⁶ 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 Jews¹⁷ as that by Parables. Only in their case, they were almost entirely illustrations of what had been said or taught;¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ which there is an almost literal Jewish parallel.²⁰ 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.²¹

16. From *παράβαλλω*, *projicio*, *admoveo rem rei comparationis causa* (*Grimm*). Little can be learned from the classical definitions of the *παραβολή*. See Archbishop *Trench* on the Parables.

17. *F. L. Steinmeyer* has most strangely attempted to deny this. Yet every ancient Rabbinic work is literally *full* of parables. In *Sanh. 39 b* we read that R. Meir's discourses consisted in third of legal determinations, in third of Haggadah, and in third of parables.

18. I am here referring only to the form, not the substance, of these Jewish parables.

19. St. Luke xv. 8-10. 20. In the Midrash on Cant. i. i

21. It is, indeed, possible that the framework of some of Christ's Parables may have been adopted and adapted by later Rabbis. No one who knows the early intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians would deny this *à priori*.

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' (*ל#μ Kλ λω#μ*) '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.²² Even this will illustrate what has been said of the difference between Rabbinic Parables and those employed by our Lord.

22. Midr. on Cant. i. 1.

The general distinction between a Parable and a Proverb, Fable and Allegory, cannot here be discussed at length.²³ 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,²⁴ and even proverbial sayings, such as 'Physician, heal thyself,'²⁵ or that about the blind leading the blind,²⁶ 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.²⁷

23. I must here refer to the various Biblical Dictionaries, to Professor *Westcott's* Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (pp. 28, 286), and to the works of Archbishop *Trench* and Dr. *Goebel*.

24. St. Matt. xxiv. 32; St. Mark iii. 23; St. Luke v. 36.

25. St. Luke iv. 23 26. St. Matt. xv. 15

27. Every reader of the Gospels will be able to distinguish these various classes.

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,²⁸ 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,²⁹ about the blind leading the blind,³⁰ about the forth-putting of leaves on the fig-tree,³¹ or in the parabolic proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself';³² or in such parabolic narratives of St. John, as about the Good Shepherd,³³ or the Vine,³⁴ 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,³⁵ the leaven in the meal,³⁶ and the pearl of great price,³⁷ 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,³⁸ 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.

28. *Cremer* (Lex. of N.T. Greek, p. 124) lays stress on the idea of a *comparison*, which is manifestly incorrect; *Goebel*, with not much better reason, on that of a narrative form.

29. St. Luke v. 36. 30. St. Luke vi. 39. 31. St. Matt. xxiv. 32. 32. St. Luke iv. 23.

33. St. John x. 34. St. John xv. 35. St. Mark iv. 26-29. 36. St. Matt. xiii. 33.

37. vv. 45, 46. 38. St. Mark iv. 26-29.

In view of what has been explained, the arrangement of the Parables into *symbolical* and *typical*³⁹ can only apply to their form, not their substance. In the first of these classes a scene from nature or from life serves as basis for exhibiting the corresponding spiritual reality. In the latter, what is related serves as type (τύπος), not in the ordinary sense of that term, but in that not unfrequent in Scripture: as example - whether for imitation,⁴⁰ or in warning.⁴¹ 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.

39. So by *Goebel*. 40. Phil. iii 17; 1 Tim. iv. 12. 41. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11.

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,⁴² the fact that Jesus spake to the people in Parables,⁴³ and *only* in Parables,⁴⁴ is strongly marked. It appears, therefore, to have been the first time that this mode of popular teaching was adopted by him.⁴⁵ Accordingly, the disciples not only expressed their astonishment, but inquired the reason of this novel method.⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸ 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,⁴⁹ consisted of a cumulation of Parables, without any hint as to their meaning or interpretation.⁵⁰ 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.

42. St. Matt. xiii. 43. St. Matt. xiii. 3, and parallels. 44. St. Matt. xiii. 34; St. Mark iv. 33, 34.

45. In the Old Testament there are parabolic descriptions and utterances - especially in Ezekiel (xv.; xvi.; xvii.; xix.), and a fable (Judg. ix. 7-15), but only two Parables: the one *typical* (2 Sam. xii. 1-6), the other *symbolical* (Is. v. 1-6).

46. St. Matt. xiii. 10, and parallels. 47. St. Matt. xiii. 36, 44-52. 48. St. Matt. xi. 13-17.

49. St. Matt. xiii. 1-9, 24-33. 50. So even *Goebel* (i. pp. 33-42, and especially p. 38.)

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.⁵¹

51. St. Matt. xiii. 13-15.

We are now in some measure able to understand, why Christ now for the first time adopted parabolic teaching. Its reason lay in the altered circumstances of the case. All his

former teaching had been plain, although initial. In it He had set forth by Word, and exhibited by fact (in miracles), that Kingdom of God which He had come to open to all believers. The hearers had now ranged themselves into two parties. Those who, whether temporarily or permanently (as the result would show), had admitted these 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.⁵²

52. Is. vi. 9, 10.

Thus much in general explanation. The record of the first series of Parables⁵³ 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.

53. St. Matt. xiii.

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,⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ 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.

54. The correct reading in St. Matt. xiii. 18 is του σπειραντος not σπειροντος as in the T. R.

55. St. Mark iv. 26-29.

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 Sower⁵⁶ 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 (δψ τλωπμ) or by means of cattle (Μψρωω#≡Ξ τλωπμ).⁵⁷ 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,⁵⁸ 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,⁵⁹ 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?

56. With the definite article - not 'a Sower,' as in our A.V., but the Sower.

57. Arach. 25 a, line 18 from bottom.

58. παρα την οδον, not παρα τον αγρον. I cannot understand how this road could be within the ploughed and sowed field. Our view is further confirmed by St. Luke viii. 5, where the seed is described as 'trodden down' - evidently on the highway.

59. Comp. the slight variations in the three Gospels.

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.⁶⁰ 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'⁶¹), 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.

60. Comp. the chapter on the Temptation. 61. St. Luke viii. 14.

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,⁶² 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. Automatic⁶³ [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 forth⁶⁴ 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.

62. St. Mark iv. 26-29.

63. I would here remark in general, that I have always adopted what seemed to me the best attested readings, and endeavoured to translate literally, preserving, where it seemed desirable, even the succession of the words.

64. This is a Hebraism - explaining the Hebrew use of the verb $\xi\lambda\#$ in analogous circumstances.

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,⁶⁵ but only a degenerate kind of wheat.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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.

65. Kil. i. 1. 66. Jer. Kil. 26 *d*. 67. Ber. R. 28 ed. Warsh. p. 53 *a*, about the middle.

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 become⁶⁸ like to a man who sowed good seed in his field. But in the *time* that men sleep came his enemy and over-sowed tares⁶⁹ in (upon) the midst⁷⁰ 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.

68. The tense should here be marked.

69. The Greek ζιζανιον is represented by the Hebrew פֶּשֶׁעִים or נֹאֲמָזִים

70. The expression is of great importance. The right reading is επισπειρεν (*insuper sero* - to sow above), not εσπειρε (sowed).

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.'⁷¹ 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,⁷² 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.'⁷³ 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.'⁷⁴

71. St. Matt. xiii. 36. 72. St. John vi. 66-70.

73. *Æon*, or 'age,' *without* the article in ver. 40, and so it should also be in ver. 39.

74. With the two articles: the well-known oven of the well-known fire - Gehenna.

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,⁷⁵ and to the 'sun-like forthshining' in glory of the righteous in the Kingdom prepared by their Father.

75. Without here anticipating what may have to be said as to Christ's teaching of the final fate of the wicked, it cannot be questioned that at that period the doctrine of endless punishment was the common belief of the Jews. I am aware, that dogmas should not be based upon parabolic teaching, but in the present instance the Parable would have been differently worded, if such dogmatic teaching had not been in the mind of Speaker and hearers.

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.⁷⁶ In fact, the expression, 'small as a mustard-seed,' had become proverbial, and was used, not only by our Lord,⁷⁷ but frequently by the Rabbis, to indicate the smallest amount, such as the least drop of blood,⁷⁸ the least defilement,⁷⁹ or the smallest remnant of sun-glow in the sky.⁸⁰ '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,'⁸¹ 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.⁸²

76. Certainly the *Sinapis nigra*, and not the *Salvadora persica*.

77. St. Matt. xvii. 20. 78. Ber. 31 a. 79. Nidd. v. 2.

80. Vayyik. R. 31, ed. Warsh., vol. iii. p. 48 a. 81. St. Luke xiii. 18, 19.

82. Comp. *Tristram*, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 472. The quotations in *Buxtorf's Lex. Rabb.* pp. 822, 823, on which the supposed Rabbinic illustrations of the growth of the plant are based (*Lightfoot*, *Schöttgen*, *Wetstein*, even *Vorstius* and *Winer*), are wholly inapt, being taken from legendary descriptions of the future glory of Palestine - the exaggerations being of the grossest character.

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'⁸³ - there, or else under the shadow of it,⁸⁴ 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,⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶ Indeed, it is specifically used as an illustration of the Messianic Kingdom.⁸⁷ 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.

83. Canon *Tristram's* rendering of the verb (u. s. p. 473) as merely perching or resting does not give the real meaning of it. He has very aptly noticed how fond birds are of the mustard-seed.

84. St. Mark iv. 32. 85. Jer. Shabb. 16 c.

86. Ezek. xxxi. 6, 12; Dan. iv. 12, 14, 21, 22. 87. Ezek. xvii. 23.

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,⁸⁸ 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,⁸⁹ while the Jerusalem ephah was one-fifth, and the Sepphoris (or Galilean) ephah two-fifths, or, according to another authority, one-half larger.⁹⁰ To mix 'three measures' of meal was common in Biblical, as well as in later times.⁹¹ 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.

88. Men. vii. 89. Erub. viii. 2; 83 a.

90. Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Handelsgesch. d. Juden*, pp. 183-185.

91. Comp. Gen. xviii. 6; Judg. vi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 24; *Jos. Ant.* ix. 4, 5; Babha B. 9 a, &c.

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.⁹² 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.⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ 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.

92. St. Matt. xiii. 36; comp. ver. 10, and St. Mark iv. 10. 93. St. John iv. 35.

94. On Is. lxi. 10, we read the following beautiful illustration, alike of the words of our Lord in St. Matt. xiii. 16, and of the exclamation of the woman in St. Luke xi. 27: 'Seven garments there are with which the Holy One, blessed be His Name, clothed Himself, from the time the world was created to the hour when He will execute punishment on Edom the wicked (Rome). When He created the world, He clothed himself with glory and splendour (Ps. civ. 1); when He manifested Himself by the Red Sea, He clothed Himself with majesty (Ps. xciii. 1); when He gave the Law, He clothed Himself with strength (*ib.*); when He forgives the iniquity of Israel, He clothes Himself in white (Dan. vii. 9); when He executeth punishment on the nations of the world, He clothes himself with vengeance (Is. lix. 17). The sixth garment He will put on in the hour when the Messiah shall be revealed. Then shall He clothe Himself with righteousness (*ib.*). The seventh garment is when He taketh vengeance on Edom, then shall He be clothed in red (Is. lxxiii. 2). And the garment with which in the future He will clothe Messiah shall shine forth from one end of the world to the other, according to Is. lxi. 10. And Israel shall enjoy His light, and say, Blessed the hour in which Messiah was born; blessed the womb which bare Him; blessed the generation which seeth, blessed the eye which is deemed worthy to behold Him, because that the opening of His lips is blessing and peace, His speech rest to the soul, and security and rest are in His Word. And on His tongue pardon and forgiveness; His prayer the incense of accepted sacrifice; His entreaty holiness and purity. Blessed are ye Israel - what is reserved for you! Even as it is written' (Ps. xxxi. 20; 19 in our A. V.). (Pesiqta, ed. *Bub.* p. 149 *a* and *b.*)

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 owner⁹⁵ 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.^{96 97} 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.

95. The εμπορος - in opposition to the κοπηλος, or huckster, small trader - is the *en gros* merchant who travels from place to place and across waters (from πορος) to purchase.

96. B. Mets. 25 *a, b*.

97. But the instance quoted by *Wetstein* (N. Test. i. p. 407) from Babha Mez. 28 *b* is inapt, and depends on entire misunderstanding of the passage. The Rabbi who found the treasure, so far from claiming, urged its owner to take it back.

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.⁹⁸ Our first question, therefore, is: Whence this un-

Jewish and anti-Jewish teaching concerning the Kingdom on the part of Jesus of Nazareth?

98. The so-called Rabbinic illustrations are inapt, except as *per contra*. Thus, on St. Matt. xiii. 17 it is to be remarked, that in Rabbinic opinion revelation of God's mysteries would only be granted to those who were righteous or learned. The Midr. on Eccl. i. 7 contains the following Parable in illustration (comp. Dan. ii. 21): A matron is asked, to which of two that would borrow she would lend money - to a rich or a poor man. And when she answers: To a rich man, since even if he lost it, he would be able to repay, she is told that similarly God gives not wisdom to fools, who would employ it for theatres and baths, &c., but to the sages, who make use of it in the Academies. A similar and even more strange explanation of Exod. xv. 26 occurs Ber. 40 *a*, where it is shown that God supports the full, and not, as man, an empty vessel. Hence, if we begin to learn, or repeat what we have learned, we shall learn more, and conversely also. Further, on ver. 12 we note, that 'to have taken away what one hath' is a Jewish proverbial expression: 'that which is in their hand shall be taken from them' (Ber. R. 20, ed. Warsh. p. 38 *b*, last two lines). Expressions similar to ver. 16 are used by the Rabbis, for ex. Chag. 14 *b*. In regard to ver. 17, R. Eliezer inferred from Exod. xv. 2 that servantmaids saw at the Red Sea what neither Ezekiel nor the prophets had seen, which he corroborates from Ezek. i. 1 and Hos. xii. 10 (Mechilta, ed. Weiss p. 44 *a*). Another and much more beautiful parallelism has been given before. On ver. 19 it ought to be remarked that the Wicked One was not so much represented by the Rabbis as the Enemy of the Kingdom of God, but as that of individuals - indeed, was often described as identical with the evil impulse (Yetser haRa, comp. Chag. 16 *a*; B. Bathr. 16 *a*; Succ. 52 *a*). On ver. 22 we remark, that not riches, but poverty, was regarded by the Rabbis as that which choked the good seed. On ver. 39, we may remark a somewhat similar expression in B. Mez. 83 *b*: 'Let the Lord of the Vineyard come and remove the thorns.' On ver. 42, the expression 'oven of fire,' for Gehenna, is the popular Jewish one ($\rho\omega\equiv v\equiv\tau\equiv$). Similarly, the expression, 'gnashing of teeth,' chiefly characteristic of the anger and jealousy of those in Gehinnom, occurs in the Midrash on Eccl. i. 15. On ver. 44 we refer to the remarks and note on that Parable (p. 595). In connection with ver. 46, we remember that, in Shabb. 119 *a*, a story is told concerning a pearl for which a man had given his whole fortune, hoping thereby to prevent the latter being alienated from him (comp. Ber. R. 11). Lastly, in connection with ver. 47 we notice, that the comparison of men with fishes is a common Jewish one (Abod. Zar. 3 *b*; 4 *a*).

Our second question goes still farther. For, if Jesus was not a Prophet - and, if a Prophet, then also the Son of God - yet no more strangely unexpected prophecy, minutely true in all its details, could be conceived, than that concerning His Kingdom which His parabolic description of it conveyed. Has not History, in the strange, unexpected fulfilling of that which no human ingenuity at the time could have forecast, and no pen have described with more minute accuracy of detail, proved Him to be more than a mere man - One sent from God, the Divine King of the Divine Kingdom, in all the vicissitudes which such a Divine Kingdom must experience when set up upon earth?

Chapter 24
CHRIST STILLS THE STORM ON THE LAKE OF GALILEE.
(St. Matthew 8:18,23-27; St. Mark 4:35-41; St. Luke 8:22-25.)

IT was the evening of that day of new teaching, and once more great multitudes were gathering to Him. What more, or, indeed, what else, could He have said to those to whom He had all that morning spoken in Parables, which hearing they had not heard nor understood? It was this, rather than weariness after a long day's working, which led to the resolve to pass to the other side. To merely physical weariness Jesus never subordinated his work. If, therefore, such had been the motive, the proposal to withdraw for rest would have come from the disciples, while here the Lord Himself gave command to pass to the other side. In truth, after that day's teaching it was better, alike for these multitudes and for His disciples that He should withdraw. And so 'they took Him even as He was' - that is, probably without refreshment of food, or even preparation of it for the journey. This indicates how readily, nay, eagerly, the disciples obeyed the behest.

Whether in their haste they heeded not the signs of the coming storm; whether they had the secret feeling, that ship and sea which bore such burden were safe from tempest; or, whether it was one of those storms which so often rise suddenly, and sweep with such fury over the Lake of Galilee, must remain undetermined. He was in 'the ship'¹ - 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 testimony² 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.

1. The definite article (St. Mark iv. 36) marks it as 'the' ship - a well-known boat which always bore Him.

2. Phil. ii. 6.

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.'³ 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.

3. St. Mark iv. 37.

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,⁴ the miracle on its proclamations of the special Divine Manifestations in the sea;⁵ 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,⁶ or with those of impatience, perhaps uttered by Peter himself?⁷ 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,⁸ or the converse?⁹ 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,¹⁰ the help first, and then the rebuke?

4. Is. vi. 9, 10. 5. Ps. cvii. 9; cvii. 25; Is. li. 10; Nah. i. 4-7; Hab. iii. 8.

6. St. Matt. and St. Luke. 7. St. Mark. 8. St. Matt.

9. St. Mark and St. Luke. 10. St. Mark probably from St. Peter.

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 them¹¹ 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.

11. From the size of these boats it seems unlikely, that any but His closest followers would have found room in the ship. Besides, the language of those who called for help and the answer of Christ imply the same thing.

When 'He was awakened'¹² by the voice of His disciples, 'He rebuked the wind and the sea,' as Jehovah had of old¹³ - just as He had 'rebuked' the fever,¹⁴ and the paroxysm of the demonised.¹⁵ 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 throbbled 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 first 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?'¹⁶ but 'Who, then, is this?'¹⁷ 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 unreachings of their faith: where was it? and how was it, they had no faith?

12. St. Mark iv. 38. 13. Ps. cvi. 9; Nah. i. 4. 14. St. Luke iv. 39.

15. St. Mark ix. 25. 16. St. Mark i. 27. 17. So literally.

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 parallel¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.

18. The supposed Rabbinic parallels in *Wetstein* (Babha Mez. 59 b) and *Wünsche's* (Chull. 7 a) works are quite inapplicable.

19. The strangest commentation, perhaps, is that of *Volkmar* (Marcus, pp. 307-312). For I cannot here perceive any kind of parallelism with the history of Jonah, nor yet see any references to the history of St. Paul's shipwreck.

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,²⁰ and the initial fulfilment of the promise which this destination implied. 'Creation' has, indeed, been 'made subject to vanity';²¹ 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.'²² 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.

20. Ps. viii. 4-8. 21. Rom. viii 20. 22. Ber. R. 12.

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.²³ 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.

23. A fact may be the basis of a symbol; but a symbol can never be the basis of a fact. The former is the principle of Divine history, the latter of human legend. But, even so, legend could never have arisen but for a belief in Divine history: it is the counterfeit coin of Revelation.

We perceive only difficulties and the seemingly impossible, as we compare what may be before us with that which we consciously possess. He also makes this outlook: but only to know and show, that with Him there can be no difficulty, since all is His - and all may be ours, since He has come for our help and is in the ship. One thing only He wonders at - the shortcomings of our faith; and one thing only makes it impossible for Him to help - our unbelief.

Chapter 25
AT GERASA
THE HEALING OF THE DEMONISED
(St. Matthew 8:28-34; St. Mark 5:1-20; St. Luke 8:26-39.)

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.¹ 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.'² 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.

1. In the history related in St. Matt. xiv. 22, &c. the embarkation was much later (see next note), and it is expressly stated that 'the wind was contrary.' But even there, when it ceased they were 'immediately' on shore (St. John vi. 21), although the distance formerly traversed had been rather less than three-fourths of the way (twenty-five or thirty furlongs, St. John vi. 19). At that place the whole distance across would be five or six miles. But the passage from Capernaum to Gerasa would not be so long as that.

2. The distinction between the two evenings seems marked in St. Matt. xiv. 15, as compared with verse 23. In both verses precisely the same expression is used. But between the first and the second evening a considerable interval of time must be placed.

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.³ This is the correct reading in St. Mark's, and probably in St. Luke's, perhaps also in St. Matthew's Gospel.⁴ 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.

3. Comp. *Tristram's* 'Land of Israel,' p. 465; *Büdeker's (Socin)* Palestina, p. 267. The objection in *Riehm's* Handwörterb. p. 454, that Gerasa did not form part of the Decapolis manifestly derives no real support from St. Mark v. 20. The two facts are in no way inconsistent. All other localisations are impossible, since the text requires close proximity to the lake. Professor *Socin* describes this cliff as steep 'as nowhere else by the lake.'

4. In this, as in all other instances, I can only indicate the critical results at which I have arrived. For the grounds, on which these conclusions are based, I must refer to the works which bear on the respective subjects.

From these tombs the demonised, who is specially singled out by St. Mark and St. Luke, as well as his less prominent companion,⁵ 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.⁶ 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.

5. St. Matt. viii. 28.

6. See Appendix XIII., 'Angelology and Demonology:' and Appendix XVI., 'Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised.' Archdeacon *Farrar* has misunderstood the reference of *Otho* (Lex. Rabb. 146). The affections mentioned in Jer. Terum. 40 *b* are not treated as 'all demoniacs;' on the contrary, most of them, indeed all, with one exception, are expressly stated to be indications of *mental disease* (comp. also Chag. 3 *b*). The quotations of *Gfrörer* are, as too often, for a purpose, and untrustworthy, except after examination of the context.

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 *Individualism*, *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 individualism, 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,⁷ the absence of self-control,⁸ his homicidal,⁹ and almost suicidal,¹⁰ 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.

7. St. Mark v. 3, 4.

8. 'Ware no clothes' (St. Luke viii. 27) may, however, refer only to the upper, not the under-garments.

9. St. Matt. viii. 28. 10. St. Mark v. 5.

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,¹¹ 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,¹² which presently manifested itself in language such as might have been expected.

11. In his endeavour to represent the demonised state as a species of mania, which was affected by the Presence of Christ, Archdeacon *Farrar* makes the following statement: 'The presence, the look, the voice of Christ, even before He addressed these sufferers, seems always to have calmed and overawed them.' But surely the very opposite of this is the fact, and the first effect of contact with Christ was not calm, but a paroxysm.

12. St. Mark v. 6; St. Luke viii. 28.

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, whose consciousness was under their control - not unified, but identified with it - exclaimed: 'I adjure Thee by God, that Thou torment me not.'

This strange mixture of the demoniac with the human, or rather, this expression of underlying demoniac thought in the forms and modes of thinking of the Jewish victim, explains the expressed fear of present actual torment, or, as St. Matthew, who, from the briefness of his account, does not seem to have been an eye-witness, expresses it: 'Thou art come to torment us before the time;' and possibly also for the 'adjuration by God.'¹³ 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.

13. Both St. Mark and St. Luke have it: 'Jesus, Son of the Most High God.'

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.'¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ For, it was a common Jewish idea, that, under certain circumstances, 'a legion of hurtful spirits'¹⁶ (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?'¹⁷

14. So substantially in St. Luke, as in St. Mark.

15. This is one of the difficulties mentioned by Dean *Plumptre*. Archdeacon *Farrar* seems to think that the man imagined '6000 devils were in possession of his soul.' His statement, that it 'was a thoroughly Jewish belief' that unclean spirits should pass into the swine, I must take leave to deny. One or another disease, such as *rabies*, were, indeed, attributed by some Rabbis to the agency of evil spirits - but there is no ground for either the general or the specific statement of Dr. Farrar as regards this 'Jewish belief.'

16. The common Rabbinic word for Legion is, indeed, *Ligyon* or *Ligyona*, but the expression (Ber. 51 a) $\tau\psi\nu\nu\iota\psi\gamma\equiv\iota\lambda:\tau\equiv\alpha\sigma\iota$) ι (Istalginit) $\psi\kappa$) $\lambda\mu$ $\lambda\#$ $\eta\lambda\beta\xi$ cannot mean anything else than a legion of hurtful spirits.

17. Ber. 51 a.

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,¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ He only 'said unto them, Go!'

18. St. Mark v. 13.

19. The verb *επιτρεπω* is used both in the active sense of permitting, and in that of not hindering. As to the latter use of the word, comp. specially St. Matt. xix. 8; St. Mark x. 4.

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.²⁰ 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.

20. This is the view of Archdeacon *Farrar*. The Gadara of which the poets *Meleager* and *Philodemus* were natives was, of course, not the scene of this miracle.

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.²¹

21. As this healing of the demonised may be regarded as the 'test-case' on the general question, I have entered more fully on the discussion. The arguments in favour of the general view taken of the demonised are so clearly and forcibly stated by Archbishop *Trench* (on 'The Miracles') and in 'The Speaker's Commentary' (N. Test. vol. i. p. 44), that it seems needless to reiterate them. To me at least it seems difficult to understand, how

any reader of the narrative, who comes to it without preconceived opinions, can arrive at any other conclusion than that either the whole must be rejected as mythical, or else be received as implying that there was a demonised state, different from madness; that Jesus treated the present as such; bade the unclean spirits go out, and by His word banished them. The objection as to the morality of the destruction of the herd seems scarcely more weighty than the sneer of *Strauss*, that the devils must have been stupid in immediately destroying their new habitations. The question of morality cannot even be raised, since Jesus did not command - only not hinder - the devils entering into the swine, and as for the destruction of their new dwellings, so far from being stupid, it certainly did secure their undisturbed continuance in the country and the withdrawal of Jesus. All attempts to adapt this miracle to our modern experience, and the ideas based upon it, by leaving out or rationalising one or another trait in the narrative, are emphatically failures. We repeat: the history must be received as it stands - or wholly rejected.

Chapter 26
THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN
CHRIST'S PERSONAL APPEARANCE
THE RAISING OF JAIRUS' DAUGHTER
(**St. Matthew 9:18-26; St. Mark 5:21-43; St. Luke 8:40-56.**)

THERE seems remarkable correspondence between the two miracles which Jesus had wrought on leaving Capernaum and those which He did on His return. In one sense they are complementary to each other. The stilling of the storm and the healing of the 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,¹ 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.

1. comp. St. Luke viii. 45; St. Mark v. 31.

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'² - and when they³ 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,⁴ was apparently not a common one.⁵ But these are comparatively small difficulties in the way of the mythical interpretation.

2. *Jesu v. Nazar.* ii. 2, p. 472. 3. *Strauss, Leben Jesu* ii. p. 135.

4. *Jos. Jewish War* vi. 1. 8, close.

5. The name, a well-known O.T. one (*Numb.* xxxii. 41; *Judg.*, x. 3), does not occur in Rabbinic literature till after the Middle Ages.

Jairus, one of the Synagogue-rulers⁶ of Capernaum, had an only daughter,⁷ who at the time of this narrative had just passed childhood, and reached the period when Jewish Law declared a woman of age.⁸ 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*).⁹ 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.

6. *Keim* starts the theory that, according to St. Matthew, Jairus was an ἀρχων in the sense of a civil magistrate. This, in order to make St. Matthew contradict St. Mark and St. Luke, as if ἀρχων were not one of the most common designations of Synagogue-rulers.

7. The particulars of her history must be gathered from a comparison of the three Gospels.

8. A woman came of age at twelve years and one day, and boys at thirteen years and one day.

9. *Godet* points out a like summarisation in St. Matthew's account of the Centurion's servant.

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 cases¹⁰ 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.¹¹ And this need of faith was the main point.

10. The following are the instances in which silence was enjoined: - St. Matt. viii. 4 (St. Mark i. 44; St. Luke v. 14); St. Matt. ix. 30; xii. 16; St. Mark iii. 12; v. 43 (St. Luke viii. 56); St. Mark vii. 36; viii. 26.

11. In general, we would once more thus formulate our views: *In the Days of Christ men learned first to believe in His Person, and then in His Word; in the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit we learn first to believe in His Word, and then in His Person.*

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 Judaean 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 Talmud¹² 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.¹³ 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.'

12. Shabb. 110 *a* and *b*.

13. Such as the ashes of an Ostrich-Egg, carried in summer in a linen, in winter in a cotton rag; or a barley-corn found in the dung of a white she-ass, &c.

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;¹⁴ to wear dirty clothes deserved death;¹⁵ for 'the glory of God was man, and the glory of man was his dress.'¹⁶ 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.^{17 18} 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.¹⁹ 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'²⁰ 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.²¹ Perhaps a distinctive garment, most likely a head-gear, was worn, even by 'rulers' ('the elder,' Νθζ), at their ordination.²² The Palestinian *Nasi*, or President of the Sanhedrin, also had a distinctive dress,²³ and the head of the Jewish community in Babylon a distinctive girdle.^{24 25}

14. In Ber. 43 *b*, it is explained to refer to such shoes as had 'clouts on the top of clouts.'

15. Shabb. 114 *a*. 16. Derekh Erets s. x towards the end.

17. Babha Mez. 52 *a*; Chull. 84 *b*.

18. Accordingly, when a person applied for relief in food, inquiry was to be made as to his means, but not if he applied for raiment (Babha B 9 *a*).

19. Erub. 65 *b*. 20. Jer. Horay. 48 *a*, 4 lines from bottom. 21. Babha Mez. 85 *a*.

22. But I admit that the passage (Vayyik. R. 2) is not quite clear. The *Maaphoreth* there mentioned may not have been an official dress, but one which the man otherwise used, and which was only specially endeared to him by the recollection that he had worn it at his ordination.

23. Ber. 28 *a*. 24. Horay. 13 *b*.

25. In general, I would here acknowledge my indebtedness on the very difficult subject of dress to *Sachs*, Beiträge z. Sprach- u. Alterth.-Forsch.; to the Articles in *Levy's* Dictionaries; and especially to *Brüll*, Trachten d. Juden. The Article in *Hamburger's* Real-Encykl. is little more than a repetition of *Brüll's*. From other writers I have not been able to derive any help.

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.²⁶ 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 gloves²⁷ 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.²⁸ As regarded shoes, a man should sell his very roof-tree for them,²⁹ although he might have to part with them for food if he were in a weak condition through blood-letting.³⁰ But it was *not* the practice to provide more than one pair of shoes,³¹ and to this may have referred the injunction³² of Christ to the Apostle not to provide shoes for their journey, or else to the well-known distinction between shoes (*Manalim*) and sandals (*Sandalim*). The former, which were sometimes made of very coarse material, covered the whole foot, and were specially intended for winter or rainy weather; while the sandals, which only protected the soles and sides of the feet, were specially for summer use.³³

26. Shabb. 120 *a*; Jer. Shabb. 15 *d*.

27. So *Landau* renders one of the words in Shabb. 120 *a*. I need scarcely say that the rendering is very doubtful.

28. *Deiekh Erest R.* x p. 33 *d*.

29. *Brüll* regards this as controversial to the practices of the early Christians. But he confounds sects with the Church.

30. Shabb. 129 *a*; comp. Pes. 112 *a*. 31. Jer. Shabb. vi. 2.

32. St. Matt. x. 10. 33. B. Bathra 58 *a*, lines 2 and 3 from top.

In regard to the covering of the head, it was deemed a mark of disrespect to walk abroad, or to pass a person, with bared head.³⁴ 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'³⁵ by 'with uncovered head'³⁶ 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*).³⁷ The *Sudar* was twisted by Rabbis in a peculiar manner to distinguish them from others.³⁸ We read besides of a sort of cap or hood attached to garments.

34. On the other hand, to walk about with shoes loosed was regarded as a mark of pride.

35. Exod. xiv. 8. 36. The like expression occurs in the Targum on Judg. v. 9.

37. Kel. xxix. 1.

38. Pes. 111 *b*. See also the somewhat profane etymology of $\rho\delta\omega\sigma$ in Shabb. 77 *b*, $\omega\psi\rho\psi\lambda \quad \bar{\eta} \delta\omega\sigma$.

Three, or else four articles commonly constituted the dress of the body. First came the under-garment, commonly the *Chaluq* of the *Kittuna*³⁹ (The Biblical *Kethoneth*), from

which latter some have derived the word 'cotton.' The *Chaluq* might be of linen or of wool.⁴⁰ The sages wore it down to the feet. It was covered by the upper garment or *Tallith* to within about a handbreadth.⁴¹ 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 possess only one such 'coat' or inner garment was a mark of poverty.⁴² Hence, when the Apostles were sent on their temporary mission, they were directed not to take 'two coats.'⁴³ 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' (χιτων) corresponds. As the garment which our Lord wore,⁴⁴ ⁴⁵ and those of which He spoke to His Apostles are designated by that name, we conclude that it represents the well-known *Kethoneth* or Rabbinic *Kittuna*. This might be of almost any material, even leather, though it was generally of wool or flax. It was sleeved, close-fitting, reached to the ankles, and was fastened round the loins, or just under the breast,⁴⁶ by a girdle. One kind of the latter, the *Pundah* or *Aphundah*,⁴⁷ was provided with pockets or other receptacles,⁴⁸ and hence might not be worn outside by those who went into the Temple,⁴⁹ probably to indicate that he who went to worship should not be engaged in, nor bear mark of, any other occupation.

39. Also, *Kittanitha*, and *Kittunita*. 40. Jer. Shan. 20 c, bottom. 41. Baha B. 57 b.

42. Meod. K.14 a. 43. St. Matt. x. 10, and parallels. 44. St. John xix. 23.

45. As to the mode of weaving such garments, see the pictorial illustration in *Braunius*, Vest. Sacred. Hebræor., which is reproduced, with full details for various other works, in *Hartmanns* Hebr. am Putzt. vol. i., explanatory notes being added at the beginning of vol. iii. *Sammter's* note in his edition of B. Mezia, p. 151 a, is only a reproduction of *Hartmann's* remarks.

46. Comp. Rev. i. 13.

47. It was worn outside (Jer. Ber. 14 c, top). This is the girdle which was not to be worn in the Temple, probably as being that of a person engaged in business.

48. This is the explanation of the Aruch (ed. *Landau*, i. p. 157 b). 49. Jer Ber. 14 c, top.

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.⁵⁰ ⁵¹ 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,⁵² and that, when worn by females, it was regarded as a mark of wealth,⁵³ 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 (ⲙⲡⲗⲗⲡⲗⲟⲡⲥⲁⲓⲛⲉⲛ).⁵⁴ The *Gunda* was a peculiarly Pharisaic garb.⁵⁵

But the upper garment which Jesus wore would be either the so-called *Goltha*, or, most likely, the *Tallith*. Both the *Goltha*⁵⁶ and the *Tallith*⁵⁷ 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 'fringes' was settled in accordance with the teaching of the School of Shammai. Four filaments (not three, as the Hillelites proposed), each of four finger-lengths (these, as later tradition put it, doubled), and attached to the four corners of what must be a strictly square garment - such were the earliest rules on the subject.⁵⁸ The Mishnah leaves it still a comparatively open question, whether these filaments were to be blue or white.⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ It seems even to imply the peculiar symbolical mode of knotting them at present in use.⁶¹ Further symbolic details were, of course, added in the course of time.⁶² 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.

50. Kel. xxix. 1; Ber. 23 *b*; 24 *b*, in the sense of kerchief worn in an accessible position; Pesiq. 15 *b*, as lying close to the body and yet contracting dust; Jer. Ber. 4 *c*, line 14 from top, as used for wrapping the upper part of the body.

51. This passage is both curious and difficult. It seems to imply that the *Aphqarsin* was a garment worn in summer, close to the body, and having sleeves.

52. Jer. Moed, K. 83 *d*. 53. Nidd. 48 *b*. 54. Sanh. 102 *b*, and often.

55. Sot. 22 *b*. 56. Jer, Sanh. 28 *c*. 57. Menach. 37 *b*. 58. Siphre, ed. Friedmann, p. 117 *a*.

59. Menach. iv. 1. 60. Targ. Ps.-Jon. on Numb. xvi. 2. 61. u. s. on Numb. xv. 38.

62. The number of knots and threads at present counted are, of course, later additions. The little tractate *Tsitsith Kirchheim*, Septem Libri Talm. P. pp. 22-24 is merely a summary. The various authorities on the subject - and not a few have been consulted - are more or less wanting in clearness and defective. Comp. p. 277, note 2, of this volume.

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*,⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ As we know, it 'was without seam, woven from the top throughout;⁶⁵ and this closely accords with the texture of these garments. Round the middle it would be fastened with a *girdle*.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ 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,⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰

63. The difference between it and the *Aphqarsin* seems to be, that the latter was worn and fastened *inside* the dress. The *Maaphoreth* would in some measure combine the uses of the *Sudar* and the *Aphqarsin*.

64. Tos. Megill. iv. p. 45 *b*, lines 17 and 16 from bottom. 65. St. John xix. 23.

66. Canon *Westcott* (Speaker's Comment. on St. John xix. 23) seems to imply that the girdle was worn outside the loose outer garment. This was not the case.

67. St. Matt. xviii. 5.

68. On this subject I must take leave to refer to the Bibl. Cyclopaedias and to '[Sketches of Jewish Social Life.](#)' pp. 220-224.

69. Zebhach. 19 *a*, *b*.

70. As the question is of considerable practical importance, the following, as bearing upon it, may be noticed. From Jer. Ber. 4 *c*, we gather: 1. That at one time it was the practice to wear the phylacteries all day long, in order to pass as pious. This is denounced as a mark of hypocrisy. 2. That it was settled, that phylacteries should be worn during a considerable part of the day, but not the whole day. [In Ber. 23 *a* to 24 *a* we have rules and discussions about depositing them under certain circumstances, and where to place them at night.] 3. That it was deemed objectionable to wear them only during prayer. 4. That celebrated Rabbis did not deem it necessary always to wear the phylacteries both on the head and on the arm. This seems to prove that their obligation could not have been regarded as absolutely binding. Thus, R. Jochanan wore those for the head only in winter, but not in summer, because then he did not wear a headgear. As another illustration, that the wearing of phylacteries was not deemed absolutely requisite, the following passage may be quoted (Sanh. xi. 3): 'It is more culpable to transgress the words of the Scribes than those of the Torah.' He that says, There are no phylacteries, transgresses the word of the Torah, and is not to be regarded as a rebel (literally, is free); but he who says, There are five compartments (instead of four), to add to the words of the Scribes, he is guilty.

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 read⁷¹ 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.⁷² 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.

71. St. John xix. 23.

72. I find that the lowest price mentioned for an upper garment was $7\frac{1}{2}$ *dinars*, or about 4s. 7d. (Jer. Kilay. ix. 1). The more common price, however, seems to have been 12 *dinars*, or about 7s. 6d. The cost of making seems to have been 8 *dinars*, or about 5s. (Jer. Babha Mets. vi. 1), leaving 4 *dinars*, or 2s. 6d., for the material. Of course, the latter might be much more expensive, and the cost of the garment increased accordingly.

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 probably⁷³ 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.

73. This, however, does not necessarily follow, although in New Testament language *κρᾶσπεδον* seems to bear that meaning. Comp. the excellent work of *Braunius* (Vest. Sac. Heb. pp. 72, 73 - not p. 55, as *Schleusner* notes).

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.'⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵

74. So literally in St. Mark's Gospel.

75. This gives the full meaning - but it is difficult to give a literal translation which would give the entire meaning of the original.

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. Mark⁷⁶ (as correctly rendered), nor of St. Luke, to oblige us to conclude that this forthgoing of Power, which He perceived in Himself, had been through an act, of the full meaning of which Christ was unconscious - in other words, that He was ignorant of the person who, and the reason why, she Had touched Him. In short, 'the forthgoing of the Power that is out of Him' was neither unconscious nor unwilling on His part. It was caused by her faith, not by her touch. 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' And the question of Jesus could not have been misleading, when 'straightway'⁷⁷ 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,'⁷⁸ 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,'⁷⁹ and be healed of thy scourge.'

76. The Revised Version renders it: 'And straightway Jesus, perceiving in Himself that the power *proceeding* from Him had gone forth, turned Him about.' Mark the position of the first comma. In the Speaker's Commentary it is rendered: 'And immediately Jesus, having perceived in Himself that the virtue had gone forth from Him.' Dean *Plumptre* translates: 'Knowing fully in Himself the virtue that had gone out from Him.'

77. The arrangement of the words in the A.V. is entirely misleading. The word 'immediately' refers to His turning round, *not* to His perceiving in Himself.

78. St. Luke viii. 47. 79. So literally.

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 Lazarus⁸⁰ 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 overheard⁸¹ it, as they whispered to the Ruler not to trouble the Rabbi any further,⁸² 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,⁸³ 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.⁸⁴

80. St. John xi. 6.

81. I adopt the reading *παρακουσας* which seems to me better rendered by 'overhearing' that by 'not heeding,' as in the Revised Version.

82. The word unquestionably means, literally, Teacher - but in the sense of Rabbi, or Master.

83. Those who believe in an 'antiPetrine' tendency in the Gospel by St. Luke must find it difficult to account for the prominence given to him in the Third Gospel.

84. I confess myself unable to see any real discrepancy between the accounts of St. Mark and St. Luke, such as *Strauss, Keim*, and others have tried to establish. In St. Mark it is: 'He suffered no man to accompany Him' (whither?); in St. Luke: 'He suffered not any man to enter in with Him.'

Within, 'the tumult' and weeping, the wail of the mourners, real or hired, and the melancholy sound of the mourning flutes⁸⁵ - 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* *Κμδ*, or *Κωμδ*, 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.

85. They are specially called 'flutes for the dead' (B. Mez. vi. 1): *τμλ Μψλψλξ*.

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.'⁸⁶ But 'He will not quench' it.

86. Is. xlii. 3.

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*] (ΜωϞθ) ταφψ:λ: + α⁸⁷), 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.'⁸⁸

87. The reading which accordingly seems best is that adopted by *Westcott and Hort*, Ταλειθα κουμ. The Aramaic or Rabbinic for maiden is either *Talyetha* or *Talyutha* (ταφωϞψλ: + Ϟ). In the second Targum on Esther ii. 7, 8, the reading is)ταφωϞλ + α (*Talutha*), where *Levy* conjectures the reading)ταφψλ + α (*Talitha*) or else *Talyetha*. The latter seems also the proper equivalent of ταλειθα, while the reading 'Talitha' is very uncertain. As regards the second word, *qum* [pronounced *kum*], most writers have, without difficulty, shown that it should be *qumi*, not *qum*. Nevertheless, the same command is spelt Μωθ in the Talmud (as it is pronounced in the Syriac) when a *woman* is addressed. In *Shabb. 110 b*, the command *qum*, as addressed to a woman suffering from a bloody flux, occurs not less than seven times in that one page (ρψβωζμ Μωθ).

88. St. Mark vii. 37.

How Jesus conveyed Himself away, whether through another entrance into the house, or by 'the road of the roofs,' we are not told. But assuredly, He must have avoided the multitude. Presently we find Him far from Capernaum. Probably He had left it

immediately on quitting the house of Jairus. But what of that multitude? The tidings must have speedily reached them, that the daughter of the Synagogue-Ruler was not dead. Yet it had been 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 cavils⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰

89. We cannot call the trivial objections urged other than 'cavils.'

90. According to *Eusebius* (Hist. Eccl. vii. 18) there was a statue in Paneas in commemoration of this event, which was said to have been erected by this woman to Christ.

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!⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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.

91. Jesu v. Nazar. ii. 2, p. 475.

92. The passage which *Strauss* quotes from *Bertholdt* (Christol. Jud. p. 179), is from a later Midrash, that on Proverbs. No one would think of deriving purely Jewish doctrine either from the Sohar or from IV. Esdras, which is of post-Christian date, and strongly tinged with Christian elements. Other passages, however, might be quoted in favour of this view (comp. *Weber*, Altsynagog. Theol. pp. 351, 352), and on the other side, *Hamburger*, Real-Encykl. (II. Abth. 'Belebung der Todten'). The matter will be discussed in the sequel.

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.'⁹³ 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.

93. 2 Tim. i. 10.

Chapter 27
SECOND VISIT TO NAZARETH
THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE
(St. Matthew 13:54-58, 10:1,5-42, 11:1; St. Mark 6:1-13; St. Luke 9:1-6.)

It almost seems, as if the departure of Jesus from Capernaum marked a crisis in the history of that town. From henceforth it ceases to be the center of His activity, and is only occasionally, and in passing, visited. Indeed, the concentration and growing power of Pharisaic opposition, and the proximity of Herod's residence at Tiberias¹ 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.'

1. Although in Ber. R. 23 the origin of that name is rightly traced to the Emperor Tiberius, it is characteristic that the Talmud tries otherwise to derive the name of what afterwards was the sacred capital of Palestinian Rabbinism, some explaining that it lay in the navel (*tibura*) of the land, others paraphrasing the name 'because the view was good' (Meg. 6 a). Rabbinic ingenuity declared it one of the cities fortified since the time of Joshua, so as to give it the privileges attaching to such.

The notice in St. Mark's Gospel,² 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.^{3 4} 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.

2. St. Mark vi. 1. 3. St. Luke iv. 16-31. 4. Compare Chapters X. and XI.

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;⁵ that Joseph had died; and that the mother and 'brethren' of Jesus had left Nazareth,⁶ while His 'sisters' apparently continued there, being probably married to Nazarenes.⁷

5. St. Mark vi. 3.

6. They seem to have settled in Capernaum, having followed Jesus to that place on His first removal to it. We can readily understand, that their continuance in Nazareth would have been difficult. The death of Joseph is implied in his not being mentioned in the later history of Jesus.

7. St. Mark vi. 3.

When Jesus had first left Nazareth to seek Baptism at the hands of John, it could scarcely have attracted much attention. Not only did 'the whole world' go after the Baptist, but, considering what was known of Jesus, His absence from, not His presence at the banks of Jordan, would have surprised the Nazarenes. Then came vague reports of His early doings, and, what probably His countrymen would much more appreciate, the accounts which the Galileans brought back from the Feast of what Jesus had done at Jerusalem.

His fame had preceded Him on that memorable Sabbath, when all Nazareth had thronged the Synagogue, curious to hear what the Child of Nazareth would have to say, and still more eager to see what He could do. Of the charm of His words there could be no question. Both what He said and how He said it, was quite other than what they had ever listened to. The difference was not in degree, but in kind: He spoke to them of the Kingdom; yet not as for Israel's glory, but for unspeakable comfort in the soul's deepest need. It was truly wonderful, and that not abstractly, but as on the part of 'Joseph's Son.' That was all they perceived. Of that which they had most come to see there was, and could be, no manifestation, so long as they measured the Prophet by His outward antecedents, forgetful that it was inward kinship of faith, which connected Him that brought the blessing with those who received it.

But this seeming assumption of superiority on the part of Joseph's Son was quite too much for the better classes of Nazareth. It was intolerable, that He should not only claim equality with an Elijah or an Elisha, but place them, the burghers of Nazareth, as it were, outside the pale of Israel, below a heathen man or woman. And so, if He had not, without the show of it, proved the authority and power He possessed, they would have cast Him headlong over the ledge of the hill of their insulted town. And now He had come back to them, after nine or ten months, in totally different circumstances. No one could any longer question His claims, whether for good or for evil. As on the Sabbath He stood up once more in that Synagogue to teach, they were astonished. The 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?'⁸

8 St. Mark vi. 2.

It was, indeed, more than a difficulty - an impossibility - to account for it on their principles. There could be no delusion, no collusion, no deception. In our modern cant-phrasology, 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,⁹ were spoken at a later time,¹⁰ 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.¹¹ Truly those to whom the Twelve were sent forth were 'troubled'¹² 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,¹³ it is to be noted: -

9. St. Matt. ix. 36-38. 10. St. Luke x. 2. 11. Comp. St. Matt. x. 26 with St. Luke xii. 1, 2.

12. So in St. Matt. ix. 36. 13. St. Matt. x. 5 to the end.

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 part¹⁴ applies entirely to this first Mission of the Twelve, although the closing words point forward to 'the judgment.'¹⁵ Accordingly it has its parallels, although in briefer form, in the other two Gospels.¹⁶

14. St. Matt. x. 5-15. 15. ver. 15. 16. St. Mark vi. 7-11; St. Luke ix. 1-5.

1. The Twelve were to go forth two and two,¹⁷ furnished with authority¹⁸ - 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.¹⁹ 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 provision²⁰ for their journey, beyond the absolute immediate present.²¹ 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.^{22 23}

17. St. Mark vi. 7.

18. So also in St. Matthew and in St. Mark. But this 'authority' sprang from the power which he gave them.

19. Dean *Plumptre* remarks: 'The words ("raise the dead") are omitted by the best MSS.'

20. *Weiss* (Matth. Evang. p. 262) has the curious idea that the prohibitions about money, &c., refer to their not making gain on their journey.

21. Sandals, but not shoes. As regards the marked difference about 'the staff,' *Ebrard* (Evang. Gesch. p. 459) points out the agreement of *thought* in all the Gospels. Nothing was to be taken - they were to go as they stood, without preparation or provision. Sometimes there was a secret receptacle at the top of the staff to hold valuables, or, in the case of the poor, water (Kel. xvii. 16).

22. Comp. for this latter aspect 1 Tim. v. 18.

23. According to Jewish Law, 'the labourers' (the Μηλι(α)ιωπῆς , at least), would be secured their food. Not so always, however, slaves (Gitt. 12 a). In general, the Rabbinic Law of slavery is exceeding harsh - far more so than that of the Pentateuch (comp. an abstract of the Laws of Slavery in *Fassel*, Mos.-Rabb. Civil-Recht, vol. ii. pp. 393-406).

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.'²⁴ 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.

24. The direction is recorded by St. Matthew only. But St. Matt. xxviii. 19 would, if it were necessary, sufficiently prove that this is not a Judaistic limitation.

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,²⁵ while the houses, springs, roads, and certain food of the Samaritans were declared clean.²⁶ At the same time, religiously and as regarded fellowship, the Samaritans were placed on the same footing with Gentiles.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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. 5.²⁹ ³⁰ 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, shoes³¹ (mark, not sandals), and a money-girdle.³² The symbolic³³ 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?'³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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.³⁶ ³⁷ In this sense, anything that clave to a person was metaphorically called 'the dust,' as for example, 'the dust of an evil tongue,'³⁸ 'the dust of usury,' as, on the other hand, to 'dust to idolatry' meant to cleave to it.³⁹ 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, who⁴⁰ 'returned to the place where his tent had been at the beginning.'⁴¹ ⁴²

25. Sanh. 15 *b*; Ned. 53 *b*. 26. Jer. Abhod. Z 44 *d*. 27. Jer. Sheq. i. 5, p. 46 *b*.

28. Ab. i. 13. 29. Ab. iv. 5; Bekhor. 29 *a*.

30. At the same time the statement in Bekhor. 29 *a*, that 'if needful money was to be paid for the acquisition of learning,' according to Prov. xxiii. 23 ('by the truth'), implies that the rule cannot always have been strictly observed.

31. The *Manal* (λαφν:μᾶ) or shoe, in contradistinction to the *Sandal* (λδᾶφν:σᾶ), as in Jer. Shabb. 8 *a*.

32. Ber. ix. 5.

33. The *Pundah* (ηδᾶφν:ωᾶπᾶ), or *Aphundah* (ηδᾶφν:ωᾶπᾶ). Comp. for ex. Jer. Shabb. 12 *c*.

34. St. Luke ii. 49. 35. Sanh. x. 3. 36. Deut. xiii. 17.

37. The explanations of this expression generally offered need not here be repeated.

38. Jer. Peah 16 *a*. 39. Sanh. 64 *a*.

40. According to Gen. xiii. 3. 41. Arach. 16 *b*, lines 12 and 11 from bottom.

42. So common, indeed, was this view as to have become proverbial. Thus, it was said concerning learned descendants of a learned man, that 'the Torah returned into its *Akhsanya* (ξενιᾶ),' or hospice (Baba Mez. 85 *a, bis*, in the curious story about the successful attempts made to convert to study the dissolute son of a great Rabbi).

These remarks show how closely the Lord followed, in this first part of His charge to the disciples,⁴³ Jewish forms of thinking and modes of expression. It is not otherwise in the second,⁴⁴ 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,⁴⁵ 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.'⁴⁶

43. St. Matt. x. 1-15. 44. St. Matt. x. 16-23. 45. vv. 16-18. 46. ver. 23.

Without here anticipating the full inquiry into the promise of His immediate Coming, it is important to avoid, even at this stage, any possible misunderstanding on the point. The expectation of the Coming of 'the Son of Man' was grounded on a prophecy of Daniel,⁴⁷ 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 Midrash⁴⁸ 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,⁴⁹ 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,⁵⁰ and visited with such punishments as these tribunals had power to inflict.⁵¹ More than this, they would be brought before governors and kings - primarily, the Roman governors and the Herodian princes.⁵² 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.⁵³ 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.'

47. Dan. vii. 13. 48. On Esther viii. 2, ed. Warsh. p. 120 *b*. 49. On Cant. ii. 14.

50. The question of the constitution and jurisdiction of the various Sanhedrin will be discussed in another place.

51. St. Matt. x. 17. 52. ver. 18. 53. vv. 21, 22.

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,⁵⁴ 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.

54. St. John xi. 48.

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,⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶ 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.

55. St. Luke xxi. 29-31. 56. St. Matt. xxi. 33-46, and the parallels.

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.⁵⁷ 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,⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ 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,⁶⁰ 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.

57. St. Matt. xvi. 28, and parallels. 58. St. Matt. xxiv. and parallels.

59. St. Matt. xxiv. 34; St. Mark xiii.30; St. Luke xxi. 32. 60. St. Matt. xxv. 1-30.

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.⁶¹ Even the direction to flee from persecution is repeated by the Rabbis in similar circumstances and established by the example of Jacob,⁶² of Moses,⁶³ and of David.⁶⁴

61. Sot. ix. 15; comp. Sanh. 97 *a* to 99 *a*, passim. 62. Hos. xii. 12.

63. Ex. ii. 15. 64. 1 Sam. xix. 12; comp. Bemidb. R. 23, ed. Warsh. p. 86 *b*, and Tanch.

In the next section of this Discourse of our Lord, as reported by St. Matthew,⁶⁵ 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:⁶⁶ 'It is enough for a servant to be as his lord' (וְהַעֲבָדֵם כְּאֲדֹנָיָם). 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,⁶⁷ 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*, (לֹא־בֵּזֵלִי:) means in Rabbinic language, not any ordinary dwelling, but specifically the Temple,⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ and *Beel-Zebul* would be the 'Master of the Temple.' On the other hand, *Zibbul* (לֹא־בֵּזֵלִי:) means⁷⁰ sacrificing to idols;⁷¹ and hence *Beel-zebul* would, in that sense, be equivalent to 'lord' or 'chief of idolatrous sacrificing'⁷² - 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!⁷³ What then might 'His Household' expect at their hands?

65. St. Matt. x. 24-34.

66. So Ber. 58 *b*; Siphra on Lev. xxv. 23; Ber. R. 49; Shem. R. 42; Midr. on Ps. xxvii. 4.

67. This is undoubtedly the correct reading, and not Beelzebub. Any reference to the Baalzebub, or 'fly-god' of 2 Kings i. 2, seems, rationally, out of the question.

68. *Zebhul* (לֹא־בֵּזֵלִי:) is also the name of the fourth of the seven heavens in which Jewish mysticism located the heavenly Jerusalem with its Temple, at whose altar Michael ministered (Chag. 12 *b*).

69. Jer. Ber. 13 *b*. 70. The primary meaning is: manuring (land) with dung.

71. Abod. Z. 18 *b*, and often.

72. It could not possibly mean, as has been supposed, 'lord of dung,' because dung is $\lambda\beta\epsilon\zeta\epsilon$ and not $\lambda\omega\equiv\beta\equiv\zeta$.

73. This alone explains the meaning of Beelzebul. Neither Beelzebub nor Baalzebul were *names* given by the Jews to any demon, but Beelzebul, the 'lord of sacrificing to idols,' would certainly be the *designation* of what they regarded as the chief of the demons.

But they were not to fear such misrepresentations. In due time the Lord would make manifest both His and their true character.^{74 75} 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,⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ 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* ($\rho\sigma\psi$), about the third of a penny.⁷⁹ 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' ($\#\nu\ \rho\beta\rho\ \#\pi\nu$), he came forth.⁸⁰

74. St. Matt. x. 26. 75. Mark the same meaning of the expression in St. Luke viii. 17; xii. 2.

76. Lev. xviii. 5. 77. Sanh. 74 *a* comp. Yoma 82 *a*.

78. I confess myself unable to understand the bearing of the special pleading of *Wünsche* against this inference from Sanh. 74 *a*. His reasoning is certainly incorrect.

79. The *Isar* (ρσαφψι), or assarion, is expressly and repeatedly stated in Rabbinic writings to be the twenty-fourth part of a dinar, and hence not a halfpenny farthing, but about the third of a penny. Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 180-182.

80. Ber. R. 79, ed. Warsh. p. 142 *b*; Jer. Shebh. ix. 1; Midr. on Eccl. x. 8; on Esth. i. 9; on Ps. xvii. 14.

Nor could even the additional promise of Christ: 'But of you even the hairs of the head are all numbered,'⁸¹ 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.⁸² And in later Rabbinic writings⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ 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.

81. This is the literal rendering.

82. Chull. 7 *b*; comp. also the even more realistic expression, Shabb. 107 *b*.

83. Pesiqta 18 *a*.

84. This appears more clearly when we translate literally (ver. 32): 'Who shall confess in Me' - and again: 'in him will I also confess.'

What follows in our Lord's Discourse⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷

85. St. Matt. x. 34.

86. The original is very peculiar: 'Think not that I came to cast peace on the earth,' as a sower casts the seed into the ground.

87. The meaning of the expression, losing and finding one's life, appears more markedly by attending to the tenses in the text: 'He that found his life shall lose it, and he that lost his life for My sake shall find it.'

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.^{88 89} 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 Targum⁹⁰ 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 Isaac, 'like who bears his cross on his shoulder.'⁹¹

88. B. Mets 33 *a*.

89. Especially if he taught him the highest of all lore, the Talmud, or explained the reason for the meaning of what it contained.

90. On Ruth i. 17. 91. Ber. R. 56, on Gen. xxii. 6.

Nor could the disciples be in doubt as to the meaning of the last part of Christ's address.⁹² 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.⁹³ The very expression 'in the name of' a prophet, or a righteous man, is strictly Jewish (*M#λ*), 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 court⁹⁴ had become the prophet of that name, because he had provided for the hundred prophets.⁹⁵ 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' (*Mψνμθ*) 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, there⁹⁶ does God not cause His Shekhinah to rest.⁹⁷

92. St. Matt. x. 40-42. 93. Comp. for example the long discussion in Ber. 63 *b*.

94. 1 Kings xviii. 4. 95. Sanh. 39 *b*.

96. According to Is. viii. 16. 97. Ber. R. 42, on Gen. xiv. 1.

We have been so particular in marking the Jewish parallelisms in this Discourse, first, because it seemed important to show, that the words of the Lord were not beyond the comprehension of the disciples. Starting from forms of thought and expressions with which they were familiar, He carried them far beyond Jewish ideas and hopes. But, secondly, it is just in this similarity of form, which proves that it was of the time, and to the time, as well as to us and to all times, that we best see, how far the teaching of Christ transcended all contemporary conception.

But the reality, the genuineness, the depth and 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.'⁹⁸

98. Sanh. 99 *a*.

It was not with such sayings that Christ sent forth His disciples; nor in such spirit, that the world has been subdued to Him. The relinquishing of all that is nearest and dearest, cross-bearing, loss of life itself - such were the terms of His discipleship. Yet acknowledgment there would surely, be first, in the felt and assured sense of His Presence; then, in the reward of a prophet, a righteous man, or, it might be, a disciple. But all was to be in Him, and for Him, even the gift of 'a cup of cold water' to 'a little one.' Nay, neither the 'little ones,' the learners, nor the cup of cold water given them, would be overlooked or forgotten.

But over all did the 'Meek and Lowly One' cast the loftiness of His Humility.

Chapter 28
THE STORY OF THE BAPTIST, FROM HIS LAST TESTIMONY TO JESUS TO HIS BEHEADING IN PRISON

(1. St. John 3:25-30.

2. St. Matthew 9:14-17; St. Mark 2:18-22; St. Luke 5:33-39.

3. St. Matthew 11:2-14; St. Luke 7:18-35.

4. St. Matthew 14:1-12; St. Mark 6:14-29; St. Luke 9:7-9.)

WHILE the Apostles went forth by two and two on their first Mission,¹ Jesus Himself taught and preached in the towns around Capernaum.² This period of undisturbed activity seems, however, to have been of brief duration.³ That it was eminently successful, we infer not only from direct notices,⁴ but also from the circumstance that, for the first time, the attention of Herod Antipas was now called to the Person of Jesus. We suppose that, during the nine or ten months of Christ's Galilean Ministry, the Tetrarch had resided in his Paræan dominions (east of the Jordan), either at Julias or at Machærus, in which latter fortress the Baptist was beheaded. We infer, that the 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.⁵ 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 indicate 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,⁶ and after that 'into the borders of Tyre and Sidon.'⁷ 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. This is the only occasion on which they are designated as Apostles in the Gospel by St. Mark.

2. St. Matt. xi. 1.

3. Their mission seems to have been short, probably not more than two weeks or so. But it seems impossible, in consistency with the facts, to confine it to two days, as Bishop *Ellicott* proposes (*Hist. Lect.* p. 193).

4. St. Mark vi. 12, 13; St. Luke ix. 6. 5. St. Matt xiv. 12, 13; St. Mark vi. 30.

6. St. John vi. 1. 7. St. Mark vii. 24.

1. It was⁸ 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.⁹ The Presence and activity of Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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.

8. St. John iii. 22 to iv. 3.

9. Comp. chapter vii. of this Book. For the sake of clearness and connection, some points formerly referred to have had to be here repeated.

10. St. John ii. 13 to iii. 21. 11. St. John iii. 25 &c.

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 Judaean illustration, he was only 'the friend of the Bridegroom' (the '*Shoshebheynd*'), with all that popular association or higher Jewish allegory connected with that relationship.¹² 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 36¹³) as formerly those of the conversation with Nicodemus.¹⁴

12. Comp. ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'](#) pp. 152, 153.

13. These verses contain the reflections of the Evangelist, not the words of the Baptist, just as previously vv. 16 to 21 are no longer the words of Christ but those of St. John.

14. St. John iii. 16 to 21.

This hour of the seeming abasement of the Baptist was, in truth, that of the highest exaltation, as marking the fulfilment of his office, and, therefore, of his joy. Hours of cloud and darkness were to follow.

2. The scene has changed, and the Baptist has become the prisoner of Herod Antipas. The dominions of the latter embraced, in the north: Galilee, *west* of the Jordan and of the Lake of Galilee; and in the south: 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ It was on that occasion that Herod seized on his person,¹⁷ 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.¹⁸

15. Comp. *Caspari*, Chronolog. Geogr. Einl. pp. 83-91.

16. Ænon may even have been in Peræa itself - in that case, on the eastern bank of the Jordan.

17. St. John iii. 24. 18. St. John vi. i.

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;¹⁹ and it is impossible to suppose, that Herod would not have sooner heard of the fame of Jesus,²⁰ 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,²¹ a name for which Josephus gives²² *Betharamphtha*, and the Rabbis *Beth Ramthah*.^{23 24} 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.'²⁵

19. Comp. *Schürer*, Neutest. Zeitgesch. p. 233. As to the name Tiberias, comp. p. 635, note 1.

20. St. Matt. xiv. 1. 21. Numb. xxxii. 36; Josh. xiii. 27.

22. Ant. xviii. 2. 1. 23. Jerus. Shev. 38 d.

24. Comp. the references in *Böttger*, Lex. zu Jos. p. 58.

25. See the description of the site in *Tristram*, Land of Moab, p. 348.

Supposing Antipas to have been at the Peraean Julias, he would have been in the closest proximity to the scene of the Baptist's last recorded 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,²⁶ 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,²⁷ 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,²⁸ 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.'²⁹ 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,³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.

26. Ant. xviii. 5. 2. 27. St. Matt. xiv. 5. 28. St. Matt. xiv. 3, 4; St. Mark vi 17, 18.

29. Sot. 22 b. 30. St. John iv. 1, 2. 31. St. Luke xiii. 31-33.

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.^{32 33} 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.³⁴ Machærus (the modern *M'Khaur*) marked the extreme point south, as Pella that north, in Perææ. As the boundary fortresses 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.³⁵ 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.³⁶

32. Ant. xviii. 5. 2.

33. A little before that it seems belonged to Aretas. We know not, how it again passed into the hands of Antipas, if, indeed, it ever was fully ceded by him to the Arabs. Comp. *Schürer*, u.s. p. 239, and *Wieseler*, Chron. Syn. p. 244, Beitr. pp. 5, &c., whose positions are, however, not always quite reliable.

34. Gen. xiv. 5. 35. Jewish War i. 8. 5.

36. Here Bassus made his attack in the last Jewish war (*Jos. War* vii. 6. 1-4).

A late and very trustworthy traveller³⁷ has pronounced the description of Josephus³⁸ 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.

37. Canon *Tristram* Land of Moab, pp. 255-265; comp. *Baedeker (Socin)* Palästina, p. 195 and, for the various passages in Josephus referring to Macharus, *Böttger*, u.s. pp. 165-167.

38. War vii. 6. 1, 2.

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 Machæus 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.³⁹ 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 Machæus, and Him Who sat down to eat and drink at a feast of the publicans.

39. St. John iii. 26.

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,⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ 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.⁴²

40. Thus viewed there is no contradiction, not even real variation, between St. Matt. ix. 14, St. Mark ii. 18, and St. Luke v. 33.

41. St. Matt. ix. 14-17 and parallels. 42. B. Mez. 85 a, 2 towards the end.

Even apart from such extravagances,⁴³ 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)⁴⁴ 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,⁴⁵ just as in Temple-times not a few would offer daily trespass-offering for sins of which they were ignorant. Then there were such painful minutiae of externalism, as those which ruled how, on a less strict fast, a person might wash and anoint; while on the strictest fast, it was prohibited even to salute one another.^{46 47}

43. Altogether, Baba Mez, 84 a to 85 a contains a mixture of the strangest, grossest, and profanest absurdities.

44. Thus a three day's fast would be on the second, fifth, and again on the second day of the week.

45. Taan. 12 a; St. Luke xviii. 12. 46. Taan i. 4-7.

47. Comp. [The Temple, its Ministry and Services.](#) pp. 296-298.

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.'^{48 49} This would give point to their complaint, 'Thy disciples fast not.' Looking back upon the standpoint from which they viewed fasting, it is easy to perceive why Jesus could not have sanctioned, not even tolerated, the practice among His disciples, as little as St. Paul could tolerate among Judaizing Christians the, in itself indifferent, practice of circumcision. But it was not so easy to explain this at the time of the disciples of John. For, to understand it, implied already entire transformation from the old to the new spirit. Still more difficult must it have been to do it in such manner, as at the same time to lay down principles that would rule all similar questions to all ages. But our Lord did both, and even thus proved His Divine Mission.

48. St. Mark ii. 18. 49. This is the real import of the original.

The last recorded testimony of the Baptist had pointed to Christ as the 'Bridegroom.'⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ Even in the Day of Atonement a bride was allowed to relax one of the ordinances of that strictest fast.⁵² 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?

50. St. John iii. 29. 51. Ber. 6 *b*. 52. Yoma viii. 1.

This appeal of Christ is still further illustrated by the Talmudic ordinance⁵³ 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' (ἡπρωξ ψνβ), 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.'⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ 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,'⁵⁶ 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.

53. Jer. Sukk. 53 *a*, near the middle. 54. ἡπρωξ Jer. Megill. 72 *d* 1.

55. 'And all bride-chambers were only within the portions of Benjamin' (the Tabernacle and the Temple). Hence Benjamin was called 'the host of the Lord.'

56. Strangely, the two designations are treated as identical in most Commentaries.

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 Baptist⁵⁷ 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.

57. St. John iii. 29.

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.⁵⁸ 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.

58. St. Matt. ix. 16, 17.

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.⁵⁹ 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 principles⁶⁰ - 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.

59. *Godet* has shown objections against all previous interpretations. But his own view seems to me equally untenable.

60. St. Luke v. 39 seems either a gloss of the writer, or may be (though very doubtfully) an interpolation. There is a curious parallel to the verse in Ab. iv. 20.

5. We are in spirit by the mount of God, and about to witness the breaking of a terrible storm.⁶¹ 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 Macharus; 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.^{62 63} 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?

61. St. Luke vii. 18-35; St. Matt. xi. 2-19. 62. St. Mark vi. 20.

63. This is both the correct reading and rendering.

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 most. 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*.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ 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,⁶⁷ 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.

64. The distinction between the two expressions will be further explained in the sequel.

65. St. Luke vii. 21.

66. Negative criticism charges St. Luke with having inserted this trait, forgetting that it is referred to by St. Matthew.

67. St. Matt. xi. 5.

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?⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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.

68. The two terms are different. The query was: would they go out *'to gaze at'* a reed, and *'to see'* one in soft clothing.

69. The reader will mark the difference between the quotation as made by all the three Evangelists, and our present Hebrew text and the LXX., and possibly draw his own inferences.

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,^{70 71} did not imply that spiritual reception which was due to his Mission.⁷² 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.⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ Even by Jewish admission,⁷⁵ the Law 'and all the prophets prophesied only of the days of Messiah.'⁷⁶ 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.'

70. St. Luke vii. 29, 30. 71. This is a sort of parenthetical note by St. Luke.

72. St. Matt. xi. 12-14. 73. St. Matt. xi. 14-19.

74. The common interpretations of this verse have seemed to me singularly unsatisfactory.

75. Comp. the Appendix on the Jewish Interpretation of Prophecy.

76. Sanh. 99 *a*; Ber. 34 *b*; Shabb. 63 *a*.

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 piped⁷⁷ 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 vindicated⁷⁸ by all her children.⁷⁹ 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.'⁸⁰

77. The pipe was used both in feasts and at mourning. So the Messianic hope had both its joyous and its sorrowful aspect.

78. Literally, justified. The expression is a Hebraism.

79. I cannot accept the reading 'works' in St. Mark. 80. St. John i. 11-13.

6. The scene once more changes, and we are again at Macharus.⁸¹ 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.

81. As, according to *Josephus*, John was executed at Macharus, the scene must have been there, and not either at Tiberias or at Julias.

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.⁸² 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.

82. The expression γενεσιᾶ leaves it doubtful, whether it was the birthday of Herod or the anniversary of his accession. *Wieseler* maintains that the Rabbinic equivalent (*Ginuseya*, or *Giniseya*) means the day of accession, *Meyer* the birthday. In truth it is used for both. But in *Abod. Z. 10 a* (about the middle) the *Yom Ginuseya* is expressly and elaborately shown to be the day of accession. Otherwise also the balance of evidence is in favour of this view. The event described in the text certainly took place *before* the Passover, and this was the time of Herod's death and of the accession of Antipas. It is not likely, that the Herodians would have celebrated their birthdays.

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,⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ 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.

83. From the circumstance that *Josephus* calls him Herod and not Philip, a certain class of critics have imputed error to the Evangelists (*Schürer*, u. s., p. 237). But it requires to be kept in view, that in that case the Evangelists would be guilty not of one but of two

gross historical errors. They would (1) have confounded this Herod with his half-brother Philip, the Tetrarch, and (2) made him the husband of Herodias, instead of being her son-in-law, Philip the Tetrarch having married Salome. Two such errors are altogether inconceivable in so well-known a history, with which the Evangelists otherwise show such familiarity. On the other hand, there are internal reasons for believing that this Herod had a second name. Among the eight sons of Herod the Great there are three who bear his name (Herod). Of only one, Herod Antipas, we know the second name (Antipas). But, as for example in the case of the Bonaparte family, it is most unlikely that the other two should have borne the name of Herod without any distinctive second name. Hence we conclude, that the name Philip, which occurs in the Gospels (in St. Luke iii. 19 it is spurious), was the second name of him whom *Josephus* simply names as Herod. If it be objected, that in such case Herod would have had two sons named Philip, we answer (1) that he had two sons of the name Antipas, or Antipater, (2) that they were the sons of different mothers, and (3) that the full name of the one was Herod Philip (first husband of Herodias), and of the other simply Philip the Tetrarch (husband of Salome, and son-in-law of Herodias and of Herod Philip her first husband). Thus for distinction's sake the one might have been generally called simply Herod, the other Philip.

84. *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 7. 1, 2; *War* ii. 9. 6.

Such was the woman who had these many months sought with the vengeance 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,⁸⁵ '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!

85. *St. Matt.* xiv. 8.

It has been but the contest of a moment. 'Straightway' the king gives the order to one of the body-guard.⁸⁶ 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.

86. A σπεκουλατωρ, speculator, one of a body-guard which had come into use, who attended the Cæsars, executed their behests and often their sudden sentences of death (from *speculator*). The same word occurs in Rabbinic Hebrew as *Sephaqlator* (פּוֹלָאָף:פּאַס׃), or *Ispbaqlator* (פּוֹלָאָף:פּאַס׃:י), and is applied to one who carries out the sentence of execution (Shabb. 108 a).

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.⁸⁷ 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 approbation 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.'

87. St. Luke ix. 9.

Chapter 29

THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

(St. Matthew 14:13-21; St. Mark 6:30-44; St. Luke 9:10-17; St. John 6:1-14).

In the circumstances described in the previous chapter, Jesus resolved at once to leave Capernaum; and this probably alike for the sake of His disciples, who needed rest; for that of the people, who might have attempted a rising after the murder of the Baptist; and temporarily to withdraw Himself and His followers from the power of Herod. For this purpose He chose the place outside the dominions of Antipas, nearest to Capernaum. This was Beth-Saida ('the house of fishing,' 'Fisher-town,'¹ as we might call it), on the eastern border of Galilee,² 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.³ It must, however, not be confounded with the other 'Fisher-town,' or Bethsaida, on the western shore of the Lake,⁴ which the Fourth Gospel, evidencing by this local knowledge

its Judaean, or rather Galilean, authorship, distinguishes from the eastern as 'Bethsaida of Galilee.'^{5 6}

1. The common reading, 'House of *fishes*,' is certainly inaccurate. Its Aramaic equivalent would be probably)δαφψ(ε τψβεε. *Tseida* means literally hunting as well as fishing, having special reference to catching in a *snare* or net. Possibly, but not so likely, it may have been)δαφψψεαφ(α β (*Tsayyada*), house of a snareer-huntsman, here fisher. It will be noticed, that we retain the *textus receptus* of St. Luke ix. 10.

2. *Jos. War* iii. 3. 5. 3. *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 2. 1.

4. I do not quite understand the reasoning of Captain *Conder* on this point (*Handb. of the Bible*, pp. 321, &c.), but I cannot agree with his conclusions.

5. St. John xii. 21; comp. i. 44; St. Mark vi. 45.

6. On the whole question comp. the *Encyclopædias*, *Caspari* u. s. pp. 81, 83; *Baedeker* (*Socin*), p. 267; *Tristram*, *Land of Israel*, p. 443 &c.

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,'⁷ which is referred to in the Fourth Gospel;⁸ and that it contains 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,⁹ that the 'Passover was nigh,'¹⁰ is confirmed by the independent notice of St. Mark,¹¹ 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.

7. St. John v.

8. Professor *Westcott* notes, that the account of St. John could neither have been derived from those of the Synoptists, nor from any common original, from which their narratives are by some supposed to have been derived.

9. St. John vi. 4.

10. There is no valid reason for doubting the genuineness of these words, or giving them another meaning than in the text. Comp. *Westcott*, ad. loc.

11. St. Mark vi. 39.

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,¹² 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.

12. Even those who hold such views assert them in this instance hesitatingly. It seems almost impossible to conceive, that a narrative recorded in all the four Gospels should not have an historical basis, and the appeal to the precedent of Elisha is the more inapt, that in common Jewish thinking he was *not* regarded as specially the type of the Messiah.

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,¹³ as those from Capernaum passed through them, perhaps, also, as they recognised on the Lake the now well-known sail,¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.

13. This seems the fair meaning of St. Mark vi. 31-33, comp. with St. Matt. xiv. 13.

14. St. Mark vi. 32 has it 'by (or rather in) the ship,' with the definite article. Probably it was the same boat that was always at His disposal, perhaps belonging to the sons of Jonas or to the sons of Zebedee.

15. St. Mark vi. 33.

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 demonised had been wrought.¹⁶ Just beyond Gerasa the mountains and hills recede, and the plain along the shore enlarges, till it attains wide proportions on the northern bank of

the Lake. The few ruins which mark the site of Bethsaida-Julias - most of the basalt-stones having been removed for building purposes - lie on the edge of a hill, three or four miles north of the Lake. The ford, by which those who came from Capernaum crossed the Jordan, was, no doubt, that still used, about two miles from where the river enters the Lake. About a mile further, on that wide expanse of grass, would be the scene of the great miracle. In short, the locality thoroughly accords with the requirements of the Gospel-narrative.

16. St. Mark v. 1-16.

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.¹⁷ Presently, as He saw the great multitudes gathering, He was 'moved with compassion towards them.'¹⁸ ¹⁹ 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.

17. St. John vi. 3. 18. St. Matt. xiv. 14.

19. Canon *Westcott* supposes that 'a day of teaching and healing must be intercalated before the miracle of feeding,' but I cannot see any reason for this. All the events fit well into one day.

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,'²⁰ 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.'²¹ 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.

20. St. John vi. 4. 21. St. Mark vi. 34.

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,'²² and 'healing them that had need of healing.'²³ Yet, as He so moved and thought of it all, from the first, 'He Himself knew what He was about to do.'²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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.'

22. St. Mark vi. 34. 23. St. Luke ix. 11. 24. St. John vi. 6. 25. Comp. St. John xiv. 8, 9.

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.²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.²⁹ With the night began the reckoning of the following day.

26. Comp. St. John vi. 9 with St. Matt. xiv. 17; St. Mark vi. 38; St. Luke ix. 13.

27. The expression in St. Mark vi. 35 is literally, 'a late hour,' ὥρα πολλή.

28. Comp. *Jos. Ant.* xvi. 6. 2. 29. Orach Chajim 261.

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.³⁰ 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?'³¹ 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.

30. St. Mark vi. 38. 31. St. John vi. 9.

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.'³² The other minute trait in St. John's Gospel consists in the use of a peculiar word for 'fish' (ὀψαριον), '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* (Νψνιωσπ:)αφ) derived from the same Greek word (ὀψον), of which that used by St. John is the diminutive, means a 'savory dish,' while *Aphyan* (Ν)ψπ)) or *Aphits* (Χψπ), is the term for a kind of small fish, such as sardines. The importance of tracing accurate local knowledge in the Fourth Gospel warrants our pursuing the subject further. The Talmud, declares that of all kinds of meat, fish only becomes more savory by salting,³³ and names certain kinds, specially designated as 'small fishes,'³⁴ which might be eaten

without being cooked. Small fishes were recommended for health;³⁵ 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* (τψρ+).³⁶ Now the diminutive used by St. John (οψαριον) 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.

32. Sotah. ii. 1. 33. Babha. B. 740 b.

34. Μψν+θ Μψγδ Beza 16 a. 35. Ber. 40 a, near the middle.

36. Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Handelsgesch.* pp. 305, 306. In my view he has established the meaning of this name as against *Lewysohn*, *Zool. d. Talm.* pp. 255, 256, and *Levy*, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 192 a.

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' (ιχθυσων μεγάλων). And yet it was not of those 'great fishes' that He gave them, but 'He took the bread and gave them, and the *opsarion* likewise.'³⁷ 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.

37. St. John xxi. 9, 10, 13.

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.'³⁸ 'green,' and fresh,³⁹ 'much grass';⁴⁰ then the people in their 'companies'⁴¹ of fifties and hundreds, reclining,⁴² and looking in their regular divisions, and with their bright many-coloured dresses, like 'garden-beds'⁴³ ⁴⁴ 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'⁴⁵ or, as St. John puts

it, 'gave thanks,'⁴⁶ and 'broke' 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,⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸

38. St. Matt. xiv. 19. 39. St. Mark vi. 39. 40. St. John vi. 10 .

41. συμποσια St. Mark vi. 39. 42. κλισιας St. Luke ix. 14. 43. St. Mark vi. 40.

44. The literal rendering of πρασια is 'garden-bed.' In Mark vi. 40, πρασιαι πρασιαι, 'garden-beds, garden-beds.' In the A. V. 'in ranks.'

45. Ber.46 a.

46. The expression is different from that used by the Synoptists; but in St. Matt. xv. 36, and in St. Mark viii. 6, the term is also that of *thanksgiving*, not *blessing* (ευχαριστεω, not ευλογεω).

47. St. John vi. 48-58. 48. Rosh haSh 29 b.

We can scarcely be mistaken as to the words which Jesus spake when 'He gave thanks.' The Jewish Law⁴⁹ 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 (Κρβμ ψμλ).⁵⁰ Similarly, we have very distinct information as regards a case like the present. We gather, that the use of 'savory' with bread was specially common around the Lake of Galilee, and the Mishnah lays down the principle, that if bread and 'savory' were eaten, it would depend which of the two was the main article of diet, to determine whether 'thanksgiving' should be said for one or the other. In any case only one benediction was to be used.⁵¹ In this case, of course, it would be spoken over the bread, the 'savory' being merely an addition. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the words which Jesus spake, whether in Aramaean, Greek, or Hebrew, were those so well known: 'Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the world, Who causes to come forth (ὈψχιτωμΞηα) 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' (κοφινοι), known in Jewish writings by a similar name (*Kephiphah*), made of wicker or willows⁵² (τψριχ:μι ηπαφψπικΞ:) were in common use, but considered of the poorest kind.⁵³ 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*,)βη) into the world.' And so the Baptist's last inquiry, 'Art Thou the Coming One?'⁵⁴ was fully and publicly answered, and that by the Jews themselves.

49. Sot. vii. 1. 50. Jer. Sot. p. 21 *b*. 51. Ber. 44 *a*.

52. Not an Egyptian basket, as even *Jost* translates in his edition of the Mishnah. The word is derived from ρχεμᾶ (Metser), wicker or willow.

53. Comp. Sotah. ii. 1.

54. See the meaning of that expression in the previous chapter.

Chapter 30

THE NIGHT OF MIRACLES ON THE LAKE OF GENNESARET. (St. Matthew 14:22-36; St. Mark 6:45-56; St. John 6:15-21)

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,¹ 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.'² 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,'³ 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?

1. Note here the want of the article: *να ποιησωσιν αυτον βασιλεα*. We owe this notice to the Fourth Gospel, and it is in marked inconsistency with the theory of its late Ephesian authority.

2. St. John vi. 15. 3. St. Matt. xiv. 23.

For whom and for what He prayed, alone on that mountain, we dare not, even in deepest reverence, inquire. Yet we think, in connection with it, of the Passover, the Manna, the Wilderness, the Lost Sheep, the Holy Supper, the Bread which is His Flesh, and the remnant in the Baskets to be carried to those afar off, and then also of the attempt to make Him a King, in all its spiritual unreality, ending in His View with the betrayal, the denial, and the cry: 'We have no King but Caesar.' And as He prayed, the faithful stars in the heavens shone out. But there on the Lake, where the bark which bore His disciples made for the other shore, 'a great wind' 'contrary to them' was rising. And still He was 'alone on the land,' but looking out into the evening after them, as the ship was 'in the midst of the sea,' and they toiling and 'distressed in rowing.'

Thus far, to the utmost verge of their need, but not farther. The Lake is altogether about forty furlongs or stadia (about six miles) wide, and they had as yet reached little more than half the distance (twenty-five or thirty furlongs). Already it was 'the fourth watch of the night.' There was some difference of opinion among the Jews, whether the night should be divided into three, or (as among the Romans) into four watches. The latter (which would count the night at twelve instead of nine hours) was adopted by many.⁴ In any case it would be what might be termed the morning-watch,⁵ 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.⁶ 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.

4. Ber. 3 b. 5. Probably from 3 to about 6 a.m.

6. Even the beautiful allegory into which *Keim* would resolve it - that the Church in her need knows not, whether her Saviour may not come in the last watch of the night - entirely surrenders the whole narrative. And why should three Evangelists have invented such a story, in order to teach or rather disguise a doctrine, which is otherwise so clearly expressed throughout the whole New Testament, as to form one of its primary principles? *Volkmar* (Marcus, p. 372) regards this whole history as an allegory of St. Paul's activity among the Gentiles! Strange in that case, that it was omitted in the Gospel by St. Luke. But the whole of that section of *Volkmar's* book (beginning at p. 327) contains an extraordinary congeries, of baseless hypotheses, of which it were difficult to say, whether the language is more painfully irreverent or the outcome more extravagant.

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.⁷ Indeed, this 'dominion over the sea' seems to exhibit the Divinely human rather than the humanly Divine aspect of His Person,⁸ 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.

7. Ps. viii. 5, 6; comp. Hebr. ii. 6-9.

8. On the other hand, the miraculous feeding of the multitude seems to exhibit rather the humanly-Divine aspect of His Person.

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,'⁹ (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.

9. Literally, a phantasma. This word is only used in this narrative (St. Matt. xiv. 26 and St. Mark vi. 49.)

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,¹⁰ but that he felt to the full the difficulties of what he so firmly believed,¹¹ and made the foundation of all his preaching.¹² Indeed, the elaborate exposition of the historical grounds, on which he had arrived at the conviction of reality,¹³ 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.^{14 15}

10. Acts xxvi. 8. 11. 1 Cor. xv. 12-19. 12. Acts xvii. 31, 32.

13. 1 Cor. xv. 1-8. 14. 2 Pet. iii. 4.

15. The authenticity of the Second Epistle of St. Peter is here taken for granted, but the drift of the argument would be the same, to whatever authorship it be ascribed.

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,'¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ And possibly such had been his intention, till He saw their difficulty, if not danger, from the contrary wind.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.

16. St. Matt. xiv. 22. 17. St. John vi. 22.

18. *Weiss* (Matthaus-Evang. p. 372) sees a gross contradiction between what seems implied as to His original purpose and His walking on the sea, and hence rejects the narrative. Such are the assumptions of negative criticism. But it seems forgotten that, according to St. Matt. xiv. 24, the journey seems at first to have been fairly prosperous.

19. *Weiss* (u. s.) certainly argues on the impossibility of His having seen the boat so far out on the Lake.

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.²⁰ 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,²¹ 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,'²² 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,²³ 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!'

20. According to St. Matt. xiv. 24, they seem only to have encountered the full force of the wind when they were about the middle of the Lake. We imagine that soon after they embarked there may have been a fresh breeze from the other side of the Lake, which by and by rose into a violent contrary wind.

21. St. John, in distinction to the Synoptists, here uses the expression θεωρεῖν (St. John vi. 19), which in the Gospels has the *distinctive meaning of fixed, earnest, and intent gaze*, mostly outward, but sometimes also inward, in the sense of earnest and attentive consideration. The use of this word as distinguished from merely *seeing*, is so important for the better understanding of the New Testament, that every reader should mark it. We accordingly append a list of the passages in the Gospels where this word is used: St. Matt. xxvii. 55; xxviii. 1; St. Mark iii. 11; v. 15, 38; xii. 41; xv. 40, 47; xvi. 4; St. Luke x. 18; xiv. 29; xxi. 6; xxiii. 35, 48; xxiv. 37, 39; St. John ii. 23; iv. 19; vi. 2 (*Lachm. and Treg.*), 19, 40, 62; vii. 3; viii. 51; ix. 8; x. 12; xii. 19, 45; xiv. 17, 19; xvi. 10, 16, 17, 19; xvii. 24; xx. 6, 12, 14. It will thus be seen, that the expression is more frequently used by St. John than in the other Gospels, and it is there also that its distinctive meaning is of greatest importance.

22. St. Mark vi. 48.

23. This seems to me implied in the expression, St. John vi. 21: 'Then they were willing to take Him into the ship.' Some negative critics have gone so far as to see in this graphic hint a contradiction to the statements of the Synoptists. (See *Lücke*, Comment. ü. d. Evang. Joh. ii. pp. 120-122.).

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,²⁴ to transform his doubt, but left him, unassured from without, to his own feelings as he saw the wind,²⁵ 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.

24. As to the physical possibility of it, we have to refer to our former remarks.

25. The word 'boisterous' must be struck out as an interpolated gloss.

And presently, as they two came into the boat,²⁶ the wind ceased, and immediately the ship was at the land. But 'they that were in the boat' - apparently in contradistinction to the disciples,²⁷ 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 spoke 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.

26. I cannot see (with *Meyer*) any variation in the narrative in St. John vi. 21. The expression, 'they were willing to take him into the ship,' certainly does *not* imply that, after, the incident of Peter's failure, He did not actually enter the boat.

27. *Weiss* (p. 373) assures us that this view is 'impossible;' but on no better ground than that no others than ten disciples are mentioned in St. Matt. xiv. 22, as if it had been necessary to mention the embarkation of the boatmen.

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 VOLUME

Page 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 an 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 un mutilated 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 of 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 .

Chapter 31

THE CAVILS OF THE PHARISEES CONCERNING PURIFICATION, AND THE TEACHING OF THE LORD CONCERNING PURITY THE TRADITIONS CONCERNING 'HAND-WASHING' AND 'VOWS' (St. Matthew 15:1-20; St. Mark 7:1-23.)

As we follow the narrative, confirmatory evidence of what had preceded springs up at almost every step. It is quite in accordance with the abrupt departure of Jesus from Capernaum, and its motives, that when, so far from finding rest and privacy at Bethsaida (east of the Jordan), a greater multitude than ever had there gathered around Him, which would fain have proclaimed Him King, He resolved on immediate return to the western shore, with the view of seeking a quieter retreat, even though it were in 'the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.'¹ According to St. Mark,² the Master had directed the disciples to make for the other Bethsaida, or 'Fisherton,' on the western shore of the Lake.³ Remembering how common the corresponding name is in our own country,⁴ 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'.⁵ 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. Mark⁶ names Bethsaida, and St. John⁷ 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.⁸ Further, it would explain, how Peter and Andrew, who, according to St. John,⁹ were of Bethsaida, are described by St. Mark¹⁰ as having their home in Capernaum. It also deserves notice, that, as regards the house of St. Peter, St. Mark, who was so intimately connected with him, names Capernaum, while St. John, who was his fellow-townsmen. names Bethsaida, and that the reverse difference obtains between the two Evangelists in regard to the direction of the ship. This also suggests, that in a sense - as regarded the fishermen - the names were interchangeable, or rather, that Bethsaida was the 'Fisherton' of Capernaum.¹¹

1. St. Matt. xv. 21. 2. St. Mark vi. 45. 3. St. John xii. 21.

4. I have myself counted twelve different places in England bearing names which might be freely rendered by 'Bethsaidsa,' not to speak of the many suburbs and quarters which bear a like designation, and, of course, my list is anything but complete.

5. In Jer. Megill. (p. 70 *a*, line 15 from bottom) we read of a $\eta\tau\delta\psi\psi\chi$, but the locality scarcely agrees with our Beth-Saida.

6. St. Mark vi. 45. 7. St. John vi. 17.

8. Comp. *Baedeker (Socin)* Paläst. page 270. 9. St. John i. 44; xii. 21. 10. St. Mark i. 29.

11. May this connection of Capernaum and Beth-Saida account for the mention of the latter as one of the places which had been the scene of so many of His mighty works (St. Matt. xi. 21; St. Luke x. 13)?

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,'^{12 13} 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,¹⁴ with all that followed, on the Friday; and, lastly, the final Discourses of Christ on the Saturday in Capernaum and in the Synagogue.

12. St. John vi. 59. 13. There is no article in the original. 14. St. John vi. 22-24.

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,¹⁵ 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*¹⁶ and the Rabbis¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ but seems both too far from the Lake, and too much south of Capernaum, to answer the requirements.

15. St. Mark vi. 53. 16. Jewish War iii. 10.7, 8. 17. Pes. 8 b; Meg. 6 a; Ber. R. 98.

18. *Bäedeker (Socin)* has grouped together the reasons against identifying *Khân Minyeh* with Capernaum itself.

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.^{19 20}

19. St. Matt. xiv. 34-36; St. Mark vi. 53-56.

20. Mr. *Brown McClellan* (N.T. vol. i. p. 570) holds, that both the Passover and Pentecost had intervened - I know not on what grounds. At the same time the language in St. Mark vi. 56, might imply more than one occasion on which the same thing happened.

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,²¹ 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.'²² As this could only have been done either on a Sabbath or Feast-Day (in this instance, the Passover²³), 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).²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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.

21. St. John vi. 22-25. 22. ver. 59. 23. St. John vi. 4.

24. This is propounded in *Wieseler*, Chronolog. Synopsis, pp. 276, 290, as a possible view.

25. Pes. 55 a.

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,'²⁶ 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,²⁷ or the Reproof of the Pharisees.²⁸ 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,²⁹ 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.³⁰

26. St. Matt. xv. 1; St. Mark vii. 1. 27. St. John vi. 59. 28. St. Matt. xv. 1 &c.

29. St. Matt. xv. 12-14. 30. St. John vi. 60-66.

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;³¹ next would follow the remark of the disciples and the reply of the Lord, spoken, probably, when they were again on the way;³² and, lastly, the final explanation of Christ, after they had entered the house at Capernaum.³³ 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.

31. St. Matt. xv. 10; St. Mark vii. 14, 15. 32. St. Matt. xv. 12-14.

33. St. Matt. xv. 15-20; St. Mark vii. 17-23.

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.'³⁴ 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.

34. St. John ix. 16, 24.

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.'³⁵ 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,'³⁶ 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 subject³⁷ 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.'³⁸ 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,³⁹ or, at least, to poverty.⁴⁰ Bread eaten with unwashed hands was as if it had been filth.⁴¹ Indeed, a Rabbi who had held this command in contempt was actually buried in excommunication.⁴² 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.^{43 44}

35. The word quite corresponds to the Jewish term. Notwithstanding the objection of the learned Bishop *Haneberg* (*Relig. Alterth.* p. 475, note 288) I believe it corresponds to the Rabbinic $\lambda\omega\xi$ or $\lambda\equiv\alpha\phi\omega\equiv\xi$ (Hebr. $\lambda\xi$) *profanus*, in the sense of 'common,' 'not hallowed.'

36. The fullest account of it within reach of ordinary readers is in the Notes to *Pocock's Porta Mosis* (pp. 350-402) though it is confused, not quite accurate, and based chiefly on later Jewish authorities. *Spencer* (*de Leg. Hebr.* pp. 1175-1179) only adds references to similar Gentile rites. *Goodwin*, even under the revision of *Hottinger* (pp. 182-188), is in this instance inferior to *Pocock*. *Buxtorf* (*Synag.* pp. 179-184) gives chiefly illustrative Jewish legends; *Otho* (*Lex. Rabb.* pp. 335, 336) extracts from his predecessors, to little advantage. The Rabbinic notes of *Lightfoot*, *Wünsche*, *Schöttgen*, and *Wetstein* give no clear account; and the Biblical Dictionaries are either silent, or (as *Herzog's*) very meagre. Other accounts are, unfortunately, very inaccurate.

37. *Yadayim*, in four chapters, which, however, touches on other subjects also, notably on the canonicity of certain parts of the O.T.

38. We refer here generally to *Chull.* 105 *a*, *b*, 106 *b*. 39. *Sot.* 4 *b*.

40. *Shabb.* 62 *b*. 41. *Sot.* 4 *b*.

42. *Eduy.* v. 6; *Ber.* 19 *a*. 43. *Chull.* 106 *a*; *Bemidb. R.* 20, ed. Warsh. p. 81 *b*.

44. Many illustrative stories are given of its importance, on the one hand, and of the danger of neglecting it on the other. With these legends it is not necessary to cumber our pages.

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.⁴⁵ Presently, Scriptural support was sought for it. Some based it on the original ordinance of purification in *Lev.* xv. 11;⁴⁶ while others saw in the words⁴⁷ '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.'⁴⁸ 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.^{49 50} 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.⁵¹ 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.

45. Chull. 106 a. 46. Chull. 106 a. 47. Lev xi. 44.

48. Ber. 53 b, end. 49. Erub. 17 b; Chull. 105 b.

50. The danger from 'Salt of Sodom' is specially mentioned. 51. Chull. 105 a, b.

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*,⁵² literally, the lifting of the hands; while for the washing before meat the term *Meshi* or *Mesha*⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ It was the practice to draw water out of these with what was called a *natla*, *antila*, or *antelaya*,⁵⁶ very often of glass, which must hold (at least) a quarter of a log⁵⁷ - 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 wrist⁵⁸ (*θρεπελα*, or *θρεπεηα δ(α* - *lappereq*, or *ad happereq*). If the water remained short of the wrist (*chuts lappereq*), the hands were not clean.⁵⁹ Accordingly, the words of St. Mark⁶⁰ can only mean that the Pharisees eat not 'except they wash their hands to the wrist.'⁶¹

52. ηλψ+ν, sometimes though rarely, τρη+ Μψδψ, but not τχψξρ, which refers to ordinary washing. Occasionally it is simply designated by the term *Netilah*.

53.)#μ (Chull. 107 a and b). 54. Chag. ii. 5, 6.

55. This and what follows illustrates St. John ii. 6. 56. αντγιον

57. Chull. 107 *a*; Baba B. 58 *b*, and often.

58. The language of the Mishnah shows that the word $\theta\rho\pi$, which bears as vague and wide meaning as $\pi\upsilon\gamma\mu\eta$, which seems a literal translation of it, can only apply to the wrist.

59. Comp. Yad. ii. 3; Chull. 106 *a* and *b*. 60. St. Mark vii. 3.

61. The rendering 'wash diligently,' gives no meaning; that 'with the fist' is not in accordance with Jewish Law; while that 'up to the elbow' is not only contrary to Jewish Law, but apparently based on a wrong rendering of the word $\theta\rho\pi$. This is fully shown by *Wetstein* (N. T. i. p. 585), but his own explanation, that $\pi\upsilon\gamma\mu\eta$ refers to the measure or weight of the water for washing, is inadmissible.

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.^{62 63} To increase this precaution, it was next laid down as a principle, that all that renders the *Terumah* unfit, also defiles the hands.⁶⁴ 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.'⁶⁵ 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 Law⁶⁶ 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.^{67 68}

62. Shabb. 14 a.

63. In Yad. iv. 6, the Pharisees in dispute with the Sadducees indicate what seems to me a far more likely reason, in the desire to protect the Scriptures from profane use.

64. Yad. iii. 2. 65. Yad. iii. 5. 66. Numb. x. 35, 36. 67. Yad. iii. 3-5.

68. By a curious inversion the law ultimately came to be, that the Scriptures everywhere defiled the hands, except those of the Priests in the Temple (Kel. xv. 6). This on the ground that, taught by former enactments, they had learned to keep the Terumah far away from the sacred rolls, but really, as I believe, because the law, that the Priests' hands became defiled if they touched a copy of the sacred rules, must have involved constant difficulties.

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.⁶⁹ 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,⁷⁰ 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.,⁷¹ where we find an allusion to the practice of continually washing the hands, in connection with prayer and thanksgiving.⁷² 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,⁷³ and hence emphatically 'a tradition of the Elders,' since these two teachers bear, in Rabbinic writings, each the designation of 'the Elder.'⁷⁴ 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 Jerusalem⁷⁵ and in the Babylon Talmud,⁷⁶ 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' Μψρβδξ ψ 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,⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ But, besides these eighteen decrees, the two Schools on that day⁷⁹ agreed in solemnly re-enacting 'the decrees about the Book (the copy of the Law), and the hands' (τωρψζγ Μψδψηω ρπση). The Babylon Talmud⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ For, it was an express Rabbinic principle⁸² that, if an ordinance had been only recently re-enacted (η#δξ ηρψζγ), it might not be called in question or 'invalidated (Νψ) ηβ Νψθπ≡θπμ).⁸³ Thus it will be seen, that the language employed by the Evangelist affords most valuable indirect confirmation of the trustworthiness of his Gospel, as not only showing intimate familiarity with the *minutiae* of Jewish 'tradition,' but giving prominence to what was then a present controversy - and all this the more, that it needs intimate knowledge of that Law even fully to understand the language of the Evangelist.

69. Chull. 106 *b*. 70. Shabb. 14 *b*, end. 71. Or. Sib. iii. 591-593.

72. We must bear in mind, that it was the work of an Egyptian Jew, and I cannot help feeling that the language bears some likeness to what afterwards was one of the distinctive practices of the Essenes.

73. Shabb. 14 *b*, about the middle. 74. ωθζη

75. Jer. Shabb. p. 3 *c*, *d*. 76. Shabb. 13 *b* to 14 *b*.

77. Jer. Shabb. 3 *c*. 78. Jer. Shabb. 3 *d*. 79. Shabb. 13 *b*; 14 *b*. 80. Shabb. 14 *b*, towards end.

81. In the 'Speaker's Commentary' (ad loc.) this 'extreme minuteness of details' is, it seems to me not correctly, accounted for on the ground of 'special reference to the Judaisers who at a very early period formed an influential party at Rome.'

82. Ab. Z. 35 *a*.

83. This is the more striking as the same expression is used in reference to the opposition or rather the 'invalidating' by R. Eliezer ben Chanokh of the ordinance of hand-washing, for which he was excommunicated (Μψδψ τρη+β θπθπ#, Eduy. v. 6). The term θπθπ, which originally means to stop up by pouring or putting in something, is used for contemning or bringing into contempt, invalidating, or shaking a decree, with the same signification as λζελ:ζα. This is proved from the use of the latter in Ab. Z. 35 *a*, line 9 from bottom, and 36 *a*, line 12 from top.

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.⁸⁴

84. Ab. Zar. v, *passim*.

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,^{85 86} and of more binding importance than those of Holy Scripture itself.⁸⁷ 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;⁸⁸ 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.⁸⁹ 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,⁹⁰ 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. 17.⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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.⁹³

85. Jer. Chag. 76 *d*.

86. In this passage there is a regular discussion, whether that which is written (the Pentateuch), or that which is oral (tradition) is more precious and to be loved (Νψβψβξ Νημ ηζψ). The opinion is in favour of the oral (ηπβ# Ντω).

87. Jer. Ber. 3 *b*; Sanh. xi. 3; Erub. 21 *b*. 88. Targum (ed. Ven.) on Cant. v. 10; comp. Ab. Z. 3 *b*.

89. Baba Mez. 86 a. 90. Ab. Z. u. s. 91. Comp. Chag. 5 b.

92. Ber. 3 a. 93. Ber. 59 a.

Sentiments like these, which occur in different Rabbinic writings, cannot be explained away by any ingenuity of allegorical interpretation. There are others, equally painful, as regards the anger of the Almighty, which, as kindling specially in the morning, when the sun-worshippers offer their prayers, renders it even dangerous for an individual Israelite to say certain prayers on the morning of New Year's Day, on which the throne is set for judgment.⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ It is even more terrible to read of God wearing the *Tallith*,⁹⁶ 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. 19.⁹⁷ 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.⁹⁸ This is deduced from Lev. xvi. 16. Similarly, He immersed in a bath of fire,⁹⁹ after the defilement of the burial of Moses.

94. Ber. 7 a; Ab. Z. 4 b. 95. Ber. 7 a. 96. Shem. R. 42, comp. Rosh haSh. 17 b.

97. Ber. 6 a. 98. Shem. R. 15, ed. warsh. p. 22 a, line 13 from top.

99. Is. lxvi. 15; comp. Numb. xxxi. 23.

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,¹⁰⁰ and that no Halakhah (traditional law) might contradict Scripture.¹⁰¹ 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,¹⁰² 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.

100. Jer. Taan. 66 *a*, about the middle.

101. It was, however, admitted that the Halakhah sometimes went beyond the Pentateuch (Sot. 16 *a*).

102. St. Matt. xv. 3, 6; St. Mark vii. 9, 13.

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 absurdity¹⁰³ - 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.

103. See the remarks this point in vol. i. pp. 567, 576, 577.

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.'¹⁰⁴ 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.'¹⁰⁵ 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.'¹⁰⁶ 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*¹⁰⁷ (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,¹⁰⁸ 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.¹⁰⁹

104. Ab. iii. 18. 105. Ber. R. 81. 106. Nedar. 9 *a*; 22 *a*.

107. According to Nedar. 10 *a*, the Rabbis invented this word instead of '*Qorban* to the Lord' (Lev. i. 2), in order that the Name of God might not be idly taken.

108. Nedar. i. 1-3. 109. Jer. Nedar. 36 *d*, line 20 from top.

It is in explaining this strange provision, intended both to uphold the solemnity of vows, and to discourage the rash use of words, that the Talmud¹¹⁰ 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*'¹¹¹ - 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'?

110. u. s. 111. βρθλ δψ M#μ (Jer. Nedar. 36 *d*, line 22).

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 obligation¹¹² - and the latter were the most frequent.

112. See *Maimonides*, *Yad haChas.*, *Hilkh. Nedar. i. 1, 2.*

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;'¹¹³ while that of the oath was a simple affirmation or negation,¹¹⁴ 'I shall not eat.'¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ 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 made¹¹⁷ to open a door for repentance.¹¹⁸ Absolutions from a vow might be obtained before a 'sage,' or, in his absence, before three laymen,¹¹⁹ when all obligations became null and void. At the same time the Mishnah¹²⁰ admits, that this power of absolving from vows was a tradition hanging, as it were, in the air,¹²¹ since it received little (or, as *Maimonides* puts it, no) support from Scripture.¹²²

113. λκω) ψν)# 114. λκω))λ 115. *Jer. Ned. u. s.* 116. *Tos. Arach. iv.*

117. 'They open a door.' 118. *Nedar. ix. passim.* 119. *Maimonides u. s. Hilkh. Shebh. v. 1.*

120. *Chag. i. 8.*

121. This is altogether a very curious Mishnah. It adds to the remark quoted in the text this other significant admission, that the laws about the Sabbath, festive offerings, and the malversation of things devoted to God 'are like mountains hanging by one hair,' since Scripture is scant on these subjects, while the traditional Laws are many.

122. On the subject of Vows see also ['The Temple and its Services.'](#) pp. 322-326. The student should consult *Siphre*, *Par. Mattoth*, pp. 55 *b* to 58 *b*.

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.¹²³ It cannot be denied that such vows, in regard to parents, would be binding, and that they were actually made.¹²⁴ Indeed, the question is discussed in the Mishnah in so many words, whether 'honour of father and mother'¹²⁵ constituted a ground for invalidating a vow, and decided in the negative against a solitary dissenting voice.¹²⁶ And if doubt should still exist, a case is related in the Mishnah,¹²⁷ in which a father was thus shut out by the vow of his son from anything by which he might be profited by him (η)αφναφηα: ωενμεψηε ρδεαφμυ ωψβι)αφ ηψαφηαφ#εεε).¹²⁸ 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,'¹²⁹ is not only explained but vindicated by the common usage of the Rabbis,¹³⁰ 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 (ψλι ηνεηενε ητεαφ)α#ε Νβεαφρ:θαφ).¹³¹

123. Nedar. ii. 2.

124. I can only express surprise, that *Wünsche* should throw doubt upon it. It is fully admitted by *Levy*, Targ. Wörterb. sub Νβρθ.

125. ωμ)ω ωψβ) δωβκ 126. Ned. ix. 1. 127. Nedar. v.

128. In this case the son, desirous that his father should share in the festivities at his marriage, proposed to give to a friend the court in which the banquet was to be held and the banquet itself, but only for the purpose that his father might eat and drink with him. The proposal was refused as involving sin, and the point afterwards discussed and confirmed - implying, that in no circumstances could a parent partake of anything belonging to his son, if he had pronounced such a vow, the only relaxation being that in case of actual starvation ('if he have not what to eat') the son might make a present to a third person, when the father might in turn receive of it.

129. Ex. xxi. 17. 130. Comp. *Wünsche*, ad loc.

131. Other translations have been proposed, but the above is taken from Nedar. viii. 7, with the change only of *Qonam* into *Qorban*.

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.'¹³² 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 the¹³³ man, that, entering into him, can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man, those are they that defile the man.'¹³⁴ 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.

132. The quotation is a 'Targum,' which in the last clause follows almost entirely the LXX.

133. Mark the definite article.

134. The words in St. Mark vii. 16 are of very doubtful authenticity.

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.'¹³⁵ 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,¹³⁶ which must end in ruin to both.

135. St. Matt. xv. 10; St. Mark vii. 14.

136. Both these sayings seem to have been proverbial at the time, although I am not able to quote any passage in Jewish writings in which they occur in exactly the same form.

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,¹³⁷ 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.¹³⁸ 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.'^{139 140}

137. In St. Mark vii. 21 these outcomings of 'evil thoughts' are arranged in three groups of four, characterised as in the text; while in St. Matt. xv. 19 the order of the ten commandments seems followed. The account of St. Mark is the fuller. In both accounts the expression 'blasphemy' (βλασφημία) - rendered in the Revised Version by 'railing' - seems to refer to calumnious and evil speaking about our fellow-men.

138. Midr. on Eccles. i. 16. 139. St. Mark vii. 19, last clause.

140. I have accepted this rendering of the words, first propounded by St. Chrysostom, and now adopted in the Revised Version, although not without much misgiving. For there is strong objection to it from the Jewish *usus* and views. The statement in Ber. 61 *a*, last line, 'The œsophagus which causeth to enter and which casteth out all manner of meat' (λακ)μ ψνψμ λκ)ψχωμω σψνκμ +#ω) seems to imply that *the words of Christ were a proverbial expression*. The Talmudic idea is based on the curious physiological notion (Midr. on Eccles. vii. 19), that the food passed from the œsophagus first into the larger intestine (*Hemses*, σσμη, perhaps = *omasum*), where the food was supposed to be crushed as in a mill (Vayyik R. 4, 18; Midr. on Eccl. xii. 3), and thence only, through various organs, into the stomach proper. (As regards the process in animals, see *Lewysohn*, Zool. d. Talm. pp. 37-40). (The passage from Ber. 61 *a* has been so rendered by *Wünsche*, in his note on St. Matt. xv. 17, as to be in parts well nigh unintelligible.) It may interest students that the strange word ἀφεδρων rendered both in the A.V. and the R.V. by 'draught,' seems to correspond to the Rabbinic *Aphidra* (αρδψπ) which *Levy* renders by 'the floor of a stable formed by the excrements of the animals which are soaked and stamped into a hard mass.'

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.'¹⁴¹ Not only the spirit of legalism, but the very terms 'common' (in reference to the unwashed hands) and 'making clean' are the same. Nor can we

wonder at this, if the vision of Peter was real, and not, as negative criticism would have it, invented so as to make an imaginary Peter - Apostle of the Jews - speak and act like Paul. On that hypothesis, the correspondence of thought and expression would seem, indeed, inexplicable; on the former, the Peter, who has had that vision, is telling through St. Mark the teaching that underlay it all, and, as he looked back upon it, drawing from it the inference which he understood not at the time: 'This He said, making all meats clean.'

141. Acts x.14.

A most difficult lesson this for a Jew, and for one like Peter, nay, for us all, to learn. And still a third time had Peter to learn it, when, in his fear of the Judaisers from Jerusalem, he made that common which God had made clean, had care of the unwashed hands, but forgot that the Lord had made clean all meats. Terrible, indeed, must have been that contention which followed between Paul and Peter. Eighteen centuries have passed, and that fatal strife is still the ground of theological contention against the truth.¹⁴² Eighteen centuries, and within the Church also the strife still continues. Brethren sharply contend and are separated, because they will insist on that as of necessity which should be treated as of indifference: because of the not eating with unwashed hands, forgetful that He has made all meats clean to him who is inwardly and spiritually cleansed.

142. It is, of course, well known that the reasoning of the Tübingen school and of kindred negative theology is based on a supposed contrariety between the Petrine and Pauline direction, and that this again is chiefly based on the occurrence in Antioch recorded in Gal. ii. 11 &c.

Chapter 32
THE GREAT CRISIS IN POPULAR FEELING
THE LAST DISCOURSES IN THE SYNAGOGUE OF CAPERNAUM
CHRIST THE BREAD OF LIFE
'WILL YE ALSO GO AWAY?'¹
(St. John 6:22-71.)

1. It is specially requested that this chapter be read along with the text of Scripture.

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.² 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.

2. We are here involuntarily reminded of the fate of Elijah on the morning after the miracle on Mount Carmel. But how different the bearing of Christ from that of the great prophet!

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.'³ 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 rate⁴) was spoken 'in Synagogue, as He taught in Capernaum.'⁵ It has been well observed, that 'there are evident breaks after verse 40 and verse 51.'⁶ Probably the succession of events may have been that part of what is here recorded by St. John⁷ had taken place when those from across the Lake had first met Jesus;⁸ part on the

way to, and entering, the Synagogue;⁹ and part as what He spoke in His Discourse,¹⁰ and then after the defection of some of His former disciples.¹¹ 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.

3. vv. 22, 24. 4. St. John vi. 53-58. 5. ver. 59. 6. Westcott, ad. loc. 7. vi. 25-65.

8. vv. 25-36. 9. vv. 41-52. 10. vv. 52-58. 11. vv. 61-65.

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.'¹² 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.

12. ver. 26.

1. The question:¹³ '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.'¹⁴ 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;¹⁵ the grain was to stand like palm trees, and to be reaped and winnowed without labour.¹⁶ 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.

13. St. John vi. 25-29.

14. Canon *Westcott* notes the intended realism in the choice of words: 'Literally, "were satisfied with food as animals with fodder."' - εχορτασθητε.

15. Shabb. 30 *b*; Jer. Sheqal. vi. 2. 16. Kethub. 111 *b*.

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 (טמ#) being, as was significantly pointed out, respectively the first, the middle, and the last letters of the alphabet.¹⁷ 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.

17. Jer. Sanh. 18 *a*; Ber. R. 81.

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 follows¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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'²⁰ - miraculous food, of all manner of taste, and suited to every age, according to the wish or condition of him who see ate it,²¹ 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.²² 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!

18. St. John vi. 30-36. 19. Comp. ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'](#) pp. 256, 257.

20. Yoma 75 b. 21. Shem. R. 25. 22. Midr. on Eccles. i. 9.

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.²³ 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 that²⁴ 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,'²⁵ it indicated that the manna and the miraculous water-supply were the sequence of Israel's receiving the Law and the Commandments²⁶ - for the real bread from heaven was the Law.^{27 28}

23. Targ. Pseudo Jon. on Deut. xxxiv. 8; Taan. 9 *a*.

24. Not as in the A.V. of ver. 33: 'He Which cometh down from heaven.' The alteration is most important in the argument as addressed to the Jews: the one they could understand and would admit, not so the other.

25. Prov. ix. 5. 26. Shem. R. 25. 27. Comp. Chag. 14 *a*.

28. In the Midrash on Eccl. ii. 24; iii. 12; viii. 15, we are told, that when in Ecclesiastes we read of eating and drinking, it always refers to the Law and good works.

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 followed²⁹ 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,³⁰ 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.³¹

29. St. John vi. 37-40. 30. ver. 41.

31. After having arrived at this conclusion, I find that Canon *Westcott* has expressed the same views, and I rejoice in being fortified by so great an authority.

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.³² Indeed, one of the names given to the Messiah - that of *Yinnon*, according to Ps. lxxii. 17³³ - has by some been derived from this very expectancy.³⁴ Again, He had said, that it was not any Law, but His Person, that was the bread which came down from heaven, and gave life, not to Jews only, but unto the world - and they had seen Him and believed not. But none the less would the loving

purpose of God be accomplished in the totality of His true people, and its joyous reality be experienced by every individual among them: 'All that (the total number, $\pi\alpha\nu\ \omicron$) which the Father giveth Me shall come unto Me (shall reach Me³⁵), and him that cometh unto Me (the coming one to Me) I will not cast out outside.' What follows is merely the carrying out in all directions, and to its fullest consequences, of this twofold fundamental principle. The totality of the God-given would really reach Him, despite all hindrances, for the object of His Coming was to do the Will of His Father; and those who came would not be cast outside, for the Will of Him that had sent Him, and which He had come to do, was that of 'the all which He has given' Him, He 'should not lose *anything* out of this, but raise it up in the last day.' Again, the totality - the all - would reach Him, since it was the Will of Him that sent Him 'that everyone ($\pi\alpha\zeta$) who intently looketh³⁶ 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.'³⁷

32. But not here and there one dead. In general, see vol. i. p. 633, where the question of Jewish belief on that subject is discussed.

33. Sanh. 98 *b*. 34. Midrash on Ps. xciii. 1; Pirké de R. Eliez. 32, ed. Lemb. p. 39 *b*.

35. So Canon *Westcott*; and also *Godet* ad loc.

36. Mark the special meaning of $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\omega\nu$ as previously explained.

37. St. John vi. 40.

Although these wonderful statements reached in their full meaning far beyond the present horizon of His disciples, and even to the utmost bounds of later revelation and Christian knowledge, there is nothing in them which could have seemed absolutely strange or unintelligible to those who heard them. Given belief in the Messiahship of Jesus and His Mission by the Father; given experience of what He had done, and perhaps, to a certain extent, Jewish expectancy of what the Messiah would do in the last day; and all this directed or corrected by the knowledge concerning His work which His teaching had imparted, and the words were intelligible and most suitable, even though they would not convey to them all that they mean to us. If so seemingly incongruous an illustration might be used, they looked through a telescope that was not yet drawn out, and saw the same objects, through quite diminutively and far otherwise than we, as gradually the hand of Time has drawn out fully that through which both they and we, who believe, intently gaze on the Son.

4. What now follows³⁸ 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 history³⁹ 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.^{40 41} 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.

38. St. John vi. 41-51.

39. This is not narrated in the Fourth Gospel. But allusions like this cover the whole early history of Jesus, and prove that omissions of the most important facts in the history of Jesus are neither due to ignorance of them on the part of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, nor to the desire to express by silence his dissent from the accounts of the Synoptists.

40. St. John iii. 3 &c. 41. Canon *Westcott* has called attention to this.

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.'⁴²

42. St. John xii. 32.

Nor did Jesus, even while uttering these high, entirely un-Jewish truths, forget that He was speaking them to Jews. The appeal to their own Prophets was the more telling, that Jewish tradition also applied these two prophecies (Is. liv. 13; Jer. xxxi. 34) to the teaching by God in the Messianic Age.^{43 44} 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 believeth⁴⁵ 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.'⁴⁶ 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,⁴⁷ for the life of the world.'

43. Is. liv. 13 in Ber. R. 95 on Gen. xlvi. 28; Jerem. xxxi. 34 in Yalkut vol ii. p. 66 d.

44. For other Rabbinic applications of these verses to the Messiah and His times, see the Appendix on Messianic passages.

45. The words 'on Me' are spurious. 46. ver. 48.

47. The words in the A.V., 'which I will give,' are spurious.

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,⁴⁸ 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,⁴⁹ 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.

48. vv. 53-58.

49. Canon *Westcott* (ad loc.) clearly shows, that the reference to the Holy Supper can only be secondary. Mark here specially, that in the latter we have 'the Body,' not 'the Flesh' of the Lord.

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,⁵⁰), nay, or martyrdom, which His words seemed to indicate, 'My Flesh is the true⁵¹ meat, and My Blood is the true drink,'⁵² and what even this fellowship secured, consisted only in abiding in Him and He in them;⁵³ 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.

50. ver. 42.

51. Comp. here the remarks on ver. 27, about Truth as the seal with which God sealed the Christ.

52. ver. 55. 53. ver. 56.

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 contemplate⁵⁴ the far more mysterious and un-Jewish facts of the Messiah's Crucifixion and Ascension!⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶

54. Mark here also the special meaning of θεωρητε.

55. ver. 62. 56. ver. 65; comp. vv. 37, 44.

And so this was the great crisis in the History of the Christ. We have traced the gradual growth and development of the popular movement, till the murder of the Baptist stirred popular feeling to its inmost depth. With his death it seemed as if the Messianic hope, awakened by his preaching and testimony to Christ, were fading from view. It was a terrible disappointment, not easily borne. Now must it be decided, whether Jesus was really the Messiah. His Works, notwithstanding what the Pharisees said, seemed to prove it. Then let it appear; let it come, stroke upon stroke - each louder and more effective than the other - till the land rang with the shout of victory and the world itself re-echoed it. And so it seemed. That miraculous feeding - that wilderness-cry of Hosanna to the Galilean King-Messiah from thousands of Galilean voices - what were they but its beginning? All the greater was the disappointment: first, in the repression of the movement - so to speak, the retreat of the Messiah, His voluntary abdication, rather, His defeat; then, next day, the incongruousness of a King, Whose few unlearned followers, in their ignorance and un-Jewish neglect of most sacred ordinances, outraged every Jewish feeling, and whose conduct was even vindicated by their Master in a general attack on all traditionalism, that basis of Judaism - as it might be represented, to the contempt of religion and even of common truthfulness in the denunciation of solemn vows! This was not the Messiah Whom the many - nay, Whom almost any - would own.⁵⁷

57. St. Matt. xv. 12.

Here, then, we are at the parting of the two ways; and, just because it was the hour of decision, did Christ so clearly set forth the highest truths concerning Himself, in opposition to the views which the multitude entertained about the Messiah. The result was yet another and a sorer defection. 'Upon this many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him.'⁵⁸ 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.'⁵⁹ ⁶⁰ 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.

58. St. John vi. 66. 59. vv. 68, 69.

60. This is the reading of all the best MSS., and not as in the A.V. 'that Christ, the Son of the Living God.' For the history of the variations by which this change was brought about, see *Westcott*, ad loc.

But of these Twelve Christ knew one to be 'a devil' - like that Angel, fallen from highest height to lowest depth.⁶¹ 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.

61. The right reading of ver. 71 is: 'Judas the son of Simon Iscariot,' that is, 'a man of Kerioth.' *Kerioth* was in Judæa (Josh. xv. 25), and Judas, it will be remembered, the only Judæan disciple of Jesus.

Chapter 33 **JESUS AND THE SYRO-PHOENICIAN WOMAN** **(St. Matthew 15:21-28; St. Mark 7:24-30.)**

THE purpose of Christ to withdraw His disciples from the excitement of Galilee, and from what might follow the execution of the Baptist, had been interrupted by the events at Bethsaida-Julias, but it was not changed. On the contrary, it must have been intensified. That wild, popular outburst, which had almost forced upon Him a Jewish Messiah-Kingship; the discussion with the Jerusalem Scribes about the washing of hands on the following day; the Discourses of the Sabbath, and the spreading disaffection, defection, and opposition which were its consequences - all pointed more than ever to the

necessity of a break in the publicity of His Work, and to withdrawal from that part of Galilee. The nearness of the Sabbath, and the circumstance that the Capernaum-boat lay moored on the shore of Bethsaida, had obliged Him, when withdrawing from that 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,¹ from the Mediterranean to the Jordan. But the event about to be related occurred, as all circumstances show, not within the territory of Tyre and Sidon, but on its borders, and within the limits of the Land of Israel. If any doubt could attach to the objects which determined Christ's journey to those parts, it would be removed by the circumstance that St. Matthew² tells us, He 'withdrew'³ 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.

1. *Jos. War* iii. 3. 1. 2. *St. Matt.* xv. 21. 3. So correctly rendered.

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 Tuesday⁴ 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.'⁵ As the Saviour apparently received the woman in the house,⁶ 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.

4. Or, the Passover-eve may have been Monday evening.

5. *St. Matt.* xv. 23. 6. *St. Mark* vii. 24, 25.

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 Canaanitish⁷ 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.⁸ 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 art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the Law."' ⁹ 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.

7. Ezra ix. 1. 8. St. Mark vii. 25.

9. Comp. Cannon *Westcott*, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Appendix C.

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.¹⁰ 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.

10. This view is advocated by Dean *Plumptre* with remarkable beauty, tenderness, and reverence. It is also that of *Meyer* and of *Ewald*. The latter remarks, that our Lord showed twofold greatness: First, in his calm limitation to His special mission, and then in His equally calm overstepping of it, when a higher ground for so doing appeared.

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,¹¹ 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.^{12 13} 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.¹⁴ 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'?

11. The term means 'little dogs,' or 'house - dogs.' 12. Midr. on Ps. iv. 8; Meg. 7 b.

13. Many passages might be quoted either similar, or based on this view of Gentiles.

14. Rev. xxii. 15.

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.'¹⁵ 'And her daughter was healed from that hour.'¹⁶ 'And she went away unto her house, and found her daughter prostrate [indeed] upon the bed, and [but] the demon gone out.'

15. Canon *Cook* (Speaker's Comm. on St. Mark vii. 26) regards this 'as one of the very few instances in which our Lord's words really differ in the two accounts.' With all deference, I venture to think it is not so, but that St. Mark gives what St. Peter had received as the impression of Christ's words on his mind.

16. St. Matt. xv. 28.

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 34

A GROUP OF MIRACLES AMONG A SEMI-HEATHEN POPULATION

(St. Matthew 15:29-31; St. Mark 7:31-37; St. Luke 8:22-26; St. Matthew 11:27-31.)

If even the brief stay of Jesus in that friendly Jewish home by the borders of Tyre could not remain unknown, the fame of the healing of the Syro-Phœnician 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,¹ were passed. Making a long circuit through the territory of Sidon,² 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,'³ 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. The ir ancient monuments show, in which of them Zeus, Astarte, and Athene, or else Artemis, Hercules, Dionysos, Demeter, or other Grecian divinities, were worshipped.⁴ 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.

1. For the Rabbinic views of the boundaries of Palestine see ['Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'](#) ch. ii.
2. The correct reading of St. Mark vii. 31, is 'through Sidon.' By the latter I do not understand the town of that name, which would have been quite outside the Saviour's route, but (with *Ewald* and *Lange*) the territory of Sidon.
3. The fullest notice of the 'Ten Cities' is that of *Caspari*, *Chronolog. Geogr. Einl.* pp. 83-91, with which compare *Menke's Bibel-Atlas*, Map V.
4. Comp. *Schürer*, pp. 382, 383.

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. Matthew⁵ 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.

5. St. Matt xv. 29-31.

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.⁶ 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.^{7 8} 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.'⁹ Peculiar, also, is the 'thrusting'¹⁰ 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.

6. μογιλαλος or μογγιλαλος does not mean one absolutely dumb. It is literally: *difficulus loquens*. The Rabbinic designation of such a person would have been *Cheresh* (Ter. i. 2) although different opinions obtain as to whether the term includes impediment of speech (comp. Meg. ii. 4; Gitt. 71 a).

7. St. Mark viii. 23. 8. In St. John ix. 6 it is really application of clay.

9. στεναζω occurs only here in the Gospels. Otherwise it occurs in Rom. viii. 23; 2 Cor. v. 2, 4; Hebr. xiii. 17; James v. 9; the substantive in Acts vii. 34; Rom, viii. 26.

10. So literally.

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,¹¹ 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 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.'

11. Κυλλος means here *incurvatus*, and not as in ix. 43 *mutilatus*.

From amongst this mass of misery we single out and follow one,¹² whom the Saviour takes aside, that it may not merely be the breath of heaven's spring passing over them all, that woeth 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;^{13 14} 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'¹⁵ - and straightway the gladsome sound would pass into 'his hearing,'¹⁶ 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.

12. St. Mark vii. 31-37. 13. Shabb. 108 *b*; *Pliny*, H. N. xxviii. 7; *Suet.* Vesp. 7.

14. *Wünsche* (ad. loc.) is guilty of serious misapprehension when he says that the Talmud condemns to eternal punishment those who employ this mode of healing. This statement is incorrect. What it condemns is the whispering of magical formulas over a wound (Sanh. 90 *a*), when it was the custom of some magicians to spit *before* (Sanh. 101 *a*), of others *after* pronouncing the formula (Jer. Sanh. 28 *b*). There is no analogy whatever between this and what our Lord did, and the use of saliva for cures is universally recognised by the Rabbis.

15. εφφαθα = ξτῆπατ:ε 16. So literally, or rather 'hearings' - in the plural.

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,¹⁷ as wrought by Jesus in these parts, and, as we infer, on a heathen.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹ The anecdote at least proves, that the application of saliva was popularly regarded as a remedy for affections of the eyes.

17. St. Mark viii. 22-26.

18. Most commentators regard this as the *eastern* Bethsaida, or Bethsaida-Julias. The objection (in the Speaker's Commentary) that the text speaks of 'a village' (vv. 23, 26) is obviated by the circumstance that similarly we read immediately afterwards (ver. 27) about the 'villages of Caesarea Philippi.' Indeed, a knowledge of Jewish law enables us to see here a fresh proof of the genuineness of the Evangelic narrative. For, according to Meg. 3 *b* the villages about a town were reckoned as belonging to it, while, on the other hand, a town which had not among its inhabitants ten *Batlanin* (persons who devoted themselves to the worship and affairs of the Synagogue) was to be regarded as a village. The Bethsaida of ver. 22 must refer to the district, in one of the hamlets of which the blind man met Jesus. It does not appear, that Jesus ever again wrought miracles, either in Capernaum or the western Bethsaida, if, indeed, He ever returned to that district. Lastly, the scene of that miracle must have been the eastern Bethsaida (Julias), since immediately afterwards the continuance of His journey to Caesarea Philippi is related without any notice of crossing the Lake.

19. The better reading of the words is given in the Revised Version.

20. Jer. Shabb. xiv. 4; Baba B. 126 *b*. 21. Jer. Sot. 16 *d*, about the middle.

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,²² but the consequence of disease, and that silence was enjoined after the healing.²³ 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.

22. Comp. St. Mark viii. 24. 23. ver. 26.

3. Yet a third miracle of healing requires to be here considered, although related by St. Matthew in quite another connection.²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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*,²⁶ 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.²⁷

24. St. Matt. ix. 27-31.

25. Thus, the healing recorded immediately after this history, in St. Matt. ix. 32-35, belongs evidently to a later period. Comp. St. Luke xi. 14.

26. I admit that especially the latter argument is inconclusive, but I appeal to the general context and the setting of this history. It is impossible to regard St. Matt. ix. as a chronological record of events.

27. He is *addressed* as 'Son of David,' in this passage, by the Syro-Phœnician woman (St. Matt. xv. 22), and by the blind men near Jericho (St. Matt. xx. 30, 31; St. Mark x. 47, 48; St. Luke xviii, 38, 39), and *proclaimed* as such by the people in St. Matt. xii. 23; xxi. 9, 15.

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, insistence²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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.

28. εμβριμωομαι - the word occurs in that sense only here and in St. Mark i. 43; otherwise also in St. Mark xiv. 5, and in St. John xi. 33, 38.

29. St. Mark i. 40, 41.

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-Phœnician woman³⁰), 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.³¹ 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.

30. It should be borne in mind, that the country, surroundings, &c., place these men in a totally different category from the Syro-Phœnician woman.

31. St. Mark i. 45.

The question has been needlessly discussed,³² 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.

32. Roman Catholic writers mostly praise, while Protestants blame, their conduct.

Chapter 35
THE TWO SABBATH-CONTROVERSIES
THE PLUCKING OF THE EARS OF CORN BY THE DISCIPLES, AND THE
HEALING OF THE MAN WITH THE WITHERED HAND
(St. Matthew 12:1-21; St. Mark 2:23-3:6; St. Luke 6:1-11.)

IN grouping together the three miracles of healing described in the last chapter, we do not wish to convey that it is certain they had taken place in precisely that order. Nor do we feel sure, that they preceded what is about to be related. In the absence of exact data, the succession of events and their location must be matter of combination. From their position in the Evangelic narratives, and the manner in which all concerned speak and act, we inferred, that they took place at that particular period and east of the Jordan, in the Decapolis or else in the territory of Philip. They differ from the events about to be related by the absence of the Jerusalem Scribes, who hung on the footsteps of Jesus. While the 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 prevailing 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.¹ 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 it² - 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:³ '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,'⁴ when it stood before the Mount. Even the tortures of Gehenna were intermitted on that holy, happy day.⁵

1. Sanh. vii. 4. 2. Peah viii. 7. 3. In Prov. x. 22.

4. Ex. xx. 8. 5. Comp. Ber. R. 11 on Gen. ii. 3.

The terribly exaggerated views on the Sabbath entertained by the Rabbis, and the endless burdensome rules with which they encumbered everything connected with its sanctity, are fully set forth in another place.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.

6. See Appendix XVII: The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath.

7. Comp. St. John v. 9, 16.

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.⁸ 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,⁹ 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 (ρμ(η τρψπσ). 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.¹⁰

8. Comp. [The Temple and its Services.](#) pp. 222, 226, 230, 231.

9. The great majority of critics are agreed as to its authenticity.

10. The view which I have adopted is that of *Scaliger* and *Lightfoot*; the alternative one mentioned, that of *Delitzsch*. In regard to the many other explanations proposed, I would lay down this canon: No explanation can be satisfactory which rests not on some ascertained fact in Jewish life, but where the fact is merely 'supposed' for the sake of the explanation which it would afford. Thus, there is not the slightest support in fact for the idea, that the first Sabbath of the second month was so called (*Wetstein*, *Speaker's Commentary*), or the first Sabbath in the second year of a septennial cycle, or the Sabbath of the Nisan (the sacred) year, in contradistinction to the Tishri or secular year, which began in autumn. Of these and similar interpretations it is enough to say, that the underlying fact is 'supposed' for the sake of a 'supposed' explanation; in other words, they embody an hypothesis based on an hypothesis.

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.¹¹ 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,'¹² which, as shown in another place,¹³ 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.

11. There were only three Paschal feasts during the public ministry of Christ. Any other computation rests on the idea that the Unknown Feast was the Passover, or even the Feast of Esther.

12. St. John v. 13. 13. Comp. Appendix XV.

The same result is reached by another process of reasoning. After the first Passover¹⁴ our Lord, with such of His disciples as had then gathered to Him, tarried for some time - no doubt for several weeks - in Judæa.¹⁵ The wheat was ripe for harvesting, when he passed through Samaria.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ Chronologically, therefore, there is no room for this event between the first Passover and Pentecost.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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.

14. St. John ii. 13. 15. St. John iii. 22; v. 1-3. 16. St. John iv. 35. 17. St. Matt. iv. 18-22.

18. Few would be disposed to place St. Matt. xii. before St. Matt. iv. 19. St. John v.

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,²⁰ 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,²¹ but with differences of detail, showing the independence of their narratives, which, as we shall see, really supplement each other.

20. Adverbs answer to the questions, How, When, Why, Where.

21. *Meyer* insists that the *οδον ποιειν*, or more correctly *οδοποιειν*, (St. Mark ii. 23) should be translated literally, that the disciples began to make a way by plucking the ears of corn. Accordingly, he maintains, that there is an essential difference between the account of St. Mark and those of the two other Evangelists, who attribute the plucking of the ears to hunger. Canon *Cook* (Speaker's Commentary, New Testament i. p. 216) has to my mind, conclusively shown the untenableness of *Meyer's* contention. He compares the expression of St. Mark to the Latin '*iter facere*.' I would suggest the French '*chemin faisant*.' *Godet* points out the absurdity of plucking up ears in order to make a way through the corn.

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 passed²² - probably by a field-path - through cornfields, when His disciples, being hungry,²³ as they went,²⁴ plucked ears of corn and ate them, having rubbed off the husks in their hands.²⁵ On any ordinary day this would have been lawful,²⁶ 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.^{27 28} This so-called 'division' of labour applied only to infringement of the Sabbath-rest - not of that of feast-days.²⁹ 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.'³⁰ 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!³¹ And yet it was forbidden to stop with a little wax the hole in a cask by which the fluid was running out,³² or to wipe a wound!

22. In St. Mark also the better reading is *διαπορευεσθα*. 23. St. Matthew.

24. St. Mark. 25. St. Luke. 26. Deut xxiii. 25. 27. Shabb. 70 *a*.

28. Thus (Shabb. 74 *b*, lines 12, 11 from bottom), if a person were to pull out a feather from the wing of a bird, cut off the top, and then pluck off the fluff below it would involve three labours and three sin-offerings.

29. Macc. 21 *b*. 30. Jer. Shabb. p. 10 *a*, lines 28 to 26 from bottom.

31. Shabb. 142 *b*, line 6 from bottom. 32. Shabb. 146 *a*.

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,³³ and indeed all other obligations.³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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.'³⁶

33. But only where the life of an Israelite, not of a heathen or Samaritan, was in danger (Yoma 84 *b*).

34. *Maimonides*, Hilkh. Shabb. ii. 1 (Yad haCh. vol. i. part iii. p. 141 *a*): 'The Sabbath is set aside on account of danger to life, as all other ordinances (λκ ρ)#κ τωχημη'.

35. Jer. Shabb. xiv. 4, pp. 14 *d*, 15 *a*. 36. Jer. Shabb. xvi. 1.

All these points must be kept in view for the proper understanding of the words of Christ to the Scribes. For, while going far beyond the times and notions of His questioners, His reasoning must have been within their comprehension. Hence the first argument of our Lord, as recorded by all the Synoptists, was taken from Biblical History. When, on his flight from Saul, David had, 'when an hungered,' eaten of the shewbread, and given it to his followers,³⁷ although, by the letter of the Levitical Law,³⁸ 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,³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ 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.

37. According to 1 Sam. xxii. 9 Ahimelech (or Ahijah, 1 Sam. xiv. 3) was the high Priest. We infer, that Abiathar was conjoined with his father in the priesthood. Comp. the [Bible-History,' vol. iv.](#) p. 111.

38. Lev. xxiv 5-9.

39. The question discussed in the Talmud is, whether, supposing an ordinary Israelite discharged priestly functions on the Sabbath in the temple, it would involve two sins: unlawful service and Sabbath-desecration; or only one sin, unlawful service.

40. Yalkut ii. par. 130, p. 18 *d.* 41. Jer. Shabb. ii. 5, p. 5 *a.*

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.'⁴² 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.⁴³

42. Mechilt. on Ex. xxxi. 13, ed. *Weiss*, p. 109 *b*.

43. We may here again state, that Cod. D has this after St. Luke vi. 4: 'The same day, having beholden a man working on the Sabbath, He said to Him: "Man, if thou knowest what thou dost, blessed are thou: but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the Law"' (*Nicholson*, Gospel according to the Hebrews, p. 151). It need scarcely be said, that the words, as placed in St. Luke, are a spurious addition, although as Canon *Westcott* rightly infers, 'the saying [probably] rests on some real incident' (Introd. to the Study of the Gospels, p. 454, note).

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,⁴⁴ according to some throat-disease,⁴⁵ while, according to others, such a disease as angina,⁴⁶ 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 taken⁴⁷ although here also there was a way of evading the Law.⁴⁸ A person suffering from toothache might not gargle his mouth with vinegar, but he might use an ordinary toothbrush and dip it in

vinegar.⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰ External lesions also might be attended to, if they involved danger to life.⁵¹ 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.⁵²

44. Debar. R. 10. 45. Yoma viii. 6. 46. Yoma 84 *a.* 47. Shabb. xiv. 3.

48. Thus, when a Rabbi was consulted, whether a man might on the Sabbath take a certain drink which had a purgative effect, he answered: 'If for pleasure it is lawful; if for healing forbidden' (Jer. Shabb. 14 *c*).

49. u. s. 4.

50. Thus one of the Rabbis regarded force of the breath as possibly dangerous (u. s. 14 *d*).

51. Displacement of the frontal bone, disease of the nerves leading from the ear to the upper jaw, an eye starting from its socket, severe inflammations, and swelling wounds, are specially mentioned.

52. Comp. Jer. Shabb. 14 *d*.

But although the man with the withered hand could not be classed with those dangerously ill, it could not have been difficult to silence the Rabbis on their own admissions. Clearly, their principle implied, that it was lawful on the Sabbath to do that which would save life or prevent death. To have taught otherwise, would virtually have involved murder. But if so, did it not also, in strictly logical sequence, imply this far wider principle, that it must be lawful to do good on the Sabbath? For, evidently, the omission of such good would have involved the doing of evil. Could this be the proper observance of God's holy day? There was no answer to such an argument; St. Mark expressly records that they dared not attempt a reply.⁵³ On the other hand, St. Matthew, while alluding to this terribly telling challenge,⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ But even the Talmud discusses cases in which it was lawful to lift an animal out of a pit on a Sabbath.⁵⁶ 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?

53. St. Mark iii. 4. 54. St. Matt. xii. 12.

55. Shabb. 128 *b*. 56. Shabb. 117 *b*, about the middle.

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,⁵⁷ 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?

57. St. Luke vi. 6.

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.⁵⁸ 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.

58. The tense indicates, that it was restored as he stretched it out. And this is spiritually significant. According to St. *Jerome* (Comm. in Matt. xii. 13), in the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites this man was described as a mason, and that he had besought Jesus to restore him, so that he might not have to beg for his bread.

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.'⁵⁹ 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.'

59. St. Luke vi. 11.

And in His Name shall the Gentiles trust. Far out into the silence of those solitary upland hills of the Gentile world did the call, unheard and unheeded in Israel, travel. He had other sheep which were not of that fold. And down those hills, from the far-off lands, does the sound of the bells, as it comes nearer and nearer, tell that those other sheep, which are not of this fold, are gathering at His call to the Good Shepherd; and through these centuries, still louder and more manifold becomes this sound of nearing bells, till they shall all be gathered into one: one flock, one fold, one Shepherd.

Chapter 36
THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND
TO DALMANUTHA
'THE SIGN FROM HEAVEN'
JOURNEY TO CAESAREA PHILIPPI
WHAT IS THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES?
(St. Matthew 15:32-16:12; St. Mark 8:1-21.)

THEY might well gather to Jesus in their thousands, with their wants of body and soul, these sheep wandering without a shepherd; for His Ministry in that district, as formerly in Galilee, was about to draw to a close. And here it is remarkable, that each time His prolonged stay and Ministry in a district were brought to a close with some supper, so to speak, some festive entertainment on his part. The Galilean Ministry had closed with the feeding of the five thousand, the guests being mostly from Capernaum and the towns around, as far as Bethsaida (Julias), many in the number probably on their way to the Paschal feast at Jerusalem.¹ 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 Judaean 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.

1. Comp. ch. xxix. of this Book.

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.² 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'?

2. This appears from the whole context. Comp. Bp. *Ellicott's* *Histor. Lect.* pp. 220, 221, and notes.

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.³ 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.⁴ 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.

3. For a summary of the great differences between the two miracles, comp. Bp. *Ellicott*, u. s. pp. 221, 222. The statements of *Meyer* ad loc. are unsatisfactory.

4. The *κοφινος* (St. Matt. xiv. 20) was the small handbasket (see ch. xxix), while the *σπυρις* (the term used at the feeding of the four thousand) is the large provision-basket or hamper, such as that in which St. Paul was let down over the wall at Damascus (Acts ix. 25). What makes it more marked is, that the distinction of the two words is kept up in the reference to the two miracles (St. Matt. xvi. 9, 10).

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,⁵ 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.⁶ 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,'⁷ 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.'⁸ 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,⁹ 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,¹⁰ 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,¹¹ 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.

5. See ch. xxix. 6. St. Mark viii. 6, 7. 7. St. Matt. xiv. 19; St. Mark vi. 39; St. John vi. 10.

8. Literally, 'upon the earth.' 9. The word ἐρημια means a specially lonely place.

10. Of *Bleek*. 11. By Dean *Plumptre*, ad loc.

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.'¹² 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.

12. Ezek. xxxvii. 3.

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.¹³ 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,'^{14 15} 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 west¹⁶ 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'¹⁷ - a word 'which implies, that they resided elsewhere,'¹⁸ 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* (Νμλ, Νψμλ, ηνψμλ = λμην), 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,¹⁹ 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*.²⁰

13. Compare, however, vol. i. pp. 238, 240, and Book V. ch. iii. Where the political element was dominant, the religious distinction might not be so clearly marked.

14. St. Matt. xv. 39.

15. It need scarcely be said that the best reading is Magadan, not Magdala.

16. It has been ingeniously suggested, that Magadan might represent a Megiddo, being a form intermediate between the Hebrew Megiddon and the Assyrian Magadu.

17. St. Mark viii. 11. 18. Canon *Cook* in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' ad loc.

19. *Sepp*, ap. *Böttger*, Topogr. Lex. zu Fl. Josephus, p. 240.

20. Bearing in mind that Tarichæa was the chief depôt for salting the fish for export, the disciples may have had some connections with the place.

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,'²¹ and let that sign come direct from heaven!

21. The word here used would, to judge by analogous instances, be τω) (Oth), and not Νιμωσ (*Siman*), as *Wünsche* suggests, even though the word is formed from the Greek σιμητων. But the Rabbinic *Siman* seems to me to have a different shade of meaning.

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 Parnassus were turned into blood.^{22 23} 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?'²⁴

22. Sanh. 98 *a* last 4 lines.

23. However, this (and, for that matter, the next Haggadah also) may have been intended to be taken in an allegoric or parabolic sense, though there is no hint given to that effect.

24. Baba Mez. 59 *b*, line 4 from top, &c.

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.²⁵ 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,²⁶ 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.

25. St. Mark viii. 12. 26. See ch. xxvii. vol. i. p. 647.

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.²⁷ 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.'²⁸ 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,'²⁹ was the warning cry of judgment and the loving call to repentance.³⁰

27. Although some of the best MSS. omit St. Matt. xvi. 2, beginning 'When it is evening,' to the end of ver. 3, most critics are agreed that it should be retained. But the words in italics in vv. 2 and 3 should be left out, so as to mark exclamations.

28. So according to the best reading. 29. St. Mark viii. 12. 30. St. Luke xix. 41-44.

It was but a natural, almost necessary, sequence, that 'He left them and departed.' Once more the ship, which bore Him and His disciples, spread its sails towards the coast of Bethsaida-Julias. He was on His way to the utmost limit of the land, to Casarea 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,³¹ 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.

31. St. John vii.

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,³² 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.

32. The figurative meaning of leaven, as that which morally corrupts, was familiar to the Jews. Thus the word ρω# (Seor) is used in the sense of 'moral leaven' hindering the good in Ber. 17 *a* while the verb Χμξ (*chamets*) 'to be come leavened,' is used to indicate moral deterioration in Rosh haSh. 3 *b*, 4 *a*.

Here, as always, Christ rather suggests than gives the interpretation of His meaning. And this is the law of His teaching. Our modern Pharisees and Sadducees, also, too often ask of him a sign from heaven in evidence of His claims. And we also too often misunderstand His warning to us concerning their leaven. Seeing the scanty store in our basket, our little faith is busy with thoughts about possible signs in multiplying the one loaf which we have, forgetful that, where Christ is, faith may ever expect all that is needful, and that our care should only be in regard to the teaching which might leaven and corrupt that on which our souls are fed.

Chapter 37

**THE GREAT CONFESSION
THE GREAT COMMISSION
THE GREAT INSTRUCTION
THE GREAT TEMPTATION
THE GREAT DECISION**

(St. Matthew 16:13-28; St. Mark 8:27-9:1; St. Luke 9:18-27.)

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.^{1 2} 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.

1. *Jos. Jew. War* iii. 10.

2. If it were for no other reason than the mode in which the ex-general of the Galileans, *Josephus*, tells this story, he would deserve our execration.

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 Baniyas. 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.³ 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'),⁴ 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.⁵ We turn north of the Lake, and west to Kedes, the Kedesh Naphtali of the Bible, the home of Barak. We have now passed from the limestone of Central Palestine into the dark basalt formation. How splendidly that ancient Priest-City of Refuge lay! In the rich heritage of Naphtali,⁶ 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.

3. For the geographical details I must refer to the words of *Stanley* and *Tristram*, and to *Bädeker's Palästina*. I have not deemed it necessary to make special quotation of my authority in each case.

4. Ps. xiii. 6. 5. Josh. xi. 1-5. 6. Deut. xxxiii. 23.

The scenery is very similar, as we travel on towards Caesarea Philippi. About an hour and a half farther, we strike the ancient Roman road. We are now amidst vines and mulberry-trees. Passing through a narrow rich valley, we ascend through a rocky wilderness of hills, where the woodbine luxuriantly trails around the plane trees. On the height there is a glorious view back to Lake Merom and the Jordan-valley; forward, to the snowy peaks of Hermon; east, to height on height, and west, to peaks now only crowned with ruins. We still continued along the height, then descended a steep slope, leaving, on our left, the ancient Abel Beth Maachah,⁷ 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 Baniyas, or Caesarea Philippi.

7. 2 Sam. xx. 14.

The situation of the ancient Caesarea Philippi (1,147 feet above the sea) is, indeed, magnificent. Nestling amid three valleys on a terrace in the angle of Hermon, it is almost shut out from view by cliffs and woods. 'Everywhere there is a wild medley of cascades, mulberry trees, fig-trees, dashing torrents, festoons of vines, bubbling fountains, reeds, and ruins, and the mingled music of birds and waters.'⁸ The vegetation and fertility all around are extraordinary. The modern village of Baniyas 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, Caesarea Philippi. The castle - mount (about 1,000 feet above Paneas), takes nearly an hour to ascend, and is separated by a deep valley from the flank of Mount Hermon. The castle itself (about two miles from Baniyas) 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.

8. *Tristram*, Land of Israel, p. 586.

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.'⁹ In Cæsarea, or its immediate neighbourhood,¹⁰ 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;¹¹ nay, far beyond that - beyond life and death - beyond the grave and the judgment, to the perfect brightness of the Resurrection-day.

9. So Dean *Stanley*, with his usual charm of language, though topographically not quite correctly (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 395).

10. Nothing in the above obliges us to infer, that the words of Peter's confession were spoken in Cæsarea itself. The place might have been in view or in the memory.

11. 2 Pet. i. 19.

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.¹² 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.¹³ Undoubtedly this had already tried their faith, as appears from the question of Christ: 'Will ye also go away?'¹⁴ 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.'

12. St. John vii. 1-5. 13. St. John vi. 60-66; comp. St. Matt. xv. 12. 14. St. John vi. 67.

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 them¹⁵ - 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!'

15. St. Luke ix. 18.

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,¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ 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.

16. I confess, however, to strong doubts on this point. Legends of the hiding of the tabernacle, ark, and altar of incense on Mount Nebo by Jeremiah, were, indeed, combined with an expectation that these precious possessions would be restored in Messianic times (2 Macc. ii. 1-7), but it is expressly added in ver. 8, that 'the Lord' Himself, and not the prophet, would show their place of concealment. Dean *Plumptre's* statement, that the Pharisees taught, and the Jews believed in, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls must have arisen from the misapprehension of what Josephus said, to which reference has already been made in the chapter on 'The Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.' The first distinct mention of the reappearance of Jeremiah, along with Elijah, to restore the ark, &c., is in *Josippon ben Gorion* (lib. i. c. 21), but here also only in the Cod. *Munster.*, not in that used by *Breithaupt*. The age of the work of *Josippon* is in dispute; probably we may date it from the tenth century of our era. The only other testimony about the reappearance of Jeremiah is in 4 Esd. (2 Esd.) ii. 18. But the book is post-Christian, and, in that section especially, evidently borrows from the Christian Scriptures.

17. On the vague fears of Herod, see vol. i. p. 675.

18. A vision of Jeremiah in a dream was supposed to betoken chastisements (Ber. 57 e, line 7 from top).

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?'¹⁹ 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.'²⁰ 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.'²¹ 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.'

19. St. Mark viii. 27, 29. 20. St. Matt. xvi. 16. 21. Rom. x. 10.

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.²² 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,'²³ 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.'²⁴ ²⁵ 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.

22. Comp. Rom. i. 4. 23. St. Matt. xiv. 33. 24. St. John vi. 69. 25. This is the correct reading.

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 Christ²⁶ - we can scarcely doubt, for that very revelation by the Father, which He afterwards joyously recognised in the words of Peter.

26. St. Luke ix. 18.

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. Luke²⁷ 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,²⁸ and in the letters of St. Paul,²⁹ 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 (Μψιμᾶ#≡Ξαφβ≡α#ε ω≡νψβι)αφ).

27. There could have been no anti-Petrine tendency in this, since it is equally omitted in the Petrine Gospel of St. Mark.

28. Ecclus, xiv. 18; xvii. 31. 29. 1 Cor. xv. 60; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12.

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 Cephias, which is, by interpretation, Peter [*Petros*, a Stone, or else a Rock]³⁰ - the Aramaic word *Kepha* (παφψκ≡Ξ, or ηπαφψκ≡Ξ) 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*).³¹ When the Lord, therefore, prophetically gave the name Cephias, it may have been that by that term He gave only a prophetic interpretation to what had been his previous name Peter (σρ+ψψπ). This seems the more likely, since, as

we have previously seen, it was the practice in Galilee to have two names,³² especially when the strictly Jewish name, such as Simon, had no equivalent among the Gentiles.³³ 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*, ρ+π). 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*, ρ+π) to build on it, and to found the world,' whence also Abraham is called a Rock (*Tsur*, ρψχ) as it is said:³⁴ 'Look unto the Rock whence ye are hewn.'³⁵ ³⁶ 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.³⁷ ³⁸ To complete this sketch, in the curious Jewish legend about the Apostle Peter, which is outlined in an Appendix to this volume,³⁹ Peter is always designated as *Simon Kepha* (spelt πψθ), 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* (ρ+ψπ) 'which is the name for stone, because he sat there upon a stone till his death' (Νβ)η λ(Μ# β#ψ#).⁴⁰

30. St. John i. 42.

31. Pesiqta, ed. *Buber*, p. 158 *a*, line 8 from bottom.

32. See the remarks on Matthew-Levi in vol. i. ch. xvii. p. 514 of this Book.

33. Thus, for example, Andrew was both 'Ανδρεας and ψ)ραδΞ:v:)α (*Anderai*) 'manly,' 'brave.' A family *Anderai* is mentioned Jer. Kethub. 33 *a*.

34. Is. li 1.

35. Yalkut on Numb. xxiii. 9, vol. i. p.243, *b*, last 6 lines, and *c*, first 3 lines.

36. The same occurs in Shem. R. 15, only that there it is not only Abraham but 'the fathers' who are 'the Rocks' (the word used there is not *Petra* but *Tsur*) on whom the world is founded.

37. Erub.19 *a*, Ber. R. 48.

38. There was a strange idea about Jewish children who had died uncircumcised and the sinners in Israel exchanging their position in regard to circumcision. Could this, only

spiritually understood and applied, have been present to the mind of St. Paul when he wrote Romans ii. 25, 26, last clauses?

39. See Appendix XVIII.

40. The reader will have no difficulty in recognizing a reference to the See of Rome, perhaps 'the Chair of St. Peter,' mixed up with the meaning of the name of Peter.

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.⁴¹ And we can further understand how, just as Christ's contemporaries may have regarded the world as reared on the rock of faithful Abraham, so Christ promised, that He would build His Church on the *Petrine* in Peter - on his faith and confession. Nor would the term 'Church' sound strange in Jewish ears. The same Greek word (*ἐκκλησία*), as the equivalent of the Hebrew *Qahal*, 'convocation,' 'the called,'⁴² occurs in the LXX. rendering of the Old Testament, and in 'the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach'⁴³ and was apparently in familiar use at the time.⁴⁴ 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'⁴⁵ shall not prevail against it.

41. The other views of the words are (a) that Christ pointed to Himself as the Rock, (b) or to Peter as a person, (c) or to Peter's confession.

42. The other word is *Edah*. Comp. Bible Hist. vol. ii. p. 177, note.

43. Ecclus. xxiv. 2.

44. Comp. Acts vii. 38, and even St. Matt. xviii. 17.

45. It is important to notice that the word is *Hades*, and not *Gehenna*. Dean *Plumptre* calls attention to the wonderful character of such a prophecy at a time when all around seemed to foreshadow only failure.

Viewing 'the Church' as a building founded upon 'the *Petrine*,'⁴⁶ 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,⁴⁷ and at his bidding first be baptized.⁴⁸

46. Those who apply the words 'upon this Rock, &c.,' to Peter or to Christ must feel, that they introduce an abrupt and inelegant transition from one figure to another.

47. Acts xv. 7. 48. Acts x. 48.

If hitherto it has appeared that what Christ said to Peter, though infinitely transcending Jewish ideas, was yet, in its expression and even cast of thought, such as to be quite intelligible to Jewish minds, nay, so familiar to them, that, as by well-marked steps, they might ascend to the higher Sanctuary, the difficult words with which our Lord closed must be read in the same light. For, assuredly, in interpreting such a saying of Christ to Peter, our first inquiry must be, what it would convey to the person to whom the promise was addressed. And here we recall, that no other terms were in more constant use in Rabbinic Canon-Law than those of 'binding' and 'loosing.' The words are the literal translation of the Hebrew equivalents *Asar* (רסא)אפ), which means 'to bind,' in the sense of prohibiting, and *Hittir* (רפטεηי, from רטאני) which means 'to loose,' in the sense of permitting. For the latter the term *Shera* or *Sheri* (רפאפ#εε:, or רפרי#εε:) 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.'⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰

49. Jer. Ber. 3 b; Jer. Meg. 71 a; Jer. Sanh. 30 a. 50. St. John xx. 23.

On the second of these powers we need not at present dwell. That of 'binding' and 'loosing' included all the legislative functions for the new Church. And it was a reality. In the view of the Rabbis heaven was like earth, and questions were discussed and settled by a heavenly Sanhedrin. Now, in regard to some of their earthly decrees, they were wont to say that 'the Sanhedrin above' confirmed what 'the Sanhedrin beneath' had done. But the words of Christ, as they avoided the foolish conceit of His contemporaries, left it not

doubtful, but conveyed the assurance that, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, whatsoever they bound or loosed on earth would be bound or loosed in heaven.

But all this that had passed between them could not be matter of common talk - least of all, at that crisis in His History, and in that locality. Accordingly, all the three Evangelists record - each with distinctive emphasis⁵¹ - 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.⁵² 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.

51. The word used by St. Matthew (δυστειλατο) means 'charged;' that by St. Mark (επειμησεν) implies rebuke; while the expression employed by St. Luke (επιτιμησας αυτοις παρηγγειλε) conveys both rebuke and command.

52. Otherwise they could not afterwards have been in such doubt about His Death and Resurrection.

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 expression⁵³ - God forbid it, '*God be merciful to Thee*.'⁵⁴ 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 intensesness, minds the things of man, and not those of God.

53. It is very remarkable that the expression ἰλεως σοι literally 'have mercy on thee,' is the exact transcript of the Rabbinic *Chas lecha* (-ל סֶּחֶ). See *Levy, Neuhebr. Wörterb.* vol. ii, p. 85. The commoner expression is *Chas ve Shalom*, 'mercy and peace,' viz. be to thee, and the meaning is, God forbid, or God avert, a thing or its continuance.

54. So the Greek literally.

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,⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶

55. In those days the extreme suffering which a man might expect from the hostile power (the Romans) was the literal cross; in ours, it is suffering not less acute, the greatest which the present hostile power can inflict: really, through perhaps not literally, a cross.

56. St. Matt. xvi. 24-27.

But why speak of the future and distant? 'A sign' - a terrible sign of it 'from heaven,' a vindication of Christ's 'rejected' claims, a vindication of the Christ, Whom they had slain, invoking His Blood on their City and Nation, a vindication, such as alone these men could understand, of the reality of His Resurrection and Ascension, was in the near future. The flames of the City and Temple would be the light in that nation's darkness, by which to read the inscription on the Cross. All this not afar off. Some of those who stood there would not 'taste death,'⁵⁷ till in those judgments they would see that the Son of Man had come in His Kingdom.⁵⁸

57. This is an exact translation of the phrase ητψμ M(+), which is of such very frequent occurrence in Rabbinic writings. See our remarks on St. John viii. 52 in Book IV. ch. viii.

58. St. Matt. xvi. 28.

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.