



Dr. _____

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by

Mr. A. A. Sweet.

No 54832

Return on
or before

~~100~~ ~~100~~

1

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOLUME VII.

List of Contributors to Volume VII.

REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, D.D., LITT.D.

REV. PROFESSOR T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.

REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.

RIGHT REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D., BISHOP OF DERRY AND
RAPHOE.

REV. PROFESSOR R. H. CHARLES, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR A. E. GARVIE, D.D.

REV. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.

REV. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, LITT.D.

REV. F. W. MOZLEY, M.A.

REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A.

REV. E. C. SELWYN, D.D.

REV. PROFESSOR G. A. SMITH, D.D., LL.D.

ALEXANDER SOUTER, M.A.

REV. G. WAUCHOPE STEWART, M.A.

REV. PROFESSOR H. B. SWETE, D.D.

JULIA WEDGWOOD.

T. H. WEIR, B.D., M.R.A.S.

REV. N. J. D. WHITE, B.D.

REV. PROFESSOR THEOD. ZAHN, LITT.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SIXTH SERIES

Volume VII.

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

— — —
MCMIII.

54832

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS
FROME, AND LONDON.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

THE following studies are meant to fill a gap which was left in *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, partly because in that volume there was no room for the adequate treatment of so large a subject ; and partly because I desired to examine once more upon the ground some of the topographical problems, and in particular to confirm by the eye the relations of a few of the sites to each other, which (I believe) had been overlooked.¹ I have now had the opportunity to do this, as well as to study afresh the controversies which have raged, and some of which will always rage, over scenes so frequently reduced to ruin, and overgrown with the traditions of three religions. The last decade has also brought to us a number of new data from the Babylonian monuments, and from the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Fund under Mr. Bliss and Mr. Dickie. The attempt may therefore be made to present some fresh studies of the history of Jerusalem, and of the principal problems connected with its name, its topography and its gradual progress, upon a position which inherited hardly a single pledge of fame, to the rank of the most sacred city in the world.

1. A GENERAL VIEW OF THE CITY.

The life of even the meanest of towns cannot be written apart from the history of the times through which they have

¹ E.g. the relation between the pools at Siloam and the Western Hill : so important to the question of the date at which the latter was taken into the city.

flourished; while still but a hill-fort, with centuries of obscurity in front of her, Jerusalem held a garrison for the Pharaoh of the day, and corresponded with him in the characters of the Babylonian civilisation.¹

When such a town suddenly, without omen, augury or natural promise of renown, becomes a capital, her historian is drawn to explore, it may be at a distance from herself, the currents of national life which have surprised her, and the motives of their convergence upon so unexpected a centre. His horizon is the further widened, if the capital, which she has become, be that of a restless nation on the path of great empires: tremulous to all their rumour, and provoking, as Jerusalem did from the days of Sennacherib to those of Hadrian, the interference of their arms. Yet this range of political interest opened to our city only as the reflection of that more sacred fame, which dawned upon her when the one monotheism of the ancient world was identified by its prophets with the inviolableness of her walls;² when the ritual of that religion was concentrated upon her shrine;³ and the One Temple was regarded as equally essential to religion with faith in the One God. Not only did the country shrink in consequence to be the mere fringe of the city,⁴ within whose narrow walls a whole nation, conscious of a service to humanity, henceforth experienced the most powerful crises of their career; not only did her sons learn to add to the pride of such a citizenship the idealism and passionate longing which only exile breeds; but among alien and far away races the sparks were kindled of a faith and of an

¹ Letters of Abd-hiba of Jerusalem in the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets.

² As e.g. by Isaiah.

³ By the Deuteronomic legislation, which, whatever its date, was first enforced by Josiah from 621 onwards.

⁴ This, which becomes apparent even in Old Testament times, so far as politics are concerned, is most conspicuous, from the writings of Josephus, through the Roman period, when Jerusalem was to Palestine virtually what Paris has been to France.

eagerness for the city almost as jealous as those of her own children. So lofty an influence was exerted by Jerusalem some centuries before the appearance of Christ; yet it was only prophetic of the worship which she drew from all the world as the site of His Cross and of His Grave. Though other great cities of Christendom—Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage and Rome—were by far her superiors in philosophy or spiritual empire, Jerusalem remained the religious centre of the earth—whose frame was even conceived as poised about her rocks—the home of the faith, the goal of the world's most distant pilgrimages, and the original of the Heavenly City, which one day would descend from God among men. By all which memories and beliefs the passions of humanity were let loose upon her. She became as Armageddon. Two almost world-wide religions made her their battle-ground: hurling their farthest kings against her walls and shedding upon her dust the tears and the blood of millions of their people. East and West hotly contended for her, no longer because she was alive—were it only with the death-throes of a stubborn nation—but in devotion to the mere shell of the life that had gone from her. Though still a focus in the diplomacy of empires and the shrine of several forms of faith, her politics were reduced to intrigue and her religion overlaid with superstition, hardly touched for generations by any visible heroism or even romance. Thirty-three centuries of a history, climbing slowly to the Central Fact of all history, and then toppling down upon itself in a ruin, that has almost obliterated the scenes and monuments of the life which made her glorious and Alone in the story of the world!

The bare catalogue of the disasters which have overtaken Jerusalem is enough to paralyse her topographer. Besides the earthquakes which have periodically rocked her foundations,¹ the city has endured nearly twenty sieges and

¹ There was the famous one in Uzziah's day, the tremors of which are visible

storms of the utmost severity,¹ some of which involved a considerable, but others a total destruction of her walls and buildings; almost twenty more blockades, or military occupations, with the wreck or dilapidation of prominent edifices; the frequent alteration of levels by the razing of rocky knolls and the filling of valleys; about eighteen reconstructions, embellishments, and large extensions,²

in the prophets, and its memory lasted for four centuries (Zechariah xiv. 5); Josephus (XV. *Ant.* v. 2) describes another which desolated Judæa under Herod, killing 10,000(?) people (cf. Matt. xxvii. 5); while no fewer than four are reported within a tenth of the city's history: viz. A.D. 735, 846, 1016, 1034. Dr. Chaplin (*P.E.F.Q.* 1883, p. 11) reports twelve shocks (apparently not severe) in twenty-two years, 1860-66.

¹ Besides the capture by David, about 1000 B.C., the following are known to history. Plunder of Temple and city by Shishonq of Egypt about 930 (1 Kings xiv. 25 f.; 2 Chron. xii. 2 ff.); overthrow by Jehoash of Israel about 790 (2 Kings xiv. 13 ff.); siege by Sennacherib, 701; surrender to Nebuchadrezzar, 597; his siege and destruction, 587-6; probable sack by the Persians about 350; destruction by Ptolemy Soter, 320 (*καθηρήκει*: Appian *Syr.* 350); destruction by Antiochus Epiphanes, 168; siege and levelling of walls by Antiochus VII. 134; brief and unsuccessful siege by the Nabateans, 63; siege, capture and much destruction by Pompey, 62; sack of temple by Crassus, 54; capture by the Parthians, 40; siege and partial destruction by Herod and Sosius, 37; insurrection and some ruin on the visit of Florus, 65 A.D.; brief and unsuccessful siege by Cestius Gallus, 66; the great siege and destruction by Titus, 70; seizure by the Jews under Bar Coheba, 131; capture and devastation by Hadrian, 132; capture and plunder by Chosroes the Persian, 614; re-capture by Heraclius, 628; occupation by Omar, 637; capture by Moslem rebels, 842; ruin of Christian buildings, 937; occupation by the Fatimite Dynasty, 969; some destruction by the Khalif Hakîm, 1010; occupation by the Seljuk Turks, 1075 (?); siege and capture by Afdhal, 1096; siege, capture and massacre by Godfrey, 1099; occupation by Saladin, 1187; destruction of walls, 1219; capture by the Emir of Kerak, 1229, surrender to Frederick II. 1239; capture and sack by the Kharezmians, 1244; plunder by Arabs, 1480; occupation by Turks, 1547; bombardment by Turks, 1825; Egyptian occupation, 1831; re-occupation by Turks, 1841.

² Before the exile by David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Uzziah and others; after the exile, at first by the few Jews who returned from Babylon to rebuild the Temple, and then in the reconstruction of the walls and other buildings under Nehemiah; after the Persian sack in 350 (?); and that by Ptolemy in 320; by the Maccabees after 168, and then more thoroughly by Simon; by Antipater after Pompey (*Jos. I. B.J.* x. 4); by Herod the Great and by Agrippa; by Hadrian from 136 onward; by Constantine (churches), the Empress Eudoxia (walls, churches, etc.), and Justinian (churches and convents); by the Moslems, especially the Khalifs Omar and Maimûn (mosques and walls); by Christians (churches) under the earliest Moslem supremacy, and especially in the

including the imposition of novel systems of architecture, streets, drains and aqueducts athwart the lines of the old; the addition of new suburbs, and the abandonment of part of the inhabited area to agriculture; while, of course, over all there gathered the dust and waste of ordinary manufacture and commerce. Even such changes might not have been fatal to the restoration of the ancient topography, had the traditions cut short by them been immediately resumed. But there have also happened two intervals of silence,¹ during which the city lay almost, if not altogether desolate, and her native life was paralysed; five abrupt passages from one religion to another,² which even more disastrously severed the continuity of her story; more than one outbreak of fanatic superstition creating new and baseless tradition; as well as the long, careless chatter about the holy sites, which has still further confused or obliterated the genuine memories of the past.

Before we put our hands to this débris and stir the dust of a hundred controversies, it is necessary to take a general view of the position of the city; of its surroundings and atmosphere; and of that common life which, under every change of empire and of faith, has throbbled through her streets and gates down to the present day.

Jerusalem lies on the mountain range of Judæa, about 2,400 feet above the sea, and some thirty-five miles from the coast of the Mediterranean. From the latter she is sepa-

eleventh century; by Crusaders in the twelfth century (churches, convents and hospices); by the Moslems again (mosques and many alterations); by Solyman the Magnificent (re-building of the walls, 1542; and since by Christians, Jews and Moslems, especially in the great alterations and expansions of the nineteenth century.

¹ After Nebuchadrezzar and after Hadrian.

² Besides the temporary occupation by Paganism in 168 B.C.; there were the passage from Judaism to Paganism under Hadrian; to Christianity under Constantine; to Islam under Omar; to Christianity under Godfrey; to Islam under Saladin.

rated by a plain, which during the greater part of her history was in the hands of an alien and generally hostile race; by low foot-hills; and by the flank and watershed of the range itself. From the west, therefore, we must realise that Jerusalem stood almost completely aloof. The most considerable valley in the mountains on this side of her, after starting from the watershed a little to the north of her walls, drives its deep trench southward, as if to cut her off more rigorously from the maritime plain and the sea. Travellers by the modern road from Jaffa will remember how after this has seemed, by its painful ascent from Bab-el-Wady, to attain the level of the city, it has to wind down the steep sides of the Wady Bêt Hanina or Kulouiyeh and then wind up again to the watershed. The only pass from the west that can be said to debouch upon Jerusalem is a narrow and easily defended gorge, up which the present railway has been forced, but which can never have been used as a road of approach either by armies or by commercial caravans. Hence nearly all the great advances on Jerusalem have been made, even by Western Powers in command of the plain, from further north: up the Bethoron road, and so along the backbone of the range, by the one main route near which the city stands.

Nor is Jerusalem perched upon the watershed itself, but lies upon the first narrow plateau to the east of this. As you stand at the Jaffa, or western gate, the watershed is the top of the first slope in front of you, and it shuts out all prospect of the west even from the towers and house-tops. The view to the north is almost as short—hardly farther than to where the head of the hidden Wady Bêt Hanina—the precise water-parting—comes over into the faint beginnings of the valley of the Kidron, draining south-east to the Dead Sea. Above the course of this valley and between it and the watershed the ground slopes obliquely from the north-west. Just before the city-walls are reached,

it divides into two spurs or promontories running south between the Kidron and the Wady Rabāby and separated from each other by the now shallow glen, once known as the Tyropæon. These spurs form the site of the city. Without going into the details of their configuration, we find enough for our present purpose in observing that the western is the higher of the two, and that running as they do southwards, the dip of them¹ and therefore the whole exposure of the city is to the east. Jerusalem faces the sunrise, which strikes across the Mount of Olives and over the Kidron.

Yet this tilt towards Olivet does not exhaust the eastern bent and disposition of the city. We have seen that the west and north are entirely shut off. The blockade is carried round the north-east and east by Scopus and Olivet; the south is equally excluded by the ridge between the city and Bethlehem. In fact there is but one gap in the circle of mountains, and this is to the south-east: looking across the desert of Judæa and the gulf of the Dead Sea to the high range of Moab, cut only by the trench of the Arnon and battlemented towards its far southern end by the hill of Kerak. In certain states of the atmosphere, and especially when the evening sun shortens the perspective by intensifying the colour and size of the Moab mountains, the latter appear to heave up towards the city and to present to her the threshold of the Arabian desert immediately above the hills of her own wilderness. Thus, what Josephus says of the tower of Psephinus is true of most of the house-tops of Jerusalem. Their one "full prospect is towards Arabia."² The significance of which is obvious. It is as if Providence had bound over the city to eastern interests

¹ According to Conder the dip of the strata is about 10° E.S.E.

² Vide V. B.J. iv. 3: ἐπὶ γὰρ ἐβδομήκοντα πήχεις ὑψηλός ὢν Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀνίσχοντος ἡλίου παρέρχεται ἀφορὰν καὶ μέχρι θαλάττης τὰ τῆς Ἰβραίων κληρουχίας ἔσχατα.

and eastern sympathies. Hidden from the west and the north, Jerusalem, through all her centuries, has sat facing the austere scenery of the Orient and the horizon of those vast deserts, out of which her people came to her. If the spell of this strikes even the western traveller as he passes a few evenings on her house-tops, he can the better understand why the Greeks were not at home in Jerusalem, and Hellenism, though not forty miles from the Levant, never made her its own; why even Christianity failed to hold her; and why the Mohammedan, as he looks down her one long vista, towards Mecca, feels himself securely planted on her site.

The desert creeps close to the city gates. The bare hills, the blistered rocks and the wild ravines of the Wady of Fire¹ are within a short walk of the gardens of Siloam. From the walls the wilderness of Judæa can be traversed in a day, and beyond it are the barren coast and bitter waters of the Dead Sea. The sirocco sweeps up unhindered; *a dry wind of the high places of the desert towards the daughter of my people, neither to fan nor to cleanse*;² gusty, parching and inflammatory, laden with sand when it comes from the south-east, but clear, cold and benumbing when in winter it blows off the eastern or

¹ Wady-en-Nar, the continuation to the Dead Sea of the Kidron valley.

² Jer. iv. 11. "It is when the wind blows from the south-east that it acquires the peculiarities which Europeans usually signify by the term *sirocco*. The more the wind tends to the south the more dull and overcast is the sky, and the more disagreeable to the feelings the state of the atmosphere. The worst kind dries the mucous membrane of the air passages, producing a kind of inflammation resulting in catarrh and sore throat; it induces great lassitude, accelerated pulse, thirst, and sometimes actual fever. It dries and cracks furniture, and parches vegetation, sometimes withering whole fields of young corn. Its force is not usually great, but sometimes severe storms of wind and fine dust are experienced, the hot air burning like a blast from an oven, and the sand cutting the face of the traveller. This kind of air has a peculiar smell, not unlike that of the neighbourhood of a burning brick-kiln. Sometimes the most remarkable whirlwinds are produced. Clouds of sand fly about in all directions, and the gusts of wind are so violent as to blow weak persons from their horses and to overturn baggage animals."—Abridged from Dr. Chaplin's account in *P.E.F.Q.*, 1883, p. 16.

north-eastern desert plateaus. It is difficult to estimate what effect this austere influence has exercised on the temperament of the city; but a more calculable result in her history was produced by the convenience of the desert as a refuge when the native garrisons of Jerusalem could no longer hold out against their besiegers. Not only was the east the most natural direction of flight for David before Absalom, and for Zedekiah¹ when he broke with a few soldiers through the blockade of the Babylonian army; but the desert sheltered both the troops of Judas Maccabæus when Jerusalem was taken by the Seleucids, and those bands of zealots who escaped when Titus stormed the citadel and the sanctuary.

Conversely the life of the desert easily wanders into Jerusalem. There are always some Arabs in her streets. You will see one or two of the few Christians of that race worshipping—like Amos at Bethel—on some high festival about the Holy Sepulchre; and through the environs you will sometimes meet a caravan, with salt, skins, wool or dates from the Dead Sea or Ma'an, or even from Sinai. Except Damascus or Gaza no Syrian town gathers to itself more of the rumour of Peræa, or of Arabia, from the borders of Hauran to Mecca.² It was in or somewhere near Jerusalem that an observer wrote the lines:

*I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction:
The curtains of the land of Midian did tremble,³*

—one of the finest expressions in any literature of the passage of evil tidings through the tremulous East. And so, too, it is Jerusalem, fully hidden from nearly every point of view in Western Palestine, which, of all sites in the latter, remains in most frequent evidence to the traveller

¹ David and Zedekiah the first and last kings: 2 Sam. xv. ff., 2 Kings xxv. 4 f.

² Cf. Robinson, *B. R.* i. 366. In 1896, when the Turks were at war with the Druzes of Hauran and the Government had stopped the telegraphs, news of the conflicts reached the Jerusalem bazaars within a few days.

³ Habbakuk iii. 7.

on the east of the Jordan. From Kerak, from Mount Nebo, from the hills above Rabbath Ammon, and, I think also, from the Jebel Osha above es-Salt, the Russian tower on the Mount of Olives is always prominent.

The single trunk route which Jerusalem commands is that along the backbone of the western range, from Hebron to the north. It is one of the least important in Palestine. No passage near the city connects the east and west. The nearest—from the maritime plain by the Beth-horons and past Michmash to Jericho—is almost twelve miles away. Jerusalem, therefore, cannot be regarded as a natural centre of commerce. When she commanded the transit trade of Western Asia, and was in Ezekiel's words *the gate of the peoples*;¹ or when, in the days of her weakness, she excited the jealousy of her enemies lest she should again become strong enough to exact tribute and toll from them,² such an influence must have been due, not to the virtues of her site, but to her political rank as the capital of a strong and compact people entrenched upon the paths between Phœnicia and Edom. Nor was Jerusalem ever, so much as Damascus, Hebron or Gaza, a port and market for the nomads, from which they bought their cloth, pottery and weapons; nor, like Antioch or Mecca, had she (except for a very short period) a harbour of her own upon the sea. Even when she swayed the commerce of Palestine and Arabia, her influence was political and financial rather than commercial;³ the only trade that came to her was due to her comparatively large population, or to her Temple and the multitude of its annual pilgrims. Her industries were also local—soap factories, potteries, weaving, fulling and dyeing—and she exported nothing of her own except to the neighbouring villages.

Another feature of life, conspicuous by its meagreness in

¹ Ezekiel xxvi. 2.

² Ezra iv. 20 f.

³ This is especially obvious in Josephus.

the district in which Jerusalem stands, is the water supply. The upper strata of the neighbourhood are of that porous limestone, through which, as in the greater part of Western Palestine, the rain sinks to a considerable depth and living springs are far between. The only point in the environs of the city where the lower, harder rocks throw up water to the surface is in the Kidron Valley immediately under the walls of Ophel; and its supplies, secured for the city even in times of siege by aqueducts beneath the walls, were supplemented through the reservoirs, for which Jerusalem has always been famous, and which were fed from the rain caught upon the multitude of her roofs. These gave the city, when blockaded, an advantage over most of her besiegers, who found no springs in her immediate neighbourhood, and in several cases were ignorant of any even at a distance.¹ To which facts we may attribute the brevity and failure of several blockades,² as well as the unwillingness of every great invader to come near to Jerusalem till he had made very sure of his base of supplies in the lower country round about.³ The city's strength, then, was this: that, while tolerably well watered herself, she lay where her besiegers could find not much food and scarcely any water.⁴

The immediate surroundings of Jerusalem are bare and rocky; with some exceptions they can hardly ever have been otherwise. The grey argillaceous soil is shallow, stony, and constantly interrupted by scalps, ledges and knolls of naked limestone. In the sides and bottoms of the wadies green patches are visible; but the only natural

¹ Such as the copious well at 'Ain Kārīm, from which the upper classes in Jerusalem still carry water in times of drought.

² Such as those of the Nabateans in 63 B.C., and of Cestius Gallus in 66 A.D.

³ Cf. *H.G.H.L.*, 298 ff. for Vespasian, Titus and Saladin. Thus also may be partly explained the long delay of Richard I. in the Shephelah, and his ultimate abandonment of the advance on Jerusalem.

⁴ The question of the ancient water-supply of Jerusalem, complicated by the number of earthquakes which have visited her, will, I hope, form the subject of a special study later on.

gardens are those fed from the overflow of the one well in the valley of the Kidron. On the north-west of the city, the winter rains render the ground swampy: for example, in the Hallet el Kasabe "the little valley of the reeds," where reeds still grow, and in the Hallet et Tarha. Here and there the environs show fields of grain or vegetables; and one of the northern gates was called Gennath, "the garden."¹ The foliage to-day is nearly altogether that of the olive-trees, scattered at intervals in the stony orchards on the hill-sides, or down the Kidron and the Wady Rababy. The vineyards are few. Within the walls there are less than half a dozen palms, exotic at so high a level, and some other trees in the garden of the Armenian monastery. Whether in ancient times the groves of olive were more numerous, or whether trees of other species ever clothed the surrounding hills, are questions difficult to answer. Olivet has almost lost its title to the name, by the Jewish graveyards and Christian buildings which have recently multiplied on the face opposite the city, and is now excelled in greenery by the western slope towards the watershed. But in ancient times the Mount of Olives would hardly have been called so, had it not stood out in conspicuous contrast to the other hills. One can well believe that its north-western flank, the high basins between it and Scopus and its eastern folds towards Bethany, were once covered with trees; they are still fertile and support a number of orchards.² The Jews who returned to Jerusalem after the Exile were bidden *to go up into the mountain and bring wood*³ for building, but this may not have been in the immediate neighbourhood. Josephus mentions a timber-market;⁴ but probably it was for imported beams,

¹ Jos. V. *B.J.* iv. 2.

² Jerome, in Jerem. vii. 30, mentions groves in Hinnom where olives still flourish.

³ Haggai i. 8.

⁴ *B.J.* II. xix. 4.

and even most of the fuel may have come from a distance. It is striking how seldom any tree appears in the present place-names of the immediate environs.¹ One has to walk several miles before encountering the name of the oak, the plane-tree, the tamarisk or the thorn, and the nearest wood is about three miles down the railway.² The latter instances prove that such trees could be grown round Jerusalem;³ and the bareness of her suburbs during the Arab period may be due to the number of her sieges. We know that Pompey cleared away the trees; and one hundred and thirty-three years later Titus is said to have done so for a distance of ninety stadia from the walls,⁴ and in particular to have cut down all the groves and orchards to the north on the line of his main assault.⁵ There may, therefore, have been periods in which the hills engirdling the city were much more green than they are to-day; but if this was the case, it has left no reflection in literature. We do not read of woods about Jerusalem; it is *mountains which stand round her*;⁶ and, except for Olivet, there is in the neighbouring place-names of the Bible-period no trace of trees.⁷

The climate of Jerusalem is easily described, especially since the details have been reduced to statistics by the scientific observations of the last forty years.⁸ As through-

¹ There are the 'Ain el-Lōze, or "Almond-tree well"; Bir ez-zētūnāt, or "cistern of the olive-trees"; Wadi ej-Jōz ("of the nut-tree"), the upper part of the Kidron; W. el mes ("of the nettle-tree"?) in the upper part of the W. Rababy; W. Umm el 'Anab (or "mother of grapes") to the north-west of the city; Maghāret el 'Anab; and Karm, "vineyard," occurs twice or thrice. See the name-lists of the Palestine Exploration Fund and "Namenliste, etc., zu Schick's Karte der näheren Umgebung von Jerusalem" by Schick and Benzinger, *Z.D.P.V.* xviii. 149-172.

² See "Namenliste, etc., zu Schick's Karte der weiteren Umgebung von Jerusalem," *Z.D.P.V.* xix. 145-221.

³ The height above the sea is too great for the sycamore.

⁴ Jos. VI. *B.J.* i. 1; viii. 1.

⁵ V. *B.J.* iii. 2.

⁶ Ps. cxv. 2.

⁷ The derivation of Bethphage is quite uncertain.

⁸ The observer to whom we owe most of these is Dr. Chaplin, whose vivid paper,

out Syria the year is divided into two seasons, a rainy winter and a dry summer, but at so high an elevation the extremes are greater and the changes more capricious than in the rest of Palestine. With an annual rainfall about that of London,¹ the city receives this within seven months of the year—a quarter of it in January alone²—and through the other five, May to October, is without more than a few showers. July is absolutely rainless; June, August and September practically so. The drought is softened by heavy dews and by dense mists, which trail away swiftly in face of the sunrise. The temperature, with a mean of 62°,³ has also its extremes. Not only is winter colder than on the plains, but the summer heat mounts higher and is more trying. In fifteen years there was an average of thirty-eight days on which the thermometer was above 90°—on twenty-eight occasions from 100° to 108°; and an average of fifty-five nights on which it fell under 40°, with 107 descents to or below freezing-point.⁴ Ice is therefore formed but does

“Observations on the Climate of Jerusalem,” *P.E.F.Q.*, 1883, pp. 8 ff.), accompanied by numerous tables giving the result of observations between 1860-1 and 1881-2 ought to be studied by all who wish to understand the climate not of Jerusalem only, but of all Palestine, (cp. O. Kersten, *Z.D.P.V.* xiv. 93 ff.). See also Glaisher “On the Fall of Rain at Jerusalem in the thirty-two years from 1861 to 1892,” *P.E.F.Q.* 1894, 39 ff.; in subsequent volumes the same author’s collection of observations since 1892; and “Die Niederschlagsverhältnisse Palästinas in alter u. neuer Zeit,” by H. Hilderscheid, in *Z.D.P.V.* xxv. (1902) i. ff. Both Chaplin and Hilderscheid (the latter more fully) present the Biblical data along with the modern statistics. The longest observations, those of Dr. Chaplin and Mr. J. Gamel, were taken “in a garden within the city about 2,500 ft. above the sea.” They differ curiously from another series taken in a garden a little lower, in the American colony to the south-west; and from the series of a third station to the north-west of the city. See Hilderscheid’s comparative statements, *op. cit.* pp. 20 ff.

¹ 25·23 inches on an average of thirty years, 1861-1890; Glaisher, *P.E.F.Q.* 1894, p. 41.

² December, February and March are the next most rainy months in that order. The rains begin to fall either in October or November, the latter rains in the end of March, but lessening through April.

³ Fahrenheit.

⁴ Glaisher, *P.E.F.Q.* 1898, p. 183 ff. In Sarona near Jaffa the number of days in which the mercury rose above 90° in ten years varied annually from 14 to 39

not last through the day. Snow has fallen in fourteen seasons out of thirty-two; for the most part in small quantity and soon melted; but there are sometimes snowstorms, and then the drifts will lie in the hollows of the hills for two or three weeks.¹ After both snow and rain the clayey soil will be muddy for days, but the porous limestone prevents the formation of swamps;² and although the air may continue damp it is raw and not malarious. Rain and snow have been known to last for thirteen or fourteen days in succession, but usually the winter rains fall for one or two days at a time, and these are followed by one or more of fine weather, "some of the most enjoyable that the climate of Palestine affords."³

When the winter east wind comes, it is clear and dry, but sometimes benumbing. The sirocco, or south-east wind, with its distressing heat and dull atmosphere of sand,⁴ blows at frequent intervals in April, May and October. The daily breeze from the sea during summer⁵ does not always reach Jerusalem, and when it does has often been robbed of its refreshing qualities: "the reason of the excess of the summer heats over those of the coast. The summer dusts are thick: at that height easily stirred and irritating. The long drought, exhausting many of the reservoirs, and the sultry nights, robbed of moisture by the failure of the west wind, are more dangerous to health than the rainy season. From May till October "the climatic

(average 23·6); the nights in which it fell below 40° varied from 2 to 15 (average 6·5) *P.E.F.Q.* 1891, pp. 165, 170. Chaplin (*P.E.F.Q.* 1898, p. 184) reports for Jerusalem once 112° and (*id.*, 1883, Tab. xiv.) once 25·9° (in January).

¹ Chaplin, p. 11. In December 1879 the fall of snow was 17 inches; on March 14, 1880, it was 5 inches; and I remember the consequent mud and cold when I reached Jerusalem in the end of the month.

² With the transient exceptions mentioned above, pp. 11, 12.

³ Chaplin, *op. cit.* p. 9.

⁴ See above, p. 8.

⁵ *H.G.H.L.*, p. 520.

⁶ Chaplin p. 15. The west wind has been observed 55 times in a year. The prevailing wind at Jerusalem is the north-west, blowing from 100 to 150 days in the year.

diseases of the country, such as ophthalmia, fevers and dysentery, are most prevalent."¹

On the whole, then, the climate of Jerusalem is temperate, strenuous, and healthy; but with rigours both of cold and heat. Except during the sirocco and some dusty summer days, the atmosphere is clear and stimulating. There is no mirage in the air, nor any glamour, except when, sometimes at evening, the glowing Moab hills loom upon the city, or when the orange moon rises from behind them, and by her beams you feel, but cannot fathom, the awful gulf of the Dead Sea. But these touches of natural magic are evanescent, and the prevailing impression is of a bare landscape beneath a plain atmosphere, in which there is no temptation to illusion nor any suggestion of mystery. This is no doubt part of the reason why the visitor is so often disappointed by an atmosphere which he expected to fascinate him. Let him reflect that this very plainness is significant. He must bring the spell with him out of the history; and his appreciation of it will only be enhanced by the discovery that Nature has lent almost nothing to its original creation.

In such surroundings and such an atmosphere, Jerusalem sits upon her two promontories in the attitude already described: facing the Mount of Olives and looking obliquely through the one gap of her encircling hills towards the desert and the long high edge of Moab. The ravines which encompass the promontories—the valley of the Kidron and the Wady Rabāby—determine the extreme limits of the town on the east, the south, and the west. They enclose a space, roughly speaking, of about half a mile square. It will be our duty to inquire how much of this was occupied by houses or girdled by walls at successive stages of the history; questions which are the subject of much dispute. But for our present purpose—which is to

¹ Chaplin, p. 20.

recall some image of the Essential City—the same which through so many centuries has grown and adorned herself, and been trampled and suffered ruin—it is sufficient to take (as much as we can) of the present town and its most prominent features. Virtually upon her ancient seat Jerusalem still sits and at much the same slope; rising, that is, from the edge of the Kidron all the way up the same easy ascent to the constant line of her western wall. Only her skirts do not extend, as they did in ancient times, over the southern ends and declivities of the two promontories; but these lie bare and open, even the ruins of their walls being buried out of sight. Along with the mouth of the Tyropœon, that opens between them, the inferior parts of these declivities formed the lowest portion of the ancient city, from which stairs and steep lanes led to the Temple terrace over the Kidron. This terrace is now the lowest stretch of the city; it remains what it always was, a large court with a sanctuary, and at its north-east corner there are barracks and a tower on the site of what was once a citadel.¹ To the north the ground, after a depression representing an ancient fosse is passed, rises somewhat quickly and is covered with houses: once a suburb, but now within the walls. To the west of the sanctuary-platform the houses, also thickly clustering, dip for a little—above the once deeper depression of the Tyropœon, the line of which is still visible across the city from north to south—and then the roofs slowly but steadily rise till they culminate in the tower of Herod and the present citadel by the Jaffa gate.

Looking down upon this sloping city, either from one of its own towers or from the Mount of Olives, we are struck by the crowding of its houses. Except round the sanctuary, and for almost imperceptible intervals at the gates and a few other sites, there are no open spaces or

¹ Antonia of the Roman period.

even open lines; for there are no streets or squares, but only close and sombre lanes, climbing steeply from the Temple Court to the west, or, at right angles to these, dipping more gently from north to south.¹ And so it must nearly² always have been. *Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together.*³ The locusts, besiegers, and death are pictured by the Prophets as entering the windows and houses directly from the walls.⁴ Throughout the Old Testament we read of 'streets' very seldom, and then probably not in the proper sense of the name, which is "broad places," but under a poetic licence.⁵ Even in Isaiah's time it is only on the housetops,⁶ or on the walls,⁷ that we see the whole population gathered for a purpose that is not religious. Josephus frequently mentions the "narrow streets," and the fighting from the housetops.⁸ Through these lanes, ever close, steep and sombre as they are to-day, there beat the daily stir of the city's common life: the passage of her buzzing crowds, rumour and the exchange of news, the carriage of goods, trading and the smaller industries, the search for slaves and criminals, the bridal processions, the funerals, the tide of worshippers to the Temple, and occasionally the march of armed men. And through them also raged, as Josephus describes, the fighting, the sacking, the slaughter: all the fine-drawn pangs and anguish of the days of the city's overthrow.

But above these narrow arteries, through which her hot blood raced, Jerusalem, to the outside world, showed clean

¹ Cf. Lam. iv. 1: *the top of every street.*

² The early Christian Jerusalem showed a line of columned street, from the present Damascus gate southwards.

³ Ps. cxxii. 3.

⁴ Joel ii. 9; Jer. ix. 21 [20].

⁵ Lam. ii. 11, 12; iv. 18; Jer. ix. 21 [20]: 'rēhōbōth.'

⁶ xxii. 1.: *What ailest thou that thou art wholly gone up to the housetops!*

⁷ xxxvii. 11.

⁸ *B.J.*, e.g., I. xviii. 2; II. xv. 5; V. viii. 1 (*bis*); VI. viii. 5: *οἱ στενωποί.*

and fair: a high-walled white city; steep and compact, but with one level space, where since the time of Solomon her Temple rose, free and apart from other buildings.

This is as much of the ancient city as we dare reconstruct by light of day from her present condition. For the strong eastern sun aggravates the nakedness of those slopes to the south which were once covered with houses and girdled with walls; emphasizes the modern buildings, and the fashions of modern life that everywhere obtrude; and flattens still further the shallow ravines, which, before they were choked with the *débris* of so many sieges, lifted the city high and gallant above their precipitous sides. He who would raise again the Essential City must wait for night, when Jerusalem hides her decay, throws off every modern intrusion, feels her valleys deepen about her, and rising to her proper outline, resumes something of her ancient spell. At night, too, or in the early morning, the humblest and most permanent habits of her life may be observed, unconfused by the western energies which are so quickly transforming and disguising her.

It was a night in June, when from a housetop I saw her thus. There was a black sky with extremely brilliant stars; the city, not yet fallen asleep, sparkled with tiny lights. I could scarcely discern the surrounding hills. Moab was invisible. After an hour a paleness drew up in the south-east, the sky gradually lightened to a deep blue, the stars shone silver, and a blood-red gibbous moon crept suddenly above the edge of Moab, and looked over into the Dead Sea. The sleeping city was now dark, lying in huddled folds of black, save where, through a wider gap, one palm and the dome of the Ashkenazim synagogue stood out against the pearly mist of the Moab hills. But as the moon fully struck her, Jerusalem seemed to turn in her sleep, and in something of her ancient outline to lift herself, grey and ghostly, to the light. I descended, and issuing by the Jaffa gate, saw

her in another aspect: the western wall erect and grim against the sky, while its shadow deepened the valley below. The wall is Turkish, and only a few centuries old, but even so must the ramparts and the towers of Herod have looked to the night-guards in the Roman trenches. A caravan of camels came up from the Hebron road; the riders in white abbas swaying over the necks of their beasts, that with long strides paced noiselessly upon the thick dust. They stopped outside the gate, the camels were made to kneel, the bales were loosened from their backs, and stacked upon the ground; the men lay down beside them, and in a few minutes were asleep. No wind stirred and, except for spasms of barking from the street dogs, answered now and then from a far-away village, scarcely a sound broke the silence for hours. The moonshine at last turned the wall and touched the muddy water at the lower end of the great reservoir beyond. A pair of jackals stole down to drink but fled before the yelp of the dogs. I returned to the housetop. The sky had grown blue in the lower west, and above that from purple to pink. Swifts began to fly past the houses: more and more till the air was thick with them. A bugle rang out from the citadel, and was answered up the town from Antonia; challenge and answer were several times repeated. In the hollow between Scopus and the Mount of Olives the sky grew red. Two camels entered the Jaffa gate laden with lemons, and knelt groaning upon the pavement; the netting broke and the lemons spilt into the shadow. A fruit-seller set out his wares on a basket. A black woman, some porters and a few sleepy soldiers crossed the open space inside the gate. In the eastern sky the crimson had spread to pink, which was followed by a deep yellow, and the first beams of the sun broke across Olivet. The Latin clock struck five. A detachment of soldiers were threading their way up from Antonia, invisible but bugling loudly. They broke on the street near

the castle, and, forming fours, passed over to the drawbridge. The lower city, the sanctuary and its court, caught the sunshine, and life grew busy. Lines of camels laden with charcoal stalked through the gate; followed by donkeys with wood for fuel. A man swept the street, and a boy put the refuse in a bag on a donkey's back. The barber and the knife-grinder took up their posts on the pavement. A small flock of sheep, peasants with eggs and cucumbers, and (since it was a summer of more than usual drought) a line of water-carriers from 'Ain Kā'im entered together in a small crowd. There was a shuffling of many feet on the pavements, and in the bazaars the merchants were opening their booths.

So Jerusalem must have looked by night to Herod when his dreams drove him to the housetop. So Solomon's caravans may have come up in the moonlight from Elath and from Jaffa. So the sick king must have heard the swifts chirping past his window. So, in the Roman occupation, the bugles rang out from the tower and were answered from Antonia. And, so through all the centuries, the dawn broke upon Jerusalem, and the hewers of wood and drawers of water, the peasants with their vegetables, the sheep for the temple sacrifices, and all the unchanging currents of the city's common life, passed with the sunrise through the gates, and stirred the gloom of the narrow lanes with the business of another day.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

JAMES MARTINEAU, AND THE HETERODOXY
OF THE PAST.

IN turning back to the first half of the last century, the change most apparent to any one who can go so far back, and who is alive to the spiritual influences which change with successive generations, is the loss of that system of accepted belief which we sum up under the name of orthodoxy. It is difficult to bring home to those who have no recollection of the spiritual atmosphere implied in that word the full effect of the subtraction. It affected every one, just as the atmosphere does. People were Christians as they were Englishmen and Englishwomen. Their country had pronounced in favour of a certain type of Christianity, and they participated in this as they participated in their nationality, it was something acquiesced in, just as a person lives in England when he might, if he chose, go to live in France. He must live somewhere. He must, it was thought in those days, come to some decision as to the matters on which the Church pronounces her decision. There were heterodox persons as there were orthodox persons; and to many minds heterodoxy had a strong attraction. I remember well that feeling when Froude's *Nemesis of Faith* came out. But what we may call adoxy—we must coin some such word if we are to express briefly the state of mind that has superseded both heterodoxy and orthodoxy—did not then exist. People who took no interest in the subject-matter of the creeds were generally, in a tepid conventional way, what we may call orthodox. To go now and then to church, to avoid certain amusements and occupations on Sunday, to speak respectfully of the Bible, and a few more habits of the same kind, provided much the most convenient shelter for that indifference to everything spiritual which those who have never either doubted or believed like to dignify with the

name of doubt. Such a state of mind passes at one end into definite unbelief, but at the other it melts into an acquiescence in which there is some sort of belief. It was rather a belief in the wisdom of the State which had expressed its adherence to Christian doctrine, than a trust in God. But it did not exclude this, and often provided a shelter under which it might grow.

The disadvantages of an adoption, by the State, of any religion in such a manner that its profession becomes desirable as a means of getting on in the world are obvious. The temptations thereby afforded to hypocrisy stood at their height when it was necessary to take the sacrament before entering on any civil office; since that time they have gradually declined. But the orthodoxy within the memory of living persons—that of the High Church revival—was like a high wave in an ebbing tide. Its exclusions were still real, the universities, for instance, opened only to those who in some sense accepted them, but every one who marked the signs of the times felt that they were doomed. With these exclusions much else has passed away. In the attempt to reverence nothing but character we have ceased to reverence anything. We have not ceased to value goodness. Gordon roused as much enthusiasm as ever was given to a saint, Gladstone owed much of his influence to the popular belief in his moral excellence, and we might add many names to theirs. But the mere fact that we naturally use another word rather than *revere* witnesses to the change that has come over the world. Enthusiasm has lost that element which made it reverence. The loss of non-moral respect deprives reverence of its seed-plot. In the age of orthodoxy parents were to be respected by their children independently of their personal character. There were disrespectful children then as now, but disrespect to parents and elders was something to blame in other people. Now there is a sense of equality

with an added claim on the side of the child which gives the latter less temptation to disrespect, but which is further removed from reverence than disrespect is. To contemplate a character and decide on its moral worth is an attitude of mind compatible with admiration, with enthusiasm, with strong attraction, but hardly with veneration. Reverence must be common in its lower form of respect before it can blossom and bear fruit in its typical character. It must be prepared by deference before it can develop its true moral aim. It will not be denied that the nursery and the schoolroom in our day neglect this aim. And subsequent life shows the trace of this neglect.

The spirit of reverence, when it enters the world of intellect, becomes reserve. It would be waste of time to point out how much we have lost in this direction ; the change as a fact is unquestionable. In every quarter—newspapers, books, conversation—the realm of silence, as compared with what it was, is like a sandbank under a rising tide. We do not always realize the literary influence of this loss. The gifted woman who chose to be known as George Eliot once said to me that she thought Tourgénéff's stories had gained much, in a literary point of view, from the need of reticence enforced by the Russian censorship ; that it was a literary gain to have to understate one's case. That remark is applicable, more or less, to all fiction and biography before a certain date. The selective spirit of literature is different from the selective spirit of orthodoxy, but they are allied. To scrutinize the things that may be said for one reason leads to a like scrutiny for another reason. It is part of a lesson in self-control which penetrated all education and general standards of life in the days of orthodoxy, and now has passed away. I have tried to indicate what we have lost in the change, but I am not endeavouring to strike the balance

of debit and credit, only to dwell, for a moment, on the side that is generally forgotten.

The transition seems to me to date itself just at the middle of the last century. The "World's Fair" of 1851 takes the aspect, to my recollection, of a landmark, accidental yet not altogether insignificant, of an alteration in the general current of attention and moral estimate. The Exhibition itself seems now a symbol of the overwhelming interest in the visible world which was to colour the coming years. Mr. Maurice, in some address given in that year, spoke of the reflection suggested by the riches there collected—that all the material wealth of the world was insignificant beside the value of a human spirit; and I remember feeling, with the arrogance of youth, that anything so obvious was not worth saying. Now the words come back to me almost with the force of a prophecy. It is in each individual the part belonging to the material world which now occupies the attention of legislators and philanthropists. "A lost soul" is an expression that has for us no meaning. I remember the time when it had a very real meaning, when to talk of a person going to "his last account" was no sign of any particular religious view, but the accredited statement of a fact. And among those who denied the finality of any spiritual change following on the death of the body were many who shrank from expressing their dissent, because the denial was associated with the belief that sin after all was not the supreme evil it had been supposed. For this reason they often let pass some opportunity of protest against the assertion that all hope ended with the grave. "I do not believe that," whispered Thomas Erskine of Linlathen to his neighbour at some religious meeting at Clapham about seventy years ago, on hearing something of the kind, but at that time he did no more than whisper his disbelief. He would have felt then that to declare it aloud would be to loosen the

roots of beliefs not less important in his regard than the eternal possibility of repentance. As long as people felt that the doctrine of Eternal Punishment was the distortion of a truth, so long nothing which affected only this present life was felt to be supreme, though to most people busy in the work of the world ideas about any other were generally dim and unreal then as now.

To children ideas of the future life are very real. I remember well the condition of mind in which the orthodox Hell loomed before me as a terrible *perhaps*. It was only as an orthodox idea that it impressed my childish imagination. I knew that those dearest to me disbelieved it. But in the nursery it was just as discernible as anywhere else that religious persons—i.e. the orthodox—thought they believed it; and exactly the same state of mind which now makes one regard the scientific world as an ultimate authority as to visible things, then made one feel the religious world an ultimate authority as to invisible things. Reviewing in age the experience of childhood we of necessity put childish feelings into mature language, and at the time they could not have been expressed in any language, but they were not only vivid but logical. All religious expression in books or sermons accessible to childhood was associated with the sense of a vast chance here that was lost for ever when we quitted this world; it was just as valid an inference that this was the decision of those who knew best as it is that doctors know best all about disease; and the heterodox belief of those dearest, though yearned after both for their sake and its own, could not wholly dispel this influence. It needs something immensely strong to dispel the influence of an atmosphere. I will mention the tragic circumstance which did this for me. A youth of much promise, but I suppose not particularly religious, lost his life in trying to save that of another. The loss of an idolized son and brother, snatched away in the first bloom of manhood, was

not the bitterest pang in the hearts which that loss made desolate. "Pray for us," so the death was communicated to a dear friend in a letter I saw; "one of us is beyond the reach of prayer." "Do not speak to me of God, speak to me only of him," was the greeting of his heart-broken mother, a deeply pious woman, to this friend, herself unable to believe that an accident, even if it had not been incurred in an act of supreme self-sacrifice, could sweep any human being beyond the reach of prayer. And it was the report of her answer to that appeal which I remember as ending my nightmare horror. But for long I craved confirming reassurance from any of those to whom the world beyond the grave was a vital reality, and this I found when I came, as a school-girl, under the influence of a teacher whose name now will be fresh in the mind of every reader of this journal.¹

The long life of James Martineau covers the change I have been endeavouring to describe. My memory goes back to the years when he was almost a young man, and my latest intercourse with him was not long before the close of his ninety years' pilgrimage. At that time he was much occupied with the reminiscences incorporated in the present volumes, and I recall a few words he said of his intercourse with J. S. Mill, which surprised me by the intellectual sympathy between the two men which it seemed to record. "Afterwards," he continued, "Mill reproached me with having changed some of the convictions we had held in common after I had had to express them in teaching" (at the Manchester New College, a successor of the Warrington Academy), "and I felt it was true that in giving out one's convictions to other minds one is insensibly led to new views of their truth. And I have sometimes thought it was a loss to Mill himself that he had never any experience

¹ *Life and Letters of James Martineau*, 2 vols., by James Drummond and C. B. Upton. Nisbet.

of this kind of testing and transforming influence of teaching." The words are illustrated by my own recollections; I am sure that the sense I retain of a living, growing, spirit in his lessons to us (his pupils at his sister's school) had some connexion with his sense of learning and teaching together. I venture to give two instances of what I mean. The first is a lesson on botany, which has remained ever since for me a sort of prelude to the "Origin of Species." He referred to the sometimes slight differences which constituted species; setting the primrose and the cowslip side by side, and forcibly suggesting the apparently natural origin of the peculiarities of each, and went on to ask how we were to account for affinities which bore the aspect of something that human intellect might account for. "To that question," he concluded, "we can give no answer except the will of the Creator." Those words are the only ones perfectly distinct to me, but he said much more, and to my recollection it is as if he had added—"This is in fact little more than a confession that our present science stops here. It is a provisional state of mind, merely reasserting the conviction that the universe owes its origin to Divine will, and coupling it with the indication of a boundary line where second causes seem to fail us." Of course he did not say exactly this to a class of school-girls; perhaps he would not have said it if the audience and the subject had been suitable, but that is the description, as nearly as I can give it, of the effect on my mind of the few words I am sure of. Almost always when I think of the "Origin of Species" I remember the very pattern of the oil-cloth at the long table and him at its head, leaning forward with the earnest gaze that might have been bent on a set of learned and mature men instead of a few school-girls, and I hear the deep, rather hollow voice that seemed, though perfectly distinct, not to bring all its sound from the lips, but as it were to express a thought as much

as an utterance, and once more I catch the nuance of a latent surprise—so it seems to me—in the voice I still hear as of a speaker only just silent.

One more fragment I will excavate from the mine of recollection, less significant, perhaps, of the particular aspect of teaching which he recalled at our last conversation, but more strictly in connexion with the main current of his thought. It was in a lesson on the Gospels and referred to the words of Christ (John ii. 19-21), "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Under the light of any critical attention the comment "But this spake He of the temple of His body" would be felt, if we allowed ourselves to read it critically, as hardly relevant to the context. Mr. Martineau did not shrink from putting before his class the possibility that the course of ages might have revealed to us something invisible to St. John. "Do away with this Temple service," so he taught us to read the words of Jesus, "abolish this ceremonial of sacrifice and liturgy, and at once I will erect the ideal Church on the ruins of the Pharisaic temple." I remember then how meaning seemed to flash into the words as he spoke—a meaning emphasized by History with a terrible significance in the actual destruction of the Temple, and rise of the Church. He gives the same interpretation somewhere in the *Life and Letters* which have revived these recollections, but they cannot come home to any reader as they did to a child who heard them from his lips fifty-eight years ago, and recalls the very gestures and tones associated with new ideas—new, and permanently abiding as a seed of thoughts larger than themselves.

James Martineau, a type of heterodoxy in the middle of the nineteenth century, was before its close a representative of those beliefs which orthodoxy exists to guard. Yet his own beliefs remained unchanged, or changed only with that gradual expansion of intellectual limit which led him

further from the old orthodoxy. But as the course of thought opened new issues it became evident that the divergence between those to whom the invisible world was everything and those to whom it was nothing admitted in comparison of no other divergence. He was, before he passed away, the ally of all spiritualistic churches. It never occurred to any one as a courageous step that Jowett made him his guest at Balliol, or that the University of Edinburgh conferred on him a degree in Divinity. Every one who cared for him, that is every one who knew him and most who knew anything about him, must have rejoiced that his life was prolonged into an epoch when the ashes of controversy were cold and the glow of a common faith was strong. But the fact that his life began in heresy and ended in union did not prevent its being a lonely one. There was a long period in his long life when the range of intellectual sympathy which made him at last the exponent of two bodies of conviction divided him from both. Take his own account of his unsuccessful candidature for the Professorship of Philosophy at University College in 1866 given in the volumes which should now be in the hands of all readers of the *EXPOSITOR* (*Life*, etc. i. 409). "My previous work having been so much within sight of University College, I sought no testimony of competency except from two or three eminent 'experts' in the subjects of the chair, who could speak with some authority on technical matters not likely to be familiar to the electing body. I was aware, from correspondence or personal intercourse, that F. W. Newman, J. S. Mill, and Dr. Thomson, Archbishop of York, had knowledge of such occasional writing as I had put forth on logical and metaphysical topics; and I asked them whether they would object to record their judgment of these, so far as they indicated fitness or unfitness to teach. Mr. Newman's answer was immediate, cordial, and exact. Mr.

Mill was even more appreciative, and said what could hardly fail to be decisive, if produced in evidence; but he added that, as he could not miss the opportunity of planting, if possible, a disciple of his own school in a place of influence, he must throw his weight into the scale of Mr. Croom Robertson's candidature, of whose competency he was well satisfied. His attestation, therefore, privately so generous to me, must be withheld from use. The Archbishop of York sent me a reply, twelve months after the affair was all over, apologizing for his silence, and candidly explaining it as a result of a theological scruple; for, if he had said what he thought true of my personal qualifications for the vacant office, he would have been helping to a place of influence one who did not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. In this spectacle, of Mr. Mill and the Archbishop moving hand in hand, under the common guidance of a sectarian motive, there is a curious irony." The man who was rejected both by an Archbishop and John Stuart Mill had indeed to stand alone!

Perhaps beside the loneliness of his position, there was something solitary in his nature. There is a pathetic letter in his Biography alluding to this characteristic in himself: "I know not how it is," he writes to an American correspondent in his fifty-first year (*Life*, etc., i. 292), "but a certain shy habit of mind, affecting my pen as well as my tongue, has persecuted me from childhood, and made me the worst of companions to friends whether distant or near." No friend of his would have used these words about him, but most would recognize the quality he meant by them. What different things we mean by coldness! It does not always imply any lack of warmth somewhere in the nature. "How cold you are!" we say sometimes to a person come in from a windy walk in whom the exertion has left nothing cold except the hand we have just grasped. The spiritual chill is not, alas! so transient, but

it may be equally partial. He was capable of even romantic friendship. A letter written in his old age (*Life*, etc., i. 32) records such a one between himself and a fellow-student at the "Manchester New College." "He and I," Dr. Martineau wrote nearly fifty years after the early death of the youth who had been the object of such strong feeling, "were like two lovers, and had not a thought kept from each other. After he left College and turned to legal studies he came to look upon our life together as an enervating romance, and severely condemned it as an unworthy surrender to sentiment. He gathered up his inward force into a Spartan rigour of self-suppression and reserve, adopted a prosaic estimate of men and things, content with small expectations from them, and objected to any utterance or recognition of feeling, though he retained in action and judgment the high faithfulness of conscience which had always distinguished him. Often have I feared that I was the unconscious cause of this, by putting too great a strain, through my own fervours, upon a nature capable indeed of being wrought up to their temperature but normally less intensely pitched. His was probably the wiser level, or at least was a warrantable recoil from a foolish and untenable one. With his small allowance of years he had to learn his mistake quickly; while we"—the other fellow-students I suppose—"through our long probation could afford to be slow pupils of experience and come to a sober mind by insensible fading of the colours once too bright." No reader of the *Biography* will object, I think, to re-peruse this touching reminiscence written in 1882, when Dr. Martineau was in his 78th year, of a kind of friendship possible only in early youth. Had he been a poet the name of Francis Darbishire might have stood beside that of Arthur Hallam and Edward King, a third in the doublet of lives whose brief span of earthly existence stands out in striking contrast to their immortality of

fame. As it is, the record, touched with the poetry inseparable from love and early death, is cited here for its pathetic hint at a disappointment in human sympathy and a consequent fear of trusting to it, of which much that is here given seems to me to bear the trace.

Through a large part of his life it may be said of him that he was "struggling between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born." He was not, after his early years, much at home in his own communion, and the union he dreamt of, which would have given a larger scope and freer exercise to his religious affinities, was but a dream. He could not, like his pupil and dear friend Richard Hutton, join the English Church; to the last he remained distinct in his opposition to her creeds, and yet one feels as if his true sphere were a National Church; this, at all events, was what he himself yearned for. There were some ways in which he was a better defender of the central truths which form the citadel of all Churches than an orthodox Churchman could be. When one who looks upon the Bible as a purely human record of events which themselves may or may not be supernatural comes forward to testify to the reality of supernatural principles, he occupies a vantage ground inaccessible to those who are pledged either to or against supernaturalism. But the path opened too late for the energies of noon, and never upon the domain he sought. He craved to belong to a Church recognized by his country—a Church unbulwarked by civil tests, but solidified by a central attraction. His ideal in some respects was much the same as that of Dr. Arnold, to whom, however, I do not remember that he ever refers. It is curious to remember that Arnold withdrew from the college which rejected Martineau—an institution in the founding of which he took a strong interest—from the fact that at its start it repudiated any distinctively Christian character. The State, in Arnold's view, should look with impartiality on all

Christian churches; it should "put no difference between Christian and Christian,"—a view, we must remember, considerably broader than was acceptable to the orthodoxy of his time—but should put a decided difference between Christian and non-Christian, and it brings home to us the distance we have travelled since his early death that he does not seem to have contemplated the difficulty of deciding who is and who is not a Christian. It would in his day (and yet he was only ten years older than Dr. Martineau) have been so great a relaxation of existing barriers to admit all Christians to the universities that those who contemplated such a reform had not to ask themselves how they should define the difference they were prepared to make civilly important. This difficulty came vividly home to Dr. Martineau. Of course the civil question did not occupy him; he could not desire to impose even the widest tests, but the Church he desired to see established was to be centred in those convictions which Arnold desired to barricade, and the difficulties invisible to one who left the world some sixty years before him occupied no small part of his thoughts. I could wish that their record occupied a smaller space in his Biography; all that is futile should surely be recorded briefly. However, I am not attempting to criticize the book, and it cannot be said that the space given to Dr. Martineau's hopes for the formation of a National Church in any degree exaggerates the space they occupied in his mind. He always strongly opposed any attempt to label the body to which he himself belonged as Unitarian. He was, he quite distinctly asserted, a Unitarian himself. The epithet, he says here (ii. 70) is like necessarian or Republican, an expression applicable to persons, not to congregations or churches. He wanted the body in which he was a teacher not to be labelled even by those negations which he himself personally thought important, but to be a union of believers in God and followers of Christ open to such views of the

central truths they asserted as the progress of thought would bring them, and he longed for a National Church which should absorb all such bodies. The position of a sect was what he yearned to escape: he craved for a religion which should be co-extensive with the life of a people. He knew that this could not be attained without some sacrifices of what he felt valuable, or at least that a national Church as he conceived it could not be in the fullest sense of the words a spiritual church. But he recoiled from the divorce of sacred and secular life, and he hoped this union might be found in a common affirmation too vague and wide, as far as appears, ever to provide a basis for a Church. Those who follow in these volumes his patient and persevering efforts after such an ideal will feel that they could not have been wholly wasted. But they bore no fruit in any outward form.

The foregoing remarks are an attempt to estimate a character, not to criticize a book. If I had attempted the latter task, I should have expressed my belief that the record might have been more various, also that the arrangement is somewhat bewildering. But I close the volumes with gratitude, and with a desire to bear witness to the author's candour on some points where candour was not easy—a candour never for a moment divorced from warm admiration and reverence. I had marked many pages for extract which would have given valuable illustration to the views here put forward, but I shall better fill what space remains to me by inserting the following letter in answer to one from me on the death of his wife, which has not been previously printed.

. . . We have not been taken by surprise. Failing memory and ebbing strength had long foreannounced the parting that must come, and enabled us, in one sense, to welcome the dear sufferer's rest. But when the real severance comes, bringing back, as it does, the image of our companionship in its brightest years, this kind of preparation goes

for very little; and the solitary way would be but a pathetic desolation were its only comfort that the beloved sleeper was safe from its frosts and storms. Happily, the moments of deepest sorrow are those which most reveal to us the beauty and sanctity of the soul that has passed from us, and which, therefore, best assure us that the affections and conscience are an enormous over-provision for the exigencies of this life, that the whole spiritual possibilities of our nature are computed to the scale of a transcendent existence, so that the mortal darkness generates its own undying light. It is vain to tell me that the mourner's estimate of what he has lost is *ideal*. It is so; and is *therefore* the only true one, penetrating to the inmost essence, and passing by the superficial specks of shadow which veiled the real being as the storms obscure the sky. I own, however, that I cannot reach the ultimate ground of this immortal faith: it lies too deep. The reasons given for it do not bring it to me; the reasons against it flow off from me without effect. It comes, in some way, from the whole experience of life, and the spectacle of death does not disturb it. I did not choose it; I cannot help it. My reason ratifies it, but did not discover it. It is woven into the very tissue of all thought and love. Only it is undoubtedly dependent on the prior recognition of *Personal Relations* with the "Father of Spirits." It is too true that the Everlasting Hope does not lift us, as it ought, to its own high level, and adequately discriminate those who hold it from those who do not; or we may put it the other way, and say that those who reject it do not descend to the level apparently suitable to so great a sacrifice of moral power. But when once an ideal of character and feeling has been formed, it will persist long after the forming influences have changed. With some, this belief is traditional and inoperative; with others, the affections and admirations it has helped to create survive its departure; and the two classes present a middle ground of character in which the real tendencies are indistinguishably mixed. Yet I think that, beyond this middle ground, the two types of mind *do present* themselves in very marked contrast. . . .

The foregoing extract will, I think, be felt by all who care for this memoir a worthy conclusion to the record of a lofty and a lonely soul.

JULIA WEDGWOOD.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

JEREMIAH IV. 3-VI. 30.

The Foe is at the Door; let Judah repent before it is too late, if perchance the Judgment may be averted.

³ For thus saith Yahweh to the men of Judah and to Jerusalem Break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns: * ⁴ circumcise yourselves to Yahweh, and take away the foreskin† of your heart, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem; lest my fury go forth like fire, and burn, with none to quench it, because of the evil of your doings. ⁵ Declare ye in Judah, and in Jerusalem publish it; and say, 'Blow ye the trumpet‡ in the land: cry aloud and say, "Assemble yourselves, and let us go into the fortified cities." ' ⁶ Lift up a standard§ toward Zion; bring (your households) into safety,|| stay not: for evil am I bringing from the north, and a great destruction. ¶ ⁷ A lion is gone up from his thicket; and a destroyer of nations is on his way, he is gone forth from his place: to make thy land a desolation, (and) that thy cities be laid waste, without inhabitant. ⁸ For this gird you with sackcloth, wail and howl: for the fierce anger of Yahweh is not turned back from us. ⁹ And it shall come to pass in that day, saith Yahweh, † that the heart** of the king shall perish, and the heart of the princes; and the priests shall be appalled, and the prophets shall be amazed. ¹⁰ And they shall say ††, 'Ah, Yahweh! surely thou hast greatly deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying, "Ye shall have peace;" whereas the sword reacheth even unto the soul.'

Description of the Enemy's Approach.

¹¹ At that time shall it be said to this people and to Jerusalem: A hot wind †† from the bare heights in the wilderness (cometh) toward

† So Pesh. Luc.: cf. Deut. 10. 16. The Hebrew text has *foreskins*.

* I.e. prepare your heart properly to receive the seed of good resolutions.

‡ Properly, *the horn*. So always. Here as the signal of danger.

§ As a way-mark to guide the fugitives to a place of safety.

|| Cf. Isa. 10. 31, R.V. *margin*.

¶ Heb. *breach* (or *breaking*).—An expression used frequently by Jeremiah and other writers of the same age (*v.* 20. 6. 1, 14, 8. 11, 21, 10. 19, 14. 17, 30. 12, 15, 48. 3, 5, 50. 22, 51. 54; Lam. 2. 11, 13, 3, 47, 48, 4. 10). See also Am. 6. 6; Is. 1. 28, 15. 5, 30. 13, 14, 26. (R.V. sometimes 'destruction,' 'hurt,' or in Am. 6. 6, 'affliction.')

** I.e. either the intelligence (5. 21; cf. Job 12. 24), or the courage (Am. 2. 16).

†† So with a slight change. The Heb. text, as pointed, has *And I said*.

‡‡ I.e. a scorching and destructive sirocco. Fig. here of the invader.

the daughter of my people, not to winnow, and not to cleanse;* ¹² a full wind from these† shall come for me: now will I also reason the case with them! ‡ ¹³ Behold, he will come up as clouds, and his chariots will be as a whirlwind: his horses are swifter than eagles.§ ‘Woe unto us! for we are spoiled.’ ¹⁴ Wash thine heart from wickedness, O Jerusalem, that thou mayest be saved: how long shall thy thoughts of naughtiness lodge within thee? ¹⁵ For hark! one declareth from Dan,|| and proclaimeth trouble from the mountains of Ephraim: ¹⁶ make ye mention to the nations; behold, publish concerning Jerusalem (that) watchers¶ are coming from a far country, and have given out their voice against the cities of Judah. ¹⁷ As keepers of a field are they against her round about; because me hath she defied, saith Yahweh. ¹⁸ Thy way and thy doings have procured these things unto thee: this is thy wickedness;*** surely it is bitter! surely it reacheth even unto thine heart

The Prophet, speaking in the People's Name, describes the Terror which thrills through him at the Prospect of War.

¹⁹ ‘My bowels, my bowels!†† Let me writhe! The walls of my heart! my heart moaneth upon me! ††† I cannot hold my peace! because my soul heareth§§ the sound of the trumpet, the shout of battle. |||| ²⁰ Destruction upon destruction¶¶ is proclaimed; for the whole land is spoiled: suddenly are my tents spoiled, in a moment my curtains!*** ²¹ How long shall I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet?’

The Reason of these Woos.

²² For my people is foolish, they know not me; they are sottish children, and they are not understanding: they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge.

* But, it is to be understood, to exterminate.

† I.e. from these heights. But LXX omit *from these*, which (in the Heb) is quite possibly a corrupt repetition of the preceding word.

‡ And, it is implied, hold them responsible for what they have done wrong, and punish them.

§ Properly, *vultures*. So always.

|| In the far north of Canaan.

¶ Fig. for *besiegers*.

** I.e. the fruit of thy wickedness.

†† The ‘bowels,’ in the psychology of the Hebrews, are the seat of deeply felt emotion: cf. Is. 16. 11, 63. 15; Cant. 5. 4; Jer. 31. 20.

††† So that I am, as it were, sensible of it as moving *upon* me. Cf. for the idiom, Ps. 42. 5, 11, 142. 3, 143. 4 (in all which passages *within* should be *upon*).

§§ So LXX: Heb. text has, *thou hast heard, O my soul* (שָׁמַעְתָּ for שִׁמְעַתָּ).

|||| See 20. 16; Am. 1. 14; Ez. 21. 22.

¶¶ Heb. *Breach upon breach*.

*** I.e. tent-hangings, cf. 10. 20.

The Prophet's Vision of the Desolation about to fall upon Judah.

²³ I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was formless and empty; and the heavens, and they had no light. ²⁴ I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved to and fro. ²⁵ I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. ²⁶ I beheld, and, lo, the garden-land was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down before Yahweh, (even) before his fierce anger.

Judah's Doom is irrevocable; no Arts or Blandishments will avail to divert the Invader.

²⁷ For thus hath Yahweh said: 'The whole land shall be a desolation; yet will I not make a full end. ²⁸ For this let the earth mourn, and the heavens above be black; because I have spoken, and have not repented, I have purposed,* and will not turn back from it.' ²⁹ At the noise of the horsemen and bowmen the whole land† fleeth; they are entered into the thickets, and have gone up into the rocks; every city is forsaken, and not a man dwelleth therein. ³⁰ And thou, (when thou art) spoiled, what wilt thou do? Though‡ thou clothedst thyself with scarlet, though thou deckedst thee with ornaments of gold, though thou enlargedst || thine eyes with antimony,¶ in vain wouldest thou make thyself fair; § they that doted (on thee)** despise thee, they seek thy life. ³¹ For I have heard a voice as of a woman in travail, distress †† as of her that bringeth forth her first child, the voice of the daughter of Zion, that panteth for breath, that spreadeth out her hands, (saying,) 'Woe to me, now! for my soul fainteth because of murderers.'

Gladly would Yahweh have pardoned, had the Nation shown itself worthy of Forgiveness: but all, high and low alike, are corrupt.

V. ¹ Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see.

* So LXX. In the Heb. text three words have become accidentally disarranged.

† So LXX. Heb. text, *city* (by error from the last clause of the verse).

‡ Jerusalem is compared here to a woman adorning herself in the endeavour to gain the attention and assistance of her admirers. Cf. Ez. 23. 40 f., Is. 57. 9.

|| Heb. *restest*.

¶ The edge of the eyelids, both above and below the eye, was blackened (as is done still in Egypt, and other parts of the East) for the purpose of making the eyes more prominent. Cf. (of Jezebel) 2 Kings 9. 20, and Ez. 23. 40. The name of Job's daughter, Keren-happūch, means 'Horn of antimony or eye-paint' (the same word which is used here).

§ Or, *And thou, O spoiled one, what doest thou, that thou clothest thyself in scarlet, that thou deckest thee with ornaments of gold, that thou enlargest thine eyes with antimony, in vain making thyself fair?*

** Fig. for political friends or allies. Cf. Ez. 23. 5, 7, 9, 12, 16. 20.

†† Read perhaps, after LXX, *a cry* (14. 2).

now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there *be* any that executeth judgment, that seeketh faithfulness;* and I will pardon her. ² And though they say ‘(As) Yahweh liveth!’ † surely ‡ they swear falsely. ³ O Yahweh, are not thine eyes set upon faithfulness? † thou hast stricken them, but they are not sick; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction: they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return. ⁴ I, however, said, ‘Surely these are poor: they are foolish; for they know not the way of Yahweh, nor the ordinance of their God: ⁵ I will get me unto the great men, and will speak with them; for *they* know the way of Yahweh, and the ordinance of their God.’ But these had altogether broken the yoke, and burst the thongs. § ⁶ Therefore a lion out of the forest shall slay them, a wolf of the steppes shall spoil them; a leopard shall watch over their cities, so that every one going out from them shall be torn in pieces: because their transgressions are many, and their backturnings are increased. ⁷ How shall I pardon thee? thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods; and when I had fed them to the full, they committed adultery, and made themselves at home || in the harlots’ houses. ⁸ They were as fed stallions: ¶ every one neighed after his neighbour’s wife. ⁹ Shall I not visit for these things? saith Yahweh: and shall not my soul be avenged on a nation such as this?

Let the appointed Ministers of Judgment, then, complete their Work.

¹⁰ Go ye up into her vine-rows, and destroy; but make not a full end: take away her branches; for they are not Yahweh’s. ¹¹ For the house of Israel and the house of Judah have dealt very faithlessly against me, saith Yahweh. ¹² They have denied Yahweh, and said, ‘(It is) not he; neither will evil come upon us; neither shall we see sword or famine: ¹³ and the prophets will become wind, and the word ** is not in them: thus may it be done unto them!’

* Or, *honesty*: see 2 Kings 12. 15, 22. 7 (where *faithfully* is lit. *in faithfulness*, the word used here).

† To swear by the national God was a token of loyalty to Him (Dent. 10., 20); but it should be done sincerely (ch. 4. 2; Is. 48. 1).

‡ So with a change of one letter. The Heb. text has *therefore*.

§ Cf. ch. 2. 20.

|| Or, *made themselves sojourners* (1 Kings 17. 20); so LXX (κατέλυον, i.e. יתנררו for יתנדרו). The Heb. text has *made themselves into marauding bands* (2 Kings 5. 2, etc.).

* So with a slight change. The Heb. text is untranslatable.

** So LXX (implying different vowel points). The Heb. text, as pointed, means apparently *speech* or *speaking*.

¹⁴ Therefore thus saith Yahweh, the God of hosts, Because ye speak this word, behold, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them. ¹⁵ Behold, I will bring a nation upon you from far, O house of Israel, saith Yahweh: it is an imperishable nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whose language thou knowest not, neither understandest what they say. ¹⁶ Their quiver is as an open sepulchre, they are all mighty men.* ¹⁷ And they shall eat up thine harvest and thy bread, (which) thy sons and thy daughters should eat; † they shall eat up thy flocks and thine herds: they shall eat up thy vines and thy fig trees: they shall beat down thy fortified cities, wherein thou trustest, with the sword.[†] ¹⁸ But even in those days, saith Yahweh, I will not make with you a full end. ¹⁹ And it shall come to pass, when ye shall say, 'Wherefore hath Yahweh, our God, done all these things unto us?' that thou shalt say unto them, Like as ye have forsaken me, and served foreign gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers in a land that is not yours.

The Moral Cause of the Coming Disaster; Prophet and Priest unite in the furtherance of Evil.

²⁰ Declare ye this in the house of Jacob, and publish it in Judah, saying, ²¹ Hear, now, this, O foolish people, and without understanding: ‡ which have eyes, and see not; which have ears, and hear not: ²² Fear ye not *me*? saith Yahweh: will ye not tremble at my presence, which have placed the sand for a bound of the sea, (by) a perpetual decree, which it cannot transgress, and though [the waters thereof]§ toss themselves, yet can they not prevail; though its waves roar, yet can they not pass over it. ²³ But this people hath a refractory and defiant heart; they are turned aside and gone. ²⁴ Neither say they in their heart, 'Let us, now, fear Yahweh, our God, that giveth winter-rain, and autumn-rain, and spring-rain, in its season; that reserveth unto us the appointed weeks of harvest.' ²⁵ Your iniquities have turned away these things, || and your sins have withholden good from you. ²⁶ For among my people are found wicked men: they watch, as fowlers crouch (?) down; ¶ they set a trap,** they catch men. ²⁷ Like a cage full of birds, so are their houses full of (the gains

* I e. warriors (2 Sam. 23. 8, and frequently).

† Or, *they shall eat up thy sons and thy daughters.*

‡ Heb. *heart.* Cf. Hos. 7. 11 (R.V. *margin.*).

§ These words (in the Heb. one word) have doubtless dropped out accidentally. Cf. 46. 7, 8.

|| I e. the blessings spoken of in v. 24.

¶ Read probably, *as fowlers watch* (one letter changed).

** Heb. *a destroyer.*

of) deceit : therefore they are become great, and waxen rich. ²⁸ They are waxen fat ; they are sleek : * yea, they overpass in deeds of wickedness : they defend not the right, the right of the fatherless, that they may prosper : and the cause of the needy do they not judge. ²⁹ Shall I not visit for these things ? saith Yahweh : shall not my soul be avenged on a nation such as this ?

³⁰ An appalling and horrible thing is come to pass in the land : ³¹ the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule at their hands : and my people love to have it so : and what will ye do in the end thereof ?

Description of the Danger as drawing nearer.

VI. ¹ Bring (your households) into safety, ye children of Benjamin, out of the midst of Jerusalem ; and blow the trumpet in Tekoa, † and raise up a beacon on Beth-haccherem : for evil hath looked forth from the north, and great destruction. ² The comely and luxurious one, the daughter of Zion, will I cut off. ³ Shepherds ‡ with their flocks shall come unto her : they have pitched tents against her round about ; they feed every one off his place. § ⁴ Prepare ye || war against her : arise, and let us go up at noon. Woe unto us ! for the day hath declined, for the shadows of evening stretch themselves out. ⁵ Arise, and let us go up by night, and let us destroy her palaces. ¶

⁶ For thus hath Yahweh of hosts said, Hew ye down her trees, and cast up a mound against Jerusalem : that is the city which hath been visited ; ** the whole of her—oppression is in her midst ! ⁷ As a well keepeth fresh †† her waters, so she keepeth fresh †† her wickedness : violence and spoil is heard in her ; before me continually are

* The Hebrews regarded fatness as a mark of self-contentedness, and associated it with impiety : cf. Job 15. 27 ; Ps. 73. 7.

† In the elevated ‘hill-country’ of Judah (Josh. 15. 48–60), 12 miles S. of Jerusalem, the home of the prophet Amos. In the Hebrew there is an assonance with ‘blow.’ Beth-haccherem (‘House or place of the vineyard’) is perhaps the height now called the Frank Mountain (from its having been made a point of defence by the Crusaders), 3 miles N.E. of Tekoa, commanding a fine view of the Dead Sea.

‡ Fig. of foes : cf. 12. 10.

§ Fig. for, ravage the country. Cf. Mic. 5. 6 (R.V. *margin*.)

|| Heb. *sanctify*. Cf. Joel 3. 9 ; Mic. 3. 5.

¶ In *vv.* 4, 5 the enemy urge one another to begin the attack. They lament that they have let noon pass—when in the East a siesta is taken, and a surprise might readily be made (cf. 15. 8, 20. 16, Zeph. 2. 4)—and propose now to make the assault at night-time (cf. Is. 15. 1).

** The rendering is uncertain. Read perhaps, after LXX., *ah, city of rapine* (Nab. 3. 1).

†† Lit. *cool*.

sickness and wounds. ⁸Let thyself be admonished.* O Jerusalem, lest my soul be severed † from thee; lest I make thee a desolation, a land not inhabited.

The Completeness of the Ruin.

⁹ Thus saith Yahweh of hosts: They shall throughly glean the remnant of Israel as a vine: ‡ 'Turn back thine hand as a grape-gatherer upon the tendrils!' ¹⁰ To whom shall I speak, and testify, that they may hear? behold, their ear is uncircumcised, and they cannot listen: behold, the word of Yahweh is become unto them a reproach; they have no delight in it. ¹¹ But I am full of the fury of Yahweh; I am weary with holding in: 'Pour it out§ upon the children in the street, and upon the assembly of young men together; for even the husband with the wife shall be taken, the aged with him that is full of days: ¹² and their houses shall be turned unto others, fields and wives together; for I will stretch out my hand upon the inhabitants of the land,' saith Yahweh.

The Cause in the Corruption of the People.

¹³ For from the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is greedy of gain;|| and from the prophet even to the priest every one dealeth falsely. ¹⁴ And they would heal the breach of my people lightly, saying, 'Peace, peace'; when there is no peace. ¹⁵ They shall shew shame, because they have committed abomination: (for now) they are neither ashamed, neither know they how to shew confusion: therefore they shall fall among them that fall; at the time that I visit them¶ they shall stumble, saith Yahweh.

In vain has Israel been warned beforehand by its Prophets.

¹⁶ Thus said Yahweh: Stand ye upon the ways,** and see, and ask for the old paths, which is the way to prosperity,†† and walk therein,

* Or, *corrected*. Cf. Ps. 2. 10, where the verb is the same. Not intellectual 'instruction,' but moral discipline or correction, is what the word denotes. ('Correction' in ch. 2. 30, 5. 3, is cognate.)

† Cf. Ez. 23. 17, 18, 22, 28.

‡ These words must be supposed to be dramatically addressed by Yahweh to the chief of the grapegatherers (i.e. the leader of the foe).

§ Yahweh's words, addressed to Jer. Or, changing a point, *I will pour it out*, etc. Yahweh's words will then begin with 'for I will stretch,' in v. 12.

|| I.e., all seek their own advantage and aggrandizement, without thinking of the welfare of their country.

¶ LXX. (vocalizing the original consonants differently), *at the time of their visitation*, as 8. 12.

** I.e., where the different ways meet.

†† Heb. *good* (i.e. *prosperity*, as 8. 15, 17. 6, Ps. 25. 13 [Heb. *abide in good*], Deut. 23. 6 *al.*). See esp. Deut. 30. 15 f., which illustrates what Jeremiah means.

and ye shall find rest for your souls: but they said, 'We will not walk (therein).' ¹⁷ And I ever raised up watchmen* over you, (saying,) Listen to the sound of the trumpet; but they said, 'We will not listen.' ¹⁸ Therefore hear, ye nations, § and know, O congregation, what is among them. † ¹⁹ Hear, O earth; behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts: because they have not listened unto my words: and as for my direction, they have rejected it. ²⁰ 'To what purpose unto me is the frankincense that cometh from Sheba, ‡ and the sweet cane § from a far country? your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasing unto me. ²¹ Therefore thus saith Yahweh, Behold, I will lay stumbling-blocks || before this people: and they shall stumble against them, fathers and sons together; the neighbour and his friend shall perish.

Renewed Description of the Invader (cf. 5. 15-17).

²² Thus saith Yahweh, Behold, a people cometh from the north country, and a great nation shall be stirred up from the recesses of the earth. ²³ They lay hold on bow and javelin; they are cruel, and have no mercy; their voice roareth like the sea, and they ride upon horses: every one set in array, as a man to the battle, against thee, O daughter of Zion. ²⁴ 'We have heard the fame thereof: our hands wax feeble: ¶ distress hath taken hold of us, and pangs as of a woman in travail.' ²⁵ Go not forth into the field, nor walk by the way; for (there is) the sword of the enemy, terror on every side. ²⁶ O daughter of my people, gird thee with sackcloth, and sprinkle thyself with ashes: make thee mourning, as for an only son, most bitter wailing; for suddenly shall the spoiler come upon us.

Jeremiah's Report on the Character of the People: all his efforts to refine them had been in vain.

²⁷ I have made thee an assayer among my people; ** that thou

* Fig. of prophets: cf. Ez. 3. 17, 33. 7 (see *vr.* 2-6).

† The second part of this verse is corrupt; and has not hitherto been satisfactorily restored. Suggestions are, *and know, O congregation, what is coming*; and, *and know that which I have testified against them.*

‡ Cf. Is. 60. 6. South Arabia was, in ancient times, celebrated as the country which chiefly produced the fragrant resin called frankincense; cf. Vergil, 'Centumque Sabaeo Ture calent arae.'

§ Cf. Is. 43. 24. It yielded a perfume (cf. Cant. 4. 14 ['calamus']), which was used in making incense. The 'far country' is probably India.

|| Fig. of the enemy, against whom the people will, as it were, stumble to their ruin (cf. *v.* 15 end).

¶ Heb. *sink down* (Is. 5. 24), or *drop down slackly.*

** The Heb. text adds, *a fortress*, which is here unsuitable, and is probably a gloss derived from 1. 18. With other vowel-points, however, the word might perhaps be rendered a *gold-washer* or *gold-extractor*; and with this sense the word should perhaps be retained.

mayest know and assay their way. ²⁸ They are all the most refractory of the refractory, going about with slanders: they are copper and iron; they all of them deal corruptly. ²⁹ The bellows blow fiercely; the lead is consumed by the fire: in vain do they go on refining; * for the evil are not separated. † ³⁰ Rejected silver shall men call them, because Yahweh hath rejected them.

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

IV. 1. *foreskin*. Not really a change in the consonantal text; Jer wrote, of course, simply ערלה; and ערלות merely represents an incorrect pronunciation of it, suggested by the preceding plural verb.

10. This seems to me to be the best solution of the difficulties presented by this verse: the false prophets (who declared that they spoke in Yahweh's name), when they see their promises of peace (6. 14, 14. 13, 23. 17) belied by the event, will reproach Yahweh for having deceived them. So Ewald, Giesebrecht, Dahm.

11. On this use of *not*, suggesting or insinuating something not expressed, see *Orf. Heb. Lec.* p. 518*b*, and cf. 2 Kings 6. 10, Is. 47. 14*b*, Job 34, 20.

12. *reason the case with them* (so A.V. marg. on 12. 1); lit. *speak judgements* (or *pleadings*) *with them*. The expression occurs also 1. 16, 12. 1, 39. 5=52. 9=2 Kings 25. 6: 12. 1, shows that it cannot really mean 'utter judgements against,' but that it must acquire the sense of *condemning* or *punishing* from the context in which it is used. The passages to be compared are those in which נִיבַט, *to argue together in judgement* (G.-K. § 51*d*) is used of Yahweh: see Jer. 2. 35, 25. 31, Is. 66. 16, Ez. 17. 20, 20. 35, 36, 38. 22, Joel 3. 2 (in all which passages 'plead' means *argue* or *dispute in judgement*, though it obviously at the same time implies that punishment will follow). אֹתָם is of course an incorrect pronunciation of the original אָתָם for אֲתָם, as often in Jer., Ez., 1 Kings 20.—2 Kings 8, and occasionally besides: see *Orf. Heb. Lec.* p. 85*b*.

13. See Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 173*f*.

14, 15. On נָאָ, rendered *naughtiness* in *v.* 14, and *trouble* in *v.* 15, see my *Parallel Psalter*, p. 450.

17. *me hath she defied*. Inversions in English prose do not appear to me to be thoroughly natural or idiomatic; but they may perhaps be

* Or, *smelting*. Cf. for the figure ch. 9. 'Behold, I will *smelt* them, and *try* (or *assay*) them'; Job 23. 10 'If he *trich* (or *assayeth*) me, I shall come forth as gold'; Zecl. 13. 9.

† A fig. description of the vain efforts made by the prophet to remove the evil elements from his people. The smelting process goes on, but it is resultless: the melted lead (used in smelting as a flux to carry off the slag) oxidized in the heat, and fails to carry off the alloy mixed with the silver.

permitted occasionally, where the emphasis indicated by the Hebrew cannot be otherwise conveniently expressed.

19. A series of exclamations expressive of the emotion under which the prophet labours.

upon me. See more fully *ibid.* p. 164, or the *Oxf. Heb. Lev.* p. 753*bd.*

alarm. I.e. properly *All' arme! To arms!* But in modern English it has lost this meaning, and is simply (except with a word such as *sound* or *blow*) a synonym for a *shock of fear*. The Heb. is *shout* or *shouting*; and the word, even in A.V., is usually so rendered. For *alarm*, see Num. 10. 3, 6 (with 'blow'); Jer. 49. 2, Zeph. 1. 16.

20. *my.* I.e. not the prophet's, but the people's (hence the plural). See, for the idiom, my *Introduction*, p. 366*f.* (ed. 7, p. 399).

23. *formless and empty.* Heb. *tōhū wā-bōhū*, an alliterative description of a chaos (Gen. i. 2), in which nothing can be distinguished or defined. *Tōhū* is a word which it is often difficult to represent satisfactorily in English: but a survey of the passages in which it is used appears to shew that it denotes properly—not a 'waste,' but—what is *undefinable, unsubstantial*, or (fig.) *unreal* (as of idols, 1 Sam. 12. 21, of what is baseless, Is. 29. 21 ['a thing of nought'], of what is morally unreal, i.e. falsehood, Is. 59. 4). The ancient versions usually render it by words signifying *emptiness, nothingness*, or (fig.) *vanity*. With this passage comp. Is. 34. 11, where it is said that Yahweh will stretch out over Edom 'the line of *formlessness* and the plummet of *emptiness*,' i.e. will reduce it to such desolation as to be comparable to a state of primeval chaos.

V. 1. *be.* The italics (both here and elsewhere) are intended to indicate emphasis. **ו** in Heb. always affirms with emphasis: e.g. Ps. 58. 11, 'that there *is* a God judging the earth'; Deut. 13. 3, 'to know whether you *do* love,' etc.

3. מִלֵּי (*mil'el*) is derived naturally from מֵיֵל, *to be in anguish*; though it might (on the analogy of a few exceptional forms, such as מֵיֵל, Job 24. 1, מֵיֵל Is. 16. 8: Ges.-K. § 75*m*) just come from מֵיֵל, *to be sick*. Prov. 23. 35, and the frequent combination of מִלֵּי and מִקְפָּה, make the latter sense the more probable; but it is better then simply to accent מִלֵּי (*mitrā'*).

4, 5. *Ordinance*, i.e. the right way of worshipping God. The word is lit. *judgement* (properly a *decision* given by a judge), the term being used in an enlarged sense of a *prescribed system of observances*: so 8. 7 (where R.V. has *ordinance*). The word thus becomes sometimes virtually equivalent to *religion*: see Is. 42. 1 ('he will bring forth,—i.e. publish,—*religion* to the nations'), 3 ('he will bring forth *religion* faithfully,'—in faithfulness to the trust committed to him), 4, 51. 4 (|| *law*); cf. 2 Kings 17. 26, 27 (where A.V., R.V. render poorly by 'man-

ner?). מִשְׁפָּט is not unfrequently rendered *ordinance* in A.V.; but *judgement* often remains where it is difficult to think that it can convey any clear idea to an English reader. It is particularly to be regretted that it remains in Is. 42. 1, 3, 4; for it here entirely obscures the prophet's sense of the 'servant's' work: *religion* is the word which ought here to have been employed. The reference to Ps. 9. 8 in the recently published R.V. with marginal references glosses the word incorrectly. In other directions, also, מִשְׁפָּט acquires meanings not covered by its etymology; thus it sometimes means *right*, not in a forensic (Is. 40. 27) or ethical sense, but in the sense of *just measure* or *proportion*: thus it denotes the *right disposition* of a building, Exod. 26. 30, 1 Kings 6. 38, Ez. 42. 11, or of a city, Jer. 30. 18, a *proper measure* or *due*, 1 Kings 4. 28 (Heb. 5. 8); *fitness*, Is. 28. 26 (R.V. 'aright,' lit. 'according to *right* or *fitness*'); and in Is. 40. 14 the 'path of *right*' is the path by which, in the work of creation, everything was arranged in its proper measure or proportion.

7. *g'dāl* means 'troop' in the sense of a *marauding troop*, not 'troop' in the general sense of *company*.

8. The rendering *in the morning* is grammatically impossible: it involves an intolerable 'false concord.' The best suggestion is to read מִצִּיּוֹנִים, 'growing צִיּוֹנִים' (Lev. 21. 20), i.e. *stallions*; the word in form would be like מִקִּרְיִים, 'growing horns,' 'growing hoofs,' in Ps. 69. 32. The marg. *roaming at large* depends upon a very questionable connexion either with the Heb. שָׁנָה, or, better, with the Ethiopic *sakwaya* (=πλωγῶν, Gen. 21. 14 *al.*); but the Hiphil form remains unaccounted for even upon the latter explanation.

10. *vine-rows*. יָרְהָ (in a sense suitable here) does not occur elsewhere. It is better to point יָרְהָ, comparing then, Job 24. 11; and the Talmudic usage as cited by Levy, iv. 425 (יָרְהָ = *row*: e.g. of men, עֲשׂוּיֵן שׁוּרוֹת שׁוּרוֹת כְּכַרְם, *arranged in rows as in a vineyard*).

13. *the word*. So A.V., R.V.; but implying הַדְּבָר for הַדְּבָר. The intention of the Mass. punctuation is not clear; Ewald (§ 156, 2a) gives it the meaning *speech*. *He that speaketh* (Hitz., Graf, Keil) implies a very late idiom (G.-K. § 138 *i, k*), and is not probable.

15. *imperishable*. Lit. *ever-full, never-failing*; said properly of a stream (Am. 5. 24, R.V. *marg.*).

19. *strange . . . strangers* (A.V., R.V.) makes an admirable point here; but, unfortunately, it is not in the Hebrew.

22. A.V., R.V. imply a transference of *its waves* from the clause in which it actually stands to the preceding clause.

23. *winter-rain*. See G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geogr.*, p. 161.

26. *crouch down* is a doubtful rendering of שָׁכַךְ (which elsewhere means only to *subside*, of waters, Gen. 8. 1, or to *abate*, of a tumult, Num. 17. 20, or wrath, Esth. 2. 1, 7. 10). בָּשָׁר (בְּשׂוּר) is more probable.

a trap. The Heb. word is found in this sense only here. Cf. *Encycl. Bibl.*, s.v. FOWL, § 10.

at their hands. More exactly *according to their hands*; i.e. at their guidance: see 33. 13 (where A.V., R.V. so paraphrase the Heb. idiom used as to render לַע, properly *upon*, by *under*!); more often in late Heb., 1 Chron. 25. 2, 3, 6, 2 Chron. 23. 18, Ezra 3. 10. For יָרָו, יָרָו (Grätz, Cornill) *give direction* or *teach*, the word used technically of priests (Deut. 24. 8, Mic. 3. 11, Ezek. 44. 23), is a plausible emendation.

vi. 6. *her trees.* עֵצָה may stand for עֵצָה; see G.-K. § 91e.

8. *Let thyself be admonished.* The *Niphal tolerativum* (G.-K. § 51c). See Is. 65. 1, with Skinner's note (in the *Cambridge Bible*): the passage is one in which both A.V. and R.V. unfortunately miss the sense.

11. Reading the inf. abs. for the imperative. See G.-K. § 113dd, and cf. 1 Kings 22. 30.

13. *would heal.* On the force of the Piel (properly, *busy themselves with healing*), see Stade. § 154, G.-K. § 52f.

17. *ever raised up.* The Heb. student will notice the tense and the place of the tone, and will remember Amos 4. 7 (G.-K. § 112dd).

29. קָצָר in Job 22. 24, 25 seems to mean *gold ore*: so קָצָר might mean *one who works with קָצָר*, viz. for the purpose of obtaining the precious metal from it. The verb does not however occur elsewhere in this sense, and the meaning is conjectural. קָצָר can hardly be anything but an incorrect gloss on קָרוֹן, suggested by l. 18, and interpreting this word in the sense of קָרוֹן, Isa. 32. 14 (*examination- or exploration-tower*), and קָרוֹן, Is. 23. 13.

*THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT IN ISRAEL OF
THE BELIEF IN A FUTURE LIFE.*¹

MY object in the following study is to recount the rise and development in Israel of the doctrine of a blessed future life.

Whilst setting before you the main intellectual stages in this development, I wish it to be borne in mind that it cannot be explained on any purely natural hypothesis.

All true growth in religion, whether in the past or the present, springs from the communion of man with the immediate living God, wherein man learns the will of God, and becomes thereby an organ of God, a revealer of divine truth for men less inspired than himself. The truth thus revealed through man possesses a Divine authority for men. In the Old Testament we have a catena of such revelations. At the Exodus God took Israel, Semitic heathens as they were for the most part, and taught them in the measure of their capacity; revealed Himself at the outset to them as their God, the God of their nation, and claimed Israel as His people. He did not then make Himself known as the Creator and Moral Ruler of the world, for in the childhood of Israel's religious history these ideas would have been impossible of comprehension. Yahweh was Israel's God, and Israel was the people of Yahweh. Yahweh was a righteous God, and required righteousness in His people. From this stage the divine education of Israel is carried forward, till in Jeremiah and the Second Isaiah God becomes known to Israel as the supreme all loving Creator and God of all mankind.

¹ Preached before the University of Dublin on October 26, 1902, the text being Heb. x. 34, "Knowing that ye have your own selves for a better and an enduring possession."

Thus before the eighth century B.C. the conception of God in Israel was henotheistic, that is, Israel recognized Yahweh as their God and Yahweh only. At the same time Israel was ready to acknowledge the actual existence of neighbouring deities, though they denied the claims of such deities to their obedience. At this period Yahweh's sovereignty was conceived as conterminous with His own land and people, and His interests and those of Israel were popularly identified. The claims of Yahwism on Israel before the eighth century are rightly expressed in the words: "Thou shalt have none other Gods but Me."

We are here in the childhood of Israel's religious faith.

But these and other limitations and defects in the conception of God—being really heathen survivals in the domain of religious faith—gave way before the attacks of the great eighth century prophets, and one by one the false views attaching to Israel's conception of Yahweh were in the course of its divine education expelled, and the monotheistic stage of Yahwism was achieved, the fundamental doctrine of which is "There are no other Gods but Me." Thus Israel came at last to recognize Yahweh, not merely as their God, but as the Creator and God of all mankind.

With this short outline of the development of religious thought regarding Yahweh, we are in a position to understand the development of eschatological thought in Israel.

Jewish eschatology deals with two originally distinct subjects—the hope of the individual, and the hope of the nation—the hope of the individual which ultimately develops into the conception of individual immortality, and the hope of the nation which gives birth to the doctrine of the Messianic Kingdom. We shall now address ourselves to the hope of the individual.

The primitive hope of the individual and his view of the future life were gloomy in the extreme. Sheol was the

ultimate goal of all men. Here a shadowy life prevailed, which faintly reflected the realities of the upper world. In Sheol, further, not moral but social distinctions were observed: a man enjoyed a position among the shades corresponding to the social position he had held in his earthly life. That such a realm was not under the sovereignty of Yahweh, was to be expected, since Yahweh was only henotheistically conceived, and His jurisdiction limited to the upper world, and there to His own nation and land. Thus the heathen view of the future life is not inconsistent with the Hebrew belief in Yahweh in its earliest stage. In other words, before the eighth century B.C., no conflict between theology and eschatology was possible, for their provinces were mutually exclusive.

But with the rise of Monotheism the relations of theology and eschatology were essentially transformed; for since Yahweh was conceived as the Creator and God of all the earth, the entire existence of men, here and hereafter, came under His jurisdiction. To the western mind this is an obvious conclusion. When once it is conceded that God is the Creator and God of all the world, then man's future life, no less than his present, must be subject to divine Providence. And yet, though Israel possessed a Monotheistic faith as early as the eighth century it did not arrive for some centuries at this conclusion, which appears to us to have been inevitable from the first. How are we to explain this startling fact? The only possible explanation appears to be that as God chose Greece to teach the world wisdom, and Rome to teach the world law and order, so He chose Israel to be the religious teacher of mankind, and therein to discover the doctrine of a blessed future life—not through logical processes of the intellect, but through religious experiences, and thus to achieve a truth for all men because verifiable by all men, should they be willing to surrender themselves to a like religious

experience. And thus we are hereby taught at the outset, and for all time, that the only belief in a future life, that can really endure, is that which we arrive at through the life of faith. But to return. Though Monotheism was implicitly at strife with the traditional eschatology of the individual, this antagonism, as we have already stated, was not explicitly felt till some centuries later. Israel was still allowed to cherish its heathen views of the future; for it was not as yet a fit recipient for the revelation of a blessed life beyond the grave. Religious life in Israel had not yet outgrown the stage of childhood, save in the case of a few spiritual leaders: its individual members had no direct access to God, but could only approach Him through the medium of priest or prophet. But when through the discipline of long ages of prophetic teaching, the individual had learnt to stand face to face with God, and to know the reality of present communion with Him, then, and not till then, was the nation fitted to wrestle with the hard problem of a future life, and in this spiritual conflict to win the assurance of a blessed immortality.

It was not till the religious man in Israel had learnt through living personal communion with God to deal with the problems of the present, that he won the vantage ground from whence, with the assurance of a tried faith, he could approach the darker problems of the future.

We shall now deal with the chief problem of the present life, the final solution of which did not loom upon Israel till it recognized the truth of a blessed hereafter.

This problem arose from the claims of the new Monotheism and dealt with the undeserved sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked. So long as Yahweh was regarded by Israel as merely their national God, and so as one God amongst many, no such problem could arise. Though Yahweh was righteous yet He was

not almighty; there were other deities whose jurisdiction circumscribed His powers. Thus there was always an explanation ready to hand for all the unmerited humiliations of His people. When, however, Monotheism drove out these false views of Deity, this explanation was no longer tenable. Yahweh was now worshipped both as perfectly righteous and as infinitely powerful. From this true Monotheistic faith the Jewish leaders of the seventh century inevitably formulated the doctrine, that the righteous must prosper, and the wicked suffer adversity.

Against this postulate of faith no valid objection can be raised. If the world is created and ruled by a righteous God, it must sooner or later be well with the righteous. But owing to the heathen views of the after-world that were current in ancient Israel, this doctrine could not be maintained in its large and true sense. It must be well with the righteous now and in this life, these ancient teachers maintained, or not at all; for, according to the views of their time, the faithful had communion with Yahweh only here; in the after-world they and all others were to be wholly removed from the sway of His Providence.

Thus from the welding together of a true theology and a heathen eschatology there resulted inevitably the conclusion, that *the righteousness of the righteous and the wickedness of the wicked must be recompensed in this life*. The sphere of retribution was thus necessarily limited to this world. The inclusion of this false conception of the future in Israel's theology leads, as we shall find, to still more extravagant views in the sixth century.

This doctrine appears on a great scale in Deuteronomy and other pre-exilic and later writings.¹ The large element of truth it embodied won for it a general acceptance, and

¹ Deut. xxviii.; Jer. vii. 5-7; xvii. 5-8, 19-27; Exod. xxiii. 20 sqq.; Lev. xxvi.

so long as the doctrine was regarded as a general statement and not applied individually, its inherent viciousness escaped criticism.

But the time for such an application was fast approaching through the development of individualism.

Down indeed to the eighth century, no individual retribution had been looked for. The early Israelite was not alarmed by the prosperity of the wicked man, or the calamities of the righteous; for Yahweh was concerned with the well-being of the nation as a whole, and not with that of its individual members. The individual was not the religious unit, but the family, or the tribe. The individual was identified with his family; a solidarity existed between him and the line of his ancestors and descendants. From this identification it was concluded, though not always justly, that God visited the virtues and vices of the fathers on the children (Exod. xx. 5; Lev. xx. 5, etc.), of an individual on his community or tribe (Gen. xii. 17, xx. 18), while His mercy was shown in transferring the punishment of a sinner to his son (1 Kings xi. 12, xxi. 29).

No right view of the present or future destinies of the righteous could be reached till Monotheism had taught the worth of the individual soul and its immediate relation with Yahweh. This was first done in the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

The ancient exposition of the modern doctrine of heredity was expressed popularly in the proverb: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Jer. xxxi. 29). In this the people explicitly denied their own responsibility in the overthrow of the nation, and at the same time arranged the justice of Divine Providence (Ezek. xix. 25). It was their fathers that had sinned, and they were involved in the consequences of their guilt. And from the iron nexus which bound them there was

no escape. Such a view naturally paralysed all personal effort after righteousness, and made men the victims of despair. The righteousness of the individual could not deliver him from the doom befalling the nation.

Now in opposition to this popular view, which destroyed all moral initiative in the nation, Jeremiah proclaimed the new doctrine of the individual. This doctrine was based on the new relation which God was to establish between Himself and the individual. This new relation was to supersede the old relation, which had existed between God and the nation as a whole. Heretofore the individual had been related to Yahweh only as a member of the nation, and as such, whatever his nature and character, shared in the national judgments, and was without individual worth. The nation was a religious unit. Henceforth, Jeremiah taught, the individual was to step into the place of the nation and to constitute the religious unit. Thus in the face of the coming exile, when the nation would cease to exist, and only its dismembered elements, the individuals, remain, Jeremiah was the first to conceive religion as the communion of the individual soul with God. Heretofore the individual had approached God either through priest or prophet. Henceforth the individual was to enter into the privileges of the prophet.

The teaching of Jeremiah was taken up and developed by Ezekiel. In pre-exilic times the individual soul had been conceived as the property of the family and the nation, but Ezekiel teaches that every soul is God's and therefore exists in a direct relation with Him (Ezek. xviii. 4). Ezekiel's individualism here receives its most noble and profound expression. Never hitherto had the absolute worth of the individual human soul been asserted in such brief and pregnant words as those of the prophet speaking in God's behalf: "All souls are mine." From this principle Ezekiel concluded that if the individual was faithful in

his immediate relation to Yahweh he ceased to be the thrall of his own sin or that of his forefathers (xviii. 21-28, xiv. 12-20), and became a free man, even God's man, wholly unaffected alike by his own past, or that of the nation.¹ And since no law of heredity could thus intervene between a man's conduct and its recompence, every man should receive a recompence, and that a recompence exactly adequate to his deserts. But the law of retribution, as enunciated by Ezekiel, was still more strictly defined and applied. For, as Ezekiel, like his predecessors, believed in the traditional view of Sheol as the unblessed abode of the shades removed from the sway of Yahweh, he could not but conclude that the perfect recompence which he taught was awarded in this life. Thus the exact measure of that which was his due was meted out to the individual in this life; judgment was daily executed on every man, and that judgment found concrete expression in the man's outward lot. The outward lot of the individual became on this view an infallible index to his character and his actual condition before God. His prosperity was a divine testimony to God's good pleasure in him, his adversity was no less surely a sign of the Divine displeasure. So strongly persuaded was Ezekiel of the certitude of this law of retribution, that he declared that in the coming destruction of Jerusalem not a single righteous man would be destroyed (ix. 3-6); only on two occasions subsequently (xvi. 21, 22; xxi. 3, 4), had the truth of actual fact and prophetic insight power to deliver him from the yoke of his doctrinaire views.

In his teaching on the individual soul Ezekiel had enunciated a great spiritual truth, but hampered its acceptance and development by associating with it positions demonstrably false. It is true, on the one hand, that the

¹ We should observe that no Old Testament prophet emphasizes so strongly the antinomies of man's freewill (iii. 16-21, xiv. 12-23, xviii., xxxiii. 1-20), and God's sovereignty (xxxiv.).

individual can in communion with God break with the iron nexus of his own past and that of his people, and make a new beginning, which is different in essence from that past, and inexplicable from it as a starting point; but on the other hand, it is no less true that this new beginning is always conditioned in some degree by the past of the individual and that of his fathers, and herein lies the truth of heredity, which Ezekiel denied.

It is easy to cavil at Ezekiel's doctrine of retribution, and yet we must admit that no other theory is possible, if we start from the same premises as the theology of that period. If with Ezekiel we hold that God is righteous, and that all souls are His, we shall be ready to conclude, with him, that a righteous retribution must be meted out to every man. If we further held, as we do not, that it is in this life only that man is under the dominion of God, then we should be forced to conclude that every man must receive the full measure of retribution in this life, and that, accordingly, a man's outward fortunes must be the index of his spiritual condition. Logically no other conclusion was possible, and Ezekiel, with a sublime defiance of the actual, maintained this view with a loyalty that hardly ever wavered.¹

Ezekiel's doctrine rooted itself firmly in the national consciousness, and was variously applied in two great popular handbooks, the Psalter and the Book of Proverbs. In these writings modifications were introduced in the exposition of the now dominant dogma, in order to make it clash less rudely with the facts of religious experience. Trouble and affliction, it was taught, were not always retributive, but were sometimes sent as a discipline to the righteous, but such adversity was always in their

¹ Amongst Ezekiel's oldest contemporaries there were not wanting voices that drew attention to the conflict between this postulate of faith and experience, Jer. xii. 1, 2; xxxi. 29, 30; Hab. i. 13, 14.

case followed by a renewal of outward blessings (Ps. xxxiv. 19-22), and the end of the righteous was always peace (Ps. xxxvii. 25, 37; Job viii. 6, 7, xlii. 12; Prov. xxiii. 18; Wisdom iii. 3, iv. 7). On the other hand, though the wicked might be prosperous, yet their prosperity was short-lived, and was permitted only with a view to make their fall the more sudden and humiliating (Ps. xxxvii. 20, 35, 36; lxxiii. 18-20).

Naturally the popular doctrine was a continual stumbling-block to the righteous when in trouble. So long as all went well with him he was assured of God's favour, but misfortune or pain destroyed this certainty; for as such they were evidence of sin. Hence the righteous man looked to God to be justified by an outward judgment. If this was granted, his righteousness was attested; but if it was withheld, his personal friends, it is true, might in their charity possibly construe his affliction as a discipline of God, but the popular conscience was only too ready to arraign it as the penalty of sin.

But it was not to the sufferer alone that Ezekiel's doctrine of retribution proved an insuperable difficulty. So long as the nation was convinced that there was a perfectly adequate retribution in this life, no higher solution of the problem of a future life was possible, nor was there any occasion to question the truth of the current views on the condition of the departed in Sheol. Thus every avenue of progress was blocked, and no advance was possible, till the orthodox doctrine of retribution was impeached at the bar of rational and religious experience, and rejected as unworthy of credit. Of the long sustained attack on the doctrine of Ezekiel two very notable memorials have come down to us, the Books of Job and Ecclesiastes.

Although Ecclesiastes was not written much earlier than 200 B.C., we shall touch on its protest first, as its services were purely destructive, and not, as in the case of Job,

destructive and constructive. Against the statement that the individual is at present judged in perfect keeping with his deserts, the writer of Ecclesiastes enters at once a decided negative. He declares, in fact, that there is retribution neither here nor hereafter: for the few sporadic passages, where judgment is threatened, are, according to an increasing number of critics, intrusions in the text, being at variance with the entire thought of the writer. Thus the author of this book maintains that evil may prolong a man's days and righteousness curtail them (vii. 15), that the destiny of the wise man and the fool is identical (ii. 14), and likewise of the righteous and the wicked (ix. 2).

From the confessedly extravagant attack of this writer on the doctrine of retribution we turn back to one of the foremost books in all the world, whether regarded from the standpoint of literary genius or of actual influence on the destinies of mankind. The Book of Job was written, at all events, before 400 B.C., and its concern from first to last is the current doctrine of retribution, and its aim is to show that the doctrine of man's individual worth, and a strictly individual retribution, are really irreconcilable. Like his contemporaries (for we may regard the main body of the book as a unity for our present purpose), Job accepted the traditional teaching, that every event that befalls a man reflects God's disposition towards him, that misfortune betokens God's anger, prosperity His favour; in short, that a strictly retributive judgment is enforced in this life. But this belief, Job found, was not confirmed by the fortunes of other men (xxi. 1-15); for the wicked prosper and go down to the grave in peace; and his own bitter experience emphasized to the full the conflict between faith and experience.

Human faith, in order to assure itself of its own reality, claims an outward attestation at the hands of God (xvii. 3-4); but as all such outward attestation was withheld,

Job concluded that the righteousness of God could not be discovered in the outer world as ruled by God; this world was a moral chaos: hence from the God of such a world, the God of outer Providence, the God of circumstance, he appealed to the God of faith, though to this appeal he looked for an answer not in this world, but in the next (xix. 25-27). In this momentous passage (xix.) we have the first approach in Jewish literature to the idea of a blessed life after death. And yet the writer has not grasped the idea of a blessed immortality; for had he risen to this height, he would have solved all the difficulties of the problem, by making his argument lead up to the doctrine of a future life. Clearly in the fifth century this doctrine had not yet won acceptance even amongst the religious thinkers of Israel.

And yet the main views and conclusions of Job point in this direction. The emphasis laid on man's individual worth, with his consequent claims upon a righteous God, and the denial that these claims meet with any satisfaction at the hands of the God of the wrongful present, point to the conclusion that at some future time all these wrongs will be righted. A momentary anticipation of this view appears in xiv. 1-15. May not man revive as the tree that has been cut down? May not Sheol be only a temporary place of sojourn, where man is sheltered from the wrongs of the present life, till God, who had once communion with him, summons him back to its renewal? In chapter xix. 25-27 this impassioned desire returns and rises into a real, though momentary, conviction.

I know that my Avenger liveth,
 And that at the last He will appear above (my) grave:
 And after my skin has been destroyed,
 Without my body shall I see God:
 Whom I shall see for myself,
 And my eyes shall behold, and not another.

Here Job declares that God will appear for His vindication against the false charges of his friends, and the false representations of the orthodox law of retribution. He declares further that he shall himself witness this vindication, and enjoy the vision of God. But we cannot infer that this divine experience would endure beyond the moment of Job's justification by God. It is not the blessed immortality of the departed soul that is referred to here, but its entrance into and enjoyment of the higher life, however momentary its duration. The possibility of the continuance, much less of the unendingness, of this higher life does not seem to have dawned on Job, though it lay in the line of his reasonings. If it had, it could not have been ignored throughout the rest of the book. Nevertheless, the importance of the spiritual advance here made cannot be exaggerated. In order to appreciate this advance, we have only to compare the new outlook into the future which it provides with the absolutely hopeless view that was then accepted on all hands; for the Book of Job reflects all the darkness of the popular doctrine (chaps. iii., viii., xxv.), and at the same time exhibits the actual steps whereby the human spirit rose to the apprehension that man's soul was capable of a divine life beyond the grave.

Two points here call for emphasis. The first is that this new view of the next world springs from a spiritual root, and owes nothing to the animistic conceptions of the soul that were then current.

The second is no less weighty. We have here a new doctrine of the soul, which teaches that the soul is not shorn of all its powers by death, even of existence (as is implied in Ps. lxxxviii. and other writings voicing the beliefs of past teachers), but that it is still capable of communion with God and of its highest spiritual activities, though without the body.

Though the Book of Job does not teach categorically the idea of a future life, it undoubtedly suggests it. That the idea was in the air is clear from xiv. 13-15, xix. 25-27; but even if these passages were absent, it would still be true, for throughout the rest of the book the antinomies of the present are presented in so strong a light that the thinkers of Israel who assimilated its contents were forced henceforth to take up a definite attitude to the new and higher theology. Some made the venture of faith, and so reached forward to the doctrine of a future life; others, like the writer of Ecclesiastes, declining the challenge of the Spirit, made the "great refusal," and fell back on materialism and unbelief. We have here arrived at the parting of the ways. From Job we should naturally pass to the consideration of Psalms xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii., in the latter two of which, at all events, clear conviction of a blessed immortality is expressed. Time will not suffer me to do more than call attention to the expression of the writer's hope in Psalm lxxiii., where he declares that the highest blessedness of the righteous is unbroken communion with God; what heaven or earth has in store for him matters not. In comparison with God, all the universe is nothing: this life ended, God is the portion of the souls of the righteous for evermore (lxxiii. 23-26).¹

We have now done with the question of individual immortality in the Old Testament, but it will be observed that, so far, we have taken no account of the doctrine of the resurrection. Without some notice of this doctrine our treatment of this subject would be wholly inadequate. You will remember that at the outset we called attention to the two hopes cherished by Israel—the hope of the individual, with which we have dealt at length, and the hope of the nation, which developed ultimately into

¹ See Duhm's Commentary *in loc.* Some recent critics refuse to acknowledge the references to a future life in these Psalms.

the expectation of the Messianic Kingdom. In this Kingdom, as originally conceived, only the righteous who lived at the time of its advent, and none others, should share. For several centuries these two hopes pursued, side by side, their own lines of development, and it was not till the close of the fourth century B.C., or the beginning of the third, that they were seen to be complementary sides of one and the same religious truth, a truth that subsumes and does justice to the essential claims of both. Thus when the doctrine of the blessed immortality of the faithful is combined with that of the coming Messianic Kingdom, the separate eschatologies of the individual and of the nation issued in their synthesis. Not only should the surviving righteous participate in the Messianic Kingdom, but the righteous dead of Israel should rise to share therein. Thus the righteous individual and the righteous nation should be blessed together, or rather, the righteous individual should ultimately be recompensed—not with a solitary immortality in heaven or elsewhere, but with a blessed resurrection life, together with his brethren, in the coming Messianic Kingdom. “Thy dead men (Israel) shall arise and the inhabitants of the dust shall awake and shout for joy; for a dew of lights is thy dew, and the earth shall produce the shades” (Isa. xxvi. 19).

Thus the resurrection, stripped of its accidents and considered in its essence, marks the entrance of the individual after death into the divine life of the community; in other words, the synthesis of the individual and the common good. The faithful in Palestine looked forward to a blessed future only as members of the holy people, as citizens of the righteous kingdom that should embrace their brethren. And herein, as throughout this evolution of religion, we can trace the finger of God, for it was no accident that His servants were unable to anticipate any future blessedness, save such as they shared in common with their brethren.

The self-centredness, nay the selfishness, that marked the Greek doctrine of immortality is conspicuous by its absence in the religious forecasts of the faithful in Israel. In true religion unlimited individualism is an impossibility. The individual can only attain to his highest in the life of the community, alike here and hereafter.

To conclude. It was only through a strenuous life of faith that Israel won its belief in a blessed immortality. And what was won through religious experience cannot be preserved otherwise than by religious experience. Into this full inheritance of the faithful the individual cannot enter by tradition or metaphysical reasonings. Only through personal communion with the Fount of Life is man enabled to rise into the eternal life. In such communions his doubtings vanish, and his assurance of a share in a blessed hereafter grows steadily deeper with the growth of his life in God.

R. H. CHARLES.

WENDT ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

WENDT's work on the Teaching of Jesus is well known to English readers, at least so far as that portion of it is concerned which deals with the substance of the Saviour's doctrine. But this, the part of the work which has been translated into English, is only the second of the two volumes of which the original consists. Of the first volume, which contains a critical examination of the Gospel records, Dr. Stalker has given an account in the *EXPOSITOR* of June 1896. In the portion of this volume dealing with the Fourth Gospel, Wendt maintained that in this Gospel, particularly in the speeches of Jesus, there were traces of older written records which had been worked up by the Evangelist. Further study of the subject has convinced him of the truth of this hypothesis; and in a book recently translated into English, he has sought to verify it by a more detailed examination of the Gospel than was possible within the limits of his former work. We propose to give a brief criticism of the argument now brought forward by Wendt in proof of the composite character of the Fourth Gospel.

The traces of the employment of a written Source which Wendt believes he can detect are of two kinds. First, there are differences noticeable between the point of view of the Evangelist and the recorded speeches of Jesus. And secondly, there is, in many cases, a distinct inconsistency between the speeches of Jesus and their historical setting. In both cases Wendt maintains that his hypothesis gives the best explanation of the facts in question, which are, he believes, inexplicable on the theory either that the Gospel as a whole is the work of an Apostle, or that it is a free composition of later date.

First, as to points of difference between the Evangelist and the speeches of Jesus. The most important is the

place assigned by the Evangelist to the miracles. They are to him the chief witness to the Messiahship of Jesus, the "signs"—thus he designates them—whereby the claims of Jesus are attested. He says at the end of his Gospel that the "signs" which he has written in his book are written that his readers might believe that Jesus is the Son of God (xx. 30 sq.); and throughout the book there are frequent references to the part they play in inducing belief in the man who wrought them (ii. 11, 23, iv. 45, 53 sq., vi. 2, 14, xi. 45, xii. 11, 18). The important point with regard to these "signs" is, according to Wendt, their supernatural character. It is in virtue of this that they witness on behalf of Jesus. Many of them are works of love, but it is not as such, but as proofs of the miraculous power of the worker that, according to the Evangelist, they testify to Him. Many again have an allegorical character, setting forth in the language of fact spiritual truths presented by Jesus in His teaching. Thus, for instance, the miraculous opening of the eyes of the blind man (ix. 1 sqq.) is symbolical of the enlightenment of the spiritually blind (ix. 39-41), the raising of Lazarus from the dead symbolical of the resurrection to eternal life to which Jesus refers in His conversation with Martha (xi. 23 sqq.). But still Wendt maintains that such miracles are called "signs," not with reference to the symbolical significance attached to them, but in virtue of their supernatural character. It is this importance assigned to the miracles as proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus that is, according to Wendt, one of the outstanding characteristics of the Evangelist.

But when we come to the speeches of Jesus Himself, we breathe quite a different atmosphere. He makes no appeal to those "signs," of which so much is made in the narrative. The witness to His Messiahship is, according to Himself, no external sign, but the life-giving character of His ministry. He is the bread of life: that is the answer

He gives to those who ask a sign, virtually refusing to give them such a sign as they desire. True, He appeals to His "works." But when we examine the passages in which He makes such appeal, we find that He means not specially His miracles, but His labours in the preaching of the Gospel, what He calls "the work that is given Him to do" (xvii. 4; cp. iv. 34). How are we to explain the difference between the Evangelist and the speeches he records on such a vital question? If John was the author, how did he appeal to "signs," while he cherished such a lively recollection of how Jesus refused to give any such witness to His claims? Again, if the Gospel is a free composition of later date, why did the Evangelist introduce no reference in the speeches of Jesus to those "signs" on which he laid so much stress in the historical portions? The only satisfactory explanation, Wendt thinks, is that the Evangelist was reproducing the speeches of Jesus from an older Source, in which, though he did not recognize it, a different standpoint was assumed from his own.

There is much plausibility in this explanation. Let us see if it will bear investigation. The first point to be considered is whether Wendt is right in his statement as to the importance attached by the Evangelist to the "signs." Does he regard a faith based upon these "signs" as the true type of belief? Certainly we meet with many instances in the narrative where reference is made to the belief in Jesus which followed the performance of certain miracles. But it does not follow that the Evangelist regarded such belief as satisfactory. He is merely stating a fact, which we can well credit, that the immediate effect of the miracles upon the people who beheld them was an enthusiasm for Jesus which, in a loose sense, may be described as belief. From various points in the narrative we gather that the Evangelist recognizes the inadequacy of such a ground of faith. Thus, for instance, he tells us (ii. 23, 24) that Jesus did not commit

Himself to those who believed in His name because of the miracles which He did. True, Wendt maintains that this remark is introduced by the Evangelist with the object of showing that Jesus was not deceived in the enthusiasm displayed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but knew from the beginning that they would prove unfaithful to Him. But even if we admit that, it contains a remarkable criticism of a type of faith which, according to Wendt, it is the purpose of the Evangelist to emphasize. Again, to take another instance, in the interview with Nathanael, which Wendt assigns to the Evangelist, the supernatural knowledge displayed by Jesus leads to the recognition of His Messiahship by the disciple. This is exactly the kind of faith that we are to believe the Evangelist approves of. Yet, strange to say, he makes Jesus in His reply recognize the inadequacy of it, and promise to give a still higher revelation of His glory. Wendt can find no place in his written Source for this word of Jesus; but he thinks it may be traced to some authentic oral tradition. But even then it is difficult to see why the Evangelist should have introduced it here. Did he not realize that it involved a criticism of the position which, according to Wendt, he was seeking throughout his narrative to establish? Or did he take the statement about the angels ascending and descending upon the Son of Man literally, and interpret the saying as a promise of still higher miraculous testimony? If so, it is strange that, with the fertility of invention with which Wendt credits him, he should have introduced no episodes in his narrative confirmatory of the promise here given. The man who, according to Wendt, made up the story about the healing of the blind man from the mere hint given in ix. 4 sq., and worked up the saying to Martha xi. 23, 25 sq. into the miracle of Lazarus's resurrection, would have had no hesitation in inventing a miracle on the lines of this saying of Jesus.

Again, in the account of the effect produced among the Samaritans by the preaching of Jesus, which Wendt assigns to the Evangelist, we have a contrast between the lower and the higher type of faith. Many of the Samaritans, we are told, believed in Him because of the witness of the woman to His supernatural knowledge (iv. 39). But after He had preached among them, we read that many more believed because of His own word, and said to the woman, "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world" (iv. 41, 42). According to Wendt, this account of the preaching of Jesus in Samaria is a piece of pure invention on the part of the Evangelist, who misunderstood the words, "Lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest" (iv. 35), and, taking the prophetic present literally, concluded that Jesus must have reaped some immediate harvest, for the description of which he drew upon his imagination. He was perfectly free, then, to give what account he pleased of the work of conversion which followed. He might have introduced fresh miracles to explain the great success which attended the work of Jesus among the Samaritans, and, as we have seen, he is supposed not to have had any hesitation in inventing miracles to suit his purpose. Yet, strange to say, this Evangelist, who is alleged to have such a predilection for faith based on miracles, in a case where he has a perfectly free hand, represents a great work of conversion as depending not upon the performance of any miracle, but upon the preaching of the word. He makes the Samaritans recognize a higher type of faith than that which is based upon the supernatural knowledge of Jesus testified to by the woman. Their faith rests not upon any outward "sign," but upon the living word of the preacher. Surely a strange admission from a man who regards a belief based upon "signs" as the true type of faith!

The same chapter contains a further disparagement of this kind of faith, and again in a passage which Wendt would assign to the Evangelist. When asked by the nobleman to come and heal his son, Jesus replies, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe" (iv. 48). Wendt endeavours to prove that this saying is not directed against the tendency to base one's faith on miracles. He would put the emphasis on the word "see." What Jesus objects to is, not that men require miracles as the ground of their faith, but that they insist on seeing the miracles with their own eyes, instead of being satisfied with the evidence of others. But the syntax does not justify this interpretation. Had the emphasis been on the word ἴδητε, it would, as B. Weiss says, have come first, or would have been supplemented by some words such as τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. As the verse stands, the emphasis naturally falls on the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. What Jesus is speaking against is a faith which requires such miraculous manifestations for its foundation. The use of the plural in the form of address confirms this conclusion. In answer to the nobleman, Jesus says, "Except ye see signs and wonders," etc., referring to the attitude of the bystanders as well. Are we to understand, then, that they were waiting for the evidence of their own senses before they would believe? Why, just a few verses before, the Evangelist tells us that they *had* seen, having been at Jerusalem at the feast (v. 45). On Wendt's interpretation the plural in the answer to the nobleman is unintelligible in view of the statement of v. 45; but if we take the word of Jesus as a protest against the tendency to base one's faith upon miracles, the plural form of address suggests a reference to the former verse in which we have read of the prevalence of the form of faith here criticized.

These passages serve to prove that the Evangelist recognizes a higher type of faith than that which rests upon the miracles alone. Still we have his distinct statement

(xx. 31) that the signs he has recorded "are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name." In view of this statement, there is no denying that the Evangelist does attach a certain value to the witness of the miracles. They reveal the glory of the Word made flesh (i. 14). They are the features in the life of Jesus most calculated to arouse attention and draw men to Him. That men should survey them with indifference, and in spite of them refuse to believe in Jesus, the Evangelist regards as a proof of their hard-heartedness (xii. 37 sqq.). Is there anything remarkable in this attitude? If Jesus actually worked miracles, is it not exactly the position we should have expected a writer to take up? If He actually rose from the dead and appeared to the disciples, is it not natural that they should have laid emphasis on such a "sign," as a witness to the truth of His claims? If the Evangelist was to record the miracles at all, what more natural than that he should do so in the hope that they might inspire belief in Jesus? But, as we have seen, he has a higher conception of belief than that which is based upon the "signs" alone; and even when he says that he has recorded the "signs" that men might believe in Jesus, he points us forward to this higher type of faith in the words which follow, "and that believing ye might have life through His name." The miracles may be the beginning, but they are only the beginning. The true faith is that which rests, not upon the witness of the miracles, but on the experience of the life-giving power of the Saviour. The Evangelist may have written the "signs" that men may believe in Jesus, but he knows that men do truly believe only when they have life through His name, only when they can say of the "signs" as the Samaritans said to the woman, "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."

So far of the position of the Evangelist. We turn now to the speeches of Jesus, and consider whether the standpoint there is essentially different. The fact that Jesus, when asked by the people to give them a sign (vi. 30), refused to accede to their request, is taken by Wendt to indicate a different attitude upon this question from that assumed by the Evangelist. Does it really do so? Surely not. Because the Evangelist finds in the miracles "signs" witnessing to the glory of Jesus, does he therefore stand on the same plane as those who refuse to believe without a sign? There is an ambiguity in the word "sign," as applied to the miracles, that may lead to confusion. They may be called "signs" in the sense that they have merely an evidential value in relation to the revelation given in Christ, that they are outward vouchers for the truth of Jesus' claims to Messiahship. Or again, they may be regarded as "signs" in the sense that they are not merely outward guarantees of the truth of Jesus's claims, but an integral part of His work as Messiah, and as such bear witness to Him. It is in the former sense that the word is used when the people ask Jesus to give them a sign, and in this sense He consistently refused to comply with their request. But it is in the latter sense that the Evangelist regards the miracles as "signs," and his position must not be confounded with that of those who demand of Jesus some external sign to attest His claims. The fact, then, that Jesus resists this demand on the part of the people for a sign is no proof that the position taken up in the speech in question (vi. 32 sqq.) is opposed to that of the Evangelist, so strongly opposed that we cannot imagine him reproducing it from memory. For the Evangelist, too, although he sees in the miracles of Jesus "signs" witnessing to Him, is opposed to the spirit of those who will not believe except they see signs and wonders (iv. 48).

In spite of the fact that the Evangelist regarded the

miracles as "signs," there is no inconsistency, then, in his recording the speech in which Jesus refused to give a sign to the people. Nay, I think we may go farther, and say that, even if there were no reference at all in the speeches of Jesus to the miracles as bearing testimony to Him, it would be quite unnecessary to have recourse to a theory of two-fold authorship, assigning the speeches to a different Source from the narrative. We can well conceive Jesus making no appeal to the miracles. He will have men believe in Him because of the truth of which He is the bearer; and it is natural that, face to face with the people, He should strive rather to convince them of the truth of His doctrine, than appeal to anything else which may serve to confirm it. But with the Evangelist it is different. He looks at the life of Jesus from without. He records not only the speeches but the wonderful works of Jesus. Is it inconceivable that he should assign to them a significance which Jesus did not attribute to them, and which he was aware Jesus did not attribute to them? Must the biographer assume exactly the standpoint of his hero on peril of having his book dismembered by the critic? Is it not rather natural that a writer, narrating the life of Jesus, should seek to swell the volume of testimony by an appeal to these wonderful works, in which the claims of Jesus appeared to receive further justification, even though he was aware that Jesus Himself laid no stress upon them?

But does Jesus make no reference to the miracles in His speeches in the Fourth Gospel? That is a point upon which there may be difference of opinion. With the exception of vi. 26,—which Wendt believes to be an attempt on the part of the Evangelist to connect the speech of Jesus about the bread of life with the miracle of the feeding of the multitude, with which it had originally nothing to do,—there is no reference in the speeches of Jesus to the *σημεῖα*. But there is frequent appeal to

His works, and the question is, in what sense these "works" are to be understood. Let us first take Wendt's interpretation. In v. 36 Jesus appeals to the witness of His "works":—"But I have greater witness than that of John; for the works which the Father hath given Me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me." The "works" of which Jesus here speaks must be the same, Wendt thinks, as the "work" to which He refers in iv. 34, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work," and in xvii. 4, "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do." And from the context in both these passages we learn that the work referred to is the preaching of the Gospel (iv. 35-38; xvii. 6-8). This conclusion, that by His "works" Jesus means specially His preaching, is confirmed by the fact that in two passages in which He appeals to the witness of His "works," xiv. 10 sq. and xv. 24, these works are so closely associated with His words, that "works" and "words" may be regarded as almost synonymous. Thus, in answer to Philip, Jesus says, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of Myself: but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me; or else believe Me for the very works' sake" (xiv. 10 sq.). Words and works are not, Wendt thinks, here co-ordinated. Jesus is not referring to two different things, but to one and the same. The works of the latter part of v. 10 are the same as the words of the former. And so also in xv. 24, where Jesus says, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin," He is only repeating in stronger form the statement of v. 22, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had

not had sin." The conclusion that Wendt reaches, then, is that when Jesus thus refers to His "works," He is not thinking only or specially of His miracles, but of His Messianic work in general, and specially of His labours in the preaching of the Gospel.

We may admit that in v. 36 the "works" refer to Jesus' Messianic work as a whole, without special reference to the miracles, yet, if Jesus actually wrought miracles, including the miracles as well. But, with regard to the other passages, one cannot help feeling suspicious of the attempt to prove that the distinction between "words" and "works" is a distinction without a difference. If "words" and "works" are the same, how can Jesus say, "Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me: or else believe Me for the very works' sake"? Where does the alternative come in? Does not the supposition reduce the statement to the meaningless, "Believe My words, or else believe My words"? And, again, in xv. 22-24, if "words" and "works" are the same, there is no *crescendo* in the argument. The second verse is merely a repetition of the first. Wendt seeks to repel this objection by pointing out that there is an advance, inasmuch as in the second verse the idea of speaking is replaced by the more general idea of working, while at the same time the incomparable grandeur of the works is emphasized. But if "words" and "works" are practically the same, the substitution of the one term for the other can make little difference, so that virtually the whole climax of the passage lies in the phrase, "which none other man did." This is something, certainly; but it will hardly be disputed that the effectiveness of the passage is much enhanced if the "works" of the second verse really mean works and not words, if Jesus is here referring to something which, even if His words were without avail, might have been expected to make an impression

on the people. It is in this spirit that Jesus appeals to His works in x. 37 sq., "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in Me and I in Him." Wendt thinks he is justified in arguing from the passages already referred to to the present verse, and concluding that the term "works" must bear the meaning here which he would elsewhere assign to it. It were more reasonable to reverse the process, and to argue from the plain meaning of the word here to its meaning in those other passages. Jesus urges the people who will not believe His own testimony to accept that of His works. He speaks of belief in His works as a matter easier of attainment, a thing to be expected even of those who refuse to listen to His own testimony. Is it not plain that by these "works" Jesus must mean something different from His words?

The arguments of Wendt in support of the narrower meaning he would assign to the "works" in the speeches of Jesus do not, then, appear conclusive. When Jesus appeals to His "works" as bearing testimony to Him, which it is an additional proof of the hardheartedness of the people not to receive, we find in the reproach an analogy to the saying of the Evangelist that "though He had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on Him" (xii. 37). Not that we understand the "works" as referring merely to the miracles. The term is more general, and it is for this reason, no doubt, that Jesus uses it rather than the *σημεῖα* of the Evangelist. But if the "works" include more than the miracles, if they refer to the whole labours of Jesus in the course of His Messianic activity, they include the miracles as well (vii. 21, ix. 3 sq., x. 32). The appeal which Jesus makes to His "works" in the Fourth Gospel finds its parallel in His reply to the question of John in Matthew xi. 4 sq.

There Jesus refers to His miracles and works of healing. But not to them alone. He includes also the preaching of the gospel to the poor. In a word, His answer to John is an appeal to His Messianic works as a whole, inclusive of the miracles. Such also is the meaning of the appeal to His "works" in the Fourth Gospel.

So far as the question of the miracles is concerned, we do not, then, find such vital difference between the standpoint of the Evangelist and that of the speeches of Jesus as Wendt endeavours to prove. We turn now to another of the points of difference between the two to which Wendt draws attention. Certain sayings of Jesus, he points out, are interpreted by the Evangelist in a sense which there can be little hesitation in deciding to be incorrect. Thus the word of Jesus at the cleansing of the temple, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (ii. 19), is taken as prophetic of the resurrection *vv.* 21, 22). The saying, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (xii. 32) is applied to the crucifixion (*v.* 33, *cp.* xviii. 32). Other instances of a like misinterpretation are to be found in vii. 37-39 and xviii. 8 sq., *cp.* xvii. 12. All these instances indicate the same tendency. Sayings of profound spiritual import are interpreted literally. Words which are true only in an ideal sense, but have nothing to correspond to them in outward fact, are supposed to find their fulfilment in later events. They are thus converted into miraculous predictions, and as such the Evangelist evidently attaches to them great value (ii. 22). This misconception on the part of the Evangelist of the meaning of the words he records is best explained, Wendt maintains, on his theory that there are two hands at work, that of the original recorder of the sayings of Jesus and that of the Evangelist.

Certainly Wendt's theory gives a satisfactory explanation

enough of the cases under consideration; and were there valid grounds for assuming the existence of a written Source, they might serve to confirm them. But in themselves the passages referred to require no such elaborate theory to account for them. Wendt himself admits that, were there no other evidence of a difference between the point of view of the Evangelist and that of the speeches of Jesus, they might be explained on the ground that the interpretative comments are interpolations. But even this hypothesis is unnecessary. The Evangelist finds in certain later events remarkable fulfilments of words spoken by Jesus. He draws attention to the fact as he records the words in question. Is there anything extraordinary in the fact? When we find him regarding the words even of a Caiaphas as an unconscious prophecy (xi. 51), is it surprising to meet with something of the same kind with reference to the words of Jesus? But Wendt objects that the interpretation given by the Evangelist is offered not as the secondary, but as the primary meaning of the words in question. To which we reply that the evidence which leads us to conclude that the meaning assigned by the Evangelist is not the correct one proves also that the Evangelist could not have designed his interpretation to be regarded in other than a secondary sense. He must have been as well aware as any critic of the present day that the phrase ἐκ τῆς γῆς in xii. 32 proved that the interpretation he gave to the saying could not have been that originally intended by Jesus, and that the ἐγερῶ in ii. 19 did not exactly agree with the explanation he offered. The fact that he did not alter the words to suit the interpretation he suggested proves that he regarded that interpretation, not as an exhaustive explanation of the meaning of the saying, but as a passing remark on a notable coincidence.

So far of the first group of facts on which Wendt

founds. We turn now to the second,—a series of alleged inconsistencies between the speeches of Jesus and their historical setting. We shall confine ourselves to the instances which Wendt himself singles out as the most striking.

The speech (v. 17 sqq.) proceeds on the assumption that Jesus is accused of working on the Sabbath (v. 18). But in the historical introduction (vv. 1-16), we do not read of Jesus doing any work. All He does is to command the impotent man to rise, take up his bed, and walk. Yet in His speech He refers repeatedly to His working, comparing it to that of His Father (vv. 17, 19, 20-27). Wendt thinks that in the Source there must have stood the story of how Jesus, on the Sabbath, rendered some practical help to a sick man, and restored him to health. A later generation conceived Jesus' healing of the sick, not as a matter of such practical intervention as is described in Mark vii. 33 and viii. 23-25, but as the mere issuing of a command. It is in this more striking aspect that the cure is represented in John v., with the result that the speech of Jesus on the occasion is deprived of all its point.

The criticism here does not appear very serious. In the first place it is to be noted that the Jews who persecuted Jesus had not seen the miracle themselves, and when they heard from the man, who was carrying his bed on the Sabbath, that he was doing so at the command of the man who had healed him, they may well have conceived of the cure as a piece of such medical work as Wendt seems to think necessary to cause offence. If it be objected that this explanation does not account for the reference to His working in the speech of Jesus, we reply that such distinction as presented itself to the Pharisaic mind between a cure wrought by a mere command and one performed by the laying on of hands would not have appealed to Jesus. We cannot imagine Him defending

Himself against the charge of Sabbath desecration on the ground that He had done no work, but had merely commanded the impotent man to rise. To Jesus the question with regard to Sabbath observance was not, How much or how little is it lawful to do? but, Is it lawful to do good or to do evil? (Mark iii. 4). To maintain that He had done no actual work would have been to accept the standpoint of the Pharisees. But is it the case that even if the Jews had been present at the miracle, they would have taken no offence at it as a breach of the Sabbath? Wendt says that the mere utterance of a command and the resultant cure of the person afflicted could not have been regarded as an offence against the law of the Sabbath. One hesitates to assign any limits to casuistical refinement. According to Wünsche (*Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 150), even sympathy with the sick was forbidden. But what avails Wendt's statement as to what could not be, when we have the evidence of the Gospels as to what was? In Mark iii. 1-6 we have an account of a Sabbath cure similar to that of the present passage, the cure of the man with the withered hand. Jesus lays no hand upon him, does no work in the strict sense of the term, but simply commands the man to stretch forth his hand and he is healed. But the hostility of the Pharisees is roused, presumably on account of the breach of the Sabbath involved, and they forthwith resolve to destroy Him. How can Wendt maintain, in the face of such evidence, that a cure brought about by the mere utterance of a command could not, even on the strictest interpretation, be regarded as a breach of the Sabbath?

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

(To be continued.)

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

I.

It is one of the merits of early Christian theology that it lays frequent emphasis upon the claim of Jesus Christ to be the supreme Teacher of men. This claim is based partly upon the relation which He bears to the world as the Eternal Word, partly upon the recorded teaching of the Ministry. "There is one Teacher," Ignatius writes, "who spake and it was done. He who truly possesses the word of Jesus can learn even from His silence. We endure, in order that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only Teacher; how can we live apart from Him? Even the prophets were His disciples through the Spirit, and looked for Him as their Teacher."¹ "The utterances that fell from Him," Justin explains, "were brief and concise, for He was no sophist, but His word was the power of God."² "Who that has been rightly instructed and has become attached to the Word," asks an early Alexandrian writer, "does not seek to have a clear understanding of the lessons which were plainly taught by the Word to His disciples?"³ With Clement of Alexandria the thought of Christ the Teacher becomes an inspiration. "Our Tutor," he exclaims, "is the holy and divine Jesus, the Word who is the Guide of all humanity. The Christian life in which we are now receiving our education is an ordered succession of

¹ Ign. *Eph.* 15, *Magn.* 9.

² Just. *Apol.* i. 14.

³ *Ep. ad Diog.* 11.

reasonable actions, an unbroken fulfilment of the teaching of the Word. He is the Teacher who educates the riper scholar by mysteries, the ordinary believer by hopes of a better life, the hardened by corrective discipline operating upon the senses.”¹

In the present series of papers we shall take a narrower view of the teaching of Christ than that which forms the theme of Clement’s great work. The teaching of the Ministry was a particular manifestation of the didactic energy of the Word, a manifestation limited both in scope and in duration. But its very limitations may attract some who are not prepared to commit themselves to the guidance of the Christian mystic. The Gospels reveal our Lord as exercising the office of Teacher under the conditions of human life, and they place the teaching in relation with human history. It is with this tangible evidence of Christ’s power as a Teacher that the study of His didactic work will naturally begin.

1. In the Palestine of the first century there was no lack of religious teaching. The scribe was a familiar figure in Galilee as well as in Judea ; he was to be met everywhere, in the synagogue, in the market-place, in the houses of the rich. With him went a numerous following of attached scholars. The first business of the Rabbi was to “raise up many disciples,” and the first care of the good Jew to “make to himself a master.”² It is not without a bitter reminiscence of the religious condition of Palestine that St. James of Jerusalem counsels the members of the Christian communities to which he wrote, “Be not many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgement.”³ In Christ’s day, however, few appear to have questioned the sincerity or the competency of a Rabbi. Wherever he went he was treated with

¹ Clem. Al. *Paed.* i. 7. 55, 13. 102; *Strom.* vii. 2. 6.

² *Virge Aboth*, i. 1, 17.

³ James iii. 1.

respect ; in places of public resort he received the greetings of all who recognized him ; in the synagogue he sat on the front benches, and at banquets was among the most honoured guests.¹

As soon as a band of personal followers began to gather round the Lord, He was addressed as "Rabbi," not only by His disciples² but generally.³ The title seems not to have been restricted to scribes ;⁴ in popular use it denoted only that the person so accosted claimed to be a public teacher of religion. In this sense Christ accepted the designation.⁵ That He did so is the more significant, because He strictly forbade His disciples to assume it.⁶ In the Christian Society His position as "the Teacher" was to be unique. He did not aim, like the Scribes, at creating a school of teachers. The Apostolic Church, indeed, possessed an order of "teachers," which was of Divine appointment ;⁷ but the spirit of Christ's prohibition is to be heard in more than one passage in the Epistles.⁸ The saying : "One is your teacher, and ye all are brethren," was of permanent import in so far as it asserted the supremacy of the Master, and the substantial equality of all His disciples in their relation to Him.

2. That Jesus took rank among the Rabbis did not conceal but rather accentuated the difference which separated the Prophet of Nazareth from the other religious teachers of the time. Men could not but institute a comparison between the new Rabbi and the teachers to whom they had so long been accustomed. The latter were moulded after one pattern ; they had been produced by the same process, they followed the same methods and taught on the whole the same doctrines. Each of them had himself

¹ Matt. xxiii. 6 f. ² John i. 38 ; Mark ix. 5. ³ Mark v. 35 ; x. 17, 51.

⁴ It is given to the Baptist (John iii. 26).

⁵ Mark xiv. 14 ; John xiii. 13 f.

⁶ Matt. xxiii. 8 f.

⁷ 1 Cor. xii. 28, *ὄς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . τρίτον διδασκάλους,*

⁸ 1 Thess. iv. 9. 1 John ii. 27.

been the disciple of a Rabbi, "brought up at the feet" of one who had "received" from his predecessor. The teaching was traditional; if from time to time it received accretions, they were on the lines of earlier decisions, and differed from them only by entering into minuter details. In all these respects the contrast presented by the new Teacher was complete. The home life at Nazareth had supplied His only preparation for the teacher's office; if He had acquired the elements of learning from the master of the synagogue school, with the higher education imparted by the Scribes He had no acquaintance;¹ in the place of professional training He could produce nothing but the experience gained in an obscure village and varied only by an occasional visit to Jerusalem, and such knowledge as could be gathered from observation and from a study of the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets. Nor was His method of teaching less singular than His training for the teacher's office. The common people, no bad judges of distinctions which depend upon character and personality, recognized in it something which was wholly new. "They were greatly struck at His teaching," St. Mark forcibly observes, "for He taught them as one having authority, and not after the manner of the scribes."² This remark is placed by St. Matthew at the end of the Sermon on the Mount,³ but in St. Mark it holds what is doubtless its original place, coming immediately after the first Sabbath discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum. One address in the synagogue was enough to convince an untrained but devout audience that this was no Rabbi of the ordinary type. The distinguishing note of His teaching was "authority" (*ἐξουσία*), not so much unusual capacity as the consciousness of a Divine right to teach; not learning, but the force of truth. Here was a

¹ John vii. 16, *πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς*;

² Mark i. 22.

³ Matt. vii. 28.

Teacher who had no need to appeal to older authorities, but stood upon His own right. The discourse was no doubt based upon the usual lesson from the Law or the Prophets, but the interpretation rested simply on the testimony of the speaker. He seemed to speak that which He knew, and to bear witness of that which He had seen.¹ No great Rabbi was quoted in support of what He said; it carried conviction by the simple weight of an *αὐτὸς ἔφα*. Yet He who spake was a man of thirty, and it was the first time, at least in Capernaum, that he had used His privilege of addressing His brother Israelites. The authority which held the audience spell-bound was not the magic of a great reputation, but the irresistible force of a Divine message, delivered under the sense of a Divine mission. Nothing could have been more opposed to the traditionalism of the scribes, who did not venture a step beyond the beaten path, and even there leaned heavily upon the authority of their predecessors.

3. It was a "new teaching"² which was heard that Sabbath day in the synagogue of Capernaum, and its freshness was not limited to method. Our Lord's teaching was not indeed "original," in the sense of being the outcome of human genius. He distinctly disclaimed originality of this kind: "My teaching," He said, "is not Mine, but His that sent Me."³ Moreover, its novelty was not absolute but relative. It came as a surprise to those whose circle of religious ideas had from childhood been filled by the jargon of the scribes, and the party cries of contemporary Judaism. Jesus was not a disciple of Hillel or of Sham-mai; He was neither Pharisee nor Sadducee nor Essene; His sympathies were not with Nationalists, Herodians, or Hellenists. The one topic which seemed to possess His mind and overflowed into His teaching was the Kingdom of

¹ John iii. 11.

² Mark i. 27, *τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ.*

³ John vii. 16.

God. Yet in this there was nothing essentially new ; it was in its central thought as old as the Law and the Prophets ; it had kindled the fire of devotion which burns in many of the Psalms. The Lord did not come to revolutionize the faith of Israel, as some soon began to suspect ; His antagonism to the teaching of the scribes and Pharisees was not due to any secret design against the national religion. "Think not," He explained, "that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets ; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."¹ His teaching had its roots in the teaching of the Old Testament ; it merely brought the latter to its legitimate and appointed end. He was in the direct line of succession from Moses and Elijah ; in Him they found their consummation, the goal to which they had been half unconsciously reaching forth, the Teacher whose voice revived and perfected their fragmentary expositions of truth.² It was His mission to give effect to ideals which had long floated before the imagination of the Covenant people. Thus the teaching of the great Scribe of the Kingdom of Heaven was old even while it was new,³ carrying the old further, but never breaking from it ; fulfilling and not destroying it, but rather bearing it on to its completion and accomplishment.⁴

4. The Kingdom of God or of Heaven—the terms are practically synonymous⁵—covers more adequately than any other single phrase the whole field of our Lord's teaching. His Gospel was "the Gospel of the Kingdom" ;⁶ it brought the good news that the reign of God on earth was about to begin. The conception of the Divine sovereignty lay at the root of the theocratic constitution of Israel ; it inspired the

¹ Matt. v. 17.

² Cf. Matt. xvii. 3-5 ; Heb. i. 1 f.

³ Cf. Matt. xiii. 52.

⁴ Cf. (but in reference to another sphere of Christ's activity) Heb. i. 3 *φέρων τε τὰ πάντα*, with Westcott's note *ad loc.*

⁵ See Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, i. p. 75 ff.

⁶ Matt. iii. 2.

Messianic hope; it colours the splendid visions of the Prophets. Yet both in the announcement of the immediate approach of the Divine Kingdom, and the interpretation which was given to the Kingdom, Jesus struck a note which had not been sounded before. According to St. Matthew, indeed, the Baptist had already proclaimed that the Kingdom was at hand; but St. Mark attributes the words to our Lord,¹ and neither St. Mark nor St. Luke recognizes an earlier use of them by the Forerunner. Certainly it was in Christ's teaching that the idea took shape and became a permanent factor in religious thought. As for the interpretation of the Kingdom, it is no exaggeration to say that this forms the staple of the instructions which our Lord gave to His Galilean hearers. It was here that He departed most widely from prevalent beliefs, and may indeed have seemed to many to depart from the teaching of the Prophets. The Prophets had drawn a glowing picture of the glories of the Messianic Kingdom, and in the pre-Christian apocalyptic writings a vast eschatology had grown up around the earlier hope. But in our Lord's presentation of the Kingdom eschatology falls into the background, while even the prophetic picture loses much of its colouring. The parables may be taken to exhibit the sovereignty of God in the light in which Christ meant it to appear before the people. They compare it to the sowing, growth, and harvesting of the crops; to the labours of the merchant, the fisherman, the housewife;² to the relations of the master of a great house with the members of his household;³ to a marriage feast and incidents connected with it.⁴ These homely illustrations bring the Kingdom into the heart of ordinary life, not only by appealing to common experience, but by representing it as a force working within men, and

¹ Mark i. 15. So also does St. Matthew a little further on (iv. 17).

² Matt. xiii. 1 ff., Mark iv. 1 ff.

³ Matt. xxv. 14 ff., Luke xix. 11 f.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 2 ff., xxv. 1 ff.; Mark ii. 19.

not merely controlling them from without. The same conception is to be noticed in sayings of our Lord which are not cast in a parabolic form. The Kingdom of God belongs to the poor in spirit, to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake;¹ the position which men will hold in it depends on their moral character;² the rich and great of this world enter it with difficulty;³ it comes not "with observation," so that men can say of it "Lo here" or "Lo there," but is to be sought around us or within;⁴ it cannot be entered, it cannot be seen, except by those who have been born into a new order and possess spiritual faculties.⁵ The Kingdom of God is coupled with the righteousness of God;⁶ it is the great moral and spiritual lever which is designed to lift men's lives up to the Divine standards of goodness and truth.

If this teaching was novel, it must have been to many disappointing in the extreme. Notwithstanding the popular form in which it was expressed, there was nothing in it which pandered to the popular taste. It took no account of the national expectations of restored independence and an imperial mission. It offered no worldly advantages; it discouraged the common passions of men; it limited itself strictly to the ethical and spiritual. Yet the preaching of the Kingdom, as Christ preached it, fascinated thousands of the common people. There was in it that which touched the springs of human life; those who heard it knew themselves to be face to face with ultimate realities. And there was in the Teacher that which corresponded with the teaching; no suspicion of insincerity, no hardness of professional formalism, no flourish of ambitious rhetoric, no self-seeking or display spoiled its general effect. Every word rang true and went home. Morality as taught by Christ was neither dull commonplace nor arid philosophy, but a matter of vital interest; the spiritual order, as He revealed it, was seen to

¹ Matt. v. 3, 10.² *Ibid.* 19.³ Mark x. 23 f.⁴ Luke xvii. 20 f.⁵ John iii. 3, 5.⁶ Matt. vi. 33.

environ the life of man; the powers of the world to come were upon His hearers,¹ and they seemed to be standing in the presence of God. No wonder that "the people all hung upon Him, listening."² But the enthusiasm evoked by His teaching was not to be limited to a single generation. The teaching asserted principles of universal application, and it clothed them in the plain strong language which is the best vehicle of religious truth. The Lord knew that in addressing the peasants of Galilee He was speaking to the world. This Gospel of the Kingdom must be preached to all nations, and with it would be spread the knowledge of even the smallest incidents connected with His ministry.³ History has more than verified His prediction; written Gospels stand behind the preached Gospel and enshrine in immortal pages the sayings of Jesus Christ. Teaching such as His could not die; its permanence was guaranteed not only by its Divine origin, but by its correspondence with the deepest needs of men, and its clear unfaltering statement of those eternal truths to which the human conscience pays homage even when the will does not render a prompt obedience.

5. There is another element in our Lord's teaching which is specially prominent in the Fourth Gospel, though it is not altogether overlooked by the Synoptists. Jesus not only proclaimed the Gospel of the Kingdom, but He proclaimed Himself as standing in a unique relation both to God and to men. In the Synoptic teaching, i.e. the teaching in Galilee, this relation is usually kept in the background of the thought; He is content to speak of Himself as the "Son of man";⁴ but occasionally He permits Himself to be called "the Son of God,"⁵ and even calls God His Father in a sense which implies a peculiar sonship.⁶ In the Johannine teaching, especially in that part of it which

¹ Cf. what is said (though in another connexion) in Matt. xii. 28, ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

² Luke xix. 48.

³ Matt. xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13.

⁴ E.g. Matt. xi. 19.

⁵ E.g. Mark v. 7; Matt. xiv. 33, xvi. 16.

⁶ Matt. xi. 25 ff., xii. 50, xv. 13.

belongs to Jerusalem,¹ His relation to the Father is handled with much fulness, and on many occasions both public and private. We need not stop here to inquire into the import of this Christology; it is enough to note that it has a place in all the records of Christ's teaching, although not the same place. In Galilee His first purpose was to awaken the consciences of the multitudes who were indifferent to the realities of the spiritual Kingdom, and the message rather than the person of the Messenger occupied His thoughts and filled His instructions. But in Jerusalem, among the learned, and on the historic ground of the Temple courts, He did not shrink from answering the questions which were rising in men's minds about Himself. There is no cause for suspecting the genuineness of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel which deal with this subject; such a passage as Matthew xi. 25-30 shows that the elements of the Johannine Christology were present in the mind of our Lord during His ministry in Galilee, although the conditions which surrounded Him there did not call for frequent or detailed reference to it. Sooner or later the self-revelation could not but have been made. The Teacher of the Church is inseparable from His teaching; the Gospel of the Kingdom is also "the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God,"² and no presentation of it is complete which leaves out of sight His Person and relation to the Father. A Christianity without a Christology is no true description of the Gospel as Christ taught it at Jerusalem or even at Capernaum.

6. Both in Jerusalem and in Galilee our Lord's teaching was partly delivered in public, partly addressed in private to His disciples. The distinction is not unimportant, for the private teaching differed from the public both in aim and methods.

¹ See cc. v., viii., x., xiv.-xvii.

² Mark i. 1. *εὐαγγέλιον* if not part of the original title of St. Mark at least sums up the impression derived from the reading of the "earliest Gospel."

The Lord began with the people at large, addressing Himself to the pious who attended the synagogues, and the mixed crowds who gathered round Him on the shore of the lake or by the road-side. His message was to all, and He devoted His first and, to the end, His chief attention to the outside crowd. There is in His public teaching no trace of contempt for the *'am ha'aretz*,¹ no lofty superciliousness; their ignorance awakened no impatience in Him, but only an infinite compassion which impelled Him to give them of His best.² But from the first an inner circle of disciples claimed His special attention. St. John enables us to see how this "little flock" had its beginnings. One or two of the disciples of the Baptist found themselves drawn to the new Teacher, followed Him to His lodging, spent the night in His company, and in the end resolved to share His life. The number might have become inconveniently large, had not Jesus Himself reduced it to twelve.³ These select disciples received special instructions, chiefly when the hours of public instruction were over. He explained to them the teaching which had been given in parables to "those outside";⁴ He entrusted to them "the secret of the Kingdom of God."⁵ Yet they were warned at the time that they received this additional teaching in trust for the whole Church; it was imparted to them only that they might be prepared, when the right moment came, to deliver it to the world. It was not an esoteric teaching in the strictest sense, not the heritage of a privileged order, but the common property of the Christian Society, spoken for the moment into the ear, but one day to be proclaimed upon the housetops.⁶ The line which the Master drew between His two methods of teaching was temporary and not permanent, due to circumstances and not to any essential difference.

¹ Contrast John vii. 49, and Hillel's caustic saying in *Aboth* ii. 6.

² Matt. ix. 36 f.

³ Mark iii. 13 f.

⁴ Mark iv. 10 f., 34.

⁵ *Ibid.* 11.

⁶ Matt. x. 27.

7. What effect Christ's teaching has had upon the world we know. But it is natural to ask how far it impressed those who were brought directly under its influence. It is strange to find but one reference in the Acts to Christian communities in Galilee;¹ it would seem as if little permanent impression had been produced, and we know from our Lord's own words that the chief lake-side towns in which He preached were unmoved.² But the crowds which attended His preaching in Galilee were not all Galileans; Judæa, Idumæa, Peræa, and even Phœnicia were represented, whilst the great roads which crossed Galilee in all directions carried His fame through Syria.³ It is impossible to determine how far the early spread of the Palestinian Church was due to these influences, to say nothing of effects produced upon individual lives, or of the priceless treasure which the Church has inherited in the records of the Galilean ministry.

Nor is it less difficult to arrive at a clear estimate of the effects of Christ's teaching of the Twelve. The results, so far as they can be discovered by a casual reading of the evidence, seem to be sadly disproportionate to the time and labour bestowed. The Apostles do not upon the whole appear to have been men remarkable either for beauty or strength of character, or for judgment, insight, or breadth of view. If we put out of sight the Apocryphal Acts, only two out of the Twelve have left any appreciable mark upon Christendom. But the influence exerted by a college of trained men cannot be estimated simply by the recorded work of the individuals who composed it. The Apostolic body formed, as the Acts of the Apostles show, a nucleus which gave coherence and order to the nascent Church; in it the Church found a centre of unity; from it she received initiation and guidance in new movements, and

¹ Acts ix. 31.

² Matt. xi. 20 ff.

³ Matt. iv. 24; Mark iii. 7 f.

a standard of teaching which was never wholly lost.¹ As soon as the Palestinian Church, the mother of a future Christendom, was able to stand alone, the Apostles were scattered, and their corporate action ceased. But even if St. Peter had not laboured both in East and West, or St. John at Ephesus, the years of patient training which the Apostles received in Galilee would not have been fruitless. The Great Teacher had in this way safeguarded the infancy of the Church, and created a deposit of doctrine and a basis of order which are with us to this day.

8. If we may accept the witness of the Fourth Gospel, the Master did not regard His work of teaching as ended by His death. "I have yet many things to say unto you," He declared on the night before the Passion, "but ye cannot bear them now; howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth, for He shall not speak from Himself. . . . These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs; the hour cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but shall tell you plainly of the Father."² The fulfilment of the last words must be sought in the dispensation of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Jesus³ and of Christ,⁴ sent in the Master's name⁵ to speak as His Vicar to the Churches.⁶ The teaching of the Spirit, both in the Apostolic Epistles and in the experience of Christendom, is thus a true continuation of the teaching of Christ. The Master, who of old taught in proverbs, teaches now with plainness of speech. To His progressive enlightenment of the Christian consciousness we look with confidence for an answer to the questions which are pressed upon us by the growth of knowledge and the complications of modern life. The Spirit of Christ will bring to the remembrance of

¹ Acts ii. 42, v. 12 ff., vi. 2; cf. Eph. ii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 2; Apoc. xxi. 14.

² John xvi. 12 f., 25.

³ Acts xvi. 7.

⁴ Rom. viii. 9.

⁵ John xiv. 26.

⁶ Apoc. ii. 7; cf. Tert. *de praescr.* 13 creditur . . . Iesum Christum . . . misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti.

the Church all that Christ said ;¹ He will take of Christ's, and declare it unto her,² and in the teaching of Christ, interpreted by the Spirit, will be found in due time the solution of problems which may for the moment threaten the foundations of our faith.

H. B. SWETE.

A MODERN SEANCE.

“ Mutato nomine de te fabula.”

“ COME in ! ” said our host, the Professor, opening the door in reply to a gentle knock ; and in stepped a small woman, dressed quietly and without jewels, yet so that not poverty but choice appeared to be responsible for the simplicity of her attire.

She glided in, just as if she knew the place, and sat down without word or greeting.

I now perceived that she had a perfectly regular face, colourless rather than pallid, and of the Roman rather than the Greek type. I was struck by something in her manner which resembled but was not impassiveness. It was not that she had taken her place without any seeming consciousness that the large reception-room was quite full of people, nor was it that she apparently saw nothing—rather it was this, that she looked away from us very attentively at something, something which interested her extremely.

So this was the mighty medium, the greatest yet known to students of psychology, indisputably (so they assured me) the mistress of strange and occult powers, concerning whom, if I was to believe my friend, the only question among well informed and unprejudiced persons was, how far did these powers extend ?

Like one who wakens, she called herself back from her own thoughts, and turned her gaze upon my friend, who had remained since her entrance expectant, silent, watchful.

¹ John xiv. 26.

² John xvi. 14.

“ Shall we then begin ? ” said he, and she assented by the least possible gesture.

A few slight passes, *very* few and slight, were enough : the strange fire which had kindled in her eyes faded out again : with a little sigh she closed them and sank back gently into her chair.

“ Where are we now ? ” said the Professor ; and she murmured, “ We are in Sydney : it is a vast city, a city of palaces and parks : it is the new and beautiful metropolis of the world ; and this is the year of the Lord Four Thousand.”

“ Good heavens ! ” cried two or three of us ; but the Professor frowned slightly and proceeded :

“ Can you see any person who appears noteworthy among the people ? ”

“ Yes,” she said, with a distinct accession of interest in her voice. “ I see a pale, thin man of about forty years entering the portico of a vast and stately building over which a golden dome is gleaming : it is the greatest university in the world : students salute him with the deepest reverence, and follow him ; but so indeed does every one : he is a very great man.”

“ Can you hear his name spoken ? ” asked the Professor.

“ No,” she said, “ but I know it : his name is Smith,” whereat some of us irreverently smiled, and the Professor raised a warning hand.

“ Follow him if you please,” said he.

“ He leads the way into a magnificent and spacious hall, lined with marbles of various colours, against which splendid statues shine out in dazzling whiteness : it is crowded with an eager multitude ; he mounts the platform : he raises his hand and quietly begins to speak. The hall is built in obedience to acoustic laws unknown to us, for the whole vast audience-chamber is filled with his gentlest utterance—is filled, but does not resound. LISTEN ! ”

And I protest that we no longer heard her dreamy voice, but another, that of a man, a masterful, modulated, musical, distant voice, and here is what he said—or will say, I suppose, two thousand and ninety-eight years hence :

“Gentlemen, we resume our study of the ancient and extraordinary legends of the British Islands. I cited last week the significant fact that, not so long at all after the death of Napoleon—that centre of myths—his very existence was questioned by an acute and distinguished writer named Whateley, who is said to have been an archbishop, but is also described as a successful writer upon logic, two assertions apparently irreconcilable.

“We need not follow him into such depths of scepticism, but content ourselves with what is certain, namely, that around the person of this formidable warrior, not only have legends gathered, but myths have striven to make him a sort of embodiment and incarnation of the new European movement, of the Revolution. This tendency is audible, for instance, in the phrase too pertinaciously applied to him by Carlyle, who calls him the ‘armed soldier of democracy,’ although he not only crushed out French democracy during his life, but invented methods of election, and devices for enslaving prefects and other officers of the government which strangled French democracy, for a full century at least, in red tape. Of one such myth, the myth of the Peninsular war, I am about to exhibit to you the very curious genesis.

“But first I must devote the bulk of this lecture to an indispensable preliminary task, the task of showing you that the literature said to be of the Victorian age belongs in reality to various periods, and was spread over a very considerable space of time ; and further, that it has been more or less seriously tampered with.”

At this point we, sitting in the Professor’s room six weeks ago, distinctly heard a movement of the great audi-

ence in Sydney, a catching of people's breath, suppressed applause, and, in general, what the reporters call "sensation in the room." Without the least apparent emotion, the lecturer calmly went on.

"I am aware of the responsibility of thus treating a literature which is among the most treasured gifts to us of the past. But I am upheld by two considerations, that the soul of this literature will remain with us whatever be our theories of its origin; and again, that truth is more precious still than any theory, and will vindicate itself. I appeal, then, in the first place, and with absolute confidence, to the infallible test of language.

"Take for example the History attributed to Lord Macaulay, and remember that two different persons are known to have borne that name. One was a philanthropist, the friend and colleague of Wilberforce, keenly interested in the home life of the people. The other, reported to have been his son, was a statesman of imperial instincts; his genuine speeches blaze with the glory of England, which he extols above that of Greece. And now open the history. Chapter differs utterly from chapter in the subject-matter, the authorities drawn upon, the heroes magnified, and in that which concerns us most of all, in the vocabulary. Dozens and scores of words occur dozens and scores of times in one set of chapters, and not once in the other set. Statistics, the state of agriculture, of trade, of the currency, just and unjust judges, harsh administration, and beneficent laws, Jeffreys, Somers, Montagne and Newton. I repeat, gentlemen, that one Macaulay is known to have been a philanthropist. But you turn the page and all is changed. Now we have battle and siege, mine, ravelin, citadel and counter-scarp, charge and rout and orderly retreat, France, Holland, Austria and England, Sarsfield and Schomberg, Marlborough and Luxemburg, James, Lewis, William, and the Pope. I said, gentlemen, that the other Macaulay was a

somewhat jingo statesman. The subjects and the vocabularies—much more various than those of J and E—alternate in such blocks as if two carts had emptied into a promiscuous heap one load of brick and one of stone. In these heaps I recognize beyond hesitation the part which belongs to each of the men whose name the work bears. But with them are curiously entangled (like those half lines of ‘Q’ and ‘R’ and the others which astonish us in the Old Testament) fragments of other writers; for I have myself discovered in the narrative of the trial of the seven bishops, lines identical with lines in the fragmentary work of Makintosh. These it is likely that both appropriated from Halifax, who was an eye-witness of the event, and therefore, in my forthcoming work, I have marked them with the letter H. But there are passages which I boldly assert that neither of the Macaulays can ever have seen. Neither the abolitionist nor his son, himself the admiring friend, in youth, of the leading abolitionists, could ever have written that page in the first chapter which describes the abolition of slavery. With no allusion in all the history to the heroic struggle and daring legislation of his own time, its abolition, and to all appearance its final abolition is placed in the Tudor times! Thus he writes, if any one can believe it to be his writing:—‘Slavery, and the evils by which slavery is everywhere accompanied, were fast disappearing . . . The change was brought about neither by legislative regulation nor by physical force . . . Moral causes noiselessly effaced, first the distinction between Norman and Saxon, and then the distinction between free-man and slave.’ And this is all.

“Take Wordsworth. Consider the bewildering difference between the soaring Ode on Immortality and the abject Ecclesiastical Sonnets—observe the word *Ecclesiastical*, and say whether there is not profound significance in the tradition that there was another Wordsworth, a bishop and

writer of hymns. In Wordsworth's poems also there is distinct evidence of their having been retouched by a deliberately unfriendly hand. It is incredible that he defended his Fears for England on the ground that he felt for her 'as a lover or a child,' and yet in the same poem described the same fears as 'unfilial'—'unfilial . . . as a child.' It is incredible that he should in one poem describe the lark as 'Type of the wise who soar but never roam,' and also as the 'Pilgrim of the sky.' What is a pilgrim who never roams? Gentlemen, the greatness of his genius forbids us to believe that these, its waters, have not been befouled.

"Can anything be more evident than that the smooth, and polished style of Tennyson, and the disjected ruggedness of Browning, belong to different stages in the development of the English language? If it is objected that extreme difference of individual temperament must be allowed for, I assent: I do not even reply that the differences here are *too* extreme, nor yet that the readers of the same age would not have tolerated both. No; my answer goes deeper: my answer is that the difference is *not* individual; it shows itself even more distinctly in the prose attributed to that age, the smooth and polished style reappears in Ruskin, and the disjected ruggedness in Carlyle. Ruskin and Tennyson belong to one stage in the history of the language; Carlyle and Browning to another. What, again, of George Eliot and Meredith? And it may be added that the barbarous Teutonisms of Carlyle, and the slipshod Gallicisms of Disraeli's novels cannot possibly have been the offspring of the same literary influences; nor can the latter be the work of a statesman whose recorded speeches are in style manly, direct and poignant. There is another writer in this group, W. S. Landor, of whom we are asked to believe that he published excellent poetry a year before Keats was born, when Shelley was three years old and Byron ten; and also that he published excellent poetry forty-three years after

the death of Keats, forty-one after that of Shelley, and thirty-nine after that of Byron, and that he was for nine years a contemporary of Samuel Johnson, and for twenty-seven years of Mr. Swinburne. You will observe, gentlemen, that the effect of these improbabilities is cumulative: it is not one or two but all of them that you must accept along with the current story of the Victorian literature.

“And now, with minds released from the tyranny of authorities professedly almost contemporaneous, let us return, if only for a moment, to the theme which I announced at starting, to the so-called ‘History’ of the Peninsular war. The story as it stands is quite incredible. Napoleon’s treachery to the royal family of Spain, his inexplicable pause in the pursuit of Moore, his plunge into a European war while this sore was still open, his unnatural endurance of the unnatural conduct of his marshals, any two of whom could more than once have crushed Lord Wellesley by a whole-hearted co-operation, the superhuman daring with which that officer presumed upon their jealousies (so far as to drive Joseph from the capital while aware of being completely over-matched), the supernatural craft with which he always retreated at the very moment when their jealousy had yielded to stronger motives—it is not any of these which staggers our credulity, it is the aggregation of these, it is the beautiful harmony with which all these co-operate to produce the desired effect. Things do not happen thus.

“But the critic has done little who simply rejects the incredible. It is easy, too easy to do this, the true task is to secure the inner meaning. Grant that it is a legend, what greatness inspired it? Grant that it is a myth, to what spiritual reality does it give illusive form and body?

“In this case, it is a myth, and the meaning is so evident that no child of this age can possibly reject it when it is shown to him. But when I have stated it, when you have

recognized that inherent appositeness which is its internal evidence, I shall add some curious evidence of another kind.

“What then was, in very deed, the struggle, the real struggle of that wonderful period? How would it present itself to the next generation, to the children of a moderate but not extreme reaction, to the period when Philippe Égalité’s umbrella was the substitute for Napoleon’s eagles? Their point of view is embodied in these mythic narratives.

“They would regard the great struggle as being at first between the stagnant past, traditions whose vitality had exhaled, cruel laws, cruel penalties, a cruel social system, between these and the Revolution, which, for its part, overturned good and bad alike in its eagerness for a Millennium without a Church. For, in its feverish desire, it also became selfish and cruel; it also, like its adversary, forfeited all right to the final victory, which could not surely belong either to the Inquisition or to the Guillotine.

“France and Spain are, in this story, the embodiment of these tendencies—Spain which only asks to be undisturbed—France, which is ever the assailant, the invader, because the Revolution must annex and absorb; it can keep no faith with kings and established usages; all its promises to these are perfidies.

“But the captains of such a system, so the wise myth teaches, are in the nature of things unable to work together, jealous, insubordinate; and as Danton is betrayed by Robespierre, Robespierre by Tallien, so the Peninsular officers of France will not co-operate against the common foe. And why so? Because, perhaps to abstract reason, but certainly to the convictions of the age when this story was created, moral belief, faith and the Revolution are incompatible: faith works not Revolution but Reform. Yet it is not, nor could it even then have seemed to be, the dead Past and its traditions which can resist the deluge of

revolutionary hope and rage; nothing is more ideally certain than the overthrow of these, that is to say, the over-running, the submerging of Spain by France. Hence comes the intervention of a third force, representing the spirit of moderate and gentle advance, equally removed from Spain with its masses and France with its *Ça Ira*s, and the type of this is England with its constitution, with its successive reform bills.

“To me it seems evident that all this allegory is too rich in spiritual meaning to be also prosaic reality. But we are fortunately not left to supposition or inference: I have to offer you, in addition to the gross improbabilities of the history at which we have glanced, four pieces of downright evidence.

“The first is the elaborate and obtrusive nature of the allegory itself: the English at first rely largely upon the Spaniards, and they suffer for it bitterly, until their general exclaims, ‘I have fished in many troubled waters, but Spanish troubled waters I will never fish in again.’ This is simply a sermon upon the text that the greatest danger of moderate conservatism, in Church or State, is reliance upon blind reaction.

“The second is the preposterous names, more like those of Bunyan’s allegory than of real life, with which the success of moderation, rather than the whole war, is connected. No matter how the armies of England may succeed, the end is always a retreat, until they entrench themselves—where? Reaction equally with revolution is innovation, all tyranny is usurpation: behind both are the grand ancient immortal principles, which alone are to be preserved; and the victory of moderation becomes assured and certain when it entrenches in Torres Vedras—in the Ancient Hills! Thence she

‘issued forth anew
And ever great and greater grew,’

until one decisive triumph drove the French clean out of the country. And where was this victory won? At a place to which, if you can believe it, there had been given in advance the highly fitting name of Vittoria—assuredly by the same prophetic nomenclator who provided, for the interview where the same general planned with Blucher his crowning triumph, a farm-house with the title of La Belle Alliance. But what would be said of things like these, if we read them in the Book of Joshua?

“My third proof is the curious fact that, next to Victoria the finest victory said to have been won during the whole war, namely that of Salamanca, is really a transference into Spain of Frederick’s great victory of Rossbach, which it follows alike in the emergency, the blunder of the foe, the successful impromptu manœuvre and the result.¹ This is just the device to which a fabulist, in quest of military science, would naturally resort.

“My fourth and last argument is a startling one. Gentlemen, it has just been proved, and my forthcoming volume will contain the evidence, that the Marquis of Wellesley, the conqueror in this allegorical struggle, was in reality that Duke of Wellington who, a little later, became Prime Minister of England in the Conservative interest, and was answerable for the first Reform Bill. *This* was his real office; and it is no wonder that, such being his battles, the Prince Regent always claimed that he himself had charged in one of them.”

There was silence. Presently, muffled as if by distance, we heard clapping and the sound of a dispersing audience; and then, as by a common impulse, we all turned our eyes to the seat which the Medium had occupied. She was gone! No one had seen her go, yet her seat was vacant.

¹ “Frederick’s counterstroke at Rossbach, or the manœuvre, so very similar in design, execution and effect to the Prussian King’s, executed by Wellington at Salamanca.”—Hamley’s *Operations of War*, 4th ed. p. 411.

And although refreshments were offered, we all, I believe, departed almost at once, as I did, in a very silent mood.

My companion, as I went, was a gifted and fearless critic, the editor of an Encyclopædia which is commonly called "advanced," because, I suppose, it has receded from nearly every belief which nearly every one holds dear.

Neither of us spoke a word until we were half-way down Piccadilly, when he suddenly broke out :

"I will tell you what I think : that woman is an impostor and hypnotised us every one while we thought she was being hypnotised herself. As for the substance of what we heard there is nothing at all in that ; I myself could have done it twice as well if I had tried."

"I am sure you could," said I, quite heartily ; and yet for some reason my friend looked almost as sour as if I had disputed his assertion.

My own opinion was that we had been most unwarrantably duped. Our host was just the man to take such a liberty with the scientific methods of criticism. And none of the coincidences which had been relied upon appeared to me to be so significant as this, that the evening papers were dated April 1.

G. A. DERRY AND RAPHOE.

NOTES FROM THE PAPHYRI.

II

SINCE my last paper was written (EXPOSITOR VI. iii. 271 sqq.), the stream of papyrus publications has been continually swelling, and grammatical and lexical matter to illustrate the Greek Bible has grown apace. I have collected the grammatical points in two articles in the *Classical Review* (February and December, 1901), and hope soon to finish the series. Meanwhile I propose to put together the lexical notes which have been accumulating *en passant*.

Most of them come from texts recently published, especially from that fertile collection of Ptolemaic documents, the *Tebtunis Papyri*, edited by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt and Mr. Smyly. The romantic history of this latest find must be read in the editors' preface—the explorers' disgust when a promising tomb was found to contain only mummified crocodiles, and their workman's vindictive slash with his spade at one of the beasts, who thereupon disclosed in his wrappings the first instalment of an almost unequalled collection of old documents. Hardly any of the papyri in this large volume are later than the early part of the first century B.C. They include official documents, private correspondence, petitions, accounts, and a series of lengthy documents relating to a land survey. To speak of the editors' work is by this time superfluous: we have ceased to be surprised at anything Drs. Grenfell and Hunt may do. We should think them marvels of industry and skill if they contented themselves with directing the diggers, unrolling the mummies, mounting the brittle sheets and deciphering their contents. They give us commentary and translation, with notes on the widest range of subjects, and a classified series of word-indexes which add indefinitely to the value of their collection. With such monuments of an *industria plusquam Germanica* to our national credit, we need not be ashamed when we speak with our rivals in the gate.

Before beginning the lexical notes, let me jot down some miscellanea.¹ The petition numbered 42 in Tb.P. (ii/) has

¹ The following abbreviations will be used:

(a) Papyri. B.U.=Berlin *Urkunde*. B.M.=*British Museum Papyri*, ed. Kenyon. T.P.=*Turin Papyri* (ed. Peyron, 1826). L.P.=*Leyden Papyri* (ed. Leemans, 1843 and 1885). C.P.R.=*Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, ed. Wessely. G.=*Greek Papyri*, ed. Grenfell, 1895. G.H.=*Gr. Pap.* 2nd series, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1897. By the same editors, with or without collaborators:—R.L.=*Revenue Law of Ptolemy Philadelphus*; O.P.=*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. F.P.=*Fayûm Papyri*; A.P.=*Amherst Papyri*; Tb.P.=*Tebtunis Papyri*.

(b) Inscriptions. I.M.A.=*Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei*, 3 vols., ed. de

some traits in common with the parable of the Unjust Steward: we may quote the editors' summary instead of the obscure original. "A priest had leased 6 *arourae* of domain land from the Crown. He sub-let to Thracidas for 36 *artabae* of wheat per annum; but the official who drew up contracts had conspired with Thracidas to write 30, on the ground that the petitioner had already received 6 as a pledge." In the next document (118 B.C.) the editors observe that there is "one of the few references to Jews in the Tebtunis Papyri." The reference consists in the name Simon, but is it so clear that he was a Jew? There are half-a-dozen Greek Simons commemorated in Smith's *Dictionary of Classical Biography*. The Jews figure more clearly in Tb.P. 86 (ii/), where there is a *προσευχή Ἰουδαίων* with a *Διὸς παράδεισος* near. Note also the Jew Teuphilus (=Theophilus) in F.P. 123 (100 A.D.).

In illustration of Matthew vi. 17 may be quoted O.P. 294 (22 A.D.), where a certain Serapion, writing to his brother from Alexandria, urgently begs for news as to a report that his house has been searched in his absence, declaring that he was not even anointing himself till he heard. The edd. compare another (unpublished) letter in which the writer says that as a token of sympathy he had not washed for a month. We see what *ἀφανίζουσιν τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν* means!

It may be worth while to quote a late Christian amulet, B.U. 954 (6/), in which the writer prays to "God and the holy Serenus" to deliver him from *τὸν δαίμονα προβασκανίας*. For this purpose he uses the Lord's Prayer, with the ending *ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πονηρίας*. Those who support the A.V.

Gaertringen and Paton. Letr.=*Recueil des inscr. lat. et grecques de l'Égypte*, ed. Letronne, 1842.

(c) iii/, ii/, i/, =3rd, 2nd, 1st cent. B.C.; 1/, 2/, 3/, etc., =1st etc. cent. A.D. Deissm.=Deissmann's *Bible Studies* (tr. Grieve). WM=Winer-Moulton's *N.T. Grammar*. HR Hatch and Redpath's *LXX Concordance*. Grimm-Thayer=*N.T. Lexicon*. LS=Liddell and Scott.

of this clause may lay what weight they please upon this evidence.

Last in this very miscellaneous collection I may place some passages bearing on the use of the first person plural in letters. One of the various lions in the path which alarm the bold Van Manen, who might otherwise—who knows?—have accepted the authenticity of *Philemon*, is the “surprising” mixture of singular and plural both in the persons speaking and in the persons addressed. It is a little difficult to find the “surprising mixture” in *Philemon*, but the vagaries of the Leyden professor need not detain us here.¹ More important scholars have found some difficulty in deciding the relations between *ἡμεῖς* and *ἐγώ* in other Pauline letters—e.g. 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, 6, 2 Cor. x. and xiii. The study of papyrus letters will show that singular and plural alternated in the same document with apparently no distinction of meaning. Thus Tb.P. 55 and 58, A.P. 37. (all ii/), A.P. 144 (5/), F.P. 117? (2/) etc.

Let us proceed then to our *λεξικάριον*, if the word may be allowed.

ἄδολος.—Deissm. 256 cites for this only an inscr. of 150 A.D. The formula *πυρὸν νέον καθαρὸν ἄδολον* occurs in Tb.P. 105 (103 B.C.), and often elsewhere. Is not *ἄδολον γάλα*, “pure milk,”—as in view of the common use of the adjective in popular language it is most naturally translated—to be regarded as one compound phrase, qualified by the *λογικόν*, which tells us that the figurative sense is to be taken? (Hort’s note seems to imply his acceptance of this use of *ἄδολος*, though of course he had not the vernacular evidence before him.) Some other early examples of the formula may be given. A.P. 43 (173

¹ By the way, if there be any wiseacres still who think Onesimus an invented name, it may be interesting to quote the slave-name *Χρήσιμος* from Ietr. 16 (2/). If that will not suffice, *Ὀνήσιμος* itself occurs in G.H. 39 (81 B.C.).

B.C.), πυρὸν νέον ἄδολον καθαρὸν ἀπὸ παντός: so, with variation of order, or omission of ἀπὸ παντός, G. 31, G.H. 29, G. 18, 28, A.P. 47, 113 (all from ii/). In F.P. 89 (9 A.D.) it is used of seed; and it is found as late as G.H. 90 (6/) applied to wine.

ἀλλά.—In Tb.P. 104 (92 B.C.)—an interesting marriage contract, the most complete yet found—we have καὶ μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλίσκῳ γυναικὰ ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλὰ Ἀπολλωνίαν. Here ἀλλά comes near “but” in the sense “except”; the preceding ἄλλην perhaps permits us to save our grammatical face by translating “to marry any other wife, but [it is allowed only to marry] Apollonia.” But the passage makes me rather less certain that R.V. and WM are right on Matthew xx. 23.

ἀνάστασις.—Three references may be given from I.M.A. (iii. 478, 479, 481—all from 2/) for the meaning *erection* (of a monument).

ἄνωθεν.—In Tb.P. 59 (99 B.C.) *bis* = ἐξ ἀρχῆς, as in Luke i. 3, etc.—a classical use.

ἀποτάσσομαι.—Rutherford, *New Phryg.* p. 75, gives the history of this word. Its N.T. sense of “bidding farewell” is found in O.P. 298 (1/) ἐπεὶ ἀποτάξασθαι αὐτῷ θέλω, “to get rid of him.”

ἀρετή.—A rather curious phrase occurs in the ordinance of Ptolemy Euergetes II., Tb.P. 5 (118 B.C.): τὴν ἐν ἀρετῇ κειμένην βα(σιλικήν) γῆν, “the richest crown land.” The editors quote Hesychius ἀρετῶσιν ἀρεταίνωσιν, εὐδαιμονῶσιν, ἐν ἀρετῇ ὄσιν. Is this an earlier evidence for Deissmann’s ἀρετή = laus (p. 95), as if “land in esteem”? In Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 6, 53 ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ παιδεία διαφέροντες καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀρετῆς ἄξιοι it seems natural to assign it the same sense. Van Herwerden (*Lexicon suppl. s.v.*) gives additional evidence for the other new meaning brought out by Deissmann, “manifestation of power.”

ἀρχηγός.—The meaning “author” (classical) may be reinforced for the N.T. by O.P. 41 *ἀρχηγὸς τῶν ἀγαθῶν*, which shows this force surviving till the third or fourth century. An early occurrence may be seen on the Rosetta Stone (ii/), *αἱ δὲ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀρχηγοὶ πᾶσιν εἰσι*. The other meaning, “leader,” survives still (Kennedy, *Sources*, p. 153).

Ἀσιάρχης.—Add to my references for this (EXPOSITOR, *l.c.* p. 282) I.M.A. iii. 525, 526 (? 2/) *Ἀσιάρχην ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* (Thera); 529, 531, 532, *Ἔσλων Πλώτιον Λεωνίδου Ἀσιάρχου υἱόν* (*ib.*).

ἄσημος.—This word recurs perpetually in the papyri to denote a man who is “not distinguished” from his neighbours by the convenient scars on eyebrow or arm or right shin which identify so many individuals in formal documents. In Acts xxi. 39 it is “undistinguished, obscure,” as sometimes in classical writers (see LS).

ἀστοχέω.—Earliest in Polybius, occurs in B.U. 531 (2/), meaning “fail, disappoint.”

ἄτοπος.—B.U. 757 (12 A.D.) has *ἕτερα ἄτοπα*, attributed to some marauders who had pulled to pieces a farmer’s sheaves of wheat, and thrown them to the pigs. The later ethical sense, familiar in the N.T., must be recognized here.

βαρύνω.—See below under *καθ’ ὑπερβολήν*.

βαστάζω.—F.P. 122 (end of 1/) may be added to the citations for the meaning “carry away.” So B.U. 388 (2/).

βιωτικός.—Tb.P. 52 (114 B.C.) has *ἕτερα βιοτικὰ σύμβολα*, “other business documents,” a good illustration of the N.T. passages (Luke xxi. 34, 1 Cor. vi. 3, 4).

βούλομαι.—The Tb.P. show this word as freely as the later papyri: Blass’s opinion (repeated in *Gram.*² pp. 39, 48), that the word was borrowed from the literary language, becomes more and more difficult to support.

γλεῦκος.—G.H. 24 (105 B.C.), οἴνου γλεύκους. (First in Aristotle.)

γλωσσοκομῆιον.—This form is still found in B.U. 824 (1/); but in G. 14 (150 or 139 B.C.) we have γλωσσόκομα γ, with the N.T. form. These articles, together with two κίσται and a βίκος ῥητίνης, etc., were deposited in a temple. Two θίβεις (Exod. ii. 3, 5, 6, LXX) appear in the list. Dr. Grenfell cites Hesychius θίβη· πλεκτόν τι κιβωτοειδές ὡς γλωσσοκομῆιον.

δεκανός is not a Biblical word, but it may be interesting to note its earliest appearance. This is apparently in Tb.P. 27 (113 B.C.): so also 251, and O.P. 387 (1/). The editors observe that the date of this passage settles the question whether it is derived from δέκα or from *decem*.

διασεῖω.—In Tb.P. 41 (119 B.C.) διασεῖειν τινῶν gives us an earlier example of the Hellenistic use “to extort.” It takes the (ablative) genitive here, if the cases of a very muddled scribe are to be regarded as deliberate: in Luke iii. 14 and many other places it has the accusative. Cf. O.P. 284 (50 A.D.) διασεῖσθην (sic) ὑπὸ Ἀπολλοφάνους. In O.P. 240 (34 A.D.) we have an oath by a κωμογραμματεὺς that he knows of no villager διασεσεισμένω . . . ὑπὸ [τοῦ δεινός] στρατιώτου. This unknown soldier might have come almost fresh from the Baptist’s exhortation!

εἶ μὴν.—An example of this spelling occurs in Tb.P. 78 (110–8 B.C.), earlier by some twenty years than Deissmann’s earliest citation (p. 208). An ex. from 27 B.C. in B.U. 543. Parallel spellings from documents of the Ptolemaic age are χρῆος loan Tb.P. 111, 112 bis, τέθη(κα) ib. 120—it is unlikely that the Attic τέθηκα survived as late as the first century B.C.—ἀρχῆον ib. 166, πορη(ῶν) ib. 121, προφητηῶν ib. 88.

εἶδος.—The R.V. of 1 Thess. v. 22 is confirmed, if it needs confirmation, by the recurrent formula παντὸς εἶδους of every kind, found in business documents *passim*

—e.g. C.P.R. 170 (1/2). So B.U. S80 (2/) *μονοδεσμίας χόρτου καὶ ἄλλων ἰδῶν δώδεκα.*

εἷς.—Tb.P. 138 (late ii.) ὁ εἷς τῶν προγεγραμμένων Ὀννώφρις; *ib.* 48 (113 B.C.), ἐπιλαβομένων τοῦ ἐνὸς ἡμῶν Ὀρου. Cf. ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα Mark xiv. 10. The “difficult article” which Swete notes there must be explained in the same way, it would seem, as in these documents, where it is hardly possible to apply either of the interpretations given in his note—certainly not the second, by which ὁ εἷς = εἷς ὄν.

ἐκθεματίζομαι.—In Tb.P. 27 (113 B.C.) this verb occurs, meaning “to be proclaimed a defaulter.” Its noun ἐκθεμα, “edict,” occurs in Polybius: the LXX of Esth. viii. 14, 17, uses it to translate the Persian loan-word 𐎧𐎥. See Rutherford, *New Phryn.* p. 319.

ἐκτενέστερον.—An example of this word (as in [Luke] xxii. 44) comes in an inscr. from ii/, I.M.A. iii. 331. Cf. Deissm. p. 262.

ἐλαιών.—Deissmann (p. 208 ff.) has sufficiently demonstrated against Blass the reality of this word: I have found nearly thirty examples in the first three centuries. Earlier still are the presumable exx. in Tb.P. 81, 87 (ii/), where we have ἐλ(αιῶνος). A curious parallel is found in the noun ἰβίων, which occurs in Tb.P. 64 (116–5 B.C.) *bis*, ἰβίωνος; add ἰβίω(νος) in 82 and 98, and ἄλλον (sc. ἰβίωνος) in 62. The editors connect it closely with ἰβίων (sc. τροφῆς) “for the feeding of ibises,” the word being treated as a nom. sing. instead of a gen. pl.: they observe that “the declension of the village called Ἰβίων probably contributed to the use of this curious form.” If this is so, we might explain ἐλαιών as starting from ἐλαιῶν (sc. ὄρος) declined by mistake. But in both cases new formation with the suffix -ων is also possible. Note the parallel (gen.) φοινικῶνος, “palmgrove, in A.P. 31 (112 B.C.).

"Ελλην.—In the ordinance of Euergetes II, Tb.P. 5 (118 B.C.) "Ελληνας = "probably . . . all non-Egyptian soldiers . . . whether Macedonians, Cretans, Persians, etc." The editors compare the antithesis between Greeks and Egyptians later in the same decree. This illustrates excellently the familiar antithesis between Jews and "Greeks," so pronounced in Mark vii. 26.

ἐν.—A variety of highly interesting uses of ἐν may be noted in the Ptolemaic papyri. Most important is that noted by the editors of Tb.P. (p. 86), who put together ἐν μαχαίρῃ in 16, ἐν μαχαίραις in 41, 45, 46 (all between 120 and 110 B.C.) and a Paris papyrus (No. 11): add ἐν ὄπλοις 48. The force of this conclusive proof of instrumental ἐν in vernacular Greek is best realized when we read the discussion in Deissm. (p. 120), where Hebraism for ἐν ῥάβδῳ (1 Cor. iv. 21) is manfully denied, in spite of all appearances. Even without the new evidence, however, D. might have suspected vernacular Greek: see the passage from Lucian in Findlay's note *in loc.* It is sufficiently unexpected evidence which enables us to banish "Hebraism" from εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ;—as well as from numerous passages in the LXX.—Another abnormal use of ἐν appears in B.U. 970 (2/) προσηνεγκάμην αὐτῷ προοῖκα¹ ἐν δραχμαῖς ἐννακοσίαις. This illustrates Eph. ii. 15, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν, "consisting in." It also resembles, in its use with a numeral, the difficult ἐν (*bis*) of Mark iv. 8 (WH)²—add Acts vii. 14. In Tb.P. 5 (the edict of Euergetes) we note also τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, = "either (1) *in their houses*, or better (2) *under jurisdiction of.*" For (1) the editors compare R.L. (3rd cent. B.C.) xxxviii. 2 ἐν τοῖς Ἀπολλωνίου; Tb.P. 12 ἐν τοῖς Ἀμεννέως "in A.'s office"; *ib.* 27 ἐν τῷ Ὠρ[ου]; for (2) Tb.P. 27 τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ ὀφειλόμενον "in his depart-

¹ See Van Herwerden's lexicon, *s.v.*

² Cannot the εἰς there be "at all rates up to thirty-fold?"

ment"; *ib.* 72 ἄς ἐν Μαρρεῖ τοπογραμματοῖ; *ib.* 120 καταλί (πονται) ἐν Βιά(γορι) π καὶ ἐν Κρονίδῃ προστάτην ρπ. The exx. under (1) are a welcome addition to the R.V. case in Luke ii. 49. The latter helps ἐν ἐμοί, "in my judgment," 1 Cor. xiv. 11, perhaps ἐν θεῷ Jude 1: they are all alike uses of ἐν where παρά c. dat. would have been expected in a classical writer. Add ἐν ὑμῖν 1 Cor. vi. 2.

ἐνώπιον.—In Tb.P. 14 (114 B.C.) παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον, "I gave notice *in person*," occurs the earliest example of this word outside the LXX. See Deissm. 213. The meaning is exactly that which D. cites there from Wilcken for his late quotation in B.U. 578 (2/)

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.—This phrase is perpetually recurring in the papyri, especially in accounts, where it represents an addition sum, "together, in all." This use comes out well in Acts i. 15, ii. 47.

ἐπιβαλὼν.—The note on this well known problem is only the record of a disappointment which may serve as a warning. In Tb.P. 50 (112-1 B.C.) I found Ἀύκος . . . ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχωσεν τὰ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ γῆι μέρη τοῦ σηματομένου ἰδραγωγού, which with St. Mark in my mind I took as "set to and dammed up the part of the water-course in question." It seemed to follow that the ancients who glossed it ἤρξατο were not far wrong: cf. R.V. margin, and ἔκλαυσεν (ingressive aor.) in Matt. and Luke. Unhappily when I reported the passage to Dr. Swete he pointed out the use of ἐπιβολή in Tb.P. 13, where it clearly = embankment: the phrase in *ib.* 50 is therefore almost certainly = ἐπιβολὴν ποιησάμενος συνέχωσεν, and the resemblance to St. Mark is fortuitous. How assured we should have been that the old problem was solved, if only that papyrus 13 had not been found or published!

ἕτερος.—On the general question of the survival of a correct

ἕτερος in Hellenistic I have at present nothing to add to my discussion in *Class. Review*, xv. 439. Meanwhile let me quote Tb.P. 41 (119 B.C.), a petition already referred to: καὶ μετὰ τοῦ παντὸς σκυλμοῦ συνεχεῖς ἐπιλήψεις ποιουμένου τινῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἑτέρων γυναικῶν διασεῖεν, “to extort from some of us and from others, viz. women”—the petitioners are men. This illustrates Luke xxiii. 32 ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο, in which the R.V. translation seems practically certain.

εὐπροσωπέω.—Tb.P. 19 (114 B.C.) ὅπως εὐπροσωπῶμεν, “may make a good show,” is some three centuries older than the earliest citation hitherto given for this Pauline word.

ἕως.—The late use of ἕως c. gen., as in Luke xxii. 51, Rom. iii. 12, to denote “as far as,” “as much as,” is well illustrated by Tb.P. 56 (late ii/) οὐκ ἔχομεν ἕως τῆς τροφῆς τῶν κτηνῶν.

θεοῦ υἱός.—To Deissmann’s exx. (p. 166 f.) add the letter of Augustus, I.M.A. iii. 174 (5 A.D.), Καῖσαρ θεοῦ υἱὸς Σεβαστός, interesting as coming from the Emperor himself. A very early ex. is B.U. 543 (27 B.C.) ὄμνυμι Καίσαρα Αὐτοκράτορα θεοῦ υἱόν.

θεωρέω.—A tendency to use θεωρεῖν more lightly (cf. Blass *N.T. Gramm.*² 59, s.v. ὄρᾶν) might be deduced from such passages as Tb.P. 58 (111 B.C.) οὗτος οὖν θεωρήσας με ὡς προσεδρέοντα καθ’ ἡμέραν ὡσεὶ δεδίλανται (though *watched* will translate it here); *ib.* 61 (118 B.C.) ἤξιον... συνθεωρεῖσθαι *conquiri*, and again τε>θεωρηθῆσαι ἐκ τῆς γεγεννημένης εἰκασίης μετὰ ταῦτα, “it was *perceived* from the subsequent estimate.” But whether the word belonged to the *Volkssprache* (Blass) or not, it was hardly a mere synonym of ὄρᾶν.

θίβεις.—See above, under γλωσσοκομείον.

ικανοδοτέω.—This new verb occurs in O.P. 259 (23 A.D.) to represent *satis dare*. Cf. the correlative λαβόντες τὸ

ἱκανόν, Acts xvii. 9, in the same technical sense of giving or receiving security. So O.P. 294 (22 A.D.) δοῦναι εἰκανόν. The Latinism is as old as Polybius.

ἴλεως.—I may repeat here from *Class. Review*, xv. 436, the parallels I gave for Matt. xvi. 22, Gen. xliii. 23 and 2 Sam. xx. 20. Letr. 221 (4/) ἴλεως ἡμῖν Πλάτων καὶ ἐνταῦθα shows the subject, which is omitted in 557 ἴλεως σοί, Ἐρμείας υἱὸς Ἐρμωγεύου, καὶ Ἡράκλειος ἀδελφός. Letr. (ii. p. 286) quotes another inscr. (Reinesius, *Synt.* p. 243. ἴλεως σοὶ Ἀλύπι: here “(Heaven) help thee, Alypius” i. clearly the meaning.¹ The deprecatory meaning is like the vernacular “Lord ‘a’ mercy.”

ἱστορέω.—The Hellenistic sense, “visit, see,” as in Gal. i. 18, is noted in the series of inscr., Letr. 201 etc., τὴν δὲ τοῦ Μέμνονος ταύτην (σύριγγα) ἔτι ἱστορήσας ὑπερεθαύμασα. Once the Lat. *inspexi*.

καθ' ὑπερβολήν.—K. ὕ. βεβαρυμμένοι ἐπὶ τῷ κ.τ.λ. in Tb.P. 23 (119 or 114 B.C.) is curiously like 2 Cor. i. 8. The adverbial phrase is common in Hellenistic.

κατά.—The form of the sentence, and the use of κατά, in Tb.P. 27 (113 B.C., correspondence of an official) ἢ δ' εἴσπραξις τῶν προεθησομένων παρὰ σοῦ κατὰ κράτος ἔσται, reminds us of Rom. ii. 2.

καταντάω.—To my exx. (ΕΧΡΟΣ. *l.c.* 272 f.) for καταντᾶν εἰς of property “descending to” an heir, add B.U. 969 (2/) εἰς τὸν συνηγορούμενον κατήντηκεν ἢ κτηνοτροφία.

κολοβίζω.—This ἄπ. εἰρ. form of the late verb κολοβόω occurs in I.M.A. iii. 323 (Thera, i/ or 1/) τὰ πλείω κεκολοβισμέ[νων] καὶ ἀφιρημένων.

κόπους παρέχειν.—This later form for πράγματα παρέχειν occurring four times in N.T. (with κόπον also once), appears in B.U. 844 (83 A.D.) κόπους γὰρ μοι παρέχει ἀσθενοῦνται.

¹ The adverb ἀλυπί, given in Stephanus on the strength of this inscr., must be eliminated: the proper name is essential.

κοράσιον.—B.U. 887 (2/) πέπρακα τὸ κοράσιον δηναρίων τριακοσίων πενήκοντα. *Ib.* 913 (early 3/) δουλικὸν αὐτῆς κοράσιον. The εὐτελισμός which old grammarians noticed in the word (see Rutherford, *New Phrygn.* 148) reappears to some extent in these papyri, though absent in the N.T.

κρίνω.—C. inf., “to decide to. . .” (as in 1 Cor. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 12; Acts xx. 16, xxv. 25) in Tb.P. 55 (late ii/) ἔκρινα γράψαι, 124 (c. 118 B.C.) οὐκ ἐκρίναμεν ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι: other Hellenistic passages in Grimm - Thayer. LS quote Menander, ζῆν μεθ’ ὧν κρίνη τις (sc. ζῆν), but this is rather for ζῆν μετ’ ἐκείνων οὐδς κρίνη τις (κρίνειν, c. acc., to choose or prefer, a classical use).

κύριος.—The title applied to a brother or other near relative is not uncommon: cf. Dr. Rendel Harris on 2 John (EXPOSITOR VI. iii. 197 f.). Some late exx. may be noticed in B.U. 949 (3/4), 984 (4/), 892 (3/), 950 (Byz.), all to a brother; A.P. 144 (5/) τῇ κυρίᾳ μου Σοφία, a sister or wife. Note ὁ κύριος, “the master,” in A.P. 135 (early 2/).

λαογραφία.—The appearance of this word (=census, preparing for a poll-tax) as early as Tb.P. 103 (94 or 61 B.C., refutes an argument for the late date of 3 Maccabees (see ii. 28), as the edd. observe.

λειτουργός.—In the Ptolemaic period is simply a workman, as the edd. remark on Tb.P. 5. So λειτουργία “business,” τὸ λειτουργικόν “work-tax,” etc. But the special sense of *religious* “service” is found here, as in the later literature, e.g. Tb.P. 88 (115-4 B.C.) γραφὴν ἱερῶν καὶ προφητηῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν λειτουργικῶν. See Deissm. 140.

λογεία.—Tb.P. 58 (111 B.C.) περὶ τῆς λογείας, “collection,” may be added to Deissmann’s collection (p. 142 f.).

μεσιτεύω.—To the literary exx. (Aristotle downwards) add B.U. 906 (1/) μεσιτεύοντας ἑτέροις.

μικρός.—Deissm. 144 shows good reason for translating by

- junior* in Mark xv. 40. Two slightly earlier papyri than that cited by Deissm., Tb.P. 63, 64 (116-5 B.C.), the second by supplement only, contain the word: γεωργὸς Πετερμουθις μι(κρὸς) Ἀμεινέως. There is no proof there that it means what Leemans showed it meant in L.P. n. (103 B.C.), but every additional occurrence makes it more probable that the formula has a constant meaning.
- ναῦς*.—Blass on Acts xxvii. 31 thinks this word taken from a Homeric phrase. But the vernacular must have retained it, though not in common use, for it is cited twenty times in HR from the LXX, and it occurs in Letr. 25 (ii/, the Rosetta Stone).
- οἰκία, οἶκος*.—On Tb.P. 46 (113 B.C.) the edd. remark on the clear ex. of the distinction between *οἰκία* = whole house and *οἶκος* = *insula*, set of rooms. The traces of the distinction are not easily traced in the N.T.; but note the appropriateness of the larger word in such passages as Matt. v. 15, Luke xv. 8, John xii. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 20. *οἰκοδομεῖν* is not used with *οἶκον* as object, except in Acts vii. 47, 49, and the Temple is always *οἶκος*: note the significant contrast ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, John xiv. 2.
- ὀπίσω*.—For ὀπισθεν (Rev. v. 1)—like Juvenal's "scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes"—cf. Tb.P. 58 (111 B.C.) τὰ πῖλοιπα ὀπίσω. Another form for "P.T.O." the editors cite from R.L. (iii/), viz., ἔξω ὄρα.
- ὀπτάνομαι*.—The earliest occurrence outside the Greek Bible seems to be Tb.P. 24 (117 B.C.) καὶ μηδαμῶς ὀπτανομένων ὑπ[. . ? .
- ὀψή*.—To my exx. (EXPOS. l.c. 282) add B.U. 531 (2/) οὐ . . με λοιπήσης (= λυπ.), where we should probably supply *μψή*.
- παρά*.—In Mark iii. 21 οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ raises some difficulty: see Swete's note, and Field *Ot. Norv. in loc.* Two Ptolemaic quotations for the phrase may be given. T.P. 4 (ii/) μηδένα τῶν παρ' αὐτῶν, "acting for them." Tb.P. 105

(103 B.C.) τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ, "his agents." Add A.P. 111, 112, (2/), O.P. 270 (94 A.D.), where this meaning is most probable, though the other is conceivable. Peyron's cheerful "solet in V. et N.T." (in note on T.P. 4) raises hopes which the facts do not justify. The Biblical passages have however a good Ptolemaic parallel in G.H. 36 (95 B.C.) οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντες, "our family."

παράδεισος.—Deissm. 148 gives early Ptolemaic exx. of παράδεισος = garden. Add Tb.P. 5 (ordinance of Euergetes (118 B.C.), on which the edd. refer to R.L. (iii/) pp. 94-6, and Wilcken, *Ostraca* i. 157: it is a garden *with fruit-trees*. Note also Tb.P. 86 (late ii/) Διὸς παράδεισος. Though no doubt the "Paradise of God" owes its first suggestion to Gen. ii., the appropriateness of the Greek word would presumably be enhanced by its use for a *sacred* garden.

παρεισφέρω.—Tb.P. 38 (113 B.C.) χάριν τῶν παρεισφερόντων, "smuggling," illustrates the nuance found in many of these παρὰ + εἰς compounds, παρεισ-άγω and -ακτος, παρεισ-δύω, παρεισ-έρχομαι. Παρεισφέρω has lost this sense in its one N.T. occurrence (2 Peter i. 5).

παρεπιδημος.—To Deissmann's citations for παρεπιδημέω (p. 149) add T.P. 8 (118 B.C.), where παρεπιδημοῦντες and κατοικοῦντες are contrasted.

πειθαρχέω.—The classical constr. c. gen. is still found in the papyri; see Tb.P. 104 (92 B.C.), O.P. 265 (i/).

περισπάω.—To my exx. (EXPOS. *l.c.* 275) add T.P. 1 (ii/), τὸν Ἑρμίαν κατὰ κέρον περισπακέσαι, L.P. a (ii/), ὑπὸ μηδενὸς περισπασθῶ, L.P. g (i/), Tb.P. 37 (73 B.C.), 43 (118 B.C.) προνοηθῆναι ὡς οὐ περισπασθήσονται. In this last we find παρενοχληθήσεται written above—was περι-σπᾶν (absolute), "distract," not yet sufficiently correct? Polybius uses it with ταῖς διανοίαις added (see Schweigh., *Lex. Polyb.* s.v.).

πληροφορέω.—A law report of 124 A.D., A.P. 66, has ἵνα δὲ καὶ νῦν πληροφορήσω, ἐλθέτωσαν οὓς ἄγεις (judge to plain-

tiff). G. and H. translate "to give you full satisfaction." This comes nearest to the meaning desiderated by Lightfoot (on Col. iv. 12) for *πληροφοροῦσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν* in Hermas: We might however render our passage "that I may finish off (the matter)," Lightfoot's (1). His (2) and (3), "convince" and "fill," are clearly inappropriate. In B.U. 747 (2/) *αἰτούμενος πληροφορεῖν* seems to mean "asking them to complete (the account)," but lacunæ follow.

πορθέω.—With a personal object this word is only classical in poetry. The N.T. use is paralleled in B.U. 588 (1/), *πορθοῦντες ὑμᾶς*.

πρεσβύτεροι.—Deissm. 154 f. shows that *πρεσβύτεροι* in Egypt were holders of a communal office. Tb.P. 40 (117 B.C.), *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν γεωργῶν*, for which *ib.* 22 (112 B.C.) has *οἱ πρ.* alone, shows more precisely what the office was, in one application of the word. Cf. A.P. 30 (middle of ii/) *τοὺς ἐκ τῆς κώμης πρεσβυτέρους*. The *γεωργοί* were cultivators of Crown lands, paying rent in kind. *ραβδισμός*.—Tb.P. 119 (105–1 B.C.), where the word occurs, the edd. note "Cf. 229 [a papyrus from Tebtunis not printed in full here]. Threshing is probably meant; cf. LXX Judges vi. 11."

σαπρός.—The late use of *σαπρός* (see Phrynichus in Rutherford, *N.P.* 474), marked in the N.T., is well illustrated in B.U. 846 (2/) *σαπρῶς παιριπατῶ. αἵγραψά σοι ὅτι γυμνός εἶμει*. Longus, a very uneducated person, begs his mother to be reconciled to him: he has no decent clothes to go about in. *σαπρῶς* accordingly = *αἰσχρῶς*, as Phrynichus implies. We may compare the history of "rot" and "rotten" in English slang.

σκύβαλον.—Occurs in C.P.R. 175; F.P. 119 (c. 100 A.D.) *χόρτον σαπρὸν καὶ ὄλον λελυμένον, ὡς σκύβαλον*, "no better than dung."

σκύλλομαι.—To my note (ECPHOS. *l.c.* 274) add the following

Ptolemaic exx. L.P. *g.* (99 B.C.) σκύλλεσθαι νεχαρί.
Tb.P. 41 (119 B.C.) μετὰ τοῦ παντός σκυλλμοῦ: the edd.
note there that σκυλλμοῦ takes the place of ὕβρεως in
ib. 16 (114 B.C.), the meaning nearly the same.

στρατεῦόμενοι.—On Tb.P. 5 (118 B.C.), line 168, τοὺς στρατευ-
ομένους Ἑλληνας, the edd. note: “στρ. here, as in R.L.
xxiv. 6 τῶν στρατευσόμενων καὶ τοὺς [. . .] κλήρους πε-
φυκότων, is a general term for persons belonging to the
army, whether on active service or not.” So in *ib.* 27
(113 B.C.) ἀπό τε τῶν στρ. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τόπους
κατοικούντων, “those in the army”; A.P. 32 (ii/) where
some στρατεῦόμενοι defend themselves against the charge
of returning their κλήροι as less than they really were.
We must therefore cancel the R.V. margin in Luke iii. 14
(“Gr. *soldiers on service*”) as unprovable: in 2 Tim. ii. 4
the meaning is clear from the context.

συμφύω.—Tb.P. 13 (114 B.C.) συμφύσαντες, “arrest”; *ib.*
48 (113 B.C.) συμφ. τὸν Λύκον, “forced him to appear.”
The edd. cf. Jer. xxxi. (= xlviii. Heb.) 33 συνεψήσθη
χαρμοσύνη; add two other places in Jer. where it trans-
lates חֲרָמָה (HR).

συνευδοκέω.—An early ex. of this common Hellenistic word
is found in G.H. 26 (103 B.C.).

σώματα.—Deissm. 160 has early exx. of σώματα = slaves, as
in Rev. xviii. 13. Earlier still is the inscr. from Thera
I.M.A. iii. 328 (iii/), but here there is αἰχμαλωτοί in the
context which may have coloured a neutral word = “per-
sons.” So in the passages quoted EXPOS. *l.c.* 275. In
Tb.P. 95 (ii/) σω might be taken as σωματικόν, or tax
on slaves, but the edd. reject this on the ground that the
absolute use of σῶμα = slave is condemned by Pollux and
Phrynichus (see Rutherford, *N.P.* 474). But Deissmann
and Rutherford show that the word was so used in
late writers.

ὑπέρ.—In 2 Cor. viii. 23 εἴτε ὑπέρ Τίτου is most simply
taken “as regarding Titus,” practically equivalent to the

nom. in εἶτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν. So Tb.P. 19 (114 B.C.) ὑπὲρ δὲ ὧν σημαίνεις κωμογραμματέων, μόλις ἕως τῆς κε χωρισθῆσονται, "as to the officials you mention, they will hardly go away before the 25th."

ὑπερευχαριστέω.—This word, found in Barnabas and Eusebius, now appears in Tb.P. 12 (118 B.C.).

φέρω.—φέρειν (intr.) εἰς = lead to, as in Acts xii. 10, is shown to be vernacular as well as classical by Tb. P. 54 (86 B.C.) τῆι νυκτὶ τῆι φερούσῃ εἰς τὴν κε τοῦ φαῶφι, "on the night which led to the 25th of Phaophi." The "day" began with sunrise.

φιλοτιμέομαι.—Some doubt as to the possibility of demonstrating the R.V. margin "Gr. *be ambitious*," in the three Pauline occurrences, is insinuated by such a passage as Tb.P. 23 (119 or 114 B.C.), καλῶς ποιήσεις φιλοτιμότερον προθυμηθεῖς, where the idea of *ambition* can hardly be even latent. One is very loth to give up the idea that the etymological force was still felt in the N.T., but it seems doubtful even in some classical passages whether we can assert its presence in the verb: see LS *s.v.*

ψωμίον.—Tb.P. 33 (112 B.C.) τὸ γεινόμενον . . . ψωμίον, "the customary titbits," gives us the only ex. of the diminutive prior to John xiii. 26. Add F.P. 119 (c. 100 A.D.), ἐπὶ κράζει Πᾶσις εἶνα μὴ εἰς ψωμὶν γένηται διὰ τὸ ὕδωρ, "Pasis is crying out that we must not allow it [apparently manure!] to be dissolved by the water": a curious development, perhaps only due to the patent fact that farmer Gemellus, who writes this series of letters, had left school before reaching the sixth standard.

ψυχὴν σώσαι.—Tb.P. 56 (late ii/) καλῶς οὖν ποιήσης . . . σώσαι (an almost isolated inf. in this construction) ψυχὰς πολλὰς ζητήσας μοι, "to save many lives by looking out for me," etc. The phrase (see Wetstein) is not so common as its opposite, ψ. ἀπολέσαι.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY
OF JERUSALEM.

II.

THE NAME JERUSALEM AND OTHER NAMES.

IN Hebrew the original pronunciation of this name (as will be shown immediately) was Yērúshālēm, from which we are derived the Greek Ierousalem and various modern modifications. But in the Tell el Amarna letters, written about 1400 B.C. in the Babylonian language and characters, the form is Urusalim; in Assyrian inscriptions of the eighth century, Ursalim[u]; in Aramean, 'Urishlem; and in early Arabic, 'Aurishalam[u]. There are thus two lines of tradition as to the original form. Since the *s* of the Babylonian is to be taken as the equivalent of the Hebrew *sh*, the difference between them is confined to the first part of the name.¹ The question to which we have to address ourselves is, Which of the two was the original? Though the question turns on a letter or two—Yērú (it may have been 'Īrú) or 'Ūrú—it involves a matter of no little historical importance. For it amounts to this: Was the name of the city a native name, or was it imposed by the Babylonians?

1. The Hebrew letters ירושלם, *y-r-u-s-l-m*, are constantly vocalised in the Massoretic text of the Old Testament as יְרוּשָׁלַם, Yērúshālám, which takes the fuller form יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Yērúshālayim, in three late passages,² and upon coins that belong either to the reign of Simon 142–135 B.C., or to the Jewish revolt against Rome, 66–70 A.D.³

¹ Winckler, Haupt, etc., spell the name of the city with the simple *s*, but Sayce 's; the root from which the second part of the name is derived is *sh-l-m*: spelt with *sh* both in Assyrian and Hebrew.

² According to Baer: Jer. xxvi. 18; Esther ii. 6; 2 Chron. xxxii. 9. Other recensions of the text add two more: 1 Chron. iii. 5; 2 Chron. xxv. 1—in both of which Baer reads שָׁלַם.

³ Eckhel, *Doct. Vet. Num.* iii. 466 ff.; Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, 66 ff.; cf. Schürer, *Hist.* ii. 379 ff. The spelling -ayim occurs also in the Talmud—e.g. Tosephtha, Kethuboth, 4.

The termination -aim or -ayim is late and probably artificial.¹ The evidence is conclusive for an earlier and more common pronunciation, Yērūshālēm. This suits the Hebrew consonants; it is confirmed by the Septuagint transliteration, Ierousalem;² it appears in the Biblical Aramaic Yērūshlem,³ and in the Hebrew contraction, Shālēm.⁴ It must in fact have been the pronunciation in ordinary use, while that of -aim or -ayim, which appears in no other dialect, was confined to the liturgical reading of the Scripture, and to other solemn occasions.

On the supposition that Yērūshālēm was the original name of the city, various derivations have been suggested: some ludicrous and none satisfactory. The latter half of the word is usually taken as meaning *peace* or *security*; but while the early rabbis interpreted the first part as *sight* or *fear*⁵ (hardly credible suggestions), modern etymologists have been divided between *the possession* and *the foundation of peace or security*.⁶

2. The rival form in the Tell-el-Amarna letters is read by Assyriologists as Urusalim;⁷ in the Assyrian inscriptions of Sennacherib, seven hundred years later, it appears as

¹ It used to be taken as the ordinary termination of the dual of nouns, and was explained as signifying the Upper and Lower Cities of which Jerusalem was composed in the Greek and Roman periods (so Gesenius, *Thes.* s.v.), though another derivation might be found in the legendary explanation of the name given below n. 5. But it may be a mere local termination, for it appears in other place-names where it is difficult to suspect a dual. See Barth, *Die Nominalbildung der Semitischen Sprachen*, § 194c, n. 1.

² Ἱερουσαλημ.

³ יְרוּשָׁלַם, Ezra iv. 20, 24, 51; יְרוּשָׁלַם— v. 14, 69.

⁴ Ps. lxxvi. 3; LXX, ἐν εἰρήμῃ.

⁵ There is one rabbinic explanation worth quoting for its humour. It occurs in a Midrash, *Bereshith rabba* ch. 89. Abraham called the place יְרוּשָׁלַם (Gen. xxii. 14), but Shem (i.e. Melchisedec) had called it יְרוּשָׁלַם (Gen. xiv.). God, unwilling to offend either Patriarch, gave it both names—Yirēah-Shālēm—Yērūshālēm. The numerical value of יְרוּשָׁלַם and יְרוּשָׁלַם is the same: 216.

⁶ יְרוּשָׁלַם, *possession of peace*: Reland and others. יְרוּשָׁלַם (from יְרוּשָׁלַם, *to cast or throw down*), *the foundation of peace*: Ges. *Thes.* Ges.-Buhl., *Lex.*¹²; cf. Grill, *Z.A.T.W.*, iv. 134 ff.; or *the foundation of security*: Merrill, *Bibl. World*, 1899, 270.

⁷ Sayce, Uru'salim.

Ur-sa-li-im[mu]. Assyriologists take the first part, Uru, as meaning *city*.¹ Sayce interprets the second as the name of a god, and translates *City of 'Salim*,² but this has been opposed, especially by Zimmern;³ and Haupt renders it in analogy to the Arabic Dār-es-Salām and Medinet-es-Salām as *Place of Safety*, “*praesidium salutis*.” He recalls the term *stronghold*⁴ as applied to the town in Hebrew, and compares the name of the “southernmost Babylonian port, Bāb-salimeti, ‘safe entrance.’” As Uru is the Sumerian word for city,⁵ and Salim is Semitic; the name, according to this interpretation, is a hybrid.

Of these two forms, the Hebrew Yerushalem and the Babylonian Urusalim, which is the original? Was the name native, that is Canaanite? or was it imposed by the Babylonians during a period when, as we know, the Babylonian culture pervaded Palestine?

In an interesting argument,⁶ Dr. Haupt decides for

¹ ‘Vielleicht’: Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, 226 f. Others (Sayce, *Records of Past*, 2nd ser. v. 61; Haupt, as below, etc.) without any qualification.

² *Records of the Past* (see Series v. 61); *The Early History of the Hebrews*, 28. “The figure and name of the god Salimmu, written in cuneiform characters, are on a gem now in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg. The same God, under the name of Shalman, is mentioned on a stela discovered at Sidon, and under that of Selamanēs in the inscriptions of Shēkh Barakāt, north-west of Aleppo (Clermont Ganneau “*Études d’Archéologie Orientale*” in the *Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études*, cxiii. vol. ii. pp. 36, 48; Sayce, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, xix. 2, p. 74).”

³ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1891, p. 263. Sayce’s argument that Salim is a divine name is based upon his reading *Issuppu* in l. 12 of Letter 102 (of the Berlin edition), which he renders “prophecy” (of the mighty king); and on his rendering *Zuruh* in ll. 14, 34 of 104, “oracle” (of the mighty king); and on his rendering of l. 16, Letter 106 “the temple of the god Uras (whose name (there is) ‘Salim.’” But Winckler, *Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna* reads, in l. 12 of 102 (Wi. 179), Zu-ru-uh, which both there and in ll. 14 and 34 (Wi. 181) of 104 (Wi. l. 33) Zimmern and he render “arm”: taking “the mighty King” not as a deity, but as Pharaoh. Winckler reads, Letter 106 l. 16 (numbered by him 15) quite differently from Sayce: (alu) Bit-Ninib.

⁴ מצודה.

⁵ Preserved in the name of the South Babylonian city Ur: Heb, Ur Kasdim; and appearing also in other place-names, e.g. Ur-dalika. Delitzsch, *Par.* 328.

⁶ In a note to the critical text of Isaiah (xxix. 1) in *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*.

the Babylonian,¹ from which the Hebrew (or Canaanite) Yerushalem—originally, as he thinks, Irushalem—was derived either by dissimilation,² or as a dialectic modification. “The dialectic form of *Uru* is *eri*”; and “*er* is the syllabic value of the ideogram for city,” that “has passed into Hebrew as עיר” (‘ir). “Urusalim is thus a compound of the Sumerian word for ‘fortified place,’ ‘city,’ and the Semitic *shalim*, ‘safety.’ The *u* after the *r* is the Sumerian vowel of prolongation; the *i* in Urishalim, (Syriac, ‘Urishlem; Arabic ‘Aurishalam) substitutes the *i* of the genitive as termination of the construct state, and is therefore more correct from the Semitic point of view. Irushalim (ירושלם) from which the common form of the name Jerusalem is derived, represents the dialectic form of the word *uru*, viz. *eri*, which has passed into Hebrew as עיר. We should expect *Erishalim* or *Irishalim*”: the *u* in *Irushalim* “may be due to dissimilation.”

The opinion of so great an authority as Dr. Haupt is to be received with respect; yet it seems to me, *first*, in itself to be open to serious objections, and *second* not to be so probable (to say the least) as the converse alternative, viz., that the Babylonian form is a corruption of a native or Canaanite name, which has been more correctly handed down in the Hebrew Yērūshālēm.

To begin with, Dr. Haupt’s argument derives no support from the fact of the survival of the initial vowel *U* in the Aramean ‘Urishlem and the Arabic ‘Aurishalam;³ for such a survival only proves the derivation of these forms

¹ “From the Assyrian point of view Urusalim is less correct than Urisalem.” Haupt; and he compares Penuel and Peniel. So also יְרוּשָׁלַם 2 Chron. xx. 16, יְרוּשָׁלַם 1 Chron. vii. 2; יְרוּשָׁלַם Kt. and יְרוּשָׁלַם Kr. 2 Chron. xxix. 14; יְרוּשָׁלַם 1 Chron. ix. 6, and יְרוּשָׁלַם 1 Chron. xv. 18.

² That is avoidance of the repetition of the same vowel.

³ This is an old Arabic form quoted by Yaḳūt (*Muḡam el Buldan*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 317) from a pre-Islamic poet. It occurs also in Edrisi: Robinson *B.R.* I. p. 380. Robinson spells it Aurūshlim (Index).

from the Babylonian—a derivation historically very probable as the Arameans were in close intercourse with Babylonia, and carried their own language far into Arabia¹—and would not offer independent evidence for the originality of the Babylonian form. Again, it is impossible to argue for Dr. Haupt's hypothesis (as might at first thought appear to be possible) on the ground that Jerusalem had a native name or names which were displaced by the Babylonian designation, and rendered archaic or confined to the language of poetry. For we have no means of knowing whether such names—the Stronghold, Zion, Ophel, or Jebus²—were ever applied in primitive times to the town as a whole; or what in any way might have been the native name for Jerusalem before the Babylonians succeeded (according to Dr. Haupt) in displacing it. There is, therefore, no external or independent evidence for Dr. Haupt's conclusion, which is entirely drawn from the Babylonian language.

Thus, unsupported by evidence outside the Babylonian language, Dr. Haupt's derivation of the name lies open (in the first place) to the objection of a foreign source. In the case of a Palestine place-name this objection is serious. So far as we know, no other name of a town or locality in Palestine is so derived, except, in one or two doubtful cases, in which, perhaps, the worship of a Babylonian god succeeded in attaching his name to a site.³ Why in the

¹ I find the Aramaic form אור־שֶׁלֶם in a Nabatean inscription (found by Doughty in El-Mezham, not far from Hegr in Arabia, and given on p. 294 of vol. i. pt. 1 of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*), which would explain the Arabic 'Aurishalem. The Mandaic is אור־אִישְׁלָם.

² Jebus, indeed, may be a late and artificial name: see "Jerusalem" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 2,416.

³ For example, Nebo, which is not certain; and Beth-lehem, in which one or two scholars trace the name of the god Lahum, but for this there is (to say the least) an equally probable etymology. G. B. Gray (*Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 127, 324), indeed argues that the presence in a place-name of Beth-, compounded with another word, proves that this latter is either a divine name or had a divine name attached to it in a fuller form of the word. But for reasons against this see *The Critical Review*, 1898, p. 20.

case of Jerusalem alone should a Babylonian name have been given, and prevail? Even to render this probable, we should require to know that the site had been without a name till the Babylonians occupied it, or that its native name was one of those terms which the Hebrews used, either poetically for the whole town, or for some parts of it. But for this, as we have seen, there is virtually no evidence; and we are, therefore, left to the conclusion that Dr. Haupt's derivation is in itself improbable.

Again, if the form Irushalem had been derived from Urusalim, and the equivalent in Hebrew of the Babylonian Uru be 'Ir (עיר), with an initial 'ayin, we might have expected in the Hebrew name an initial 'ayin, or at least, as in the Syriac and Arabic derivations from the Babylonian, an initial 'aleph. The absence of this seems to prove that in Irushalem or Yerushalem we have a form on another line of tradition altogether than that which the Babylonian started.

But more important still, Dr. Haupt's hypothesis is confronted with an alternative, for which there is some evidence in other Palestine place-names. He says that the Hebrew Yerushalem (Irushalem) was produced from Urusalim either by dissimilation or, more probably, as a dialectic variety. But not only is it equally possible on phonetic grounds that Urusalim is a corruption, by assimilation of the vowels, from Yerushalem. There are, besides, actual instances of such a change in the Assyrian transliteration of the native names of other places in Palestine. For while it is true that the long, or otherwise well marked, vowels, in such native names are correctly reproduced in the cuneiform transliterations, as in the cases of Lāk̄hish, Ashdōd, Yāphō (Joppa) and Sidōn, which in Assyrian appear as Lā-kī-s-u, As-du-du, Ya-ap-pu-[u], and Si-du-n[u]; it is also very significant that when in a native name a weak vowel precedes a strong one, as in the first part of Yērûshālēm, it is very often in the Assyrian transliteration assimilated to the sound of the latter. Thus 'Ēdom

(אָרוֹם) becomes U-du-um[u];¹ Pēkōd (פְּקוֹד) Pu-ku-d[u];² Bēnê-Bēraḳ (בְּנֵי-בְרָק) Ba-na-a-a-bar-ak; and 'Ēlūl (אֱלִיל) the name of the month) U-lu-l[u]. Even a long vowel is sometimes assimilated to another long one as in Mōāb, which in one Assyrian form is Ma-'aba; Ammōn (עַמּוֹן) which becomes Am-ma-n[u];³ and the Talmudic, 'Ushā (אוּשָׁא),⁴ which becomes U-s-u[u]. An instance of assimilation is also found in the Assyrian Ma-ga-du-[u] (but elsewhere Ma-gi-du-[u]) for Megiddo, and perhaps in mi-ṣir and mu-ṣur for the name of Egypt, which the Hebrew gives as Miṣraim. The last instance reminds us that in several cases the Assyrian shows a fondness for the vowel *u*, where there does not appear to have been any trace of this in the original: as in Al-ta-ku-[u],⁵ from 'Eltēḳēh (אֱלְתֵּקֶה), and Gu-ubli,⁶ from Gēbal (גְּבַל). In face of all these—really a large proportion of the few place-names of Palestine of which we possess Assyrian forms—it is clear that Urusalim may very probably have been produced by assimilation from Yērû- or Iru-shalem. And this alternative to Dr. Haupt's derivation has a further superiority over the latter in that it implies for Yerushalem what we find in almost every other place-name in Palestine, a native origin.

What the etymology was it is almost impossible to descry. The rabbinic fancies quoted earlier in this article may be dismissed. The resemblance of the first part of the Hebrew name יְרֵי, Yeru, to the verbal imperfect, and the composition of instances of the latter with a divine title in so many of the Palestinian place-names, suggests a similar derivation for Yērûshālēm: as if it were from the root יָרָה, Yārāh, and should mean *Shalem casts or founds (the city)*.⁷ But, as we have seen, Professor Sayce's interpretation of Salim as a divine name is unconfirmed by other

¹ Del. Par. 295.

² The name of a tribe (Jer. i. 21; Ezek. xxiii. 23).

³ Though in this case the native pronunciation may have been 'Ammān.

⁴ Succa, f. 20a. ⁵ Del. Par. 288. ⁶ Ibid. 283. ⁷ Cf. p. 125 n. 1.

Assyriologists, and on the whole it is safer to take *salim* or *shalem* as being either a noun, *peace*, or an adjective, *safe*, *secure*, *inviolable*. "Yeru" might either be a verb, and the name mean *he* (the god) *founds peace*, or a noun, as if *secure foundation*. There are, however, other alternatives. The Arabic 'Arya means *abiding, continuous* ('iryu, a stable or stall). And there is the common Semitic root 'ūr or 'ir, to *lighten* (Arabic, 'awwar, *to kindle*), from which we have the Hebrew word 'ūr (אור), *fire* or *hearth*, and the Arabic 'Irat, *focus* or *hearth*. The probability of this latter derivation is increased if we read (with Cheyne and others) Isaiah's name for Jerusalem,¹ 'Ariel, *God's lion*, as 'Uriel, *God's hearth*, and suppose that the prophet formed it in analogy to the name of the city. Yerushalem would then signify *hearth of peace* or *inviolable hearth*. But all these are suppositions, which we have no means of proving.

We have now to pursue the history of the name through Greek and Latin to the languages of modern Europe.

The Hebrew Yērūshālēm appears in the Alexandrine translation as *Ιερόουσαλημ* (Ierousalem): the constant form in all those books of the Greek canon which have been translated from the Hebrew. As in the case of so many other proper names in the Septuagint, it is an exact transliteration of the original, made before the vowel-points were inserted in the Hebrew text, and therefore reflecting (as we have seen) the early and common pronunciation of the name. The earliest appearance of this form in other Greek, which I have been able to discover, is that in a passage of Clearchus of Soli,² a pupil of Aristotle, which is quoted by Josephus.³ He gives it accurately, but with a Greek termination: Ierousalēm-ē. Since he says that it

¹ xxviii. 2.

² End of 4th and beginning of 3rd cent. B.C.

³ C. *Arion*, i. 22: Τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν (i.e. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) ὄνομα πάνυ σκολιόν ἐστιν· Ἰερουσαλήμην γὰρ αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν. In the meantime the initial breathing is purposely omitted from *Ιερουσαλημη*.

is "altogether awkward" to pronounce—which he would hardly have asserted of the Hellenised form Hierosolyma—and since Josephus everywhere else uses Hierosolyma, we may be sure that in Ierousalēm-ē we have the original spelling of Clearchus himself.¹ And if this be so, it is another proof of the original pronunciation of the name.²

It is doubtful what breathing the Septuagint translators and the citation by Josephus from Clearchus prefixed to Ierousalem;³ but in any case the rough breathing came into early use: Hierousalem. This may have been originally due to an effort to express the consonantal force of the first letter;⁴ but more probably arose from—and was at least confirmed by—the fashion prevalent in Western Asia from the second and first centuries B.C., of Hellenising proper names. To the same source we may trace the further modification of the name into the plural noun *Ἱεροσόλυμα* (with or without the article), Hierosolyma. When this first appeared it is impossible to discover. The earliest, directly recorded, instances of it, so far as I can trace, belong to the first century B.C. In Maccabees ii.-iv., in which the Septuagint spelling of proper names is so often followed,⁵ we find not Ierousalem but Ierosolyma; and so in the "Letter of Aristeas"⁶ (under the later Ptolemies), and in Strabo, quoting probably from an author who wrote soon after the

¹ Therefore Niese's note—'suspectum'—to the reading *Ἱεροσαλημη* (see Index to Niese's ed. of *Jos. s.v.*) is unnecessary.

² See above, p. 123.

³ The edd. of the LXX (including Swete's), and Niese's ed. of *Jos.*, prefix the *spiritus asper*. But in his *Introd. to the O.T. in Greek* Swete gives the light breathing, pp. 305, 313: and so Reinach in the excerpt from Clearchus (*Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, p. 11).

⁴ As in the expression of 'Ayin, yet in other cases of the initial *yod*, this is transliterated as *l* with the light breathing: e.g. *Ἰορδάνης*, *Ἰησοῦς*, etc.

⁵ Swete, *Introd.* 313.

⁶ Both with and without the article. See Thackeray's ed. in Swete's *Introd.* pp. 525 f. In the Letter of Aristeas, the rough breathing is prefixed; and it is a question whether the rough breathing should not also be prefixed in Maccabees ii.-iv.; as is done in Tischendorf's ed.

Syrian campaign of Pompey in 63 B.C.¹ In Latin Cicero has it,² and subsequent writers, for example Pliny, Tacitus, and Suetonius:³ still in a plural form Hierosolyma. It was therefore in common use by the first century B.C. But it appears also so uniformly in quotations from earlier Greek writers,⁴ that we are justified in tracing its origin to some distance behind the first century; and all the more so that the materials for its formation were present in Greek literature and were quoted in connection with the Jews as early as the fifth century B.C. Josephus, who in his Hellenic fashion constantly employs the form Hierosolyma⁵—though he must have known better—derives it more than once⁶ from Solyma, that is the Salem of Melchisedec.⁷ He spells it Solyma because Greek writers had already used this shorter form and found for it an etymology of their own.

¹ See Reinach, *op. cit.* p. 97. It occurs, too, in Philo (*Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23), Plutarch, and so through Appian (*Syr.* 50), Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* (xxxvii. 15 l., etc.), and subsequent writers: always as a plural and generally with the article.

² *Pro Flacco*, c. 28.

³ Pliny, *H.N.*, v. 14 f.; Tac. *Hi.* ii. 4, v. 1; Suet. *Tit.* 5. We find it also on an inscription of the time of Claudius: [Hi]erosolymitana (*Corp. Inscr. Lat.* x. no. 1971).

⁴ From Hecataeus of Abdera (c. 300 B.C.), in a fragment of Diodorus Sic. preserved by Photius; from Manetho (3rd cent. B.C.) in *Jos. C. Ap.* i. 14 f.; Berosus (under Antiochus Soter, 280–261 B.C.) in *Jos. I. Ant.* vii. 2; from Menander of Ephesus (probably early in 2nd cent. B.C.), and Dios (?) in *Jos. VIII. Ant.* v. 3, cf. *C. Ap.* i. 17; from Agatharchides of Cnidus (under Ptolemy VI., 181–146 B.C.) in *Jos. C. Ap.* i. 22; from Polybius (c. 210–128 B.C.) in *Jos. XVI. Ant.* iii. 3; from Timochares (probably 2nd cent. B.C.); Xenophon the topographer (? before the 1st cent. B.C.), and Philo the elder, an epic poet—all three in Eusebius, *Praep. Evarg.* ix. 35, 36, 37, cf. 20, 24; from Posidonius of Apamea (c. 135–51 B.C.), in *Diod. Sic.* xxxiv. (preserved by Photius). The historical Greek writers quoted here are all given in Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. But the student will find more convenient the collection of these extracts, and of those of pagan Latin writers given above and below, which has been drawn up by Théod. Reinach in his useful *Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris, 1895.

⁵ Both with and without the article: e.g. *Ant.* V. ii. 2; VII. ii. 2, iii. 2; VIII. x. 2, 4; X. vii. 1; XI. i. 1, 3, iii. 1, 10, iv. 2, v. 6, 8.

⁶ *I. Ant.* x. 2: ὁ τῆς Σολυμᾶ βασιλεὺς; τὴν μέντοι Σολυμᾶ ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα. VI. *B.J.* x. 1.

⁷ Gen. xiv.

He quotes¹ the Greek poet Choerilus, who so early as the fifth century B.C. had spoken of the Judæan range as the "Solymian mountains";² and Manetho,³ who speaks of the Hebrews, leaving Egypt, as the Solymites.⁴ It was natural to classic writers to identify this name with that of the Lycian Solymi mentioned by Homer.⁵ This appears to have been the origin of the form Hierosolyma; though we cannot help wondering if its resemblance to the name of Solomon had anything to do with its rapid acceptance.⁶ The form Solyma, which Josephus⁷ uses as a feminine singular (but indeclinable), appears as a plural neuter in Martial,⁸ and as an adjective, Solymus, in Valerius Flaccus, Statius, and Juvenal⁹—all at a time when the siege by Titus had made the name of the city very familiar throughout the Roman world. In Greek, Pausanias, in 175 B.C., also gives the form Solyma.¹⁰

So much then for the history of a false form. It is curious to observe that the one pagan writing in which the correct spelling is found, *Ἱεροσαλημ*, is that ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to the pedantic Emperor Julian.¹¹

The New Testament employs both forms, *Ἱεροσαλημ* and *Ἱεροσολυμα*. The former (indeclinable) is used mostly in the writings of Luke (about twenty-seven times in the Gospel and forty in Acts, as against the use of *Ἱεροσόλυμα* four times in the Gospel and over twenty in Acts¹²) and Paul; but also occasionally elsewhere. Grimm¹³ has pointed

¹ *C. Arion*, i. 22.

² Ἐν Σολέμοις ὄρεσιν.

³ *C. Arion*, i. 23.

⁴ Οἱ Σολυμίται.

⁵ So Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 2. Jos. VII. *Ant.* iii. 2: ἐπὶ γὰρ Ἀβράμῳ . . . Σόλυμα ἐκαλεῖτο μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ αὐτὴν φασὶ τινες, ὅτι καὶ Ὅμηρος ταῦτ' ὠνόμασεν Ἱεροσόλυμα· τὸ γὰρ ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων γλῶτταν ὠνόμασε τὰ Σόλυμα, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀσφάλεια.

⁶ Compare Menander of Ephesus: Σολομών ὁ Ἱεροσόλυμων βασιλεὺς; and Dios: τυραννῶν I. Σολομών; both quoted in Jos. VIII. *Ant.* v. 3, and *C. Ap.* i. 17 f.

⁷ Above, p. 131, n. 5.

⁸ *Epigram.* xi. 94 (written in 90 A.D.).

⁹ Val. Flaccus (fl. 70-90 A.D.) *Argonautica*, i. 13; Statius, v. 2, 138; Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 544.

¹⁰ *Perieg.* VIII. 16, 4, 5.

¹¹ *Epist.* 25.

¹² See Knowling on Acts i. 4.

¹³ *Lex.* s.v.

out that it has been selected where a certain sacred significance is intended;¹ or in solemn appeals.² It has the article only when accompanied by an adjective.³ The form *Ἱεροσόλυμα* appears as an indeclinable feminine only once.⁴ Elsewhere it is a neuter plural, as in Josephus and Greek writers; so in all the Gospels,⁵ and Acts and Galatians. It occurs only in John with the article in the oblique cases.⁶ It is doubtful whether either of the two forms should have the aspirate. Blass gives it to the Greek alone; Westcott and Hort deny it to both.

Following the Greek Testament the Vulgate has both the Hebrew and Greek forms, in some codices with the aspirate, in some without: Hierusalem and Hierosolyma, Ierusalem and Ierosolyma; and all these four continue through the Christian centuries. The Pilgrim of Bordeaux⁷ and Eucherius⁸ write Hierusalem; Eusebius in the *Onomasticon* *Ἱεροουσαλημ*, and Jerome Ierusalem; Antoninus⁹ and Arculf¹⁰ Hierosolima; Willibald, Bernard and Theodoric¹¹ Ierusalem; Chroniclers of the Crusades Hierosolyma and Hierusalem and Ierusalem;¹² documents of the Crusades, Hierosolyma.¹³ The earliest French writings have Iherusalem,¹⁴ Jerusalem, Jerusalem and Jerusalam.¹⁵ Barbour's *Brus* (iv. 29) has Ierusalem, and Spenser's *Faerie Queen* (Bk. I. Canto X. 57) Hierusalem. The English

¹ Gal. iv. 25.

² Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34. Add Luke xxiii. 28.

³ Winer, *Gram.*, E.T. 125; yet see Acts v. 28.

⁴ Matt. ii. 3. See also in Matt. iii. 5; where it stands for the inhabitants of the city.

⁵ E.g. Matt. xx. 17, xxi. 1?; Mark iii. 8; Luke xxiii. 7; John ii. 23, v. 2.

⁶ John v. 2, x. 22, xi. 18. So Winer, *op. cit.* p. 125. In John v. 1 the accusative is without the article.

⁷ 333 A.D.

⁸ c. 427-440.

⁹ c. 570.

¹⁰ 680.

¹¹ Wil. c. 722, Bern. 867, Theod. c. 1172.

¹² Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*.

¹³ Röhricht, *Regesta Regni Hieros.*

¹⁴ In the *Cité de Ih.* 1187.

¹⁵ *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, from the end of the 12th cent.: but in a revised form of somewhat later date (published Paris, 1897).

Authorised Version of 1611 has Ierusalem in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, but Hierusalem in the New Testament.

Thus Jerusalem (with some variants) comes to be the form in the languages of Europe. Hierosolyma, and the shortened Solyma, treated now as feminine, appear occasionally in poetry and romance. We have seen that an early Arabic form was 'Aurishalam. Other Arabic forms are Shalamu and Shallamu,¹ and Yerusolim; the last used in Palestine, to-day, by Jews, Levantines and native Christians.²

OTHER NAMES. (1) AELIA.

When the Emperor Hadrian razed the City, he strove also to destroy the native name by substituting Aelia Capitolina. Till the time of Constantine and for at least two centuries later Aelia was the official name;³ was still longer continued in writing;⁴ and even passed over into Arabic as 'Iliya.⁵ From the other part of Hadrian's name for the city comes Ptolemy's *Καπιτολιας*.

(2) HOLY CITY—EL-KŪDS.

In later passages of the Old Testament Jerusalem is sometimes designated The Holy City,⁶ and on the coins mentioned above Holy Jerusalem.⁷ This reappears in the New Testament,⁸ and on the Mosaic map in Medeba. Philo has Hieropolis.⁹

¹ Guy de Strange's *Palestine under the Moslems*, 83.

² *Z.D.P.F.*, xvii. 257.

³ *Onomasticon*, Euseb. *Αιλια*, Jer. Aelia; also in Canon of the Council of Nice, vii.; Acts of a Synod held in Jerusalem in 536 (cited by Robinson, *B.R.* ii. 9).

⁴ Cf. Adamnanus, *De Locis Sanctis*, i. 21.

⁵ Yakūt, iv. 592.

⁶ Isa. xlvi. 2; Neh. xi. 1, etc. Epiphanius (c. 840).

⁷ *ירושלם קדושה*.

⁸ *Ἡ ἀγία πόλις*, Matt. iv, 5, xxvii. 53.

⁹ *Ἱερόπολις*: *In Flaccum*, § 7.

So in Arabic the commonest designation is derived from the Semitic root for *holy k-d-s*. It appears in various forms: Bêt el Maḳdis, el Muḳaddas, el Muḳaddis,¹ or (in the modern vernacular) el Ḳuds esh-Sherif, or more briefly el Ḳuds "the Sanctuary." In the East this is by far the commonest name to-day.

The interesting suggestion is made by M. Clermont Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine*, vol. i. 186, that el-Muḳaddas or el Ḳuds betrays a reminiscence of a dedication of the sanctuary at Jerusalem to the Canaanite deity Ḳadesh. But for this there appears to be no evidence.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

WENDT ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

II.

THE next case which Wendt brings forward is the speech in vi. 27 sqq. It does not harmonize with the historical situation. The speech follows upon the request of the people for a sign similar to that given by Moses in the manna. Could any more inappropriate occasion, Wendt asks, be imagined for such a demand? The people who asked this sign had received precisely such a sign the day before. Wendt thinks that in the original tradition the discourse vi. 27 sqq. had no connexion with the miracle of the feeding of the multitude. The Evangelist thought to give it an appropriate setting by connecting it with this miracle. What more fitting than that the feeding of the multitude should be followed by the speech in which Jesus spoke of Himself as the bread of life! So he endeavoured to connect the two by vi. 26 in which Jesus reproaches the people with seeking Him, not because they saw the signs, but because they ate and were filled. But the connexion thus estab-

¹ Yakût, iv. 590; *Taj el 'arus*, iv. 214.

lished is but artificial; and the demand of the people for a sign, which the Evangelist faithfully transcribed from the Source, is a witness against the setting he has given the speech. There are further traces, Wendt thinks, that the speech is not in its right place. In *v.* 36 Jesus says to the people, "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen Me, and believe not." To what previous saying of Jesus does this refer? Wendt can find nothing in the chapter to which the words may apply. But he does find something to correspond in *v.* 17-47, where, after speaking of the works which bear witness to Him (*v.* 36), Jesus reproaches the people with their unbelief (*vv.* 37-47). But the speech in chapter *v.* is addressed to the people of Jerusalem, while that of chapter *vi.* is delivered in Galilee. How can Jesus say that He has told these Galileans things which He said a long time before in Jerusalem? The only conclusion is that He must have had one and the same audience before Him in both cases, i.e. that the speech in chapter *vi.* was delivered not in Galilee at all, but in Jerusalem on the same occasion as that in chapter *v.*

Whatever difficulties there may be with regard to the points which Wendt here adduces, it is questionable whether his explanation does not raise more than it solves. The Evangelist is supposed to have deliberately broken up a speech into two portions, giving to one an entirely different setting and audience from the other. For what purpose? Merely because the latter part of the speech spoke of Jesus as the bread of life, and it seemed a happy idea to connect that saying with the miracle of the loaves. In the latter portion of the speech there is an allusion to something that has been said in the former. But the Evangelist brought so little intelligence to bear upon the matter that, though he had the speech as a unity before him, he was "not conscious of the reference of *vi.* 36 to the speech in chapter *v.*," a reference, however, which is per-

fectly clear to the critic of the present day, in spite of the fact that the two speeches are represented as being given on entirely different occasions. Still the Evangelist does seem to have felt that vi. 36 must refer to something, and accordingly invented *v.* 26 to account for it. And though the demand of the people for a sign could not have been introduced on a more unfortunate occasion than after the miracle of the feeding of the multitude, he never seems to have felt the incongruity, but was apparently quite satisfied that by the interpolation of *v.* 26 he had not only accounted for *v.* 36, but made the transition from the miracle to the speech smooth and natural. There may be inconsistencies enough in the Fourth Gospel calling for explanation, but it is questionable whether any or all of them present difficulty to be compared with the character of the Evangelist, as we must imagine him on the Wendtian hypothesis,—a man at once of preternatural dulness and most lively imagination; blind to the most obvious allusions in the speeches he records, yet anxious to establish a connexion where none exists; with no regard for the unity of the text before him, yet with such respect for the letter that he will not omit one word that may bear witness against himself; a man at once of a most destructive and most constructive tendency, with a passion for breaking a whole to pieces for the mere pleasure of the thing, yet delighting to manufacture out of the merest fragments such as ix. 4 sq. and xi. 23, 25 sq. such wholes as the story of the blind man in chapter ix. and the resurrection of Lazarus in chapter xi.; a man who has wilfully broken the magnificent window on which the Apostle had painted the picture of the Saviour, in order that with the pieces of painted glass he might construct the kaleidoscope of the Gospel. Wendt may think to account for the Fourth Gospel by the character of the Evangelist, but who shall account for the character of the Evangelist?

To return to the passage immediately under consideration, the chief reason Wendt has for arguing that the speech vi. 27 sqq. cannot have been delivered on the occasion described in the Gospel is that the demand of the people for a sign is singularly inappropriate after the miracle of the feeding. One would rather think that this very inappropriateness is a strong reason against the hypothesis that the Evangelist invented the situation. A man with such an imagination as the Evangelist is supposed to have had must surely have realized that the request of the people was out of place. What was to have hindered him from leaving out the demand altogether? He had but to omit *vv.* 28-32, and all would have run smoothly. The apparent effrontery of the demand for a sign in the circumstances is, to our mind, rather a witness to the historical truth of the situation. And upon consideration, the demand is not so unwarranted as we are apt to think at first. Weiss's explanation serves sufficiently to account for the facts. The miracle of the feeding of the multitude had created great enthusiasm among them. Their Messianic expectations had been aroused (*v.* 14). Jesus, fearing an outbreak, had withdrawn Himself from them. He would not immediately confirm their expectations. Yet He required them still to believe in Him. Let Him, then, give them some specific sign from heaven to attest His Messiahship, and they would be content to wait. "What sign shewest Thou, then," they ask, "that we may see, and believe Thee?" On this interpretation, the preceding narrative of the miracle and the excitement it aroused, so far from rendering inappropriate, rather suggests the motive for the demand of the people for a sign, a sign to confirm the expectations which had been kindled and yet chilled by Jesus' refusal to fall in with them. And for the allusion of the word in *v.* 36 we do not need to go beyond the present chapter. Wendt would refer it to *v.* 17-47. But the very length of the passage cited is a proof

of how indefinitely it satisfies the requirements of the case. When Jesus says, "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen [Me], and believe not," we look for some direct, pointed saying, rather than a long discourse in which this conclusion may be implied but is never distinctly stated. And such a direct statement we have in *v.* 26 of the present chapter. There Jesus reproves the people for seeking Him, not because they saw the signs, but because they ate of the loaves and were filled. They have seen, and yet they have not believed. Wendt's distinction between the "works" of Jesus and the "signs" of the Evangelist obscures to him the reference of *v.* 36 to *v.* 26. He finds the allusion of *v.* 36 in chapter *v.*, because Jesus is there speaking of His "works"; and refuses to admit the much more evident reference to *v.* 26, because Jesus there speaks of "signs," and it is essential to his theory to maintain that Jesus never did appeal to "signs." But to those who are not bound by the exigency of such a hypothesis, it will seem much more natural to find the allusion of *v.* 36 in the saying, a few verses before, that, though the people have seen the "signs," they are drawn to Jesus not by any worthy motives, but only for the satisfaction of their material expectations. We may note in passing that there is some doubt about the "us" in *v.* 36. If it be omitted, the reference to *v.* 26 becomes even plainer.

Our space will not permit us to discuss with fulness the other passages in which Wendt thinks to find evidence of displacement of certain of the speeches of Jesus. But we might briefly indicate the nature of Wendt's arguments in the other cases he brings forward, and our reasons for dissenting from them.

The passage *vii.* 15-24 he would also connect with chapter *v.* on the ground that it refers to the healing of the man on the Sabbath, which had given occasion to the speech in that chapter, and to the design against the life of Jesus

there recorded (v. 18). But according to the chronology of the Gospel, there is an interval of at least seven months between chapter vii. and chapter v. Yet Jesus addresses the Jews before Him at the Feast of Tabernacles as if they were the same as the men of chapter v., and speaks of their design upon His life, and their attitude towards the healing of the man on the Sabbath, not in the past, but in the present tense (*ζητείτε* v. 19, *θαυμάζετε* v. 21, *χολᾶτε* v. 23). The conclusion is, according to Wendt, that vii. 15-24 must be dated not seven months after chapter v., but on the same occasion. It is a sufficient answer to these arguments to point to vii. 1, in which we read that Jesus was aware that the conspiracy against His life was still active. If that was the case, then no doubt the discussion of the Sabbath desecration, which had provoked it, and the anger at it, were active too; and we can quite well understand Jesus referring to them not as past but as present. This explanation seems much more reasonable than the hypothesis of Wendt, who can suggest no better reason for the Evangelist's destroying the original continuity of the Source than the fact that the question of the Jews in vii. 15 led him to suppose that this must be the beginning of a new scene. The Wendtian treatment of such passages labours under peculiar difficulties. It must make the connexion between the passage under discussion, and the place in the Source to which it would refer it, so plain as to convince the critic of to-day that this is where the passage must have originally stood; and yet the plainer it makes the connexion, the more difficult it is to explain how the Evangelist could have missed it.

Further traces of the disintegrating work of the Evangelist are found, Wendt believes, in chapters vii. and viii. Chapter viii. opens with the words, *πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (v. 12). The *αὐτοῖς* cannot refer to the officers or members of the Sanhedrim who have been men-

tioned immediately before (vii. 45-52), but must apply to the people. That is to say chapter viii. continues as if the situation remained the same as in vii. 37-44. And the speech of Jesus in chapter viii. is really a continuation of that in the latter part of chapter vii. The theme is practically the same. The saying, viii. 12, "I am the light of the world," etc., is only a different figure to express the thought of vii. 37, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink." viii. 14 takes up the thought of vii. 28 sq., and viii. 21 that of vii. 33 sq. The conclusion is that, as it is the same theme that is pursued in these various sayings, they must all have been uttered on the same occasion, and that the episode of the attempt to take Jesus (vii. 32, 45-53) is an interpolation of the Evangelist. We need not again press our question,—Why should the Evangelist thus break up the unity of the speeches of the Source? It is the ever-recurring objection to the procedure of Wendt. We would only remark that to our mind it is much more likely that Jesus, in addressing the same audience, should have dwelt upon the same points, particularly points which had given rise to considerable misunderstanding (vii. 27, 35, 40 sqq.), than that the Evangelist should have acted in the way Wendt supposes.

In xii. 44-50 the similarity of theme is again the reason with Wendt for connecting the passage with 35, 36*a*, and regarding *vv.* 37-43 as an interpolation of the Evangelist. We should rather say that the similarity in question is the reason for the Evangelist's introducing here the saying for which he assigns no special occasion. The connexion between 35, 36*a* and 44-50 does not appear so close as Wendt would make out. If the two passages were originally connected, *vv.* 44, 45 would rather disturb the continuity of the thought. While we recognize, then, that *v.* 46 has a certain relation to *vv.* 35, 36*a*, in virtue of the figure employed (which was possibly the Evangelist's reason for

introducing the passage 44-50 here), we fail to feel that *v.* 44 sqq. contains, as Wendt says, "the natural, we may say the necessary, continuation of the thought of *v.* 35 sq." To the question,—Why should the Evangelist have inserted the heterogeneous section 36*b*-43 in the middle of the speech of Jesus instead of at the end, Wendt has a most ingenious reply. In the Source, he thinks, there must have stood after *xii.* 36*a* some remarks about the attitude of the Jews towards the words of Jesus, probably something to the effect that the meaning of His saying was hidden from them. But the Evangelist misunderstood the remark, and took it to mean that Jesus had hidden Himself from the Jews. The explanation, while not complimentary to the intelligence of the Evangelist, is certainly creditable to the ingenuity of the critic.

The passage *xiii.* 12-20 presents, according to Wendt, a particularly favourable opportunity for observing the interposition of the Evangelist. Having explained to the disciples that His washing their feet is meant to be an example to them to exhibit like humility, Jesus goes on, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (17). Here follow two verses in which the traitor is excluded from the promise of blessedness thus given. And the section concludes with the words, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me" (20). Plainly *vv.* 18, 19 are an interpolation, Wendt says. *V.* 20 stands in utter isolation, while *vv.* 18, 19 proceed on a misconception of what immediately precedes them. For Jesus has not given an absolute promise of blessedness to the disciples, but only on condition of their obedience to His admonition. Omit *vv.* 18, 19 and *v.* 20 follows naturally upon *v.* 17. But as the passage stands *vv.* 18, 19 indicate a misconception of Jesus' saying, while *v.* 20 is unintelligible, a state of matters to be accounted for only on the

theory that the Evangelist was reproducing the words of Jesus at second hand.

We cannot accept this explanation. If there is an interpolation at all, we should say it is *v.* 20 rather than *vv.* 18, 19, not so much because of its want of relation to what precedes it, as because it interrupts the connexion between 19 and 21 sq. But it does not seem necessary to resort to this explanation. Such connexion as exists between *v.* 20 and *v.* 17 does not appear to be seriously interrupted by *vv.* 18, 19. In *v.* 17 Jesus has announced the blessedness of the disciples if they follow His example. Wendt's objection that the exclusion of the traitor ignores the condition on which this blessedness is pronounced seems somewhat finical. Jesus is describing the conduct of the true disciple. He is addressing His own band of faithful followers. And He looks forward with confidence to their obtaining the blessedness of which He has given them the promise. But not all. There is one who will not share this blessedness, because he is no true disciple, but a traitor. If *v.* 20 resumes the thought of *v.* 17, magnifying the office which is to be discharged in the spirit described, does it not cast a side-glance, too, at the case of him who has proved himself unworthy that office? Judas is excluded from the blessing, because he has proved untrue to the duty, of discipleship. "He that receiveth whomsoever I send," says *v.* 20, "receiveth Me." These words take us back again to the lowly service and rich blessedness of faithful discipleship described in *vv.* 16 sq., but they have their side-reference, too, to the case of Judas, who is not of the faithful, who is not included in the "whomsoever I send."

The last instance cited by Wendt in support of his hypothesis is the farewell speech, chapters xiii.–xvi. The speech appears to close at the end of chapter xiv. Not only do the last words *ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐν τεύθειν* (which in his earlier volume Wendt regarded as an addition of the Evan-

gelist, founded on Mark xiv. 42) indicate this, but the whole tenour of the speech from *v.* 25 onwards points in this direction. But with chapter xv. the speech goes on as if there had been no interruption, and without any formula such as *πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν* (cp. viii. 12, 21) to introduce what follows. A further point which attracts attention is the remark of Jesus, xvi. 5, that He is going away to Him that sent Him, and none of them asketh Him, Whither goest Thou? How can Jesus say this in view of the questions of Peter and Thomas, xiii. 36, xiv. 5? Both these facts point to some transposition in the order in which the farewell words of Jesus are placed. Wendt suggests that chapters xv. and xvi. should be inserted after xiii. 35. The mistake is due to the Evangelist, who quoted from memory, and thought that the question of Peter xiii. 36 was called forth by the words of Jesus in xiii. 33, "Whither I go ye cannot come," and did not realize that by introducing xiii. 36, on which chapter xiv. followed close, at this point, he was disturbing the close connexion between xiii. 34 and chapter xv.

One has some sympathy with the feeling of the Evangelist that xiii. 36 should follow the saying of Jesus in xiii. 33, for the connexion between the question of Peter and what precedes it, in the present arrangement of the Gospel, is much more striking than that which Wendt would assign to it by his re-arrangement of the farewell speech. If we insert chapters xv. and xvi. in the place Wendt suggests, then the question of Peter xiii. 36 is called forth by the saying of Jesus in xvi. 32. But Jesus says nothing there about His leaving the disciples, but tells the disciples that they will all desert Him. This certainly leads up well to the announcement of Peter's denial in xiii. 38, but not to the question of Peter, "Lord, whither goest Thou?" (xiii. 36). That question comes in much more naturally where it stands, and we are disposed to account for its place, not by

assuming a mistake on the part of the Evangelist, but by accepting the order of the Gospel as the true order of events. But further, if we follow the arrangement of Wendt, it is difficult to understand the questions of Peter xiii. 36 and Thomas xiv. 5 at all. Jesus has distinctly said that He is going to the Father (xvi. 5, 16, 28). How then can Peter and Thomas immediately after ask whither He is going? And what answer does He give save that which He has given already, that He is going to His Father (xiv. 2-4, 12)? As to Wendt's objection that the saying of Jesus (xvi. 5) is unintelligible after the questions of Peter and Thomas referred to, that depends upon the sense in which the saying is interpreted. The most natural explanation is that of B. Weiss, that they do not ask whither Jesus is going because they know already. The questions of Peter and Thomas have brought out the answer, and they have no need to ask further. Indeed in the verse in question Jesus repeats the information, "I go My way to Him that sent me" (xvi. 5*a*). What need is there to ask further, "Whither goest Thou?" But if we place chapter xvi. before xiii. 36, then it is difficult to understand why none of the disciples acts immediately upon the suggestion of Jesus in xvi. 5. Jesus' remark, "none of you asketh Me," must be understood here as a reproof. But none of them lays it to heart. They listen without question to the rest of the speech in chapter xvi., in which He speaks of going to His Father, and then at the end of it Peter, apropos of no special reference to Jesus' departure, suddenly bethinks him of the question which Jesus some time ago complained about their not asking. To our mind the present order of the chapters gives a much more connected account than that which Wendt proposes.

As to the objection that the speech at supper appears to come to a close with the end of chapter xiv., that is quite true. But even under Wendt's rearrangement, chapter xvii. still

remains to be spoken after they have risen from table. Why not chapters xv. and xvi. as well? It is true that there does seem to be a certain connexion of thought between xiii. 34 sq. and chapter xv., in which we find a further reference to the commandment to love one another (*vv.* 12-17). But the opening verses of chapter xv. do not immediately pursue this theme, and the manner in which it is introduced suggests rather recurrence to a subject touched on before (*cp.* xv. 15, 20) than continuous development of the line of thought presented in xiii. 34 sq. The connexion secured by making chapter xv. follow on xiii. 35 is too dearly purchased at the cost of the difficulties in which this rearrangement of the chapters involves us.

We have examined, with such fulness as our space permitted, the evidence which Wendt brings forward in support of his hypothesis that the Fourth Gospel is based upon a written Source. We have sought rather to investigate the grounds than to discuss the conclusions of his hypothesis. In respect of the latter much more might be said in opposition to the theory he advances. But it seemed better to give a fair hearing to the reasons he brings forward in support of his hypothesis, and to weigh carefully the evidence upon which it is based. We do not believe that that evidence justifies the conclusion Wendt draws. We take exception to his treatment of many of the passages he discusses. But we cannot withhold our admiration of the critical acumen displayed in the book. Wendt states his case with a clearness and vigour that captivate the reader. No stronger defence could be desired of the Source-hypothesis. If the book fails to convince us of the truth of that hypothesis, it is not through any imperfection in the manner of its presentation, but because of the inherent weakness of the hypothesis itself.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

III.

JEREMIAH VII. 1-ix. 22.

Not the Presence of Yahweh's Temple in Judah, but Amendment of Life and Obedience to Yahweh's moral Commands, is the Condition of His Favour and Protection.

VII. ¹ The word that came to Jeremiah from Yahweh, saying, ² Stand in the gate of Yahweh's house, and proclaim there this word, and say, Hear the word of Yahweh, all Judah, ye that enter in at these gates to worship Yahweh. ³ Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place. ⁴ Trust ye not in lying words, saying, 'The temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh, are these.*' ⁵ For if ye throughly amend your ways and your doings; if ye throughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbour; ⁶ if ye oppress not the sojourner,† the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not‡ innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your own hurt: ⁷ then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers from of old and even for evermore. ⁸ Behold, ye trust in lying words, in order not to profit. ⁹ Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye have not known; ¹⁰ and come and stand before me in this house, over which my name hath been called,§ and

* I.e. the temple itself, and the buildings round connected with it.

† I.e. the foreigner temporarily resident in Israel, who had no legal status of his own, and who in the 'Book of the Covenant' (Ex. 21-23), and Deuteronomy, is repeatedly commended to the regard and benevolence of the Israelite.

‡ So transposing two letters. The Heb. text, by a scribal error, has *do not shed* (imperative).

§ In token of ownership (see 2 Sam. 12. 28; Isa. 4. 1). Often in Deuteronomic

say, 'We are delivered,' in order (forsooth) to do all these abominations? ¹¹ Is this house, over which my name hath been called, become a cave* of robbers in your eyes? I also,—behold I have seen it! saith Yahweh.

Yahweh threatens to do to His Temple in Jerusalem as He did formerly to His Temple at Shiloh.

¹² For go, I pray you, unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I caused my name to dwell at the first; † and see what I did to it because of the wickedness of my people Israel. ‡ ¹³ And now, because ye have done all these works, saith Yahweh, and I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not; ¹⁴ I will do unto the house, over which my name hath been called, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I did unto Shiloh. ¹⁵ And I will cast you out from before my face, as I have cast out § your brethren (even), all the seed of Ephraim.

Yahweh will accept no Intercession on behalf of His People; for it is wholly given to idolatry.

¹⁶ And thou, pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee. ¹⁷ Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem?

writers, of the temple, the people, or the city of Jerusalem, as Deut. 28. 10; 1 Kings 8. 43; Jer. 14. 9; 25. 29; 32. 34 *al.*; and occasionally besides (cf. Am. 9. 12; Isa. 63. 19).

* There are many caves in the limestone strata of Palestine, which in ancient times were often the homes of robbers. (LXX. σπήλαιον, as also Matt. 21. 13 = Mark 11. 17 = Luke 19. 46).

† Josh. 18. 1; Judges 18. 31; 21. 9 ff.; 1 Sam. 1-3.

‡ This destruction which overtook Shiloh is alluded to also in Jer. 26. 6, and Ps. 78. 60; but it is not mentioned in the existing historical books. It most probably happened after the events described in 1 Sam. 4.

§ So LXX. The Heb. text inserts *all* (which has the effect of weakening the 'all' which follows).

¹⁸ The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven,* and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods, in order to vex me. ¹⁹ Do they vex *me*? saith Yahweh; is it not themselves (that they vex), in order to (bring about) the confusion of their own faces? ²⁰ Therefore thus saith the Lord Yahweh: Behold, mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall burn, and not be quenched.

Yahweh has demanded of His people not sacrifice, but loyalty to Himself, and obedience to His moral Commands. But to these Demands Israel has never responded.

²¹ Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh!† ²² For I spake not with your fathers, neither commanded them, in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, with regard to burnt offering or sacrifice: ²³ but this thing I commanded them, saying, Harken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the way that I command you, in order that it may be well with you.‡ ²⁴ But they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked § in

* In all probability Ashtoreth (Astarte), 2 Kings 23. 13. Cf. ch. 44. 17, 18, 19.

† The words must be supposed to be spoken with irony and contempt. The burnt-offering was not eaten by the worshipper, but only parts of the peace-offering. Yahweh however cares so little for either, as offered by these idolatrous Israelites, that they may, if they please, eat both together; they are nothing really sacred, but only 'flesh.'

‡ When Jeremiah wrote, the priestly parts of the Pent. had not yet been combined with the rest of the Pentateuch, and the reference here is to the latter. Sacrifices are indeed enjoined in JE (Ex. 23. 14-19), and Deuteronomy: but little stress is laid upon them; and the *promises* (as here, 'in order that it may be well with you') are annexed more generally to loyalty to Yahweh and the refusal to follow after other gods. See Ex. 15. 26, 19. 5, 6, 23. 21ff.; Deut. 28. 1, 2; and cf. Deut. 4. 40, 5. 33 (which particularly resembles *v.* 23 *b* here), 6. 3, 18; also 10. 12-13.

§ So LXX. (cf. 3. 17, 9. 14, 11. 8, 13. 10 *al.*) The Heb. text adds, *in counsels.*

the stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward, and not forward. ²⁵ Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily* rising up early and sending them: ²⁶ yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff: they did worse than their fathers.

Nor will the People respond to them now.

²⁷ And thou shalt speak all these words unto them, but they will not hearken to thee: thou shalt also call unto them, but they will not answer thee. ²⁸ And thou shalt say unto them, This is the nation that hath not hearkened to the voice of Yahweh their God, nor received correction: faithfulness† is perished, and is cut off from their mouth.

*Let the Nation mourn over the Idolatry which has caused
Yahweh to cast off His People.*

²⁹ Poll thy locks,‡ (O Jerusalem,) § and cast them away, and take up a dirge on the bare heights; for Yahweh hath rejected and forsaken the generation of his wrath. ³⁰ For the children of Judah have done that which is evil in my sight, saith Yahweh: they have set their detestable things || in the house over which my name hath been called, to defile it. ³¹ And they have built the high places ¶ of Topheth, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to

* So doubling a word. The Heb. text, as it stands, would mean *by day*.

† Cf. 5. 1, 3.

‡ To poll the hair was a mark of mourning: Mic. 1. 16, Job 1. 20 (where 'shave' is the same Heb. as 'poll' here); cf. Deut. 14. 1.

§ This word is inserted because in the Heb. the pronouns are feminine, shewing that the city, or the population personified, is addressed (as often in Jer., e.g. 4. 30, 10. 17).

|| Cf. 2 Kings 23. 13 (where 'abomination' [the first two times] in A.V., R.V., represents the same Hebrew).

¶ LXX has *high place*, which may be right.

burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded not, neither came it into my mind.

A terrible Judgement will overtake the People.

³² Therefore, behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that it shall no more be called Topheth, nor The valley of the son of Hinnom, but The valley of Slaughter: and they shall bury in Topheth, because there shall be no place (else).^{*}
³³ And the carcases of this people shall be food for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray † them away. ³⁴ And I will cause to cease from the cities of Judah, and from the streets of Jerusalem, the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride: for the land shall become a waste.

Even the Bones of the buried Israelites will suffer indignities: their graves will be opened and desecrated by the Enemy.

VIII. ¹ At that time, saith Yahweh, they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of his princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, out of their graves: ² and they shall spread them before the sun, and the moon, and all the host of heaven, ‡ whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and after whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshipped: they shall not be gathered, nor be buried; they shall be for dung upon the face of the ground.
³ And death shall be chosen rather than life by all the

* The land will be so full of corpses that they will have to be buried even in the unclean place of Topheth.

† An archaism for *frighten*. (Really a shortened form of *affray*, of which the participle is *afraid*. See Hastings' *D.B.* s.v.; and cf. Deut. 28. 26.)

‡ See Deut. 4. 19, 17. 3; 2 Kings 21. 3, 5, 23. 4, 5; Jer. 19. 13.

remnant that are left of this evil family in all the places * whither I have driven them, saith Yahweh of hosts.

Judah's utter Refusal to repent and return to Yahweh.

⁴ And thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh: Do men fall, and not rise again? Doth one turn back, and not return again? ⁵ Why then hath this people† turned back with a perpetual backturning? they hold fast deceit; ‡ they refuse to return. ⁶ I listened and heard, but they spake not aright: no man repenteth him of his wickedness, saying, 'What have I done?' every one turneth back in his course, as a horse that rusheth headlong in the battle. ⁷ Yea, the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; § and the turtle and the swift and the swallow observe the time of their coming; || but my people know not the ordinance of Yahweh. ⁸ How do ye say, 'We are wise, and the law of Yahweh is with us?' But surely, behold, the false pen of the scribes hath wrought falsely. ¶ ⁹ The wise men are put to shame, they are dismayed and taken: lo, they have rejected the word of Yahweh; and what manner of wisdom have they?

* So LXX. The Heb. text has *in all the places that are left*. (A word accidentally repeated by error. The Heb. cannot be rendered as it is rendered in A.V., R.V.)

† So LXX. The Heb. text adds *Jerusalem* (without 'of,' as A.V., R.V.)

‡ I.e., probably, either insincerity towards Yahweh, or the false teachings of idolatry (cf. 14. 14, 23. 26).

§ I.e. the times of their migration, the birds mentioned being migratory birds, which return to Palestine every spring with great suddenness and regularity (Tristram, *NHB.* 205, 219, 246). Cf. Isa. 1. 3.

|| Or, *hath made (it) into falsehood*.

¶ The priests gave *tôrâh*, or 'direction,' on cases of ceremonial or other usage submitted to them (Deut. 24. 8 [where *teach* means *direct how to act*], Hag. 2. 11-13 [render in *v.* 11, 'Ask, now, *direction* of the priests']); and they declare here that they possess the legitimate traditional body of directions, or 'law,' respecting religious practice (cf. 2. 8, 18. 18). Jer. replies that the scribes have falsified this body of directions,—exactly in what way we do not know: perhaps by claiming to have Yahweh's sanction for practices or ceremonial usages, of which in reality He did not approve.

The Retribution which will fall upon them.

¹⁰ Therefore will I give their wives unto others, and their fields to them that shall possess them: for from the least even unto the greatest every one is greedy of gain; from the prophet even unto the priest every one dealeth falsely. ¹¹ And they would heal the breach of the daughter of my people lightly, saying, 'Peace, peace'; when there is no peace. ¹² They shall shew shame, because they have committed abomination: (for now) yea, they are not ashamed, neither know they how to be confused: therefore they shall fall among them that fall; at the time of their visitation they shall stumble, saith Yahweh.*

Another Description of the Approach of the Invader from the North.

¹³ I will utterly make an end of them, saith Yahweh: there are no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig tree, and the leaf fadeth; † and I have appointed them those that shall pass over them. ‡ ¹⁴ 'Why are we sitting still? assemble yourselves, and let us enter into the fortified cities, and perish there: for Yahweh our God hath caused us to perish, and given us water of gall § to drink, because we have sinned against Yahweh. ¹⁵ We wait for peace, but no good cometh; for a time of healing, but behold dismay!' ¹⁶ From Dan is heard the snorting of his horses; || at the sound of the neighing of his

* *Vv.* 10b-13 are repeated, with only slight verbal variations, from 6. 13-15.

† A fig. description of the state of the people: it is like a tree with no fruit worth anything upon it. Contrast 17. 8.

‡ Or, *pass through them*, i.e. invade them (cf. Is. 8. 18, 28. 15): but the text is suspicious.

§ Heb. *rōsh*, the name of a herb (see Deut. 29. 18; Hos. 10. 4 [R.V. *hemlock*]) yielding some extremely bitter fruit or extract, which cannot now be certainly identified. Cf. 9. 15, 23. 15; Lam. 3. 5, 19; Ps. 69. 21. 'Gall,' i.e. *bile*, is in all these passages to be understood not literally, but merely as fig. of something very bitter.

|| Cf. 4. 15.

steeds the whole land trembleth : and they are come, and have devoured the land, and all that is in it ; the city, and them that dwell therein. ¹⁷ For, behold, I will send serpents, (even) adders, among you, which cannot be charmed ; and they shall bite you, saith Yahweh.

Jeremiah's Grief and Distress at the Troubles imminent upon his People.

¹⁸ Oh that I could brighten myself * in time of sorrow ! my heart is heavy † upon me. ‡ ¹⁹ Behold, the voice of the cry of the daughter of my people from a land that is very far off : § ‘ Is Yahweh not in Zion ? is her King not in her ? ’ Wherefore have they vexed me with their graven images, and with foreign vanities ? || ²⁰ ‘ The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved. ’ ²¹ For the breach of the daughter of my people am I broken ; ¶ I go in mourning ; appalment hath taken hold on me. ²² Is there no balm in Gilead ; is there no physician there ? for wherefore is not the fresh flesh of the daughter of my people come up (upon her) ?

Jeremiah bewails the desperate Condition of his People.

IX. ¹ Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people ! ² Oh that I had in the wilderness a travellers' lodging place ; that I might leave my people and go from them ! for they be all adulterers, an assembly of faithless men. ³ And they bend their tongue (as) their bow in falsehood ; and not in accordance with faithfulness are they mighty in the land : ** for they proceed from evil

* Heb. *Oh my brightness.*

† Heb. *sick.*

‡ Cf. 4. 19.

§ Jeremiah in thought imagines the people as in exile, and pictures them complaining bitterly that Yahweh has forsaken Zion.

|| Cf. 2. 5.

¶ I.e. broken mentally, prostrated by grief.

** I.e. those in authority abuse their power and position.

to evil, and they know not me, saith Yahweh. ⁴ Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother: for every brother doth utterly overreach, and every neighbour goeth about with slanders. ⁵ And they mock every one his neighbour, and speak not the truth: they have taught their tongue to speak lies; they weary themselves to commit iniquity. ⁶ Thy dwelling is in the midst of deceit; through deceit they refuse to know me, saith Yahweh.

The Judgement upon this Corruption.

⁷ Therefore thus saith Yahweh of hosts, Behold, I will smelt* them, and try† them; for how (else) should I do, ‡ because of the evil of § the daughter of my people? ⁸ Their tongue is a deadly arrow; the word in their mouth is deceit: || one speaketh peaceably to his neighbour, but in his heart he layeth ambush for him. ⁹ Shall I not visit them for these things? saith Yahweh: shall not my soul be avenged on a nation such as this?¶

The Desolation destined shortly to come upon Judah.

¹⁰ For the mountains will I take up a weeping and lamentation, and for the pastures of the wilderness a dirge, because they are burned up, so that none passeth through; neither can men hear the voice of the cattle; from the fowl of the heavens unto the beasts, they are fled, they are gone. ¹¹ And I will make Jerusalem heaps, a dwelling place of

* Fig. for, purify by severe discipline: cf. 6. 29 (where the same word is rendered 'refine'), Is. 1. 25 ('purge away'), Ps. 66. 10b ('try'), Zech. 13. 9 ('refine').

† Or, *assay* (6. 27).

‡ Or, *for how (terribly) will I do because of the evil of the daughter of my people!*

§ So LXX (cf. 7. 12, 32. 32 ['evil' and 'wickedness' represent the same Heb.]). The Heb. text omits *the evil of*.

|| So LXX (improving the parallelism of the verse, and implying a different vocalization only). The Heb. text has, *one speaketh deceit: with his mouth*.

¶ Cf. the same refrain in 5. 9, 29.

jackals : and I will make the cities of Judah a desolation, without inhabitant. ¹² Who is the wise man that may understand this ? and (who is) he to whom the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken, that he may declare it ? wherefore is the land perished, and burned up like a wilderness, so that none passeth through ?

The bitter Consequences of Judah's Abandonment of Yahweh.

¹³ And Yahweh said, Because they have forsaken my law which I set before them,* and have not hearkened to my voice, nor walked therein ; ¹⁴ but have walked after the stubbornness of their own heart, and after the Baals, which their fathers taught them : ¹⁵ therefore thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold, I will feed them, (even) this people, with wormwood, and give them water of gall to drink : ¹⁶ and I will scatter them among the nations, whom neither they nor their fathers have known ; and I will send the sword after them, till I have consumed them.

*Let the Mourning Women come, and chant a Dirge over
Judah's Fall.*

¹⁷ Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, Consider ye, and call for the women that chant dirges, † that they may come ; and send for the skilful women, † that they may come : ¹⁸ and let them hasten and take up a lamentation for us, and let our eyes run down with tears, and our eyelids gush out with waters. ¹⁹ For a voice of lamentation is heard out of Zion, ' How are we spoiled ! we are put greatly to shame, because we have forsaken the land, because they

* Alluding in particular to Deuteronomy : see Deut. 4. 8, 44 ; and cf. chap. 26. 4.

† I. e., women acting as professional mourners, such as still in Syria assist at funerals, and either recite from memory, or extemporize for the occasion, dirges constructed in a particular metrical form, in which the virtues of the deceased are recounted, and his loss is bewailed.

have flung down our dwellings.' ²⁰ For hear, O ye women, the word of Yahweh, and let your ear receive the word of his mouth; and teach your daughters lamentation, and every one her neighbour a dirge. ²¹ For death is come up into our windows, it is entered into our palaces; to cut off the children from the street, and the young men from the broad places. ²² [Speak thus, saith Yahweh:] * And the carcasses of men shall fall as dung upon the face of the field, and as a handful after the reaper, with none to gather it.

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

VII. 4. With the plural אלה ef. הכמה 2 Ch. 8. 11.

9. On the graphic 'exclamatory' (Ew. § 328) use of the inf. abs., see G.-K. § 113ee. Cf. Hos. 4. 2. Is. 21. 5; and with a question, as here, ch. 3. 1 *end*, Job 40. 2.

10. *in order (forsooth) to do*, etc. Supposing that by your observance, in the Temple you secure impunity for your crimes.

11. It is true, in Old English *den* meant a cave (Wycliffe, Heb. 11. 38 for σπηλαιος; *Titus Andron.* ii. 3. 215, of a pit—both cited by Murray); but probably few readers now associate that idea with the word.

I also. The כִּי 'correlativum' (*Lev.* 169b 4) expressing correspondence, especially in the matter of retribution: cf. 4. 12 now will I *also* (in correspondence with their deeds) reason the case with them! Hos. 4. 6; Ps. 52. 4, 5 thou lovest all devouring words, O thou deceitful tongue: God *also* (on His part) will tear thee down for ever, etc.; Pr. 1. 26, I *also* will laugh in (the day of) your calamity; Mic. 6. 13.

18, 19. *in order to.* The consequence of the action being represented, forcibly and ironically as the *design*. Cf. 27. 10, 15, Hos. 8. 4, Is. 30. 1, 44. 9 (*Lev.* p. 775b).

18, 19. *ven.* The idea of כעס הכעיס is not *anger* ('provoke to anger'), but *vexation* or *chagrin* at unmerited treatment: when applied to Yahweh, usually on account of His being ungratefully abandoned by Israel for the sake of other gods. See my notes on Deut. 4. 25, 32. 16, 19, 27. The verb is particularly frequent in Deuteronomic writers (in Deut. itself (besides the Song) 4. 25, 9. 18, 31. 29; in the parts of Kings which are due to the compiler, as 1 Kings 14. 9, 15. 30, 16. 2; 7. 13, 26, 33 [in all,

* The bracketed words are omitted in the LXX. They are peculiar in the Hebrew; they interrupt the connexion; and are probably no part of the original text.

17 times]; and in Jer., as 8. 19, 11. 17, 25. 6 [in all 11 times]]. See also (of Peninnah's treatment of Hannah) 1 Sam. 1. 6, 7. For the subst., see 1 Sam. 1. 16, Ps. 6. 7, 10. 14, 31. 9, 85. 4, Prov. 12. 16, 27. 3, Job 5. 2, 6. 2, 10. 17, 17. 7 (in all, not 'grief,' 'anger,' 'wrath,' 'indignation,' or 'spite,' but *revation*).

21, 22 f. The general sense of these verses is well paraphrased by David Kimchi (12 cent.), as quoted by Dr. König, *EXPOSITOR*, Aug. 1902, p. 138, and Nov. 1902, p. 367. See also Prof. Andrew Harper, *ibid* April 1894, p. 231 f.

29. The Heb. for *locks* is the same word which in Num. 6. 9, 12, 18, 19 is rendered *separation*: it means properly the *separation* (or consecration) of a *Nazirite*; then it comes to denote the long hair which was the mark of such separation (see Num. 6. 19); and here it is used of long hair generally.

30. *detestable things*. Cf. on 4. 1.

32. *It shall no more be called Topheth*. The rendering is not literal: for the 'it' in 'it shall no more be called' is not the subj. of אָמַר. The Heb. is *Topheth shall no more be said*. sc. to it, לוֹ being understood. (Cf. Is. 4. 3 'he that is left over in Jerusalem,—holy shall be said to him' = 'he shall be called holy' (so Is. 19. 18, 32. 5, 61. 6, 62. 4, etc.).

VIII. I. *his princes*. The pron. refers to any one of the individual 'kings' just mentioned. Cf. 22. 4 ('he'), 44. 9 (where in the Heb. 'their wives' is 'his wives'); and see also the note on 16. 7.

5. מְרוֹעַ שׁוֹבְבָה הֵעֵם הַזֶּה יְרוּשָׁלַם. The gender of שׁוֹבְבָה (as the text stands) is impossible, and the apposition הֵעֵם הַזֶּה יְרוּשָׁלַם is very harsh. The obvious alternatives are מְרוֹעַ שׁוֹבְבָה יְרוּשָׁלַם and מְרוֹעַ שׁוֹבֵב הַזֶּה יְרוּשָׁלַם. The LXX. supports the latter. The ה at the end of שׁוֹבְבָה is simply dittographed from the following הֵעֵם.

7. *the swift*. The rendering rests upon the statements of Tristram (*N.H.B.* 205) and Post (Hastings' *D.B.* s.v. CRANE) that *sûs* is the vernacular name of the swift in Arabia. This meaning suits both Is. 38. 14 (the only other passage in which the word occurs) and here; for the swift has a harsh, constantly repeated cry, and is also a migrant returning with great regularity and suddenness every spring. עֲנוּר is uncertain. It also occurs besides in Is. 38. 14 כַּסּוּם עֲנוּר כִּן אֲצַפְצַף 'like a swift . . . so did I chatter,' where it *might* be either an adjective to כַּסּוּם, or the name of another bird attached ἀσπυδέτως. The renderings of the ancient versions are inconsistent, and not always clear; but Targ. and Pesh. have *swallow* here; and that is also the meaning given to עֲנוּר by Abul-walid, Rashi, and Kimchi. Though not certain, it may reasonably be acquiesced in: the swallow is a migrant, and the *garrula hirundo*, whose note was proverbial with the Greeks of a barbarous tongue (Aesch. *Agam.* 1050), would quite suit the simile in Is. 38. 14. The etymology is, however, obscure, there being no root עֲנַר known in Heb., or (in a sense available here) in the cognate Semitic

languages.¹ The view of Ges., that it denotes the *twitterer*, rests upon the very doubtful hypothesis that ענר is cognate (by transposition) with the Eth. *ge'era*, to *cry* or *call* (not, specifically, to *twitter*); this word, however, seems to appear in Heb. in נער, to *rebuke* (sq. ב); properly, it seems, to *call out at*.

Crane (R.V.) goes back to Saadiah (10 cent.) in Is., and is defended by Bochart; but it is open to the serious objection (Ges. *Thes.*) that, though the crane is a migrant, its note is a 'very powerful, clear trumpeting,' not a 'chattering' (Tristram, *N.H.B.* 239; see also Post, *l.c.*).²

8. See further, on the idea of 'law' in the O. T., the writer's note in *Joel and Amos*, p. 230 f., or, more fully, LAW (in O. T.) in Hastings' *D.B.* The Heb. word for 'law' means properly 'pointing out,' 'direction'; the Pent. contains a number of particular 'directions' on different subjects; and by later writers the whole *corpus* of these regulations was called 'the direction,' or 'the law.'

13. אָסַף אִסְיָם. If correct, this must mean 'with a gathering (inf. abs. of אָסַף) will I bring them to an end' (Hif. of אָסַף to *come to an end*): cf. Zeph. 1. 2. אָסַף אִסְיָם 'with a gathering will I bring them to an end'; but this combination of two different verbs is against analogy; and probably we should read here אָסַף אִסְיָם, and in Zeph. 1. 2 אָסַף אִסְיָם (with אָסַף for אִסְיָם twice in *v.* 3), 'with a gathering will I gather them,' i.e. *gather them away, destroy them* (אָסַף as 1 Sam. 15. 6, Ez. 34. 29, Ps. 26. 9), Comp. G.-K. § 72*aa*.³

16. *steeds*. Lit. *mighty ones*, poet. of horses, as 47. 3. 50. 11, Jud. 5. 22; of bulls, Ps. 22. 12, 50. 13, 68. 30, Is. 34. 7.

17. *adders*. The species of serpent denoted by אִפְעָנִי (also Is. 11. 8. 59. 5, Prov. 23. 32) has not been identified; and *adder* is used here merely as a familiar word for a venomous serpent: it can hardly be the species really intended; for the eggs of the אִפְעָנִי are alluded to (Is. 59. 5), and adders, if I am not mistaken, are viviparous. There is no reason for supposing a fabulous creature (A.V. *cockatrice*;⁴ R.V.

¹ In Arabic (Lane, 1958 f.) 'ajara is to *bend* (of the neck), *extend the tail*, go *briskly*, etc., and 'ajira is to *be bulky* or *big-bellied*, from any of which meanings the name of a bird *might* be derived; but they are too vague and varied to afford any clue as to what bird is denoted by the Heb. 'āyār.

² What kind of sound was expressed by the Heb. אִפְעָנִי may be inferred from its being used of young birds *chirping* in their nest (Is. 10. 14); see also Is. 29. 4 (where 'peep' is simply Old English for 'chirp').

³ אָרִיִּיִּי in Is. 28. 28 can hardly be anything but an error for אָרִיִּיִּי. Ewald (§ 240c) held that אָרִיִּיִּי in Jer. Zeph., and אָרִיִּיִּי in Is., were for אָרִיִּיִּי and אָרִיִּיִּי, for the sake of assonance with the following word: but this is too artificial to be probable.

⁴ From *cocatrix*, i.e. *calcatrix*, a translation of *ιχνεύμων*, corrupted by confusion with *cock*, because it was supposed to spring from a cock's egg!

*basilisk*¹) to be intended. Furrer (in Riehm's *H.W.B.* s.v. *SCHLANGEN*) suggests the *cat-snake* ('*Ailurophis vivax*'), an agile species, with large glaring eyes, and quick to bite, which, though not actually venomous, is in Palestine popularly believed to be so.

18. On the word rendered *brighten*, derived from a root (בִּלַּג), the meaning of which was lost to the Jews, and wrongly supposed by them to be *to be strong*, till it was recovered, when Arabic began to be studied, by Schultens, in the 18th cent., see my note on Amos 5. 9; and cf. the R.V. *marg.* on Job 9. 27, 10. 20; Ps. 39. 13.

22. *Fresh flesh* (צֶרֶף). See Fleischer's note *ap.* Delitzsch on Is. 58. 8. according to whom *arika* in Arabic means the fresh flesh *lengthening itself*, i.e. gradually forming, over a wound. The word occurs six times in Heb. viz. Jer. 8. 22, 30, 17, 33. 6. Is. 58. 8; and fig., of the repairing of a wall or building, Neb. 4. 1 (A.V. 7) (lit. 'fresh flesh came up upon the walls), 2 (Ch. 24. 13 (lit. 'fresh flesh came up upon the work'). See also Field, *Journ. of Phil.* xiii. 114-116, who points out that the ancient versions often render the word by terms expressive of *ricatization* (as Jer. 33. 6 LXX *συνούλωσις*; Is. 58. 8. Theod. *συνούλωσις*, Aq. *κατούλωσις*; Jer. 8. 22 Aq. and Symm. prob. *συν-* or *κατούλωσις*). For בָּלַע, or הֵעֵלָה, to *come* or *bring up*, often used with the word, cf. Ezek. 37. 6, 8.

IX. 4. *Overreach*, so Gen. 27. 36. The idea in בָּקַע appears to be not to *trip up by the heel*, i.e. to *supplant*, but to *follow insidiously at the heel*, i.e. to *circumvent craftily* or *overreach*. Cf. the derivatives, Jer. 17. 9 'deceitful,' and 2 Kings 10. 19 'subtily.'

10. *a dirge*. Heb. *kīnāh*, which means not a spontaneous effusion of natural emotion, but a composition constructed with some art in a definite rhythmical form. The Heb. *kīnāh*, or *elegy*, as Professor Budde has shown, had a definite rhythmical form, which is traceable throughout the Book of Lamentations (or 'Dirges'), as well as in various passages of the prophets. See my note on Am. 5. 2, 16, and pp. 232-4. נִהַי ('lamentation') was probably a more general term than *kīnāh*.

22. *After*. Notice in the Heb. the idiom. use of אַחֲרָיו, properly *from after*, i.e. falling away from him as he goes along. Cf. *Lea.* p. 30, 4.

¹ The basilisk, or 'little king'—so called, according to Pliny, from its being supposed to have on its head a spot like a crown—was the subject of many fables; it was especially noted for its alleged power of killing by its look. Cf. *Henry V.*, v. 2. 15-17; *2 Henry VI.*, iii. 2. 52 f.; *Rich. III.*, i. 2. 151.

FREDERICK MAURICE AND THE BROAD CHURCH.

A GENERATION has passed since the world lost all that part of the influence of a great and holy mind which depends on its visible nearness; and it cannot be said that the present hour offers any special opportunity for commemorating that influence. Nevertheless that is the object of this essay. The distance of time seems appropriate for such an endeavour, a further delay would render it impossible. Few survive who remember that influence at its height, of those few only a small proportion stood sufficiently apart from it to recall it critically, and of that small number none have a long time to pass in this world. The suggestion that before it is too late some attempt might be made by one of those few to attempt this estimate has come from without, but the response, though diffident and hesitating, is not reluctant. I turn gladly to speak of one revered by all who remember him, beloved by almost all—outside the circle of his own dearest and his immediate disciples by none more than by me. I cannot call myself a disciple. But I speak of him as of a teacher associated with all that was elevating, inspiring, purifying, one in whose presence all that was ignoble withered away. And I speak of him, too, as the representative of Christianity to the latter half of the century that has just closed. Many no doubt would protest against any single person being chosen as such a representative; much in his own writings enforces such a protest. Christianity was one of the words to which he entertained what

I venture to consider a somewhat superstitious dislike, and I hardly remember his using it. But if it be conceded that any one man should be chosen as representative, in our own country and our own time, of faith in God as revealed in Christ, I cannot think that any name would come before or beside that of Frederick Denison Maurice. It is worth making an attempt to understand the influence of such a spirit from different points of view—to seek to realize both its strength, and its limits.

Yet I cannot deny that one among many causes for diffidence in making such an attempt is that it was one with which, in any similar case, he would have had no sympathy. He disliked criticism. Our object in contemplating any human spirit, he thought, should be always to discover whatever in it was positive, constructive, or fruitful. What was negative, destructive, or barren was, he thought, better passed over. Of course, he would not have denied that protest and judgment had their place in mutual duty. But it is only etymologically that we can identify the judge and the critic. A criminal is a person who has lost his right to the freedom of an average human being; a judge decides on the fitting substitute for such freedom. There is, in the position of the critic, nothing analogous to this. There is much more, and much less. The judge makes no attempt to decide on the absolute merit of the condemned person before him, whether in the circumstances and with the hereditary influences of the thief or murderer he himself would have committed theft or murder he does not consider, at least if he does he is neglecting the proper duty of a judge. The thing he has to decide is what in the interests of society is the proper fate of a person who has broken the law. The critic has no practical decision to make, but on the other hand the decision he does make is in one sense more ambitious. "So-and-so is a second-rate poet" is a more

penetrating judgment than "The prisoner at the bar is a murderer." By what right does a person who could not himself write even third-rate poetry decide that somebody else's is only second rate? "You may say without arrogance"—so I imagine Maurice arguing—"This man has committed murder.' That is a question of evidence, and if we declined to act upon such certainty as we can attain here we should decline to take any important step whatever. But where is the necessity, where is the value, of this judgment by which the small decide on the rank of the great?" I never heard him say this, and nothing like it occurs in his writings, still I believe it to be a fair summary of what he might have said if vague feeling had been formulated in definite argument. He said of me once that I was like Iago, "nothing if not critical," and though I can imagine the kindly, humorous smile with which the words were spoken, and cherish the mention with unmixed amusement and pleasure, still I know it was not a habit of mind he wished to encourage in any one. And although I think the dislike to criticism narrow; the recollection of how he would have felt with regard to any attempt, such as the present, to criticise one as worthy of reverence as he was does add to the many causes of diffidence and hesitation which I overcome now.

It is a much smaller cause for such diffidence that I have made the attempt before. When his biography was published, now nearly twenty years ago, I tried to express what in my view was his claim on the gratitude of his survivors, and his place in the history of his church, and his country. But I spoke then from a different point of view from that which I would occupy to-day. I aim now at an egotistic presentment of his influence which would have been then unsuitable. No truer picture of one mind can be given, I believe, than an accurate account of its influence on another mind, and I cannot think he influenced

any mind more than mine. I came under his influence as a pupil at Queen's College (his own creation), at its first opening, now nearly fifty-five years ago, and remember his preliminary lecture. I do indeed just remember a still earlier glimpse, when as an unnoticed child I accompanied a friend of his first wife's to ask after her in her last illness; the visit remains in my memory as something solemn and awe-inspiring, beyond anything that the few common-place words I can have heard would account for, and I feel sure that his countenance, in its profound and controlled sorrow, must have impressed my childish imagination even then. And afterwards, for many years, I listened to every word he said and read every word he published, and such opportunities of intercourse as occurred were prized by me, I venture to say, bold as is the assertion, at their actual value. It was he who first urged me to write, whose value for some imperfect attempts remain with me still as a pledge that they were not wholly worthless. What he was to me he was to many. His was the friendship that "roots itself in benefits bestowed," it followed the track of need, not merit, and the friends of such a one will be numerous. I do not mean that his friendship was limited to such cases. Many causes swelled the number of those who, whatever their differences, found a centre in their love for him. I have often wondered how many middle-aged "Maurices" record ardent longings and prayers at the baptismal font that they might commemorate his influence as his name. We should have to reckon in the list some who know little about him, but not one with whom the ascription was otherwise than from the heart.

In this sense his friends would almost coincide with a list of those who ever came near him. But if we take the word in a more specific sense, and indicate by the word that atmosphere of preference which makes one person nearer to us than another, apart from any particular esti-

mate of either merit or need, we shall find them, perhaps, less numerous than we might expect. He had his likes and dislikes, but less than most people. He did not dwell much in that region. Intercourse with him was sometimes disappointing for the moment. His greeting was indescribably heart-warming and inspiring. It always had something of the same effect as a meeting with a fellow-countryman in a foreign land. The sweet smile, the warm handclasp expressed his attitude to humanity; one saw, in that reception, what every human being was to him. But nobody likes to be merely a human being, and when one got beyond that first greeting one was sensible at first of a certain flatness. The first welcome was not more satisfying than the communion of close intercourse; but the moments of greeting are soon over, while the opportunities of close intimacy are in the nature of things rare; and in the intermediate stages something seemed lacking. An admirer might come back from an eagerly desired evening in his company having listened only to some tiresome bore, who had held forth to the assembled guests, him among them, without any interruption from him. This would be mainly the result of a humility that would not recognise his own intellectual rank and a kindness that refused to inflict a moment's mortification, but perhaps in some degree also of a want of readiness in striking a keynote which would have been a relief to all. Hence he was never a social figure in the way that Kingsley was. The lack that we escape either by falling back on the universal or by going forward to the closely individual may seem not worth mentioning, but as a matter of fact the bulk of average intercourse goes on in the interval between these two regions, and a person who can expand only in them, while he may give all that is most truly valuable in the commerce between one soul and another, yet fails to satisfy the instincts that build up what we call society.

In saying that he was not a social figure I mean something more than that he was utterly unworldly. I mean that too. He seems to me to have cared as little for all this world can give and take away as is possible in a state of things where its favour is the condition of so much valuable influence; perhaps, indeed, less than any one would, who fully realised how much this is the case. No churchman of equal importance and influence, I should imagine, ever received so little notice from Government; this was so insignificant a circumstance to himself that he somehow made it seem not worth notice by others, and reference in any reminiscence of him seems irrelevant. But also I should say that his social attitude marked the lack of something which might have made his teaching more valuable. What told as shyness or absence of mind always seemed to me to curtain off some understanding of average men and women which would have enabled him to enter more sympathetically into their difficulties. Anything that he felt as a promise of human culture or happiness awakened his keen and immediate interest, and at the focus of all else there burnt the steady flame of that hope wherein, he believed, centered all the true welfare of humanity. But the facts of life have often no bearing that we can see on the love of man and the trust in God, and unless he could see that they had that he regarded them with slackened attention, and when he spoke of them was somewhat commonplace. I think it was partly some sense of this lack in himself which made Kingsley's very different neighbourhood so delightful to him, and I suppose he was the person, beyond his own innermost circle, whom Maurice loved best. There were some who never felt this lack in him. I remember another intimate friend of his, F. J. Hort, could not understand what I meant when I once spoke of it to him. Still I am sure that it was the experience of

ordinary acquaintance and of some friends. And it seems to me worth dwelling on because it was no mere accident of temperament or circumstance—not indeed that these can ever be void of moral significance—but had a close connexion with much that was found difficult in his teaching even by those who listened to it earnestly and reverently. Whenever people had nothing particular to say about him in his lifetime they said he was difficult to understand. Very often, I suppose, they meant merely that it was an arduous thing to follow out a line of thought on the ultimate subjects of human attention ; but it is true that there was something baffling in his treatment of these subjects which there is not in all attempts to deal with them, and I should connect this difficulty partly with his lack of exercise in ordinary, undidactic, superficial but real intercourse between human beings. It must not be thought that he was himself indifferent to any form of intercourse. I remember an instance of his strong feeling on the other side. A person in whom he was interested was inclined (for reasons good as far as they went) to withdraw wholly from society and lead what might be called a recluse life. Maurice had a great—perhaps even a somewhat morbid—horror of taking up anything like the position of a director. He shrank from anything like interference with another life more than everybody does. But on this occasion he overcame this shrinking and spoke with remarkable distinctness and emphasis of the danger of any exceptional line, dwelling on the advantage of the *common-place* in intercourse with a force that might seem to make what I have just said untrue. I think it true all the same, and even feel this pleading an illustration of it in some sense, but I fully allow that the latter seems to go the other way. Nobody could have put the case for the ordinary, even the conventional, better than he did. But the truth was, I believe, that something in him—not his

conscious judgment, but some deeper instinct—awakened to a sense of his own dangers, and his generous spirit flung aside taste and prejudice in his desire to save another person from them. He shrank from everything separating, and if there were a name for the opposite of a Pharisee it would be applicable to him.

The notion that there was something unintelligible in his teaching, so common among those who listened to him, has disappeared from the criticism of those who know him only from his books. Of course the contemporaries of a teacher find him more difficult to understand than the succeeding generation, he has taught to very little purpose if they do not. But I think many of those who made the remark in his lifetime were under a delusion as to what the difficulty of following his teaching really was. They supposed that if he would put his meaning into clearer words they should understand it. Yet his words were always perfectly simple, and he wrote excellent English. Every single sentence was intelligible to any one of average understanding; it was only when a hearer or reader gathered them up and tried to summarize their drift that he was sensible of some chasm over which the teacher had floated where foothold was lacking for any follower. And no explanation, I am convinced, could have bridged that gulf. It was not a different dialect that was required, but a different logic. He saw difficulties, for a moment, with a keen eye, sometimes he stated them as clearly as those who felt them overwhelming could do. But it always seemed to me that he mistook the statement for the explanation. And not only he, many of his hearers, finding their doubts and perplexities put so forcibly side by side with some statement entirely ignoring them, felt as if they had been answered, when the fact was they had been merely stated and dismissed. If they had been consciously dismissed, as

problems which must await solution in another stage of being, almost all would have been done that can be done with the great perplexities of life. Those help us most with them who can say, in some form or other, "I see all in this world which seems to protest against the idea of God, and I still trust in Him." But Maurice said rather more than that, and also less. His recognition of the difficulty of tracing this world to the decision of a holy will always melted into a confession of the sins of man, especially of priests, as an explanation of that difficulty, and his own utterance of trust was accompanied with something disputable. "I said some words to you yesterday," he wrote to a friend nearly forty years ago, "which it has grieved me to recollect because I fear they gave you pain. They were spoken as my words generally are about myself, and against myself. I feel all the incapacity to believe which you speak of, in my case I can only describe it as *reluctance* to believe, even when it is mixed with much desire. I, therefore, spoke of belief having to do with the Will. The bondage I groan under is a bondage of the Will, and that has led me to acknowledge God so emphatically as the Redeemer of the Will. It is in that character He reveals Himself to me. I could not think of God at all as the living God if I did not regard Him as such a Redeemer. But if of my will then of all wills; sooner or later I am convinced He will be manifested as the Restorer, Regenerator of the spirit that is in us. I believe that [it is in] this same spirit that I can walk across the street, that I know any friend or relation, that I can understand the words they speak—this is often hard work. But He who enables me to believe so far can enable me to believe anything that is true. And if me, why not every one? What is there to dissociate me from any one else? I become devilish when I do not confess myself human. God saves me because He saves every fellow-

creature." The words, which I copy from an old letter, surely illustrate alike his strength and weakness in dealing with doubt. In giving it this wide expansion he lost the sense of its special incidence. And then, so far as he found it originate in any *reluctance* to believe, he stood apart from the anguish of those who have thirsted after God, and have found the experience of this world a barrier against the belief in Him. I confess I do not know what he meant by the assertion that he felt any reluctance to believe, and I accept it only from the compulsion of trust in his absolute sincerity. He meant something important by it, I am certain; but something I should vainly strive to put into other words or echo in his own.

To Maurice, if to any one, the *sense of God* was a wider, deeper and more penetrating thing than the sense of evil; if either must be surrendered as an illusion it would be the last. But he thought that in setting forth the declaration—God sent His Son to redeem the world—would be found the true answer to all the perplexities of mankind. To many minds, my own among them, the belief in that declaration enormously extends such doubts and perplexities. To believe that such a world as we see was made by Omnipotent Love is hard enough; but to think that it remains what it is after the stupendous fact which we name Redemption—this is a difficulty which we can escape only through the hope of a spiritual maturity to us in this world not only unattainable but inconceivable. Maurice always shrank curiously from any attempt to still the pain of life's perplexity with a mere promise, however sure. He would not link Eternal Hope with anything that depended on time, and the word he most disliked next to Religion was, I think, "Heaven." When Newman's *Apologia* was fresh in all our minds I remember citing to him that wonderful list of the ills of humanity which I always re-peruse with the satisfaction of feeling that there

the worst is said, and said by one who still sees God. I do not think it expressed anything valuable to him. "Yes, Newman sees Death, and I see Death, but I see Life too," was all I can remember his saying, rather in the tone of a person turning from some unnecessary and distasteful point of view. Perhaps this picture of the ills of humanity, made by one who still felt the greatest suffering without sin a less evil than the smallest sin without suffering, jarred on Maurice as much by its resemblance to his own feeling as by his remoteness from it. The semitone discord, we all know, is much the harshest. His life was spent in a ceaseless battle with the evils of the world. Institutions still flourish among us which owed their initiative to him, quite apart from the greatest aim of his life (I need only mention the Working Men's College); he believed that in all such attempts Christ was his captain and comrade, and that was enough for him. He thought this might be the experience of any one; he could not endure the idea that this possibility belonged to the region in which one man differs from another.

I remember well, after an interval of years which does not clearly define itself but which covers more than a generation, a vehement outburst of my own against what I felt his unreasonable optimism, the occasion for which, if there were any, escapes my memory. It was winter, and we had come in from a walk together; perhaps it was merely the contrast of the bitter weather outside and the pleasant warmth within, and the remembrance of those for whom such a contrast was unattainable—but I turned upon him, as if he gave too little thought to the misery of the world. How could he ever speak as if we had only to open our eyes and look around to see God?—something like that I must have flung at him, for I know how his teaching always stirred some protest to that effect, but I can only recall his few gentle words of answer, of which the tones are still in

my ears: "I assure you it all looks very black to me"—words identical (it is strange to remember) with some I once heard from Ruskin. We did not pursue the subject, those words indeed were all I wanted; to have gone further would have re-opened differences, for the thing that looked black to him was different from what looked black to me and to most people. The horror of the world, to him, was its alienation from God, its refusal to accept that gift of Redemption which was offered in Christ. So far as that was accepted, he thought man entered on his true vocation, suffering became transfigured, death lost its terror, the path lay clear before the pilgrim, the unseen Comrade was ever at hand. That seemed to me the view of a person living in a different world from ours. This feeling always came out with regard to physical ills. I remember well one Bible class where we were reading the account of the Gospel miracles of healing, at which I and others tried to put before him the difficulties we felt in making the application, to him easy and natural, of these "mighty works," as expressive of our Lord's antagonism to all evil, in a world where trust in Him had so little traceable influence on health of body. Nobody had heard of "Christian science" forty or fifty years ago, but one has only to mention it now in order to summon up the kind of difficulties roused by any recollection of the miraculous cures in face of the incurable, or even the curable disorders of humanity. He waited until we finished our objections, and then repeated with added emphasis, as if they had strengthened it, his conviction that physical ill was the shadow of sin on the physical world, and beyond that we could never advance a step.

This made him sometimes unsympathetic. A cry of anguish, I should think, never reached his ear without attracting sympathy so rich, so liberal, so sustaining, that for the moment the pain, whatever it was, loosened its grip

on the heart. There must be still some living who felt this, and to them perhaps my record will seem unjust. But strange to say—strange at first sight—the egotistic had more claim on him than the disinterested suffering. The sympathy poured out in a flood which sometimes abashed the individual sufferer was not proportionately forthcoming for one to whom no private grief weighed as did the problem—God sees this, and does nothing to hinder it. He was fenced against that point, to some extent, by his life-long activity. Where he saw an evil he strove to remove it; he felt that God was on the side of all such effort, and the consciousness of the battle and the leader was enough for him. He never entered into the *thoughts*—I do not say the feelings—of those who come in contact with the irremediable ills of the world, and have to conclude—“For us, here and now, these things are God’s will.” He would not associate God’s will with any form of evil, not even one which was transient, and a saviour from evil far greater.

What has all this to do with the Broad Church? it may be asked. Quite as much, I should answer, as he had. He belonged to it only as you might say a man going to America who got into a carriage at Euston Station with a party going to Willesden belonged to that party. The proportion of their and his common aims and beliefs was not greater than the ten minutes in the train to the journey across the Atlantic. His remoteness from the Broad Church party was less evident than it might have been, because all parties, as parties, were distasteful to him. From “plati-tudinarian, latitudinarian and attitudinarian,” as the epigram ran some forty years ago, he had an equally decided shrinking, but I think in reality the latitudinarians were furthest removed from his sympathies. He did not argue against them, but a teacher is much more remote from those he ignores than from those whom he most passionately denounces. An evangelical, writing against him in the

Record, was nearer to him than the ordinary Broad Churchman of to-day. That movement of thought which we may call Progress, or Evolution—that movement which has made the invisible world remote, which has focussed attention on the seen world instead of the unseen, which has set us to save bodies instead of souls, and to dread disease more than sin—this movement, to the minds of many among us, as inevitable as the change from winter to spring, was, by him, quite unforeseen, and hardly recognised when he was in the midst of it. The Broad Church gathers to its fold the spirits leading on this change, and accepting its result as the Divine will in some other sense than that in which we must say an epidemic or a famine is the Divine will. I do not know how Maurice would have answered any one in that state of mind, it was one to which he never approached near enough to disagree with it. He could not conceive of the position of any human soul to which its relation to God was a question simply unmeaning, or uninteresting, and he thought one who believed himself to feel thus was a victim to some superstition taught by priests, an unconscious witness to the truths he seemed to deny. If working men, or scientific men, were deaf to the message of the Church it was because her ministers had been unfaithful in the deliverance of her message. One hesitates to put it that way because thus baldly stated the statement, at this time of day, seems to ascribe to him a want of sense. To suppose that a view of the Atonement, disentangled from distorting superstition, would have converted Huxley and Tyndall into churchmen brings in a sense of absurdity far indeed from anything that was ever possible in listening to him. Nevertheless the belief of which that absurdity is a mere application does seem to me characteristic of him. A deep modesty and a great reluctance to judge would have kept him from any interference with another man's belief if all his taste and impulse had not gone against that tendency;

and he had always when I knew him—it may not have been so in his youth, and perhaps some mistake then inclined him afterwards in an opposite direction—a sort of superstitious respect for the mere secular nature, just because it was so unlike his own. There was in him something of that centrifugal generosity, which often leads to injustice while it keeps off the worst injustice. His words were, as he says in the letter I have quoted, always spoken against himself primarily, and then against his order; and thus it happened that his sympathy and his harshness ceased together. I think it is as dangerous to declaim against one's own spiritual kindred as against any other kindred, and that under the deceptive "we" a good deal of antipathy sometimes steals into the seeming confession. And I think, too, that this kind of inverted self-reference generally leads to irrelevance in addressing an individual mind. Nevertheless it is in the form it took with him possible only to a noble nature, and I record it with reverence.

I have sometimes thought that—contrary to what would have been my expectation—it is not the seer who is the best guide to the events of the morrow. It has been said of Cromwell, that in his foreign policy the dangers of the past loomed larger than those of the present. Maurice, at any rate, seems to me like a person meditating improvement in archery after the invention of gunpowder. The only book in which he dealt with the spirit of scientific denial characteristic of the last half of the nineteenth century, and attaining its meridian before he left the world, was surely the least valuable he wrote, even its name has grown dim to me, and I will not try to recover it. His whole life was a testimony against such a spirit, but when he attempted to address it he could only emphasize convictions which were irrelevant to any perplexities which blocked the way to faith, and even, I think, sometimes raised fresh barriers in its way. And thus I cannot doubt

that he made some sceptics, or at least that he provoked a recoil of disappointment which sometimes made the faith which at any rate would have been quitted the object of a sort of bitter dislike. In the only instance in which he entered into direct antagonism with the critical spirit, his attitude towards Colenso, he showed himself, I cannot but think, actually unjust, and while it was later that he received the recognition of his Professorship at Cambridge, which as a removal of the stigma of heterodoxy meant so much to him, I do not think his influence was ever afterwards quite so great as it had been before. He ceased to be a heretic, and also an inspirer of new and stimulating thought. A teacher he never ceased so be, but in those years at Cambridge what told was rather the influence of a holy character than of a powerful mind.

I have said that he, whom I should mark out as the representative of Christianity to our time, disliked the word Christianity. It was to him a symbol of narrow ecclesiasticism, identifying the influence of Christ with the conscious reception of that influence, and shutting in the Divine life to a transcript of our ideas about it. Perhaps this feeling itself was but one form of a reluctance to see that the truths of eternity, manifested through the atmosphere of time, were themselves, as far as they are objects of our perception, subject to change. He did not deny this. I can even recall striking hints of a possibility of this in his own writings. But he never so far accepted it as to allow it to influence his thought.

Science, he saw, must grow, and growing must change. In the spirit of what I have called centrifugal generosity he was always ready to allow to the spirit of science a kind of advantage with regard to spiritual truth which I should think exaggerated, and yet he never realised how this must influence our views of spiritual truth itself. If, for instance, the lesson we have to learn from apparent dis-

crepancies in the different Gospels be a lesson of humility to ourselves, as he said it was, there is evidently something exceptional in those writings shutting them off from all criticism; and the circumstances which they narrate, therefore, must also have in them something unintelligible and out of harmony with the sequence of history. I repeat that he would not have accepted this as an accurate statement of what he did believe and that we might find passages in his teaching which denied it. But this, I venture to consider, is a fair statement of what his belief became in any logical mind.

“The strait and narrow way” of spiritual truth lies always along the watershed of error. On the one hand we have seen in the past that the Divine influence on humanity has been regarded as confined to a narrow spot of earth and a space of time ending two millenniums ago. The week of creation has been paralleled by the generation of redemption and those centuries of Jewish education which preceded it, and both limitations seen under the light of science must disappear. As the seven days of creation expand into the uncounted ages of mundane existence, so must the few years or centuries of Redemption expand into the eight or ten millenniums of human history. But because no age is shut off from the belief in God are all ages on a level with regard to that belief? Have there been no epochs when insight into the Divine was clearer, the glow corresponding to that light stronger and more expanded? To deny this, it seems to me, is to fall into an error more dangerous, at the present day, than those which would shut the Divine influence into a narrow spot of earth, and a narrow space of time. It matters little, as far as the result on other minds goes, whether we say that God never speaks to man, or that He always speaks with the same distinctness. To deny that the words near and far have a real meaning with regard to Him is just as great a stumbling-block to Faith as

to assert that He once spoke to human ears and is now silent. It is only superficially and apparently that it is less of a stumbling-block to science. We must read history with a strange refusal to attend to its most vital aspects if we refuse to recognise a more and less in the sense of God in the world. But this, no doubt, is the side to which the scientific spirit inclines as the religious spirit inclines towards its opposite. The path from which the traveller surveys both and escapes both is narrow.

These were the times when Maurice trod that height and looked across the expanse on either side. He not only saw its dangers, but earnestly and eloquently, at times, asserted them. But he was like an engineer who should carefully fence in some yards of a mountain pass and then, when it became most dangerous, not only omit his palisade but remove stones set up to mark the edge of the precipitous descent. His insistence that in the Bible we should accept what appeared irreconcilable statements as a lesson in intellectual humility was a claim for the writers of the Bible to live in an age when men were under different spiritual laws from that of the Divine government in our own day. And then again when he quitted that point of view and declared that all history was sacred history, he seemed to me to exaggerate homogeneity into monotony as he had exaggerated difference into contrast, and with the same result of seeming to speak of another world from that in which we live. This is how I should describe the limits of his influence, especially, perhaps, as it concerned the Broad Church. But I believe that to him I owe not only some appreciation of the truths he taught, but also much of the power to discern those he ignored, or even (so far as he ever did such a thing) seemed to oppose. And I will conclude by trying, in this belief, to express my own understanding of the meaning of the word Revelation.

There is in the physical world an agency which we know

as Heat, a word familiar enough to us as expressive of a sensation, but which, apart from the arts of human invention and the speculations of science, we might never know as an objective reality. We have discovered in modern times that this agency, if we have only enough of it, becomes dynamic. The chief part of the work of the world is done by steam, and steam is only water transformed by heat. Till it is thus transformed its only power is that it seeks the lowest place; after that transformation the words low and high lose their meaning, its expansion on all sides is irresistible. The change is sudden: in aspect, miraculous. Added warmth does not begin to change a liquid to a gas until we get above a certain temperature. Then we find suddenly, with no preliminary symptoms of such an alteration, that we are dealing with a new force. We can move mountains. We can do what on the plane of our former condition would be a miracle. Is there nothing like this in the spiritual world? All men are sons of God, the Divine life is, as a spark, within the nature of every one. If ever it was within any man as a fire, may not the completeness of that presence which we know always as a yearning and an aspiration equally confer new powers, and raise the natural into the supernatural? The epochs of such transformation are rightly regarded as supernatural and rightly as natural. They show forth the nature of man, they reveal a force above that nature. Why they should be granted at one time and not another is a question which neither science nor theology need undertake to answer. Its whole stress depends on the recently familiar assumption that man's seventy or eighty years here include either his whole existence, or that portion of it which fixes his everlasting condition. When the Divine influence is recognised as the inheritance, to be declared in good time, of every son and daughter of man, the question as to the where and how it shall transform

and expand each human spirit becomes a matter of deep interest indeed, but of an interest unmixed with anxiety or perplexity. Nor should any timid desire to keep the past unique shut off the hope that these eras of revelation are part of a course of evolution; that the Water of Life shall—when and how we know not—once again become steam, and fling its dynamic influence on lives fettered within the province of the things that are seen and temporal. At that hour these outward things shall become intelligible as a language to express the unseen and eternal, the only realities of human life.

JULIA WEDGWOOD.

*THE OBJECTIVE ASPECT OF THE LORD'S
SUPPER.*

A MORE adequate conception of the sacraments is probably one of the most vital desiderata of present-day Protestantism. The ascendancy of Ritualism has compelled many people to think out their position afresh, and to recognize the value of clear and worthy ideas on the subject. Further, the controversy is one which has a great history behind it, rather more closely connected with the form the problem assumes to-day than we commonly find to be the case in doctrinal discussions. For these and other reasons the question of the Eucharist continues to be one of inexhaustible importance.

The purpose of the following pages is to consider briefly the objective aspect of this sacrament. To state the matter compendiously, what is the gift bestowed in communion, and what is the relation of this gift to the elements of bread and wine? This restriction of the issues means, in the first place, that we must leave on one side the critical questions which have recently been raised about the evan-

gelical narrative of the institution. Scholars like Jülicher and Spitta are disposed to deny that the earliest tradition, represented by Matthew and Mark, exhibits any traces of a command given by Jesus to observe the sacrament perpetually; and Spitta actually goes the adventurous length of suggesting that in what took place in the upper room no reference was made, or intended, to the death of Christ at all. We cannot discuss these critical conjectures now. But it may be said that we have what seem to be overwhelming reasons for continuing to believe that St. Paul, in his statements to the Corinthian Church, was simply passing on what had come to him from authentic sources, and ultimately went back to Christ Himself. If St. Paul was really the creator of the Lord's Supper, he had even more to do with the genesis of Christianity than the Tübingen school itself believed. Such views, though infinitely ingenious, produce no conviction.

Again, we must leave on one side the history of Eucharistic doctrine. In particular I do not propose to enter upon any investigation of patristic teaching on the Eucharist. For one thing, we must never forget the famous dictum of Principal Cunningham, *à propos* of a difficult Eucharistic statement in Justin Martyr: "It holdstrue of this, as of many other passages in the writings of the fathers, which have given rise to much learned discussion in modern times, that it really has no definite meaning; and that if we could call up its author, and interrogate him on the subject, he would be utterly unable to tell us what he meant when he wrote it." Moreover you can prove almost anything out of the Fathers. An appeal to these writings invariably results in a great deal of *ex parte* quotation, in which passages unpropitious to the appellant's theory are left severely alone. For instance, Anglican writers seldom consent to face squarely the language used by the Fathers regarding the effect of consecration on the water of baptism, or to learn the

caution it suggests to the interpreter of similar patristic sayings about the bread and wine. On the Fathers' general teaching however it may be said broadly that while from the earliest times—at least from Justin onwards—there existed the form of language which was not unnaturally to give birth to sacramentarian conceptions, yet individual writers, and these the greatest, showed all along that they were occasionally conscious of being on dangerous ground, and persisted in drawing distinctions which seemed to them to protect the truth from contamination by doctrines less than Christian. Thus, in a well known passage of his Commentary on Hebrews, Chrysostom says: "We do not then offer a different sacrifice, as the high priest formerly did, but always the same; or rather *we celebrate a memorial of a sacrifice.*" Similarly, the fact that Augustine gives the mere likeness of the elements to the Body and Blood of Christ as the reason why they are *called* the Body and Blood of Christ, appears, as Dr. Dale has urged, "hardly reconcilable with the hypothesis that he believed that in any sense they actually became the Body and Blood of Christ." But as time went on the distinction between material and spiritual conceptions of the Eucharist tended to fade out of all but the profoundest minds; and we can hardly close our eyes to the rapid development and external victory of the sacrificial view, together with a tendency to take for granted that the visible rite invariably carried with it benefit to the soul. Either conception, the more physical or the more Scriptural, could be drawn out of the sacramental language according to the sympathies of the interpreter. We may apply to the *Corpus Patrum*, as a source of Eucharistic doctrine, the old distich once daringly applied to Scripture:

Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque;
Invenit hic pariter dogmata quisque sua.

Passing from these preliminary topics, let us now inquire,

Can we lay down any limiting points of doctrine between which the truth about the Lord's Supper may, or even must, be conceived to lie? Can we enunciate any principles or criteria by which we may be guided, not only in avoiding error but in reaching truth? One or two tentative principles of this kind I should like to suggest.

First, we cannot accept *any theory which of necessity involves that the first celebration in the upper room was not a true communion*. In the New Testament the Supper, as partaken of daily or weekly, is regarded as reproducing, in all its essentials, the solemn and touching rite inaugurated on the night on which the Lord Jesus was betrayed. The Church perpetuates in her communion-feast the last supper of her Saviour. Not only would the view found in the New Testament become unintelligible if later celebrations were cut off from historical continuity with the night of institution, but this would equally be the case if the inaugural rite were somehow detached from those which followed, and placed upon a lower plane of reality. Now this latter view is an inevitable consequence of certain theories. Take, for example, the doctrine of the sacrament put forward by Bishop (then Canon) Gore, in his deeply impressive book *The Body of Christ*. There we are taught that the gift bestowed in the Eucharist is the real flesh and blood of the glorified Saviour. How then can it be denied that the body given to believers now is very different from that imparted to the Twelve in the upper room? And is not this tantamount to saying that the first celebration was not, in the full sense of the words, a true communion? It is interesting to find that the difficulty gave Bishop Gore some trouble, for he deals with it in a special note, which virtually concedes the point. "How could the Eucharist," he asks, "be instituted before the Passion? How could Christ, while yet in His mortal body, give His disciples His flesh and blood to eat? To this question

there is, I think, no answer, except by regarding the institution of the Eucharist as an anticipation of glory akin to the Transfiguration." Such a conclusion obviously reduces the first celebration to an inferior level of essential meaning. An element of anticipation in the first rite there was, beyond all question, but it was anticipation of the Cross.

Now we need only hold firmly to the conviction that in every vital respect what took place on the night of institution was a true communion, perfect and complete, to be led naturally and consistently to construe the whole transaction in genuinely spiritual terms. When we inquire what Jesus meant by the words "This is My body," and what is the sense they must have borne to the disciples' ears, it hardly seems too much to say that the physical identification of the loaf and His flesh, as He sat there in His visible manhood, could not occur to any one. We must take the copula *ἐστίν* as significant of symbolic existence; otherwise, as Meyer succinctly puts it, "the identity of subject and predicate would form a conception equally impossible to Speaker and hearers." There can be little doubt that the plausibility which sacramentarian writers have given to their literal theories is due, in no small degree, to their confining their attention, and the attention of their readers, to the Eucharist as it is celebrated now, thus refusing to allow the mind to verify its ideas by reference to the initial rite, and virtually denying that in the first celebration the grace of the sacrament was really conveyed to the hearts of the Apostles. It would seem, then, that we may usefully find here a principle by which sacramental doctrines are to be judged.

Second, we cannot accept *any theory which implies that, by participating in the Lord's Supper, unbelievers receive a spiritual gift*. The view in question is widely held and passionately defended. The complete title of Dr. Pusey's great book on the Real Presence, published in 1857, is as

follows: *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ: the doctrine of the English Church, with a Vindication of the Reception by the Wicked, and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ truly Present*, and some of the most vehemently argued pages it contains are in support of the thesis that unbelievers also partake of Christ's flesh and blood. In his recent work Bishop Gore comes to similar conclusions. It is inevitable indeed that he should. If "the spiritual gift of Christ's Body and Blood is, in some way, attached to the elements before they are eaten or drunken, and independently of such eating and drinking," we cannot marvel that he should find no difficulty in believing that here, as in baptism, even a bad man really receives a spiritual endowment of his nature, though of course it ministers not to his growth in grace, but to his greater hurt. It is not difficult to discern, and in some measure to sympathize with, the motives which underlie such arguments. Theologians like Pusey and Gore are concerned, above all else, to ensure the objectivity of the Presence. They are resolved never to rest satisfied with anything that even in appearance depends for its reality on merely moral and spiritual conditions in the recipient. The Body and Blood of Christ must be present prior to reception, and independently of the individual's faith. So far as their interest lies in ensuring that the benefit of the sacrament shall be certain and indubitable to believers, this is a mood of mind which calls forth our earnest sympathy. It is to be found conspicuously in Luther, and led him also to contend fiercely that even admittedly unworthy participants received the flesh and blood of the Lord. It is a different matter when, as Mr. Anderson Scott remarks, "the real importance of the objectivity of the Presence is that it is necessary to the theory of a Eucharistic sacrifice." When men defend a view of the nature of the Saviour's Presence

which commits them, in Dr. Dale's strong words, to the assertion "that every tide-waiter who took the sacrament to qualify for office, and went away from the altar to celebrate his appointment with a drunken carouse, received Christ," we may be sure they have gone wrong somewhere. Either their reasoning is faulty or their premises are false. We are no longer in the world of ideas and standards created by the New Testament. We are certain by instinct that so unmoral and materialistic a view of what connexion with Christ even at its lowest must be, is no lineal descendant of Apostolic teaching. The argument which pleads for objectivity does not move us. We have all the guarantees for objectivity we require in Christ's own promise, a far surer foundation for the reality of His presence than the fallible sacramental logic of men can be. It is interesting to recall at this point Rabbi Duncan's comment on the line in Aquinas' hymn on the Eucharist, *Sumunt boni, sumunt mali*. "They do no such thing. This doctrine is my abhorrence. There is an eternal difference. The latter take only the shell, and miss the kernel."

Whenever we find then a theory of the Supper which involves that unworthy partakers receive some real Divine gift through eating the bread and drinking the wine, we may conclude without misgiving that it has fallen from the Christian level. Its authors have lost their way, and wandered into the world of magic, the only world where spiritual results occur quite unmediated by moral processes. That when the elements are placed in the hands of men, they are offered the grace of Christ our Lord, offered His grace even though wicked and unbelieving, we also affirm; for the Lord's Supper is a visible and acted sermon, a showing forth of the death of Christ for sinners. So that one could imagine conversion taking place at the communion-table purely as a result of the Gospel appeal made

to the human heart by all that the celebration symbolizes. But though God's grace in Christ is offered there, neither in the sacrament nor elsewhere can any spiritual gift be received without faith, and the theory which implies the opposite is *ipso facto* sufficiently condemned.

Third, we can accept *no theory which views the Eucharist as primarily a human performance, rather than a Divine means of grace.* In one sense indeed, though a subordinate sense, this sacrament may justly be regarded as a human performance. We come together for its celebration; in celebration we are conscious of obeying the Lord's command, "This do in remembrance of Me." Further, the soul is active during the service, active in the exercise of faith and love, active in that movement of consecration and self-surrender which on any theory forms an integral part of true communion. But what the principle stated above really affirms in no way excludes this. It only asserts that whenever the sacrament is conceived as supremely and predominantly a human performance, it is essentially misconceived. To use the older language of Waterland, a sacrament is rather an application of God to man than of man to God. It is indeed a transaction between persons, and therefore so far mutual. But the initiative is with God; only the response is with man. God takes the first step in the sacrament, as He has already borne all the cost of its institution. And this puts inexorably in the wrong every theory of the Supper which represents it chiefly as a human operation in which we give or declare something, rather than as a gracious ordinance of God in which we receive.

Now this is a principle which cuts two ways. It excludes, first of all, the view which we may broadly call Socinian, though it is to be found in quarters where Socinianism is abhorred. Take for example the Independent description of the Eucharistic service, as set forth in the

1833 Declaration of their faith, order and discipline.¹ Here it is declared that the rite is to be celebrated "as a token of faith in the Saviour, and of brotherly love." The poverty and barrenness of the doctrine underlying this statement is obvious. It directs our thoughts to the disposition of man, not to the disposition of God. It implicitly represents the Supper as being rooted in the love of believers to Christ, rather than in the love of Christ to believers. The sacrament is designed to show forth, not the sacrifice of Christ in His death, but the faith of man; not to seal the benefits of Christ's death to all who trust Him, but to draw closer the bonds of charity which unite Christian people. The fact that, as has been said, sacraments are acts originating with God, not with man, is hardly glanced at. They are described as though they had been called into being by the Church to nourish and stimulate its own life, instead of being Christ's deliberate legacy and keepsake to His people. We cannot be surprised that those to whom the sacraments appear in this light are frequently at a loss to comprehend the reason for their existence, and have even been led to speak of abolishing them altogether. On such terms the sacraments have only an artificial and external connexion with the Christian religion. There might, without serious spiritual loss, be no sacraments at all; there might conceivably be sacraments to any number.

But here, as so often, extremes meet. Rome is at one with the Socinians in teaching that the Eucharist is mainly the act of man; and not merely Rome, but the extremer Anglo-Catholics. We observe that the term *Lord's Supper* is rarely employed by adherents of this school, who prefer some designation which lays a less open emphasis on the fact that the Supper is the Lord's, and not man's. Wherever the rite is viewed as a *sacrifice*, in

¹ Cf. R. W. Dale, *Essays and Addresses*, p. 376.

which the Elements, assumed into union with our Lord's Body and Blood, are offered to God with propitiatory, or quasi-propitiatory effect, what has come to be uppermost in the theory is not the part God has in the transaction, but the part played by man. We are presenting to God what, according to the New Testament, He is in fact presenting or representing to us.

The principle that we are primarily receivers in the sacrament is fatal to all sacrificial conceptions of the matter. This decisive truth was urged with great force by Calvin. "While the Supper itself," he says, "is a gift of God which is to be received with thanksgiving, the sacrifice of the Mass pretends to pay a price to God to be received as satisfaction. Sacrifice differs from the sacrament of the Supper as widely as giving from receiving. But herein appears the wretched ingratitude of man, that when he ought to have recognized the liberality of the divine goodness, he makes God to be his debtor." Or, as Bishop Cooper put it with unanswerable force and brevity: "A sacrifice is a thing given to God: this sacrament was a thing given to us. Nothing therefore can be of nature more contrary than your sacrifice and Christ's sacrament." It was indeed a fatal and ominous day for the Church when early in the centuries men began to pass from the simpler conception of the Supper as a sacrifice in the sense that the elements used in the service are offered for the purpose by members of the congregation, to the novel and sinister notion that it is sacrificial in the sense of purifying the conscience and atoning for sin. The Church was brought into being by the one perfect sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and it is inconceivable that in any sense she should be able to repeat the act by which she herself was called into existence. Spiritual offerings are indeed presented to God in the Eucharist, offerings of faith, penitence, and self-surrender, but neither would *they* be acceptable save only for the

offering of Christ which the sacrament not reproduces, but commemorates. The position of the Reformed Church on this subject could not be better expressed than in the masculine verses of Tennyson, quoted by him from one of his own poems when partaking of the sacrament just before his death :

It is but a Communion, not a Mass,
No sacrifice, but a life-giving feast.

The import of the principle upon which we have been dwelling, viz. that the sacrament moves from God to man, rather than from man to God, might perhaps be formulated differently by saying that wherever the duality essential to the very idea of a sacrament has been destroyed, some serious error has crept in. A sacrament consists of two parts, the outward sign and the spiritual grace, and if either be obliterated or absorbed in the other, the result is confusion and loss. The figurative view, in which the elements are no more than naked and bare signs, completely ignores the truth that through participation Divine grace is conveyed to the faithful soul. Were the sacrament merely symbolical and didactic, could we adequately describe it as but a picture of Christ's death, the visible breaking of the bread and pouring out of the wine would suffice, without distribution and without participation, for the *picture* of Christ's death would be complete in the breaking and pouring forth. No better instance than the figurative view, indeed, could be found to prove how much harm has been done to sacramental thought by the notion that the sacraments are meant to shadow forth certain doctrinal truths, rather than to unite us to Christ Himself. On the other hand, transubstantiation is guilty of the converse error of obliterating the visible sign. If spiritual grace is to be symbolized, the symbol must exist as such. The visible has its rights, and we tamper with them at our peril.

The doctrine of the Lord's Supper on its objective side, to which we are brought by this process of elimination, may be stated broadly as follows. In receiving with faith the symbols of Christ's flesh and blood we receive Christ Himself. The whole is a spiritual transaction between persons, a spiritual conveyance of Christ to the soul of the believer. We feed upon Him spiritually in so intimate and real a fashion that He could describe it as eating His body. When the bread and wine are put into our hands, and we partake of them worthily, we have received in and through an emblematic action all that Christ's death won for us. And if we be asked—how do you know that this is true? we reply, *first*, because we have Christ's own promise for it, and *second*, because it is vouched for by Christian experience. No other grounds of religious belief will bear being tested by the test of time and human life than these two—Divine authority, which fulfils and realizes itself in the experiences of the pious soul. We can be assured of spiritual things in no other way, but in this way we can be assured of them.

In exposition and defence of this view, which I believe to be the Reformed doctrine in its simplest terms, much might be said. I may point out, for example, that it possesses this signal merit above some theories which have appeared in the course of the doctrinal evolution, that it keeps the entire discussion on the *personal* plane. It exhibits the sacrament as a real communion, a direct dealing between one spirit and another. And this is the real complaint, in the last resort, which we must press against Ritualistic and Romish theories: they attempt to explain the whole matter in terms that apply to things rather than to persons, or, in the technical language of philosophy, they operate with sub-personal categories. It is for this reason that they are so much in love with the mysterious, as distinct from the mystical, aspect of the sacrament. The Eucharist is to them a mystery, or it is nothing. And the mystery is

essentially of the kind that leans towards magic, i.e. it is mediated by the action of matter upon spirit rather than by moral motives and forces. Beyond all question for us also the Supper is a mystery, and this element we reverently acknowledge. I do not say we shall ever be able to solve the mystery of it, but we may understand in what the mystery consists; and this is what many theories are deficient in. The mystery must be looked for in the fitting place. The sacrament is mysterious in precisely the same sense as conversion or prayer is mysterious; i.e. in every case of contact and interaction between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man there remains a gracious supernatural element beyond our power to analyze or subsume under purely intellectual conceptions. But this form of mystery, as it is found in the sacrament, we can connect with the teaching of Jesus, and with our own religious experience. It is spiritual, not external or physical. It lifts up the soul with the presentiment of a higher and diviner world than that in which we ordinarily move and have our being. Above all, it does not meet us with the blank unintelligible fact of portent and prodigy, of miraculous changes in the bread and wine which have no thinkable relation to the effects they are supposed to produce on spiritual life and moral character.

This tendency to depersonalize the sacramental transaction is illustrated very clearly when, as so often, the presence of Christ is placed in the elements rather than in the hearts of the receivers. The real and objective presence of Christ is confused with His local presence. There is a kind of materialism in this. Those who plead for it are not content till they can point to something visible, tangible, edible, which shall guarantee the reality of a supernatural gift. It has been said that the Atonement is a miracle for ethics, as rising far above the ethical plane; but this is a miracle for ethics as sinking beneath it. We

cannot consent to give the mere elements the importance this view assigns them. As mere elements they are nothing. They must be taken up organically and instrumentally into a personal operation ere they become significant. They draw their meaning and efficacy from one Person, and they can convey it only to another person, spiritually made ready for its reception. Abstract, hypostatize, deify the elements apart from Christ's actual and gracious use of them in feeding the soul, and of course it is vain to ask wherein their spiritual power can lie. Abstract the elements from the persons for whom they are designed, treat the presence or absence of communicants as a matter of no moment, and again the bread and wine cease to have a meaning. We are once more in the region of unethetical mystery.

It may even be said, I think, that some of the best Reformed divines are not guiltless of depersonalizing the sacramental process, in so far as they lay a false emphasis upon the flesh and blood of Christ, in contrast to Christ Himself. Dr. Dale's noble restatement of the full Protestant doctrine was in this respect a timely service to the Church. How much fruitless debate as to whether that which is received is the natural body or the glorified, the humanity of Christ or His Divinity, might have been avoided had men clearly kept in view that what flesh and blood signify is simply the person of our Incarnate Lord! But the Reformed writers of whom I speak seem to be haunted at times by the fear that it is not enough to know that in the sacrament the soul feeds upon Christ by faith and love; they must get behind that, as they suppose, and grasp some spiritual and heavenly *substance*, by assimilating which celestial benefits become ours. Notions of this kind are to be found even in Calvin, elements which we are tempted to declare the lineal posterity of the physical idea of redemption prevalent in Greek theology. This is especially the case

in one or two passages, where Calvin alludes to the bearing of the sacrament on immortality. We may suitably bring this paper to a close by glancing briefly at some aspects of the great Reformer's doctrine of the Supper. It has often been praised, and with justice; but now and then the eulogy has been marked by a somewhat ignorant enthusiasm. The truth seems to be that in the higher reaches of his theory Calvin put forward certain speculations which have very little real meaning, and which he himself must have been at a loss to understand.

He lays extraordinary emphasis on the fact that we really partake of the actual flesh and blood of Christ. Let us take the following from the *Institutes*: "We say that Christ descends to us, both by the external symbol and by His Spirit, that He may truly quicken our souls by the substance of His flesh and blood." Or this from His tract on the Supper: "We all confess with one mouth that on receiving the sacrament in faith we are truly made partakers of *the proper substance* of the body and blood of Jesus Christ."¹ This was a modification of his attitude in the first edition of the *Institutes*, where it is stated that the very substance of Christ's body is *not* given. In all this there is, indeed, nothing to object to were it made clear simultaneously, as I do not think Calvin makes it clear, that after all what "flesh and blood" mean is not any undefinable substance, but simply Christ Himself, as a person, Incarnate and Crucified, and clothed in the gospel of His death. It is a fact worthy of remark that in the 6th chapter of St. John, after speaking in pictorial wise of our eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man, Christ appears to have desired to prevent the possibility of His words being understood in a realistic and unspiritual sense, for He deliberately chooses another form of language to end with, and says by way of explanation: "He that

¹ These illustrative passages could easily be multiplied.

eateth *Me*, even he shall live by *Me*." No doubt in emphasizing, in what seems an unfortunate manner, the presence of Christ's actual flesh and blood in the sacrament, Calvin was strongly influenced by custom, by the exigencies of his polemic, and by a natural desire to preserve the very words of Scripture. But the only interest we have in affirming our participation in Christ's *flesh and blood* is to make it clear that the Saviour whom we receive, and with whom we have real communion, is an Incarnate Saviour, Who died for our sins. The phrases "eat and drink" and "flesh and blood" are in strictness *both* symbolical, the former of spiritual assimilation, the latter of an Incarnate Redeemer and our interest in His death.

But what is the least satisfactory element in Calvin's theory and the surest proof that he still held in some degree to the realistic view, has now to be stated. He repeatedly enunciates what we can only call the strange conception that the soul of the believer partakes of the substance of Christ *by ascending to heaven*, and feeding upon His body there. This is made quite plain in the Catechism which he drew up for the Church of Geneva, in 1545. There, after asserting with wonderful lucidity and power that we have in the Supper not only a figure of Christ's benefits, but an application of them in their reality, he proceeds: "Q. But how can this be, when the body of Christ is in heaven, and we are still pilgrims on the earth? A. This He accomplishes by the secret and miraculous agency of His Spirit, to whom it is not difficult to unite things otherwise disjoined by a distant space. Q. You do not imagine, then, either that the body is enclosed in the bread, or the blood in the wine? A. Neither is enclosed. My understanding rather is, that in order to obtain the reality of the signs, our minds must be raised to heaven, where Christ is, and that it is improper and vain to seek Him in these earthly elements." The influence of this conception may be faintly

traced in one sentence towards the close of John Knox's well known *Fencing of the Table*, where we read: "The only way to dispose our souls to receive nourishment, relief, and quickening of His substance, is to lift up our minds by faith above all things wordly and sensible, and thereby to enter into heaven, that we may find and receive Christ, where He dwelleth undoubtedly very God and very man." Would it be too much to say that the view thus stated by Calvin is intended as an amicable rejoinder to Luther's doctrine of the ubiquity? The earlier Reformer had taught that the body of Christ is consubstantiated with the elements, and can enter into this relation in virtue of its superiority, as glorified, to the conditions of space; the later Reformer, to secure the same interest, reverses the situation, and instead of thus bringing the body of Christ down to us from heaven, raises us up to where it dwells. But it is impossible to deny that they are both speaking of the same body, or that both are inspired by the sentiment that more is needed than a spiritually real communication of grace. They are not content with personal forms of thought. It is not enough that in the sacrament we have Christ Himself; we must, besides, have His flesh and blood in some substantial and quasi-material sense. This may be thought unjust to Calvin; but that it is not so, is made at least probable by the vigorous words of Principal Cunningham, surely no unfriendly judge: "We have no fault," he says, "to find with the substance of Calvin's statements in regard to the sacraments in general, and with respect to baptism; but we cannot deny that he made an effort to bring out something like a real influence exerted by Christ's human nature upon the souls of believers, in connexion with the dispensation of the Lord's Supper—an effort which, of course, was altogether unsuccessful, and resulted only in what was about as unintelligible as Luther's consubstantiation." The real merit of Calvin's work lay in his

magnificent refutation of the doctrine of the Mass, coupled with his strenuous assertion of the objective reality of Christ's presence in the sacrament. But it will not do to lay much stress on his specific language. When he goes beyond the objective reality of the presence of Christ to affirm the presence of Christ's flesh and blood as something more and more precious—a *materia coelestis* in short—we detect the traces of his age.

In conclusion, the question may be raised whether any theory can hope to express all that the Eucharist means. Could even Christ have put into human speech all that it signifies? Surely the very fact that He went further than speech, and embodied what was at His heart in a visible act, apprizes us that something is here which no doctrine can exhaustively set forth. Wherever the human soul enters into close and personal dealings with God there will be mysteries, of love and grace and compassion on the one side, of faith and humility on the other. But they are spiritual mysteries, unutterable not because they cannot be experienced, but because they cannot be explained. So when Christ is given and received in and with the elements, and deep calleth unto deep, the line of human interpretation will find abysses of grace and blessing which its line can never sound.

This is one truth which we Protestants need to accentuate, but there is another. The Eucharist is in line with the gospel, therefore what it declares has a reality apart from human deficiencies in the administrator, nay in a certain sense apart from the faith of the receiver. In other words, as we have to do in the gospel with the finished work of Christ—with something complete and perfect in itself which empowers men to preach full salvation *now*—so in the Supper we are face to face with an offer, a gift of Christ whose reality is not conditioned by our receiving it. The blessing of the sacrament is dependent on faith,

but the reality of the grace with which Christ is filling it is not so dependent. The worth and content of this symbolical act of Christ as Host at His table *are there* irrespective of the faith of man; for salvation is of God alone. The sacramental gift is not created by the response of human trust; rather, we rest upon Christ as given, for He is the author of the rite and the soul of its present meaning.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

THE VIRGIN-BIRTH.

THE *Nineteenth Century and After* for January contains an article, the name of the writer of which recalls "battles long ago." *Supernatural Religion* was published in 1874-1877, and is now chiefly remembered on account of the opportunity it afforded to Lightfoot of reassuring, by his massive learning and strong common sense, the righteous who were fearing that the foundations were being cast down.

"Lightfoot showed," says Dr. Salmon (*Introd. N.T.* p. 8), "that this supposed Bishop Thirlwall [to whom the book had been attributed] did not possess even a schoolboy acquaintance with Greek and Latin, and that his references were in some cases borrowed wholesale, in others did not prove the things for which they were cited, and very often appealed to writers whose opinion is of no value."

Dr. Salmon notices the work as illustrating the fundamental principle of the school of Strauss and Renan.

"The author starts with the denial of the supernatural as his fixed principle. . . . This explains their seeming want of candour : . . . why they meet with evasions proofs that seem to be demonstrative. It is because, to their minds, any solution of a difficulty is more probable than one which would concede that a miracle had really occurred."

In the present case Mr. W. R. Cassells does not bring before the public any theory of his own, but merely seeks to point the moral of what he calls "The Ripon Episode."

Under this title he includes "some reported utterances of the Dean of Ripon at a meeting of the Churchmen's Union on the 29th of October, regarding the birth of Christ from a Virgin, the Ascension and the Resurrection," also the subsequent correspondence between the Dean and the Bishop of Ripon, the Bishop's own *Introduction to the Temple Bible*, and finally a work recently published, *Contentio Veritatis*, which consists of lectures by six Oxford clerical tutors.

For our present purposes it is quite immaterial whether Dean Fremantle was correctly reported or not, or whether or not his explanation of his words harmonizes with the Catholic Faith on these cardinal points. The utterances of men in high place commonly have an importance attached to them quite disproportionate to the knowledge and judgment of the speakers.

For us the significance of "The Ripon Episode" and of Mr. Cassells' article lies not in the speakers but in the things spoken, and the publicity of their utterances. For us the question is, Does the Catholic Faith in the twentieth century include a belief in the literal objective truth of the miraculous Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ, or does it not? Do the articles of the Creed, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost; the third day He rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven," refer to facts which took place, actually, at distinct moments of past time, as really as did the birth and death of Napoleon Bonaparte, or are they merely mystical phrases by which the Christian Church sought to express the greatness of its founder, and so have no more correspondence with external reality than the titles "Son of Heaven," or "Serene Highness"?

This second alternative is thus suggested by one of the contributors to *Contentio Veritatis*, quoted by Mr. Cassells:

"Is it certain that the Christ of the Church is not merely an idealised figure, to whom was attributed (in perfect good faith) all that the

religious consciousness of the age found to be most worthy of a Divine Being?"

It must be remembered that the writer, whose words these are, asserts "that belief in the 'Divinity' of the Historical Christ is still an essential part of Christianity." There is an ambiguity in this word Divinity. Is it *θειότης* or *θεότης*? Divinitas or Deitas? Is Christ only a manifestation of the divine, or is He absolute essential Deity? Is it not possible that we are witnessing an unconscious revival of the Arian heresy? We are warned that

"the only external criterion to which we can appeal is the judgment of the Christian Church as to what it 'behoved' the Son of God to do and suffer, and this is a matter on which human beings cannot speak with authority, and are not likely to agree."

Language such as this is natural from those who regard the Catholic Church merely as an association, or a congeries of associations, of human beings, an association merely human in its origin and continued life. But to those who believe the Catholic Church to be essentially a divine society, "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," not founded by man, but a new creation of God, and continually guided into all truth by the Spirit of God—to those who have this belief the judgment of the Christian Church of the earliest times as to what it behoved the Son of God to do and suffer is equivalent to a revelation from God Himself. The development of the Church's thought on articles of the faith must be, as Liddon has well said, "a development by explanation, a development which places the intrinsically unchangeable dogma . . . in its true relation to the new intellectual world that grows up around Christianity" in each generation. The doctrine of the Resurrection, for example, may conceivably have wider issues to a Christian of the twentieth century than it had to one of the second, but the clause "the third day He rose again" cannot

possibly admit of a spiritualizing process which would make it equivalent to "the third day He did not rise again," and so of the other dogmas in question.

A system of religion which includes in its factors, elements, or leading ideas, a Jesus Christ, of whatever moral supremacy, who had a human father as well as a human mother and whose human body not only never ascended into heaven, but saw corruption in some unknown grave, a system which in private maintains these facts, while in public, in lectures and books, it throws a luminous haze over them, such a system may possibly sustain, or even produce, individuals of great ethical beauty, but, unquestionably, such a system is not the Catholic Church of Christ, nor is its faith the faith that overcometh the world.

The author of *Supernatural Religion* has, in his recent article, made this fact abundantly clear :

"After allowing," he says, "the solid basis of the doctrines to crumble away, it is curious how confidently a spiritualized semblance of them is made to replace the vanished substance. There seems to be no recognition of a difference of validity between the solid rock upon which the belief was once held to be built and the shifting sand upon which the mystic interpretation is supposed to be solidly erected."

And again, while expressing "sincere respect for the writers" from whom he has quoted, for having "voluntarily stepped forth to help the weaker and more troubled brethren, and provide them with spiritualized views of doctrines regarding which their minds have been of late rudely shaken," he thus proceeds :

"But they have had to make bricks without straw, of which no abiding city can be built. If they have led the doubting into a seeming paradise of rest, it is one, unfortunately, from which they may any day be expelled by the Angel of Truth with two-edged sword, and it seems to me both right and expedient that warning of this should be given."

The warning is a timely one, with whatever expectations it is given, and it is proposed to discuss here the Scriptural evidence for the birth of Christ from a virgin ; not for the

satisfaction of those whose fundamental principle is disbelief in the possibility of miracles, but rather as a help to those students of Scripture and of dogma who, while they find no difficulty in the miracle, are yet perplexed by the nature of the New Testament attestation to it, especially as that attestation is represented in some modern theories of the Synoptic problem.

To one unacquainted with modern New Testament criticism and its varying phases, it might seem that we had in the opening narratives of SS. Matthew and Luke a "solid rock" upon which the Church to-day, as well as the Church of earlier days, may build her belief in the Virgin-birth of Christ. In recent times however it has been sought to depreciate the value of this double attestation by means of a theory about the Synoptic Gospels which is usually associated with the name of Dr. Edwin Abbott.

Mr. Cassells writes as though the theory had been originated by the Bishop of Ripon; but as the question of authorship is here immaterial, it may as well be described in the words of his article:

"Taking the first three Gospels, the Bishop points out that there are certain portions which are common to all three, others which are common to two Gospels, and lastly each Gospel has a portion peculiar to itself. The portions common to all three Gospels he proposes to call the common stock, and he decides that the nearest sources of information about Jesus Christ are to be found in this common-stock Gospel."

He proceeds then to quote the Bishop's own words:

"Now, in the common-stock Gospel, the miraculous accessories connected with the birth and resurrection of Jesus do not find a place. These accessories are found in the group of secondary witnesses. . . . Upon these, in the first instance, we have purposely refused to lay stress. Our belief in Jesus Christ must be based upon moral conviction, not upon physical wonder."

It is unnecessary to quote further. It is only fair to say that the Bishop of Ripon subsequently implies that he

himself believes in the Virgin-birth of Christ as well as in His resurrection. But it is unfortunate, to say the least, to find a Christian chief pastor using language which can be easily interpreted into a concession that the scriptural evidence for what he calls the "physical marvels at the opening and close of Christ's career" is insufficient, and that in any case they are of very secondary importance.

The fallacy underlying this argument, based on the so-called common-stock Gospel, was exposed long ago by Dr. Salmon when dealing with it in its original form as presented by Dr. Edwin Abbott. What Dr. Boyd Carpenter calls the common-stock Gospel, Dr. E. Abbott styles the triple tradition. But as Dr. Salmon points out (*Introd. N.T.* p. 135),

"'Triple tradition' does not mean 'triple attested tradition,' but singly attested tradition. If you compare the history of the early Church, as told by three modern historians, you will find several places where they relate a story in nearly identical words. In such a case an intelligent critic would recognise at once that we had, not a story attested by three independent authorities, but one resting on the credit of a single primary authority, coming through different channels. When we come further down in the history, and Eusebius is no longer the unique source of information, exactly as authorities become numerous, verbal agreement between the histories ceases, and our 'triple tradition' comes to an end. Thus, instead of its being true that the 'triple tradition' is the most numerous attested portion of the Gospel narrative, we may conclude that this is just the part for which we have a single primary authority. For example the triplicity of our tradition fails us when we come to the history of the Passion and Resurrection . . . But the cause of this variety is simply that we have the testimony of independent witnesses."

With respect then to the belief of the Apostolic Church in the Virgin-birth of Christ we have the testimony of independent witnesses.

"The narrative of the Conception in the first Gospel is absolutely independent of the narrative in the third. They are not simply distinct accounts proceeding from two independent observers, but

they cover almost entirely different ground . . . It is natural to conjecture that S. Matthew's story originated with Joseph, as S. Luke's with the mother of the Lord" (Swete, *Apostle's Creed*, pp. 50, 51).

We may add that if these two Gospels represent respectively the Hebraic and the Hellenic side of the Apostolic Church, their agreement in the main fact possesses an additional cogency.

But we are told :

"Outside these first two chapters of S. Matthew and the first two chapters of S. Luke, the Virgin-birth is absolutely non-existent in the New Testament. The natural inference is that it was unknown to the writers of the New Testament, except to those who penned those four chapters" (Times' Report of Dean Fremantle's speech).

In reply, it must of course be granted that nowhere else in the New Testament is there a specific statement of the fact ; but is there not involved in the objection something of an anachronism, and a misapprehension of the nature and historical setting of the writings which compose the New Testament ?

From the very nature of the case the miraculous birth of Jesus was a topic which could not find expression except in the intimate circles of a community that was living in an unquestioning belief of His Messiahship and resurrection from the dead.

Bishop Butler mentions the incarnation of Christ as an example of what he calls "invisible miracles,"—miracles, that is, "which being secret cannot be alleged as a proof of a Divine mission, but require themselves to be proved by visible miracles." This logical necessity is illustrated by the words of St. Paul in the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, where he says that Jesus Christ "was declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection of the dead."

The whole energy of the Church in early Apostolic times was devoted, as far as controversy was concerned, to

the proving that Jesus was the Christ. And even supposing that Virgin-birth were a note of the Messiah, it would have been inconceivable folly to have alleged it of Him until His resurrection from the dead and the logical consequences of His resurrection had been completely realized. As a matter of fact it would seem as though the controversy with the Jews as to the Messiahship of Jesus was, almost from the first, complicated by the practical consequences that were felt to be involved in the admission that He was the Christ. The abolition of the Mosaic law, the loss of special privileges by the Jews, the admission of the Gentiles, and other profound changes, must have rendered it almost impossible to discuss the personality of Jesus purely as a question of abstract theology. Now almost all, certainly the most important, of the Epistles in the New Testament not only reflect this disturbed state of religious thought, but are actually expressions of it, pamphlets on one side of the question, so to speak. It is only in works written after the fall of Jerusalem that the normal inner quiet home life of the Church begins to find expression. When we realize the circumstances under which the Epistles were written the marvel is not that they are silent about the Virgin-birth of Jesus, but that from scattered phrases in them the Church has been able to construct a systematic Christology of any kind.

The silence of the early Epistles on this subject, if the non-introduction of irrelevant matter can be fairly called silence, is paralleled by the absence of a narrative of the infancy of Jesus from the Gospel according to S. Mark. It is generally acknowledged now that that Gospel is the best representative of the very earliest Apostolic teaching about our Lord, and the scope of that teaching, as we learn from the words of S. Peter, as recorded by S. Luke in the first chapter of the Acts, deliberately limited the Apostolic testimony to what the Apostles themselves had

seen and heard between the baptism of John and the Ascension.

The narrative of S. Matthew might seem a sufficient indication of what the Apostles believed as to the miraculous incarnation of their Master; but for argument's sake we will not press this point; though in truth the chief reason why some modern critics deny that Matthew the Apostle compiled the first Gospel is because the Church has always attributed it to him. It is not however generally recognized that the story of St. Luke almost compels us to acknowledge that S. Paul believed in the Virgin-birth of Christ. It is not meant that S. Paul had actually seen and sanctioned the third Gospel as we now have it; but we know that S. Luke was a constant and intimate companion of S. Paul, and it is inconceivable that S. Luke could have placed in the forefront of his history a statement in which he knew his great teacher did not believe. As we have seen already, the subject of the Virgin-birth of Christ was even less likely to be prominently mentioned in public discourses then than now. But, on the other hand, it was more likely then than now to be inquired into and emphasized in the inner and more advanced Church teaching, since an unequivocal answer to the question, Whose Son is He? was the most important factor in the determination of the problem, What think ye of the Christ?

And indeed the terms in which S. Paul speaks of Christ in his Epistles cannot be explained if, in the background of his thoughts, there lay the knowledge or even a suspicion that He had come into the world as other men do. Too much weight cannot perhaps be laid on the expression "born of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4), or the reference to the consecration of motherhood in the Incarnation in 1 Timothy ii. 15, "She shall be saved through the child-bearing." It is not however too much to say that S.

Paul's whole doctrine of sin, the universal sinfulness of mankind, and the sinlessness of Christ, in virtue of which He has broken the entail of sin transmitted from the first Adam, who "was of the earth, earthy," and so becomes a second Adam, the first parent of a new creation, "a life-giving spirit,"—all this would be absolutely meaningless and baseless if, as a matter of fact, Jesus Christ did not differ in His human origin from other men. And herein lies the place or function in the Divine economy of salvation of the article "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary."

"When the theologian," says a contributor to *Contentio Veritatis*, "puts historical propositions into his creed, he does so because he is convinced that there are important truths, in the spiritual order, which are dependent on, or inseparable from, those events in the past."

We have only touched the fringe of the subject. All the indications in the Lord's own words of His consciousness of a unique relationship to God, all the testimony from the Gospels, and indeed the whole New Testament, to His Divine pre-existence point in the same direction. Enough has been said. Not enough perhaps to convince those whose attitude towards the mysteries of Christianity is that "contempt prior to examination," which, as Paley has said, "will account for the inefficacy of any argument or any evidence whatever." More than enough perhaps for believers who feel that the subject is too sacred for public discussion. But there is "a time to speak" as well as "a time to keep silence," and such a time assuredly comes when "the faith once for all committed to the saints" is attacked, not by avowed opponents, but by the "shadow'd hints" of some who profess and call themselves Christians.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

*STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY
OF JERUSALEM.*

III.

THE WATERS.

IN the general description of the City, which formed the first of these Studies,¹ some account was given of the hydrography of Jerusalem. But before we begin the story of the City's growth, a more detailed examination is necessary of the water-supply of so remarkable a site, not only that we may understand the character of the latter and its capacity for sustaining a large population, but that we may have also before us the data of some of the most critical problems of the topography and history. Nowhere so much as in the East do such problems depend on the exact position and constancy of the water-sources; but in the case of Jerusalem the meagreness of the latter enhances their topographical importance to a degree unusual even in the Orient.

The natural causes which affect the water-supply of Jerusalem are four: three which may be regarded as constant—the average annual rainfall,² the height at which the City stands, the geological constitution of the site; and one which introduces a considerable element of uncertainty—the earthquakes that have so frequently rocked the foundations of the City. It is strange that this last has been so much ignored by writers on the topography of Jerusalem—although both the Bible and Josephus contain hints of its significance for the questions we are treating—and how in consequence these questions have often been answered with

¹ EXPOSITOR for January 1903.

² Various attempts have been made to prove that the annual rainfall in Palestine was in ancient times much greater than it is to-day, but none of these can be said to have been successful. The main causes of rain at Jerusalem—viz., the position of the range, on which the City stands, relatively to the sea, and the prevailing winds—are what they always were, and we saw that the distribution of trees about Jerusalem can never have been very different from what it is to-day (EXPOSITOR, January 1903).

a dogmatism which the merest recollection of the earthquakes ought to have rendered impossible.

1. We have seen that the average annual rainfall about Jerusalem is considerable—as much as twenty-five inches, or about that of London—but that it falls in winter only, and leaves a long summer drought.

2. This rainfall happens upon a large basin, some two-and-a-half miles square, which lies upon what is virtually the summit of a mountain-range. The lowest levels of the basin are about 2,000, and its highest edges from 2,600 to 2,700 feet above the sea. The principal hollows by which it is drained—the Kīdrōn, the Wady er Rabāby and the small intervening valley once known as the Tyropoeon—run round or through the City's site, joining below its south-east angle upon the basin's one outlet towards the Dead Sea. The City is therefore situated where any water that falls in the basin and remains upon the surface must gather before leaving it. Here then is one of the greater reasons why Jerusalem stands where she does. So large a population as has generally filled her would have been impossible anywhere else on this part of the range. But while enough water falls within the basin to sustain so great a city, the limits, the height, and the somewhat rapid slope of the basin towards its single outlet forbid the formation of either a river or a lake.

3. But the want of streams and natural pools about Jerusalem is not fully accounted for till we take into consideration the geology of the district. This, as we have seen, consists of strata of limestone of various degrees of softness and porosity.¹ First, as on the top of Olivet, there are patches of the soft upper chalk, known locally as "kakūli." Below this lies a harder reddish and grey limestone, "Mezzeh," with strips of flint, of which much of the surface of the City's site is composed. Then comes a

¹ For the material in the following sentences I am indebted to descriptions by Major-General Wilson and Colonel Conder.

bed, some thirty-five feet thick, of "Meleki"—a limestone so soft that it can be cut with a knife, but hardening to exposure; in this have been hewn the quarries, cisterns and aqueducts immediately under the City. And below it there is a hard dolomitic limestone, which comes near the surface only in the bed of the Wady Abu Nār, between Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives.

These are the full reasons why neither lake nor stream has ever blessed the neighbourhood of the Holy City. Pools formed by the winter rains quickly disappear,¹ and there are but one or two small transient swamps.² Except for a brief interval after heavy downbursts of rain, water does not run above ground outside the Wady Abu Nār. It is in the latter therefore that we must seek—at a depth some thirty feet below, and 240 feet to the west of the present bed—the only stream of the district of which we read in the Bible and Josephus. This is called *the brook which flows in the midst of the land*,³ *the brook* "par excellence,"⁴ and *the brook Kīdrōn*.⁵ The name brook (Hebrew "naḥal," Greek χείμαρρος) signifies a mere winter stream, dry in summer. That it sometimes came down in great force is proved by the verb "shōṭēph," *rushing, flooding*, which is applied to it in 2 Chronicles xxxii. 3. In the present day the most of its waters disappear immediately east of the City under the rubbish with which the valley is choked; but lower down, beyond the Bir Eiyūb, they flow in a considerable stream for several days after the heavy rains of spring.⁶

¹ Schick mentions one which lies every winter for a few weeks near the Nablus Road on the north of the City. *P.E.F.Q.*, 1892, 9.

² See p. 12.

³ 2 Chron. xxxii. 3.

⁴ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14; Neh. ii. 15.

⁵ קִדְרֹן. 2 Sam. xv. 23; 1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Kings xxiii. 6, 12; Jer. xxxi. 40; 2 Chron. xv. 16, xxix. 16, xxx. 14; Κεδρών John xviii. 1; Josephus VIII. *Ant.* i. 5.

⁶ Thomson, *Land and Book*, 659, 'gushing out like a millstream.' *P.E.F. Mem.*, "Jerus." 371. Masterman, *Biblical World*, 1902, 89 f.

As for fountains, it is evident that in such a basin these are not probable except where the lowest of the four strata, the hard dolomitic limestone, comes near the surface. We must look for them therefore in this same K̄idrōn Valley, or possibly also in the natural grooves which in ancient times descended into it from the City. Everywhere else the porous strata prevail, and lie deep below the surface; there appears to be no hard rock to throw up the subterranean waters to the light. It is true that both in ancient times and within recent years rumours have risen of the existence of fountains outside the K̄idrōn Valley. The so-called "Letter of Aristeas" states that the Temple had an inexhaustible supply of water not only in its wonderful cisterns, but from a copious natural spring, within itself.¹ Tacitus² speaks of a "fons perennis aquae," apparently also within the Temple. Robinson³ and others⁴ have placed the spring Gihon on the west of the City by the head of the W. er Rabāby. Others⁵ have sought for Gihon on the north, and have taken the aqueduct which runs from the Damascus Gate towards the Temple area as a channel for its waters; while Pierotti⁶ calls the Hammām esh Shefā, the large cistern in the Tyropoeon to the west of the Temple, "a spring." But the statements of the "Letter of Aristeas" and of Tacitus are probably inversions of the prophecy that a fountain of living water would issue from the Sanctuary; we shall see that Gihon is to be found in the K̄idrōn Valley; and a careful examination of the Hammām esh Shefā proves it to be a mere reservoir for the surface-waters and percolations immediately below the surface, and no true spring.⁷

But, indeed, all efforts to find fountains in the City, or

¹ See Thackeray's edition in Swete's *Introd. to the O.T. in Greek*, p. 535.

² *Hist.* v. 12.

³ *B.R.*, i. 323-329; *L.B.R.*, 243 ff.

⁴ E.g. Schultz.

⁵ E.g. *Holy City*, ii. 474.

⁶ *Jerusalem Explored*, p. 15.

⁷ So Dr. Chaplin reports *P.E.F. Mem.* "Jerusalem," 262 ff.

round its northern and western sides, may be given up, not only because of the geology already described, but in face of the extraordinary provision made in the City for collecting rain and surface water—both the multitudinous remains of ancient aqueducts and cisterns, and the usage of the present population.

Nothing of ancient Jerusalem has been so well preserved as her reservoirs, cisterns and conduits; and among all her remains nothing is so impressive as those vast and intricate monuments from every stage of her history.

The first of them which strike the eye are the great tanks round and within the city,¹ the Pool of the Sultan, the

¹ 1. Birket es Sulṭān in the W. er Rabāby beneath the western city-wall and the road to Bethlehem, which crosses the Wady on the south of the Pool: 555 × 220 feet; but as Masterman (*Bibl. World*, 1902, 102) says, "the enclosed area probably never was a pool, but the greater part was a collecting ground for a large rock-cut cistern at the lower end." The construction has been assigned to the German Knights in 1170 A. D.: and, for a time, the pool was called 'the German,' after them, but its present name is due to the Sultan Sūleiman ibn Selim (in the middle of the 16th cent.) who repaired it. It may however be very much older. Benzinger even suggests an ancient Jewish origin (Bädeker's *Palästina*, 4th ed. 103).

2. To the N. W. of this at the head of the W. er Rabāby is the Birket Mamilla: 292 × 193 × 19½ feet. The origin and age are unknown. It seems rather far from the city walls to be the pool mentioned in Isa. vii. 3, xxxvi. 2 (2 Kings xviii. 17). Without sufficient reason some take it to be the Serpent Pool of Josephus, V. *B.J.* iii. 2.

3. Within the city and connected with the Mamilla Pool by an aqueduct is the Birket Hammām el Batrak, or Pool of the Patriarch's Bath. This is the Amygdalon (i.e. ברבת מנדלין, Pool of the Towers) of Josephus V. *B.J.*, xi. 4. How much older than his date it may be, is unknown. It has long been called Hezekiah's Pool, but there is no evidence for or against this assumption.

On the north of the Temple area, within the old ditch that used to protect this, are a series of pools:—

4. The Twin Pools near Antonia: 165 × 20 and 127 × 20: arched over (see *P.E.F. Mem.* "Jerus." 209 ff.; (cf. 295 and plan, p. 265) identified by Clermont Ganneau with the Strouthion of Josephus V. *B.J.* xi. 4. M. Clermont Ganneau thinks the pools were roofed during the period of Aelia Capitolina. They are held to be the Twin Pools which Eusebius and other early Christian writers identified with Bethesda.

5. In the east of the ancient ditch—the Birket Isra'in: 360 × 124 × 69 ft. below the level of the Temple area; identified since 12th century with Bethesda.

6. A little to the north of this and close to, on the west, the Church of St. Anne, is another pool cut out of rock on at least two sides, with a sluice for

Pool Mamilla, Wady er Rabāby; Amygdalon or Hezekiah's Pool, the Twin Pools, the Birket Israel, and the vaulted Pool by the Church of St. Anne, within the city; the Pool of our Lady's Bath close to St. Stephen's gate; and the two Pools of Siloam, besides others outside the City to the north. For number and size the like of these great tanks, all of them either now or once above ground, are found in no other city of Palestine. Then there are the great series of thirty-seven reservoirs beneath the site of the Temple.¹ caverns large and small, hewn from the living rock, 30, 40, 50, and 60 feet deep—one of them, "the Great Sea," with a capacity of two million gallons—carefully cemented, "the roofs of rock cut into arches" and occasionally supported by heavy piers of masonry, but sometimes formed of flat stones; with passages for inspection and conduits for draining the water at various levels.² Beneath the rest of the City there are the public reservoirs like the Hammām Shefā, once perhaps a surface pool, whose walls as the rubbish rose through various generations were heightened yard by yard and finally roofed over; and the numberless domestic cisterns. The modern excavator may be said to come upon these everywhere in rubbish of all possible ages or in the rock. On Ophel Dr. Guthe uncovered a great number.³ To the north of the city again the Survey plan is dotted with the name "cistern,"⁴ and here too they are of all styles and possible origins. Two large ones near

emptying it, and above part of it vaults on which rest two Christian (crusading) churches one above the other. *P.E.F.Q.* 1901, 163.

7. A little to the E.N.E. of this, outside the city-wall, is the Pool of Lady Mary's Bath. Birket Hammām Sitti Miriam, 95 × 75 × 13.

Besides these, other pools have recently been discovered on the north of the city: e.g. one in the W. el Jōz. *P.E.F.Q.* 1892, 9 ff., and another mentioned *id.* 289; and on Ophel, *ZDPI.* 333 f.

The Siloah Pools, as depending on spring water, will be afterwards noted.

¹ Described by Colonel Conder in detail in *P.E.F.Mem.* "Jerus." 217.

² *Id.* 162, 165.

³ *ZDPI.* v. 336, and Tafel viii.

⁴ See especially Schick's plan, opposite p. 9. of *P.E.F.Q.* 1890.

Jeremiah's Grotto, outside the Damascus gate, were excavated by Dr. Schick—one not older than the Christian period, but the other assigned by him to the Canaanites.¹

In communication with the tanks, temple-caverns and public cisterns there spread an intricate system of conduits and channels, also of various dates, and on different levels of the City's growth. Of these the principal were the aqueduct from near the Damascus Gate to the Twin Pools, and probably at an earlier time to the Temple reservoirs²; the channels from the latter towards the Kīdrōn Valley,³ Jewish, Byzantine and Arab; the aqueducts down the Tyropoeon, for public use by means of holes above them, through which buckets were lowered⁴; the conduit from the Mamilla Pool to Amygdalon; and the two great aqueducts, "the high" and "the low level," which brought water to the City from Solomon's Pools beyond Bethlehem.⁵ There are also traces of an ancient aqueduct along the great north road to Bethel, by which water may have been led to the City from the wells of Bireh.⁶

Than these innumerable tanks, reservoirs, cisterns, and conduits, ancient Jerusalem has left no more conspicuous evidence of the habits of her life; and what do they prove? Dating, as they do, from all periods of the history—repeated, altered, and replacing each other on different levels of the gradually rising surface of the city—they prove to us very distinctly that in the main the people of Jerusalem have always depended for their water upon the gathering and storage of the rains and surface percolations, while some more enterprising generations have introduced by aqueducts spring water from a great distance. The

¹ *Id.* pp. 11 f., with plans.

² *P.E.F.Mem.* "Jerus." 265, with plan.

³ See above, p. 213.

⁴ *P.E.F.Mem.* "Jerus." 183.

⁵ Their courses with the extension to the W. el 'Arrūb have been fully described by Dr. Schick in *ZPDV.* 1878, 1 "Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt Jerus.," and by Dr. Masterman in the *Biblical World*, 1902, 101 ff.

⁶ Dr. Schick in *P.E.F.Q.* 1901, pp. 3 f.

patience, the labour, the skill which these vast remains exhibit are eloquent of one unvarying need and purpose through the ages. And all this is confirmed by the usage of the present population. To-day virtually all the houses within the city have cisterns, fed from the rain that falls on their vaulted roofs¹ or trickles through their surroundings. In the new town to the north and north-east no house of any size is built without such a cistern. A hotel-keeper in that quarter told me during the drought of 1901, that he had stored water sufficient for all his purposes for three years! Nothing then could be more clear than that in all ages the inhabitants of Jerusalem have relied for their water *mainly* on the rain, the surface percolations and supplies introduced from springs at a distance.

Having now these facts clear, we may proceed to the spring or springs, which, as we have seen, are to be expected only in the Kīdrōn Valley.

Here there still flows at least one real fountain. It is that known as the 'Ain Sitti Miriam, or Virgin's Spring, and the 'Ain Umm Derraj, or Spring of the Steps, which lead down to it from the present bed of the valley. The steps are in two flights, the upper of sixteen ending in a landing under a vault, and the lower of fourteen ending under an overhanging rock or cave, and projecting seven feet over a rocky basin, thirty feet long by eight broad, filled from a source in its centre. During the summer of 1901, in consequence of a diminution of the water, the municipality of Jerusalem had the basin cleared of a large accumulation of rubbish. At the invitation of Yusuf Pasha I had the opportunity of accompanying him and Dr. Schick

¹ That in earlier times the roofs were not all (at least) of stone is proved by the discovery during an excavation in the Tyropoeon (*P.E.F. Mem.* "Jerus." 182 f.) of one of the stone rollers commonly used in Palestine for keeping hard and close the clay-covered timber roofs. This may also be taken as a bit of evidence that in ancient times there was more timber procurable near Jerusalem than is possible to-day. See *EXPOSITOR* for January, p. 13.

on a visit to the well, the results of which are described by Dr. Schick in the *Palestine Fund Quarterly* for last year.¹ About six feet west of the lowest step is the opening of the source, a hole in the rock, apparently natural and about a foot wide. As is well known, the flow of water is intermittent and due to a natural syphon below: three to five times a day during the rainy season, but during the long drought twice, and later less than once. The cliff above projects eastward over the lower flight of stairs about seventeen feet from the source. The basin, thus lying under the rocky roof, appears to be the original pool of the spring, and its overflow must at first have passed directly eastward into the bed of the Naḥal Kīdrōn, but Dr. Schick supposes that at some time there was another and larger pool in the valley, south of the present mosque. From this uncertainty we may turn to other provisions for leading and storing the water of this famous spring, for they are certain and of great historical interest.

Some years ago Dr. Schick discovered an aqueduct leading north from the lower pool of Siloam up the edge of the Kīdrōn Valley towards the Virgin's Well,² which he believed might be found to start on the landing between the two flights of steps. Here in 1901 a shaft was sunk, and the entrance opened to a conduit running south on the edge of the valley towards the Lower Pool of Siloam. This was examined by Messrs. Hornstein and Masterman for a distance of 176 feet and found to be partly excavated in the rock and partly built with rough stones.³ Whether it is actually the upper end of Dr. Schick's aqueduct is not yet certain; but in any case the existence of a conduit leading from the Virgin's Well southwards in the direction of the Lower Pool of Siloam is put beyond all doubt by Dr. Masterman's exploration.

This aqueduct led along the edge of the valley bed and

¹ *P.E.F.Q.* 1902, p. 29.

² *P.E.F.Q.* 1891, 13 ff.; cf. 1886, 197 ff.

³ *P.E.F.Q.* 1902.

on or near the surface of the ground. But there is another conduit from the Virgin's Spring to the *Upper Pool of Siloam*, cut through the rock of the ridge of Ophel. We need not go into the details of this famous tunnel. It is enough to remind ourselves of its length, 1,706 feet; of the winding course which it follows; of the immense labour needed in its execution; and of the ancient inscription found upon it, relating how it was excavated from both ends by two parties of workmen. At the end of the serpentine tunnel from which this Siloam aqueduct properly starts, and about ninety feet from the actual opening, Sir Charles Warren discovered a perpendicular shaft forty-four feet high, continued by a series of sloping passages that issue in a vault three quarters of the way up Ophel and due west from the Virgin's Spring.

To all these passages we must return afterwards. In the meantime it is enough to say that it seems probable that the earliest conduit was the one along the edge of the valley to the Lower Pool of Siloam, and that when it was found to be too open to besiegers of the city, the tunnel (and perhaps at the same time¹ the shaft) was made in order to bring the waters of the spring within the walls.

The two pools of Siloam, to which these aqueducts lead, lie in the mouth of the Tyropoeon. The upper one the Birket Silwān, in which the water issuing from the tunnel is known as the 'Ain Selwān, was originally, according to Dr. Bliss, about fifty feet square; from Roman times onward it has been so built upon that the present pool is an oblong of some fifty by fifteen feet.² Its position, within one of the ancient walls of the city, makes

¹ Or perhaps earlier.

² *Excavations at Jerusalem*, 1894-1897, by Bliss and Dickie. Guthe (*ZDPV*, v. 59 ff.; 355 ff., with Tafel ii.) reports the discovery of a pool a few feet to the N.E. of the present Birket Silwān, but this does not appear in the report or plans of Bliss and Dickie; what Guthe found seems to be the N.E. corner and E. wall of the original pool of Siloam.

it probable that it is younger than the Lower Pool, which indeed is generally called the Old Pool.¹ This is fifty-two feet square. The two pools were connected by a rock-cut channel; and from the lower another conduit led to the Bir Eiyüb, nearly 1,000 feet down the K̄idrōn Valley.

The Bir Eiyüb is a great well 125 feet deep; the water in which has almost never been known to fail, and can be drawn upon all the year around.² It is from an overflow near this well³ that the stream spoken of above⁴ breaks down the valley for a few days after the latter rains. Whether we have here only the gathering of the surface-water or a true spring, and whether the well existed in ancient times are questions very difficult to solve. Towards the answer of the first it may be noted that the quality of the water in the Bir Eiyüb is distinctly better than that of the Virgin's Spring. It cannot therefore be wholly due to the overflow of the latter or to percolation from the surface, which undoubtedly contribute to it,⁵ but may have besides a deep natural source still undiscovered. We might even expect a spring to issue on the eastern edge of the K̄idrōn Valley, for the Mount of Olives above this must receive annually an immense quantity of water, which after sinking through the porous strata would find its most natural outlet here. Sir Charles Warren discovered an unfinished aqueduct leading down the valley near the well, but of what date it is impossible to say.

Before we seek to identify the pools, conduits and

¹ In Arabic the Birket el Ḥamra.

² "In the height of a particularly dry summer I have known of a hundred and twenty animals—donkeys, mules, and horses—being employed night and day carrying goatskins of water (two or three to each animal) up to Jerusalem. On an average every animal made four or five journeys within the twenty-four hours. In addition great quantities of water were taken locally—for Silwān and for the vegetable gardens near the well."—Masterman, *Bibl. World*, 1902, 89.

³ *P.E.F. Mem.*, "Jerus." 371. ⁴ p. 210.

⁵ Sir Charles Wilson says (*P.E.F. Mem.*, "Jerus." 371): "The supply is directly dependent on the rainfall"; but this seems true only of the overflow at the rainy season.

fountains just described with any of those mentioned in the Bible and Josephus, we have to consider what degree of uncertainty is imparted to the whole question by the fourth of the natural causes which we quoted as affecting the water supply of Jerusalem: the earthquakes.

To the mountain-range on which Jerusalem stands earthquakes do not extend with the same frequency or violence with which they have disturbed the shores of the Dead Sea, the shores of the Lake of Galilee, and other volcanic districts of Palestine. Nevertheless (as we saw in the first of our Studies), Jerusalem, besides being visited at irregular periods by fits and starts of earthquake, has suffered several convulsions of disastrous magnitude.¹ One of these happened in King Uzziah's reign; while another devastated Judæa under Herod the Great.² The tremors of the former are visible in the prophetic writings of the eighth century,³ and its memory lasted into the Christian era. The description by Josephus,⁴ whether applicable or not to this particular convulsion, is evidence of the ruin which some earthquake had effected upon the site of Jerusalem. "Before," that is, to the east of, "the city, at what is called Erōgē,⁵ half the mountain broke off from the remainder on the west, and rolling four furlongs came to a stand at the eastern mountain, till the roads as well as the king's gardens were blocked up." That is to say, a large piece of the Temple Hill (or of the ridge of Ophel) was sundered from the rest and rolled down and across the Kīdrōn Valley till it was stopped by the foot of Olivet. Josephus wrote more than eight hundred years after the earthquake under Uzziah, but the magnitude of a convulsion which could be remembered so long is thereby only the more emphasized. From the details which Josephus gives it is clear that either

¹ EXPOSITOR, 1903, p. 3, n. 1.

² Josephus, XV. *Ant.* v. 2.

³ Amos iv. 11, viii. 8; Isaiah ix. 9.

⁴ IX. *Ant.* x. 4.

⁵ Πρὸς τῇ καλουμένῃ Ἐρωγῇ (or Ἐρρωγῇ).

Uzziah's earthquake or some other had caused a havoc, the traces of which were visible in his day. Taking his evidence along with the other records we possess of the liability of Jerusalem to earthquakes, we may conclude that the K̄idrōn Valley, the part of the district in which (as we have seen) springs may be most naturally looked for, has suffered from geological disturbances of considerable severity.

In order to estimate how far these may have affected the number and disposition of the ancient springs, I have consulted the eminent geologist, Sir Archibald Geikie, and the following is his answer: "The question you ask me is one to which no confident reply either way can be given. On the one hand it is well known that springs are sometimes seriously affected by earthquakes, being closed up or opening out from new vents in the rocks underneath. On the other hand it is equally certain that even after violent earthquakes old springs may continue to maintain their old exits. Of this persistence we have a good example in the Roman Forum. The Fons Juturnae, at which Castor and Pollux watered their horses when they came to announce the victory of Lake Regillus, is still flowing, and has recently been laid open once more to light by the removal of the church, etc., built over it. Yet during the last 2,000 years Rome has been visited by many earthquakes, some of them severe enough to shake down buildings and do much damage.

"I do not think much stress can be laid on the position of the Jerusalem spring. It *may* have maintained its position in spite of all the earthquakes, but on the other hand it *may* have had its passage opened for it within historic time, and other springs may have existed which have had their passages closed up. Of course a close study of the ground might enable a geological expert to express an opinion a little more definitely in one direction or the other, but I hardly think he would feel himself justified in expressing any confidence either way."

It is evident, therefore, that in attempting to identify

the present spring or springs in the K̄idrōn Valley with those of history, as well as in estimating how numerous the latter may have been, we must be content to leave a large margin of uncertainty.

Some facts, however, are clear. The aqueduct,¹ tunnel and shaft, leading from the Virgin's Spring, prove that when they were executed the Spring was already a considerable source of living water. The famous inscription, describing the excavation of the tunnel, is almost certainly of the eighth century B.C., when great public works were executed by, at least three kings, Uzziah, Jotham and Hezekiah; and the aqueduct (as we have seen) is probably older than the tunnel. We may, therefore, assume that the Virgin's Spring is as old as,² if not older than, the eighth century. Again, the pool into which the tunnel flows, the higher of the two present pools in the mouth of the Tyropoeon Valley, the Birket Silwān, must be at least as old as the tunnel, because the inscription says that when the tunnel was finished, the waters flowed from the exit into the pool. But it may have been older, and if so must have been previously used to collect the surface-water and percolations of what was afterwards known as the Tyropoeon.

To this water-system, in the K̄idrōn Valley and at the mouth of the Tyropoeon, the earliest contemporary reference is found in the Book of Isaiah viii. 6: *Forasmuch as this people despises the waters of the Shiloah, which flow softly and . . .³ therefore, lo, the Lord will bring up against them the waters of the River, the Euphrates.* No one doubts that the Shiloah (or according to another ancient spelling Shilloah),⁴ which (a passive form) means *the sent*

¹ Schick's and Masterman's.

² There is always the possibility that it first found its present exit in the earthquake of Uzziah; and that its appearance here was the occasion of the making of the aqueduct and tunnel. But, as we shall presently see, we have evidence of its still earlier existence.

³ This clause is uncertain. See Cheyne in *S.B.O.T.* and Marti's commentary.

⁴ So the *Cod. Babyl.*, the Complut. Bible and other early edd. This reading is accepted by Baer.

or *conducted*, applies to the water-system in or about the mouth of of the Tyropoeon, where the name has always been at home. In Josephus Siloa or Siloam, when used with the feminine article,¹ is a copious spring of sweet water, obviously the present issue of water from the tunnel into the Birket Silwān and known to the Arabs as 'Ain Silwān.

But Josephus also uses Siloa with the masculine article² which has been held to mean the district³ of Siloa, and this is the sense in which Dr. Guthe⁴ interprets the Shiloah of Isaiah viii. 3. *The waters of the Shiloah which go softly* would accordingly mean all the water, artificially controlled and led, about the mouth of the Tyropoeon, in order to irrigate the gardens in the Kīdrōn Valley. But whether we put this, or a more particular, meaning upon the name, The Shiloah, the latter implies the existence in Isaiah's day of a conduit or conduits; and these may have been either the older conduit⁵ leading from the Virgin's Spring, or else the rock-cut channel connecting the Birket Silwan with the Birket Ḥamra, and continued into the Kīdrōn Valley. The latter suits *the conduit of the upper pool towards the highway of the fuller's field* mentioned in another passage of the same date: Isaiah vii. 3.⁶ A gloss to Isaiah xxii., verses 9b-11a, records in addition *the lower pool and a reservoir between the two walls for the waters of the old pool.*⁷

We may, then, conclude that in the reign of Ahaz the

¹ ἡ Σιλωάμ (so in Niese's text: though some MSS. have Σιλωαμ), V. B.J. iv. 1-2 vi. 1; ix. 4. VI. B.J. viii. 5. ἡ Σιλωάμ, V. B.J. xii. 2.

² Μεχρὶ τοῦ Σιλωά (Niese: some MSS. Σιλωάμ) II. B.J. xvi. 2; VI. B.J. vii. 2.

³ Sc. χωρὸς: cf. Guthe, Z.D.P.V. V. 359 ff. The masculine article is also used in the N.T. with the form Σιλωάμ: Luke xiii. 4; John ix. 7. The form Σειλωάμ or Σιλωάμ is that used in the LXX. of Isaiah viii. 3: though some codd. read Σιλωά.

⁴ See previous note.

⁵ Schick's and Masterman's.

⁶ Stade, Marti, etc., identify *the upper pool* of Isaiah vii. 3 with the pool which Guthe (Z.D.P.V. V. 271 ff.) claims to have discovered a few feet to the N.E. of the Birket Silwān; but, as we have seen, this pool, supposed by him to be separate, is probably part of the wider ancient pool, which extended on both sides of the present Birket Silwān.

⁷ For evidence that these verses do not belong to the original discourse of Isaiah in chap. xxii., see Cheyne in S.B.O.T. and Marti's commentary.

two pools on the mouth of the Tyropoeon were already in existence; that *the conduit of the upper pool* was the present rock-cut channel leading into the Kīdrōn Valley from the Birket Silwān. These were probably parts of a wider system of irrigation, which was known as The Shiloah. In any case we have no evidence for confining this name to either the tunnel from the Virgin's Spring (which perhaps did not exist in the reign of Ahaz), or to the older aqueduct from the same source along the foot of Ophel. Nehemiah mentions, as immediately north of the Fountain Gate, *the pool of the Shelah* (? aqueduct) (iii. 15), one of the two in the mouth of the Tyropoeon¹; *the king's pool* (ii. 14), one of the same; and *the made, or artificial, pool* (iii. 16), which lay to the north of *the pool of the Shelah*, that is, nearer Giḥōn, and may have derived its name from being the earliest artificial pool in the district. Where the *old pool* was, the present data do not enable us to determine.

We have seen that the tunnel to the Birket Silwan may have been made by Hezekiah, who, according to 2 Kings xx. 20, made a pool and a conduit and brought the waters to the city. This was indeed the tradition in the time of the Chronicler,² whatever be the date of his sources. *And he, Hezekiah, sealed the issue of the waters of Giḥōn, the upper, and directed them down, westwards, to the city of David*³; *he built an outer wall to the city of David, west of Giḥōn in the Nahal* (i.e. the Kīdrōn Valley) *to the entry of the Fish-Gate, and he surrounded Ophel, the ridge between Kīdrōn and the Tyropoeon, and made it, the wall, very high*.⁴ Another passage explains Hezekiah's purpose: *much people were gathered, and they sealed all the springs and the Nahal flowing through the midst of the land, saying, why should the kings of Assyria come and find much water?*⁵ The geology leads us to look for springs

¹ But see Guthe, *Z.D.P.V.* V. 3716.

² Circa 300 B.C.

³ 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.

⁴ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14.

⁵ 2 Chron. xxxii. 3.

within the Ḳīdrōn Valley; this is indeed expressly named—the Naḥal—in these passages of the Chronicler: and the references to Giḥōn suit the present Virgin's Spring; for a wall, to be of use to the besieged, must have run to the west of this on the slopes of Ophel, while the present tunnel would direct the waters to within the city. Those, therefore, are right who identify Giḥōn, *the pourer*, with the Virgin's Spring. That it is called *the upper issue of Giḥōn* may be due to the fact that in the Chronicler's day water issuing from the other end of the tunnel into the present Birket Silwān was known as the *lower Giḥōn*. That several springs are mentioned (Josephus also affirms a plurality of springs in the Ḳīdrōn Valley)¹ where only one is now found may be accounted for by possible changes made by earthquakes in the bed of the valley, or by the accumulation of débris. If the latter be the only cause of their disappearance, they may yet be recovered either above or within the Bir Eiyūb; but it is quite as possible that their ancient vents have been closed by earthquakes.

Of Giḥōn we also hear as early as the reign of David. The King sent his son to be crowned *in*, that is *beside*, Giḥōn.² This proves the latter to have been by David's time a sacred and therefore an ancient spring. We have thus every reason to believe it to be the original well of the City.

We now turn to the other name for a fountain in this neighbourhood: En-Rogel. This is usually rendered *Fuller's Spring*, but Rogel is not the Hebrew for *fuller*, and a more probable meaning is suggested by the Syriac rogūlo, *current* or *stream*.³ En-Rogel was either the Virgin's

¹ V. B.J. ix. 4.

² 1 Kings i. 33, 38. 45. בְּנְהוֹן The Hebrew preposition means *in*, but that with the name of a well it may be used for *beside* is proved from 1 Sam. xxix. 1; the Israelites pitched בְּעֵין *beside the fountain*. Note that 1 Kings i. 45 says that when the people returned from Giḥōn to the city, *they came up* to the latter, without evidence that Giḥōn lay in the valley.

³ Levy, *Chald. Wörterbuch*, ii. 406. We need not ask, therefore, whether En-Rogel had anything to do with the Field of the Fuller (בֹּבֵב) which must have lain outside the mouth of the Tyropoeon. See above on Isaiah vii. 3.

Spring or the Bīr Eiyūb or some other spring in the Ḳidrōn Valley now lost. The Biblical data are these. When David fled before Absalom, Jonathan and Ahimaaz stayed in En-Rogel out of sight of the City to obtain for the King news of the progress of the revolt.¹ When Adonijah set himself up as David's successor *he sacrificed sheep, oxen and fat beasts by the stone of the Zoheleth, which is beside En-Rogel.*² And the Priestly Writing mentions En-Rogel as the southmost point of the border of Judah and Benjamin which thence turned north up the valley of Hinnom *to the shoulder of the Jebusite.*³ On these data some have identified En-Rogel with Giḥōn, the modern Virgin's Spring, because the latter is the only known spring in the valley⁴; because the name Zoheleth is still attached to the rocky ascent to Silwan village opposite the spring; and because the spring cannot be seen from the City where Absalom was in power. Others prefer Bīr Eiyūb, because while it also may be regarded (even now) as a spring, the corner of the frontier coming from the north and turning up Hinnom would be more naturally found there than at the Virgin's Spring. The discovery of an equivalent for the name Zoheleth, so near the Virgin's Spring, and so far from the Bīr Eiyūb, is the one strong reason for the identification of the former with En-Rogel. But it is not final.⁵ And on the other hand the narrative of Adonijah's feast at En-Rogel and Solomon's coronation at Giḥōn (= Virgin's Spring) seems to imply that the two situations were at some distance from each other.⁶

We may therefore safely include that En-Rogel was not

¹ 2 Sam. xvii. 17.

² 1 Kings xvii. 17.

³ Josh. xv. 7; cf. xviii. 16. *The issues* of the border were at En-Rogel: that is to say, one left the territory at Benjamin there.

⁴ Zehweileh. Clermont Ganneau in *P.E.F.Mem.* "Jerusalem," p. 293.

⁵ The Zoheleth of 1 Kings xvii. 7 is a *stone*, that is a separate boulder or pillar. The modern Zehweileh is a rock-face. Besides names drift.

⁶ Besides the different names, which as occurring in the same narrative can hardly be intended to signify the same place; it is clear that Adonijah and his friends did not know that Solomon was crowned until Jonathan came and told them. (1 Kings i. 41 ff.)

Gihon, but lay some way off down the valley, and was either Bīr Eiyūb or a fountain now lost. In regard to this latter alternative we must keep in mind the uncertainty brought into the question by the earthquakes.

It is not clear, indeed, that En-Rogel is always used as the name of a spring. While waiting for information from the city to carry to David, Jonathan and Ahimaaz, anxious as they were to escape the notice of the townsfolk, would hardly choose so public a place as a well. A suburban village would better suit their purpose, and En-Rogel in their story may well be the name of such a village, standing on the eastern bank of the Kīdrōn Valley, either on the site of the present Silwan or farther to the south. (It may be also a village that is intended by En-Rogel in the delimitation of the frontier between Judah and Benjamin).¹ If the village existed it took its name from a spring, and for this it would not be unreasonable to look on the east edge of the Kīdrōn Valley. A great volume of water falls on the porous limestone strata of the mountain above. Sinking through these it might as naturally be ejected, on the eastern side of the valley, by the harder strata which come to the surface in the latter, as the waters of Gihon are ejected on the west. Against such a hypothesis there is the possible identification of En-Rogel with the Erogē of Josephus, which he seems to place to the west of the Kīdrōn Valley. But, however this may be, it is certain that En-Rogel was at some distance from Gihōn.

The Spring or Well of the Dragon² mentioned by Nehemiah, cannot be identified. He says that the Gate of the Ravine lay in face of it. By *ravine*³ is usually understood the valley of Hinnom. If this was the present Wady Rabāby, Nehemiah's phrase would roughly suit the identification of the Dragon's Well with the Bīr Eiyūb, and some

¹ Jos. h. xv. 7, xviii. 16.

² עַיִן הַדְּרָקוֹן The LXX has Well of the Figs (Ὠκεῖνον), but the Hebrew text is confirmed by Lucian : τοῦ δράκοντος.

³ רָבִי

authorities, who have also identified En-Rogel with the latter appeal to the Stone of the Zoheleth or Serpent-Stone, which was beside En-Rogel—as if serpent and dragon meant the same. But if the valley of Hinnom was the Tyropoeon, the Dragon's Well must have lain in the latter, and was either the issue of water from an aqueduct down its course—just as the Arabs to-day call the mouth of the Siloam tunnel an 'Ain or spring—or else a true spring which has been lost. Here is another case of uncertainty produced by the action of the earthquakes.

The long study we have pursued is full of dark details, and we leave it baffled by many of the answers of which we have been in search. Yet it has its own prizes, and they are more precious than those of topographical certainty. We cannot have worked through this series of water-systems without a vivid imagination of the ceaseless age-long labours which produced them, or without a profound sympathy with the hopes which their meagre results excited in the hearts of their authors.

In casting our imagination along the history of Jerusalem we are too apt to be content with recalling her markets, walls, palaces and temples, and with the endeavour to construct from these alone the full picture of her interests and activities. But preliminary to trade, warfare, worship and every kind of art, woven through all, and on those high and thirsty rocks—more constant than any of them—there was the struggle for water. Nature lent but a grudging assistance. Nor are there mighty arches or other imperishable constructions to bear witness that genius, or imperial wealth, or the power that could command hordes of slaves, ever atoned, as on other waterless cities, for the absence of physical resources. The work was nearly all done by the people under pressure of their daily needs, by petty kings hurriedly providing against sieges, by statesmen with limited revenues in a nation of no capacity for architecture. What thrift and storage of scanty supplies! The dykes of Holland,

to keep the water out, tell no more eloquent tale of the ceaseless labour of centuries, the piety and resolution of generations mostly nameless, than does this story of what Jerusalem has done to keep the waters in: the rough rock-cisterns of her early settlers; the long aqueducts and deep reservoirs of more numerous and civilized generations; the irrigation of gardens; the struggle to keep pace with the gradual rise of the City's levels above the sinking water supplies of the past; the desperate care to bring in the outside water from reach of besiegers; the execution of tunnels and pools with (as the Siloam tunnel pathetically witnesses) the possession of but poor engineering abilities; and all the repairs and restorations required after the earthquakes and numberless sieges and overthrows which Jerusalem endured.

When all these labours resulted in such moderate achievements—when the reservoirs and springs were liable to be exhausted by the winter's drought, and the irrigated gardens scarcely relieved the barrenness of the landscape—do we wonder that as the mirage of the desert appears as pools and lakes to the parched travellers, so this thirsty people's hopes assumed the form of streams and rivers about their Holy City? It is only such a study as we have come through that can give us a full sympathy with these words of psalmist and prophet:—*There is a river which makes glad the city of our God. And he brought me back to the door of the house; and behold waters issued out from under the threshold of the house eastward . . . and it was a river that I could not pass through, for the waters were risen, waters to swim in, a river that could not be crossed. But there the LORD will be with us in majesty, a place of broad rivers and streams: wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will save us.*

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

IV.

JEREMIAH IX. 23-XI. 8.

*Only the right Knowledge of Yahweh, and of His will for Men,
will profit a Man.*

²³ Thus saith Yahweh, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: ²⁴ but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth, and that he knoweth me, that I am Yahweh which do kindness, judgement, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things do I delight, saith Yahweh.

*If Judah has only the Circumcision of the Flesh, it will be
treated by Yahweh as no better than other Nations.*

²⁵ Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will punish* every one that is circumcised in uncircumcision; †
²⁶ Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that have the corners (of their hair) clipt, ‡ that dwell in the wilderness: for all the nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart. || -

* Heb. *visit upon*.

† Lit. *with a foreskin* (an oxymoron). The meaning is, those who are circumcised externally, but have the foreskin of their heart (4. 4) unremoved.

‡ Certain Arab tribes, who, contrary to the Jewish practice (Lev. 19. 27), shaved the hair off their temples (Herod. iii. 8). The same peculiar epithet (lit. the *corner-clipt*) recurs, 25. 23, 49. 32.

|| Judah, having no circumcision of the heart, is no better than Egypt, Edom, etc., which, like it, are circumcised externally, or than other nations which are not circumcised at all.

X. 1-16.—*Against Idolatry.**

Let Israel not be tempted to stand in Aice of the Idols of the Heathen.

¹ Hear ye the word which Yahweh speaketh unto you, O house of Israel: ² Thus saith Yahweh, Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; † for the nations are dismayed at them. ³ For the customs ‡ of the peoples are vanity: for (an idol is) a tree which one cutteth out of the forest, the work of the hands of the craftsman § with the axe. ⁴ They beautify it with silver and with gold; they fasten it with nails and with hammers, that it shake not. ⁵ They are like a pillar in a cucumber-garden, || and speak not: they must needs be borne, because they cannot go. Be not afraid of them; for they cannot do evil, neither is it in their power to do good.

The Idols are a Thing of nought: it is Yahweh who made Heaven and Earth.

⁶ Whence is any like ¶ unto thee, O Yahweh? thou art great, and thy name is great in might. ⁷ Who should not fear thee, O King of the nations? for

* This section (10. 1-16) interrupts the connexion (for 10. 17-25 carries on the train of thought of chap. 9); and in all probability is the work not of Jeremiah himself, but of some later prophet, probably of one living in the latter part of the Babylonian captivity, when the exiles were in danger of being overawed by the elaborate idol-worship carried on by the Babylonians around them. Cf. the similar descriptions and argument of the second Isaiah, Is. 40. 19-22, 41. 7, 29, 44. 9-20, 46. 5-7.

† I.e. extraordinary celestial appearances, such as eclipses and comets.

‡ Heb. *statutes*.

§ See Dent. 27. 15.

|| I.e. what we should call a *scarecrow*. Cf. Ezech. 6. 70 (where an idol is compared to a *προβασκάριον ἐν σικνηᾷ τῷ*).

¶ So with a change of punctuation. Or, omitting a letter, *There is none like*, etc. The Heb. text, as it stands, is not translatable. So in v. 7.

thee it beseemeth ; forasmuch as among all the wise men of the nations, and in all their kingdoms, whence is any like* unto thee? ⁸ But they are one and all senseless and foolish : the instruction† of idols ‡ is wood.§ ⁹ (There is) silver beaten into plates which is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Ophir, || the work of the craftsman, and of the hands of the goldsmith ; blue and purple is their clothing, they are all the work of skilled men. ¹⁰ But Yahweh is God in truth ; he is a living God, and an everlasting king : at his wrath the earth trembleth, and the nations cannot abide his indignation : [¹¹ ¶ Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens.] ¹² who made the earth by his power, who established the world by his wisdom, and stretched out the heavens by his understanding. ¹³ When he uttereth his voice,** there is a roar of waters in the heavens, and he causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth ; he maketh lightnings for the rain, and bringeth forth the wind out of his treasures : †† ¹⁴ (then) every man becometh senseless and loseth knowledge ; every goldsmith is put to shame by his graven image : for his molten image

* See note ¶, p. 230.

† Heb. *mūsār*, i.e. *moral education* (Prov. 4. 1, 13, 8. 10, 33, 13. 1).

‡ Heb. *vanities* (see 8. 19).

§ I.e. is no better than the idol itself : idolatry is destitute of moral or spiritual force.

|| So Targ. Pesh. and LXX (Luc.) ; the Heb. text has *Uphaz*, an unknown locality.

¶ This verse is written in Aramaic ; it interrupts the connexion between v. 10 and v. 12, and was probably originally a marginal note, suggested by the argument of the text, and intended as a reply which might be used by Jews living in heathen countries, when invited to take part in idol-worship.

** Heb. *at the voice of his uttering*. The allusion is to the thunder (Ps. 18. 13, 29. 3-9 ; cf. Ex. 9. 28 R. V. *margin*).

†† Cf. Ps. 135. 7.

is falsehood, and there is no breath in them.*
 15 They are vanity, a work of mockery: in the time
 of their visitation they will perish.† 16 The portion
 of Jacob is not like these; ‡ for he is the former of
 all things; and Israel is the tribe of his inheritance: ‡
 Yahweh of hosts is his name.

*Continuation of chap. ix. The Prophet sees in Spirit the
 Capital invested by the Foe, and bids the Inhabitants
 prepare to depart into Exile.*

17 Gather up thy bundle from the ground, (O Jerusalem,)§
 thou that abidest in the siege. 18 For thus saith Yahweh,
 Behold, I will sling out the inhabitants of the land at this
 time, and will distress them, that they may feel|| (it).
 19 'Woe ¶ to me for my breach! ** my wound is grievous: ††
 but I said, Truly this is my sickness, ‡‡ and I will bear it.
 20 My tent is spoiled, and all my cords are broken: my
 children are gone forth from me, and they are not; there
 is none to stretch forth my tent any more, and to set up my
 curtains.' §§ 21 For the shepherds |||| are become senseless,
 and have not inquired of Yahweh: therefore they have not
 prospered, and all their flock ¶¶ is scattered. 22 Hark! a

* The verse describes the effect of the thunderstorm (*v.* 13): man is dumb
 before the spectacle; and so every idol-maker is put to shame by the obvious
 inability of his graven image to produce anything like it.

† Cf. 6. 15.

‡ The LXX (omitting words) reads, perhaps rightly, *for the former of all
 things is his inheritance.*

§ The pronouns are fem., showing that the *community* is addressed. Cf. 7.
 29.

|| Heb. *find*. The text is open to suspicion.

¶ In *vv.* 19, 20, the community, personified, is introduced dramatically
 bewailing its fate. (The pronouns are feminine: cf. the note on 7. 29.)

** See 8. 11, 21.

†† Heb. *made sick*.

‡‡ So Targ. Pesh. MSS. of LXX., Aq. Symm. Vulg. In the Heb. text a
 letter ('my') has accidentally fallen out.

§§ See the note on 4. 20.

|||| Fig. of rulers, as 2. 8, 3. 15, 23. 1 *al.*

¶¶ Heb. *their pasture*.

rumour, behold it cometh, and a great commotion out of the north country, to make the cities of Judah a desolation, a dwelling place of jackals.

Jeremiah, speaking in the Name of the People, prays for a Mitigation of the Judgement.

²³ 'I know, O Yahweh, that not unto man belongeth his way; not for man is it to walk and direct * his steps.†
²⁴ Correct me, O Yahweh, but with judgement; ‡ not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing.§ ²⁵ Pour out thy fury upon the nations that have not known thee, and upon the families that have not called upon thy name: for they have devoured Jacob,|| and consumed him, and have laid waste his homestead.'¶

JEREMIAH XI. 1-17.

Jeremiah is instructed to exhort the People to live in accordance with the Deuteronomic Law.

XI. ¹ The word that came to Jeremiah from Yahweh, saying, ² Hear ye the words of this covenant, and speak thou ** unto the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, ³ and say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh, the God of Israel: Cursed be the man that heareth not the words of this covenant, †† ⁴ which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of

* So with a change of points (cf. the Vulg.). The rendering of A.V., R.V., is not legitimate, a conjunction in clause *b* being not expressed.

† Cf. Prov. 16. 9; Ps. 37. 23.

‡ Or, *in measure*. See the note on 5. 4 (p. 47).

§ Heb. *diminish me* (29. 6, 30. 19 ['be few']; Ezek. 29. 15; Ps. 107. 39 ['are minished']).

|| So LXX. The Heb. text adds, *and devoured him* (a corrupt repetition of the previous, and anticipation of the following word).

¶ Cf. Ps. 79. 6, 7.

** So LXX. The Hebrew text has *speak ye* (followed by, *and say thou, v. 3*).

†† Cf. Deut. 27. 26, 29. 9; also 11. 28, 28. 13.

Egypt, out of the iron-furnace,* saying, ‘Hearken unto my voice, and do† according to all that I command you; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God; † that I may establish the oath which I sware unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey, as at this day.’ ‡ And I answered and said, ‘Amen, O Yahweh.’

Jeremiah instructed again to exhort the People to like effect, and to remind them of the Consequences of Disobedience.

6 And Yahweh said unto me, Proclaim all these words in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, saying, Hear ye the words of this covenant, and do them. 7 For I earnestly protested unto your fathers in the day that I brought them up out of the land of Egypt, even unto this day, rising early and protesting, saying, ‘Hearken unto my voice.’ 8 Yet they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked every one in the stubbornness of their evil heart: so I brought upon them all the words of this covenant, which I commanded them to do, but they did them not.

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

X. 5. אִתָּם. For אִתָּם (i.e. *with them, in their power*), as often in Jer.: see on 4. 12, p. 45.

6, 7. It is impossible to explain, or justify logically, מִיָּחָד; see my note in *Hebraica*, ii. 34–37. With a change of points we can read מִיָּחָד, *whence?* (Gen. 29. 4, and frequently); with its use here (if this is the true reading) comp. 30. 7 ‘whence is its like?’ (R.V. ‘so that none is like it,’ implying the punctuation מִיָּחָד). It is, however, quite possible that the ח is in both cases dittographed from the preceding ח (so König, *Lehrgeb.* iii. § 352 e); we then get the ordinary מִיָּחָד, *there is none like thee* (2 Sam. 7. 22).

* I.e. the furnace in which iron is smelted; fig. of a place of severe suffering. So Deut. 4. 20; 1 Kings 8. 51.

† So LXX. The Heb. text adds *them*. (Probably by error from *v. 6 end*. Here the pronoun is without a proper antecedent.)

‡ Cf. Deut. 8. 18.

8. *senseless*. A survey of the passages in which **בָּעַר** and **בִּעַר** occur shew that the idea expressed by them is *want of understanding*: notice how frequently the || is **כִּסִּיל**, and the addition of words implying the absence of knowledge in v. 14, Ps. 73. 22, 92. 6 [Heb. 7], 94. 8, Prov. 30. 2.

11. The Aramaic is that of a particular dialect: see my *Introduction*, p. 240 (ed. 6 or 7, p. 255).

12. As soon as this verse is translated correctly (notice the *participles* **עֲשֵׂה** and **כִּבִּיץ**), it is apparent that it can connect only with v. 10, so that the proper place for v. 11 cannot really be between v. 10 and v. 12.

13. The primary idea of **הַמֶּוּן** is a *confused noise* or *hum*, as of a multitude of peoples, Is. 17. 12, or of a city, 32. 14; then it comes to denote a *humming throng* or *multitude*, as Jud. 4. 7, and frequently. The cognate verb, **הִכְמִה**, includes such sounds as we denote by *growl* (Ps. 59. 7, of dogs), *groan* (Is. 59. 11, of bears), *moan* (Ez 7. 16, of doves), *roar* (of the sea, Jer. 5. 22, Ps. 46. 3, or of a distant multitude, Jer. 6. 23, Ps. 46. 6 [R.V. 'raged']). Here, and in the || 51. 16, as also in 1 Kings 18. 41 (A.V., R.V., 'abundance'), the subst. is applied to the roaring noise of rain driven by the wind in a heavy storm.

17. *bundle* (**בִּנְעָה**). So R.V. *margin*, following Ges. and moderns generally, the root being taken to be the Arab *kana'a*, to be contracted, folded in; properly, therefore, something *done up tightly*. A.V., R.V., *wares*. This connects the word with **כַּנְעָנִי**, **כַּנְעָנִי**, 'Canaan,' 'Canaanite,' in the sense of *merchant* (the Canaanites, or Phœnicians, being the chief merchants known to the Hebrews): see in the Heb. Is. 23. 8, Job 40. 30 [A.V. 41. 6]; and R.V. *margin* of Hos. 12. 7, Zeph. 1. 11, Zech. 14. 21, Ez. 16. 29 (where the *text* of R.V. gives a false sense), Prov. 31. 24. But this is not a likely explanation of **כַּנְעָה**; besides, if it were correct, we should expect a **נ** after the **ע**. It must be admitted, however, that the isolation of **כַּנְעָה** in Heb. (for the root itself in Heb. means to be humbled), and the remoteness of the Arab. *kana'a*, make even the first derivation somewhat doubtful; but we have nothing better to put in its place.

19. We speak only of a *person* as being sick; Heb. speaks also of a *wound* as being 'sick.' So 14. 17, 30. 12, Nah. 3. 19; cf. Mic. 6. 13 (lit. 'I have made sick to smite thee' = I have smitten thee grievously).

23. Read with Giesebrecht **הִלְךָ וְהִלְכִין** (inf. abs.) for **הִלְכִין וְהִלְכִין**: cf. Vulg. *nec viri est ut ambulet et dirigat gressus suos*.

SOME RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

THE volume on Psalms xc.—cl. completes Prof. Kirkpatrick's commentary on the Psalter in the *Cambridge Bible*. The whole is now also published in a single volume, which, unfortunately, is printed on a larger page than the rest of the series. It is hardly necessary to say that Prof. Kirkpatrick's work ranks in the matter of careful and thorough scholarship with the most successful of these commentaries. For the most part it is written from a sound critical standpoint. We entirely sympathize with the author's evident scepticism as to the various theories which "discover a metrical system in the Psalms, on the basis of quantity, or of number of syllables or accents"; and also with his acceptance of the principle that a heading "Moses" or "David" does not show that a psalm was composed by the Lawgiver or the King, as the case may be. Our author's unqualified acceptance of modern critical principles is shown by the fact that he does not commit himself to the Davidic authorship even of Psalms xxiii., li., and cx. Sometimes, however, we are made to feel that an ingrained habit of thinking on traditional lines has unconsciously warped the critical judgment, e.g. in the ascription of Psalm ci. to David.

Prof. H. G. Mitchell of Boston has a predilection for publishing commentaries on the first ten or a dozen chapters of an Old Testament book. Probably this is the amount of work he takes with a class during one session—an ample allowance if everything is as carefully and thoroughly discussed as it is in the book before us. Thus Prof. Mitchell's volume on Isaiah i.—xii. is now followed by *The World before Abraham*,¹ a commentary on Genesis i.—xi., with an introduction, a new translation indicating the documents, J, P, etc., and full notes. While much of the

¹ Constable, London, 1901, 5s. nett.

contents will be specially useful to students, the greater part of the book is quite intelligible to the general reader, who will be able to enjoy and profit by it, without being bewildered by technical matter.

Dr. Hermann Gollancz's *The Ethical Treatises of Berachya*,¹ is a most interesting and useful work. It includes an introduction dealing with the life and work of Berachya, and the Hebrew text of his two ethical treatises, the *Compendium* and the *Masref*, printed in ordinary square Hebrew characters, with explanatory notes and an English translation. The introduction gives a glimpse into the wonderful intellectual activity of mediæval Judaism, and is also an example of the application of the Higher Criticism to literary problems. Most diverse opinions have been held as to Berachya; what his exact name was; whether there were one, two, or three Berachyas; whether he lived in the twelfth, thirteenth or fifteenth century; and whether his home was in England, France or Spain. Dr. Gollancz decides that "The literary development of Berachya's activity probably took the following course. He started as a translator of such philosophical works as the *Questions of Adelarð*. . . . At the same time he probably pursued grammatical, Talmudic and simple exegetical Biblical studies. . . . He then proceeded to philosophical compilations, . . . and he seems to have concluded his literary activity with the fable and apologue." The character of his work points "to the years 1160-1170, and to Lunel [in the South of France], or the surrounding district, as the time and place of Berachya's activity." Dr. Gollancz also holds that Berachya did *not* know Arabic, and that his correct style and title was "Berachya, son of Rabbi Natronai ha-Nakdan."

Berachya is not important as an original contributor to the development of the science of Ethics. His *Compendium*

¹ David Nutt, London, 1902, 21s. nett.

is mainly the ethical and religious portions of Saadya's *Emunoth Vedeoth*, with some additional quotations from Bahya's *Choboth Ha-lebaboht* and the works of Ibn Gabirol. The *Masref* (or Refiner) repeats *verbatim* whole sections of the *Compendium*. This *Masref* is not so much an abstract of other men's work as the *Compendium*; the plan and arrangement are Berachya's; but, as we gather from Dr. Gollancz, it is rather a systematization of current teaching than an exposition of original ideas.

Berachya's chief service to his own generation was very much the same as that which this volume may render to our own—he made the Judaistic philosophy and theology of the early Middle Ages, especially that of the great scholar Saadya, accessible in a compact and attractive form. Here the curious reader may find, done into idiomatic and forcible English, specimens of the rabbinical method at its best. Berachya or his authorities are fond of laying down a principle and then adducing a string of proof texts, often interpreted according to a somewhat literal exegesis. There is a curious feature about these quotations; Berachya belonged to a family whose special business was to see that the Hebrew Scriptures were copied accurately; he was himself a Biblical scholar, yet his quotations often differ from the current Massoretic text. Like another pupil and doctor of the Rabbinical schools, the Apostle Paul, Berachya seems to have sometimes emphasized and at other times ignored the exact words of the passages he quoted. Again, while there is much formal deference to the Torah, and occasional insistence on details, these treatises are by no means dominated by pettifogging absorption in minutiae, but discuss broad questions in a liberal spirit. If space permitted we would gladly multiply interesting quotations, but we can only venture on one or two. Thus arguing for monotheism, he writes: "If the world had had more than one Creator, there would have been differences of opinion

among them upon the subject of the creation of beings, and the creation of the world would never have become an accomplished fact" (p. 242). Again, Berachya is much exercised about the sins of Old Testament worthies, which he treats with remarkable frankness.

Berachya quotes (apparently) a Rabbinical opinion "that we should not hold a man guilty who deviates somewhat from the truth for the purpose of obtaining favour, provided that his faith be not thereby impaired or be altogether lost by reason of this thing. For we find that the prophets were sometimes led that way, when not prophesying." The examples of Abraham, Jacob and David are cited. Berachya does not seem to have been satisfied; he dwelt long on this theme, until he despaired of being able to fathom such points. "If such failings and shortcomings," says he, "were manifest in the case of the great men referred to, how shall we find fault with the meaner class belonging to the rest of mankind?" At last Berachya found a solution of the difficulty in a saying of Saadya's "that God created the prophets prone to failings, frail like ourselves . . . for the purpose of demonstrating to us that, when they act in any uncommon way, they do so by virtue of some power not their own . . . that it is the action of the Creator."

The title "ethical" applied to these treatises is misleading; they also deal with Theology. For instance, the thirteen chapters of the *Masref* deal with "The Basis of Life, the Eye, the Heart, Limitation, Justice, Oppression, Poverty, Honour, Conversation, Grades, the Soul, Hope, the Resurrection." The Hebrew text, with the translation and notes, will also serve for a reading-book in Rabbinical Hebrew. Berachya's style is comparatively easy. One could wish that Dr. Gollancz had added an index and an abstract of the two treatises.

Principal Douglas' *Samuel and his Age*,¹ and the late Dr.

¹ Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Sharpe's *Student's Handbook to the Psalms* (2nd ed.) are written from the standpoint of traditional criticism. The *Handbook* is an introduction, and does not include a commentary; prefixed to it is a brief but interesting life of the author by Dr. Sinker, the Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge. Dr. Sharpe was evidently both a scholar and a devoted pastor, one of a class to which the Church of England is deeply indebted.

W. H. BENNETT.

CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM.¹

I.

It has been well said that "the Old Testament does not merely contain prophecies: it is from first to last a prophecy." It is the record of the revelation of a religion of hope, of progress, of evolution. Through trial and failure and disappointment it looks steadily forward to an end, a consummation, a fulfilment. Its scope and reach are wide as the universe, for it opens with the vision of Creation, and bids us contemplate the idea of a world which in its Maker's mind and purpose is "very good"; the book which contains the quintessence of its spirit ends with a chorus of universal praise to that sovereign Lord:—"Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord"; while what is perhaps the latest writing in the whole collection closes by pointing forward to "the end of the days" as the goal of hope and patience (Dan. xii. 13).

But progress could not be in an unbroken line. Man disobeyed the sovereign will of his Maker. Sin entered into the world, and the history of the world must become the history of Redemption—redemption through discipline and suffering. While God "left not Himself without witness" among the other nations of the world, He chose the people of Israel to be the special trustee of His revelation of Himself, the herald of His salvation to the ends of the earth. Step by step He made known His character and His will through the teachings of lawgiver and prophet and psalmist and wise man; age after age through times of

¹ A sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, January 25, 1903, on the foundation of Dr. Macbride for a sermon on Messianic Prophecy, the text being Rom. x. 4 :

"Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth."

anarchy and apostasy and exile and persecution He preserved and disciplined that people. Yet at the end of the Old Testament the curtain falls on apparent failure; on glorious promises unfulfilled; on splendid hopes unrealized. "I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth." . . . "Arise, shine! for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee" (Isa. xlii. 6; xlix. 6; lx. 1). Were not such glowing words of promise a mockery when Israel's religion was still merely national, and as a nation Israel was partly scattered in exile, partly struggling for bare existence as an insignificant province of one or other of the great heathen empires?

II.

The Old Testament is a prophecy: if it stood alone, it would be a magnificent failure. But Christianity and Judaism both claim to "fulfil" it, to carry forward and develop its teachings, and so to accomplish Israel's mission to the world. Christian apologists would not lay so much stress now as they used formerly to do upon the fulfilment of particular and circumstantial prophecies as a proof of the truth of Christianity. They would appeal rather to the whole drift and tenor and tendency of the Old Testament; and the controversy between Judaism and Christianity at the present day is concerned not so much with the interpretation of particular prophecies, as with the relation of the whole New Testament to the whole Old Testament, or rather of the dispensation of which the New Testament is the record to that of which the Old Testament is the record. Still, as in the Apostolic age, the central question is, "Is Jesus indeed the Christ? is He in truth the Son of God?" To us, the paramount claims of Christianity are obvious; but Judaism maintains no less strenuously that it, and it alone, has preserved unimpaired the faith of a pure and lofty monotheism, and held fast to

the unshaken confidence that at last the God of Israel will be the God of the whole world.¹

Let us consider then (1) the claim of Christianity, and (2) the position of modern Judaism.

1. In act and word, if the records of the New Testament are in any degree trustworthy, Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, and to stand in a position of authority towards the ancient law of Israel. Twice, at the beginning and at the close of His ministry, when He cleansed the Temple, He claimed in act to fulfil the prophecy of Malachi :—“ The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His Temple.”² Deliberately in His triumphal entry to Jerusalem He offered Himself to the people as the King whom Zechariah had foretold (Zech. ix. 9; Matt. xxi. 5). Though He seldom spoke to His disciples of Himself as the Messiah, the conviction grew upon them as they listened to His teaching and saw His working that He was indeed the fulfilment of Israel's hopes; and when growing faith sprang forth into open confession, He welcomed it as a Divine gift of insight (Matt. xvi. 13 ff.).

He claimed authority to interpret the Law; to infuse new life and power into its enactments by pointing to the spirit which lay beneath the letter, and to the fundamental principles of which the several precepts were but single examples. He rose above the view of its obligations maintained by the religious authorities of the time, and dared to pronounce that some of its provisions were but temporary accommodations to the needs of the times at which they were given. He laid bare the inadequacy, the perversity, the falsity of prevalent ideas of religion as an interpretation of the Old Testament. To His disciples after the resurrection He interpreted the Scriptures, and showed them that a suffering Messiah was not contrary to their teaching.

¹ Cf. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 184.

² Mal. iii. 1: compare the context.

From the first the Apostles claimed that Jesus was the Christ, in whom the Old Testament was fulfilled. St. Peter and St. John strove to show the Jews how He united the types of the King and the suffering Servant, in accordance with what the prophets had foretold, and how His claims had been attested by His resurrection.¹ St. Paul affirms the continuity of his ministry with the Old Testament. "I stand unto this day, testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ must suffer, and how that He first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles" (Acts xxvi. 22, 23). Throughout his Epistles we see how his mind is saturated with the Old Testament; he naturally speaks its language: far more than merely by direct quotation he implies that the Christian Church is the heir of the promises to Israel. Henceforth Israel is to be merged in the vaster unity of the Christian Church. Jew and Gentile are to be one. There must be no distinction of race or rank. All are one in Christ Jesus. The law was temporary, provisional; as a system it had fulfilled its work; a new era had opened, absorbing, enlarging, spiritualizing, confirming, all that was of permanent significance in the old dispensation. A new era, ushered in by a new fact, yet the true continuation and completion of the old, designed in the purpose of the one God from all eternity.

From a different point of view again the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews urged the same lesson, bidding the Christians of Palestine find in Christ the fulfilment of all that the ancient ritual of sacrifice and ordinances of priesthood had been meant to teach.

¹ Acts ii., iv. Note the R.V. rendering of τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ, *his Servant*, iii. 13, 26; cp. iv. 27, 30.

But I need say no more. To us Christians the thought is familiar that the New Testament from first to last maintains that Jesus was the goal to which the Old Testament had been pointing *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, "by divers portions and in divers manners"; that by His Person and His work not less than by His teaching He fulfilled law and prophecy and psalm, and was Himself the Word and the Wisdom of God. He taught the Christian Church in principle how it was to absorb and expand all the permanent truth of the Old Testament, abandoning temporary, national, material elements, transmuting what was national and limited into what was universal and expansive. All the rays of light from every quarter find their focus in Him, to shine forth with new purity and intensity to illuminate the whole of humanity throughout the ages.

But when it is maintained that Christianity is the legitimate fulfilment and heir of the Old Testament, it is not meant that the course of God's dealings with men could have been clearly foreseen beforehand in exact detail; that law and prophecy would have enabled men to anticipate the miracle of the Incarnation. It was a new thing in the history of the world, that God who had spoken of old time in the prophets, should speak in the person of His Son. Looking back, men could see how the past had all been preparing for it; how it interpreted and unified the past; but the fulfilment utterly transcends all that prophecy could foretell beforehand, and brings a new power into the world. It is the re-creation of humanity.

2. But Judaism urges its claim not less strenuously to be the rightful heir and the true fulfilment of the Old Testament. But what is Judaism? One of the most learned of modern Jews pronounces this question to be not less perplexing than the problem, "What is God's world?" "Judaism," he says, "is also a great Infinite, composed of

as many endless units, the Jews. And these Unit-Jews have been, and are still, scattered through all the world, and have passed under an immensity of influences, good and bad. If so, how can we give an exact definition of the Infinite, called Judaism?"¹

If Dr. Schechter declines to give a definition of Judaism, how can I venture to attempt one? But there are at the present time two distinct types of Judaism, which are rival claimants to represent the true spirit of Jewish religion. Each no doubt has innumerable degrees and variations, but they represent two distinct and apparently irreconcilable tendencies. Reformed Judaism involves a mental attitude which is acknowledged by its adherents to be distinctly different from that of their orthodox co-religionists,² I would rather say, entirely incompatible with it. Let me quote two descriptions of these two schools of Judaism, one from a Christian scholar who has the most intimate and sympathetic acquaintance with Jewish thought and literature, and one from a Jewish source.

"Judaism," writes Dr. Dalman, "is very far from being the religion of the Old Testament. Jewish orthodoxy is based on the Talmudic tradition of the post-Christian period, and is therefore in many respects of more recent origin than Christianity. Reformed Judaism either is or aims at being the most improved form of Jewish religion; it sees in the mediaeval religious philosophy, and moreover in Talmudism, earlier stages of the evolutionary history of the religion which finds its completion in reform itself. Just as orthodoxy judges the Old Testament according to the standard of Rabbinic tradition, so Reform substitutes its special Jewish religious conceptions for the thoughts of the Old Testament."³

¹ Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 184.

² Simon in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, vi. 265.

³ Dalman, *Christianity and Judaism*, tr. by Box, p. 38 (1901).

Now listen to a comparison of Orthodox and Reformed Judaism from a Jewish writer.¹

“Rabbinical Judaism is ‘law.’ The law is twofold, written and oral. Every command of the written law in the Pentateuch, and of the oral law as codified in the *Shulchan Aruch*,² is equally binding. The ceremonial law has equal potency with the moral commands. Reformed Judaism, on the other hand, claims that there is a vast difference between the universal precepts of religion and morality and the enactments arising from the circumstances and conditions of special times and places. . . . No ceremonial law can be eternally binding.” Rabbinical Judaism maintains that the laws whose fulfilment is dependent on residence in Palestine are not abrogated, but only suspended. The burden of its thought is national. It prays for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine under a ruler of the house of David, for the rebuilding of the Temple, and the restoration of sacrificial worship. Reformed Judaism “contends that the Jews are a religious community only; that the national existence ceased when the Romans set the temple aflame and destroyed Jerusalem. With the dispersion of the Jews all over the world the universal mission of Judaism began.” Again “Rabbinical Judaism believes in the coming of a personal Messiah; reformed Judaism places its hope in the coming of the age of universal peace and good will among men. . . . Not a Jew, but *the Jew*, is the Messiah. Israel is the Messiah of the peoples of the earth.” Circumcision need no longer be considered a *conditio sine qua non* for admission into Judaism.

¹ D. Philipson, *The Progress of the Jewish Reform Movement in the United States*, *J.Q.R.* x. 52 ff. (1898). Compare the articles on *Reformed Judaism* by O. J. Simon in *J.Q.R.* vi. 262 (1894), and on *Liberal Judaism in England*, by C. G. Montefiore, *J.Q.R.* xii. 618 (1900).

² “The Table arranged,” a compendium of Rabbinical law and usage, compiled by R. Joseph Karo, in the sixteenth century.

An expression of belief in the distinguishing doctrines of the faith on the part of the would-be proselyte is all-sufficient for entrance into the religion.¹

III.

Thus, on the one hand, the attitude of orthodox Judaism is that of strenuous and rigid conservatism. This, it is acknowledged, is the attitude of the majority of Jews in England, who nevertheless are far from being sufficiently strict to satisfy the rigorism of many of their continental co-religionists. "Many Jews from abroad decline to partake of meat-food at the table of any Jewish minister in this country."² The Authorised Daily Prayer-Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire still retains the Thirteen Principles of the Faith as formulated by Maimonides in the 12th century, which include professions of belief in the integrity and immutability and permanent validity of the Law, in the coming of the Messiah, and in the Resurrection of the dead. It contains numerous prayers for the restoration of Israel to the Holy Land, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the re-establishment of sacrificial worship.³

¹ *J.Q.R.* x. 92 ff. ² *J.Q.R.* vi. 307.

³ Principle viii. "I believe with perfect faith that the whole Law now in our possession is the same that was given to Moses our teacher ; peace be unto him."

ix. "I believe with perfect faith that this Law will not be changed, and that there will never be any other law from the Creator, blessed be His Name."

xii. "I believe with perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah, and though he tarry I will wait daily for his coming."

xiii. "I believe with perfect faith that there will be a resurrection of the dead at the time when it shall please the Creator, blessed be His Name, and exalted be the remembrance of Him for ever and ever." (*Prayer-Book*, ed. S. Singer, p. 90).

In the *Evening and Morning Service for Sabbaths* the following prayer is used (*ib.* pp. 119, 142): "May it be Thy will, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, that the temple be speedily rebuilt in our days, and grant our portion in Thy Law. And there we will serve Thee with awe, as in the days of old, and as in ancient years. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in ancient years."

See also the *Services for the Day of Atonement*, p. 265, and *Grace after Meals*, pp. 282, 285.

On the other hand the attitude of Reformed Judaism is a critical eclecticism, guided by the influence of modern thought, of Western civilization, and in some respects even of Christianity. It is not only prepared to abandon the Rabbinical developments of Judaism, but it speaks of the ritual laws of the Pentateuch in language which the majority of believing Christians would regard as irreverent. It claims the right "to pick and choose among the ceremonies and the rites and the beliefs which have become associated with Judaism in the course of centuries."¹ It feels that orthodox Judaism is powerless to accomplish what it believes to be the mission of Judaism to the world. "Any influence of Judaism upon the outer world," it sadly confesses, "any active witnessing to God, is impossible, so long as its pure doctrine is overshadowed and overcrusted by a mass of oriental, restrictive, and in their origin superstitious observances."² "A convert to the *dogmas* of Rabbinical Judaism is in the present day an impossibility."³ The "amazing idealization of the Law," which has been the unifying power in Judaism, "is slowly breaking down, when the Pentateuch is being estimated at its actual historic worth, and subjected to the scalpel of a criticism which disintegrates its unity, and bereaves it of its supernatural glamour."⁴ In consequence Judaism is losing the one unifying power, which has linked together the fragmentary and often inconsistent elements of its religious teaching—the love of the Law. Reformed Judaism can, it would seem, only hope to accomplish the mission of Judaism to the world by abandoning much of what has always been regarded as essentially characteristic in the rites and beliefs of Judaism, by stigmatizing as puerile and absurd, much of the Law which Jews have always been taught to regard as divine and

¹ *J. Q. R.* vi. 309.² *Ibid.* viii. 412.³ *Ibid.* vi. 311.⁴ Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 550.

eternal, and by relinquishing as a foolish illusion hopes which they had been taught to cherish as their consolation and their glory in the midst of obloquy and persecution. It is an attitude toward the Law far less reverent than that of St. Paul, whom they condemn as the great misinterpreter and traducer of the Law.

IV.

The attitude of Christianity towards the Old Testament is in strong contrast to the attitude alike of Orthodox Judaism and of Reformed Judaism. While it maintains that "the old things have passed away," nay, rather "are become new," transfigured in the light of a new revelation, it sees in that old order not puerilities and absurdities and survivals of pagan superstitions, but a scheme of divinely ordered preparation for a higher order and a larger truth. It is to the Christian mind pathetic to find Reformed Judaism confessing the impotence of Rabbinic Judaism—and that means the faith of the vast majority of Jews at the present day—to fulfil the mission of Judaism to the world, and desiring exactly what Christianity has to offer—a unifying and interpreting principle, which may take the place of the love of the Law, and enable it to discriminate with authority between what was temporary, propædeutic, national, and what is eternal, permanent, universal. It feels "the want of a dominant and consistent doctrine, adequate and comprehensive, soul-satisfying and rational, which can set forth and illumine in its entire compass the relation of the individual to society and to God."¹ Such a comprehensive doctrine is not to be found, as this writer suggests it might be, by combining a selection of "the words attributed in the Gospels to Jesus" with "the highest religious teaching in the Old Testament and the early Rabbinical literature." The unifying, harmonizing,

¹ Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 550.

interpreting principle and power must be sought for, not in any eclectic body of doctrines, but in the Person of Jesus Christ. In Him is to be found the unity of the past and the future, the unity of all humanity, the unity of the individual and society, the unity of the seen and the unseen, the unity of man and God.

V.

Yes, in Jesus Christ; but to-day, as of old, that is the obstacle. Jesus the Son of God! The very thought is blasphemy. A crucified Messiah! The bare notion is an offence and a stumbling-block. It was and is the trust committed to Judaism to maintain a pure and strong and spiritual monotheism, in the face of a corrupt polytheism, a nerveless agnosticism, a soulless atheism. Never was the witness more needed than in this twentieth century, with its chaos of beliefs and half beliefs and unbeliefs.

“God spoke, and gave us the word to keep,
 Bade never fold the hands nor sleep
 Mid a faithless world—at watch and ward,
 Till Christ at the end relieve our guard.
 By His servant Moses the watch was set:
 Though near upon cockcrow, we keep it yet.”¹

And though many of the Jews only look for the coming of Christ in the spread of civilization, they would still maintain their trust.

But did that trust exclude the possibility of a new revelation, based upon, yet extending, the old revelation?—a revelation of the destiny of man by the union of God and man, a revelation of the inherent nature of the Godhead so far as man may understand that mystery, a revelation of life and restoration for humanity through a supreme act of sacrifice? Were there no precludings and hints of such possibilities in the Old Testament? not intelligible before-

¹ R. Browning, *Holy-Cross Day*.

hand indeed, but enough to show after the event that the Incarnation and the Passion were parts of the same Divine plan?

1. Was not man originally made in the image of God, after His likeness? Did not the name Immanuel suggest the possibility of a Presence of God among His people in some permanent way? Does not the Messianic King of prophecy bear Divine titles?—Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace? Yes, even *Mighty God*. “In such passages the Old Testament revelation falls into a self-contradiction, from which only a miracle has been able to deliver us, the Incarnation of the Son of God. . . . Even in the time of the old covenant the Spirit of God was consciously striving after the goal that we see reached in the new.”¹

2. Law and Prophecy combine to teach the profound principle of Atonement through suffering and death. The great sacrificial system, according to the Christian view of it, was designed to impress on Israel the needful lesson of the guilt and hatefulness of sin. The prophecy of Isaiah liii., interpret it in detail as you will, is the most profound exposition of the redemptive virtue of representative suffering. Not without reason does the New Testament claim that sacrifice and prophecy alike pointed forward to the Death of Christ and receive their fulfilment in it.

VI.

It was and is a tremendous demand to ask a Jew to believe that Jesus is the Son of God; that the Man who hung upon the cross of Calvary is the Messiah. Was it harder, one asks, for the Jew who had known Jesus familiarly, walked and talked with Him as a friend, seen Him hungry and tired, watched Him agonizing in Gethsemane and dying upon the cross; or for the modern

¹ Orelli, *O. T. Prophecy*, E. T., p. 274.

Jew, in an age of materialism which resents mystery, after eighteen centuries through which his faith has kept its watch and ward until it seems treason to all that he holds dear even to doubt its truth? The Jew of the Apostolic age had the witness of the resurrection as a fresh and familiar fact, to confirm the claims of Jesus; the Jew of the twentieth century has the historic witness of the spread of Christianity as the religion of the world.

Strong evidence indeed must have been needed to convince St. Peter and St. James, St. John and St. Paul, that Jesus was God and Lord, to be addressed in prayer, to be "associated with the Father as the ground of the Church's being, the source of spiritual grace, and as co-operating with Him in the providential ordering of events." Yet so it is: in the earliest of his Epistles, written less than twenty-five years after the Ascension, St. Paul attributes to the Son a co-equal Godhead with the Father, and that "not as though he were laying down anything new, but as something which might be assumed as part of the common body of Christian doctrine."¹ The Apostles speak of Him, they address Him, in language which would have been simply blasphemous if they had not believed Him to be Divine, co-equal with God, God in the truest sense as the Son of God, distinguished from the Father, yet one with Him, in a mystery which human language is inadequate to describe, human thought too weak to fathom. What can have brought those monotheist Jews to that tremendous conclusion but the Lord's own teaching, confirmed by the fact of the Resurrection, which set God's final seal to His teaching and His work?

VII.

It is a tremendous demand to ask the Jew to accept the Christian doctrine of the Person and work of Christ: yet

¹ Comp. Sanday in *Hastings' Dict.*, ii. 624.

I cannot but feel that Judaism, even at its best, misunderstands Christianity, not less perhaps than Christianity misunderstands Judaism, and that if Judaism would but study the Christian faith seriously and dispassionately, many obstacles might disappear. Doubtless Christians are partly to blame: they have too often misrepresented their own faith themselves, and given occasion to their opponents to speak evil of it.

1. But it is startling to find one of the most learned and liberal of Jewish theologians implying (unless I quite misunderstand his meaning) that Christianity is polytheism. "Every Israelite," writes Dr. Schechter, "was able to be in perfect communion with his God by means of simple love, without the aid of any supposed self-condensation of the Deity, which, in spite of all attempts at explanation, is at the bottom nothing else than a pretext for the most undiluted polytheism. Judaism did most excellently well without all these modern theological appliances."¹ Christian theology, he must surely know, has ever guarded itself most carefully against the heresy of tritheism. Nor on the other hand has Christian theology ever been content to regard the "Persons" of the Trinity as mere "aspects" of the Divine nature. It does not pretend that human language can adequately express the infinite; it does not imagine that the language of the creeds, which guards the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity against the misrepresentations of heresy, *explains* these profound mysteries; it does maintain that the doctrine which it holds, and that alone, satisfies the language of the New Testament, and that it is consonant to reason, if transcending reason.

2. Again it is but a shallow conception of the meaning of the Atonement when it is alleged that "it was a retrogression on the part of Paul when he stooped to represent

¹ Schechter in *J.Q.R.*, vi. 645.

God with human passions, requiring a compromise between the demands of His justice and the demands of His mercy.”¹ Doubtless theologians of a certain school have given too much cause for such a travesty of the teaching of the New Testament; but Reformed Judaism at any rate seems to be dangerously wanting in acknowledgement of the truths which the death of Christ teaches, in any deep sense of man’s need of the Redemption which it effects. It seems to possess little deep realization of the seriousness of sin, or the need for humanity of a great act of sacrifice which should at once condemn sin and proclaim the love of God, making it possible for Him to pardon without fear of being misunderstood, and exhibiting the infinite attraction of supreme self-sacrifice. To a Christian there is something painfully flippant in the suggestion that among articles of belief for modern Judaism, “one would not even object to accept the article . . . that we have to look upon ourselves as sinners” . . . for “morbid as such a belief may be,” it might have a wholesome effect.² Admittedly Judaism is deficient in that sense of sin which is a necessary factor for human progress; and it is just that sense of sin, and the realization of the love manifested in the sacrifice of the Cross, which makes Christianity so tender, so gentle to the sinner, so earnest in its efforts to raise the fallen and restore the lost. The sacrificial system of the Law ought to have taught Judaism something of the need of atonement; but Reformed Judaism seems bent on regarding the Levitical sacrifices as survivals of superstition rather than as significant, though temporary, ordinances, through which God designed to educate His people and the world.

3. Once more, Christian faith is not, as Judaism often seems to think, a blind and credulous acceptance of irrational dogmas, but allegiance to the Person of Jesus Christ,

¹ Simon in *J.Q.R.*, vi. 275.

² Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 219.

uniting the believer to Him in His death and in His life, that he may share that death and that life, so that it may be reproduced in his own experience. It is a principle of power; an effective means of righteousness, of holiness, of salvation in the largest sense of the word.

4. Again, one of the fundamental objections of Judaism to Christianity is, we are told, that it claims to be "final." It is said that "there is and there can be no such thing as finality in religion."¹ Let it be granted. But in what sense does Christianity claim to be "final"? Not surely in the sense that its meaning is exhausted in certain stereotyped formulas, that it possesses no vital power of expansion and adaptation to the ever growing needs of humanity. Christ is indeed "He that should come," and we "do not look for another"; but we claim that the revelation centred in His Person grows and will grow in significance as it meets the needs of every man and every nation and every age until the end of time.

VIII.

What is the verdict of history upon the controversy between Judaism and Christianity? Must it not be that Judaism has been sterile, while Christianity has been fruitful? Judaism has remained the religion of a race; Christianity has spread throughout the world. *Ante Christum* and *Anno Domini* are no mere arbitrary chronological distinctions. It is a simple fact of history that a new era began with Jesus Christ. What was the cause? Whatever view be taken of the Person of Christ, it cannot be denied that with Him came "a new teaching with authority" which changed the face of the world. With all its failures, with all its crimes—not least those crimes of which it has been guilty against the ancient people of God; of which, to the shame of civilized Europe be it spoken, it is still guilty,

¹ Montefiore in *J.Q.R.*, xii. 740.

though now it is as a rule not the Church but the State which is the persecutor—Christianity has been expansive, progressive, cosmopolitan. What would the world have been without Christ? Was there the smallest probability that if Christ had not come, Judaism would have reformed the world? The Old Testament predicts an universal religion; Christianity realizes it; Judaism has remained national, particularist. Admittedly Orthodox Judaism cannot fulfil the mission of Judaism to the world. Can Reformed Judaism possibly do it, by dropping characteristic doctrines and practices of Judaism as a concession to modern progress, and incorporating some few Christian ideas? No. It lacks the vital strength of Christianity, for that vital strength is devotion to Christ.

IX.

Has Judaism then no future? "Hard it is," writes one of its defenders, "to discern the purpose of God. But for my own part I do not believe that the religious mission of the Jewish race terminated with the production of Christianity."¹ Most heartily do I echo his words. "The Jews have," to quote one to whom students of the Old Testament as well as the New owe a deep debt of gratitude, "their purpose still to fulfil in the Divine plan. The well known answer to the question 'What is the chief argument for Christianity?'—'The Jews'—reminds us of the continued existence of that strange race, living as sojourners among men, the ever present witnesses to a remote past which is connected by our beliefs intimately with the present. By their traditions to which they cling, by the Old Testament Scriptures which they preserve by an independent chain of evidence, by their hopes, and by their highest aspirations, they are a living witness to the truth of that which they reject."²

¹ Montefiore, *J.Q.R.*, xii. 650.

² Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, p. 345.

But I cannot rest in the belief that till the end of time they are to remain merely as external witnesses to the salvation for which they laid the foundation. I cling to St. Paul's hope that "when the fulness of the Gentiles is come in, all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. xi. 25, 26). And "if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness!" (Rom. xi. 12). Can it be that Israel will indeed be the Messianic nation, bearing God's salvation to the ends of the earth? It can only be, if they turn to the Lord, and accept Him as their Redeemer. It seems impossible, incredible; yet not more impossible, more incredible than the coming of Christ would have seemed a year before He came. Only through Christ, at once Son of God and Son of Man, the revelation of the Father, the representative of humanity, the Redeemer of the world, the pledge and giver of eternal life, can Israel's mission be fulfilled. Judaism may think that it can absorb the best teachings of Christianity "without believing that Jesus is God, or that His body rose out of the tomb in which it had been buried";¹ but it cannot appropriate its power. The centre of Judaism, we are told, round which its ideas and ideals concentrate themselves, is Dogma.² The centre of Christianity is a Person, in Whom its ideas and ideals are summed up; a living Lord, who has once for all united man to God. That living Lord, working through His Spirit in His Church and in the hearts of men, is perpetually revealing the Father to men, and establishing His kingdom in the world, until in the fulness of the times the final purpose shall be revealed, and God shall be all in all.

¹ Montefiore in *J.Q.R.*, xii. 742.

² Schechter, *Studies*, p. 221.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

II.

WHEN we proceed to examine our Lord's teaching in detail, it becomes evident that there is more than one way by which the subject may be approached. The Gospels may be taken in the common order, and the testimony of each discussed in turn, as was done by Rudolf Stier sixty years ago. Or we may follow Wendt in his endeavour to reconstruct the teaching on a basis which will represent it in the light of an organic unity. In the present sketches we propose to employ a method which is perhaps better adapted to a brief treatment. We shall interrogate each of the chief sources used by the Evangelists, and when this has been done we shall endeavour to compare and co-ordinate the results.

We begin with the tradition which forms the substance of our earliest Gospel and the basis of a large portion of the other Synoptic narratives.

The Marcan tradition has preserved no great discourse and few important parables. Frequent reference is made to the preaching and teaching of Jesus,¹ but His recorded sayings are chiefly incidental remarks or short instructions; the only considerable fragments are the parables of the Sower (iv. 3-9), and the Husbandmen (xii. 1-11), and the apocalypse in chapter xiii. This comparative scarcity of recollections of the Lord's teaching is consistent with the statement of Irenaeus that St. Mark reproduced the preaching of St. Peter.² The primitive preacher would doubtless relate anecdotes and brief sayings, but he would leave to the catechist the transmission of the Master's discourses.

¹ Mark i. 14, 21 f., 38; ii. 13; iv. 1, 33; vi. 2, 6; vii. 14; xi. 18; xii. 1, 35, 38.

² Iren. iii. 1, *Μάρκος . . . τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδεδωκε.*

But the records of Christ's teaching which are to be found in the "memoirs of Peter" are not the less valuable because they are scanty and short. Doubtless the Apostle selected for preaching the sayings which had made the deepest impression upon his memory, or which he judged to be the most characteristic or important. It may prove that the Marcan tradition is thoroughly representative of the teaching as a whole, so that if we have grasped its significance, we possess a key to the understanding of the fuller reports preserved in the other sources.

1. This view is confirmed by the first words attributed to Jesus in the Second Gospel.¹ They are evidently the text, so to speak, of His Galilean preaching; they recite in the most compressed form both its message and its call. "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand," is the substance of the Gospel which Christ preached; "repent ye, and believe in the Gospel," is the twofold call which He based upon His message. Both message and call were heard during the ministry not once or twice only, but again and again; though clothed in many different forms and presented in varying degrees of completeness, these topics were never far from the Master's thoughts, and appear in the background if not in the forefront of all His utterances.²

2. When the Kingdom of God, the Divine sovereignty over the whole life of man upon earth, presented itself in the person and ministry of Christ, it was confronted by tremendous obstacles. The first and chief of these was human sin, and it is to this that our Lord addresses Himself in the next word which the Marcan tradition ascribes to Him.³ His remark to the scribes at Capernaum, "The Son of

¹ Mark i. 15.

² When e.g. St. Luke adds *eis metánoian* to the saying of Mark ii. 17, he merely brings out what was latent in *καλέσαι ἀμαρτωλούς*.

³ ii. 14.

Man hath authority to forgive sins upon the earth," revealed at the very outset of His work the power by which He intended to fight this enemy. He would do it by proclaiming an *ἄφεσις*,¹ a full discharge of the sins contracted by men in the past, a discharge which would leave them free to begin their lives afresh. Even the scribes recognized that God could forgive sins, but the difference is immense between a forgiveness locked up in the treasures of the Divine clemency and a forgiveness committed to man on earth for the benefit of men. The charter of the Kingdom of God opens with the gospel of a present forgiveness. The scribes rightly judged this claim to be of the first magnitude,² nor was it made by Jesus in any spirit of light-hearted optimism, but with a full sense of its significance. That He realized the deep-seated strength of the disease which He undertook to heal is evident from His later saying, "From within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed."³ Sin is not, according to Christ, a superficial evil, but one which is both immanent and inveterate; yet, knowing this, He claims the power to set the sinner free from it. Miracles of physical healing were indeed easy when compared with the moral force exerted in an act of absolution; when He said, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," He uttered a harder word than when He bade Lazarus "come forth." But He was conscious of the right to say this harder word, and He said it at the earliest opportunity; that such a power should be possessed and exerted on earth was the first condition of the Divine Kingdom being set up among men.

3. Other hindrances stood in the way of the Kingdom of God, and they were met with equal determination. Foremost among these was Pharisaic Judaism, with its insistence on external duties and its neglect of "the weightier

¹ Cf. Luke iv. 18 (Isa. lxi. 1).

² Mark ii. 7. ³ vii. 21 ff.

matters of the Law." The resistance offered to the gospel by this system is seen in the Marcan tradition in connexion with three questions: the question of weekly fasting,¹ the question of the Sabbath,² and the question of ceremonial purification.³ The first and the third of these observances rested simply upon the tradition of the Rabbis, and our Lord declined to be bound by them in any way; the second, which was required by the Torah, He accepted, but lifted it up to a level high above that which it occupied in the teaching of the scribes. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,"⁴ asserts a principle which places that institution in the light of a Divine gift, whereas to the scribes it wore the aspect of an arbitrary law. But in proclaiming the Sabbath a gift of the Divine love, Christ left no opening for licence; the inference⁵ which He drew was not that every Israelite was free to observe or to neglect it as he pleased, but that the Son of Man had power to regulate its use.⁶ With the weekly fasts and "the Jews' manner of purifying"⁷ He dealt in a different way. Fasting was not prescribed by the law except on the Day of Atonement, and the fasts observed on Mondays and Thursdays⁸ were mischievous if they ministered to ostentation⁹ or were imposed on men's consciences as a religious duty. Moreover, to the disciples of Jesus, who were now rejoicing in the light of the Bridegroom's presence, they would have been a burdensome unreality. He had not come to patch up the thread-bare cloak of Judaism, or to pour a new spirit into its obsolete practices.¹⁰ Of the ceremonial of purification prescribed by the Rabbis Jesus was even less tolerant. Not only was it

¹ Mark ii. 19 f. ² ii. 27 f., iii. 4. ³ vii. 6 ff.

⁴ ii. 27. ⁵ ii. 28 (*ὥστε*).

⁶ Compare the anecdote preserved in Cod. D at Luke vi. 5: *τῆ αὐτῆ ἡμ ρ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου.*

⁷ John ii. 6. ⁸ *Didache*, 8. ⁹ Luke xviii. 12. ¹⁰ Mark ii. 21 f.

purely traditional, as the scribes confessed,¹ but it encouraged an externalism which was fatal to any sense of the inwardness of the religious life, and opposed to the first principles of the Kingdom of God. Nor was the danger limited or likely to yield to better teaching. The system worked like leaven,² spreading through Jewish society, and it could only be checked by the most rigorous condemnation.

The Gospel of the Kingdom encountered another and more mysterious obstacle. Whatever view may be taken of "possession," it is clear that our Lord is represented in the Marcan tradition as recognizing and withstanding an evil power which was more than human. The reality of this power seems to be assumed in His reply to the scribes from Jerusalem who charged Him with collusion with "Beelzebub." He gave them to understand that He had forced His way into the house of "the Strong," and intended to bind him and spoil his house.³ In other words, the casting out of the *δαιμόνια*, however we may interpret this class of miracles, was a symbol of our Lord's purpose to conquer the hostile power which had asserted its claim over human nature, but was in fact foreign to it and could therefore be dispossessed.

4. So far the teaching has been limited to the forces which obstruct or resist the progress of the Kingdom; it now passes to the contents of the conception itself. At this point the Parable comes into use, for the "mystery of the Kingdom,"⁴ the secret of its strength and manner of working, could not be imparted to the uninitiated multitude. The Marcan tradition has but three parables at this stage,⁵ and they are all based upon the analogy of vegetable growth, which lends itself in an especial manner to the description of spiritual processes. The first parable insists on the

¹ vii. 5.² viii. 15 ff.³ iii. 27.⁴ iv. 11⁵ iv. 3 ff., 26 ff., 31 f.

importance of character as determining the degree of influence exerted by the Kingdom of God over the individual; the second points out the spontaneity and the mystery of spiritual growth; the third foretells the expansion of the small beginnings of the Church into the greatness of a catholic mission. The conversion of the Empire and of the world itself is shadowed forth in the lodging of the birds of heaven under the branches of the tree which had grown from the least of all seeds. Taken together the three parables cover the whole work of the Christian society in the present world. We see before us in these familiar pictures the entire history of the *Regnum Dei*—its struggle with human indifference, shallowness, and sin; its sure but unobserved assimilation by all who receive it in sincerity; the final triumph of its cause. Every stage in the long record passes under review, from the uncertain start when the birds of the air are ready to devour the seed to the day when they are glad to seek shelter under the cover of the universal Church.

5. A new stage in the teaching is reached when the Galilean ministry is drawing to an end. By this time the Twelve had been brought into the closest association with the Master. Intimacy had been fostered by two long journeys which they took in His company, the first leading them through Phoenicia to the Decapolis, the second to the sources of the Jordan and the foot of Hermon.¹ These were not preaching-tours, but though they may have been undertaken partly to secure retirement and rest or even personal safety, they were doubtless used as opportunities for the instruction and training of the Apostles. It was at the end of the second of these journeys that our Lord revealed His glory to the innermost circle of the Apostolate in the vision of the Transfiguration. But before He did this, He called forth from Peter a con-

¹ vii. 24-31, viii. 27, ix. 30.

fession of His Messiahship, and then at once proceeded to foretell the Passion. Henceforth the Cross was the keynote of His teaching; He seemed to have found a new text, and how it was to be reconciled with the earlier preaching of the Kingdom passed the comprehension of the Twelve. That the "Christ should suffer"¹ was a doctrine altogether foreign to the Messianic Hope as they had received and entertained it. Repeated predictions, in which the details of the Crucifixion were distinctly foreshadowed,² failed to impress them with the certainty of the coming Passion; it loomed before their minds as a disquieting but unimaginable fear.³ But prediction did not exhaust Christ's teaching of the Cross. The crucifixion of the Master involved the con-crucifixion⁴ of the disciples, and for this He began at once to prepare them. The first lesson of this kind was shared by the crowd which followed Him through the villages of Cæsarea Philippi; immediately after his rebuke of Peter "He called unto Him the multitude with His disciples and said unto them, "If any man is minded (*θέλει*) to come after Me, let him disown himself (*ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν*), and let him take up his cross and follow me."⁵ "Self-denial," "bearing the cross," have passed amongst Christians into household words, but their true meaning eludes many who use them glibly. The disciple who "denies himself," in the sense intended by Christ, loses himself in the Master, so that, as St. Paul has it, it is no longer he who lives, but Christ who lives in him.⁶ The man who takes up his cross not only bears a burden laid upon him, but goes to his death, is prepared to die with Christ, i.e. to pass out of his life of sin into a life unto God.⁷

¹ Acts xxvi. 23, *εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός.*

² Mark viii. 34, ix. 31, x. 33 f.

³ ix. 32, *ἠγγούον τὸ ῥῆμα.*

⁴ Rom. vi. 6, *ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη.* Gal. ii. 19, *Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι.*

⁵ viii. 34.

⁶ Gal. ii. 20, *ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός.*

⁷ Rom. vi. 6 ff.; Col. iii. 3.

To the crowd the words could have served only as a deterrent, warning off any who took discipleship too lightly; to the Apostles they revealed the true nature of the calling which they had embraced. Henceforth it was the chief concern of the Master to form in these twelve men the type of character which would fit them to deny themselves and take up the cross. We see this in the stern rebuke of personal ambition which followed their return to Capernaum;¹ in the warning that he who would "enter into life" or even escape the "Gehenna of fire" must sacrifice hand or foot or eye when it becomes a stumbling-block;² in the intimation that places of honour in the Messianic Kingdom are to be won only by sharing Christ's cup and baptism.³ The same great lesson is taught when the Master makes childhood the symbol of fitness for the Kingdom,⁴ and represents material wealth as a bar to admission which it needs omnipotence to surmount.⁵

6. Besides self-abnegation Christ impressed upon His followers the necessity of faith. Faith was joined with repentance, as we have seen, in the original call (i. 15), and it was made the condition of the exercise of our Lord's miraculous powers in the case of rational beings (ii. 5; v. 34, 36; vi. 5 f.; ix. 23; x. 52). On the Twelve it was urged with special earnestness. They had "believed in the Gospel" from the first, but there were moments when their faith seemed to vanish, and the Lord called them back to this primary condition of the Christian life.⁶ But it was especially in connexion with prayer that He enforced the need of faith. The failure of the disciples to cast out an unclean spirit was attributed to the want of prayer,⁷ or rather, as St. Matthew states, to the *ὀλιγοπιστία* which made prayer of no effect. A few days before the end the Lord returned to this matter,

¹ Mark ix. 33 ff.² ix. 43 ff.³ x. 38 f.⁴ x. 14 f., cf. ix. 36 f.⁵ x. 23 ff.⁶ iv. 40, οὐπω ἔχετε πίστιν.]⁷ ix. 29, cf. Matt. xvii. 20.

ascribing almost boundless powers to prayer inspired by faith: "have faith in God . . . all things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye receive them (when ye asked), and they shall be yours."¹ He added that mountains might be moved out of their places at the call of an adequate faith. By these words He planted at the centre of man's spiritual life a force of incalculable power; while He took away from His Church the incentive of a self-seeking ambition, He revealed the secret of a strength which could overcome the world.

7. When the scene is shifted from Galilee and Peræa to Jerusalem, we find ourselves in quite another atmosphere, and the teaching accordingly is of another character. The audience was differently constituted from that which gathered round our Lord in Galilee. In the Temple-courts, as on the shores of the Lake, a crowd speedily assembled whenever the Master was to be seen and heard, but it contained elements which were not present in Galilee—townsfolk from the Tyropœon, and pilgrims from the Dispersion in many lands, as well as peasants from the rural parts of Palestine. And on the fringe of the crowd, now and again coming to the front with simulated homage² or captious questions, were members of the Sanhedrin, not scribes only or elected counsellors, but the heads of the Priesthood, who, Sadducees as they were, now joined hands with the Pharisees in a determined effort to entrap the great Teacher. Our Lord's answers are preserved, together with a few fragments of His teaching addressed to the multitude, and they form a series of judgments which exhibit His attitude toward a variety of subjects debated in His own generation. We learn in this way His view of certain uses to which the Temple-courts were put; of the claim of the Roman government upon the allegiance of Jews who were under it; of the rejection by the Sadducees of the Pharisaic

¹ xi. 23 ff.

² Luke xx. 20, ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοῦς δικαίους εἶναι.

doctrine of the Resurrection; of the relative importance of the duties prescribed by the Law.¹ His answers not only silenced His adversaries at the time, but asserted certain broad principles which still illuminate life and thought. But even more important are the few final words which He said about Himself. He implies that the authority which He exercised was from above;² He refers to Himself as the only and beloved Son of the Owner of the Vineyard,³ and as the Stone which was declared to be the "Head of the Corner";⁴ He calls attention to the paradox that the Christ, though the Son of David, is also his Lord;⁵ and at length, when interrogated by the High Priest, He explicitly confesses Himself to be "the Son of the Blessed," and the ultimate fulfiller of Daniel's vision of the Son of Man who comes with the clouds of heaven.⁶

8. The great eschatological discourse which ends the "day of questions" (Mark xiii.) is unique in more than one respect. It is the only prolonged utterance in the Marcan tradition, and almost the only utterance which deals with the Last Things. Elsewhere the teaching of Christ is singularly free from apocalyptic; it has to do with present duties, with things upon earth and things close at hand.⁷ No such reticence is practised here. The Apostles had, according to St. Mark, limited their inquiry to the fall of the City and Temple,⁸ but Christ of His own motion went further afield. It has indeed been maintained by recent scholars that certain portions of the discourse

¹ Mark xi. 17, xii. 15-17, 24-27, 29-31.

² xi. 29 ff.

³ xii. 6.

⁴ xii. 10.

⁵ xii. 35-37.

⁶ xiv. 62. Mark's *ἐγώ εἰμι* is perhaps not so near to the original as the more characteristic *Σὺ εἶπας* of Matt., or *Σὺ λέγεις* of Luke, but it is doubtless a true interpretation of the Lord's answer.

⁷ There is a momentary unveiling of the future in viii. 38, but when James and John ask for places of honour in the Messiah's Kingdom, their thoughts are recalled to the Messiah's sufferings (x. 37 f.).

⁸ The word *καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος* added by St. Matthew have probably arisen from that Evangelist's interpretation of St. Mark's *συντελείσθαι* seen in the light of the discourse itself.

(viz. Mark xiii. 7 f., 14–20, 24–27, 30 f.) are fragments of a primitive Christian Apocalypse which have been worked into the original tradition. In favour of this view it is urged that they “stand in no inward relation to the rest of the discourse”;¹ but, granting this statement, it proves no more than that the discourse has not been preserved in its original order, or was not all delivered at the same time. Even if these passages are removed, there remains in this remarkable chapter a revelation of certain features in the history of the future Church, ending with final *parousia*; and this alone places chapter xiii. on a different level from the sayings of chapters i.–xii. But was there not a cause for a new departure of this kind? The end of the Ministry and of the Master’s earthly life was at hand; within two months the new society of Christ’s disciples would have started on its mission, and “the last hour”² have begun. Now, if ever, there was a fitting opportunity for foreshadowing the course of future events, and inspiring hope. Yet apart from the use of certain metaphors borrowed from the Old Testament—the “abomination of desolation,” the darkening of sun and moon, the falling of stars from heaven, the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds³—the whole story of the great future is told with a reserve which is in marked contrast with the extravagance of other apocalyptic descriptions. The Master is not led by the curiosity of His disciples to fix a time either for the destruction of the City or for the end of the age; His words give no support to the belief that He would return in the lifetime of the first generation; they mention no symbolical numbers which might give ground for idle guesses; they refer to no mystical periods such as those which appear in the Apoca-

¹ Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, E. Tr., ii. p. 366 n.

² 1 John ii. 18.

³ All these occur in the passages which have been regarded as interpolated.

lyse of St. John; indeed, Jesus disclaims all knowledge of "that day or hour."¹ Such disclosures as He makes are made with a practical purpose. "Take heed that no man lead you astray . . . when ye hear of wars and tumults, be not troubled . . . take heed to yourselves . . . watch and pray . . . what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch."² These are the notes which are heard throughout the discourse, and they reveal the Master's aim. On this one occasion, just before the end of His course, He desired to illuminate the future for the guidance of His disciples in the coming years. So far as we can judge, His teaching would have been wanting in an important particular if it had contained no such limited apocalypse. Moreover, that the eschatology should come just where it does in His teaching is surely in accordance with the general plan of our Lord's ministry. Each group of utterances is seen to arise naturally out of the circumstances in which it occurs. What could be more natural than that the one eschatological discourse should be reserved to the end?

10. The last charge of the risen Lord to the eleven and the future Church is preserved by St. Matthew only,³ but it may have stood in the original ending of St. Mark, and it forms an apt conclusion to the teaching of the second Gospel. Once again, as in the first days of the Galilean ministry, Jesus strikes the note of "authority"; but the authority which He now claims is universal, embracing things in Heaven as well as things on earth.⁴ As He had Himself in those days made disciples and taught them, so He now commits to the Apostles and the Church the task of "discipling" and teaching the nations. But the disciples they made were to be His and not theirs,

¹ xiii. 32. ² xiii. 5, 7, 9, 23, 33, 35, 37.

³ Matt. xxviii. 18-20. The words have been handled by the present writer in a recent number of the EXPOSITOR.

⁴ ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Contrast Mark ii. 10.

and their teaching was to be but an enforcing of precepts which they had received from His lips. The mission of the Church was to find its inspiration in the words of the Master, and its strength in His invisible presence, which He pledged Himself to continue until the end of the age.

It is improbable that the sayings in the Marcan tradition were selected or arranged with the definite intention of representing the teaching of Christ as an ordered whole. Yet we have found in them an order, a purpose, and a relative completeness which suggest that they are in fact fairly representative of the great lines of our Lord's teaching in Galilee and during the last week at Jerusalem. And they exhibit certain characteristics which stand out in clear relief, and which it may be worth while here briefly to note.

(a) We are struck by the *inwardness* of the teaching. The heart, the centre of the moral life in man, is the field in which Jesus sets Himself to work. Repentance and faith, renunciation of self-love, obedience, sacrifice, are the conditions of life under the Kingdom of God. The seed of the Kingdom lives and grows and yields fruit only when it is lodged in good ground. External things, whether ceremonial acts or natural powers or wealth and place, may be stumbling-blocks in the soul's way to God. All sins come from within, and it is within that the work of purification must begin. The value of a gift is independent of its money-worth, and proportionate to the spiritual effort which it represents.

(b) But with this inwardness there is joined in the teaching of Christ an intensely *practical direction*. It is wholly free from the error of regarding external things as indifferent because they are valueless apart from the Spirit. Jesus was precise in His directions with regard to marriage and divorce; He cleansed the Temple from a traffic which was the symbol and occasion of a selfish greed, and refused to allow the house of prayer to be made a thoroughfare;

He instituted sacramental actions for perpetual observance in His Church. While His teaching rested on the broad principles of moral and spiritual truth, it could descend to small matters when a principle was even remotely involved. One of His sayings "made all meats clean";¹ another has blessed infancy and childhood for all time. His charge to the Twelve enters into trifles connected with food and clothing; when the child of Jairus awoke from her death-sleep, He "commanded that something should be given her to eat." Nothing was overlooked because it was in itself trivial or external, if it could be made to serve the good of man or the Kingdom of God.

(c) Although delivered under conditions which limited its immediate scope, the teaching possesses an *universality* which strikes even the casual reader. The Master is the Son of Man, and His words are for all men. Quite early in the ministry such sayings as "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins," "The Sabbath was made for man," "Out of the heart of man evil thoughts proceed," look far beyond the narrow limits of Galilee and of Judaism. The parable of the Sower was addressed to simple people amongst agricultural surroundings, and, as many a country clergyman knows, it appeals to the farmer and the ploughman of rural England to-day: yet the picture which it draws of the various fortunes experienced by the word of God in human hearts is a heritage for all mankind. There is scarcely a saying in the Marcan teaching which is not of far-reaching significance, charged with a lesson for one or more of those types of human character which are always with us.

(d) Simple and unpretending as the sayings are, they possess a tone of authority which is without parallel in literature. If the Lord does not often in the second Gospel

¹ Mark vii. 19 (reading *καθαρίζων* with **SABLD**).

preface His teaching by the solemn ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,¹ throughout the book His words carry conviction or at least command attention. Not a hesitating note is struck from the day when he begins, "The Kingdom of God is at hand" to the last scene when He proclaims, "All power hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth"; He speaks at all times with the same absolute conviction and consciousness of His Divine right. There is majesty in His least utterance, and it is nowhere more easily recognized than in the unvarnished record of the Gospel according to St. Mark.

H. B. SWETE.

THE PARABLE OF THE "UNJUST" STEWARD.

(ST. LUKE XVI.)

THERE are two things which are especially essential in seeking to understand the parables of our Lord:

- (i.) A careful examination of the context, particularly when that context contains explanatory comments.
- (ii.) A realization of the fact that they were spoken by One who was a Jew, to Jews, in the Jewish language; and also that the method of expression, as well as the *underlying* thoughts, are Jewish.

The former of these axioms is universally acknowledged to be correct, though whether it is always sufficiently acted upon is another question; but with regard to the second, it must be confessed that it is rarely taken into consideration. The Greek of the New Testament (including the Gospels) is so often illustrated by references to classical writers, both as regards expression and thought; but very rarely do commentators refer to Jewish literature for explaining New Testament forms and methods of thought.²

¹ It occurs only twice in the Galilean teaching (Mark iii. 28, viii. 12), and eleven times in the rest of the Gospel.

² There are, of course, some notable exceptions; e.g. Edersheim.

It is proposed to examine the parable of the "unjust" ("dishonest" would perhaps be a better word)¹ steward on the basis of the two above-mentioned axioms.

I.

One of the chief points upon which the interpretation of the parable turns is the relationship between the master and the steward. Here it is of prime importance to settle whether this relationship is conceived of as being under the Roman or Jewish *régime*. Some modern commentators hold that it is the former, and point out further that the steward, in bidding his master's debtors strike off from their bills part of what was due, was not doing his master any further wrong, but was denying himself of something that was his by right, in order to gain the good-will of the debtors and thus secure himself against the evil time before him. If the conditions in the parable are "Roman," then it is possible that the above explanation is correct; but if it can be shown that the conditions are not "Roman," but "Jewish," then a different explanation will be required.

That the whole *venue* of the parable is not "Roman" but "Jewish" is probable on *a priori* grounds, for it must be allowed that, on the face of it, one would expect that our Lord would have in view a Jewish master with a Jewish steward. He was, according to the flesh, a Jew Himself, living in a Jewish country, deeply versed in Jewish writings, having the fullest knowledge of Jewish conditions of life and customs; He was speaking in the Jewish language and addressing Jews. Why should it be supposed (as is so frequently done) that He would choose for the subject of His discourse the scene of a Roman household (even supposing that His hearers knew anything about the conditions there prevailing), when He was well aware of the hatred of His countrymen towards everything Roman? One may

¹ Or "unrighteous," in view of Luke xvi. 8.

ask, rather, what is there in the parable to suggest that our Lord, in uttering it, had anything "Roman" in view? That, on the contrary, the whole passage is impregnated with Jewish thought and expression will, it is hoped, be made clear.

First, a few general remarks on the position and functions of a steward from a *Jewish* standpoint. The Hebrew equivalent for *οἰκονόμος* is סֹכֵן, and the meaning of the word ("one who is over the house") is well illustrated in Isaiah xxii. 15: לְרֹבֵא אֱלֹהֵסכֵן הִזָּה עַל־שִׁבְנָא אִשֶׁר עַל־הַבַּיִת, cf. also Genesis xliii. 19, xliv. 4; the same function is entrusted to Eliezer in Genesis xxiv. 2 (זָקֵן בֵּיתוֹ הַכֹּשֵׁל בְּכָל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ), and to Joseph in Genesis xxxix. 4 (וּכְלִישְׁלוֹ נָתַן בִּידוֹ); the idea in each case being that a steward had charge of all that belonged to his master, and that he was placed "over the house." In the New Testament precisely the same meaning attaches to the word; *οἰκονόμος* always, as the word implies, has reference to household matters, viz.: 1 Corinthians iv. 1, 2, where St. Paul has been speaking of building upon the foundation of Christ, it is therefore a question of a steward in the house of God; again, Titus i. 7, where the bishop or *overseer* is spoken of as the steward of God's house; so also in 1 Timothy iii. 5: *But if a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?* Cf. also 1 Peter iv. 10.

In *Roman* households the steward (*villicus*) was always a slave;¹ in *Jewish* households he would, almost invariably, be a slave.² Now if, in the parable, he had been a Roman steward, dismissal would not have been his punishment; Roman masters had absolute control over the lives and

¹ See H. A. Wallon, *Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, ii. 214 ff.

² Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.*, i. 177. "Charakteristisch für die Stellung, welche die Sklaven in Israel einnehmen, ist die Thatsache, dass das Gesetz auf den doch gewiss öfter vorgekommenen Fall Rücksicht nimmt, dass ein Sklave von der ihm gegebenen Möglichkeit frei zu werden, keinen Gebrauch macht." Compare in the present connexion Luke xii. 42, 43, where the *οἰκονόμος* is spoken of as δοῦλος, "bond-servant," i.e. slave.

persons of all their slaves (see Wallon, *op. cit.*), and the punishment which a Roman master would inflict on his slave for the offence of robbery or the like would be either death, or imprisonment, or torture, or (most probably) degradation, but certainly not the granting of freedom. The chief aim of the Romans was to get the utmost use out of their slaves (see Wallon, *op. cit.*); it is therefore reasonably certain that no Roman would *dismiss* his slave for any offence at all. In *Jewish* households the case was quite different; for an insight into the relationship between master and slave here we may refer, firstly, to the cases of Abraham and Eliezer, and Potiphar and Joseph;¹ and, secondly, to the legislation regarding slaves. Without going into details, a reference to these shows that a slave (the steward is spoken of as עֶבֶד = bond-servant) was almost in the position of one of the family,² and that the legislation concerning him was of a most merciful character, utterly different from that of the Romans. It is most true, as has been pointed out by Benzinger,³ that among the Jews it was preferable, by far, for slaves to continue in that condition than to become free—and poor; the freed slave was in such danger of starvation that the law compelled a master to supply his slave "liberally" with the necessaries of life on his leaving.⁴ For a Jewish slave to leave his master's house was like leaving home. Generally speaking, the most cruel punishment that a Jewish master could inflict upon his slave was to dismiss him, for it meant that he was cast out into the world, without home, without friends, without occupation, and in great danger of dying of starvation; the more highly placed the slave, as in the case of the steward in the parable, the more difficult

¹ Though the scene here is in Egypt, yet the *conditions* are set forth from the Hebrew point of view.

² Cf. Nowack, *op. cit.*, § 29.

³ *Hebr. Archäologie*, p. 161.

⁴ Deut. xv. 14.

would it be to find work which he could undertake. Bearing this in mind, there seems to be peculiar force in the words of the steward in the parable, when he says: *What shall I do, seeing that my lord taketh away the stewardship from me? I have not strength to dig, to beg I am ashamed.* These words show, moreover, that the steward took for granted that he would be dismissed; had he been the steward of a Roman master, his thoughts would have run rather in the direction of what sort his punishment was going to be.

Thus, we may take it that the relationship existing between the master and the steward was a *Jewish* one; this emphasizes the Jewish character of the whole passage before us. There are, in the next place, several words and expressions which likewise show the Jewish setting of the section:

βάτος (בַּת) and κόρος (כֶּרֶס) are Hebrew measures;¹

μαμωνᾶς is an Aramaic word;

the following expressions are all Hebraisms:

ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας,
² οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου,
² οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός,
 ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας.

Moreover αἰών, in the sense here used, is the equivalent of the Aramaic עלמא. A very important point, too, is the use of *parallelisms* throughout the section, both in the parable and in the explanatory comments, but especially in these latter; these, as is well known, are a characteristic feature in both Hebrew and Jewish literature. In the present case special attention must be drawn to them, for they are so "Hebraic" in their balanced structure, and there is such a consistent method running through them, that one ventures to believe that even in their *outward*

¹ Cf. Ezek. xlv. 10, 14.

² Cf. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 161-163.

form of ordered consistency they illustrate the lesson which is intended to be inculcated.¹

The matter may be put, unconventionally, thus :

<p>v. 9. <i>Making friends of the mammon of unrighteousness</i> is being</p> <p>v. 10. <i>Faithful in that which is least,</i> that is,</p> <p>v. 11. <i>Being faithful with the unrighteous mammon ;</i> this, from the point of view of the sons of light, is</p> <p>v. 12. <i>That which is another's.</i></p>	<p>v. 9. <i>Being received into everlasting tabernacles</i> is the reward of being</p> <p>v. 10. <i>Faithful in that which is much,</i> that is,</p> <p>v. 11. <i>Being entrusted with the true riches ;</i> this, from the point of view of the sons of light, is</p> <p>v. 12. <i>That which is your (our) own.</i></p>
---	---

The question running through the whole is one of *consistency* ; the conclusion drawn is that

No man can serve two masters (v. 13),
hence the final dictum,
Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

This balance of verses, working out in logical consistency, is very striking, and ought assuredly to be taken into consideration when seeking to understand the meaning of the parable.²

II.

We come to consider in some little detail the main points in the explanatory comments :—

i. *For the sons of this world are for their generation wiser than the sons of light (v. 8b).* "The sons of this world" is a pure Hebraism (בני העולם הזה) ; for this use of *αἰών* in a temporal and evil sense cf. Gal. i. 4, *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστῶς πονηρός*, and 2 Cor. iv. 4, *ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*.³

¹ This would be quite in accordance with the method of Jewish Paedagogics.

² It must be remembered that this parable, with its explanatory comments (unlike the three preceding ones, which were addressed to the Pharisees and scribes, see xv. 2), was spoken to the disciples (xvi. 1), who are presumably the "sons of light."

³ Cf. also Eph. iii. 21, *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, which means not "all the generations of the world," but "all the generations of time." For this use in Aramaic literature see Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, i. 133-145.

The phrase εἰς τὴν γενεάν τῆν ἐαυτῶν is equivalent to בְּדוֹרָם, cf. this use in the following (Gen. vi. 9): נַח אִישׁ בְּדוֹרְתָיו (בְּדוֹרְתָיו = LXX ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ); so that γενεά (דור) is used here in the sense of "contemporary," as distinct from תּוֹלְדוֹת; εἰς as used in this verse = כִּי, which would here have the sense "as regards" (for this use see e.g. Gen. vii. 21). The words may therefore be paraphrased thus:

"The wicked here on earth are, as regards those among whom they live, wiser than the 'sons of light.'" The reason why they are wiser is obvious enough; worldly people act on certain principles, viz. they are here to enjoy themselves and to get the greatest possible amount of pleasure out of life; for this purpose they require wealth;¹ this therefore must be got, no matter how. This is their guiding principle, and they *consistently* live up to it. But the "sons of light" also have fixed principles (e.g. Eph. v. 9, ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε, ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν πίσσῃ ἀγαθωσύνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀληθείᾳ . . .), yet, too often, their conduct is *inconsistent* with their principles. Generally speaking, and certainly as far as "wisdom" is concerned, he is a wise man who acts *consistently* in accordance with his principles.

ii. *Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into eternal tabernacles (v. 9).*

There is a parallelism between this verse and the eleventh: ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας (v. 9) must be taken with εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε . . . (v. 11). As already pointed out above, making friends of the mammon of unrighteousness is being faithful in that which is least; but according to verse 10, "he that

¹ It is worth noticing, that immediately after our Lord had finished speaking, the Pharisees, "who were lovers of money," came and "scoffed at Him," v. 14.

is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much," i.e. if he is faithful in a very little, it is an earnest of what he will be in greater things, and therefore his reward of being received into eternal tabernacles is regarded as assured.

The R.V. rendering of ἐκ, "by means of," is inadmissible if ἐκ, as can scarcely be doubted, is the equivalent of כִּי; the R.V. mg. "out of," in the sense of "from," is surely more correct. Whether, in the next place, we accept the reading ἐκλίπη or ἐκλίπητε is of little consequence, as the interpretation will not be affected; whether used impersonally or not, the meaning of ἐκλείπω here will be: "coming to an end," i.e. dying.¹ The main difficulty of the verse centres in δέξονται; the grammatical structure would point to the "friends of the mammon of unrighteousness" as the subject, but the *sense* absolutely forbids this; the friends of mammon would certainly be the last to receive the sons of light into eternal tabernacles, for the friends of mammon are essentially of this world, and their place hereafter is plainly intimated in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, which follows immediately after our present section; ἵνα δέξονται ὑμᾶς must clearly be paraphrased "that ye may be received"; this is a well-known Hebrew usage, and the instance before us is not an isolated one in the New Testament; a perfect parallel to it is found in Luke xxiii. 31: εἰ ἐν ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν . . .; there is no subject to ποιοῦσιν, and it would be perfectly legitimate to translate, "if these things are done." Lastly, the phrase εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς is certainly strange, for αἰώνιος and σκηνή would seem, according to common usage, to contain two antagonistic ideas, those namely of "eternity" and "temporary abiding"; but the phrase is supported by Hebrew usage, e.g. Psalm lxi. 5: אָנֹכִי בְּאֶהְלֵךְ עַל־כַּיִם, according to the LXX rendering: παροικίσω ἐν τῷ σκηνώματί σου εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. More-

¹ For this use see Hebrews i. 12 . . . καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσιν.

over, the exact phrase before us is not unknown in later Jewish literature.

The verse may then be paraphrased thus: Be faithful with the mammon of unrighteousness, that when all is over here on earth, ye may be received into abiding mansions.¹ This explanatory comment is immediately followed by:

iii. Verses 10, 11, 12, which are three links of a chain, and, as already pointed out, they answer to and balance one another. They illustrate and emphasize the lesson of *consistency*, and lead up to the logical conclusion contained in v. 13.

iv. *No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*

It is of extreme interest to notice how the argument rises from quite a worldly standpoint, step by step in logical sequence, up to the highest stage, where the final alternative, the gathering together of all that has preceded, is put with startling curtness, yet with unanswerable force: *Ye cannot serve God and mammon.* It was the glaring inconsistency in the lives of so many of His hearers that called forth from our Lord the whole of the discourse xvi. 1-13. From the explanatory comments which have been referred to it seems difficult to deduct any other lesson than this, that what God demands of His followers is *consistency*; and the ordinary relationship of worldly men to one another is taken as the starting-point for showing that this demand is, from the very nature of things, a fair and a just one. The teaching, then, of these explanatory comments of our Lord, viz. the need of *consistency*, is what must be borne in mind in dealing with the parable itself.

¹ One cannot avoid noticing the parallelism and contrast between "their houses" in v. 4, and the "eternal tabernacles" in v. 9.

III.

It is not intended to go into much detail as regards the parable, as the main point of its teaching has been already indicated in the explanatory comments; there are, however, a few points which seem to corroborate the conclusion there arrived at. In the first place it is worthy of note that all the characters in the parable are "sons of this world," i.e. evil. The steward is dishonest, he does not attempt to deny the accusation brought against him. The rich man commends the dishonesty of the steward, and may therefore not unreasonably be regarded as belonging to the same category. The debtors partake of the dishonesty of the steward; they not only acquiesce in it, but are also willing to benefit by it. It cannot be argued that the debtors thought the steward was acting for his master, because of the words in verse 4: *that they may receive me . . .*; the whole point lies in their regarding the steward as the one to whom it was due that their bills were lessened; the master would know nothing of the falsification of the bills until the accounts were gone through prior to the departure of the steward; then the relation of the latter to his master would cease, but the relationship between him and the debtors would be of vital importance.

Still more noteworthy, in the second place, is the *consistent action* of the characters in the parable; this is very important in view of the interpretation of the parable here offered. The steward first defrauds his master by "wasting his goods"; *consistently* with this he deliberately and for his own ultimate benefit deducts a portion from the debts owing to his master.¹ The rich man is a server of mam-

¹ Edersheim (*Life and Times*, ii. 267) says that though the steward was acting "unrighteously," he could not be charged with "criminality" in remitting part of the debts owing, because he was "strictly within his rights." If, however, as is here maintained, the "conditions" are Jewish, he would have no "rights"; a Jewish steward had no perquisites by right.

mon;¹ *consistently* with this he commends the dishonesty of his steward, for the methods employed by the latter appealed to his worldly instincts. The debtors partook of the dishonesty of the steward; *consistently* with this they receive him into their houses² when he has lost his means of livelihood; there is "honour among thieves."

This *consistent action* on the part of the characters in the parable is very striking, and seems to be the key-note of the whole section. It will have been noticed that the explanatory comments emphasized the need of *consistency*; therefore, taking the parable with these comments, one seems unmistakably led to the conclusion that it too has for its main object the teaching of the *lesson of consistency*.

There is a further point which seems to give emphasis to this interpretation; immediately after the parable (with its comments) has been uttered, we read that *Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all these things; and they scoffed at Him*. Our Lord's answer is very significant: *Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts*; i.e. here was a living instance of the converse of what our Lord had been teaching in the parable,—*inconsistency* between the outward appearance and the inward reality.

In conclusion, it may be added that this lesson of the need of *consistency* is more than once insisted upon by our Lord; for example, in St. Matthew xii. 24-35 there is a considerable section devoted to it, and the teaching is summed up in v. 33 with the words: *Either make the tree good and his fruit good: or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt*.

¹ This is not expressly stated, but may reasonably be assumed from the sense of the parable, and especially in view of the story of Dives and Lazarus which follows in close connexion.

² This, likewise, is not expressly stated in the parable, but it is certainly implied, see *vr.* 4, 9.

DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.

VII.

Montanism a Link in the Chain of Prophecy.—The Late Canon Bright on Montanism.

Mason. I wonder, Riddell, whether you know a small volume by the late Canon Bright, in which he deals with Montanism and other topics, called *Waymarks in Church History*? I have brought it to show you.

Riddell. I know it, Mason; it has even been offered to me for a *quietus*, as a sort of “bare bodkin,” as if to “do for me.” I regard the author as one of the eminent and admirable writers of the Church of England in our time, now, alas! taken from us. But this does not blind me to the possibility that he has followed the traditional way of treating Montanism, and followed it too closely, without taking a dispassionate view of the facts. Here is the book. It opens with the observations: “A bias of some kind is unavoidable. We cannot ignore our own beliefs, or even our own prepossessions; to pose as external to a subject on which we have interior convictions . . . would be like trying to take ourselves out of ourselves, to pretend not to be what we are. If our object is truth, we must not begin by being untrue; and affectation or unreality is untruth.” What do you think of that?

M. You surprise me—I mean with the quotation. It is a defence of heathenism! I can imagine myself a missionary to an intelligent Moulvie who confronts me with the prefatory remark, “A bias of some kind is unavoidable. We cannot ignore our own beliefs, or even our own prepossessions; to pose,” etc., etc. And I do not think my argument would be able to proceed beyond his preface, unless indeed I were a better missionary than the reverend Canon, which is unlikely, layman as I am.

R. You really do believe, then, in a common ground of truth, Mason—I would not be uncomplimentary to a layman in theology. Yes, I felt sure you did. But then I also felt sure of the same in the late Canon, until he told me that he believed in bias, that he would not ignore his own prepossessions, could not therefore “pose as external to a subject on which he had interior convictions”—*exterior* convictions are something else!—could not therefore do anything “like trying to take himself out of himself.” He forgot that he himself was something of a poet. Ah, yes! he did just then “pose as external to” poetry. I am afraid he is self-condemned in “pretending not to be what he was”—a poet.

M. Yes. Don't you think on the whole it must be another Canon Bright? “Affectation or unreality is untruth.”

R. However, Mason, you and I can perhaps for a while “take ourselves out of ourselves” without “posing” in a too theatrical manner in this study, enough to examine the Canon's remarks on Montanism. And he really has some good remarks presently. “We need to be reminded,” he says, “of Newman's homely plainness of speech, ‘it is not honest to distort history.’ . . . We must not ‘let reverence for any man cause us to err’ . . .” But let me read you some of his longer remarks on Montanism. He says: “Now it is quite true that prophesying had been current, not only in the Apostolic age, but to some extent in the Sub-Apostolic period, or even later, and that the more fervid Christians were still wont to believe in revelations by vision.” I call that a great concession, don't you?

M. Yes. *Cela donne furieusement à penser*. It makes me think what is meant by “the more fervid Christians.”

R. Does it mean, think you, “opposed to the lukewarm” of whom John the Elder says that Christ says: “I will spit thee out of my mouth” (Rev. iii. 16)? If so, it is accurate,

for that writer was a Prophet, a brother of "his brethren the Prophets" (Rev. xxii. 9), and thus was one of those same more fervid Christians, and my point is that the Montanists were his direct successors.

M. Quite so; your argument is one that will take a good deal of answering. But I fear the Canon implied something less complimentary to the Montanists when he said "more fervid Christians." More *fervent* would have been kinder than *fervid*, which is not at all kind; at least it strikes me so.

R. You will note that not a word is said by the Canon concerning ecstasy or trance, and yet that is what the term "revelations by vision" conceals. It may be there is something antipathetic to the British mind in "ecstasy." Perhaps it sounds feminine, or extravagant, or "gushing." Theologians are afraid of it for fear the laity might dislike it, or for other reasons. Nevertheless the thing must be faced and the term must be used. Ecstasy is a Scriptural term, and it was once applied to Jesus by some who knew Him (Mark iii. 21). Here then is the concession that some Christians from 30 A.D. to 130 were wont to believe in revelations by ecstasy.

M. What then are the objections to the Montanists? They seem to have been really on the conservative side, as you observed before—to have been old-fashioned.

R. Well, listen while I give you Canon Bright's account: "It was not prophesying as such, nor visions as such, which finally led the bishops of Asia to pronounce against Montanus and his two female companions, Maximilla and Priscilla. It was the application of the idea in what was called a 'false kind of ecstasy,' in prophesyings claiming to 'develop' the disciplinary and practical teaching of the apostles into an indefinite series of rules austere and rigoristic, which alarmed and shocked the churchly mind."

M. I take that sentence to mean that there were two

objections felt to Montanists : first, they practised “ false ecstasy ” ; secondly, they made new rules of austere living, for which they claimed apostolic authority.

R. You have correctly divided the subject, and you agree with the Canon’s division. But we have already discussed the first charge of “ false ecstasy ” (EXPOSITOR, December, 1902), and have seen that it might easily rest upon exaggeration. We should like to hear the other side, if not from Montanus, which is impossible, at least from Tertullian, who maintained it, without a doubt, in his six or seven books on “ Ecstasy.” If you try to examine what “ the churchly mind ” thought of false ecstasy, and had to say of it, you will find, unfortunately, little. We find it recorded (Eusebius, *Church History*, v. 16) “ that the spirit, speaking through Maximilla, said : ‘ I am chased as a wolf from the sheep ; I am not a wolf ; I am word (*ῥῆμα*) and spirit and power.’ ” Now, what does this amount to ?

M. We have, I remember, the term “ wolf ” applied to a false prophet by St. Paul in a well known passage (Acts xx. 29). And the comparison to a wolf is in St. John (x. 12).

R. Quite so. Some one of the churchly mind had accused Maximilla of being a false prophetess, and excommunicated her or threatened to do so, and she repelled the charge as false. Her denial was put down as the utterance of the false and lying spirit within her. Indeed, as among persons who agreed in believing that they all had a spirit within them, it is not surprising that a prophetess should say the words given above partly in her own character, partly in that of the possessing spirit. There is nothing in the words, as actually uttered and heard, to show that she deserved excommunication. “ But,” says Canon Bright, “ the false ecstasy implied a suspension of intelligent consciousness, and this was a mark, not of Biblical prophecy in its normal condition, but of the *mantiké* of the old

world." Here it must be confessed by both sides, his and ours, that we enter on very difficult ground. But it may be observed that "a suspension of intelligent consciousness" is something very much like St. Peter's condition when he was in an ecstasy at the Transfiguration.

M. Do you really think that he was in an ecstasy then?

R. I do, certainly, and am convinced that he was. It is the simplest explanation of the data which nobody has ever explained in any more satisfactory manner, and it is the oldest Christian explanation, given by Tertullian. However, you remember the words in Luke ix. 33, "*not knowing what he said?*" It would be safer on the whole to suppose that there were degrees of suspension of consciousness, and it may well be that the Montanist Prophets often became unduly excited, and their intelligent consciousness unduly suspended. I would not defend all their actions and sayings, in spite of the bias and prepossession of the Canon. I think it is most probable that they were betrayed into extravagances of prophecy. Still we can try to do them justice. And when it comes to comparing them with the *mantiké* of the old world, and saying "there was a heathenish twang about their utterances in the way in which they were uttered," this we may dispute, for there is not a scrap of evidence to show that the bishops of Asia thought of any such comparison, or accused the Montanists of being mantically inclined. We know that the most famous *mantiké*, the oracular prophecy of Delphi, was usually exceedingly intelligent, and even if the priestess was popularly supposed to suspend consciousness, that did not prevent the Christian fathers of the fourth century from believing in the genuineness of some communications of the oracles, which swarmed in the century following the Emperor Hadrian, 138 A.D. Indeed they were anxious to induce the oracles to acknowledge the Divinity of Christ.

M. Some of the oracles are among the best reading in

Greek literature, as the late Frederic Myers has shown in his brilliant essay on them.

R. The Canon goes on to make an amazing statement that the Montanists "claimed to supplement the apostolic teaching on matters of order and conduct, so that requirements, largely dictated by excitable women, might be pressed on the Christian conscience as equally sacred with the precepts of St. Paul." What does that amount to?

M. I should say it amounted to a condemnation of the Church order which the Canon himself upheld, and in which he "claimed to supplement the apostolic teaching on matters of order," since the obedience of a bishop to an archbishop, and of a priest to an archdeacon, and scores of other requirements are not to be found in Scripture. They could not be. Some slight measure of supplement of teaching must be allowed, or no church body could exist in these days.

R. No, indeed, though the supplement may be reasonable and inoffensive enough. Very likely he means nothing more than "application" of the general to the particular. But where, I wonder, does the Canon find that the Montanists pressed their requirements on the Christian conscience as equally sacred with the precepts of St. Paul? He also says these requirements were largely dictated by excitable women. Are not men also excitable? Were not the bishops at Nicaea and Ephesus excitable? "Dictated" is a question-begging term, and very ambiguous. There is nothing to show that the women were actuated by a dictatorial temper, or that they were anything but honest in believing that they were true Prophetesses inspired by the Holy Spirit. As to their actual utterances we know next to nothing; but if we are to use the writings of Tertullian to supplement our scanty evidence about the "excitable women" who lived two generations before him, and as far away from him as Central Asia Minor is from Carthage, and

who spoke in Greek while he wrote in Latin, then we shall look in Tertullian to see whether he, on his part, pressed these requirements on the Christian conscience as equally sacred with the precepts of St. Paul. And we shall find that he does the exact opposite, that he can hardly write a page without referring to the authority of St. Paul. The Pauline Epistles and the rest of the New Testament and the Old are his never-failing standard. He never dreamed of laying down anything that was not properly based upon Holy Scripture. He protests against a charge of vacillation being brought against "Paul the Apostle of Christ, the teacher of the Gentiles in the faith and the truth, the vessel of election, the founder of the Churches, *their censor in matters of discipline.*" Again, he calls "Paul the immovable pillar of matters of discipline" (Tertullian on *Modesty*, 14, 16). And he labours with great pains to arrive at his actual meaning as an authority. It is then a mere travesty of the great Montanist to say that *he* "claimed to supplement the apostolic teaching, so that requirements, largely dictated by excitable women, might be pressed on the Christian conscience as equally sacred with the precepts of St. Paul."

M. Yes, you are right. The Canon is biased against Montanism; but as he said at the outset, in self-defence I suppose, "a bias of some kind is unavoidable." He must have known what was to follow his own preface.

R. Excuse me one moment, Mason. I am now just looking to see how many times Tertullian, the Montanist, refers to Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla in the course of his works. I am looking in the Index to Oehler's edition. I think you will be surprised when I tell you how many times he mentions them in the 1,700 pages of his writings. Just twice! And yet that editor's Indices are so complete as to fill 163 pages.

M. It is quite plain that Montanus and the Prophetesses did not subtend a very large angle in Tertullian's mind.

R. Now we come at last to the third objection, "which finally led the Bishop of Asia to pronounce against Montanus."—Remember, the works of Tertullian have been treated by the assailants as an armoury for the attack on Montanism; and yet this involves the great assumption that Tertullian was a true follower of Montanus. This is the third attack. "The rules put forth (by the Montanists) were all in the direction of severity; more and longer fasts to be observed, second marriages absolutely forbidden, self-surrender during persecution made a duty, absolution to be impossible after certain heinous sins." (Bright, *Waymarks*, p. 42, referring to Tertullian's Montanist books.) Now we may suppose the bishops in Asia knew as much about the question as Canon Bright. They did not know what Tertullian was going to write two generations or more later. Would you believe that just the opposite of severity was charged against the Phrygian Montanists by the "Church writer" Apollonius (in Asia Minor about 185 A.D.), who says that Montanus "taught dissolutions of marriage-ties"? This is a charge of laxity, not of severity—we are dealing only with the charge, not with the truth of it, which is beyond our data to ascertain. Again, then, you will note the contradiction. Then, as to fasting. It is obvious that fasting is recognized in the New Testament, fasting rather too diverse to be included in any one formula. What Tertullian says is this: "How very little interference with eating there is with us! Two weeks of fasting in the year, and those not entire weeks."

M. How would that suit the modern Church discipline in some quarters? The moderns want more than two weeks' fasting in the year. Tertullian was moderate.

R. However, we may admit that Apollonius does charge Montanus with having "laid down the law of fastings," as if he were a *lawgiver*, a *Nomothetês* like Moses; but here again we have the orthodox impaling themselves upon

the horns of a dilemma just as awkward as that of the Montanists. For if we admit Tertullian as a witness, we find him quoting the gospel text (Luke xvi. 16), that the law and the Prophets were until John, and it is urged that he pushed the meaning of this text too far, in that he took it as a basis for the "New Prophecy," as the Montanist dispensation of the Spirit was called. But what reason is there in saying in one breath that Montanism emulated Moses as the *Legislator* of fasting in accordance with the Old Testament, and that Montanism superseded the New Testament, and, much more, left the Old Testament behind? This does not look like consistency in the assailants of Montanism.

M. I suppose you are satisfied that the fault of inconsistency did not rest with Montanism first, and so provoked the equally inconsistent attack?

R. On the contrary, I am not concerned—let me repeat—to defend Montanism in all points. It is quite possible that it may have been inconsistent and somewhat irregular. Nevertheless, that would not prevent it from being the direct successor of the Apostles on their prophetic side, and the evidence goes to show that it was the direct successor of that older school which the three Synoptists represent, while the tradition of the Fourth Gospel is that which the orthodox champion, Claudius Apollinaris, drove like a wedge into the heart of Asia Minor, where it finally came to prevail over Montanism. However, we have not yet finished with the reasons which Canon Bright assigned as having led the bishops of Asia to pronounce against Montanism. As to the prohibition of a second marriage Tertullian had much to say, as also about Flight in Persecution, and about Restoration (not Absolution) after heinous sin. He had many scriptures to quote on his side of each of those three questions. But it would detain us long to discuss them now. Yet I must say that he is unique

among the Fathers for the freshness and energy and life that he puts into all his handling of scripture. Though Origen rivals him in some respects, having the advantage of writing in Greek, it does one good to read him. It appears, however, when we turn to the bishops of Asia Minor, that so far from complaining that Montanists were unduly severe in regard to flight in persecution, so far from saying that they were greedy of martyrdom, Bishop Claudius Apollinaris taunts them by asking, "Let them answer us before God: Is there one of these who began their talking from the time of Montanus and the women, who was persecuted by the Jews or was put to death by the heathen?"

M. I see the discrepancy between the Montanism as represented at 150 A.D., and as represented at 200 A.D. Are we then to infer that times had changed between the Asiatic Montanists and Tertullian, so that what was true of the former was not true of the latter witness, and that Montanists were more ready in Tertullian's time to die in martyrdom than they had been two generations earlier?

R. It must be uncertain. Persecution had increased in the interval. But whatever Tertullian's orthodox opponents cast in his teeth, the Asiatic bishops were far from using the taunt of undue severity against the Montanists of their time and place, and undue severity was not a ground of condemnation with them.

M. I have heard the Montanists called "The Puritans of the early Church."

R. Yes, and you will judge of the accuracy of that sweeping statement by the remarks of Apollonius on the dice-playing and the face-painting, which I will give you presently. Now we come to a fourth charge. "The erection of a small Phrygian town into a New Jerusalem, a centre of Montanist religious life, would be felt to savour of Judaical localism." The Canon is right here. This is one of the charges of Apollonius, who mentions two towns,

Pepuza and Tymium. But does this suffice to make Montanism a heresy? It was not a shocking offence. These small towns were not to be rivals to the destroyed Jerusalem, however their importance was exaggerated by Montanus. Not even the Canon will venture to say that Tertullian, for instance, thought of them as his Mecca.

M. No. It is also easy to imagine how the Montanists would sometimes, like other people, use the florid language of hymns and be misunderstood by their opponents in doing so. If these towns were the head-quarters of the Montanist army and seemed to be "cities of refuge" or "holy cities"—and well they might be pardoned for so regarding them—it would be a very small matter in itself, I agree.

R. Yes. But now we come to the last of the grounds. "Fifthly, an arrogant, self-righteous temper was developed, expressing itself in scorn for the historic Church and its ministry, to which were applied, as freely as by Gnostics, such terms as 'unspiritual' or 'carnal.' Against it was set up a new church, calling itself 'spiritual,' professing to be alone faithful to the inspirations of the Paraklete, and speaking, not through any appointed order, not through a 'mere number of bishops,' but through individuals pronounced to be 'spiritual' men. . . . The Montanist conception of the Church and its life was in effect revolutionary, clean contrary to that which appears, not only in Irenæus and in the sub-apostolic Fathers, but most pointedly in the Epistles of St. Paul." Here the Canon has waxed very bold in his statements. "A mere number of bishops," is, of course, a well known saying of Tertullian's. But, unfortunately, he is very wide of the mark. He has not said what he ought to have said, and he has said what he ought not to have said.

M. What ought he to have said?

R. That one consideration which weighed with the Asiatic bishops was the supposed financial malversation of Mon-

tanus and his followers. First the Anti-montanist writer (Claudius Apollinaris is he) comments on the shocking death of their "first steward or something like a steward"—apparently a financial officer. Then Apollonius taunts Montanus with "having appointed exactors of money, and devising a corrupt system under the name of 'offertories,' and providing salaries for his preachers of the word, in order that the teaching of the word may be fortified by means of gluttony." Indeed the greater part of Apollonius's polemic is directed against a prophet receiving gifts and money. He denounces one Themison who "wrapped himself in covetousness as with a cloak" and "bought off his imprisonment with money." He challenges "the prophetess to tell us about one Alexander" and his "robberies." "We will show," he says, "that these so-called prophets and martyrs are making small gains out of the poor, the orphan, and the widow, as well as the rich." "Alexander has been judged before the proconsul at Ephesus for his robberies." "Does a prophet dye his hair, paint his eyebrows, and play dice?" This is the charge of Apollonius, an Asiatic writer, if not a bishop, in denouncing Montanism. (Eusebius, v. 18.)

M. To judge by the charges of the assailants, I should say there was not much that resembled Tertullian's Montanism in the Montanism which Apollonius attacked. Or had Montanism improved as it grew older, and given up painting its face and playing with dice?

R. No, indeed. You may infer, on the other hand, that the Church was quite ready to launch two charges mutually inconsistent in character within a limited time—for we cannot exactly determine Apollonius's date: he was, however, contemporary with Tertullian—against Montanism. If both kinds of charges were true—that of dice-playing and that of undue severity—then Montanism was an impossible combination, an idol of clay and iron, that was not worth the powder and shot of any attack whatever. Why did

Canon Bright not once mention the charges which Eusebius quotes from Apollonius and his preceding Anti-montanist, when Canon Bright himself knew Eusebius so well, and is his editor?

M. I wonder why. He must have known them very well.

R. An omission of the first water. I leave you to answer the question. You will answer it, please, without imputing motives—if you can.

M. If I can! Well, now tell me what the Canon ought not to have said.

R. Yes, things are apt to escape even the most biassed and prepossessed theologian. But you will note here, *à propos* of the Montanists being “the Puritans of the early Church”—and I often wish myself more of a Puritan than I am—will you note that if Puritanism is a misnomer as applied to the Montanists, as it must be unless the Anti-montanist Apollonius wrote a tissue of falsehoods, then the characteristic feature of Montanism is not its severity of morals, which Canon Bright passed so lightly over, nor is it anything of an ethical nature at all? It must be sought elsewhere. And where can we seek and find it except in the strong prophetic character which marks its operation whether in Asia in the time of Claudius Apollinaris and Miltiades and, rather later, Apollonius, or as regards the theory of ecstasy in the time of Tertullian in Asia?

M. I see your contention is that Montanism is stamped with the mark of prophecy, not with the mark of “Puritanism.” Current opinion has clung, with a tenacity worthy of a better cause, to Puritanism as “the enemy”—doubtless it long has been so in the University of Laud—but you make out a strong case for prophecy being the mark of Montanism; held, of course, to be false prophecy, but, whether false or true, held to be a reason for condemning Montanism and so effecting its extinction. I quite

agree with your view. Now, will you kindly tell me, before we part, what you consider the Canon ought not to have said?

R. He manifestly ought not to have said that the Asiatic bishops condemned Montanism for assuming the term "spiritual" and calling the church party "carnal," when there is not a sign or a trace of Montanists doing any such thing till we come to the later writings of Tertullian, two full generations later. Observe that the Anti-montanist Apollonius is taunting the Montanists with carnal living, while Canon Bright is charging them with undue severity and with scorning the historic church as "carnal."

M. Which was right?

R. I am afraid we must say the Canon was wrong. He certainly was wrong if Apollonius was right; and if Apollonius was wrong, it was the duty of the historian of the English Church and editor of Eusebius to point out where he is wrong, and to clear away the historical difficulty, if any. This he has not done. He has utterly confused two separate periods, attributing to the earlier what belonged to the later. He has shown a defect of historical accuracy, a lack of historical imagination, and an utter want of historical criticism in dealing with these Anti-montanist charges and allegations.

M. I think you began by reading me the Canon's own words: "A bias of some kind is unavoidable. We cannot ignore our own prepossessions." That is how he began, and this is how he ends! As only a layman, I cannot wonder. He thinks the Montanist conception of the Church was revolutionary as shown in Tertullian, and he asserts the earlier Montanists were the same, and *therefore* the Asiatic bishops condemned them, when there is no trace, I understand you to say, that they had any conception of the Church at all except the traditional one of maintaining the practices of the Prophets. So that the most conservative

body of Christians then existing is by him dubbed revolutionary.

R. Exactly. That is my point. That is how Church History is written!

M. By an eminent Anglican divine! Then, Riddell, it wants overhauling.

R. It wants a new bottom, Mason—the Christian Prophets; a new bias, or rather balance—that of Truth; but though the crew is ever slowly changing, I find comfort in knowing that our Pilot remains the same, as faithful as He is sure. And we can trust Him still.

E. C. SELWYN.

*STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY
OF JERUSALEM.*

IV.

THE PRELUDE.

THE histories of many of the famous cities of the world run back into legendary tales of their origins: the selection of a site by some wandering hero surprised into the intuition of advantages which it takes centuries of fame to prove; a sacrifice and the descent of favourable omens; or a miracle; or the apparition of a deity. It is the fate of the most sacred city of all to be destitute of such memories. Her name, as we have seen, betrays no certain sign of a belief in her divine foundation.¹ There is no story of the choice of her site by the first men who dwelt, or worshipped upon it. And (if we leave aside in the meantime the ambiguous narrative in Genesis xiv.) the earliest notices of Jerusalem present her entering history with a plain, unromantic air, singularly in keeping with that absence of

¹ EXPOSITOR for February, 1903. Yet see farther on in this article.

mystery which we have noted in her atmosphere and grey surroundings.¹ About 1400 B.C., four centuries before her fame began, we have from Jerusalem herself, though discovered among the archives of the Egyptian court, a small number of clay tablets, eight in all; which describe with plaintive truthfulness and no touch of the ideal her primitive conditions. They invoke no deity, they assert no confidence either material or spiritual. They speak only of her loneliness and her dependence, her abandonment to an approaching foe, and her disappointment in her protectors. Yet, even so, these tablets are as symbolic as any legend or prophecy could have been. Their tone is in unison with the dominant notes of the long tragedy to which they form the prelude. They express that sense of forsakenness and of vanishing hope in the powers of this world which haunts Jerusalem to the very end.

Nor is it less typical of the course of her history that the Tablets should reveal Jerusalem as already under the influence of the two great civilisations, which, between them, shaped the fortunes and coloured the character of her ancient people. The Tablets are written in the cuneiform script, and in the language, of Babylonia: a proof that the influences of that most ancient seat of human culture already lay strong across Western Asia. The politics, which the Tablets reveal, have their centre at the other side of the world, with Babylonia's age-long rival. Jerusalem is a tributary and outpost of Egypt; and Egypt is betrayed to us in that same attitude of helplessness towards her Asian vassals which is characteristic of her throughout history. As in the days of Isaiah she is *Rahab that sitteth still*; promising much, but when the crisis comes inactive and unwilling to fulfil her pledges.² As in the days of Jeremiah, the expected *King of Egypt cometh not any more*

¹ EXPOSITOR for January, 1903, p. 16.

² Isaiah xxx. 7.

out of his land,¹ and Jerusalem is left alone to meet the foe from the north. Other instances might be found. When Antiochus Epiphanes took Jerusalem in 169 B.C., and desecrated the Temple, Judæa was a vassal of the Ptolemy of the time, but he did not stir to her help. Down to the retreat of Ibrahim Pasha in 1841, Egypt, whether because of the intervening desert or the fitful prowess of her people, has been unable, for any long period, to detach Palestine from Asia and bind her to the southern continent.

Soon after 1600 B.C. Egypt, under the Eighteenth Dynasty, began a series of campaigns in Syria, which carried her arms (on one occasion at least) to the Euphrates, and reduced the states of Palestine for four centuries to more or less regular dependence upon her. No fewer than fourteen of these campaigns were undertaken by Thutmosis III. *circa* 1500 B.C. He defeated, at Megiddo, a powerful Canaanite confederacy, but left to his successors, Amenhotep II. and Thutmosis IV., the reduction of some separate tribes. So far as we know, the next Pharaoh, Amenhotep (Amenophis) IV., enjoyed without interruption the obedience of his Asian vassals. By his only possible rivals, the kings of Mesopotamia and Babylonia, he was recognised as sovereign of Syria, and his influence extended as far north as Armenia. His vast Empire; his lavish building throughout Egypt and Nubia; his magnificent temples at Thebes; his mines and organisation of trade; his wealth; along with the art and luxury which prevailed under all the monarchs of his dynasty, and their influence on the Greek world,—represent the zenith of Egyptian civilisation. Whether, in his security and the zeal with which he gave himself to the improvement of his own land, Amenhotep III. neglected the Asian provinces of his empire is uncertain. But in any case he was succeeded by a son whose interests in Egypt were still more

¹ 2 Kings xxv. 7.

engrossing, and who for this or other reasons was unable to preserve the conquests of his predecessors. Amenhotep IV. was that singular monarch who effected a temporary but thorough revolution in the religion and art of Egypt. Turning his back upon Amen and the other ancient gods, he spent his reign in the establishment of the exclusive worship of Aten, the Sun's Disk, and in the construction of a centre for this and a capital for himself. He introduced styles of art as novel as his religious opinions; free and natural, but without other proofs of ability. Absorbed in these pursuits Amenhotep IV. was the last kind of monarch to meet, or even to heed, the new movements in Asia which threatened his empire. Across the Euphrates there lay three considerable kingdoms: Babylonia, then under a Kassite dynasty; Assyria, her young vassal, but already strong enough to strike for independence; and Mitanni, a state of Hittite origin in Northern Mesopotamia. It was not, however, from these, divided and jealous of each other, that danger had to be feared by Egypt. From Asia Minor, the main branch of the Hittite race, the Kheta or Khatti were pushing south-east, alike upon their kinsfolk of Mitanni, and upon the Egyptian tributaries in Northern Syria.

It is beneath this noontide, and approaching eclipse, of Egypt's glory that Jerusalem emerges into history. The correspondence, of which her eight clay tablets form a small portion, was discovered at Tell el Amarna, in Middle Egypt, the site of the capital of Amenhotep IV. It was conducted between his father and himself on the one side and the Trans-Euphrates Kingdoms, and the Syrian feudatories of Egypt on the other.¹ We see through it, passing over

¹ The tablets of Tell el Amarna are now in Berlin and London. The following facts, recorded in them, are taken from H. Winckler's transliteration and translation in *Die Thontafeln von Tell el Amarna*: Berlin, 1896. In the following references B., followed by a figure, signifies the Berlin collection; L. the London collection; and W. Winckler's re-arrangement and numbering

Palestine a close and frequent communication between the Nile and the Euphrates.

The human interest of these Letters is intense: kings at peace, but in jealous watch of one another, their real tempers glowing through a surface of hypocrisy. They marry and give in marriage; they complain that they cannot get evidence whether their daughters or sisters sent abroad for this purpose are alive or well treated; they appeal to the women of the courts which they seek to influence. Above all they are greedy of gold, of which Egypt was then the source; one complains that a present of gold-ore, when it arrives, yields less than the promised value, another that wooden images have been sent instead of golden. One even grumbles that his royal brother has not inquired for him when he was ill.¹ There is some humour and appreciation of humour; much cunning, and once (if the interpretation be correct) a frank proposal of villainy.² Between these very human courts and their countries there moves a constant commerce: "Write me what thou desirest from my land, they will bring it thee, and what I desire from thy land, I will write thee, that they may bring it."³ For the Egyptian gold and oil, the states of the Euphrates send manufactured gold, precious stones, enamel, chariots, horses and slaves. These are not all royal presents. A

of the letters. Knudtzon, in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, iv. pp. 101 ff., 279 ff., gives some revision of the Tablets, and the correction of earlier readings and translations. An account of the substance of the Tablets is given by C. Niebuhr, in *Die Tell Amarna Zeit* in the 2nd Heft of vol. i. of *Der Alte Orient*, and by Wallis Budge in the last chapter of vol. ii. of his *History of Egypt*. See also Winckler, pp. 192-201 of 3rd ed. of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*.

¹ B. 7: W. 10.

² B. 9: W. 15: "Why should the ambassadors not remain on the journey, so that they die in foreign parts? If they remain in foreign parts, the estate belongs to the king. Therefore when he (thy present ambassador) remains on his journey and dies, then will the estate belong to the king. There is therefore no [reason why we should fear] that the ambassadors die in foreign parts, whom we send . . . the ambassadors . . . and . . . and die in foreign parts."

³ B. 1: W. 6.

Mesopotamian king complains that his merchants have been robbed in Canaan, Pharaoh's territory. Caravans cross Palestine or pass from it into Egypt. Phœnician ships, not without danger from Lycian corsairs, bring to Egypt copper, bronze, ivory, ships' furniture, and horses from Alashia, either Cyprus or Northern Syria; and take back silver, oil and oxen.¹ One letter begs the king of Egypt not to allow the writer's merchants to be wronged by his tax-gatherers.²

Such are a few of the many details, so many, and so intimate that it may be truly said that before the Roman Empire, there is no period for which we have records so replete with the details of social life or with revelations of personal character and policy. All is vivid, human, frank. Of this busy passionate life, in 1400 B.C., Jerusalem was a part, lying not far from one of its main arteries.

The letters from the chiefs of Palestine, among whom the ruler of Jerusalem was one, reveal the duties that Egypt require of her feudatories, the awe in which they hold her power, the dangers that threaten them through her inaction, and all the intrigue and duplicity arising from so ambiguous a situation. The writers have Semitic names; that is, they are native Canaanites or Amorites. They profess themselves slaves of Egypt, and address the Pharaoh with fulsome flattery. They prostrate themselves before him—seven and seven times. He is their lord, their king, their gods and their sun.³ They are his slaves, and the slaves of his horse.⁴ They hold their hereditary domains by his gift.⁵ They send tribute,⁶ and are obliged to certain services, such as provisioning the royal troops who march through the land,⁷ and maintaining royal garrisons.⁸ They guard the posts entrusted to them by the

¹ L. 5-7 and B. 11-15; W. 25-33. ² B. 12; W. 29.

³ A frequent formula. ⁴ B. 118-122; W. 210-213.

⁵ Frequent. ⁶ E. G. L. 67; W. 198.

⁷ L. 52, 54; W. 207, 209; B. 114; W. 194.

⁸ B. 113, 121; W. 193, 212; L. 52, 53; W. 207, 208.

king, and the king's chariots; but also the gods of the king.¹ In return they expect to be protected by Egypt, and to receive supplies.² One of the chiefs, Iapitiri of Gaza, says that in his youth he has been taken to Egypt.³ In short the position of these feudatories of Pharaoh is analogous to that now occupied by the semi-independent rajahs of India under the British Government. And just as the latter places, at the courts of the rajahs, political agents with great powers, so Egypt had at that date in Palestine her own officials, who went from place to place as advisers and superintendents of the feudatories.⁴

Dushratta, king of Mitanni, had written to Amenhotep III. of the pressure of the Hittites on his kingdom.⁵ Correspondents of the Egyptian court in Northern Syria give warnings of the same danger. But these and the chiefs in Palestine intimate other foes. "The power of the Khabiri⁶ is great in the land," advancing from the north; and with the Khabiri are sometimes named the Suti.⁷ These enemies are not without allies among the Canaanite chiefs. A certain Lapaya of Megiddo and his sons are chiefly accused by those Egyptian vassals who remain or pretend to remain loyal.⁸ Biridiya of Makida writes that since the royal troops were withdrawn the sons of Lapaya have so closely watched his town, that his people cannot get vegetables or go outside the gates.⁹ But indeed no man is sure of his

¹ B. 122 : W. 213.

² Frequent.

³ L. 237 : W. 214.

⁴ Paḥannuta, Shūta, Paḥura and Iankhamn are named. A title for these officials is *rabīš*.

⁵ L. 9 : W. 16.

⁶ B. 113 : W. 113 : L. 49 ; W. 204, etc. etc. An unknown people, identified by some (as is well known) with the Hebrews ; cf. Niebulr, *Die Amarna-Zeit*, 23f. They were Semitic immigrants into the land and belonged to the same movement as, or more probably to an earlier movement than, that which brought Israel there: "tribes," says Winckler (*Keilinschr. v. das A. T.*,³ p. 198), "represented as in the process of immigration and invasion of civilised territory, the same rôle taken up later by the Israelites."

⁷ L. 51, 74 : W. 206, 216.

⁸ B. 111, 115 : W. 192, 195 ; L. 72 : W. 196, etc.

⁹ B. 115 : W. 185.

neighbour. The letters of the vassals are full of accusations of each other, and excuses for the writers. Iapahi of Gezer says that his younger brother has revolted from him to the Khabiri,¹ and Tagi writes that he would have sent his brother to the King, but he is full of wounds.² Some, perhaps all, must be telling lies.

Among these chiefs of Southern Palestine who thus accuse each other is Abd-Khiba, the writer of the eight Jerusalem letters. In Letter I.³ he defends himself against some one who has been accusing him as a rebel (lines 5-8).⁴ Yet it was neither his father nor his mother who set him in this place, but the strong arm of the king⁵ which introduced him to the territory of his father [bit (amilu) abi-ia] (9-13). Why then should he rebel against the king (14 f.)? By the life of the king he is slandered; because he had said to the king's official [rabiṣ sharri], "Why do you favour the Khabiri and injure the tributary princes [khazianutu]?"⁶ and, "The king's territory is being ruined" (14-24). The king knows that he had placed a garrison⁷ in Jerusalem but Iankhumu (the king's deputy or general) has removed it (25-23). Let the king take thought and trouble for his land, else his whole territory will disappear, the king's towns under Ili-milku having already revolted (34-38). Abd-Khiba would come to court, but he dare not unless the king send a garrison (39-47). He will continue his warnings, for without royal troops the king's territories will be wasted by the Khabiri (48-60). The letter concludes with a message to the king's secretary to impress the contents on him.

Letter II.⁸ describes the dangers to the king's territories

¹ L. 50: W. 205.

² L. 70: W. 189.

³ B. 102: W. 179.

⁴ The accuser appears to have been a neighbouring chief Shuwardata.

⁵ See above, EXPOSITOR for February.

⁶ Lehnshfürsten: Winckler; heads of the tribes of the country: Budge.

⁷ Besatzung: Winckler; Outpost: Budge.

⁸ B. 103: W. 180.

as increased—all towns have conspired against Abd-Khiba, Gezer, Askalon and Lakish have given the enemy provisions (4–24)—and repeats the assurance that Abd-Khiba holds Jerusalem [Urusalim] solely by the king's gift (25–28). Another chief has yielded his land to the Khabiri (29–31). Abd-Khiba is innocent in the affair of the Kashi, who are themselves to blame by their violence (32–44). They appear to have been the Egyptian garrison in Jerusalem, and were perhaps Kushites or Ethiopians. Paura the Egyptian official came to Jerusalem when Adaya, along with the garrison, revolted, and said to Abd-Khiba, “Adaya has revolted: hold the town.” So the king must send a garrison (45–53). The king's caravan has been robbed in the territory¹ of Ajalon. Abd-Khiba could not send the king's caravans on to the king (54–59). The king has set his name on Jerusalem for ever, he cannot surrender its territory (60–63). The postscript to the secretary of the king says that the Kashi remain in Abd-Khiba's territory.

In Letter III.² Abd-Khiba, after again repudiating the slander against him (7–8), describes himself as no prince [khazianu] but an *u-i-wa*³ of the king, and an officer who brings tribute, holding his territory not from father or mother, but by the king's gift (9–15). He has sent the king slaves, male and female (16–22). Let the king care for his land, it is all hostile as far as Ginti-Karmil (22–39). Some chiefs, presumably loyal, have been slain (40–45). If the king cannot send troops, let him fetch away Abd-Khiba and his clansmen that they may die before the king (47–60).

Letter IV.⁴ is broken: fragments report chiefs as fallen away from the king, and beg for troops. Letter V.⁵

¹ Shati-i; W. compares Heb. שָׂדֵי.

² B. 104: W. 181.

³ Uwü: Niebuhr; stabsofficier.

⁴ B. 105: W. 182.

⁵ B. 106: W. 183.

repeats the loss of the king's land to the Khabiri, among other towns Bit-Ninib in the territory of Jerusalem (5-17), and asks for troops (18-28). Letter VI.¹ repeats former assurances of Abd-Khiba's submission and complains that the king has not sent to him. Letter VII.,² two-thirds of which are wanting, after telling the same tale of disasters to the Egyptian power, and the wish of Abd-Khiba to repair them (1-16), adds that the garrison which the king sent by Khaya has been taken by Adda Mikhir into his territory of Gaza (17-20). Letter VIII.³ deals with two of the rebels Melk-ili and his father-in-law Tagi.⁴ All of these tablets have the usual introduction, in which Abd-Khiba does homage to the king.

The name Abd-Khiba, to which we may first turn our attention, is obviously Semitic;⁵ and theophorous: *slave or worshipper of Khiba*. The formation is very common in Phœnician with the names of many deities and in Arabic. In the Old Testament we have Obed-Edom the Gittite, Ebed-Melik, Abed-nego, Obadiyah, and Abdēēl. The name of a deity Khiba does not elsewhere occur; but the root ḥabab (Hebrew) or khaba (Arabic, and Assyrian),⁶ *to hide, or hide oneself*, is not unsuitable to a divine title. The suggestion has been made that Khiba disguises an original Jahu, that is a form of Ihvh, the consonants of the name of the God of Israel. But in the two cases the radical *h* is not the same; and it has not been proved (although suggested) that a possible link between the two forms, viz. Iba in certain compound names, is a corruption of Jahu.⁷ It would indeed be a marvellous discovery if Abd-Khiba, this early

¹ B. 174: W. 184.

² B. 199: W. 185.

³ B. 149: W. 186.

⁴ The territory of these chiefs appears to have been on what was afterwards the Philistine Plain near Gath.

⁵ Sayce gives it as Ebed-Tob, but other Assyriologists as Abd-Khiba or (in another system of transliteration) as Abd-ḥiba.

⁶ Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch*, 265 f.

⁷ See Johns (following Jensen) *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*, iii. p. xvi.

king of Jerusalem, was really an Obadiah, but the hypothesis is purely imaginative.¹

Before proceeding to describe Abd-Khiba's political position we may continue the religious question to which his name gives rise. That the princes of Palestine at this time had native gods is proved by their theophorous names—Milki-el and the like. Their silence about these is to be explained by the fact that the king to whom their letters are addressed not only belongs to a different race, but was himself conceived as an incarnation of the deity. Hence the fulsomeness of the terms in which they write to him: "their sun, their gods." The only gods the Syrian chiefs mention are the gods of Egypt. We have seen that one chief calls himself the guardian of these gods.² This phrase is perhaps explained by a stele of Sety I. discovered at Tell esh Shiḥab by the present writer in 1901. It is a large basalt slab representing the king of Egypt in the act of making offerings to Amen and Mut. In a manuscript communication the eminent Egyptologist W. Max Müller says that the style of this monument proves it to be no mere Syrian imitation of Egyptian religious art; but the work of Egyptian artists. Probably similar representations of their gods were set up by Egyptian conquerors in other towns of Palestine. As Sety's is in basalt, the rock of the district in which Tell esh Shiḥab lies, those in southern Palestine would be in limestone; the reason of our failure to discover them there. Abd-Khiba bases one of his appeals to Amenhotep IV. not to desert Jerusalem on the fact that "the king has set his name on Jerusalem for ever."³ With some probability Winckler argues that this means that Amenhotep IV. had set up the worship of Aten, of whom he conceived himself to be the incarnation, within Jerusalem. If this is correct, some monument was placed

¹ See Zimmern in *Keilinschr. u. das A.T.*³ p. 467.

² B. 122 : W. 213.

³ B. 103 : W. 180, line 61.

there analogous to that of Sety I. in Tell esh Shiḥab. Further, there was in the territory of Jerusalem a town, Bet Ninib, that is the sanctuary of the Babylonian deity Ninib. The attempt to identify this town with Jerusalem has not been successful. But it is to be noted—against the statement, made in the beginning of this article, that a divine title has not been clearly identified in the name Jerusalem—that some Assyriologists hold that the Assyrian Sulmān is probably an epithet of the god Ninib.¹ So much for the religion.

Abd-Khiba held Jerusalem by appointment of the King of Egypt. Winckler says that the Tablets distinguish between *Amelu*, princes ruling in their own right, and *Khazanûta*, not the old hereditary princes, but others selected for the headship by Pharaoh out of the princes or families of the towns or tribes;² and that Abd-Khiba was such a Khazanu. Yet the latter describes his domains, although he had not received them from father or mother, but from Pharaoh, as his ancestral domains. The phrase expressing this is so often repeated that it seems to have been a formula of submission. To Jerusalem there was attached a certain "territory," including the town of Bit-Ninib. Jerusalem itself appears to have been a fortified place. At least it contained an Egyptian garrison, and even without that it might hold out against the king's enemies.³ Taking this bit of evidence along with others, viz. that Abd-Khiba appears to have been held responsible for the disaster to a caravan in Ajalon,⁴ and that he maintained his post against a universal hostility, we may infer that Jerusalem was already a place of considerable strength. Its chief could send caravans of his own to Egypt; but it is to be noted that no products of the soil are described as his

¹ See Zimmern in the *Keilinschr. u. das Alte Testament*,³ 411, 474 f.

² *K.A.T.*³ 193 f.

³ Letter ii. 45-53.

⁴ *Id.* 51-59.

tribute, only a number of slaves, probably captives of war.¹

We have now to ask where this primitive Jerusalem was situated—this Canaanite fortress which held an Egyptian garrison, and which when that fled was still expected to hold out against the enmity of all its neighbours and the foe advancing from the north. There is a general agreement that the site must be found somewhere within the limits of the later Jerusalem; that is, upon one or other of the two promontories which run south to the west of the valley of the K̄idrōn. But opinions are divided between the eastern and the western of these spurs.

We can have little doubt about two things: *first*, that the earliest settlers in this district would select the sides of the only valley in which water was present in any quantity—that is, as we have seen, the K̄idrōn, or the sheltered mouth of the valley running into it—the later Tyropœon; and, *second*, that when it became necessary to fortify themselves they would do so on one or other of the two promontories or spurs, which, except at their north ends, sink steeply, if not precipitously, into the gorges below them.

¹ Founding upon his own transliteration and translation of the Tablets (different in some important points from that on which Winckler, Jensen, Niebuhr and Budge are substantially agreed, and which is accepted above) Prof. Sayce (*Early Hist. of the Hebrews*, 28 f.) maintains that the Tablets “show that Jerusalem was already the dominant state of Southern Palestine. Its strong position made it a fortress of importance, and it was the capital of a territory which stretched away towards the desert of the south. . . . Abd-Tob [so Prof. Sayce transliterates the signs which others read as Abd-Khiba] reiterates that he was not, like the other governors of Canaan, under Egyptian rule. They had been appointed to their offices by Pharaoh, or had inherited them by descent from the older royal lines of the country. . . . He, on the contrary, was the friend and ally of the Egyptian king. His kingly dignity had not been derived from either father or mother, but from the ‘Mighty King,’ from the god, that is to say, whose temple stood on ‘the mountain of Jerusalem.’” But against this view may be urged (1) that the other scholars above mentioned see no allusion to a god on the tablets: “the mighty king” to them is Pharaoh himself; and (2) the terms in which the chief of Jerusalem submits himself to Pharaoh (terms accepted by Prof. Sayce’s translation) are as humble as those in which the other princes express themselves. There is really nothing in the tablets of Abd-Khiba to show that he held rank higher than the neighbouring chiefs.

Our choice clearly lies between these. Although very early dwellings may have been excavated on the eastern bank of the Kīdrōn Valley, on the site of the present village of Silwān, where there are still cave-dwellings, the place is not suitable for fortification.¹

Josephus, arguing from the conditions of Jerusalem in his own day, apparently takes for granted that the Canaanite, pre-Davidic fortress lay upon the western promontory, the traditional Mount Zion. Under his influence this view prevailed till recent times, and, in face of the younger theory that the original Jerusalem lay upon the eastern promontory, has been revived by (among others) the missionary Georg Gatt² of Gaza, and Dr. Carl Mommert, of Schweinitz, Silesia.³ They place the fortress on the southern end of the western promontory, generally known as the southwest hill. The height of this above the encircling valleys and the steepness of the slopes by which it rises from the latter, are quoted by those who regard it as the original citadel, as proof of its fitness for fortification; while some are further prejudiced in its favour by the long, chiefly ecclesiastical, tradition which identifies it with Mount Zion. But it is doubtful whether so broad and long a hill, without any separate eminence upon it, would have been suitable for a citadel.⁴ But, worse still, it is waterless, and lies aloof from the ancient source, or sources, of water in

¹ It is to be wished that excavations were possible along this bank of the Kīdrōn Valley.

² *Sion in Jerusalem*, Brixen, 1900, pp. 34, 38 ff. See also the same author's *Die Hügel von Jerusalem*, a new exposition of the description of Jerusalem in Josephus V. B.J. iv. 1 f., Freiburg, 1897; also in *Z.D.P.V.* vol. xxv.

³ *Topographie des alten Jerusalem*, Erster Theil; *Zion und Akra, die Hügel der Altstadt*, Leipzig, n.d. (Preface dated December, 1900), p. 19; with plan; also in *Z.D.P.V.* xxiv. pp. 183 ff.

⁴ So Sir Charles Wilson, art. "Zion" in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, vol. iv. 983: "The western spur is broad-backed, and so far as the original form is known, there is no broken ground or conspicuous feature upon it that would naturally be selected as the site of a castle such as those usually erected for the protection of an ancient hill-town."

the Kīdrōn Valley. Unless the earthquakes or the rubbish of the many overthrows of the city have closed some former vent, there was no spring on the Tyropœon or the W. Rababy, by the foot of this south-western hill; and indeed the geology, as we have seen, renders very improbable the existence there at any time of a fountain. It is true that some towns in Palestine are planted at as great distance from their wells as the south-western hill is from the Kīdrōn Valley; but in no instance (I think) does this happen where a more, or equally, suitable site for the town lies nearer the spring, as is the case in Jerusalem. Finally no remains have been discovered on the south-western hill which can be assigned with certainty to the pre-Israelite period. The cisterns are comparatively few; the walls and aqueducts that have been traced may be referred to a later age; and the rock-cutting above the western slope, known as Maudslay's scarp, is of uncertain date. Summing up, we may say that while there is no positive evidence for an early settlement on the south-western hill it is also improbable that a citadel was built there.

The eastern hill is not so high as the south-western, nor (if we exclude the Temple-site, which appears not to have been occupied before the time of Solomon,¹ and take into account only Ophel, the ridge to the south of the Temple), is it so extensive? But it is surrounded on three sides by valleys, into two of which, east and west, it sinks abruptly, while southward it gradually slopes to the junction of these valleys. Above all, one of these valleys, the eastern or Kīdrōn, is the only line in the district on which, as we have seen, it is probable there were always wells. Here lay Gīhon, now the 'Ain Sitti Miriam, just under the eastern hill. Dr. Mommert's hypothesis,² that the Bir Eiyub was the original spring in the Kīdrōn Valley and that the 'Ain

¹ Till the Temple was built it was a threshing-floor: always placed outside a town.

² *Op. cit.* p. 13 f.

Sitti Miriam was opened in later times in order to secure a vent for the subterranean waters of the Kīdrōn Valley, close to the city, has no evidence to support it. On the contrary, as we have seen,¹ Gihon not only existed in the time of David, but was even then a sacred, that is, an ancient, well. We may, therefore, in spite of the earthquakes which have shaken the district, regard it as the original well of Jerusalem: flowing during the Canaanite period. Gatt endeavours to discredit its importance to the early inhabitants by talking of the evil taste of its waters.² But this cannot be imputed to it in early times: the bad taste seems due to the sewage of the present city.

It is true that if they built their fort on the eastern hill above Gihon, the Canaanites would not include the latter within its walls, nor be able wholly to prevent its use by an enemy besieging them. Gihon lies at the foot of a steep rock, on which a wall could not well run except high above the spring. But at least, even with primitive means of warfare, the besieged could seriously hamper an enemy's use of Gihon. Moreover the needs of times of peace must be taken into consideration. It is most probable that the earliest and unfortified settlement would be as near to the Kīdrōn spring or springs as possible, that is, on the slopes of the eastern hill, and perhaps in the mouth of the Tyropœon Valley, and that when a fort became necessary it would be built on the same hill somewhere above Gihon rather than on a hill further away.

That the eastern hill immediately above Gihon is suitable for such a fort is affirmed by so eminent a military engineer as Sir Charles Wilson. But even the eyes of those who are not soldiers or engineers may see the possibility of the Canaanite fort on that position. Down either side the ground falls away abruptly to the Tyropœon and the Kīdrōn. The position is nearly 200 feet above the bed

¹ EXPOSITOR, March, 1903. ² *l. p. cit.* p. 39.

of the *Ḳidrōn*¹ and over 100 above that of the *Tyropœon*. There is a steep slope to the south. The sole difficulty is to the north. Immediately above the Virgin's Well (2,087 feet above sea-level) there is a contour line of 2,279 on the Survey Map, from which the ground gradually slopes northward to 2,299, to 2,312, and finally at the foot of the South Haram wall, 2,379. Such a slope is certainly not suitable for the northern wall of the fort. Dr. Guthe indeed claims to have discovered a trench or ravine running across it; this is doubted by others who are familiar with the ground; for example, Sir Charles Wilson and Colonel Conder. But there is as yet no certainty as to what the formation of this part of Ophel was in ancient times; and even with the surface as it is at present Sir Charles Wilson and Sir Charles Warren believe that the Canaanite fort stood above *Gilōn*. It is significant that since the English survey a very considerable number of authorities, by far the majority, have come round to the same conclusion.²

We have now to ask whether any of the ancient remains discovered on the ridge of Ophel indicate the Canaanite period. Both the English surveyors and Dr. Guthe discovered a large number of walls, rock-dwellings, cisterns,

¹ The descent into the valley of the *Ḳidrōn* is very steep, about 30°, and the natural surface of the rock is covered with *débris* from 10 to 50 feet in height.—Sir Ch. Warren, *P.E.F. Mem.*, "Jerusalem," p. 368.

² Foremost among them should be mentioned the Rev. W. F. Birch, who advanced the opinion as early as 1879 (*P.E.F.Q.* for that year, pp. 129, 178; also 1885, pp. 55, 250); Robertson Smith (*Enc. Brit.* art. "Jerusalem," p. 1648, and *Stade (G.V.I. i. 267 f.)* in 1881; Sayce, 1883 (*P.E.F.Q.*: two papers); Guthe, *Z.D.P.V.* 1883; Socin and Benzinger in *Baedeker's Palästina*,³ the latter also in *Hebr. Archäologie*, 1894; Buhl, *Geogr. des Alt. Pal.* 132; Ryle on *Neh. iii. 15 (Camb. Bible for Schools)*; Driver in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, ii. 554; Warren (*ib.* 386 f.), who had previously held another view; Bliss (*Excav. at Jerus.* 1894-7, pp. 287 ff.); practically also A. B. Davidson, *The Exile and Restoration in Bible Class Primers*. On the other side so eminent an authority as Colonel Conder (*Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Jerus.") still favours the south-western hill. He argues that the Ophel ridge was too small for a Canaanite fortress; he measures it as only 10 acres. But the fort must have been small, and the town or large village may have extended to the junction of the valleys or up their beds.

reservoirs, steps and scarped rocks. A number of these are as late as the Greek period; others may be very ancient. The oldest relic of a wall (or tower?) was that unearthed by Dr. Guthe above the Gihon spring;¹ with a thick layer of black cement apparently ancient, but whether Jebusite or not he wisely abstains from affirming. Round cisterns he found only among those hewn in the rock:² such a shape of cistern is assigned by some to the Canaanites, but this also is uncertain. Of more importance are "the rock-chambers, with doors and openings for light"; and the dwellings half-cut in the rock and half-built against it. Some of these, Dr. Guthe thinks,³ go back to the earliest period. There can have been little building in stone before Solomon's time, or he would not have had to bring masous from Phœnicia, and no traces have been found of building in timber.⁴ But even from the rock-dwellings it is precarious to infer a very early date: for the habit of living in houses that were half hewn in the rock, half-built against it, continued in Greek times,⁵ and persists to-day in the village of Silwān. On the whole, then, while nothing that has been found on Ophel is unmistakably Canaanite, there is a good deal which suggests the primitive practice of dwelling in caves.

We may, therefore, conclude that the eastern hill, or Ophel, was, more probably than the western, the site of the castle and town of Jerusalem in the days of Abd-Khiba. I have in this study purposely refrained from using any of the Biblical evidence in this question. But when we come to it, we shall see that on the whole it corroborates our conclusion.

¹ See point E on Tafel viii. in his reports *Z.D.P.V.* v.; cf. pp. 319 f.

² *Ibid.* 336. ³ p. 341. ⁴ 344f.

⁵ As is proved from the mosaic under some of these leaning constructions.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

V.

JEREMIAH XI. 9-17.

The present Generation has returned to the sins of their Forefathers, and the Prophet therefore re-affirms against them the Sentence of Judgement.*

⁹ And Yahweh said unto me, A conspiracy is found among the men of Judah, and among the inhabitants of Jerusalem. ¹⁰ They are turned back to the iniquities of their forefathers, which refused to hear my words; and they are gone after other gods to serve them: the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken my covenant which I made with their fathers. ¹¹ Therefore thus saith Yahweh, Behold, I bring evil upon them, which they shall not be able to escape; and they shall cry unto me, but I will not hearken unto them. ¹² And the cities of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem shall go, and cry unto the gods unto whom they offer incense: but they shall not save them at all in the time of their trouble.† ¹³ For according to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Judah; and according to the number of the streets of Jerusalem have ye set up altars to the shameful thing,‡ (even) altars to burn incense unto Baal.§

* Viz. after the reformation (2 Kings 23), following the discovery of the 'Book of the Law' (i.e. the discourses of Deuteronomy) in Josiah's eighteenth year, B.C. 621 (2 Kings 22).

† Heb. *evil* (i.e. *misfortune*, as *vv.* 11, 17, 2. 27, 28, Am. 3. 6, and elsewhere).

‡ Heb. *shame*; cf. 3. 24.

§ LXX have only, *have ye set up altars to burn incense unto Baal.*

*Yahweh will accept no Intercession on behalf of His People ;
and hypocritical Service will not avail to avert the Doom.*

¹⁴ And thou, pray thou not for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them: for I will not hear them in the time that they call unto me in the time of * their trouble. † ¹⁵ What hath my beloved ‡ (to do) in mine house, (seeing) she bringeth evil devices to pass? § Will vows and holy flesh remove thine evil from off thee? ¶ then mightest thou rejoice! ¶ ¹⁶ A spreading olive tree, fair with goodly fruit, had Yahweh called thy name: (but) at the noise of a great roaring ** he hath kindled fire upon it, and its branches are marred. †† ¹⁷ For Yahweh of hosts, that planted thee, hath pronounced evil against thee, because of the evil of the house of Israel and of the house of Judah, which they have loved to do, ††† to vex me by offering incense unto Baal.

JEREMIAH XI. 18-XII. 6.

*Jeremiah's Discovery of a Plot formed against his Life by the
Men of his native Place, Anathoth ; and the Judgement
pronounced by him upon them in consequence.*

¹⁸ And Yahweh caused me to know, and I knew it: then thou shewedst me their doings. ¹⁹ But I was like a tame §§

* So LXX Targ. Pesh. (one letter different). The Heb. text has *on behalf of*.

† Cf. 7. 16.

‡ I.e. Judah: cf. 12. 7.

§ The Heb. as in Ps. 37. 7.

¶ So with slight changes, following LXX. The Heb. text cannot be intelligibly translated.

¶ Or, following LXX, *Or shalt thou escape by these?*

** I.e. as the tempest rose.

†† Yahweh had likened thee to a flourishing olive-tree (for the figure, cf. Ps. 52. 8, Hos. 14. 6): but a great storm has now arisen, the olive-tree has been struck by lightning, and its beauty is sadly marred.

†† Heb. *done for themselves*.

§§ Lit. *familiar* (Ps. 55. 13, 'companion'); and so innocent, unsuspecting (LXX ἀκακος).

lamb that is led to the slaughter; and I knew not that against me had they devised devices, (saying,) 'Let us destroy the tree with its sap,* and let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name may be no more remembered.' ²⁰ But, O Yahweh of hosts, that judgest righteously, that triest the reins and the heart,† let me see thy vengeance on them: for unto thee have I revealed my cause. ²¹ therefore thus saith Yahweh concerning the men of Anathoth, that seek thy life, saying, 'Thou shalt not prophesy in Yahweh's name, that thou die not by our hand': ²² therefore thus saith Yahweh of hosts, Behold, I will punish them: ‡ the young men shall die by the sword; their sons and their daughters shall be consumed § by famine: ²³ and there shall be no remnant unto them: for I will bring evil upon the men of Anathoth, (even) the year of their visitation.

Jeremiah is surprised at the Prosperity enjoyed by the Wicked; and demands upon the Conspirators summary Vengeance.

XII. ¹ 'Righteous art thou, O Yahweh, when I complain unto || thee; yet will I reason the case with thee: ¶ Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? wherefore

* So omitting one letter (cf. the cognate adjective, 'full of sap,' Ezek. 17. 24, 20. 47 [R.V. 'green']). The Heb. text has *bread*. The 'tree with its sap' is fig. for a person in the full strength and vigour of life.

† Jeremiah appeals to Yahweh, who can test the inmost feelings and purposes both of himself and of his foes, and knows therefore on which side the right lies. The 'reins' (i.e. the kidneys) were regarded by the Hebrews as the seat of *feeling* (cf. Prov. 23. 16; Ps. 16. 7, 73. 21; Job 19. 27), as the heart was with them the seat of the *understanding* (cf. ch. 5. 21): hence when it is said of Yahweh that He 'tries' (i.e. tests or examines), or 'sees,' the 'reins and hearts,' the meaning is that He is cognizant of man's emotions and affections as well as of his purposes and thoughts. Cf. 17. 10, 20. 12; Ps. 7. 9, 26. 2; also Jer. 12. 2.

‡ Heb. *visit upon them*.

§ So LXX (two letters transposed): cf. 14. 15, 44. 12. The Heb. text has *die* (as in the preceding clause: the variation, however, is more expressive.

¶ Or *contend with*. Cf. on 2. 9, 29 (pp. 330 f., 332).

¶ See on 4. 12 (p. 45).

are all they at ease that deal faithlessly? ² Thou plantest them, yea, they take root; they spread,* yea, they bring forth fruit: thou art near in their mouth, and far from their reins. † ³ But thou, O Yahweh, knowest me; thou seest me, and triest mine heart toward thee: pull them away like sheep for the slaughter, and prepare ‡ them for the day of killing. ⁴ How long shall the land mourn, and the herb of the whole country wither? for the wickedness of them that dwell therein, beast and bird are swept away; because they say, “He will not see our latter end.” §

His Impatience is rebuked: he may have in the Future still greater Trials to endure.

⁵ ‘If thou hast run with footmen, and they have wearied thee, then how wilt thou vie with horses? and though in a land of peace thou art secure, yet how wilt thou do in the pride of Jordan? || ⁶ For even thy brethren and the house of thy father, even they have dealt faithlessly with thee; even they have cried aloud after thee: believe them not, though they speak fair words unto thee.’

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

XI. 15. I.e. : אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ
Or, following LXX (ἡ ἐν τοῦτοις διαφύξῃ):, for the last five words : אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ אִז תַּעֲלֹזוּ ; but the deviation from the Heb. is rather considerable. At the beginning of the words quoted עֲשֵׂתָהּ מִזִּכְתָּהּ comes in abruptly, and a

* Hos. 14. 6.

† I.e. far from their affections and desires. See the note on 11. 20.

‡ Heb. *sanctify*,—as though they were victims for sacrifice.

§ I.e. the prophet will not see his predictions fulfilled: we shall survive him, and even, it may be implied, put him out of the way.

|| I.e. the luxuriant growth of bushes and thick vegetation fringing the banks of the Jordan. See especially Jer. 49. 19=50. 44, and Zech. 11. 3, which shew that this ‘pride of Jordan’ was infested by lions, and consequently dangerous to enter.

causal particle, such as כִּי or אֲשֶׁר is desiderated before it. The restoration of the following words, *Can cows . . . from off thee?* which are the most important part of the sentence, is however quite satisfactory. מִזִּמָּה does not mean *lewdness*; it is זִמָּה, not מִזִּמָּה, which has this meaning (13. 27, Jud. 20. 6 *al.*). The Aram. form of the pron. suffix in רַעַתְתָּ כִּי is not probable in Jeremiah; it occurs otherwise only in late Psalms (103. 3-5, 116. 7, 19, 135. 9), and, apparently dialectically, in 2 Kings 4. 2, 3, 7, also Cant. 2. 13 (G.-K. § 91e, l). R.V. (=A.V.) is no real translation of the existing Hebrew text.

16. *spreading*. A spreading or luxuriant tree is no doubt commonly a 'green' one; but רַעַנָּן is not a term expressive of colour. LXX represent it by words such as *leafy, thick*. See Delitzsch's note on Ps. 37. 35; and cf. mine on Dent. 12. 2.

17. *have loved to do*. See, for the idiom (the reflexive הִ, throwing back the action upon the subject), *Lev.* p. 515*h*.

XII. 3. וּבַחֲנֹתָי. The perf. with waw consec., according to G.-K. §112 *m*; so Ez. 29. 7 (where presents would be better than past tenses in the English).

5. *the pride of Jordan*. A.V. 'the swelling of Jordan' (cf. Josh. 3. 15); for מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן in connexion with water, see Job 38. 11, and cf. מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן Ps. 46. 4, מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן Ps. 89. 10, and מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן (the verb) in Ez. 47. 5 (properly *to rise up*, Job 8. 11): elsewhere in Heb. both the verb and the derivatives are used nearly always in the fig. senses of *majesty*, or *pride*. Ewald, both here and Jer. 49. 19=50. 44, Zech. 11. 3, took it as A.V.; but the terms in which it is mentioned in these three passages (as 'spoiled,' and to all appearance, also, as the abode of lions) seem to make this sense hardly possible. It is a pity that it has been adopted in the recently published R.V. with marg. references (both here and on Josh. 3. 15). The view adopted in the note above is that of modern commentators generally.

S. R. DRIVER.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY
OF JERUSALEM.

V.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HISTORY.

WE have seen¹ that about 1400 B.C., Jerusalem, under that name, was a fortress and a town, with command over an uncertain extent of surrounding territory. The inhabitants were a Canaanite tribe, under their hereditary² chief Abd-Khiba, who, however, owed his position neither to his father nor his people, but to the then lord-paramount of the land, the King of Egypt. The fortress, already recognised as strong,³ had been occupied by an Egyptian garrison of Kashi, probably Ethiopians or negroes; and the Pharaoh, Amenhotep (Amenophis) IV., had "placed his name" on the town: that is (to adopt the most reasonable interpretation of these words) he had imposed upon Jerusalem the worship of himself as the incarnation of Aten, the Sun's Disk, in whose interest he was attempting to disestablish the other gods of Egypt. This interpretation is confirmed by the servile terms in which Abd-Khiba and the neighbouring chiefs prostrate themselves before Amenhotep, "their sun and their gods," as well as by the fact that in other places to which the Egyptian arms were carried the Pharaohs set up images of themselves and their deities.⁴ It is worth a passing notice that the form of Egyptian religion which most nearly approached Monotheism,⁵ should have been imposed, for however brief a

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1903.

² Tell-el-Amarna Letters 179 (Wi.) l. 13: "lands of my father."

³ See above, p. 303 n. 3.

⁴ Witness, for example, the stele of Sety I. discovered in 1901 at Tell esh Shihab by the present writer.

⁵ Sayce, *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, 92 ff.

day, upon Jerusalem. How was its worship performed there? Were its high hymns¹ chanted by Egyptian officials and soldiery? Its Asiatic origin,² we are tempted to feel, may have helped its acceptance by the Canaanites. Yet how were they to understand its language? Would they comprehend more than what their letters express,—that it was the adoration of the Egyptian monarch himself? We can hardly think so; but, however this may have been, no trace of the worship of Aten survived. Overthrown in Egypt by the following dynasty it cannot have persisted in Syria. Amen and Mut are the gods whom Sety I. set up at Tell esh Shihāb.

For Jerusalem there was, of course, a local deity; but Abd-Khibā naturally refrains from alluding to him in letters to a sovereign who claimed to be “the glory” of the only god.³ The worship of this local deity can hardly have been interrupted by that of the Pharaoh, and must have continued till David brought to the town the ark of his Lord. Who was the predecessor of the God of Israel on the high place of Jerusalem? From what name did the inhabitants transfer to that of Jahweh the titles of Baal and Adon? Did the immemorial rites of the Canaanite religion continue by the side of the purer worship of the Temple, or is it they which we find recrudescing in the horrible sacrifices of the valley of Hinnom?⁴ Where in Jerusalem was the site of the Canaanite sanctuary?

These are questions which, however interesting they be, we are unable to answer with certainty in the present state of our knowledge. No god of Jerusalem is anywhere directly mentioned, and we are left for conjecture to the

¹ See Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iv. 125: Sayce, *op. cit.* p. 95 f.

² Sayce, *op. cit.* 92.

³ Khu-en-Aten, the title of Amenhotep IV., means “the glory of Aten.”

⁴ That the sacrifice of children to the deity formed part of the Canaanite religion appears illustrated by the discoveries of Mr. Macalister in connection with the Canaanite sanctuary at Gezer: *P.E.F.Q.* 1903, 32 f.

theophorous names of her kings and perhaps of herself. Abd-Khiba's own name is theophorous, but there is no clear trace in the Semitic pantheon of a god called Khiba, and we have seen that the attempt to discover in the name a corruption of that of Jahweh cannot be justified.¹

The earliest Hebrew tradition records another theophorous name of a chief of Jerusalem, Adoni-Şedeķ, who was reigning when Israel entered the land.² Şedeķ was a deity of the Western Semites,³ and appears in several men's names both Aramean and Phœnician.⁴ It is worthy of notice that a priest of Jerusalem in David's time was called Şadoķ, and natural also to compare Melki-Şedeķ, king of Salem, in the story of Abraham.⁵ But again, if the latter part of the name Jerusalem be that of Shalem or Shulman, another deity of the Western Semites,⁶ he may have been the local god of whom we are in search. Once more it has been

¹ EXPOSITOR for March. One of David's heroes, from the Canaanite town of S' a'album (Josh. xix. 42, Jud. i. 35) bears the name 𐤀𐤏𐤊𐤁𐤁 El-Yahbā (2 Sam. xxiii. 32), in the second part of which it is possible to see the same root as in Khiba: but the formation is different.

² Joshua x. 1 ff. This passage is from JE, and substantially from E. The parallel in Judges i., from J, names the King Adoni-Bezek, and the LXX have this form in both passages. On which ground some prefer the reading Adoni Bezek. This is, however, improbable, since in personal names Adon is always compounded with the name of a deity, and no deity Bezek is known, while Şedeķ occurs several times as the name of a Western Semitic god. Besides, the reading Bezek may easily have arisen in Jud. i. 5, through confusion with the name of the place where Israel encountered the king. Moore, Bennett and Nowack read Adoni Sedek. Budde, who previously preferred Adoni-Bezek, leaves the question open in his recent commentary on Judges.

³ See Zimmern, *K.A.T.* 3 473 f.

⁴ Kemosh-Şedeķ, Şedeķ-Rimmon, Sedek-Melek. Also as a Canaanite name in the Tell-el-Amarna Letters, No. 125 (Wi.), line 37: Ben Sidķi (spelt by the Canaanite scribe Zidķi), for which Knudtzon (*Beitr. z. Assyrl.* iv. 114) reads Rab-Sidķi.

⁵ Gen. xiv. 18. Winckler, *K.A.T.* 3, p. 224, takes Salem in this passage, not as an abbreviation for Jerusalem, but as a form of the divine name Shalem, and Melek-Salem as only another form of Melki-Sedeķ, whom he assigns to the city of Hazazon Tamar=Banias (*Gesch. Isr.* ii. p. 37). All this is very precarious: yet Winckler founds upon it the identity of the god Sedek with the god Sulman or Shalem.

⁶ Zimmern, *K.A.T.* 3 474 f. Winckler, *id.* p. 224, sees in Shelomoh, the Hebrew for Solomon, a form derived from the divine name Shalem.

supposed that in the name of David and other personal names, and in the designation of Jerusalem as the *city of David*, there lurks Dōd, either a divine name or an appellation for the *genius loci*.¹ And finally in Isaiah's name for the city, Ari- or Uri-el, we have another possible designation of the Canaanite god of Jerusalem. But whoever he was, whether one of these or another, it is remarkable that no direct mention of him has survived in the later history, although his worshippers were spared, and lived in the city along with the Hebrews. Either the later scribes took great care to eliminate from the Hebrew records every trace of this predecessor of Jahweh; or his influence was so restricted and unimportant that his name and memory disappeared of themselves. One fact is significant, that Jerusalem is not regarded in the Old Testament² as having been a famous shrine before David brought his people's God to it. Beersheba, the various Gilgals, Gibeon and Bethel are all mentioned as high places, whose ancient sanctity impressed the invading Israelites and attracted suppliants and pilgrims down to at least the eighth century. That Jerusalem does not appear in this list along with her neighbours is surely proof that her Canaanite shrine had only a local importance and was without influence on the rest of the land. The significance of this for her subsequent history we shall see later on.

The last of our questions is that of the exact position of the Canaanite sanctuary in Jerusalem. For remains of this it is hopeless to search on a site so crowded and so disturbed during all the subsequent centuries. The shrine may have been about the well of Giḥon, for in David's time, as we saw, this was regarded as sacred;³ or it may have

¹ So Winckler, *K.A.T.*³, p. 225. But this would imply that David received his name only after the capture of Jerusalem or else that there was a remarkable coincidence between his name and that of the city he conquered. Again we see how precarious Winckler's reasoning is.

² Outside the ambiguous Salem of Gen. xiv.

³ EXPOSITOR for March.

stood in the valley of Hinnom, where the sacrifices of children, a feature of Canaanite worship, afterwards broke out among the Israelites.¹

But if unimportant religiously—at least as compared with Bethel, the Gilgals and Beersheba—Jerusalem must have been in those early days a fortress of no ordinary strength. We have seen² that her citadel lay upon the south-eastern of her hills, just above Gihon, where on all sides save one the ground falls from the ridge to a considerable depth: on both east and west with precipitous rapidity. Apart from what may be an editorial gloss the Old Testament traditions are unanimous that before David the Israelites failed to capture the citadel³; the garrison felt themselves so secure that they laughed even at the challenge of David.⁴ In fact through the earliest centuries of Israel's history Jerusalem was the most easterly of a line of positions—Gezer, Beth-Shemesh, Sha'albim, Ayyalon, Kiriath-ye'arim (Kephira, Gibeon, Be'eröth), Jerusalem—from which Israel did not succeed in ousting their occupiers, but which, during the period of the Judges, formed a barrier between the children of Judah to the south, and the rest of Israel.⁵ The Elohist documents calls those

¹ See next paper, on Millo.

² EXPOSITOR for April.

³ The gloss above mentioned is Judges i. 8: and the men of Judah fought against Jerusalem and took it, and smote it at the edge of the sword and set fire to it. But this seems contradicted by Jud. i. 21: and the Jebusite who dwelt in Jerusalem the children of Benjamin did not drive out, but the Jebusites have dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem to this day; and by Josh. xv. 63: and the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah did not drive them out, but the Jebusites have dwelt (with the children of Judah: omit LXX) in Jerusalem till this day. The substitution in Jud. i. 21 of Benjamin for Judah of Josh. xv. 63 is usually supposed to be due to an editor who thereby strove to remove the contradiction with Jud. i. 8. It is possible to effect a technical conciliation between Jud. i. 8 on the one hand and Jud. i. 21 and Josh. xv. 63 on the other (cf. e.g. Sayce, *Early Hist. of the Hebrews*, p. 246 f.; Otley, *Hist. of the Heb.* 87 f.). But even those who propose this either interpret Jud. i. 8 only of the town, and agree that the Hebrew invaders did not capture the fortress of Jerusalem; or suppose that the Hebrew occupation was only temporary.

⁴ 2 Sam. v. 6. See below.

⁵ In the Song of Deborah Judah is not mentioned.

tribes who thus maintained their position against Israel *Amorites*; the Jahwistic document, *Canaanites*: both of them general terms for the Semitic populations which preceded Israel in Palestine. More particularly the Jahwistic document defines the inhabitants of Jerusalem and some neighbouring states as Jebusites, a name which is not found outside the Old Testament, but is sufficiently accredited within that.¹ This compact little tribe is of interest to us, not only because of the stand which it made for centuries against the Israelite invaders, but because it became, upon David's capture of its stronghold, a constituent of that strange medley, the Jewish people, and doubtless carried into their life the tough fibre of its tribal character and the temper of its immemorial religion. We can have no doubt that the tribe was Semitic, and that it subsisted by agriculture—the Jebusite is called *the inhabitant of the land*²—and by the simpler industries of the long-settled Canaanite civilisation. But, as we have seen, and shall have to emphasize again, the position of Jerusalem was not very favourable to trade, and we ought probably to exclude all but local forms of the latter from our conception of the life of the Jebusites. Beyond these indications there is little to enable us to define the relation of the Israelites to those Canaanite *enclaves* which

¹ The name Jebusite has been handed down all along the main lines of the tradition. J: Josh. xv. 63; Jud. i. 21, xix. 11 (Moore). J E: Ex. iii. 8, 17, xxiii. 23, xxxiii. 2 (xxxiv. 11?); Num. xiii. 29 (Jud. iii. 5?). D: Ex. xiii. 5; Deut. vii. 1, xx. 17; Josh. iii. 10, ix. 1, xi. 3, xii. 8, xxiv. 11. P: Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16, 28. Redactor: Gen. x. 16 (perhaps also Josh. iii. 10, xxiv. 11; Jud. iii. 5—see above). Other writers: 2 Sam. v. 6, xxiv. 16, 18; 1 Kings ix. 20; Ezra ix. 1; Neh. ix. 8; 1 Chron. i. 14, xi. 4, 5, xxi. 15, 18, 28; 2 Chron. iii. 1; "Zech." ix. 7. The word Jebus for the town itself is found only in Jud. xix. 10 f. and in 1 Chron. xi. 4 f. In the latter passage it appears to be an intrusion: but although this is also held to be the case in Jud. xix. 10 f., we cannot be so sure. Jebus may have been a geographical designation—that is for the tribal territory, from which the writer transferred it to the city, or else a late and artificial form (see *Encycl. Bibl.* vol. ii. col. 2416).

² 2 Sam. v. 6. Therefore as formerly under Abd-Khiba, so now Jerusalem must have commanded some extent of the surrounding territory.

endured for centuries in their midst. In the story of Judges xix. the Levite refuses, though night is near, to turn aside into *this city of the Jebusites and lodge in it*, for it is *the city of a stranger, where there are none of the children of Israel*.¹ Israelite and Jebusite, therefore, kept apart, but they talked what was practically the same dialect; there must have been some traffic between them, the less settled Israelites purchasing the necessities and some of the embellishments of life from the townsfolk, as the Bedouin do at the present day; and, in addition, there may have been occasional intermarriage. So affairs lasted till the time of David.

The story of David's capture of Jerusalem (about 1000 B.C.) raises a number of questions of chronological and other details which lie outside the scope of our present aims. These are rather to discover David's reasons for the choice of Jerusalem as his capital, and the effect of this choice on the subsequent history of Israel. We may, however, give a brief statement of the former.

The account of the capture comes to us as part of the Second Book of Samuel, chapters v.—viii., which present a summary of David's reign written from a religious point of view.² The order in which the events, now of interest to us, are arranged is as follows. After Ishba'al's death Northern Israel submits itself to David, who is king in Hebron. He then takes Jerusalem, and thereupon has to sustain a double attack of the Philistines, whom he defeats. He brings the ark to Zion, and proceeds with the rebuilding of the city. If this is meant by the editor to be the chronological order, it implies that the Philistines were moved to attack their former vassal by the extension of his power over the northern tribes, which also had been subject to

¹ Verses 11 and 12.

² See the Commentaries, especially Driver's *Notes to the Books of Samuel*, H. P. Smith's *International Critical Commentary*, and Budde's *Kurz Hand-Kommentar*.

them,¹ and by his capture of a fortress, which must have threatened Israel in the rear in all their previous campaigns against Philistia. But this order seems contradicted by the details from which the summary account has been composed. One of these, *v.* 17, states that the Philistine attack upon David followed the submission to him of Northern Israel, and that when he heard that the Philistines were advancing he *went down to the hold*. But a hold to which he had to *go down* cannot have been Jerusalem,² but was some fortress at the foot of the hill-country, perhaps Adullam. If he was already in possession of Jerusalem, such a procedure is hardly intelligible. We may infer therefore that David's capture of Jerusalem was subsequent to his defeat of the Philistines. Again, this latter (according to *v.* 17) followed the anointing of David as king of all Israel. And yet the phrase in verse 6, *the king and his men went to Jerusalem against the Jebusites*, seems to imply that David attacked that fortress before he had all Israel behind him, and when he was only a southern chief with a band of followers.³ Accordingly other arrangements of the chronological order than that followed by the editor of chapters v.-viii. have been offered by modern scholars. Kittel and Budde suppose that after David became king of all Israel the Philistines opened war upon him, and that only after defeating them he took Jerusalem and brought in the ark. Others⁴ place the capture of the city first, and find in it the provocation of the Philistines to attack David, who defeats them, and is only then joined by Northern

¹ As Kamphausen was the first to point out.

² As Ottley and others maintain.

³ For this phrase the Chronicler (1 Chron. xi. 4) has substituted *David and all Israel went to Jerusalem*, which seems to be an effort to reconcile the above difficulties.

⁴ E. G. Ottley, *Hist. of the Hebrews*, 138. Winckler dates the capture of Jerusalem before a forcible conquest of Benjamin, which he imputes to David, and the effects of which he traces in the subsequent life of the king (*K.A.T.*³ 230).

Israel. Whichever of these arrangements be the right order of the events—and perhaps it is now impossible to determine this—the capture of Jerusalem is closely connected, either as preparation or as consequence, with the renewed hostility of the Philistines and David's assumption of the kingship over all Israel.

The narrative of the actual capture of the stronghold also raises questions. The text is uncertain, and, as it stands, hardly intelligible. It tells us that when David and his men went up against the Jebusites these taunted him. By a slight change in one of the verbs their taunt most naturally runs thus: *Thou shalt not come in hither: but the blind and the lame will drive thee off*¹: meaning David cannot come in hither. Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Sion—the first appearance of this name in the history. The next verse (8) is both uncertain in its text and impossible to construe as it stands. Our familiar English translation, even in the Revised Version—And David said on that day, “Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites, let him get up to the watercourse and smite the lame and the blind, that are hated of David's soul”—is purely conjectural, as may be seen from the word introduced in italics and the alternative versions in the margin. Besides, we should not expect directions to take the *hold*, after the statement of its capture in verse 7. The original has *a Jebusite*,² and the word translated *watercourse* means rather *waterfall*, of which there was none in Jerusalem; while the consonants of the text read the active form of the verb: *they hated*. The first clause can only be rendered *Whosoever smiteth a Jebusite*, and the rest, as Budde and others have inferred, ought to be emended so as to express some threat against the slaughter of a Jebusite, in conformity with the testimony that David

¹ Reading with Wellhausen הַסִּירָה לְיִסְרָאֵל

² So Ps. xlii. 8. But in Mishnic Hebrew the word does mean “conduit.”

spared the defenders of the city when he took it.¹ Budde's own emendation, though not quite satisfactory for it introduces a negative, may stand in default of a better. By the omitting one letter and changing the vowel points,² he gets rid of the difficult *waterfall* (which besides is not what the Greek translators read) and substitutes for it the word *his neck*, rendering the whole thus: *Whoso slayeth a Jebusite, shall bring his neck into danger, the halt and the blind David's soul doth not hate.*³ We thus lose a picturesque but impossible account of how the citadel was taken, with all occasion for the topographical conjectures that have arisen from that; but we gain a sensible statement following naturally on the preceding verse and in harmony with other facts. The concluding clause of verse 8: *wherefore they say a blind man or a halt may not enter the house*, is obviously an insertion that attempts to account for the later Levitical provision to exclude all blemished persons from entering the Temple.⁴ *And David dwelt in the stronghold and called it the City of David.*

From these details we may turn to the larger questions of David's policy in regard to Jerusalem. Here for clearness' sake we may distinguish between his capture of the city and his choice of it as his capital.

The capture of Jerusalem—whatever he might afterwards make of the city—was necessary for David in respect equally of his dominion over Northern Israel, and of his relations to the Philistines. The last of the alien *enclaves* on the hill-country of the Hebrews, the Jebusite fortress, stood between the two portions of David's kingdom, and hard by the trunk-road that ran through them. If, as is likely from 2 Samuel v. 6, the capture happened before David's accession to the united sovereignty, it may be taken

¹ 2 Sam. xxiv. 16.

² Instead of *בְּצִנּוֹר וְאֶה*, he reads *בְּצִנּוֹר אֶה*. The Greek version has "with a dagger."

³ *לֹא יִשְׂאֵנָה*

⁴ Lev. xxi. 18.

as proof of his political foresight and of the fact that he already cherished the ambition of being ruler of all Israel; while its achievement may have helped the attraction of the northern tribes to his crown. Most probably it did not happen before his campaign or campaigns with the Philistines¹; and in that case his experience in these must have shown him the inexpediency of leaving an alien stronghold on his rear as often as he should have to descend to meet the Philistines on the border of the Shephelah. Besides, Jerusalem lies near the head of one of the passes leading up from the Philistine territory. David had himself encountered the Philistines on the plain of Rephaim near the Jebusite fortress, and by that alone must have felt the indispensableness of having the latter in his possession. Plainly therefore, the capture of Jerusalem was as necessary to Israel's independence of Philistia as it was to their unification.

The same motives must have worked in David towards the selection of the captured city for his capital—but along with others. As king of all Israel he could not remain in Hebron. This town lay too far south and its site possesses little strength. On the other hand, to have chosen one of the fortresses of Ephraim or even to have settled in Shechem, the natural centre of the country, would have roused the jealousy of his own southern clans. His capital must lie between the two: most fitly between Bethlehem and Bethel. But upon this stretch of country there was no position to compare for strength with Jerusalem. Bethel, indeed, was better situated for the command of roads and the trade on them, but the site has little military value. Bethlehem, again, might have made a better fortress than Bethel, and lay in a district of much greater fertility than Jerusalem. But it had not even the one spring, which (at least) Jerusalem possessed; and it was wholly southern and shut off from the north. To the prime necessities of

¹ See above, p. 328.

great strength and a tolerable water-supply, to the further advantages of a position on the trunk-road and not far from the head of an easily defended pass into the western plain, Jerusalem added the supreme excellence of a neutral site which had belonged neither to Judah nor to the northern tribes, and was therefore without prejudice in the delicate balance of interests to preserve which strained David throughout the rest of his reign and which was so soon to be disturbed under his grandson. Nor within the basin in which Jerusalem lies could there be any question between the exact site of the Jebusite stronghold and the other as fortifiable hills around. The capture of many an eastern city has meant the abandonment of its site and the rise of a new town at some little distance. But, as we have seen,¹ the position in that large basin most favourable for sustaining the population of a town is where the waters of the basin gather and partly come to the surface before issuing by their one outlet—to the south-east. Here flowed the only spring or springs. There was thus no other way for it. *David dwelt in the stronghold,*² in the ancient Jebusite fortress which lay, as we have seen,³ on the south-eastern hill of the present Jerusalem, and immediately above Gihon.

David, then, being (or about to be) monarch of all Israel supplied his monarchy with its correlative, a capital, strong in her natural position, and politically suitable by her neutrality towards the rival interests in his kingdom north and south. To this capital hitherto unimportant religiously—another advantage—he brought the dwelling and symbol of his people's God. It was a movable chest—the sanctuary and palladium of a nomad people; that had come with them through the wilderness; that except for intervals had never settled anywhere; that had gone into their battles; that had fallen into the hands of their foes. With

¹ EXPOSITOR for March.

² 2 Sam. v. 6. ³ EXPOSITOR for April.

the prestige of the defeat of the latter, and as if its work of war were over, David brought it for the first time within walls. As the Psalm says,¹ he gave it *a resting-place, a resting-place for ever*. We can have little doubt that what moved David to recover an object which had so long fallen out of his people's history, and give it a place in the new capital, was not merely that it was the only relic of the past with which any memories Israel had of their unity as a nation were associated. David was moved by a religious inspiration. The national unity had never been maintained or when lost had never been recovered, except by loyalty to the nation's One God and Lord. His Ark implied Himself. It was His presence which sealed the new-formed union, and consecrated the capital.

The nation, then, appeared to be made; and in every respect, military, political and religious, Jerusalem stood for its centre. Yet such achievements could not be the work of one day nor of one man; least of all could this happen in the case of a town so lately adopted, and with so many natural disadvantages, among a people so freshly welded together. Those historians therefore are premature, who at this point celebrate all the meaning of Jerusalem in the history of Israel, as if that were due to David alone. The work was Divine and required the ages for its fulfilment. The most we can say of David, beyond the splendid insight with which he met the exigencies of his own day, and his religious devotion, is that in giving Israel Jerusalem he gave them the possibility of that which was yet to be. But for centuries the position of Jerusalem remained precarious. She was violated by Shishak; harassed by the Northern Kingdom, so far as she was a capital, and ignored so far as she was a sanctuary. Elijah passed her by when he went to seek Jahweh at Horeb; and according to Amos² the Israelite devotees

¹ cxxxiii. 8, 14.

² viii. 14.

of Jahweh in the eighth century preferred Beersheba to Zion. It required the disappearance of the Northern Kingdom; the desecration of the rural sanctuaries by the Assyrian invasion, the splendid vindication of her own inviolableness by Isaiah, and the centralisation of worship in the Temple by the Deuteronomists of the seventh century, before, in the providence of God, Jerusalem became the heart and soul of the nation, from which all their life went forth and with whose fall they died.

At the same time David took other steps towards this final result than those which lay in his capture of the city, his residence there and his bringing in of the Ark.

The first of these was the reprieve, which he granted to the Jebusite population, of the massacre or deportation which often followed the capture of a besieged city. There can be little doubt that David, who surrounded himself with a foreign body-guard, and amid the rival jealousies of his still incohesive people found his most faithful supporters among foreigners—witness the passionate loyalty of Ittai the Gittite¹—obeyed not merely the promptings of his native generosity towards his foes, but a sound political instinct in sparing the Jebusites and allowing them to remain in his capital. David's policy may be compared with that of Herod amid the Jewish factions of his time, in building for himself at Sebasté a Greek town upon Samaritan soil.

Again, David fostered a considerable development of trade, which was doubtless to the advantage of Jerusalem, and must have further swollen the increase of her population caused by the settlement in her of his soldiers, officials and priests. Historians and critics, who have recounted the advantages of Jerusalem as a capital, have generally included among these a central position for the trade of the land.² But to do so is to be ignorant

¹ 2 Sam. xv. 21. ² So Kittel, *Gesch. Hebr.* ii. p. 134.

of the geographical facts, and consequently to write without discrimination. Jerusalem does not lie, as has been frequently asserted, upon *two* of the trade-routes of Palestine—that running north and south along the backbone of the land and connecting most of the chief centres of population from Bethshan to Hebron and Beersheba, and that climbing across the range from east to west. She lies on the former. The latter traverses the range near Bethel—hence a market as well as a sanctuary—and some twelve miles north of Jerusalem. Jerusalem had therefore no natural command of the transit-traffic—not half so much as Bethel had, and scarcely the equal of that of Hebron, with her more open roads to the coast, and her market for the nomads of the southern desert. If then Jerusalem did compel the trade of the land to concentrate upon her gates, this was not so much by virtue of natural advantage, as by her political supremacy.

That there was, however, more of this trade to feed Jerusalem than historians have recognised, is a fact discernible by an exact consideration of the Biblical data. Even in the times of the Judges the lines of Israel's fighting were frequently along trade-routes; and that the commerce which happened on these was not without its value is proved by the glitter of gold here and there in the account of the campaigns, and by the reckoning of shekels in the other narratives. In the Philistines Israel encountered a trading people, settled upon the great road between Egypt and Mesopotamia; and the lines of the Philistine occupation of Israel's territory are exactly those of the cross traffic between the coast and Eastern Palestine.¹ The Philistine designs upon Israel must therefore have included the taking from them of the transit-trade. That Saul by his partial

¹ The cross-routes are three—(1) Ajalon, Beth-horon, Michmash and Geba, Ain Duk (Docus, Beth-Dagon), Jericho. (2) By Shechem to the Damieh fords of Jordan, on which route lies another Beth-Dagon. (3) Aphek in Sharon-Jezreel, Beth-Shan.

resistance of the Philistines enhanced the commercial prosperity of his people is clear from David's praise that Saul brought up *adorning of gold on the raiment* of the daughters of Israel.¹ But the symptoms increase under David himself. The rise in the East of such a monarchy as his always means the development and organisation of trade: a modern analogy may be seen in Palgrave's account² of Telal Ibn Rasheed's commercial policy at Ha'il in the fifties of last century. Other proofs are found in David's introduction of foreigners—so Ibn Rasheed attracted trading families from other towns to his own—in his alliance with Hiram, in his stamping of standard shekels,³ a sure sign of other royal regulations of commerce; and in two other invariable consequences—in the East and elsewhere—of a rapid increase of trade; namely, the formation of a corps of foreign mercenaries, and great activity in building.

From all this it was Jerusalem which would chiefly benefit; but (in accordance with what has been said above) not so much because of natural necessity as by her political rank. She was the capital, and in those times trade was the business of the king, and pursued, as Hebrew, Babylonian, and Egyptian records agree, by his servants. This must have greatly increased the population, and led to that extension of her walls and other buildings which is imputed by the Old Testament to David himself.

David's rebuilding of Jerusalem must be left to another paper; but before we close this study it is necessary to remark on one other consequence to the later history of

¹ 2 Sam. i. 24.

² *Central and Eastern Arabia*, ed. 1883, p. 93.

³ 2 Sam. xiv. 26: *the King's weight*. The phrase is taken by some commentators as a post-exilic of loss; but it seems to me without sufficient reason. The other proofs of the organisation of trade under David given above; and the general development of trade in Western Asia by that period under such a measure as the stamping of weights by David extremely probable. See *Trade and Commerce* by the present writer in *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. iv.

David's policy. He spared the heathen population. We are not told that he destroyed their sanctuary, or forbade the continuance of their worship. He certainly did not substitute the Ark for the image and symbol of whatever god had occupied that sanctuary before. The Ark was placed beneath a tent. But whatever may have happened to the Jebusite sanctuary, it is clear that a considerable heathen population, and all the attractions which a god in ancient possession of a definite territory has always had for the invaders of the latter, remained in Jerusalem side by side with the Israelite worship of Jahweh. If we are to understand the subsequent history of religion in Jerusalem, we must, with Ezekiel, keep in mind this native heathen strain. *Thine origin*, he tells her when exposing her affection for debased rites, *thine origin and thy nativity is of the land of the Canaanite; the Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was an Hittite.*¹

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XI.

THE COMPANIONSHIP OF THE TWELVE.

1. THE public ministry in Galilee, according to Matthew and Mark, began with the call of four disciples, Simon and Andrew, James and John. Luke, after recording a preaching tour through Galilee, reports the call of Peter, following on a miraculous draught of fishes. There seems to be little doubt that Luke's account is less trustworthy than Matthew's and Mark's. The visit to Nazareth is placed at the beginning of the ministry, although it belonged to a later date, as it serves as a programme of the work of Jesus, as

¹ Ezek. xvi. 3.

the Evangelist conceived it. And the story of the miraculous draught of fishes is probably a varying tradition of the same incident as is reported by John in connexion with one of the appearances after the Resurrection, and as prior to, and preparatory for Peter's restoration to his apostleship after his denial, an occasion on which his confession. "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord" (Luke v. 8), would be very much more appropriate than it is in the connexion which Luke gives to it.

2. The relation which this call of four disciples at the Sea of Galilee has to the interview between probably all of them and Jesus at the Jordan, as reported in the Fourth Gospel (i. 35-51), has been indicated in a previous *Study* (vi. The Early-Self-Disclosure). The first meeting was the beginning of friendship, and the companionship then begun did not last long, as the disciples soon returned to their homes and callings. At the second meeting the call to surrender all and to follow Him always was given. The promptness and completeness of the obedience to this call becomes more intelligible if already there was, not only acquaintanceship, but also an attachment more or less close to His person, through faith in His mission. Two questions may in this connexion be asked, although they cannot with any certainty be answered. Why did these disciples leave Jesus at all? Why were they at this time called to constant companionship? With reference to the first question two possible answers suggest themselves: Jesus may have sent them away, or they may have left Him. After His discovery of the unpreparedness of the nation as a whole to receive Him, He may have desired to withdraw for a time into solitude and silence to wait the clearer indications of His Father's will, and He may Himself have disbanded the small company. Or, as has already been suggested, the enthusiasm with which He at first inspired His disciples may have given place to disappointment and distrust, when

He did not fulfil their anticipations of the Messiah, and the people did not realize their expectations in receiving Him. Thus, they may have left Him of their own accord, and He may have suffered them to go, in the assurance that they would not be able to cast off the influence He had won over them, and in due time would be ready to return to their allegiance to Him.

3. Jesus' position accounts for the call He at this time addressed to them. Luke reports that "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (iv. 14). Although he connects this spiritual exaltation directly with the victory over temptation gained in the wilderness, and although the acceptance of John's record as historical compels us to place between the two events thus closely connected the *Early Ministry*, yet we may take these words as a suggestion that the distrust of the motives of the people in attaching themselves to Him, which His rebuke of the request of the nobleman from Capernaum betrays (John iv. 48), had again, through communion with His Father, yielded to confidence in His mission. His intense desire to fulfil His vocation had been revived, but events had taught Him that the method of His work must be more adapted to the state of unpreparedness of all classes of the nation, which, as a whole, could not respond to His appeal or recognize His authority. It was, therefore, necessary, while continuing the public ministry with greater reserve and restraint of utterance and action, to exercise on chosen individuals a more private influence, in which greater freedom and boldness of self-discovery would continue possible. Even as Isaiah turned from the king and people to the small *remnant*, among whom as disciples he bound up the testimony, and sealed the law (viii. 16), so Jesus chose a small company to receive "the mystery of the kingdom."

4. The words, "Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men" (Mark i. 17), indicate the pur-

pose of the call. These disciples were intended not only to believe in Him themselves, but so to witness and work for Him as to win others for the same faith. If, as has been maintained in a previous *Study* (iv. The Vocation Accepted) Jesus knew that His calling involved His sacrifice, then He was now taking steps for the continuance of His mission, and the extension of His message after His own work on earth was ended. His method was by personal intercourse to exercise so transforming an influence over His disciples, that they in turn would be able to exercise as transforming an influence over others. He was confident that by the simple means of daily companionship He could not only so develop their faith in Him that they would become altogether His for the ends of His ministry, but also so change them in their characters and capacities that through them others could be brought into the same relation to Himself. If we consider on the one hand how ignorant and imperfect these men were, and on the other how profound in wisdom and sublime in excellence the ideal to be realized in them and in others through them, we cannot but marvel at His confidence in the influence which by His companionship He hoped to wield.

5. What effect His companionship had at the beginning of the ministry is suggested by the comparison which He makes between the relation of His disciples to Himself and the relation of the friends to the bridegroom (Mark ii. 19, 20), a comparison which served at the same time to indicate the contrast between their mood and that of the Baptist's disciples, as well as to suggest the change which their feelings would in the future undergo. As Jesus did anticipate that through sacrifice He would fulfil His vocation, there is no good reason for suspecting the genuineness of this veiled reference to future separation from His disciples. But, as He looked forward to sacrifice as the means of salvation, until the Cross came into closer view, and began to

cast its drear shadow even over His soul, "the joy that was set before Him" inspired confidence and courage. This anticipation of separation from His disciples did not interfere with His experience of satisfaction in their companionship. They, without any such insight or foresight as He had, lived in the present moment, and that for them was joy, so that any fasting would have been a hypocrisy. The first lesson the disciples learned in the school of Jesus was to rejoice in His companionship, for it brought them assurance of God's love, enlightenment in His truth, and the experience of His salvation. At first they learned, not what faith might cost, but what it could win.

6. Not only did Jesus share in their satisfaction ; it was His joy of which they had caught the contagion. It was His meat and drink to do His Father's will, and in the doing of it He gained greater joy because He had for His companions those whom He was training for the same delight. The separation from His kindred which the fulfilment of His vocation involved was doubtless a great trial to Him, but He found consolation and compensation for the loss in their companionship. "Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mark iii. 34, 35). Had He been indifferent to the love of His kindred, these words might mean very little, but so tender a heart as His we may be sure felt the love of home deeply and keenly. A genuine and intense affection bound Him to His disciples as to His family. May we not even conjecture that, apart from the purpose for which He had called His disciples, He himself needed and yearned for close companionship and intimate intercourse. The love for mankind which was prepared for sacrifice on man's behalf craved the satisfaction which the love of men could give ; and this was found in the disciples.

7. For what ends did Jesus use this love for, and joy in,

Himself? The essential condition of discipleship was faith in Him, and in God through Him. By faith He did not mean assent to His claims, for at first He did not put forward His claims, but self-committal to Him personally, involving confidence in, and submission to, God. They were to trust Him and God in Him as unquestioningly and unhesitatingly as they were to obey unreservedly and completely. The extent of the faith required is shown in a very striking way in two incidents, which, it must be confessed, are not without serious difficulty for all who cannot accept without doubt or question the supernatural aspects of the life and work of Jesus, *the stilling of the storm* (Mark iv. 35-41), and *the walking on the waters* (vi. 45-52). Without now discussing the distinction of which so much has been made by recent criticism, between the *healing* and the *nature* miracles, let us consider Jesus' utterances on both occasions, that we may discover the indication of a purpose so necessary to and congruous with the fulfilment by Him of His vocation as to make more intelligible and credible the miraculous display of Divine power involved. After the storm ceased, He reproachfully asked the disciples the question, "Why are ye fearful, have ye not yet faith?" (Mark iv. 40). When approaching the disciples on the waters He allayed their terror with the assurance, "Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid" (vi. 50). Both utterances teach the faith which inspires confidence and courage. The disciples were being trained for a work, the dangers, difficulties, and disappointments of which would be so many and great, that only an invincible and triumphant constancy of faith could carry them through. By faith they must remove mountains and cast them into the midst of the sea; they must attempt and achieve the humanly impossible; they must never falter in their belief that God can do all things. How were they to be taught this lesson? Would words, how-

ever eloquent, be sufficient? Are not deeds more persuasive than words? When the storm was changed to calm they learned that with Jesus they were in God's hand, and that He could and would do all that was needful for their safety. When Jesus came to them on the waters they learned that His Presence and protection would ever be with them, as though they might be forgetful of Him, He would never forget them. If we realize that the establishment and extension of God's kingdom depended on the faith of these men, and that the faith which in their circumstances they needed was an absolute faith in God's omnipresent care, omniscient wisdom, and omnipotent might, the difficulty in believing even such miracles may be removed. Unless we reduce the healing miracles to simple instances of *faith-cures*, and so deny that they are in any sense miraculous acts of supernatural power, it does not seem more easy to conceive the exercise in such acts of such power in healing human disease than in controlling nature's forces. If the kingdom of God is that for which nature exists, it is not credulity but reason to admit that the laws of nature must be subordinate to the ends of the kingdom. If it should be argued that the faith of the disciples should have been developed in other ways and by other means than by miracles, then it might be replied that we do not know and cannot judge all that was necessary to make these men, sinful, feeble, fearful, all that for their work they needed to become. It is more fitting that we should trust the wisdom and skill of Jesus to use always the best means to foster in them a faith of the same kind and in the same degree as His own, so far as their human limitations allowed.

8. The disciples were being trained in this personal attitude to Jesus, and God in Him, that they might be fit to receive instruction in the mystery of the kingdom, which to the multitude was given in parables (Mark iv. 11). But

theirs was no unjust favour, for the parable of the *Sower* showed that they had proved good soil into which the seed of the Gospel might be cast (Matt. xiii. 23). On their receptivity depended His communicativeness. He explained to them the character, conditions, and destiny of the kingdom in plain words, while He secured the attention and stimulated the curiosity of the multitude by figurative speech. We must not assume, however, that if any anxious inquirer, any interested hearer, had come for the same interpretation it would have been denied. Not for mere concealment did He speak in parables, but that He might on the one hand avoid the misunderstanding His literal language would have produced owing to the unpreparedness of most of His hearers, and on the other arouse the interest of those who were capable of further instruction. It is impossible to believe that, as the quotations from Isaiah (Matt. xiii. 14, 15) suggest, it was His intention to hide the truth from the multitude for their ruin, although the result of His teaching was that many went away hardened. To secure the attention and interest of His disciples, He further impressed on them the value of His teaching by telling them that theirs now was the blessedness long desired by saints, seers, and sages of past times, who had looked forward to the revelation being made to them (Matt. xiii. 16, 17). He was eager to awaken their desire for His instruction, for it depended on their intelligence whether the mystery of the kingdom now revealed to them alone would at the appointed time be effectively made manifest to the world (Mark iv. 22). They must listen not as learners only, but as teachers. Each of them was a disciple that he might become a scribe of the kingdom. But even as He Himself did not teach as the Jewish scribes, who repeated by rote the opinions they had been taught, He desired His disciples to be "like a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new

and old" (Matt. xiii. 52). While dependent on Him they were nevertheless to possess liberty to develop and apply His teaching as the new conditions might require. To guide and guard that liberty there was afterward given to them the Spirit of truth, who continued in interpreting the revelation of Jesus.

9. The firstfruits of the harvest of which He had been sowing the seed in the good soil of the minds of His disciples was reaped by Him at Cæsarea Philippi, when Peter, for the other disciples as well as himself, confessed Him the Christ, the Son of the Living God. Many find in this incident one of the strongest arguments against the trustworthiness of John's Gospel. They maintain justly that Mark represents Jesus as exercising a strict reserve about His claims, as allowing His disciples entirely from His words and works gradually for themselves to reach the conviction of His Messiahship, as accepting for the first time with grateful surprise this confession at the mouth of Peter. With this representation, which has undoubtedly psychological probability in its favour, they further maintain John's account of the first interview of the disciples with Jesus is absolutely inconsistent. We must frankly on the one hand admit that possibly the Evangelist makes the confession of Andrew to his brother Simon, of Philip to Nathanael, and of Nathanael to Jesus Himself much more definite than was their language at the time. On the other hand we may with probability maintain, that if Jesus did not expressly claim the Messiahship, yet He did speak less reservedly about His aims and hopes than afterwards, and that for a time at least His holy enthusiasm did inspire the Baptist and his disciples with faith in His mission. It seems improbable that the four called at the Sea of Galilee should respond so promptly to the call, unless they had been previously influenced. It is probable that they had been prepared for Jesus' influence by the Baptist's teaching. It is

improbable that the two first disciples would leave John for Jesus without some adequate reason. How much Jesus did at first reveal we cannot confidently conjecture. But it was possibly just enough to arouse and keep up their attachment to Him, but not enough to relieve them of the task of discovering, as they did, for themselves how completely the prophecy of the Messiah was fulfilled in Him. An analogy may here help us. A young convert in the enthusiasm of a revival movement is carried far above and beyond the range of his experience, and it is only by a slow and it may be painful discipline and development afterwards that he actually incorporates in his experience the truth which he confessed at the beginning. Whatever expectations these disciples cherished at first there was as much to contradict as to confirm them in the ministry of Jesus. Even if they at the beginning confessed Him Messiah, on the Baptist's and His own testimony, in a moment of spiritual exaltation, yet since He proved so different from the Messiah they desired and expected their faith could be maintained and completed only by a slow growth in mind and heart under His instruction and influence. This education of their faith needed to be continued after their confession at Cæsarea Philippi. May not Jesus be referring to the difference of the belief in testimony and the faith of experience in the words, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 17). If we inquire how the revelation of the Father came to Peter, the words of Jesus give the answer, "No one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (xi. 27). It was through the Son that the Father's knowledge of the Son had come. The training and teaching of Jesus had been the means of the experience in which God revealed the truth which Peter had confessed.

10. This confession was of utmost importance to Jesus for two reasons. Therein a beginning was made of the Christian community, the people of the Messiah, who would bear witness to and do work for Him in the world. As the first members of the Christian Church in virtue of their confession as the result of their discipleship, Peter and those for whom he spoke are described as the rock on which the church would be built. No privilege peculiar to Peter, or transmissible by him alone, was by these words conferred. There was simply indicated the function of the disciples as apostles after the Resurrection, when by their testimony and influence the congregation of believers with them in the Christ was firmly established and widely extended. The confidence of Jesus in the constancy and sincerity of the faith of the disciples is most strikingly shown in this prophecy of a community, that no power even from the Unseen could dissolve, neither His own death nor the deaths of these disciples. Another reason for Jesus' satisfaction in this confession was, that He could now lay aside His reserve not only as regards His Messiahship, but also as regards the sacrifice to which He knew Himself called. The faith of the disciples, which had been so far assured, was at once put to a severe test. By His words and works hitherto Jesus knew that He had tried their faith, that they might have found "occasion of stumbling," as John the Baptist had found; but now He was about to make a much severer demand on their fidelity. For while a Messiah who went about doing good and preaching the Gospel to the poor was not altogether incredible, a Messiah who chose to die strained faith to breaking point. He had allowed them to discover His Messiahship without explicit declarations, but to secure their acceptance of His ideal of a Saviour through self-sacrifice, frequent and urgent persuasion was necessary, especially as His most solemn and sacred words fell on incredulous minds and unsympathetic hearts. Previously

the disciples had grieved Him by their lack of understanding." "Are ye also even yet without understanding?" (Matt. xv. 16). "Do ye not yet perceive, neither remember?" (xvi. 9). But now He was to discover a settled unbelief and a fixed resolve against His purpose. They could not and would not believe His words about the death to which He was unfalteringly advancing. We may be sure He said more to them than what we find in the meagre announcements of the Passion which the Gospels contain. They did not report because they did not remember, and they did not remember because they were not only indifferent but even hostile to His purpose. His vehement rebuke of Peter's remonstrance, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a stumbling-block unto me; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men" (Matt. xvi. 23), is a vivid flash of light on the shadows which to so large an extent fall on the relation of Jesus and His disciples. Hitherto His temptations had come to Him from the multitudes desiring to use Him only as a Healer, or to make Him king that He might continue freely feeding them, or from the scribes and priests who wanted Him to work a sign to prove His claims. But now these came from His chosen companions who wanted Him to spare Himself and them by refusing the cup which the Father was giving to Him. Temptations so coming were much more dangerous, for the more intimate the relation and the more intense the affection, the greater the power for evil or for good. The Transfiguration, the significance of which must be dealt with in a future *Study*, was probably intended not only to confirm the resolution of Jesus Himself, but also to remove one of the most painful and dangerous hindrances to His maintaining His steadfastness, by not only overcoming the opposition to, but even by winning the sympathy with, His sacrifice of the inner circle of disciples, whose attitude most keenly and strongly affected Jesus Himself.

11. We may here turn aside a moment to consider a most interesting question which the Gospel record suggests. Did Jesus in His disappointment with His chosen disciples sometimes long for more intelligent learners and followers? Were His disciples the "babes" whom He contrasted with "the wise and understanding," and did He, in His gracious invitation to the labouring and heavy laden (Matt. xi. 28-29) think of and yearn for another class of disciples, who would prize His gift more highly because they had felt their need more keenly? It is not at all improbable. Had He been able to secure a disciple like Paul, surely the loneliness He felt in view of the Cross would have been relieved by at least one companion, who allied insight with love. In this connexion Jesus' relation with Mary of Bethany seems to gain fresh significance. The "one thing needful" for Him, which she had chosen, "the good part" of bestowing (Luke x. 42), was sympathy. He found in her a ready and eager listener, as He spake of what was dearest to His heart. The anointing for His burial which she bestowed upon Him a few days before the Passion, of which her lavish, precious gift was the token (Mark xiv. 6-9), was the love which approved while it mourned His sacrifice. Thus not improbably Jesus found without what He vainly sought within the disciple-circle.

12. To return, however, to the training of the Twelve, not only by repeating from time to time the announcement of His passion did He seek to overcome their opposition and to win their submission to His will; His teaching on the duties of discipleship now assumed a more tragic note. There can be little doubt that, owing to the grouping of similar material, irrespective of order in time, by the Evangelists, especially Matthew, much teaching about the sufferings of the disciples in consequence of their confession of Him is given before the incident at Cæsarea Philippi, which obviously belongs to a later period. To refer to only one

passage, the teaching in Matthew x. 16-39, with the exception of a sentence or two here and there, is quite inappropriate as counsel given to the disciples on their first mission in Galilee. It is not at all credible that He should warn them that fidelity to Him would bring extreme suffering on them before He had announced that He Himself would so suffer. His call to fidelity, His prophecy of the persecution to which fidelity would expose them, His warning of the eternal loss which lack of fidelity would involve, His promise of the eternal gain fidelity would bring—all these elements in His teaching we can confidently assign to the period when He was striving to prepare His disciples for His passion. By thus laying down the law of sacrifice for all subjects of the kingdom, He was endeavouring to reconcile them to the expectation of His own Passion. His aim was to convince that it was good that He should suffer, and that they should suffer with Him. To the same period we must assign the interviews of Jesus with three candidates for discipleship (Luke ix. 57-62). There must be on the part of all His followers absolute self-sacrifice that they might be partners with Him in His sacrifice. Ease and comfort, home and kindred must once for all be surrendered in devotion to Him. Need we wonder at the severity of the demands, if we remember the position of peril in which He then found Himself, and the pain and trouble which the divided affections and faltering allegiance of the Twelve were causing Him? This same explanation is applicable to the case of the rich young ruler. In view of the Cross He could accept no disciples who were not prepared to forsake all for Him and to endure anything with Him. What He in any case would have suffered in anticipation of the Cross was increased by the loneliness in which His disciples left Him to endure. They who had rejoiced with Him would not mourn with Him. Again and again did they grieve Him with clear proofs of their estrangement from Him, of their

indulgence of tempers and passions opposed to His spirit and purpose.

13. Let us briefly glance at the story of Jesus' dealing with His disciples during this period. Their rivalry with the discord and division caused by it was exposed, and humility was taught by the example of the child in the midst (Matt. xviii. 2-3). They all had need to turn and become as little children even to find entrance into the kingdom, not to speak of places of rank and power in it. Their arrogance in forbidding the man who was casting out devils in the name of Jesus, when confessed by John, was rebuked by a declaration that they had no exclusive monopoly in the use of that name (Mark ix. 38-40). James and John grieved His heart by seeking to call down fire from heaven to destroy the Samaritan village which would not receive them (Luke ix. 54-56). When Peter desired to know the reward which they would get for their abandonment of home and calling, Jesus, while assuring him that every sacrifice would be rewarded abundantly, warned him, that the first might prove last, and the last first (Matt. xix. 30), for by his spirit he was showing that he might lapse from the position he held. The sons of Zebedee were refused their request for an exceptional favour, and the indignation of the other disciples against them gave Jesus the occasion for contrasting with their spirit His own. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." The inevitable result of their distrust and disobedience was the failure of their fidelity when the test came. In Judas hostility and disgust ended in treachery. In Peter foolish boastfulness, in spite of tender, earnest warnings, gave place to cowardly denial. When Jesus was arrested, all forsook Him and fled. John, it is true, was in the Judgment-Hall and at the Cross, but in the hour of the power of darkness, in the agony and desolation of the Cross, the

companions whom He had chosen and called, taught and trained, held aloof, and gave Him no help or comfort. Was not His burden made heavier, and His shadow darker, and His loneliness drearier by this failure and desertion? Not the fickle multitude alone, not only the Jewish authorities in their hate, and the Roman soldiers in their cruelty, had a share in the crime and tragedy of the Cross. Even the disciples increased the agony and desolation of the great sacrifice. And yet, although the faith of the disciples seemed to be done to death on the Cross, even as the Crucified was raised from the dead, it, too, attained a resurrection. Weak, foolish, and wilful, as these men were, the instruction and influence of Jesus had not been vain. His love and grace held them fast, and so their trust and loyalty revived. His appearances to them after the Resurrection saved them from despair, inspired them with confidence and courage. The certainty that He still lived filled them with that holy enthusiasm, of which Pentecost was but the first manifestation, which continued to be the most prominent characteristic of the Church in the Apostolic Age. In His disciples Jesus saw the travail of His soul, and was satisfied.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

VI.

JEREMIAH XII. 7-17.

*A Lamentation on the Desolation of Judah by its
evil-disposed Neighbours (v. 14).**

⁷ I have forsaken mine house, I have cast off mine heritage; I have given the dearly beloved of my soul into the hand of her enemies. ⁸ Mine heritage is become unto me as a lion in the jungle: † she hath uttered her voice against me; therefore do I hate her. ⁹ Is ‡ mine heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey? § are † the birds of prey against her round about? 'Go || ye, assemble all the beasts of the field, bring them to devour.' ¹⁰ Many shepherds ¶ have destroyed my vineyard, they have trodden my portion under foot, they have made my choice portion a desolate wilderness. ¹¹ They have made it a desolation; it mourneth to my sorrow,** being desolate: the whole land is made desolate, because no man layeth it to heart. †† ¹² Upon all the bare heights in the wilderness †† spoilers are come; for the sword of Yahweh devoureth from one

* I.e. probably the Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, who overran Judah after Jehoiakim's revolt from Nebuchadnezzar, c. 600 B.C. (2 Kings 24. 1, 2).

† I.e. it has become my open enemy.

‡ Questions of astonishment at what nevertheless has really happened.

§ I.e. like a bird of unusual plumage, which the other birds of the same kind attack.

|| Words of the prophet inviting beasts of prey as well to come and devour.

¶ Fig. of foes, as 6. 3.

** Heb. *upon me*. Cf. Gen. 48. 7 'Rachel died to my sorrow' (R.V. marg.), lit. 'died upon me'; i.e. as a trouble resting upon me.

†† I.e. no one has considered what would be the end of the policy which Judah had been pursuing (v. 13).

‡‡ I.e. the uncultivated pasture-ground: cf. Ps. 65. 12. (The Heb. word 'wilderness' means properly a *driving place* for cattle, and does not denote a sandy desert.)

end of the land even to the other end of the land: no flesh hath peace. ¹³ They have sown wheat, and have reaped thorns; they have made themselves sick, and profit nothing: and they shall be disappointed of * their fruits † because of the fierce anger of Yahweh.

Judah's evil-disposed Neighbours will be taken into Exile; but if they adopt from the Heart Judah's Religion, they will be restored to their own Lands.

¹⁴ Thus saith Yahweh concerning all mine evil neighbours, that touch the inheritance which I have caused my people Israel to inherit: Behold, I pluck them up from off their land, and the house of Judah will I pluck up from the midst of them. ¹⁵ And it shall come to pass, after that I have plucked them up, I will turn, and have compassion on them; and I will bring them back, every man to his inheritance, and every man to his own land. ¹⁶ And it shall come to pass, if they diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, '(As) Yahweh liveth,' ‡ even as they taught my people to swear by Baal, then shall they be built up in the midst of my people. ¹⁷ But if they do not hear, then will I utterly pluck up that nation, plucking up and destroying it, saith Yahweh.

JEREMIAH XIII.

Jeremiah performs a symbolical Act, illustrating the corrupt Condition of the People, and its Consequences.

¹ Thus said Yahweh unto me, Go and buy thee a linen waist-cloth, and put it upon thy loins, but bring it not into water. ² So I bought the waist-cloth according to the word of Yahweh, and put it upon my loins.

* Heb. *be put to shame by.* See on 2. 36.

† So changing a letter. The Heb. text has, *and be ye disappointed (or and they shall be disappointed) of your fruits.*

‡ Cf. on 5. 2.

³ And the word of Yahweh came unto me a second time, saying, ⁴ Take the waist-cloth that thou hast bought, which is upon thy loins, and arise, go to Euphrates,* and bury it there in a chink of the rock. So I went, and buried it by † Euphrates, as Yahweh commanded me. ⁶ And it came to pass after many days, that Yahweh said unto me, Arise, go to Euphrates, and take the waist-cloth from thence, which I commanded thee to bury there. ⁷ Then I went to Euphrates, and digged, and took the waist-cloth from the place where I had buried it: and, behold, the waist-cloth was marred,‡ it was profitable for nothing.

Explanation of the symbolical Act.

⁸ And the word of Yahweh came unto me, saying, ⁹ Thus saith Yahweh, After this manner will I mar the pride of Judah, and the great pride of Jerusalem. ¹⁰ This evil people, which refuse to hear my words, which walk in the stubbornness of their heart, and are gone after other gods, to serve them, and to worship them—let it be, then, as this waist-cloth, which is profitable for nothing! ¹¹ For as the waist-cloth cleaveth to the loins of a man, so have I caused to cleave unto me the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah, saith Yahweh; that they might be unto me for a people, and for a name, and for a praise, and for a glory: but they hearkened not.

* Heb. *Pērāth*, the usual Heb. name of the river (Ass. *Purātu*). So. *vv.* 5-7. Perhaps, however, as *Pērāth*, when it means the Euphrates, has generally 'the river' prefixed, and as a double journey (*vv.* 5-7) for such a distance is not very probable, the word should be read, with the change of a point, as *Parah*, the name of a town (*Josh.* 18. 23) in a wild and rocky valley, watered by a copious spring, and still called the *Wādy Fāra*, about three miles N.E. of Jeremiah's native place, Anathoth. The *Wādy* runs into the *Wādy Kelt*, which flows down, past Jericho, into the Jordan.

† Or (more naturally, though not necessarily: see *Ezek.* 10. 15, 20 Heb.) *in* (to go with the reading *Parah*).

‡ It had been in a moist place to which the water had penetrated.

*A Parable declaring the Disaster about the Fall upon
Judah.*

¹² And thou shalt speak unto them this word : Thus saith Yahweh, the God of Israel, Every jar * is filled with wine : and they will say unto thee, 'Do we not know that every jar is filled with wine?' ¹³ Then shalt thou say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh, Behold, I will fill all the inhabitants of this land, even the kings that sit upon David's throne,† and the priests, and the prophets, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, with drunkenness.‡ ¹⁴ And I will dash them one against another, even the fathers and the sons together, saith Yahweh : I will not pity, nor spare, nor have compassion, that I should not destroy them.

Take this Message to Heart betimes.

¹⁵ Hear ye, and give ear ; be not proud : § for Yahweh hath spoken. ¹⁶ Give glory to Yahweh your God,|| before he cause darkness,¶ and before your feet stumble upon the dark mountains ; ** and, while ye wait for light, he turn it into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness. ¹⁷ But if ye will not hear it, my soul shall weep in secret because of (your) pride ; and mine eye shall weep sore, and run down with tears, because Yahweh's flock is taken captive.

* An earthen vessel (see Is. 30. 14, R.V. 'vessel' ; Lam. 4. 2, R.V. 'pitcher') in which wine was kept (Jer. 48. 12, R.V. 'bottles'), probably something like the Roman *amphora*.

† Heb. *for David upon his throne*.

‡ Every jar is naturally made to be filled with wine : so the men of Judah will be filled with 'drunkenness,'—fig. of the mental paralysis and bewilderment, rendering men helpless in face of a great calamity,—and then 'dashed' like so many earthenware vessels (Ps. 2. 9) against each other. Cf. 25. 15 f., Is. 51. 17, Ps. 60. 3 ('Thou hast made us to drink the wine of staggering,' fig. for, thrown us into bewilderment by a great disaster).

§ Viz. by refusing to listen to Yahweh's warnings.

|| I.e. recognize His majesty, by obeying His words.

¶ Or, *it grow dark*.

** Heb. *mountains of twilight*.

A Lamentation on the approaching Fate of Jehoiachin, and his Queen-mother, Nehushta (see 2 Kings xxiv. 8, 15; and cf. chap. 22. 26).

¹⁸ Say thou to the king and to the queen-mother, Sit ye down low: for your crown of beauty is come down from your head.* ¹⁹ The cities of the South † are shut up, and there is none to open them: Judah is carried into exile all of it, an entire exiled people. ‡

The Prophet laments the Disaster which the Sins of Jerusalem are bringing upon her.

²⁰ Lift up thine § eyes, (O Jerusalem,) || and behold them that come from the north: where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock? ²¹ What wilt thou say, when he shall appoint over thee (though thou thyself hast trained them against thee ¶) familiar friends as (thy) head? ** shall not sorrows take hold of thee, as of a woman in travail? ²² And if thou say in thine heart, 'Wherefore are these things come upon me?' for the greatness of thine iniquity are thy skirts uncovered, and thy heels suffer violence. ²³ Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are

* So LXX. Pesh. Vulg. (omitting a letter). (The word rendered 'head-tires' in R.V. has that meaning nowhere else.)

† Heb. *the Negeb*, the name of a particular district in the S. of Judah (see Gen. 12. 9, R.V. marg.), the cities in which are enumerated in Josh. 15. 21-32.

‡ So LXX (two slight changes): lit. *an entire exile* (= *exiled company*), see Am. 1. 6, 9, Heb. The Heb. text has (after 'all of it'), *she is wholly (?) carried into exile*; but the word rendered 'wholly' is peculiar, and does not occur in this sense elsewhere.

§ So LXX (in agreement with the verbs, which are both singular, and the pronouns *thee*, and *thy*, at the end of the verse). The Heb. text has *your*.

|| Inserted (with LXX) for the reason stated on 7. 29.

¶ Viz. by entering into political relations with them (cf. 2. 36).

** I.e. What wilt thou say, when thou seest the allies, whose friendship thou once courtedst, turned against thee, and ruling over thee? Cf. 2. 36, 4. 30; Ez. 23. 22; and for the expression 'head,' Lam. 1. 5.

accustomed * to do evil. ²⁴ I will scatter them, therefore, like stubble that passeth away, to the wind of the wilderness. † ²⁵ This is thy lot, the portion measured unto thee from me, saith Yahweh; because thou hast forgotten me, and trusted in falsehood. ²⁶ And I also have stripped off thy skirts before thy face, and thy shame shall appear. ²⁷ Thine adulteries, and thy neighings, ‡ the lewdness of thy whoredom—I have seen thy detestable deeds on the hills in the field. Woe unto thee, O Jerusalem! how long will it yet be, ere thou becomest clean! §

JEREMIAH XIV.—XV.

A Dialogue between the Prophet and Yahweh, arising out of a Drought in Judah.

XIV. ¹ That which came as Yahweh's word unto Jeremiah with regard to the drought.

The Distress of Men and Animals occasioned by the Drought.

² Judah mourneth, and the gates thereof languish, they sit in mourning upon the ground, || and the cry of Jerusalem is gone up. ³ And their nobles send their inferiors to the waters: they come to the pits, and find no water; they return with their vessels empty: they are put to shame ¶ and confounded, and cover their heads. ** ⁴ And they that till the ground are dismayed, †† because no rain hath been in the land; the plowmen are put to shame, ¶ they cover their heads. ⁵ For even the hind in

* Heb. *taught*. † Cf. 4. 11. ‡ See 5. 8.

§ Heb. *thou wilt not become clean, after how long yet!*

|| The gates, as places of public concourse (Ru. 4. 1, 2, 11), are personified: cf. Is. 3. 26.

¶ In Heb., 'be put to shame' is said where we should say 'be disconcerted' or 'disappointed.' See esp. Joel 1. 11, and Job 6. 20; and comp. my *Parallel Psalter*, Glossary I. s.v. *Ashamed, to be*.

** A mark of grief: see 2 Sam. 15. 30.

†† So Duhm, after LXX. The Heb. text has, *Because of the ground, which is dismayed*.

the field doth calve, and forsaketh (her young) because there is no grass. ⁶ And the wild asses stand on the bare heights, they pant for air like jackals; their eyes fail, because there is no herbage.

The Prophet, interpreting the Drought as a Sign of Yahweh's Anger, utters a Confession and Supplication in the Name of her People.

⁷ ' Though our iniquities testify against us, work * thou, O Yahweh, for thy name's sake: for our backturnings are many; against thee have we sinned. ⁸ O thou hope of Israel, the saviour thereof in the time of trouble, why shouldst thou be as a sojourner in the land, and as a way-faring man that turneth aside to tarry for a night? † ⁹ Why shouldest thou be as a man surprised, as a mighty man ‡ that cannot save? yet thou, O Yahweh, art in the midst of us, and thy name hath been called over us §; leave us not.'

Yahweh's Reply: He will accept no Intercession on behalf of the People,

¹⁰ Thus saith Yahweh unto this people: Even so || have they loved to wander; they have not refrained their feet: and Yahweh doth not accept them; now will he remember their iniquity, and visit their sins. ¶ ¹¹ And Yahweh said unto me, Pray not for this people for (their) good. ¹² When they fast, I will not hear their cry; and when they offer burnt-offering and oblation, I will not accept them: but I will consume them by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence.

* Or, do: cf. 1 Kings 8. 32, 39; Ez. 20. 9, 14, 22.

† I.e. as a passing visitor or traveller.

‡ I.e. a warrior. Contrast Zeph. 3. 17.

§ See on 7. 10.

|| I.e. in the same proportion in which I have held myself aloof from them (v. 8).

¶ A quotation from Hos. 8. 13.

Jeremiah endeavours to excuse the People, laying the Blame upon their Prophets.

¹³ And I said, ‘ Ah, Lord Yahweh ! behold, the prophets say unto them : “ Ye shall not see the sword, neither shall ye have famine ; but I will give you assured peace * in this place.” ’

Yahweh replies again : the Prophets to whom Jeremiah refers have spoken Lies in His Name ; and the Doom of Jerusalem will not be deferred.

¹⁴ And Yahweh said unto me, ‘ The prophets prophesy lies in my name : I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake I unto them : they prophesy unto you a lying vision, and a worthless divination, † and the deceit of their own heart. ¹⁵ Therefore thus saith Yahweh concerning the prophets that prophesy in my name, and I sent them not, yet they say, “ Sword and famine shall not be in this land : ” By sword and famine shall those prophets be consumed. ¹⁶ And the people to whom they prophesy shall be flung out in the streets of Jerusalem because of the famine and the sword ; and they shall have none to bury them, them, their wives, nor their sons nor their daughters ; for I will pour their wickedness upon them. ¹⁷ And thou shalt say this word unto them, “ Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease : for the virgin daughter of my people is broken with a great breach, with a very grievous ‡ wound. ¹⁸ If I go forth into the field, then behold the slain with the sword ! and if I enter into the city, then behold the torments § of famine ! yea, both the prophet and

* Heb. *peace of faithfulness*.

† So, omitting one letter (‘ and ’). The Heb. text has *divination and worthlessness*. For the thought of the verse cf. 23. 16, 26, 32.

‡ Heb. *sick* (as 10. 19).

§ Heb. *sicknesses*.

the priest have gone as traffickers* into a land that they knew not." †

Jeremiah, in more beseeching Tones, renews his Supplication and Confession in the Name of his People.

¹⁹ 'Hast thou utterly rejected Judah? hath thy soul loathed Zion? why hast thou smitten us, and there is no healing for us? we wait for peace, but no good cometh; and for a time of healing, but behold dismay! ²⁰ We acknowledge, ‡ O Yahweh, our wickedness, and the iniquity of our fathers: for we have sinned against thee. ²¹ Do not contemn (us), for thy name's sake; do not treat with contumely the throne of thy glory: remember, break not thy covenant with us. ²² Are there any among the vanities § of the nations that can cause rain? or can the heavens give showers? art not thou Yahweh our God? and we wait for thee; for *thou* hast made all these things.'

The Prophet's Intercession is rejected even more decisively than before: the Fate of Judah is sealed.

XV. ¹ And Yahweh said unto me, 'Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind || would not be toward this people: send them away from before me, and let them go forth. ² And it shall come to pass, when they say unto thee, "Whither shall we go forth?" that thou shalt tell them, Thus saith Yahweh: Such as are for death, ¶ to death; and such as are for the sword, to the sword; and such as are for famine, to famine; and such as

* Or, if a rare Syriac usage may be followed, *have gone as beggars*. In either case degradation from an honourable office is the idea expressed.

† In v. 18 Jeremiah, vividly realizing the future, imagines himself to be witnessing the approaching invasion, siege, and exile.

‡ Heb. *know*.

§ I.e. false gods: cf. 2. 5, 8. 19.

|| Heb. *my soul*.

¶ I.e. death by pestilence: cf. 18. 21.

are for captivity, to captivity. ³ And I will appoint over them four kinds,* saith Yahweh : the sword to slay, and the dogs to drag, and the fowls of the heaven and the beasts of the earth to devour and to destroy. ⁴ And I will make them a consternation to all the kingdoms of the earth, because of Manasseh the son of Hezekiah king of Judah, for that which he did in Jerusalem. ⁵ For who will have pity upon thee, O Jerusalem? or who will commiserate thee? or who will turn aside to ask of thy welfare? ⁶ *Thou* hast cast off me, saith Yahweh, thou ever wentest backward : and I have stretched out my hand against thee, and destroyed thee; I am weary with repenting. ⁷ And I have winnowed them with a winnowing-fork in the gates of the land : I have bereaved, I have destroyed my people ; they returned not from their ways. ⁸ Their widows are increased to me above the sand of the seas : I have brought upon them against the mother of the young men † a spoiler at noonday : I have caused agitation (?) ‡ and dismay to fall suddenly upon her. ⁹ She that hath borne seven languisheth : she hath given up the ghost ; § her sun || is gone down while it was yet day ; she hath been put to shame and abashed : and the remnant of them will I deliver to the sword before their enemies,' saith Yahweh.

Jeremiah laments the hard Fate which has made him, through the Message of Evil which he bears, an Object of Ill-will to all Men.

¹⁰ Woe to me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth !

* Heb. *families*.

† I.e. of the young warriors slain in battle.

‡ The meaning of the Heb. word is very uncertain.

§ Heb. *breathed out her soul*. Here fig. of mental collapse at the death of her sons in battle. (Cf. Job 11. 20 Heb., 31. 39 Heb.)

|| Fig. for the brightness of her home.

I have not lent upon interest, neither have men lent to me upon interest; * yet all of them curse me.

Yahweh reassures him: The Time will come when his Enemies, crushed by the Chaldean Power, and with Exile imminent before them, will come to implore his Help.

¹¹ Yahweh said, 'Verily I will strengthen thee† unto good; verily I will cause the enemy to make supplication unto thee in the time of evil and in the time of trouble. ¹² Can one break iron, even iron from the north, and bronze? ‡ ¹³ Thy § substance and thy treasures will I give ||for a spoil without price, and that because of all thy sins, and in all thy borders.|| ¹⁴ And I will make thee to serve¶ thine enemies in a land which thou knowest not: for a fire is kindled in mine anger,** which shall burn up upon you.'††

Jeremiah entreats Yahweh to interpose on his Behalf: why should he be persecuted for having delivered his Message faithfully?

¹⁵ *Thou* knowest, O Yahweh; remember me, and visit me, and avenge thyself for me of my persecutors; take me

* I.e. I am an object of hostility to all, though I have engaged in no transactions likely to arouse hostility. Jeremiah's unpopularity was due to his predictions of coming disaster.

† So, with a slight change, the Heb. text. The Heb. marg. reads, *I will release thee.*

‡ Can anything avail to resist the power of the Chaldæans, the 'northern Colossus'? (Ewald).

§ *Vv.* 13, 14, recur, with textual differences, as part of 17. 3, 4.

|| Read probably (as in 17. 3), *for a spoil; and thy high places, for sin, throughout all thy borders.*

¶ So LXX (cf. 17. 4). The Heb. text has, *I will make thine enemies to pass into.*

** See Deut. 32. 22.

†† *Vv.* 13, 14 (if they are in their right place here) must be supposed to be addressed to the *people*—in spite of the pron. of the 2nd pers. in *v.* 11 denoting Jeremiah. The prophet is assured that the Chaldæans will effect their purpose; and that he will be relieved of his foes by their being all carried away into exile.

not away in thy longsuffering : * know that for thy sake I have borne reproach. ¹⁶ Thy words were found, and I did eat them; † and thy words were unto me a joy and the rejoicing of mine heart : for thy name hath been called over me, ‡ O Yahweh, God of hosts. ¹⁷ I have not sat in the assembly of them that make merry, nor rejoiced : § because of thy hand || I have sat alone ; for thou hast filled me with indignation. ¹⁸ Why is my pain perpetual, and my wound desperate, which refuseth to be healed ? wilt thou indeed be unto me as a deceitful ¶ (stream), as waters that are not sure ?

Yahweh's final Reply. Jeremiah, if he desires Happiness and Success, must turn back from following the false Path of Distrust and Despair.

¹⁹ Therefore thus saith Yahweh, If thou turnest, then will I bring thee back, that thou mayest stand before me ; ** and if thou bringest out the precious from the common, †† thou shalt be as my mouth : ‡‡ *they* may return unto thee ;

* I.e. through thy mercy towards my enemies.

† Fig. for, I found thy revelation in my heart, and eagerly appropriated it. For the figure, comp. esp. Ez. 2. 8-3. 3. LXX, however, reads (*v. 15 end*), . . . *I have borne reproach from them that despise thy words* (cf. 23. 17 R.V. marg.). *Consume them* (Ps. 59. 13), and let thy word be to me a joy, etc.

‡ I.e. thou hast taken possession of me (7. 10) as thy own.

§ I have taken part in no worldly festivities.

|| The grasp of Yahweh's hand, seizing him and throwing him into a prophetic ecstasy or trance : see 2 Kings 3. 15, Ez. 1. 3, 3. 14, 22, Is. 8. 11 (with R.V. marg.).

¶ Heb. *lying*. Cf. Job 6. 15 ; Is. 58. 11 (where 'fail' is lit. *lie*).

** If Jeremiah turns back from his distrust and despair, then Yahweh will co-operate with him, and help him again to resume his place as His minister. To *stand before* any one is to *wait upon* him, or *be his servant* (see e.g. Deut. 1. 38 ; 1 Kings 10. 8, 12. 8 ; and of the Levites, performing menial offices for the worshippers, Num. 16. 9). It is used of the priests, as God's ministers, Deut. 17. 12, 18. 10 *al.* ; and of a prophet, as here, specially of Elijah and Elisha, 1 Kings 17. 1, 18. 15, 2 Kings 3. 14, 5. 16.

†† I.e., probably, if thou separatest, like a refiner, what is pure and divine in thee from the slag of earthly passion and weakness, with which it is mixed

‡‡ I.e. as my spokesman, or prophet. See esp. Ex. 4. 16, comp. with 7. 1.

but *thou* shalt not return unto them. ²⁰ And I will make thee unto this people a fortified wall of bronze: and they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail against thee: for I am with thee to save thee and to deliver thee, saith Yahweh. ²¹ And I will deliver thee out of the hand of the wicked, and I will redeem thee from the clutch* of the terrible.

JEREMIAH XVI.

Further Predictions of the coming Disaster.

Jeremiah is not to be the Father of a Family: for a terrible End will ere long overtake the Families of Judah.

XVI. ¹ The word of Yahweh came also unto me, saying, ² Thou shalt not take thee a wife, neither shalt thou have sons or daughters in this place. ³ For thus saith Yahweh concerning the sons and concerning the daughters that are born in this place, and concerning their mothers that bare them, and concerning their fathers that begat them in this land; ⁴ they shall die of grievous deaths; † they shall not be bewailed; neither shall they be buried; they shall be as dung upon the face of the ground: and they shall be consumed by the sword, and by famine; and their carcasses shall be food for the fowls of heaven, and for the beasts of the earth.

He is to take Part in neither the domestic Sorrows nor the domestic Joys of his People: for a Time is coming in which there will be no Place for either.

⁵ For thus saith Yahweh, Enter not into the house of grief, ‡ neither go to wail, neither commiserate them: for

* Heb. *palm*.

† Heb. *deaths of sicknesses*.

‡ Heb. *of shrill crying*, with allusion probably to the loud and piercing cries of grief with which in the East a death is bewailed. Cf. Mark 5. 38 (of the people assembled in the death-chamber of Jairus' daughter), ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά.

I have withdrawn my peace from this people, saith Yahweh, even kindness and compassion. ⁶ Both great and small shall die in this land; they shall not be buried: neither shall men wail for them, nor cut themselves, nor make themselves bald for them; * ⁷ neither shall men break (bread) for them in mourning, to comfort them for the dead; neither shall men give them the cup of consolation to drink for their father or for their mother. † ⁸ And into the house of feasting thou shalt not enter to sit with them, to eat and to drink. ⁹ For thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I cause to cease out of this place, before your eyes and in your days, the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride.

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

XIII. 1. *Waist-cloth*. See W. R. Smith's art. in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1892, p. 289 ff.; more briefly, GIRDLE in *Enc. Bibl.*, § 1, or *Lex. s.v.* אָזֵר. Like Jer. here, Isaiah (20. 2) has only a waist-cloth wound round the loins (so Elijah, 2 Kings 1. 8); and in Job 12. 18^b the king who is humiliated is represented as wearing one. The close and constant attachment of the waist-cloth to the body gives the point of the comparison in Is. 11. 5 (twice). The other places in which the 'ēzōr, or waist-cloth, is mentioned are Is. 5. 27, Ez. 23. 15. The references here to Ex. 28. 39, Lev. 16. 4, in the R.V. with marg. references, gloss the word incorrectly: both the word and the thing (אֲבִנֵי, a long, richly embroidered sash, wound twice round the body, with the ends reaching to the ankles, and thrown round the left shoulder, when the priest was officiating: *Enc. Bibl.* l.c. § 5) are there completely different.

4-6. If the Euphrates is intended (which, it is true, would be appropriate, as suggestive of the people's future place of exile), the prophet's symbolical act was perhaps enacted in a vision, as must have been the case with the one narrated in 25. 17 ff. Hitzig, following

* Marks of mourning: see Deut. 14. 1, Am. 8. 10, Mic. 1. 16, Is. 22. 12.

† The allusion is to the custom, according to which, when the first outbreak of grief had subsided, the friends of the mourners would endeavour to comfort them, and induce them to take food (cf. 2 Sam. 3. 35, 12. 17). Food partaken of in this way was 'unclean,' on account of the mourners having been in close proximity to a corpse: cf. the allusions in Deut. 26. 14, Hos. 9. 4, Ez. 24. 17.

Bochart, thought that Ephrath, i.e. Bethlehem (Mic. 5. 2), might be intended. The suggestion to read *Parah* was made by Schick, Marti, ZDPV. 1880, p. 11. and Birch, PEFQSt. 1880, p. 236; and adopted by Cheyne (*Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, 161; and *Enc. Bibl.* ii. 1429, iii. 3583): cf. also already Ewald, *Propheten*² (1868), ii. 158, iii. 496. It should however be observed that in Josh. 18. 23 the form is הַפָּרָה with the art. LXX Φαρα). If the Euphrates is referred to, the part meant cannot be anywhere near Babylon, where there are no 'rocks,' or rather 'crag's' (סלע),—but in the upper part of its course, above Carchemish, or even above Samosata, where it still flows between rocky sides.

4. *chink*. The word occurs elsewhere only 16. 16, Is. 7. 19.

bury. The word does mean properly to *hide*; but it is often used specially of hiding in the *earth*, where we should say idiomatically *bury* (cf. Gen. 35. 4, Ex. 2. 12, Josh. 7. 21, etc.). That the waist-cloth was 'buried' here is implied also by the use of the word *digged* in v. 7.

10. *let it be, then*. The jussive, וייהי, cannot be legitimately rendered *shall be*.

19. שלומים, though explicable syntactically (G.-K. § 118*q*), is very strange, as שלום occurs nowhere else in the sense of *full number*. It is far better to read with Buhl (*Lex.*¹²; cf. Siegfried-Stade), and Duhm, following LXX (ἀποικίαν τελείαν) גְּלוּיֹת שְׁלֵמָה, exactly as in Am. 1. 6, 9. (συντελέσαν is merely a misreading of בְּלֵי, as though this were בְּלֵי.)

XIV. 1. The construction in the Heb. is very peculiar and unusual, recurring otherwise only in the titles 46. 1, 47. 1, 49. 34; Ez. 12. 25 is, however, partly similar.

4. ועבדרי הארמה חתה for בעבֶר הארמה חתה, a clever and convincing emendation of Duhm's, based upon LXX, which at one stroke improves the parallelism of the verse, and removes an awkward expression in the Heb. (the ground being 'dismayed'). LXX have τὰ ἔργα for עֲבָרָה; i.e. they pronounced 'עֲבָרָה', understanding the word—as they not unfrequently do with other words in the O.T.—in its Aram. sense (see Eccl. 9. 1).

9. *surprised*. The meaning of רהם (only here) is clear from the Arabic (Lane, *to come upon one suddenly*, or *surprise one*). So already, substantially, Abul-Walid in his *Lex.*, and Jos. Kimchi, as cited by his son, David Kimchi, in his *Book of Roots*, s.v. D. Kimchi himself explains it as meaning one who is *helpless* in time of trouble, in Spanish, *asperduto* (i.e. *perditus*). No doubt 'astounded' (i.e. *attonitus*, thunder-struck) once meant this; but the word is not now generally understood; and 'astonished' does not quite give the *nuance* required.

18. אל ארץ cannot be legitimately rendered 'in the land.'

XV. 4. *a consternation*. Heb. וְנִטְוָה. Is. 28. 19, and in the *K'tib* of Jer. 15. 4, 24. 9, 29. 18, 2 Chr. 29. 8; the form וְנִטְוָה is found in Deut. 28.

25, Ez. 23. 46, and in the *Qrê* of Jer. 15. 4, 24. 9, 29. 18, 2 Chr. 29. 8 (the pronunciation in these passages being assimilated by the Massorites to Deut. 28. 25). As the root is פָּחַח, the form פָּחַח־יָּ is the correct one. As to the meaning of the word, פָּחַח is to *shake* (Eccl. 12. 3), *move in fear* or *tremble* (Esth. 5. 9); it is much more common in Aram. than in Heb.; so in Syr. פָּחַח is a *shaking, trembling, terror*, etc. In Is. 28. 19 פָּחַח־יָּ means evidently *terror*, or—to use a word which would have the advantage of being more distinctive—*consternation*; and the same sense will suit all the other passages quoted,—Deut. 28. 25 and the other two occurrences in Jer. being in the same phrase as here, and Ez. 23. 46, 2 Chr. 29. 8 being similar (except that ‘to all the kingdoms of the earth’ is omitted),—‘consternation’ having naturally the sense of ‘the object of consternation,’ or ‘what arouses consternation,’ just as פָּחַח־יָּ, properly *dismay*, means evidently an *object of dismay* in Jer. 48. 39. So Rashi: ‘whosoever hears of the misfortune that has come upon them will tremble (פָּחַח־יָּ). R.V. ‘to be tossed to and fro among’ is a paraphrase of Ges.’s *divexatio* (cf. Ewald’s ‘play-ball’); but it is only the intensive, reduplicated form of the root (פָּחַח־יָּ), which means to *shake to and fro* (Hab. 2. 7 Heb. [see R.V. marg.]; and in Syr., e.g. for *δίεσεισε* in the Hexaplar Syriac of Job 4. 14, *συνέσεισε* Hex. Ps. 59. 4, *έσάλευσε* Hex. 4 Reg. 17. 20, 21. 8 [see P.S. col. 1107; and note the Ethpalp. *ibid.*]); so that פָּחַח־יָּ, derived from the Qal conjug., meant more probably nothing more than the *shaking of fear*.

5. *Commiseration* is used by Shakespeare; and *commiserate* appears as early as 1606 (Murray): so the word is no modernism. There is no reason for supposing that נָּחַח meant specifically to ‘bemoan.’

7. ‘Fan,’ whether verb or noun, is now practically obsolete in the sense here intended; in the N.T. (‘whose fan is in his hand’) the meaning can be conjectured from the words which follow.

winnowing-fork. Heb. *mizreh* (from *zārāh*, to *scatter* or *winnow*), also Is. 30. 24. The corresponding Arab. word *midhrā* (with *dh* = ذ, for the Heb. ڤ) is in use in modern Syria, and denotes a wooden fork almost six feet in length, with five or six prongs, bound together by fresh hide, which, on shrinking, forms a tight band (*Enc. Bibl.*, col. 84, from Wetzstein). There is an illustration of a *midhrā* in Hastings’ *D.B.* i. 51. The wooden ‘shovel’ of Is. 30. 24 was used with it. The mixture of corn, chaff, and broken straw, produced by threshing, was shaken about with these two implements, usually in some exposed spot, when a wind was blowing (generally in the afternoon or evening, Ruth 3. 2), and the wind carried away the chaff and the straw (Ps. 1. 4). If however the wind was too violent, it would blow away the corn as well: hence the point of Jer. 4. 11.

8. *agitation.* Heb. פָּחַח, a most uncertain word. צִירִים in Heb. denotes the pains of childbirth, 1 Sam. 4. 19, Is. 21. 3, fig. of mental distress

or terror, Is. 13. 8, 21, 3, Dan. 10, 16: hence (1) it has been supposed that עיר is Aram. for ציר; an Aram. ע however corresponds to a Heb. צ only when the corresponding Arabic word has ض (my *Tenses*, § 178), which does not here appear to be the case; moreover, צירים occurs only in the plur., never in the sing.; and thirdly, where the reference is to a woman, the word might be so easily misunderstood in a literal sense that it is hardly likely to have been used by the prophet: accordingly this view must be rejected. (2) The view that עיר is a scribal error for ציר falls through for the two last-mentioned reasons. (3) Ges. had recourse to the Arab. غار *to be very hot* (e.g. of noon-day); thinking עיר might be applied, like the Lat. *aestus*, to the glow or ardour of an emotion, and denote here the *aestus doloris*, as in Hos. 11. 9 (where also עיר occurs, but where this meaning is unsuitable), the *aestus irae*. But it must be evident that the meaning thus obtained rests upon a very precarious and uncertain basis. (4) In default of anything better, עיר may perhaps be connected with עור, *to be stirred up*, and denote (*Lex.* 735*b*) the excitement or agitation of alarm: this explanation, if not positively probable, may at least be said to labour under fewer objections than those mentioned above. (In Hos. 11. 9 בעיר is probably corrupt.)

10. For בַּלְהֶם מוקללוני, with the *monstrum* מוקללוני, read בַּלְהֶם קללוני.

11. The *Kt.* is שְׁרוּתִיד; from שָׁרַר, a common Aram. root meaning *to be strong*, or, in the causative conjugations, *to strengthen, confirm* (e.g. Jer. 10. 4 Pesh. for וַיִּחְזְקוּם); but in Heb. found otherwise only in derivatives. The *Qal* is however intransitive in Aram.; so it seems we must, at least if this sense is accepted, read either the *Piel* שְׁרַרְתִּיד, or the *Hiphil* הִשְׁרַוְתִיד. The *Qrē* is שְׁרִיתִיד, from a root found otherwise only once in Heb., viz. Job 37. 3 (R.V. *sendeth it forth*), but common in Aram., and meaning there *to loosen, release* (e.g. in Jer. 40. 4 Targ. and Pesh., the same form as here, for פִּתְחֵתִיד; and in Is. 58. 6 Pesh. for פִּתְחֵת). In either case, therefore, the word is an Aramaism. Of the two alternative readings the first seems to yield the more appropriate sense.

12-14. Ewald, on account of the awkward change (from *v.* 11) in the persons addressed, conjectured that these verses had become misplaced, and that their proper place was after *v.* 9. Yahweh's speech however in *vv.* 1-9 seems to end naturally with *vv.* 8, 9; and these verses, added there, seem rather superfluous.

15 *end*, 16. LXX read וְגַם יְהִי וְגַם נִמְצְאוּ דְבָרֶיךָ: וְגַם יְהִי וְגַם נִמְצְאוּ דְבָרֶיךָ וְאֵלֶּם וְיְהִי וְגַם (cf. 23. 17) for נִמְצְאוּ דְבָרֶיךָ וְאֵלֶּם וְיְהִי וְגַם.

19. *common*. On A.V., R.V. *vile*, which to a modern reader suggests an incorrect sense, see the footnote above, Nov. 1902, p. 332.

S. R. DRIVER.

THE MEANING OF ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ.

PROFESSOR T. K. Abbott's essay on *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, in his essays on Old and New Testament questions, reprinted 1898 as a separate pamphlet ("Do this in Remembrance of Me, —should it be *Offer this!*") is the fullest answer that has been offered to the upholders of a sacrificial meaning of *ποιεῖν* in the narrative of the Institution. Others may be found in an article by Dr. Plummer in the *EXPOSITOR* of June 1888 (referred to below as *Expos.*), and in his commentary on St. Luke, *ad loc.* Prof. Abbott's essay is evidently meant to be exhaustive and final; and though he thought worth while to supplement it by another pamphlet, *A Reply to Mr. Supple's and other Criticisms*, it remains the principal argument on that side, and is from time to time referred to as such. I venture however to call attention to some points in it which are not satisfactory and to commend a form of the sacrificial theory suggested by Scudamore's *Not. Euchar.* ed. ii., not as certain, but as being in a difficult case more probable than the traditional.

There is a want of clearness and consistency in Prof. Abbott's paper which makes it not always easy to grasp his exact meaning, but his contention in the main appears to be:—(i.) that *ποιεῖν* nowhere has a sacrificial meaning of its own; in its general sense it may be applied to sacrificial as to other action, that is all; (ii.) that the common rendering of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, "Perform this action" is perfectly obvious, simple and devoid of difficulty; (iii.) that no authority ancient or modern is on the side of the new rendering, Justin no more than any other.

I wish to show, perhaps with some rearrangement of familiar arguments, (1) that within narrow limits yet clearly and unmistakably, *ποιεῖν* is found with a sacrificial

meaning. As to this it is possible that on reconsideration Prof. Abbott, while denying the relevance, will allow that he has overstated the matter; others, who agree with his main conclusion, are not at one with him here, e.g. Bishop Ellicott, approved apparently by Dr. Plummer, *Expos.* p. 441; (2) that the common rendering is not free from difficulty; (3) that Justin Martyr, though perhaps he alone directly, is on the side of the new rendering; (4) that in view of unsolved difficulties on both sides what may perhaps be called Scudamore's theory has considerable probability.

1. "The general conclusion so far is (1) That in the LXX ποιεῖν never means offer" (*Do this*, p. 26). Abbott points out a large number of LXX cases in which the use of ποιεῖν has been no doubt improperly claimed as supporting the sacrificial sense, though some of these would admit it were such a sense otherwise made out. But there remain those in which it stands for עשה used in a sacrificial sense. That עשה has a technical sacrificial sense is not a novel theory of High Churchmen, but is, I understand, accepted by Hebrew scholars, e.g. Gesenius, "9. to offer, present, as in Greek, ῥέζειν ἔρδειν." The new Lexicon: "II₁ make offerings [instances given of עשה with concrete object זבחה, עולה, etc.]; also with accusative of thing sacrificed (perhaps originally, prepare, divide) . . . abs. = offer sacrifice Ex. 10₂₅ . . . 2 Kings 17₃₂." Why the suggestion "(perhaps, etc.)," if it was a simple application of the verb's general meaning *make* or *do*? So Delitzsch on Ps. 66₁₅. "עשה used directly (like the Aramaic and Phœnician עבר) in the signification to *sacrifice* (Exod. 29₃₆₋₄₁ and frequently) alternates with עָלָה the synonym of הִקְטִיר." If ποιεῖν is used to render עשה in these cases, the presumption is that it follows the meaning of עשה whether by so doing it is used classically or not. And this seems to be the Professor's view (*Do this*, p. 4).

“The Hebrew verb, which corresponds generally in its range of application with ποιεῖν including the signification of ‘do,’ ‘make,’ ‘cause,’ etc., is עשה, which occurs about 2,500 times. Hence, as was inevitable, the Greek translators almost always rendered it by ποιεῖν. It follows that in the LXX we find ποιεῖν used not only in its classical senses but in others.” One would think from this that he allowed what is all I am maintaining, that in these passages ποιεῖν was used in the exact sense of עשה, not derived from or testifying to any previous Greek use of the word, but simply by a Hebraism of translation, the mere transference of a Hebrew word into Greek by its ordinary but not idiomatic equivalent, such as is the case in other LXX renderings. It must be then that in denying a sacrificial sense of ποιεῖν in the LXX he would deny a sacrificial sense of עשה as well, though there is nothing in his argument to show that he is opposing a received view. In his first paper, *Do this*, he takes no notice at all directly of this question of עשה; in his second, *A Reply*, he throws in (p. 11) a remark, “As regards the use of the Hebrew word itself, I must now add that in the judgement of Hebrew scholars it was not properly used of ‘offering’ but of preparing and slaying the victim,” a footnote being added, “Cp. Wünsche or Keil on Hosea ii. 8” (Hebr. verse 10).

These scholars then go beyond Abbott in holding that עשה was properly used in a special meaning, for they plainly are not speaking merely of an application of the general meaning; no one could deny what Prof. Abbott emphasizes, that עשה could be applied generally to the action of offering. But moreover they can hardly mean to confine the technical application of עשה to preparing and slaying; that was exactly what did not take place “upon the altar” (Exod. 29₃₈). Evidently by “properly” is meant “originally,” i.e. with a relative originality; and

it is very pertinent to point out that where the object is *gold* the sacrificial use of ΠΨΥ is inappropriate with its associations of food and culinary preparation.

A prominent feature of Professor Abbott's paper is the pointing out that uses of words (*ποιεῖν* in particular) which are adduced as special are really general; and he illustrates from other languages, English in particular. Up to a certain point it is necessary to go with him; but as there seems on both sides a want of distinctness here, it is necessary, even more for a later part of the argument than for this, to dwell on the matter at the risk of seeming to waste words on a minor point. When we claim a distinct sacrificial meaning for *ποιεῖν*, or for the matter of that for ΠΨΥ, we mean a distinct meaning in the full sense, as *horse* has a distinct meaning from *animal*. One of the most common processes of change of meaning is through words of a general meaning assuming a specific. Where that is a gradual process there may often be a doubt whether there is to be considered a specific meaning or not, whether the point has been reached at which a new meaning is definitely formed, e.g. in English *do* for *cook*; and this uncertainty is one of the reasons why lexicographers group uses under a number of specific heads which often at first sight seem merely applications of a general sense. Abbott indeed says (*Reply*, p. 14), "Are we getting back to the days of the lexicographers who reckoned more than 40 'special meanings' of *ποιεῖν* in the N. T. and twenty of *λαμβάνειν*?" But allowing for exaggeration, it will be clear from Murray's *New Dictionary* that we are getting, rather have got, back to those days, if indeed they were ever left.

In the specialising of the meaning of a word the general meaning may be entirely lost, as in *Queen*, *starve*, *undertaker*. Or it may continue to live by the side of the special, as in *property*, *animal*, *cultivate*; and then the context has

to show which meaning is taken just as much as in *It rained, he reigned, the Lord Mayor, the grey mare*. But effects of context have to be distinguished. Dr. Kay, in a poetical mood (I have not been able to recover the place), compares this ποιεῖτε in its sacrificial context to a diamond looking red by the side of a rose; but in no individual passage can context convey meaning into a word, though a repeated habitual context can, as in *Queen*, etc. In the case of a word of general meaning, as genus can only actually exist in species, context may show the species; just as in *grey horse* the meaning of horse is not affected by the adjective, so in οὕτως ποιεῖτε, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, though the first word stand for sacrificial action the ποιεῖτε is still merely general. But in the case of a word of several meanings the context has not to assist in creating a meaning, but to select the ready-made meaning intended: *A property of matter, this watch is my property, the property market, man is an animal, animals have not the power of speech, this powder is harmless to animals but fatal to insects*; or to take a technical term—*such a farmer is cultivating to-day*, where the hearer, even if ignorant, would probably be able to see that a special process was meant; he would not be able to guess from the words the special process of land-cleaning by steam, but were the thing indicated a familiar one, would very likely infer it from the context. Or still nearer the point, *He did me over the bargain* (not mere modern slang, *v. Murray*). The context here says nothing of cheating or overreaching, and so cannot convey that meaning into the verb; but it drives us to select that meaning of *do* which implies overreaching. This is what it seems to me the context may do in the case of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε. It may show the ordinary general meaning unsuitable, and a sacrificial meaning, if such exist, suitable, and therefore eligible.

Without then claiming to settle the question altogether,

I maintain that we can rely on ample authority in giving to ΠΩΥ a special sacrificial meaning distinct from the general.

Another point is that, viewed from the Greek side, there are many places in which ποιεῖν, standing for the sacrificial ΠΩΥ, cannot be construed by ordinary Greek idiom.¹ By an ordinary Greek idiom, most familiar perhaps in εὖ ποιεῖν τινα, ποιεῖν with adverbial expression of treatment governs an accusative of the thing affected; and this idiom is freely employed in the LXX. even where the Greek accusative corresponds to a Hebrew dative (ב). But this usage does not cover ποιεῖν without expression of treatment, as Prof. Abbott's argument would require. And yet I might speak with more reserve in view of his authority were it not that he himself can be quoted against it. He groups indeed under the one head of ποιεῖν, as a substitute for a more special verb to avoid repetition (*Do this*, p. 3), both the Greek ταῦτὰ ἐποίησαν τοὺς ταῖς βώλοις βάλλοντας and the English *If you correct this sheet and verify the references, I will do the other; when I have painted and varnished this panel, I will do that one*; but on the other hand he is apparently pointing to ποιεῖν and accusative without words of treatment when he concludes (*Do this*, p. 26), "So far as this usage of the LXX goes beyond that of classical writers it is not an Hellenistic idiom, but a Hebraism due to literalness of translation." Again he says (p. 9), "The last class of passages consists of those in which ποιεῖν is used in the familiar way to avoid the repetition of a specific word or complex description contained in the preceding context. . . . For example, in Exodus 29₃₉, τὸν ἀμνὸν τὸν ἕνα ποιήσεις τὸ πρῶτὸ κ.τ.λ., the sort of ποιεῖν is specified in the preceding verse, ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου,

¹ There are also cases where, though the Greek considered alone will construe as Greek, the Hebrew verb is unambiguously sacrificial as Leviticus 9₁₆.

and by a well understood idiom ποιήσεις carries on this specification. This is what is known as 'brachylogy' or brevity of expression. . . . Indeed even ποιήσεις itself might have been omitted had not the Greek idiom permitted this brachylogy. . . . Psalm 65₁₂ is similar: ὀλοκαυτώματα . . . [sic] ἀνοίσω σοι μετὰ θυμιάματος . . . [sic] ποιήσω σοι βόας μετὰ χιμάρων. The poetical parallelism here makes the brevity of expression less harsh in Hebrew. In Greek it would not be possible, except in a very literal translation, and that even in a translation it was felt to be scarcely tolerable appears from the fact that about a hundred MSS. substitute ἀνοίσω." It is perplexing to be told that Greek idiom permits what is harsh, except in a very literal translation impossible, and even there scarcely tolerable.

I claim then that the sacrificial meaning of ποιεῖν is so far tenable that ΠΨΥ has a sacrificial meaning, and is able conceivably to give birth to a sacrificial meaning of ποιεῖν as a Hebraism for it has done so in the LXX.

2. There are in the context difficulties of applying the ordinary meaning of τοῦτο ποιεῖν, these difficulties arising from the word τοῦτο. It may be quite true (excluding the passages in question) that, as Abbott claims, the phrase τοῦτο ποιεῖν "recurs frequently in classical Greek and always='do this'; frequently in the LXX and always in this sense; frequently in the New Testament (about twenty times), and everywhere in the same sense." But context has to be regarded. (a) τοῦτό μου ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Two clauses, short and mysterious (at least the first of them) side by side beginning with the same word, as it would seem, with intentional emphasis. One must feel what a congruous element of dignity it would be that the two τοῦτο have the same meaning, and how strange the collocation otherwise. Abbott indeed says, "Had it been intended

to express *Do this*, no other words than *τούτο ποιείτε* could have been used." Why not *οὕτως ποιείτε, ταῦτα ποιείτε*, or even *ποιείτε τούτο*, to say nothing of the more probable employment of a longer and more explicit phrase, such as *ὡς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήσετε*. It is use which has habituated us, as it did the Greek Fathers, to sever *τούτο* from *τούτο* without feeling of strangeness. If then the second *τούτο* is the same as the first, it points to a concrete object and not a verbal action, and the common rendering of *ποιείτε* will not stand. (β) *τούτο ποιείτε ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. It is argued by the sacrificialists that *πίνητε* can only find an object in the previous *τούτο*, which therefore must = *τὸ ποτήριον* (in the sense of *τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτ.*).¹ Abbott replies (*Do this*, p. viii.): "It is said further that as there is no word in the Greek corresponding to the 'it' inserted in the E.V. it is natural to suppose that *ποιείτε* and *πίνητε* have the same object. On the other hand if *αὐτό* had been expressed, it might have been said that it is awkward to overleap *τούτο* in order to find the antecedent of *αὐτό*. Compare in fact

	<i>τούτο ἐστὶ . . . τούτο προσφέρετε</i>
	<i>ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε αὐτό</i>
with	<i>τούτο ἐστὶ . . . τούτο προσφέρετε</i>
	<i>ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε</i>

[I copy the accentuation.]

In the former case one is almost compelled to refer the three pronouns to the same antecedent; in the latter there is more freedom. In the passage in question I think no Greek reader or listener would miss *αὐτό* or think necessary to supply an object to *πίνητε*. If he thought of supplying anything, it might quite as well be 'thus' as 'it.' And the proof is that no Greek ever did feel such a

¹ Cf. Hort's note on *τῷ λόγῳ* 1 Peter 2, even though the position spoken of is not the same, "The position rather suggests that it belongs to both by a natural and common Greek usage too much ignored by commentators."

difficulty." But whether *αὐτό* has to go looking for an antecedent or *πίνητε* for an object the difficulty of over-leaping an obvious one at hand is the same. Still one cannot help saying that some of Prof. Abbott's sensitiveness as to an awkward reference might have been applied to the repeated *τούτο*. That it has not been shows how easily the mind accommodates itself to a received interpretation. There is an obvious rendering of *ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε* (grammatically possible, *v.* 1 Cor. 10₃₁) which has been taken up by Dean Stanley and others: "Do this whenever you satisfy your thirst. Turn every meal into a reminder of Christ." This seems to be purely modern. The Greek Fathers (if what Prof. Abbott says is correct) were too entirely limited by the traditional rendering to think of it. And the same limitations made them simply acquiesce in the omission of *αὐτό*. It is too much to say that no Greek felt any difficulty or at least awkwardness in it. Probably in every page of the New Testament they were as sensible of a difference of style from their own day as we are with the A.V., and this would go with the rest. After all that has been written in recent years, and though a translation can be tested by the original, there are, I believe, hundreds of educated people who take "I know nothing by myself" in the modern sense. If Stanley's rendering is to be rejected (as I doubt not), it seems to me that some special point has to be looked for in the omission of *αὐτό* for the Biblical style is not chary of pronouns, and that that may be found in the intention pointedly to contrast *ποιεῖτε* and *πίνητε*. Commentaries do not much help to the reason of inserting *ὁσ. ἐ. πίν.* May it be "You are quite aware the Eucharist is a joint religious meal (*πίνητε*); mind then it is also a sacred service offered to God (*ποιεῖτε*)." In this way it will be the *τ.π.* clauses which contain the main point of the argument, and do most to explain the *γὰρ* of *v.* 23.

(γ) Another point may be worth mentioning. *Τούτο ποιεῖτε*

in its ordinary rendering is as general and undescriptive as possible: its natural position would be once at the end of the whole; for the rite is everywhere regarded as one whole with two parts. But that is not the use of τ.π. in the accounts of the institution. In both accounts¹ it applies to the half rite, not to the whole. If the τούτο has a concrete reference, this will be natural, for a single τούτο could not include both Bread and Cup; and the sacred dealings with the two are quite separate acts.

(δ) Prof. Abbott insists that “τούτο ποιέίν has a well established meaning which is invariable”; but neither he nor any one applies that here. Without answering that no parallel whatever can be found to the common rendering, there is, so far as I can see, none in the New Testament. Some may perhaps so take St. John 5₁₉, “ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκείνος ποιῆ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ.” But it can hardly be questioned that Westcott is right in identifying the works of the dependent clause with those of the principal. Not that the Father does some work and the Son imitates in others, but that their working is coincident.²

What does the common rendering make the antecedent of τούτο? In all three cases (St. Luke 22₁₉₋₂₀, 1 Cor. 11₂₄₋₂₅), in WH, in two of the three in TR (which has λάβετε φάγετε 1 Cor. 11₂₄) nothing has been said to which τούτο can refer, though the mention in narrative easily disguises the fact from the reader. The τούτο must refer

¹ The T. R. of St. Luke 22₁₉₋₂₀ is assumed without judging anything respecting the autograph of the Evangelist as being allowed, I believe very generally, a sufficiently early date to make its testimony of value for the present purpose.

² Of passages bearing on this apart from τούτο, ταῦτα would not St. John 14₁₂ (τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ποιήσει) be parallel to 5₁₉? Not “He shall do works like those of healing, etc., which I am now doing,” but “He shall share in my operation as I share in the Father’s.” ποιῶ not ποιήσω, because our Lord is regarding his operation present and future as one whole.

Passages on the other side are St. John 15₂₄, εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποίησα . . . ἂ οἶδεις ἄλλος ἐποίησεν where the negative οὔδεις eases the expression, and Rev. 2₅ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποιήσου.

to the action of our Blessed Lord (including benediction, thanksgiving and the responsive action of the disciples); but that was a series of individual acts which can no more be repeated than a man can be doubled. The common rendering takes *τούτο* as = *τοιούτο*. This is not impossible, but so far as at present appears is unexampled. But in a command to imitate certain actions, the natural form would be far more explicit. Cf. St. John 13₁₄₋₁₅, where the fact that the command was not understood literally will hardly make the difference. Compare also Judges 7₁₇₋₁₈, 9₄₈. And remember that according to the common rendering this unusual form is chosen where, through the neighbourhood of another *τούτο*, it occasions a special confusion. In the new rendering, on the other hand, the *τούτο* is justified by the mystical identification with *τὸ σῶμά μου*.

Here then are reasons drawn from the New Testament texts for holding that the antecedent of the *τούτο* is a concrete object and not a verbal action or group of verbal actions; and if it is so, there is no meaning which, according to Greek idiom, can be attached to *ποιεῖτε*; but if there existed a sacrificial meaning of *ποιεῖν* parallel to that of *ἵψυ*, the context, as indicating the prominent use of a material object in the worship of God, would easily suggest that as the meaning to be selected here.

3. The argument from Justin Martyr is that he has a concrete thing for the object of a *ποιεῖν* identical with the verb of *τούτο ποιεῖτε*, and that therefore (as just stated) in view of the context none but a sacrificial meaning of *ποιεῖν* is possible.

(i.) *Apology*, i. 66: οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν μου, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου κ.τ.λ.

The inversion makes the strangeness of severing the one

τούτο from the other still more perceptible; the narrative helping it less, as the second has to pass the first in looking back for a reference.

(ii.) Trypho 41: τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους οὐ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν.

(iii.) *Ibid.* 70: περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ σεσωματος ποιῆσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς αὐτὸν δι' οὓς καὶ παθητὸς γέγονε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὃ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστοῦντας ποιεῖν.

In these two passages the ποιεῖν of 1 Corinthians 11. occurs three times governing twice ὃν, i.e. τὸν ἄρτον, and once ὃ, i.e. τὸ ποτήριον, itself being the object of παρέδωκε in each case; or even if we took the ὃν, ὃ as directly objects of παρέδωκε, they would have to be understood again after the infinitive (cf. Acts 12₄, 16₄). In two of these cases ποιεῖν stands in a very emphatic position, making a slipshod clumsy sentence unless capable of corresponding emphasis. Professor Abbott and Dr. Plummer have two main methods of disposing of Justin's witness. For one, Abbott says, "As to ποιεῖν I think we must conclude that he simply introduces the words by way of quotation without intending to give an interpretation" (*Do this*, p. 36), and Plummer (*Expos.* p. 445), "The words εἰς ἀνάμνησιν are an intentional quotation of the words of institution, and they naturally draw after them the verb with which they are joined, viz. ποιεῖν"; i.e. both writers say there is an irregularity of construction from the confusion of a quotation. It is not sticking to the order that confuses it, nor confining himself to the thoughts or words of the Scripture passage, and it is on the face of it unnatural that an irregularity should be repeated three times. The other reply attempts no justification of Justin. It is simply

that no other Father takes it so, and therefore Justin must be either wrong or misunderstood. But Justin's is genuine evidence which must constitute a difficulty until it is explained or accepted; evidence moreover to which time and place give a value of its own. A writer in the *Church Quarterly*, vol. 22, p. 329, says, reasonably, "It is not the exigences of controversy which drive him to give the word this meaning. He does not defend it as if it was a novelty or an explanation needing to be justified; it is evidently to him the natural way of taking the word, and no other interpretation seems to occur to him." Dr. Plummer says some of the Fathers must have noticed it had Justin intended a sacrificial sense; but even if they read him carefully enough to notice an irregularity, would they be likely to spend time on discovering its significance? As to the practical fact they were at one with Justin, and the question would have been as purely philological as the way of construing *μίαν ὄραν ἐποίησαν* in S. Matthew 20₁₂.

4. While then it may be granted that the other Greek Fathers show no knowledge of any but the common use of *ποιεῖτε*, Justin's language will not admit of the common use, but points to a sacrificial. Justin and the other Fathers do not agree; one or other must be wrong, but there is no need to exaggerate the difference. It is wrong to say with Abbott (*Do this*, p. v.), "The two renderings are entirely different and incompatible"; and again, p. 1, "If [the special sacrificial meaning] is correct, the words ought to be so translated, for in that case 'do this' is wholly wrong and misleading." Were it indeed so, there would be no doubt that the Liturgies and Fathers accepted the new rendering, for they speak and act on the strength of its being practically true. Prof. Abbott would no doubt agree in referring the prayer "Summe Sacerdos et vere Pontifex" of the Missal to a period when the new rendering was unknown. It has the words, "Accedo ad altare tuum licet

peccator ut offeram de donis tuis sacrificium quod tu instituisti et offerri tuæ Majestati præcepisti in commemorationem tuam et pro nostra salute." Would that have struck any of the older Fathers as less exact¹ than our "Did institute and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious Death until His coming again?" The Liturgies at least, if they ignore the new rendering as a rendering, practically accept it as a gloss upon the traditional. Scudamore, holding Justin to be right, offers briefly (*Notit. Euchar.* 2nd edition, p. 625) an hypothesis to explain why the rest of the Greek Fathers are wrong. It has no direct evidence to demonstrate it, but seems to offer an explanation of facts hard to reconcile. He is (as I understand) ready to agree with Prof. Abbott that the Greek Fathers knew no sacrificial meaning of ποιῆν because there was none to know in genuine Greek; but thinks that a sacrificial use of עָשָׂה, or of the corresponding word in another language, may have continued attached to the Mosaic rites till it passed out of sight and knowledge of Christians some time after the destruction of the Temple, and so may in time have been forgotten, but that Justin was familiar with it possibly even more than foreign-born Christians. The striking character of Justin's meaning must not be exaggerated. The existence of schools denying or belittling the sacrificial character of the Eucharist has brought out the contrast of the two renderings. But when all the valley is flooded one may fail to mark the stream so clearly. When the sacrificial character of the rite was neither questioned nor analyzed Justin's use, even if already obsolescent, might escape critical notice.

With regard to the received rendering it is said that no Greek writer finds any difficulty in it. This is explained first by the unquestioned fact that it is a possible rendering,

¹ Unless in the words "tuæ Majestatis," omitted by the Roman Missal. The quotation is made from the Burntisland edition of the Sarum.

and then by what is here allowed that the Fathers knew no other, not recognizing the relevance of the few Old Testament passages. When once then a meaning was established it became a law to itself, bearing down the difficulties of context, the more so from the familiarity and constant repetition of the words. There was, I believe, a long period during which the meaning of *allto* in Judges 9₅₃, was widely unknown, and consequently in spite of the spelling *brake* and the unusual form of sentence people were driven to understand it, "She did all for the purpose of breaking his skull."

The Liturgies, amid a general ignoring of the new rendering, have some evidence the other way. In spite of Dr. Plummer's argument (*Expos.*, p. 446)? I think most people will think that οὖν, τοίνον, *igitur*, following the institution, sound somewhat inexact without a previous command of oblation. In the Clementine also he has failed to notice the words κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν (προσφερόμέν σοι τῆ βασιλείῃ καὶ θεῶ κ.τ. αὐ. δ. τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο). I would however allow that these, the *therefore* and the κ.τ. αὐ. δ., have persisted into an age when their purport was no longer exactly understood. But while they lose (as we are inclined to think) the old meaning of τ.π., the greater number of them (i.e. of Hammond's) including the Clementine, St. James, St. Mark, the Roman,¹ at the same time change its use.

Placing it once at the end of the whole institution, and evidently referring it to the rite as a whole, they give evidence of a deflexion from the original meaning of the words. But we may fairly claim the testimony of the whole body of Liturgies down to 1552 in another way. We have in the Anglican Communion Service of that year

¹ Of the rest of Hammond's, the Coptic and Mozarabic follow 1 Cor. 11. in the double mention, St. Chrysostom (as also Serapion) omits altogether; the Nestorian has lost the Institution. Of variations in wording the one bearing most on the present point is the *Haec* of Roman and Ambrosian.

and its derivatives a liturgy drawn up on purely Scriptural lines as then understood. In it the sacrificial character, which is evident in Scripture apart from the τ.π., is acknowledged, but how different the result! In the old Liturgies the sacrificial character supplies the system of the service and the Communion follows as an essential and sacrificial feature. In the Anglican the sacrificial character is obscured in the greater part of the service. Understand the words "Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving" in the most Zwinglian sense, and the form of our office does not suggest it. The mind prepared by the opening of the Anaphora is thrown off the lines by the Prayer of Humble Access. It is not simply a question of High doctrine. Our service does fit in with High doctrine of the Real Presence better than with any other. A sacrificial character might, as was said, consist with very low doctrine. But our service makes it hard to bear in mind any sacrificial character, though in the last prayer asserting one. Whence then did the ancient Liturgies draw this most conspicuous and paramount feature that the sacrificial character should govern the form of the rite? Apostolic tradition would be sufficient, as with the Lord's Day. Yet in a matter of such extreme importance, and in a service where so much is made of Scripture, basing itself by explicit declaration on the Scriptural account of the institution, we should expect here also an original belief in the explicit support of Scripture; and if so, this is the only point at which it can be found. Without going so far as the words to which Dr. Plummer objects that "no other explanation of the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is forthcoming," we may still say that no other Scriptural explanation is forthcoming of its dominating to such an extent the form of the service. And so when Dr. Plummer asks, "Is it likely that a tradition of such moment would have left no impression on any of the Greek Fathers?" we can answer,

It has made the very greatest impression, living, lasting, clearly marked. The seal may have been, so to say, mislaid, or its writing obliterated by the cataclysm of Jewish apostasy, as Scudamore holds, but not before it had impressed the Church ineffaceably.

For the new theory has been adduced not only the LXX *ποιεῖν*, but the Homeric *ἔρδειν* and *ῥέζειν* and the Latin *facere* and *operari*, to which Prof. Abbott adds a later Greek use of *ποιεῖν* absolute (*ἱερά* understood) with dative of the deity.¹ These are, as he points out, various, both in origin and in construction; they are historically independent. But can it be quite fortuitous that thus again and again we find the vague word of used *doing* technically of sacrifice. The very point of sacrifice is that it has a mystical side, that something meets the eye, but something not less important and characteristic evades exact description. Hence the resort to a vague expression, the vagueness of reverence, and it is evident how appropriate it is to this holy mystery.

The evidences for a sacrificial sense in *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* may not justify an actual demand for its acceptance. But those who have felt it a reasonable and probable view may, I think, properly wait for a clearer refutation than is found in Prof. Abbott's articles, trenchant rather than consistent, *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται εὐρεθῶσι καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς*.

¹ *Do this*, pp. 3, 39. In view of the fact that Liddell and Scott give no instance of this use (Hdt. 2. 49 is hardly an exception), it would have been convenient had Prof. Abbott given some unambiguous references.

F. W. MOZLEY.

MISSIONARY METHODS IN THE TIMES OF THE
APOSTLES.

WE have more express and oft-repeated instructions for missionary work in the words of Jesus, and more clearly defined, and at the same time more richly coloured, examples in the Acts of the Apostles, than we have of any other Church work. The most important and difficult questions referring to *inner Church life*, which had to be answered soon after the Ascension of Jesus, are either ignored by the tradition of the community or only very slightly referred to, and even then rather in prophetic intimations than in distinct commands in the words of their Lord. And, in fact, the tradition, which has been reduced to writing, answers very truly to the historic reality. In many respects Jesus was content to plant faith and the kingdom of God in the hearts of His disciples, and to leave it to the productive power of this germ to fashion a visible body for itself. Jesus *commanded* time after time that missionary work was to be carried on, from the day He declared that the fishermen by the Lake of Gennesaret should be fishers of men till the day when, as the risen One, He commissioned the Apostles to make disciples of all nations. The Apostles were not only missionaries, the Lord had also called them to be the shepherds of the community that had been gathered in, the stewards and overseers of His house, the Church. But their name of "Apostle" was given to them because their Master had sent them out to preach, first to the lost sons of His own house, then to the cities of the Samaritans, and on the highways of world-wide traffic which led to the most distant heathen nations; and this name of "messengers, missionaries" Jesus gave

to them Himself.¹ For this, the principal work of their calling, and from which they derived their name, He did not leave them without instructions, which seem from their wording to enter into the minutest particulars, even to their dress and the whole outfit for their journey. The difference is undeniable which comes to light here between missions and other manifestations of Church life. It was a matter of course that the believer should live by his faith, and that the community of saints should edify itself, and endeavour to preserve its most blessed possession. But to carry the gospel to those who were outside, or even in opposition, was something so difficult and hazardous, so far removed from all instincts of life and self-preservation, that the oft-repeated commands, the newly-awakened sense of duty, and the indelible recollection of the binding and encouraging commands of Jesus were needed, and are still needed, to keep this work going. The missionary command of Jesus was the goad of the driver which was needed even by the Apostles. St. Paul felt it, for he says, "Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 16); and he drove it deep into the flesh of his scholar Timothy, who had become indolent. We may also well say that the missionary command of Jesus to the Apostles was a light that illuminated their path, and which placed a glorious goal before their eyes in the pressure and darkness of an imperfect present. However, it is by no means the case that the Apostles possessed, either in the words or in the example of their Master, precepts of which the conscientious fulfilment would form their missionary work.

¹ Luke vi. 13, xi. 49; John xiii. 16; comp. Matt. x. 16, John iv. 38, xx. 21. I do not know of any satisfactory investigation of the apostolate. The unsatisfactory book by W. Seuffert, *Der Ursprung und die Bedeutung des Apostolats* (Leiden, 1887), ought to have incited some one to write another. A lecture given by me at the Pastoral Conference at Dresden, in the year 1890, on this subject has not been printed, because the want can only be supplied by a much fuller and more scholarly treatment.

Let us look more closely at the instructions Jesus gave to the Apostles when He sent them out for the first time on a missionary journey.¹ Two things are plain: that principles were laid down which reach far beyond the particular events recorded, but that the details, definite laws and prohibitions, were not rules binding on all future missionary work. Neither were they so regarded by the Apostles. It is true that we come across either one or the other of these rules in the later conduct of missions,² but they were not kept to the letter. The command which Jesus gave to His disciples, to go only to their countrymen was from the first only temporary. When it was set aside later by the command to convert all nations, that which had been placed before the eyes of the disciples all along as the end of their calling only came to light as an express command. Had they not long since been called the salt of the *earth* and a light of the *world*? But when it became a question of carrying out this command, no saying of their Lord clung to the memory of the Apostles, which gave a definite answer to the questions, when faith to their own people had been sufficiently kept, through which of themselves, in what direction, and under what forms and conditions the gospel was to pass over from Israel to the heathen. The instructions to go forth without money for the journey, without provisions, without a purse, and a double supply of clothing, and, on the other hand, to claim everywhere the hospitality of all good men, could not be carried out in all places. It

¹ Matt. x. 5 ff.; Mark vi. 7 ff.; Luke ix. 3 ff.; comp. x. 1 ff.

² 1 Cor. ix. 14; 1 Tim. v. 18; comp. Matt. x. 10, Luke x. 7. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* the same expression is applied to the settled prophets and teachers (c. xiii.); but with reference to the "Apostles," which means in this book the missionaries or itinerant teachers, the instruction of Jesus is altered, so that they may only claim the hospitality of the community for one day, or, at the most, for two, and that at their departure they were only to take provisions for one day but no money (c. xi.; cf. my *Forschungen*, iii. 298 f.).

is, perhaps, indicative of the way in which these rules were interpreted, even in the first generation, that they have not been once consistently transmitted.

According to St. Mark, the Apostles were to take a staff as their only equipment for the journey. According to St. Matthew and St. Luke, they were not to take one.¹ Jesus may have said either the one thing or the other, or both, on different occasions, but the meaning remains the same, and has certainly been rightly interpreted in essentials from the first. Jesus describes and demands by intelligible examples and characteristic marks of outward behaviour the spirit in which His messengers are to follow their calling. But this is nothing else than a spirit thankful for grace given, trusting in God, joyful in faith, self-denying; and without such a spirit no man is worthy to be called Jesus' disciple. Circumstantial instructions and methodical directions for the management of missions were not bequeathed by the Lord to His disciples. The disciples were to evolve the right methods for the conduct of missions from the nature of the task recognised as a duty, from a knowledge of the circumstances under which it was to be solved, from the leadings of God, and from their own experience. This was done by apostolic Christendom with great skill and magnificent results, not only because a consciousness of the

¹ Mark vi. 8; Matt. x. 10; Luke ix. 3. In his Syrian *Diatessaron* Tatian, who was followed by the Syrian translators of the Gospels, and also by the Latin harmonists of the Middle Ages, got rid of the contradiction by saying that Jesus forbade the carrying of a thick staff but allowed a thin stick to be carried (comp. *Forschungen*, i. 143; *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1895, Sp. 18; *N. kirchl. Ztschr.*, 1894, p. 95). Still more foolish, however, was the alteration of the original *ῥάβδον*, Matt. x. 10, Luke ix. 3, into *ῥάβδους*, as though Jesus had only forbidden several sticks to be carried at the same time; for so the alteration must have been intended, although the object was by no means thereby attained. The contradiction is only apparent with reference to shoes or sandals. From Mark vi. 13, compared with James v. 14, we might conclude that Jesus instituted anointing with oil at that time. In fact, Tatian seems to have mixed up something of that kind with the last missionary command (*Forsch.*, i. 219, note 4; *Gesch. d. Kanons*, ii. 554).

duty to carry on missions was alive in the majority of its members, but also because that spirit, which Jesus had described as especially necessary for missionary work, was present in a remarkable degree in the leaders. Missionary work requires no other virtues than those which naturally belong to the normal conditions of Christian life, but it requires them in a marked degree; it requires whole Christians, or, in other words, it requires the *union* of those moral qualities by which faith is everywhere converted into fruitful deeds. And it was just to this union of opposing qualities, especially indispensable in mission work, that Jesus expressly referred in His instructions when He said, "Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves."

These words applied primarily to the dangers which awaited the missionaries. They were to unite the wisdom of serpents and the harmlessness of doves because Jesus sent them as sheep amongst wolves. They were to show the wisdom of serpents, especially by being on their guard before men who would bring them to the judgment seat and seek to get them punished. They were to show the harmlessness of doves by trusting entirely to their Father in heaven, who by His Spirit would put into their mouths the right words for their defence in the hour of danger. But this rhetorical rather than logical enumeration of qualifications which must be united no more exhausts the meaning of these words than it confines them to times of persecution. They are of universal importance for all mission work. The right way in which to deal with men in order to avoid danger and persecution, or, if it must be, to endure triumphantly, and the frame of mind which this presupposes, cannot be essentially different from the way by which men must be won for the gospel. But this right method, which is, however, an art, depends upon the union of qualities which are very often separated, the qualities of which serpents and doves are the types. Jesus did not

hesitate to take the serpent, in whose image the old, evil enemy appeared, as the type of that good sense and thoughtful wisdom without which missionary work cannot be carried on with complete success. The serpent in Paradise, with as much skill as determination, knew how to make use of every circumstance in the position of those he wished to draw into his net. Missionaries, too, must study the circumstances under which they will have to work, and the inner and outer circumstances of those they wish to win. They must ponder over the ways and means which will lead them to the goal, they must choose the best and use them with determination. It is self-evident that their object can only be beneficial to the salvation of men, and not murderous like that of the serpent, and that this holy aim must not be sought by unrighteous means. But it is only in accordance with the experience of the one-sidedness of man's nature that the Lord expressly adds that the simplicity and harmlessness of which the dove is a type must not be lost sight of in the wisdom of the deliberations and the expediency of the actions. If such principles are not deeply rooted in the heart, no real devotion to the heavenly calling and no true inspiration for it, no heeding of the silent beckoning and still small voice of God, and no resignation to the hidden ways of providence are possible. Humble trust in the guidance of the Lord, when doing His work, is replaced by self-seeking and self-glorification.

When we consider the manifold missionary activities of apostolic times in the light of these words, and in the directions given by Jesus, the missionaries seem to be divided naturally into three classes. The gospel was then spread by those who felt impelled to do what they could, and who acted with the harmlessness of doves. We see no trace in their work of far-seeing plans, no definite methods. Others, again, carried on missions with such cunning

deliberation, with such skilful use of circumstances favourable for their object, but also with such complete absence of pure devotion to the cause of the gospel, that their actions reminded St. Paul of the guile of the serpent who tempted Eve.¹ But a third kind of mission in those times answers to the requirement of Jesus that the wisdom of the serpent should be added to the harmlessness of the dove, and to this last class the Lord, the righteous Judge, has accorded the prize of victory in the missionary contest.

I.

In the first eleven chapters of the Acts of the Apostles we read of the activity displayed in spreading the Christian faith, and we see how the first of the three methods of carrying on missions predominated. In the nature of the case there was little room for human deliberation as to how, when, and where this activity should first be exercised, and there was little to suggest the development of definite methods. It was the express command of Jesus that witness should be first borne of His Resurrection to the people of Jerusalem who had taken part in the Crucifixion in varying degrees, but, nevertheless, deliberately. The element of the supernatural is predominant in the execution of this commission. Signs and wonders not only accompany the preaching of the Word as the confirmatory witness and judgment of God, but they precede it and prepare the way for it. An audience was provided for St. Peter's first sermons by the miracle of Pentecost, the unpremeditated healing of the lame beggar at the Temple gate, and the compulsory appearance of the Apostles before the Sanhedrim. The continued participation of the oldest community in the Temple worship naturally brought

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 3; comp. below, note p. 399. According to the context Romans xvi. 20 (cf. v. 17 ff.) links similar appearances of that time with the remembrance of Genesis iii. 15.

about the hearing of the gospel by many in the halls of the extensive buildings of the Temple. The miraculous powers, which issued forth from the community, formed a barrier against the barbarities of the populace and against the disciplinary measures of the Temple police. In fact, the whole theory of missions was summed up in the words of St. Peter: "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts iv. 20). The theme of the missionary sermons was provided; it was the personal experience of the preachers: "He, whom ye have killed and believe to be dead, is risen and lives"; and the art of its delivery and the mode of its presentation consisted chiefly in the frank expression of undoubting conviction. The certainty that they had seen the Risen Lord, the lively remembrance of the teachings of Jesus which had thus been confirmed, the popular knowledge of the Scriptures which the Apostles had always possessed, and the fellowship in religious customs and a national point of view which united the preachers and hearers: all these things worked together to make these idiots and unlearned men impressive missionary preachers, to whom their opponents could not refuse a certain amount of admiration (Acts iv. 13).

Neither was the first important advance from this early stage of missions the work of human deliberation, the well-planned discharge of missionary duty. The local community of Jerusalem became the Church of the land of Palestine chiefly as the result of the persecution in which first flowed a martyr's blood. The violent dispersion of Christendom, which till then had been crowded together within narrow bounds, resulted in the release of her slumbering powers of expansion. It was as though the gardener who had reared his plants in narrow boxes had set them in the open garden; only there could they branch out and bear blossom and fruit. While those who had been called to be missionaries, the Apostles, even yet felt bound to

hold on in Jerusalem, those members of the community, who were scattered abroad from Jerusalem, could not help bearing witness to their faith in the villages of Judæa and Samaria where they had found refuge. Philip, whose calling had hitherto been to administer the funds for the poor and the widows in Jerusalem, that the Apostles might carry on unhindered their calling as preachers, became an evangelist, a leading missionary. The boldest steps, such as carrying the gospel from the Jews to the only half-Jewish Samaritans, the first baptism of a Gentile from a distant land, who inclined to Judaism, were carried out blindly, and by those even who had no personal commission to preach the gospel. The Apostles had the oversight, but with a single eye they recognised all as the work of God that had been brought about by simple faith, without the wisdom of the serpent. The work went on in this way for a considerable time. Antioch became a second Christian metropolis, the cradle of the name of Christian. The novelty did not consist in the fact that here, as in Palestine, a few, like Cornelius, of heathen birth, were joined to the otherwise Jewish Church as isolated exceptions, but that a community arose in which such exceptions formed a new rule. Neither was this decisive step taken by those who had been called to be missionaries. The original community in Jerusalem had been formed, in no small measure, from the beginning of Jews and Jewish proselytes from distant lands, who had been settled in Jerusalem a longer or a shorter period. Amongst them were people from Cyrene, Cyprus, and Antioch.¹ Driven out of Jerusalem, many of them returned to their old homes, and did not keep silence there about the new faith which they had received in Jerusalem, and for the sake of which they had been driven out. When such people, unknown to history,

¹ Acts iv. 36, vi. 5, xi. 19 f., xxi. 16; comp. ii. 5-11, 14, 41.

first dared, on their own account, to tell the heathen in Antioch of Jesus, it was certainly not done in the conscious conviction that now the hour had come to cross the boundaries of Israel. How could such people have felt called upon to take such a responsible step! Rather we see again here that which was most momentous occurring as it were by chance, and those who had been called to be the leaders of missionary work only subsequently proving and justifying the accomplished fact. Barnabas, who was sent by the Apostles to Antioch, could only state as a fact that the grace of God had produced true Christian faith in the heathen there. Reflections on the importance of the event, and conscious measures for the furtherance of the same, amongst which the permanent settlement of Barnabas in Antioch and St. Paul's migration from Tarsus were the most important, only followed this epoch-making event. If we knew the missionary history of those times more exactly, we should certainly be able to prove, in many other cases, that many prosperous settlements grew out of such simple, planless, and undesigned missionary work. This is at least very probable with reference to the Roman community. History knows nothing of any eminent missionary who there laid the foundation. Surely some traces would have been left in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans! On the contrary, we learn from the last chapter—if that chapter was originally intended for Rome—that at that time many Christians lived in Rome who had migrated there from the East. We find there, if we are not deceived, the family of the cross-bearer, Simon of Cyrene,¹ also Andronicus and Junius, who were already Christians before St. Paul's conversion, and who, therefore, must have belonged to the community in Jerusalem in the first year of its existence, and who were held in good reputation by the

¹ Rom. xvi 13; comp. Mark xv. 21.

Apostles there, as we learn from St. Paul.¹ The house of Aquila, which had served as abode and workshop to St. Paul for years in Corinth and Ephesus, was at that time to be found in Rome. It is probable that this family, who had formerly removed from Corinth to Ephesus, had, for the same reason, removed again from Ephesus to Rome, their former place of abode, in order that they might provide a dwelling-place for the Apostle, who for so long had desired to see Rome, and thus, according to their means and in their own way, furthered the cause of missions. But it must have been quite recently that Aquila and Priscilla had come to Rome, as less than a year earlier they were still at Ephesus. The origin of the Roman community, the importance of which at that time is reflected in the Epistle to the Romans, must not therefore be attributed to them, but to those other Christians who had migrated from Palestine to Rome. Now these men and women certainly did not go to Rome as missionaries; but having been led to Rome² by the same cause, or one similar to that which led the first Christians to Cyprus and to Antioch, they were not content to keep by themselves, but endeavoured to draw others into their company. It was thus that the foundation was laid in the most important centres, in the country districts of Palestine, in Antioch, and in Rome, not by carefully planned and systematic missionary work, but by little groups of Christians who, through God's providence, were led hither and thither, and who, by

¹ Rom. xvi. 7. The view that these two persons were numbered amongst the Apostles, and had taken up a prominent position amongst them, is grammatically possible but really inadmissible; for, however wide we may understand the circle of the Apostles to have been, Andronicus and Junius (or Junia?), even if they had belonged to it, could only have counted as Apostles of third or fourth rank.

² We must continually remember Acts ii. 10, and, with reference to the fixing of the date of Romans xvi. 7, we must remember the date of Acts viii. 1 or Acts xi. 19.

means of the sympathetic nature and infectious power of their exuberant faith, became the germ and seed of large communities.

II.

Another mode of spreading Christianity, the extreme opposite of that which has just been described, is almost solely made known to us by St. Paul's opposition to it and by his letters. It also was initiated by the mother Church.

When St. Paul wrote the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon, he was able, in spite of his imprisonment, to carry on missionary work that was by no means unimportant.¹ A considerable number of helpers assisted him. Luke and Aristarchus had accompanied him to Rome; others, like Timothy, Tychichus, Epaphras, and Demas, seem, on hearing of his unexpectedly favourable position, to have joined him for a longer or shorter time. Mark also, who had been estranged from him since the first missionary journey, drew closer to him again. St. Paul boasts of him, as of a certain Jesus called Justus (Col. iv. 11), that they had been fellow-workers with him in the kingdom of God, and had comforted him. The emphatic way in which it is said of these two, who are at the same time described as men of the circumcision, in connection with the fact that those other friends of St. Paul, already referred to, are called his fellow-workers, proves the correctness of the interpretation that St. Paul means to say that Mark and Justus were the only missionaries of the circumcision, who were working for the kingdom of God in such a manner as to give him consolation and encouragement. He needed such consolation, in view of the fact that other Jewish preachers were carrying on missionary work in Rome in a very trying manner. The great city of Rome, with its mixed population, offered large scope

¹ Acts xxviii. 30 f.; Eph. vi. 19 f.; Col. iv. 3 f.; Philemon 10. With reference to his helpers, comp. Col. i. 1, 7 f., iv. 7, 10-14, Philemon 23 f.

for varied missionary work. Jewish Christians who had received the faith independently of St. Paul, and who had devoted themselves to missionary work in no way connected with him, might well consider they had a right to carry on their work in Rome quite independently of St. Paul, chained and confined within his hired dwelling.

St. Paul had not founded this missionary centre, and could not lay claim to any special authority. Neither did he; but it must have been very painful to him that most of these Jewish Christian preachers either avoided his company or else actually placed hindrances in his way. We see in the Epistle to the Philippians, which was written somewhat later, how bitterly these men opposed him. The Apostle's position had changed. After a delay of two years his case had been tried. His friends far and near had been anxious about him and the cause of the gospel. But soon after the beginning of the legal examination it appeared that the charges, which had obliged him to appeal to the Emperor, were not credited by the judges in Rome, and that Christian preaching, which was proved to be the real cause of his imprisonment, was not looked upon as worthy of punishment by the court. It is easy to see that this change of circumstances was very encouraging to the missionaries in Rome, and that they would carry on their work more boldly than ever. But St. Paul cannot make known these joyful facts to the Philippians without also telling them of his sorrow that of these missionaries only some carried on their work in sincerity and with friendly feelings towards him, while others, on the contrary, carried it on in strife and envy, intending thereby to make his heart the heavier in his otherwise straitened circumstances. They used his temporary helplessness in order to supplant him and get possession of his sphere of work for themselves. St. Paul's noble nature constrains him to look beyond this personal trial; he rejoices, or at all events endeavours to

rejoice, that Christ is preached with success, whether in sincerity and truth or under false pretences, for very insincere and selfish objects. This state of things would neither have been allowed nor possible if those missionaries had not preached Christ and His Gospel, but had preached themselves and heretical doctrines. We learn from St. Paul's verdict that this was not the case. In earlier days he had also known people who had sought to check his work, and even to undermine it, but who nevertheless did not preach doctrine diametrically opposed to his, at all events openly.

THEOD. ZAHN.

(To be continued.)

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

III.

BESIDE the memoirs which were the chief source of St. Mark's Gospel the Apostolic age possessed at least another body of tradition in which the Lord's teaching was more fully represented. Whether this second cycle is to be identified with the "oracles" attributed by Papias to the Apostle Matthew,¹ we need not stop to inquire; certainly it was largely used by the writer of our first Gospel. To the Matthean tradition, as we will venture to call it, our attention must now be turned.

1. The most extensive collection of sayings in the Synoptic Gospels is that which in Augustine's time² had already received the title of the "Sermon on the Mount." The name is misleading if it suggests a formal discourse, or even a *κήρυγμα* addressed to the crowd who hung about our Lord's person. The "Sermon" was, in fact, an instruction or a series of instructions intended, as both St. Matthew and St. Luke are careful to say,³ for the disciples who formed the inner circle of His audience.⁴ It is a specimen, not of Christ's public preaching, but of His manner of teaching those who acknowledged Him as their Master. Moreover, it does not belong to the first days of the Galilean ministry, as its early place in the Gospel of St. Matthew might lead us to suppose, but rather, as St. Luke's more chronological arrangement makes evident, to the days

¹ Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39: Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. On *λόγια* see Dean Armitage Robinson's *Study of the Gospels*, p. 69 f.

² See the opening words of his *De sermone Domini in monte*.

³ Matt. v. 1: ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ . . . ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. Luke vi. 20: ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν κ.τ.λ.

⁴ That it was delivered in the hearing of the multitude, appears from Matt. vii. 18, Luke vii. 1; but they were not primarily in view.

which followed the choice of the Twelve.¹ By that time the Lord's popularity had perhaps reached its highest point, and the crowd which followed Him was daily replenished by fresh arrivals from all parts of Syria and the adjacent lands²; while on the other hand the breach with the official teachers of Israel was practically complete.³ The moment was opportune for gathering the whole body of His adherents together, and promulgating the fundamental laws of the new Kingdom. Ancient writers compare or contrast the Sermon with the Lawgiving. On both occasions the scene was a mountain, and the voice Divine. But the Lawgiving was attended by circumstances of terror, while the Sermon opens with beatitudes; the Decalogue was written on tables of stone, whereas Christ was content to inscribe His new law on the memory and the heart. The parallel, however, is closer and deeper than at first sight it may appear to be. In the Sermon our Lord is not merely the Teacher, but the Legislator; it is in great part a code of laws enacted by Him on the strength of His personal authority. The *ἐξουσία*, which at an earlier stage had revealed itself in authoritative teaching and miraculous powers, is now manifested in legislative acts. Six times in one chapter Christ overrules an old enactment by a new one which rests on His own word.⁴ Yet the new Law is not a rival of the Law of Mount Sinai, but its complement.⁵ Jesus had not come to break down the ancient barriers which protected human life from the inroad of the selfish passions, but to introduce principles of conduct which would gradually supersede the necessity of legal re-

¹ Cf. Luke vi. 12 ff., vii. 1; in Mark there is a manifest break (at iii. 19b), where it is easy to fit the teaching in the hill-country.

² Mark iii. 7, Luke vi. 17, *ὄχλος πολλὸς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ πληθὸς πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ*.

³ Mark iii. 6.

⁴ The remarkable formula *ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις . . ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῶν* occurs with slight variations in Matt. v. 21 f., 27 f., 31 f., 33 f., 38 f., 43 f.

⁵ Matt. v. 19: *οὐκ ἤλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι*.

straints. If His disciples were to be no longer "under law," it was because they would be "led by the Spirit" which instinctively fulfils the Law.¹ "That which was said to the ancients" is definitely set aside by Christ only when, through the hardness or dulness of the times, the earlier legislation had been unable to give effect to the fulness of the Divine Will.²

From the precepts of the ancient Law the Lord proceeds to deal with the "righteousness,"³ i.e. the religious practice, of His own age, which is treated under the three heads of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting.⁴ Here, again, He is careful not to disturb existing landmarks unnecessarily; it was enough to correct what was amiss and supply what was wanting at the time. The "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" was insufficient, and defaced by hypocrisy; but Christ does not propose any radical change in its main features. Almsgiving, prayer, and fasting had their place in the religious life, and He recognizes the fact. But in these external acts of religion He requires more than the external performance; each is to have its inward and spiritual side turned towards the Father of spirits and looking to His approval for its only recompense.⁵ It is thus that Christian righteousness is to "exceed"⁶ the righteousness of the Synagogue—not in the multiplicity of its acts but in the inwardness and concentration of its spirit. How little importance is ascribed by Christ to mere quantity in religious actions is apparent from the model⁷ prayer which He gives, in

¹ Gal. v. 18, Rom. viii. 4.

² Thus, *e.g.*, the regulation of Deut. xxiv. 1, which Christ withdraws in Matt. v. 31, was in His judgement a temporary concession to the *σκληροκαρδία* of Israel, made with the purpose of limiting an evil which at the time could not be suppressed; see the writer's note on Mark x. 5.

³ Matt. vi. 1, where read *δικαιοσύνην* with **S**^bBD.

⁴ Matt. vi. 2 ff., 5 ff., 16 ff.

⁵ See the refrain in Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18.

⁶ Matt. v. 20.

⁷ Matt. vi. 9, *οὕτως προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς*.

which all the necessities of life are compressed into the fewest words.¹ Even in the most spiritual of the three chief acts of righteousness there was danger from externalism; words must needs be used in common prayer as the vehicle for desires which in themselves are voiceless,² but the multiplication of words for the words' sake was no better than a heathenish *βατταλογία* in the sight of the Father, who needs no such incentive to bestow His gifts.³

In the next place Christ insists on that which lies behind all true acts of devotion, the upward trend of mind which finds its goal in the Presence of God. The subject of the Kingdom of Heaven must not seek his treasure on earth. "Mammon"—the word reminds us that the audience is an Aramaic-speaking crowd⁴—may not share his allegiance with God; his one aim must be to gain the Divine Kingdom and righteousness, and earthly things, even the most necessary, should take the second place.⁵ Christ's disciple must be free from the anxiety which distracts while it does not satisfy.⁶ His whole life is to be lived upon a plane from which he will be able to see all things in their true proportions.

The Sermon ends with a code of directions for the guidance of daily conduct, which refutes the suspicion of transcendentalism. The Lord charges His disciples to abstain from hasty judgements⁷: to exercise a wise reserve in religious communications with non-Christians⁸: to deal with their brother men as they would themselves be dealt with by God.⁹ They are not to suffer themselves

¹ The Lucan text of the Prayer is even shorter than the form in Matthew, and possibly more primitive.

² Rom. viii. 27, τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερευτρυγχάνει στέναγμαῖς ἀλαλήτοις.

³ Matt. vi. 7; cf. vii. 11.

⁴ Aug. *De serm. Domini*, ii. 14, 47, *lucrum Punice mammon dicitur.*

⁵ Matt. vi. 24-33.

⁶ Matt. vi. 27 ff.

⁷ Matt. vii. 1 ff.

⁸ *Ibid.* 6.

⁹ *Ibid.* 12.

to be carried away by the current of popular opinion or prevalent practice¹: they are especially to guard against religious teachers whose deeds belie their words.² Above all they are to beware lest their enthusiasm for the Christian cause should expend itself in a mere confession of the Name, or even in the bustling activity of outward service. The Lord ends with the warning that His words will profit only those who obey them: the rest of His disciples are as men who build their house on the sandy floor of a *wady*, where the first storms of winter will bury them under its ruins.³

2. With a characteristic perception of the inner affinity of incidents remote from one another in time and place, St. Matthew brings together in chapter xi.⁴ a series of sayings which reveal Christ's view of His own office and person. Teaching of this kind is rare in the Synoptic Gospels, and therefore peculiarly welcome when it is offered.

The Evangelist begins with the question which reached our Lord from the prison of John the Baptist, now in the dungeons of Machaerus. It was brought to Christ, if St. Luke's order is right, shortly after the great miracle at Nain, and not long after the sermon on the Mount. Such teaching, confirmed by such a miracle, must have deeply stirred the heart of Galilee, and raised in many minds the question which the Baptist put into words, *Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*; Christ points the way to the true answer without anticipating it: He places the facts before John and leaves the Baptist to draw the natural inference.⁵ This incident probably took place in private, or in the presence of the Twelve only; but the crowd outside was aware of the coming of the Baptist's disciples, and Jesus seized the oppor-

¹ Matt. vii 13 ff.

² *Ibid.* 15 ff.

³ *Ibid.* 24 ff.

⁴ The corresponding sections in St. Luke are Luke vii. 18-28, xvi. 16, vii. 31-35, x. 13-15, 21 f. The last three verses in St. Matthew (xi. 28-30) have no parallel in St. Luke.

⁵ Matt. xi. 4 ff.

tunity of directing attention to the mission of John.¹ John, He taught, was at once greater than any of the Old Testament heroes, and yet inferior in privilege to the least disciple of the Kingdom, since he came to prepare the way of the Kingdom, and therefore himself stood outside its borders.² Such teaching left no reasonable doubt as to the Lord's own position; if St. John was the last herald of the Advent, who could Jesus be but the Christ? More plainly than this He declined to speak, for He recognized in the crowd about Him none of the moral earnestness which would have rendered them capable of receiving a great spiritual truth³; they were as children who played with the solemnities of life, and wondered that the Forerunner and the Christ did not share their levity.⁴

So far the first and third Gospels follow the same order, but at this point St. Matthew, in accordance with his principle of arrangement, goes to another part of his document for the logical sequel. It belongs, as St. Luke shows us, to the narrative of the mission and return of the Seventy-two, which followed the Lord's final departure from Capernaum.⁵ Capernaum and the adjacent lake-side towns had but too fully justified Christ's verdict upon the Galileans of His generation, and the purpose of the new mission seems to have been to awaken in the villages of Peraea and central Palestine a sense of the greatness of the opportunity which Galilee had slighted, and which was now at their own doors. The Seventy appear to have met with some success; at all events, they returned flushed with hope, and their enthusiasm stirred in the human heart of Christ a sense of joy which is quite unexampled in

¹ Matt. xi. 7, *τούτων δὲ πορευομένων* (Luke, *ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάννου*) ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου.

² Matt. xi. 11 ff.

³ *Ibid.* 12: *βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν.*

⁴ *Ibid.* 16 ff.

⁵ St. Luke ix. 51, x. 1, 13 ff, 21 ff.

the records of His life. He knew that the names of these simple but loyal followers were "written in heaven"; He saw in them the type of some of the best members of His future Church, men of childlike faith, unlettered and without personal weight, yet strong in the possession of a Divine secret which was hidden from the great world.¹ As He realized this vision of the victory of faith, the Lord "exulted in the Holy Spirit"; the "oil of joy" descended upon Him.² His "exultation" revealed itself in a solemn act of thanksgiving,³ and this, uttered doubtless in the presence of the Twelve, passed into the words of self-manifestation to which reference has been made. "All things are delivered to Me by My Father, and none knoweth the Son⁴ except the Father, nor doth any know the Father⁴ except the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son shall choose to reveal Him."⁵ As Dr. Sanday remarked thirty years ago, "there is nothing in the Johannean Christology that [this passage] does not cover. Even the doctrine of pre-existence seems to be implicitly contained in it. For how and when is this unique and mutual knowledge to be regarded as obtained? Clearly it is no empirical guessing; it does not appear possible that it should be grounded on anything short of an essential unity."⁶ The knowledge claimed is that of a son, and it rests upon sonship; it is a strange misreading of the words which reverses this order, as Prof. Harnack seems to do, when he bases Christ's con-

¹ Luke x. 21; cf. 1 Cor. i. 26 ff.

² Luke l.c.: ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ. Cf. Heb. i. 9 (Ps. xlv. 7) ἔχρισέν σε ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου, ἐλαίῳ ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.

³ Matt. xi. 25: ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ κ.τ.λ. ἐξομολογεῖσθαι here of course= הִלָּלְתִּי as in Ps. vii. 17, ix. 6, etc.

⁴ St. Luke writes: "Who is the Son," "Who is the Father," a paraphrase which is true but not exhaustive of the sense, and not structurally necessary (cf. Matt. vii. 16, 20, etc., where ἐπιγινώσκειν τινά occurs).

⁵ Matt. xi. 27.

⁶ Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel* (London, 1872), p. 109.

consciousness of Sonship upon His knowledge of the Father.¹ It is not knowledge which makes Him "the Son," but Sonship which enables Him to know. He declares that He knows God as only a son can know his father, and that this knowledge is not a possession which other sons of God² naturally share with Him, but one which belongs of right to Him alone, and to others only so far as He is pleased to impart it. This is to claim not only unique knowledge, but an unique Sonship. It is difficult to discover any essential difference between this statement in St. Matthew and the closing words of St. John's prologue: "God none hath seen at any time; God only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, He declared Him."³

The exquisite invitation to the "weary and heavy laden," which in St. Matthew follows the *ἀγαλλίασις*,⁴ may well have been spoken on another occasion. It seems to require the presence of a crowd of toil-worn peasants, bringing their sick to be healed, or pressing round the Christ with wistful faces and half-formed longings for His help. Yet no reader of the Gospels will wish to dislodge this saying from the place which the consummate skill of the Evangelist has found for it. If the words of *v.* 27 lift the Son to a height where none may approach Him, in His *δεῦτε πρὸς μέ* He steps down once more to our level, and He to whom all things are delivered, and who alone knows God, shows Himself the sympathetic friend of suffering humanity. Yet the note of authority, of ownership, of superhuman greatness, can still be heard: "Take My yoke, learn from Me ;

¹ Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 81 (= Saunders, E. Tr., p. 127 f.).

² Cf. Matt. xvii. 16.

³ Let the reader compare the two passages and judge for himself:—

Matt. xi. 17.

John i. 18.

οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

⁴ Matt. xi. 28-30. St. Luke has no parallel.

I will give you rest." It is the voice of the Only-begotten Son; we recall Augustine's words: "Fecisti nos ad Te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in Te."¹

3. Twice in the first Gospel² the Lord speaks of the future Christian Society, using the word ἐκκλησία. The two passages, which we will bring together here, contain important teaching on the powers and responsibilities of the Church.

The first is the famous promise to St. Peter, "Thou art Peter (Πέτρος), and upon this rock (πέτρα) I will build My Church." Christ has already used, in the Sermon on the Mount,³ the metaphor of building upon a rock. There it denoted the security which the individual life attains by obedience to the words of Christ; here the building is not an individual but a congregation, Christ Himself is the builder, and the rock appears to be Peter, representing the whole Apostolate.⁴ For the aggregate of successive generations of the faithful St. Matthew employs the word which in the Greek Old Testament is the usual equivalent of לְקָהָל,⁵ the "congregation" of Israel; Christ probably used the corresponding Aramaic. In so doing He created a new Israel, substituting the congregation of His disciples for "Israel after the flesh," who knew Him not.⁶ Israel was "the congregation of Jehovah," and the Christian brotherhood bears in the Epistles of St. Paul the corresponding title, "the Church (or the churches) of God."⁷ But Christ

¹ *Confessions*, i. 1.

² Matt. xvi. 18 f.; xviii. 15-20.

³ Matt. vii. 24: ἠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

⁴ He had spoken on behalf of all in answer to the question, Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι (Matt. xvi. 15; Mark viii. 29). Peter's name supplied an apt image of the relation which the Twelve were called to fulfil towards all future generations of disciples; cf. Eph. ii. 20: ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν. Apoc. xxi. 14: τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχον θεμελίους δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα ὀνόματα τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρνίου.

⁵ Cf. Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 3 ff.

⁶ Cf. Rom. ii. 28, ix. 6 f.; Gal. vi. 16; Apoc. iii. 9.

⁷ 1 Cor. i. 2, xv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 14: Αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ χριστοῦ occurs, however, in Rom. xvi. 16.

does not hesitate to speak of the new congregation as His own (*οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*). No such claim is attributed to Moses, whose relation to Israel was that of a servant set over the House of God. Jesus speaks as the Master and owner of the house; the Church of God is His, since He is the Son and the Heir of God.¹

Not less remarkable are the words that follow: "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."² Human institutions, one after another, fall under the power of dissolution, and pass into oblivion, or become memories of the past. Christ foresaw that the society which He was founding was destined to outlive every other organization upon earth; the day would never come which should see its downfall or disappearance. History has thus far fulfilled this prophecy, and Christians are entitled to believe that it will hold true to the end. An institution which has survived the Roman Empire and the governments that rose upon its ruins, can await without fear any changes that time may work in the existing order of the world.

We will pass to the second occasion on which the Lord referred to the Ecclesia.³ It is precarious to build chronological inferences on St. Matthew's order, but it may probably be assumed in this instance that the second reference is later than the first; certainly it fits in well with the context where it occurs. The Lord had spoken much of the danger of placing a stumblingblock in the way of a brother. But what if a brother be the offender? are you to connive at his trespass? No, he must be brought to see and confess the fault. Private remonstrance

¹ Heb. iii. 6; see Westcott's note.

² For *πύλαι ᾧ Ἄδου* cf. Isa. xxxviii. 10 (LXX) and 3 Macc. v. 52. The Risen Christ has the keys of Hades (Apoc. i. 18) and can liberate the dead. But the imagery in Matt. i. c. goes further: Hades prevails against the individual, though in the end it will be forced to set him free; but the Church as a body can defy its power altogether.

³ Matt. xviii. 15 ff.

is to be tried first, and if this fails, remonstrance in the presence of two or three witnesses; as a last resource, the matter must be referred to the congregation, whose judgment is to be final. Should the offending brother refuse to listen to the congregation, he puts himself outside the pale of Christian fellowship, and may be regarded as the Jew regarded the pagan or the outcast.¹ The principle affirmed is merely the inherent right of a society to exclude a member who declines to submit to its ruling. This power was exercised by the Synagogue, and Christ claims no less for His Church. But the next words reach much further: "Whatsoever things ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." "Binding" and "loosing" are terms borrowed from the Synagogue; the Rabbis were said to bind what they forbade, and to loose what they allowed²; and Jesus transfers this judicial power to the Christian Ecclesia, which was in future to be the judge in questions of religious belief and practice. But He does much more, for He declares that the decisions of the Church shall be ratified in heaven. The promise which had been made to the Apostolate in the person of Peter is now extended to the whole body of the Church.³ Not the Apostolate only but the whole Church was to be the organ of the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit speaking through the Church would pronounce judgements which were binding alike on earth and in heaven. The human infirmity which is so conspicuous in the history of the Church sufficiently explains her frequent

¹ ἔστω σοι ὡσπερ ὁ ἔθνικὸς καὶ ὁ τελώνης, i. e. as the ἀποσινάγωγος (John ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 2) was regarded by the Jewish community. But the ἐκκλησία can scarcely be itself the Jewish community, though Dr. Hort (*Ecclesia*, p. 10) inclines to this view; there is no example of this use of the word in the N. T., and its meaning here is surely governed by c. xvi. 18.

² Abundant instances of this use of בָּרַךְ and הִקְיִי will be found in J. Lightfoot's *Hæcrae Hebraicæ* (ed. Goudell), ii. p. 237 ff.

³ Matt. xvi. 19: ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς . . . ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς; Matt. xviii. 18: ὅσα ἐὰν δήσῃτε . . . ὅσα ἐὰν λύσῃτε.

failures in the attempt to reach this high ideal. Great Church councils have arrived at decisions which it is impossible to regard as ratified by the judgement of God. Yet it is not too much to say that what the universal conscience of Christendom has affirmed does bear the stamp of Divine approval, whilst that which all faithful Christians reprobate is assuredly 'bound' in heaven. *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*¹ is a maxim which enshrines a great truth; the voice of the whole Christian people in all time is the Voice of God.

But the Church has another privilege which can be exercised by the smallest of Christian congregations. "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there I am in the midst of them."² The promise is still to the Church, not to the individual³; that its fulfilment may be claimed, there must be at least two disciples acting in Christian fellowship, and thus representing the whole body. But this *minimum* is assured of Christ's presence no less than the largest congregation; for the purposes of common prayer it possesses the privileges of the body, provided that it be gathered in Christ's Name.⁴ Christ's "there am I" necessarily involves the coming of the Spirit, thus again anticipating the fuller treatment of the Fourth Gospel. Only when the Spirit had been sent from the Father in the Son's Name did it become possible for the Lord to be in the

¹ Vincentius Lirinensis, *Commonitorium*, 2.

² Matt. xviii. 20.

³ The Matthean saying is thus distinct from the Oxyrhynchian *logion*; see Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. i. p. 3: [λέγει [Ἰησοῦς, Ὁπ]ου ἐὰν ὦσιν [β, οὐκ] ἐ[ἰσι]ν ἄθροαι, καὶ [δ]που [ε]ἰς ἐστὶν μόνος, [λέ]γω, ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ.

⁴ Cf. Tertullian, *De cast.* 7, "Sed ubi tres ecclesia est, licet laici." He might have written "ubi duo," for he read the passage as we do (*præser.* 16, *ad uxor.* ii. 9). And he overlooks *εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα*, which guards against the sectarian spirit that prefers the company of two or three. The *a fortiori* claim upon this promise of the regular assemblies of the Church is well urged in the original of the "Prayer of St. Chrysostom"; see Bright, *Liturgies*, i. p. 367, ὁ τὰς κοινὰς ταύτας καὶ συμφέροντος ἡμῶν χαρισάμενος προσευχάς, ὁ καὶ διὰ καὶ τρισὶ κ.τ.λ.

midst of every congregation of His Church to the end of time.¹ The Ascension and the Pentecost have illuminated a saying which to those who first heard it must have been perplexing indeed.

4. Our Lord's teaching, as represented in the Matthean tradition, places in contrast with the Ecclesia the world in its two aspects, as the visible order of the universe (*κόσμος*), and as the course of human affairs under the conditions of time (*αἰών*).²

Christ manifests no hostility to the world in either sense. The visible world is the harvest field in which He sees the ripening crops awaiting His labourers; from another point of view, the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are not Apostles and Evangelists, but the angels who will attend His coming.³ If His own countrymen and His own generation afforded little ground for hope, or indeed seemed likely to go from bad to worse,⁴ His eye saw the Gentile nations flocking into the Kingdom from the four quarters of the earth.⁵ The present age must reach its appointed end⁶; but Jesus expects a new world to take the place of the old, and a regeneration of heaven and earth analogous to the new birth which ushers individual lives into the Kingdom of God.⁷ His outlook is therefore, upon the whole, full of hope; the present state of mixed good and evil will issue in the final triumph of good.

¹ Cf. Matt. xxviii. 20.

² Dalman, who observes that Matthew alone of the Synoptists uses *κόσμος* freely, shows that in the Jewish literature *עוֹלָם* cover both senses (*Worte Jesu*, i. pp. 136, 138, 140=E. Tr. pp. 167, 169, 171).

³ Matt. ix. 37 f., xiii. 37, 39.

⁴ Matt. xii. 39-45.

⁵ Matt. viii. 11; cf. Luke xiii. 29.

⁶ The *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* is mentioned five times by St. Matthew (xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20), and in this sense by St. Matthew only.

⁷ Matt. xix. 28. For *παλιγγενεσία* see Tit. iii. 5, and cf. John iii. 5; in Matt. the term seems to be equivalent to the *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων* mentioned in Acts iii. 21, though Dalman (p. 145 f.) denies this.

Yet Jesus does not minimize either the extent to which evil prevails in the world as it now is, or the seriousness of the issues which it entails. The latter point is brought out with great variety of illustration in the Matthean parables, which, when all allowances have been made for the high colouring of eastern imagery, leave no doubt as to the general purport of Christ's teaching on the subject. The angel reapers "shall gather out of His Kingdom those that work lawlessness, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire";¹ "there," it is twice said, "shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth."² The angel fishers in the sea of life "shall cast the worthless outside";³ the Master will deliver the debtor who had been forgiven, but proved himself unworthy, into the hands of the ministers of torture, until he shall have paid the whole⁴; the guest who is not suitably attired for the wedding feast is to be cast out of the banqueting-hall into the darkness of the night⁵; the virgin attendants of the Bride who let their lamps die down will find the door shut against a diligence which has come too late⁶; the slave who has neglected his talent, though but one was committed to him, not only loses it, but is cast out from his Lord's presence.⁷ These scenes represent the fate of disloyal or negligent disciples, but the final parable extends the principle, *mutatis mutandis*, to all mankind. In all nations of the world those who have failed to serve Christ by ministering, according to their lights and opportunities, to His brethren, their fellow-men, must go away from the judgement seat into age-long punishment.⁷

¹ Matt. xiii. 30, 42: 'Ο κλωνθμός, ὁ βρυγμός (so also in viii. 12, xxii. 13, xxiv. 5, xxv. 30; Luke xiii. 28), misery which is such κατ' ἐξοχήν.

² Matt. xiii. 48: τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ ἔξω ἔβαλον.

³ Matt. xviii. 34.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 18: εἰς τὸ σκοτός τὸ ἐξώτερον. Cf. John xiii. 30, where it is significantly said of Judas, ἐκείνος ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸς ἦν δὲ νύξ.

⁵ Matt. xxv. 11.

⁶ *Ibid.* 29 f.

⁷ *Ibid.* 46.

The general import of this teaching is too plain to be disputed ; beyond a doubt the Lord points to loss and suffering of the gravest kind as the lot of those who sin against the light they possess, or neglect their opportunities of doing good.

The Matthean teaching possesses all the features which we have observed in the Marcan tradition ; the same inwardness, practical bent, universality of application, majesty of manner, are apparent in both records ; the same unique personality can be recognized in both. But the field of observation is larger in St. Matthew than in St. Mark ; the range of subjects embraced by the teaching is more varied, and the teaching itself more extended and less fragmentary. We are therefore in a better position for gaining a conception of our Lord's scope and purpose as a Teacher, and we see Him in some lights which are quite new. He appears, as we have learnt, in the character of a legislator, and we notice the wisdom with which, while conserving for the time a system that could not be at once abandoned, He aims at substituting for mechanical obedience the great principles of morality and religion which lie at the root of all true goodness. He reveals Himself also in the light of a great architect, a constructive mind which could plan and lay the foundations of a spiritual building destined to last as long as the world itself. We are struck again by the width of His outlook on human life ; His appreciation of the forces which are struggling for mastery in the world ; His calm anticipation of the end, and the richness and variety of the imagery which He adopts in order to impress upon an unspiritual age the gravity of the issues to which time is carrying the race and each individual man. Lastly, in an hour of unexampled exultation, He reveals to us that which lay behind all His teaching and all His life, the secret source of Divine knowledge which belonged to

Him as the Only-begotten Son. We catch but a momentary glimpse into the mystery of His relation to God, but it is enough to send us back to the Gospels with a deeper sense of the graciousness of One who, possessing a perfect knowledge of God, condescended to teach men the elements of truth.

H. B. SWETE.

*HOSTILE AND ALIEN EVIDENCE FOR CHRIST
AT PASSIONTIDE.*

To a dispassionate student of history the evidence of events which comes from indirect or even hostile sources is often more convincing than the categorical statements of the writer. This is certainly true in regard to the trial, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Words uttered with a hostile intent at this momentous crisis seem by a kind of irony to acquire a strange and deep significance in an opposite sense. Several actors come upon the scene in those last hours, who are either actively hostile, or, from their position, hitherto indifferent to the great events which are taking place. These men, by their words and actions, give incidental but valuable testimony to the truth of the Gospel record; and the object of this paper is to exhibit the force and use of this kind of evidence in its proper light by collecting it from the various narratives of the Passion in which it appears.

It will be convenient to consider the evidence in three divisions: I. The Testimony of Pilate. II. The Testimony of the Jewish Priests and People. III. The Testimony of the Roman Soldiers.

I. The Testimony of Pilate. (a) *The title on the Cross.* Whatever be the reason for the discrepancies in the versions given by the different Evangelists of the title on the cross, there can be no reasonable doubt that there was a title, and that it contained the words "Jesus the King of the Jews," and that this title was not only placed on the cross but expressly defended by Pilate and deprecated by the Jewish chief priests and elders. Indeed it is perhaps the latter circumstance that has caused the Evangelists to record the title, and has given importance to it. For Pilate, indeed, it was a title of

mockery and something more. It was the crowning insult of that sad morning's scornful cruelty, to which the conception of mock sovereignty had given all its point. So Pilate wrote that title partly to please his soldiers, and to complete his cruel jest ; partly, too, to vex the Jews, and to fling back upon them in derision that name which they had for their own purposes used as a lever to enforce the condemnation of Jesus—" If thou let this man go,—who had forbidden to give tribute unto Cæsar, saying He Himself is Christ, a King—thou art not Cæsar's friend." But the word " King " impressed Pilate. He saw in it something more than a clever device to compromise him with the Roman Emperor. In all serious earnestness he asked Jesus, " Art Thou a King then ? " With these mixed motives, then, Pilate wrote the title, and once written, persisted in retaining it over the cross of Jesus. In so doing he bore unconscious testimony to the kingship of Christ.

But it was not only in the soldiers' mockery that the thought of the kingship of Christ was prominent. It gave the key-note to Passiontide, from the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy (ch. xiv. 4) on Palm Sunday to the admission of Christ Himself before Pilate: " Thou sayest it." As divine King of Israel Jesus cleansed His Father's house from pollution ; as King He triumphs over Pharisee and Sadducee in argument, and passes judgment on their works and influence, and as King He foretells His final victory on the judgment day. Lastly, even if we cannot accept the ancient traditional reading of Psalm xcvi. 10, *regnabit a ligno*, it is true that as King He reigned from the cross, and Pilate's word of scorn becomes a testimony to truth in history and a wonderful summing up of the lessons of Passiontide.

Something may be said about the precise term " King of the Jews." It is not an Old Testament expression, and in the New Testament it is found only in connexion with the Nativity and in connexion with the Passion of Jesus Christ.

The Magi's inquiry was, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" (Matt. ii. 2). In the scenes of the Passion the phrase is used by the soldiers and by Pilate, but not by the chief priests and scribes, who taunt Him with being the King of Israel (Luke xxiii. 37), which is indeed a Messianic title, as we see from Nathanael's address to Jesus, "Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel" (John i. 49).

To the Oriental Magi and the Romans, however, the title "King of the Jews" would connect itself with the vague Messianic expectation, which had become prevalent in the East. For Herod it is equivalent to the predicted Christ, for as soon as he hears that inquiry is being made for the "King of the Jews" he puts the question to the Sanhedrin where the Christ should be born.¹

The title on the cross, then, was distinctly Messianic both to Jew and Gentile, and as such is a valuable testimony to a claim which Christ Himself made before both tribunals.

(b) *The assertion of the innocence of Christ.* But Pilate's witness did not end here. He also bore remarkable testimony to the sinlessness of Christ. When Jesus was brought before His judgment-seat, it was the interest of Pilate to please the Jews and find their prisoner guilty. We may well believe that he listened with keen anxiety to detect some point of technical guilt, on which, consistently

¹ See Schürer, i. 1-292, Eng. Trans. Aristobulus (B.C. 105-104) was the first of the Maccabean family to assume the style of King (Joseph. *Antiq.* xiii. 11, 1, and *Wars of the Jews*, i. 3, 1), and even he did not use the designation on his coins. The nearest approach to the title previous to Aristobulus is that of Simon, the high priest, the governor and leader of the Jews (*στρατηγός και ἡγούμενος Ἰουδαίων*, 1 Maccabees xiii. 42), of whom there is a striking eulogy in Ecclesiasticus, ch. 1. There can be little doubt that in our Lord's day the vision of a restored Kingdom of Israel (Acts i. 6) with many of the Jews took shape and colour from the Maccabean ascendancy. It is a mark of accuracy in the synoptic Gospels that the title "King of the Jews" is always put in the mouths of Gentiles. It is the chief priests who say: "Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from the cross" (Mark xv. 32); but the soldiers mocked Him, saying, "If Thou be the King of the Jews, save Thyself" (Luke xxiii. 37). The title was fatal to Jesus now, being used to force Pilate to condemn: as it would have been fatal to Him in His childhood if the will of Herod had prevailed.

with his Roman sense of justice, he could bring himself to convict and sentence the innocent man before him. If so, the endeavour was in vain. The admission was forced from his unwilling lips: "I find no fault in Him." It was as when Jesus Himself appealed to the Jews: "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" The only reply was a wild and frivolous charge which confuted itself (John viii. 46).

(c) *The deference of Pilate to Christ.* But perhaps the most interesting confirmation of the Gospel narrative will be found in the attitude of the Roman Procurator towards the lowly Galilean peasant who stood before him to be judged.

It would have seemed inconceivable to Pilate himself, or the officers of his court, or even to the Jews, that a prisoner so mean and so unsuccessful could have the slightest influence on the highly placed Roman official, to whom the question of the life or death of the Jewish prisoner must have been of small account. And yet, as the questioning went on, Pilate felt himself first interested, and then awed. He asked the question, "Art Thou a King then?" in all sincerity. And soon, possibly to his surprise, he found himself in the position of a disciple of Christ, asking, not scoffingly, but in earnest: What is truth? Pilate had come under the wonderful influence of Christ and felt His ascendancy.

II. The Testimony of the Jewish Priests and people. (1) The most noteworthy, both from the person and position of him who uttered it, was the word of the high priest, Caiaphas. St. John alone has recorded it. It dwelt in his mind, and long years afterwards he recalled it as a divinely inspired, though quite unconscious utterance of one who had almost a prophetic right to speak. "It is expedient," he said, "that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (John xi. 49, 50. See Westcott, *ad loc.*).

The intention of the unscrupulous judge was, of course,

that Jesus should be slain, innocent and holy though He was, in order to end for ever His dangerous popularity. And yet how deeply true that word was! How impressively was it fulfilled! No short formula could express more clearly the truth about the Atonement, and the sacrifice of the death of Christ.

(2) St. Matthew and St. Mark distinguish between the mockery of the passers by and the mockery of the chief priests, scribes and elders. St. Luke does not record the first, which would not be fully intelligible to his Gentile readers, but adds the mockery of the soldiers, omitted by the other Evangelists.

The report of St. Matthew is as follows:—"And they that passed by railed on Him, wagging their heads, and saying: Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save Thyself: if Thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross. In like manner also the chief priests, mocking Him with the scribes and elders, said: He saved others; Himself He cannot save. He is the King of Israel; let Him now come down from the cross, and we will believe on Him. He trusted on God; let Him deliver Him now, if He desireth Him: for He said, I am the Son of God" (ch. xxvii. 39-43).

This passage contains the testimony by the enemies of Jesus in regard to: (a) The prediction of the Resurrection; (b) The Godhead of Christ and the divine birth; (c) Salvation in Christ; (d) His self-sacrifice.

The enemies of Christ, gathered round the cross in mingled hate and triumph, eagerly produce the once dreaded prediction and the high asserted claim of this leader of a lost and ruined cause. In so doing they place on record in broad lines precisely those parts of the teaching of Jesus, and those notes of His mission, which had become popularly known.

(a) *The Prediction of the Resurrection.* Though the

saying about the destruction and the rebuilding of the temple is cited in perverted fashion, it is valuable evidence of the authenticity of the prediction, and of the impression which it made on the people. The Evangelist St. John has explained the words as relating to the Resurrection of Jesus ; so that, at the moment when they were cited in mockery, the temple of the body of Christ was being destroyed on the cross in order that in three days it might be raised again.

In another sense also those words were on the eve of fulfilment through the actual destruction of the material temple and all that it implied, and in the rebuilding of it in the purer form of religious life and worship to be moulded and inspired by the divine Sufferer on the foundation of the sacrifice of the death on the cross.

(b) *The Godhead of Christ.* Both priests and people agree in bearing witness by their words to the all-important fact that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God in the highest sense. This is an admission which the enemies of Christ would often refuse to make in these days. It is therefore a note of much importance. These open adversaries who stood before the cross thought they saw the refutation of that high claim visibly made in the dying Victim ; but in that dark hour the Christ was "verily a God who hid Himself" (Isa. xlv. 15).¹

(c) *Salvation in Christ Jesus.* There is a special interest in that other taunt, "He saved others." Hollow, insincere and contemptuous though the words are, they enshrine a truth very dear to Christian thought. Perhaps they were intended to bear a close relation to the name of Jesus—the Lord Saviour. To others He was a Jesus, a Lord Saviour ; He cannot be a Saviour to Himself. In any case the

¹ It is worthy of note also that both priests and people tauntingly demand a test of divine powers almost in the words of Satan in the Temptation. Compare, "If Thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross" (Matt. xxvii. 40) with "If Thou art the Son of God, cast Thyself down" (Matt. iv. 6).

truth is uttered. The claim of Jesus Christ to be a Saviour is affirmed by those who thought Him impotent to save.

(d) *The self-sacrifice of Christ.* "Himself He cannot save." So Jesus would have said Himself. In a true sense He could not, and He would not save that life which He came to offer on the Cross for our sins. Himself He cannot save; for as He Himself taught, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it."

III. The testimony of the Roman soldiery. (a) *The Roman centurion.* It has often been noted that the centurions named in the Bible are distinguished for the integrity and excellence of their character. This is not to be wondered at, for as the Roman centurion was not chosen so much for impetuous courage as for judgment, firmness and presence of mind, there were doubtless many noble and thoughtful characters among them. (Comp. Polyb. Hist. vi. 24-9: Βούλονται δ' εἶναι τοὺς ταξιάρχους οὐχ οὕτω θρασεῖς καὶ φιλοκινδύνου; ὡς ἡγεμονικοὺς καὶ στασίμους καὶ βαθεῖς μᾶλλον ταῖς ψυχαῖς κ.τ.λ.)

In this instance the wonderful scene of which he was witness made a deep impression on the centurion's mind. According to the first two Synoptists the words in which his thought found utterance were: "Truly this was the Son of God"; according to St. Luke: "Certainly this was a righteous man." It is possible that both utterances were made; it is also possible that St. Luke interpreted the expression for his Gentile readers. But the interest of the word is that it was probably suggested by the taunts of the chief priests, and that what the centurion had heard and seen in that eventful watch compelled him to turn the word of mockery into a confession of the truth. It was another instance of the effect of that wondrous personality working on a heart prepared for faith.

(b) *The guard at the Sepulchre.* The proceedings of the

soldiers of the guard are narrated with a minuteness which seems to imply that one or more of them became personally known to the disciples of Christ. The most interesting part of their evidence is concerned with what they witnessed at the sepulchre. It is recorded by St Matthew xxviii. 4 and 11. From these passages it appears that the guard saw the angel of the Lord descend and roll back the stone from the entrance to the sepulchre, and they did shake (*ἐσειέσθησαν*) and became as dead men. The two Marys were also at the sepulchre, experienced the earthquake, and saw the angel, who consoled them with the tidings that the Lord had risen. As the women were returning some of the watch entered the city and announced to the chief priest all that had taken place.

It thus appears that these soldiers were the first to bring the news of the Resurrection to the Jewish priesthood. They became unconsciously the first messengers of good tidings to Sion. But it is clear that we have not the whole of their evidence. Part of it is for ever inaccessible. That they had assured themselves of the disappearance of the body of Jesus is proved by the action of the chief priests. But we may be certain that the risen Lord did not show Himself either to these or, at that moment, to the women.

The action of the priests is striking, and characteristic of themselves, and of the times in which they lived. The precautions taken beforehand to guard the sepulchre indicate a knowledge of the prediction of the Resurrection, and a fear of its fulfilment. The enormous bribe, which would be necessary to commit the guard to a statement which would be fatal to them, unless supplemented by a further enormous bribe ¹ to secure their immunity from

¹ The confidence with which the chief priests calculated on bribing Pilate throws light on the vicious administration of Roman provincial government. It was a confidence justified by many precedents. The trial of Verres Prætor of Sicily gives ample illustration of this. See Cic. in Verrem, i. 40 foll. In a letter of Agrippa I. cited by Philo the "corruptibility" of Pilate is spoken of.

punishment, is a measure of the importance they attached to the soldiers' message. The absolute incredibility of their story was probably one of the causes which facilitated the Apostles' witness to the Resurrection on the Day of Pentecost and afterwards.

Although the testimony thus cited does not prove the truth of the Resurrection, or the divine nature of the Christ, it does prove that the prediction of the Resurrection was widely known in Jerusalem; and that the knowledge that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God was not confined to the narrow circle of the disciples, but had spread both among the people and the chief priests and elders. It is also valuable as proving the complete inability of the enemies of Jesus to formulate any genuine charge against Him. Like Pilate they too could find no fault in Him.

Further, the attitude of so cruel and unscrupulous a judge as Pilate towards Jesus, and the conviction of the stern Roman centurion that he had been witnessing the death of a just and innocent man, or even the Son of God, as the priests had called Him in cruel mockery, proved as clearly as the attestation of a disciple how commanding and impressive were the presence and personality of Jesus Christ.

Still more valuable is this unwilling testimony of the enemies of Christ for the encouragement which it gives to the Church in the darkest hour for hope and final victory, though at the moment every external sign may point to failure and defeat. For never did cause seem more irretrievably lost, or hopes more fatally crushed, than when the Son of God hung upon the cross, exposed to cruel taunts and mockery, and deserted by His nearest friends; and yet, even then, the victory was being won and the hopes assured.

ARTHUR CARR.

For the general rapacity of provincial governors see Sucton. Tiberius, 23. Tac. Annal. i. 8, iv. 6.

*SOME FRESH BIBLE PARALLELS FROM THE
HISTORY OF MOROCCO.*

IN Judges 12. 6, we read how the Ephraimites were distinguished from the men of Gilead by their inability to articulate the letter ψ , which they sounded \varnothing . One derivation offered by the historians of Morocco for the name of the city of Fez is the following: When Idrees began to build the city, his secretary asked him how he proposed to have it called. He replied: "Call it after the name of the first person who passes by you." A man passed by, and they asked him his name. Now his name was F \acute{e} ris, but he could not pronounce the letter r , but called himself F \acute{e} is; whence the city received the name of Fez. It is also said that the Jews in the town of Mequinez are unable to pronounce ψ , and use \varnothing instead.

When Idrees had finished the building of the city of Fez, and the circuit of the walls had been completed, and the gates had been made to ride upon their hinges, the question arose whence people should be found to fill the town. Idrees, therefore, caused the surrounding tribes to take up their residence in it, each tribe in the quarter of the town adjacent to its pasturing ground. A like drastic solution for the same problem was adopted by Nehemiah, when he rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, and set up its doors about the year 444 B.C. (11. 1).

The picture drawn in Ps. 84. of the sparrow and swallow building their nests and rearing their young in fearless security in the Temple has been paralleled by the similar immunity of birds in the temples of Greece and the mosques of Islám. One of the commonest sights in North Africa is the minaret crowned with a stork's nest. In these countries any one who should injure one of these birds would be reckoned no better than the ancient mariner, who slew the harmless albatross. This love of birds, especially of storks

and pigeons, is found in all Muslim countries.¹ When the minaret of the Karaweeyeen mosque, the principal mosque of Fez, was built, holes were left in the sides for birds to build in, and it was not long before they were filled with starlings' and pigeons' nests.

The realistic account of the misappropriation by the priests of the contributions of the people towards the upkeep of the Temple in the reign of Joash (2 Kings 12.) finds a curious parallel in the history of the Karaweeyeen mosque also; for in the days of Alee, the son of Yoosuf the "Almoravid," the mosque could no longer hold the Friday congregations, which overflowed into the surrounding streets, so that funds had to be raised for its enlargement. The Sultan was willing to defray the expense out of the public treasury; but the kadee was of opinion that the endowments of the mosque would prove sufficient for the purpose. Upon inquiry, however, it turned out that the trustees had looked upon the income of the mosque as their private property, and had spent it, so that there was no accumulated surplus, on which to draw. The kadee, however, did not cancel the arrears, like Jehoiada, but compelled the trustees to refund the sums they had "eaten."

The commentaries do not appear to offer anything in illustration of the practice of threshing in secluded places in troubled times, as Gideon threshed wheat in a wine-press, to save it from the Midianites (Jud. 6. 11). The citizens of Fez were reduced, under the rule of petty Berber dynasties in the eleventh century, to a condition very similar to that of Israel under foreign masters, so often depicted in the Old Testament. In the days of these oppressors, famine raged in Morocco, and the people of the City of Fez, both small and great, made for themselves underground cellars within their houses, for storing, grinding and cooking, so that the noise of the grinding should not be heard. In their

¹ Jer. 8. 7, etc.

houses they made also upper rooms which had no stairs leading to them, but when night fell, a man would go up into them by a ladder, he and his wife and his children, and they would draw up the ladder after them, so that none might enter upon them unawares.

All Semitic history is written from the moral and religious, or, as it is now somewhat inaptly named, the "Deuteronomic" point of view. The rise and fall of dynasties are traced to moral and religious causes. The historian of the Berber dynasties in Morocco sums up that period precisely as the author of the Books of Kings sets forth the religious "pragmatism" of the story of the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings 17.). "They oppressed their subjects, seizing their property, spilling their blood, and violating their hareems. Terror reigned in the land, and prices rose. Ease was turned to straitness, security to fear, and justice to oppression. The last of their days were days of violence and tyranny, until insurrections grew rife. Famine and dearth reigned in the city of Fez, until an ounce of flour was sold for a dirhem, and provisions failed. The chiefs of the Berbers would force their way into the houses of the citizens, and carry off any food they found there. None had the power to hinder, nor the courage to protest. The baser sort of Berbers would climb to the top of a neighbouring hill, and cast their eyes over the city lying at their feet, and if they saw smoke rising from a house, they would make for that house, and, entering, seize whatever food they found there. But when they did such things, God took the kingdom away from them, and changed His favours towards them; and, verily, God doth not change His favour for a people, until they change what is in their hearts.¹ So He gave them into the power of the Almoravids, who brought their kingdom to an end, dispersing their gathering, and slew them, and cast them out of the country of Morocco."

¹ Koran 13. 12.

The Almoravids, led by Abdallah ibn Yaseen, played the same part in Morocco as did the Israelites under Joshua in the land of Canaan. The account of the death of that hero in the year 1059 A.D., forms a striking parallel to the last two chapters of the Book of Joshua. When he was borne into the camp out of his last fight, heavy with wounds, he summoned around him the shaikhs of the Almoravids, and delivered to them his last charge. "O company of Almoravids, ye are in the enemy's country, and I am dying on this my day, beyond a doubt. Beware, therefore, lest ye turn back and become faint-hearted, and your breeze fall. But be ye friends and helpers for the truth, and brethren in God ; and beware of disputings and of envy, arising from the love of ruling ; for God giveth His kingdom to whom He will, and maketh His vicar upon earth whom He loveth of His servants. And now that I am gone from you, look out for yourselves one whom ye may put at your head, to manage your affairs and to lead your armies, and to divide your plunder, and to receive your poor-rates and your tithes."

The Almoravids ran the wonted course for a hundred years, when they in their turn were swept away by the rising tide of the "Almohads" under Muhammad ibn Toomart. This Muhammad ibn Toomart began life very poor, but such was his love of learning that he travelled the world in search of it. In the East he met with Al Ghazálee, the greatest of the great men of many generations, who pointed him out to his disciples, assuring them that "this Berber would one day attain to empire." On his return to Morocco Ibn Toomart first found Abd el Mu'min, to whom he made known his designs ; after which he proclaimed himself as the long-expected "Mahdi," who should arise in the last times, to fill the earth with justice. He entered into the market-places preaching righteousness and denouncing wrong, breaking the instruments of music

and pleasure, and pouring out the wine in every place to which he came, until he reached Fez, where he remained teaching for three years. Then he set out for the city of Morocco, for it could not be that his mission should be accomplished out of the Almoravid capital. Haled before the Sultan, the latter mocked at his sorry and poverty-stricken estate, but Ibn Toomart rebuked the Sultan to his face, for his neglect of the religion which it was his business to maintain. Confronted with the "Ulemas" he put to them questions, which they could not answer, and consequently denounced him as an impostor and a heretic and a raiser of sedition. He was therefore driven out of the city, but built himself a hut in the low hills to the north of the town, where many of the students visited him, and read and studied under him. The number of his disciples increased, and the hearts of men were filled with the love of him. But when he made known to his most intimate followers his hope of establishing a new dynasty in Morocco, when that came to the ears of the Sultan, he went about to kill him. He fled, therefore, with ten of his disciples who had been the first to join him to the hills, where he soon began to spread his cause by force, at the same time sending out disciples into the country, to call men to his allegiance and to sow the love of him in their hearts, telling them of his virtues and wonderful works, and his forsaking of the world, and his devotion to the truth. He appointed fifty other disciples also, on whose counsel he might rely in difficulty and doubt. And so he stole the hearts of men by his tact, and by the sweetness of his voice and of his words.

The above excerpts have been taken from the history of Morocco by the fourteenth-century writer, Ibn abee Zera, of Fazzán. The arrangement of the work is similar to that of the Books of Kings or Chronicles or, indeed, to that of almost any other oriental history: that is to say,

the accession-years of the various rulers form the links of the chain on which the narrative is hung; and the accuracy of the dates is vouched for by a comparison with the contemporary coinage. Of a new sultan it is said that he walked in the way of his father or grandfather, in piety, and that there was great prosperity, and people flocked to Fez from all countries until the city could not contain them; or that he lived an evil life, and came to a violent end.

A characteristic of the oriental narrator is that he puts the climax of the tale at the beginning, and then proceeds to show how this came about; but sometimes the end does not justify the opening statement. A curious example of this occurs in the 9th chapter of the Book of Judges, where the commentators have missed a rare opportunity of making another breach in the text. In *v.* 50 we are told: "Then went Abimelech to Thebez, and encamped against Thebez, and took it"; but the detailed narrative which follows gives one a different impression as to the course of events. Similar, but more accurate, instances of thus anticipating the conclusion of a story are common enough. In the description of the famous battle of the River Makházín, as a result of which the kingdom of Portugal was for eighty years blotted out from the map of Europe, the issue of the battle and the fate which befell one of the kings who perished there, are stated at once, instead of being held back to the last.

It goes without saying that in any genuinely eastern history impending events are foreshadowed by means of dreams and omens. When Muhammad al Kaim, the founder of the last dynasty in Morocco, was in Madeenah, one of the people of the City of the Prophet dreamed that he saw two lions come forth from Muhammad's breast; which was interpreted to signify that his two sons should turn out something great. And when he had returned to

Morocco, as his two children sat one day in school, learning to repeat the Korán, it is said, a cock flew in at the open door, and perched, first on the head of the one, and then on the head of the other, crowing loudly; which was regarded as a sure indication of the good fortune which awaited them.

One of the first principles of present-day criticism appears to be that any work of antiquity, however long, must have been composed at one sitting. Only on this supposition can all liberty to change his style, or alter one of his expressions or phrases, be denied to an author. Yet when there is a change in the turning of a phrase, it is confidently put down to a change of authorship or a change of source; although some glaring examples are passed over unnoticed. But one does not require to go to oriental writers to find an author modifying his language and altering his style in the course of a work which must have been written at many sittings and in many moods. In the works cited above there are several examples of this.

The right to curse an enemy whom one is powerless to injure in a more effective way belongs to every Arab or Hebrew. The Arabic expression for "to curse" is "to pray against," the opposite of "to pray for," which is to bless; and in the case of a saint "whose prayers are answered," blessing and cursing are most effective weapons of weal or woe. Sometimes the imprecation is sought as a means of resisting invasion, as in the case of Balak and Balaam: sometimes it concerns individuals, and then results in the death of the offender, as did Jotham's¹

¹ There is an interesting parallel to Jotham's address to the citizens of Shechem and his immediate flight (Jud. 9.) in Chenery's translation of the Assemblies of Al Hariti, p. 476, where an Arab, standing at a safe distance, recites jeering verses to a hostile tribe, and then runs away.

imprecation upon Abimelech, and the extinction of his posterity : at other times it takes the form of banishment from Muslim territory, as Isaiah's curse upon Shebna was to result in his expulsion from the land of Israel (22. 18).

T. H. WEIR.

THE JOHANNINE VIEW OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

It is proposed to consider in this article the aspect of the Crucifixion which is brought before us in the fourth Gospel, more especially as it is illustrated by the contrast between the tone, the spirit, of the words, "They shall look on him whom they pierced," as quoted by St. John (xix. 37) with that of their original context in Zechariah (xii. 10), and again with the spirit in which allusion is made to them in Revelation i. 7.

Any great act of wrong which is of sufficient importance to take its place in history affects men in at least three ways. There is pity for the innocent sufferer, as he is assumed to be; there is fierce indignation against the authors of the crime, and, as time goes on, and familiarity with the details of the transaction becomes part of our habitual knowledge, while our emotional expression of pity and of indignation becomes less intense, we learn to view the matter more from the point of view of its historical and permanent significance. In the department of secular history the execution of Charles I., as that event was regarded by High-Anglican Royalists, affords a good illustration of what I mean. It is unnecessary that I should enlarge upon it.

As a matter of fact the great world tragedy which we are now considering has affected mankind in these three ways; and we may conveniently refer to them respectively the three passages in which reference is made to the piercing of the Messiah. The tone, the spirit of the three contexts differ considerably one from the other. I do not mean to say that the difference was designed, but it is there, and it may assist us in the ordering of our thoughts on this subject.

“ In that day . . . I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication ; and they shall look unto me, whom they have pierced ; and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn ” (Zech. xii. 10). This may be, as Westcott says, (note on St. John, l.c.), “ the vision of a Saviour, late recognized by a penitent people ” ; but there is in the words I have quoted an unmistakable tone of the tenderest pity and regret for the pierced One, as exhibited by those who look unto Him whom they have pierced.

On the other hand, in the preamble to the Revelation of St. John, the look and the mourning are those of hopeless remorse, the surprise and disappointment of the adversaries, and that too recorded by one who feels a fierce indignation against them : “ Behold, He cometh with the clouds ; and every eye shall see Him, and they which pierced Him ; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over Him. Even so, Amen.” Here we have a tone of indignation against those who pierced the sacred body, indignation which might easily degenerate into sectarian hatred, a tone of triumph in the final and open vindication of the once despised Sufferer, which might easily degenerate into a Tertullian’s vindictive joy over the future torments of unbelievers, a sentiment which has in fact been the ultimate sanction of the cruel persecution of Jews by Christians for many centuries.

It is not necessary to prove that this excessive indignation against those who murdered Jesus is utterly unchristian and unreasonable. “ Father, forgive them ; for they know not what they do.” That is the divine and true appreciation of their act, considered by itself. And as for the moral obliquity which led to that act, do not we, some of us, need to pray, “ From hardness of heart and

contempt of Thy Word and Commandment, good Lord, deliver us"?

"The prophetic vision," says Bishop Westcott (l.c.), "as applied to Christ in the Apocalypse, is primarily the vision of one slain returning to judgment"; and it was natural and proper for the seer of the Revelation to anticipate the confusion and too late remorse of an unbelieving world; but it may be questioned whether Christians of the twentieth century profit much by dwelling on thoughts such as these.

The other look, the look not of remorse, but of pity, may seem to many not only more natural, but also absolutely unexceptionable, if not the only possible way of regarding the Crucifixion: "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." These words, and others of a similar character from the Old Testament have been constantly applied in Christian literature and devotional works to the sufferings of our Lord. The purely physical aspects of the great tragedy, in their minutest details, have been appealed to, to excite our pity and arouse our sorrow, the insults and the scourging, the cross too heavy to be borne by the weakened frame of the Saviour, the crown of thorns, and the five wounds, the prolonged torture and the despairing cry, all that in modern phraseology would be termed the sensational features of the death of Christ.

"One should be fearful of being wrong in poetry when one thinks differently from the poets, and in religion when one thinks differently from the saints." There is sufficient truth in these words of Joubert to make us hesitate before deprecating, much less condemning, the look of tender pity and commiseration with which many, perhaps most, of the saints of Christendom have gazed on the cross of Jesus. The "*Mater dolorosa*" has many to weep with her. And yet I think it is something more solid than good taste that

makes some of us shrink from the horribly realistic crucifixes and stations of the cross of mediæval and modern Romanism. We feel that there is a capital and fundamental error in this emphasizing of the material details of the death of Jesus, so that the thoughts and imagination cannot take in any other conception of it. This overemphasis of the cruel details defeats its own purpose; for it inevitably and logically invites a comparison with other exhibitions of human cruelty; and not only lowers the death of Christ to the level of a martyrdom, and so impairs its unique significance, but candour compels us to assign it an unimportant place in the ranks of martyrdoms. The annals of the cruelty of man to man, even within the last quarter of a century, supply stories, the horror of which reduce the Crucifixion, if it were only a crucifixion, to the level of a very commonplace event.

And when we examine afresh the Gospel record we cannot fail to be struck by the reserve of the historians of the Passion, the complete absence of sensationalism in the account they give of the death of their Master. Mr. Row (*Christian Evidences*, p. 78) notes as a "proof of the artless character of the Gospels" the fact that their authors "never once dilate on the great qualities of their Master. . . . All that they do is to record His actions and discourses with scarcely a remark. They have even scarcely a hard word to say of His opponents, although they must have regarded the chief agents in bringing about his Crucifixion as the worst of murderers." "The facts," as Bishop Butler says, "are related in plain, unadorned narratives." And not only do the Evangelists abstain from calling attention to the actual bodily pain endured by Christ, but on the contrary they leave the reader with a picture in his mind of a great spiritual triumph, an exhibition of moral power: "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children." "To-day

shalt thou be with me in Paradise." "When the centurion . . . saw that He so gave up the ghost, he said, 'Truly this man was the Son of God.'" It was only in accordance with the spirit of the Gospels that the psalm should run, "Tell it out among the heathen that the Lord hath reigned from the tree."

But while this is true of the Synoptists it is much more true of St. John's narrative. Here we have the effect of the lapse of time exemplified in two ways. As men grow older their characters ripen for good or bad; and when St. John wrote his Gospel, the Boanerges, the Son of thunder, of the Apocalypse had mellowed into the apostle of love, whose only sermon was, "Little children, love one another." "They shall look on Him whom they pierced" had been a feature in his vision of judgment, the look of remorse, of despair; it was now to suggest the look of trust and hope. Experience had taught the Evangelist that "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through Him." And therefore he had come to see in the blood and water that issued from the pierced side of Jesus not only "a sign of life in death," but also symbols of the new natural and spiritual life of which Christ is the source (Westcott in loc.). "For He is the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world." And so, as being the Paschal Lamb, "a bone of Him was not broken," and as the antitype of the brazen serpent, on which if a man looked he lived, so they who desire life "shall look on Him whom they pierced"; for "He was wounded for our transgressions."

Again, the years, the generation rather, that had passed since the beloved disciple had stood by the cross of Jesus, produced on his mind the effect of distance on a landscape. The details of savagery were not forgotten by him. How could they be? But they were seen in their true proportion.

Most of them were now perceived to have had no eternal significance. For St. John the main, almost the only, aspect of the death of Christ is the atoning virtue of it. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" This witness of the Baptist determines the attitude of the Evangelist towards the crucifixion all through the fourth Gospel.

"Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." This sentiment of St. Paul's, uttered probably in rebuke of the claims of some who thought themselves more highly favoured than he, seems to actuate St. John in his treatment throughout of the Crucifixion.

In the previous part of the Gospel the language used of it is very significant and remarkable: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up" (iii. 14). When ye have "lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am He" (viii. 28). "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself" (xii. 32). Elsewhere, as Westcott notes, the phrase "lifted up" occurs in reference to the Ascension. The Bishop's comment on the last passage cited is worth quoting: "St. John does not ever, like St. Paul, separate the Passion as a crisis of humiliation from the glory which followed. The 'lifting up' includes death and the victory over death. In this aspect the crisis of the Passion itself is regarded as a glorification (xiii. 31); and St. John sees the Lord's triumph in this rather than in the Return."

We are here reminded that in this Gospel Christ always speaks of His own "glorification" in connexion with His death, as, for example, "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit" (xii. 23, 24).

Again, in this Gospel our Lord speaks constantly of His death as "laying down His life." The phrase has so completely passed into our current speech that it may be a surprise to some to learn that it only occurs in this Gospel, and once in St. John's First Epistle, and nowhere else. The metaphor, as Westcott suggests, may be drawn from the putting off and laying aside of a robe. It expresses the voluntariness of Christ's sufferings, which is so markedly emphasized in this narrative.

Once more, the death of Christ is treated in a very special way as being, if the phrase may be allowed, an incident in our Lord's arrangements. It is one of the things to which the term "His hour" is applied. "Mine hour is not yet come," He says to His mother at the marriage in Cana. To His brethren He says, "I go not up yet unto this feast; because My time is not yet fulfilled." So with reference to His death we read, "No man laid his hand on Him, because His hour was not yet come" (vii. 30, viii. 20); and "Jesus knowing that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father" (xiii. 1).

And then when we come to the actual narrative we cannot fail to notice that in place of the agony in the garden, and the traitor's kiss, and the desertion by all, St. John gives us the great Prayer of Consecration, the recoil of the officers from Christ's majestic presence, and the calm request, "Let these go their way." In place of the examination before the Council we have the true Messiah confronted with the false high-priest Annas; and the fact is noted that, at first at least, Jesus bore His cross for Himself; and many of the painful incidents recorded in the other gospels are not mentioned. There is nothing approaching to a contradiction or even a correction of the earlier narratives; it is only that the point of view is somewhat changed. It is as though looking back over the years, and viewing the Passion through the medium of the spiritual experiences of himself and of

thousands of his children in Christ, the aged Apostle beheld on Calvary not a gallows, not a crucifix, but an altar throne radiant with an everlasting glory, and on the throne "a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, slain from the foundation of the world."

While the joy of the Resurrection morn grows and deepens for the individual soul as it draws nearer to death, and becomes ever more significant for the human race as it advances through the centuries, it must be otherwise with Good Friday. The Christian can never pass a Good Friday, like the first, as passed by St. Peter and his brother apostles. What sorrow could be like his who knows that no bitter tears of sincerest penitence can ever restore to him the Master he has denied, or change the meaning of that last penetrating glance? For us "the darkness is passing away," nay, it is past, "and the true light already shineth." We look unto Him whom we have pierced, solemnized by the knowledge that we have a share in the sins that called for that tremendous sacrifice. But there is, there must be, a prevailing note of thankful joy. "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life."

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

A NEW VIEW ABOUT "AMBROSIASTER."

THE question as to the personality of the author of the Latin commentaries on thirteen epistles of St. Paul, commonly attributed in manuscripts to St. Ambrose, and of the pseudo-Augustinian work, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* CXXVII., is one which has taxed the ingenuity of many scholars since Erasmus showed that St. Ambrose could not have been the author. Name after name has been put forward only to be rejected as insufficiently supported, and one name alone has been brought forward, that has been widely accepted amongst those best capable of judging, that of Isaac, a converted Jew, who flourished during the pontificate of Damasus (366-384 A.D.).

The author of this last suggestion is the well-known Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., of the Abbey, Maredsous, Belgium, one of the greatest patristic scholars now living. This "suggestion"—for he explicitly stated that he did not intend it to be anything else¹—was clearly expounded to readers of the EXPOSITOR, with the reasons given in support of it, by the Rev. A. E. Burn, in November, 1899. The present writer was disposed, and even undertook, to support the view in a work at present in the press, but has gradually moved farther and farther from the position.

The chief pillar in the argument, that *Isaac ex Iudaeo* might be the author, consisted in linguistic parallels between the commentaries and *Quaestiones*, on the one hand, and two fragments of the undoubted work of Isaac, on the other. A growing acquaintance with the style of the author, fostered by the experience of collating seven manuscripts of the *Quaestiones*, in which ear and eye were made to aid each other, has convinced me that these parallels, cogent as they (especially in the use of the words *nascibilitas*

¹ Though Zimmer, in his valuable work, *Pelagius in Irland* (Berlin, 1901), p. 120 n., has represented Morin as making a categorical statement.

and *renascibilitas*) may appear, are quite insufficient to prove common authorship, and only show that the authors lived at the same time (which is otherwise certain), and were perhaps also of the same school of theology, if we may use the expression.

It was hard to have to give up a view which had obtained such wide support. It had been pleasant, after being dashed hither and thither by the waves of opinion or fancy, to settle down in rest and believe that the real author had been discovered. I do not agree with some who have considered that as we know the date of the author, his identity is of little importance. It is the fate of anonymous, or wrongly ascribed works, to be neglected, but it is a fact, as Prof. Jülicher has said,¹ that *this commentary is the best on St. Paul's epistles prior to the Reformation*. It claims therefore the attention of every educated student of St. Paul, who desires either to get help towards reaching the Apostle's meaning, or to understand the estimation in which his writings were held at the great age in the world's history, when paganism was fighting its last battle for existence, when the words of St. Hilary of Poitiers were still ringing in the ears of the western world, and when the new voices of St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine were beginning to claim a hearing. Nor can the *Quaestiones* be safely neglected by any student of that period. When the text has been properly edited, it will be found that a most interesting personality has been revealed to the world, as well as a new witness to the Old Latin version or versions of the Bible, an interpreter of Holy Scripture of sane and independent judgment, and an important authority for the history of his period.² For these reasons, it was right to persevere and seek fresh light in every quarter for the

¹ In the article *Ambrosiaster* in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*.

² There is no reference to him in Dill's excellent book, *Roman Society in the Western Empire*.

solution of the question. This is what Dom Morin has done, and with characteristic courage he now puts forward as the result of four years' careful study, a new view with which I willingly agree.¹

Side by side with the tradition that Ambrose was author of the commentaries, there run two other streams of tradition. The oldest MS. of the commentaries, that of Monte Cassino (written in the sixth century), and it alone, to the best of my knowledge, gives no author's name to the commentaries in the subscriptions thereto. But the other tradition attributes the work to Hilarius. No MS. of any commentary or any set of the commentaries attaches this name to the work, but quotations from the commentaries (in reality from the commentary on *Romans* only, a point of some importance, which has not been emphasized) in different Irish-Latin MSS., are given as words of Hilarius. For the discovery of these references we are beholden to the lamented Dr. Samuel Berger² and Prof. Heinrich Zimmer, of Berlin, the distinguished exponent of Keltic origins.³ They are contained in the celebrated *Book of Armagh* and an entirely independent MS. of Würzburg, both Irish-Latin manuscripts of the ninth century. This important discovery gives new meaning to a reference in St. Augustine which has been long known. The great bishop, in one of his controversial treatises against the Pelagian heresy,⁴ quotes a portion of our commentary (on *Romans* v. 12), headed by the words *nam et sic sanctus Hilarius intellexit quod scriptum est*. Augustine therefore, in the early fifth century, and the Irish Church, in the early ninth century, were acquainted with copies, at least of the

¹ See *Revue Bénédictine*, xx. (1903), pp. 113-131. I owe my copy of the article to the author's kindness.

² In a posthumous work, *Les Préfaces Jointes aux Livres de la Bible dans les Manuscrits de la Vulgate* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1902), p. 26.

³ *Pelagius in Irland* (Berlin, 1901), pp. 117-120.

⁴ *Contra duas epist. Pelagian.*, lib. iv. No. 7 (of date about 420 A.D.).

commentary on Romans, bearing the title *Hilarius*. It is almost certain that Augustine believed he was quoting a work by the greatest Hilary of all, him of Poitiers. He probably never thought of any other Hilary, when he saw that name in the title. Nothing in the work would (or shall we say? could) seem to him un-Hilarian. To us who are well removed from those days and can look with a critical eye on all those ancient writings, questions of language and the like become decisive in settling the question of authorship one way or another. Contemporaries, however, are greatly blind to such. How many, who ought to have known better, attributed *Supernatural Religion* to Bishop Thirlwall? Have we not heard also of persons of mature and exquisite literary taste, who were unable to tell in the case of a composite work what was written by each author? Are all agreed as to the parts of plays written by Shakespeare and Fletcher in collaboration? Let no one therefore blame Augustine if he made a mistake in this matter. The mistake was much more venial in his time, when the important thing was not so much who made a statement or wrote a book, as what the statement or writing was, and what it was worth. This attitude of the ancients has an important bearing also on the higher criticism of the New Testament.

There has long been an opinion that some one named Hilary wrote the work. People searched dictionaries of biography for possible candidates, and with considerable rashness selected Hilary, a deacon of Rome, for the author. Even Dr. Hort followed that opinion.¹ But, other reasons apart, no deacon of Rome could have written the violent diatribe, Question 101, "On the Boastfulness of the Roman Deacons." I had joined in the search for a suitable Hilary, but could find no one important enough. Dom

¹ In the posthumous work, *Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions* (Macmillan, 1901), p. 90.

MORIN has now found one, whose full name was *Decimius Hilarianus Hilarius*,¹ and who satisfies all the conditions of the problem.

Decimius Hilarianus Hilarius was a Christian layman, who flourished in the latter part of the fourth and the early years of the fifth century. He was proconsul of Africa in 377; a law was addressed to him by the emperors Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius on February 19, 383,² in 396 he was *praefectus praetorio* and had four laws of the Theodosian code addressed to him during his tenure of that office,³ and finally he was in 408 prefect of Rome. Five letters in the huge collection of his contemporary Symmachus, the doughty champion of dying paganism, are addressed to him.⁴ These letters belong probably to the year 397.⁵

In connexion with his family, Prof. Seeck, perhaps the greatest living authority on the history of that period, has made what I regard as a certain conjecture. St. Jerome in his 54th letter, section 6, addressing a Roman lady of the name of Furia, uses the following words: *Pater tuus, quem ego honoris causa (i.e. with all respect) nomino, non quia consularis et patricius, sed quia christianus est, IMPLEAT NOMEN SVVM: LAETETVR filiam genuisse Christo, non saeculo* Furia's father, then, must have had a name connected etymologically with the idea of *rejoicing*. The name cannot be Gaudentius, as Jerome would then have used *gaudeat*, such plays upon words being in perfect taste in ancient literature. Again, no important person of the

¹ Known from an inscription discovered at Bedja (ancient Vaga), in ancient Africa, which was roughly equivalent to modern Tunis (*Corp. Inscr. Lat.* viii. 1219).

² *Codex Theodosianus*, v. 1, 3.

³ See *Cod. Theod.* xiii. 11, 6; vii. 4, 22; xi. 21, 2; vii. 4, 23.

⁴ *Lib.* iii. 38-42.

⁵ To save misapprehension, I ought perhaps to mention that the aristocrats of the day did not break friendship with their peers because of differences on religious questions.

name of Laetus, living at that time, is known to us, though, thanks to Symmachus, and his best editor, Seeck, the personalities of no period of Roman history, with the exception of that of the last twenty years of the Republic, are so thoroughly known. The word *hilarescat* is not quite so rare as Morin, placing too much reliance on our lexicons, which have no authority in the Latinity of the fourth century, fancies,¹ and might have been used, were it not that it appears to be confined to Old Latin and the Latin of Africa,² which, like modern America, preserved for long many features of the ancient language. Everything points to the name *Hilarius*. His rank, his age,³ and his religion suit the situation perfectly. If this identification be accepted, we know further that the wife of Hilarius had been Titiana, deceased at the time. She was the daughter or sister of Furius Maecius Gracchus, who, when prefect of Rome in 376-377, showed his zeal for Christianity in a very striking manner by destroying a *speleum* or cave devoted to the worship of the god Mithras. The three references in our author to the *speleum*,⁴ twice by name, acquire new meaning in this light. Other particulars of the family are also known.

The works themselves are of a character entirely in harmony with this theory. The author was certainly a Christian, and also a married man. The latter conclusion can be safely drawn, I think, from remarks which bespeak an experience of married life. He gives (qu. 117) as the reason why Abraham kept the secret of Isaac's sacrifice from Sarah, that he knew "*circa adfectum filiorum pro-*

¹ He says "*hilarescat* n'allait guère, ou même point du tout" (p. 123, n. 1).

² It occurs in Augustine at least five times, also in Primasius, another African (Benoist-Goelzer's *Dictionnaire*, and my own collections).

³ His career would put his birth about 330 at latest, and he would thus be old in 394, the probable date of the letter.

⁴ *In 1 Cor.* xiv. 24-25; qu. 114, and once elsewhere. I write *speleum* intentionally following the MSS. and some inscriptions (Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.* II. (Berl. 1902), 4224 4226, etc.).

cliviores in amore esse matres." He had made the same remark before in qu. 109: "*non ignarus fragiliores esse circa filios feminas, et posse huic deuotioni lacrimarum miseratione impedimentum adferre.*" Again (qu. 118) the serpent-devil, casting about for means to entrap Job, remembers that he had deceived Adam through Eve, and resolves to try the same means with Job. The author gives the reason: "one is easiest cheated by a member of one's household." These remarks may be considered merely as the result of close observation, but every one will admit that they come most naturally from a husband and father.

The author was also a layman. It is no wonder that this "will o' the wisp" personality eluded capture for so long. It is probable that laymen who wrote on religious questions were much less numerous and less sensible in ancient times even than they are now. The idea that the author of these commentaries and *Quaestiones* could be a layman was therefore never conceived till Dom Morin pointed out the reasons for such an opinion. Close study only confirms us in the belief. If the author were a clergyman, he must have been a bishop, a priest, or a deacon. A bishop he almost certainly was not, as he affirms, once in each work, the original identity of bishop and presbyter, an identity of which a bishop, one may say, would be apt to lose sight.¹ A layman, however, who had discovered this interesting historical fact, would feel a temptation to remind the bishops that their position in origin was not really any higher than that of the presbyters. Neither was the author a presbyter. He speaks habitually of the priests by the phrase *sacerdotes nostri*. The reason given by him for the celibacy of priests is such as no clergyman would give, but such as a lay lawyer or administrator might give. "Everything has its own law. There is that which is permissible

¹ The passages are referred to in Prof. V. Bartlett's article in the *Contemporary Review* for April, 1902, p. 540 f.

to no one at all; there is that which is permitted to some, but not to others; there is that which is sometimes permitted, but not allowed at other times" (qu. 127). There is one difficulty in this connexion which Dom Morin has skilfully removed. *Quaestiones* cxvi.—cxi. are of a homiletical nature, being addressed to "dear brethren." *Quaest.* cxx. even begins with the words: "*consonum est, fratres carissimi, deuotissime dei sacerdotem et praepositum plebis Christi exhortari populum, sub cura sua positum, in doctrina sana.*" His explanation is that these are merely notes of sermons, and this certainly suits their length. The sermons of St. Augustine would on the average take ten minutes apiece to deliver. The documents under consideration are much shorter, and are rather collections of "heads" than actual sermons. If they be thought, however, to have been delivered by the author, is there anything to prevent our wealthy aristocrat, so learned in the Scriptures, from having occasionally delivered sermons to his household, which would include many slaves? I think not, but rather believe the temptation must have been very great. If the author was married, this was another bar to the priesthood (qu. 127). Nor was our author a deacon. The bitterness of the attack on the deacons of Rome (qu. 101) makes this impossible. The author mentions that he does not wish to hurt their feelings, as he was on terms of friendship with some of them. It is known that the deacons of Rome were seven in number only, according to the original constitution of the diaconate (Acts vi.), and were in consequence very important and influential persons. The higher order, that of priests, contained about seventy members in Rome, and a priest was in consequence a much less important person than a deacon. Is it likely that such persons would admit any to their friendship except those of highest station?

This brings us to the question of the author's position in life. Do the works show any signs of a writer of high

station? The answer must be in the affirmative, now that Dom Morin has shown the true import of many references to the Emperor, Government, and Law, which are found in both works. These references strike the careful reader of Latin Christian literature as characteristic of this author. St. Augustine, for example, never, or hardly ever, draws any illustrations from this source. The passages are enumerated by Dom Morin on pages 119 to 121, and more fully by the present writer,¹ but cannot be repeated here. Let me quote Dom Morin's summary of the evidence (p. 119): "Les passages . . . révèlent clairement chez notre auteur ce qu'on pourrait appeler la science expérimentale et habituelle des hautes dignités, un sens impeccable de l'étiquette, des convenances du rôle exact correspondant à la naissance ou aux fonctions des divers individus. Il connaît et signale les moindres nuances de la hiérarchie, depuis l'empereur jusqu'au dernier des officiers subalternes." He knows all about such officials as *praefecti*, *vicarii*, *legati*, about senators, their dress, what they may and may not do. The whole multitude of details comes naturally from one who lived in the midst of them. The language of the author, too, is full of legal terms, and yet these are not such as the lawyer, pure and simple, like Tertullian, would employ. They are less severely technical than those of Tertullian. They are, in fact, exactly such as an administrator, who was not actually a lawyer, but had long experience in and about law-courts, would employ. One could fill pages with examples of such terms. There are two allusions to the venality of judges, which were always a difficulty to me, on the supposition that the author was an ecclesiastic, who could perhaps be punished for such a statement, but are natural in the mouth of a man who, having held high administrative posts, and given judges their orders again

¹ *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, pp. 23-31 (in the press). They were collected by me for a different purpose.

and again, had nothing to fear from them, even if the veil of his anonymity were penetrated. Another point is that the author speaks as a travelled man.¹ He is acquainted with the customs of all the churches (qu. 101). His references to Egypt in both works, the rights of a presbyter there in the absence of a bishop, and the library of Ptolemy in Alexandria, etc., have always seemed to me to be a proof that the author had visited that country. Dom Morin's theory explains this also. The author had been governor or on a governor's staff in Egypt. A papyrus will perhaps be found, has perhaps been already found, containing his name. He must have had a long official career before he attained to the proconsulship of Africa in 377, as this position was one of the highest prizes open to the administrator under the Empire, and very possibly a post in Egypt was part of that career. We might infer from references to the customs of Moors, etc., that he had visited their countries.² It is extremely likely that, as excavation and research proceed, much more of the history of this interesting man will be revealed.

If it be asked how the identity of the author was lost sight of, there are several reasons ready to hand. The existence of another Hilary helped to obscure his identity.³ Also, most of the copies of his works must have been issued anonymously. It must have been quite the exception for a layman to write religious works, and a high official might expose himself to ridicule by publishing such books under his own name. In Italy at least, this might have been so, in spite of the fact that for two generations Christianity had been the official religion of the Empire.⁴ To compare small

¹ Dom Morin has not actually referred to this.

² Customs of Garamantes and other Africans, Persians, etc., are referred to (qu. 115, col. 2350). The predominance of Africa is very significant in view of the inscription referred to above.

³ Dom Morin has given other instances of this phenomenon (pp. 115, 116).

⁴ Except of course during Julian's reign (355-363).

things with great, the present writer, a layman, trained in classics, but not in theology, has been pitted by more than one Cambridge man for showing an interest in Latin Christian authors. My own belief is that the commentary on *Romans* was issued separately in Africa, when the author was governor there, and, being practically a king, had no one to fear. This explains how Augustine had a copy there. It is well known that the Irish Church was practically separate from the rest of the Western Church from the fifth century onwards, and retained the theological literature of the early centuries, and the early customs of the whole Western Church, to an extent which it is difficult to realize. One copy of the commentary on *Romans*, bearing Hilary's name,¹ would be sufficient to cause the phenomena already detailed. I would say that the entire commentary was published anonymously in Rome, and that the Monte Cassino copy, which, as we have seen, is anonymous, may be taken from an original copy of the edition.² Cassiodorus, in a well known passage,³ mentions a rumour that there was a commentary on St. Paul's epistles by St. Ambrose in existence, but that he had been unable to find it, in spite of careful search. It is probable that he had our commentary in his possession all the time, but as an anonymous work.⁴ I believe the ascription to St. Ambrose to have been made in good faith by the learned editors either of the fifth or sixth centuries. They were doubtless helped to this conclusion by the fact that the author not only shows the same, or an almost identical biblical text with Ambrose, but uses many expressions,

¹ In this connexion it is pertinent to observe that an old catalogue of Bobbio, the Irish monastery in N. Italy, mentions a copy of Hilary on the *Romans* (Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, No. 32, p. 65).

² Probably with some contamination of text, but this does not affect the present discussion.

³ *De Inst. Div. Litt.* c. 8.

⁴ So think H. Zimmer (*Pelagius in Irland*, p. 200 ff.) and C. H. Turner (*Journ. Theol. Studies*, iv. [1902] 132-141, a lucid and excellent account of some Latin commentaries on the Pauline epistles).

such as *non otiose*, which are characteristic of that father. The *Quaestiones* must also have been published anonymously at first, for reasons already stated, and also because qu. 109, on Melchisedech, had been published apart and sent to Jerome as an anonymous work.¹ The ascription to St. Augustine (in the best MSS. *Agustinus*, which in itself suggests Italian origin)² is due to the same men of learning, who, in spite of the fact that the treatise is pre-Augustinian in character, and is not mentioned in the *Retractations*, had a certain show of reason for attributing the work to him in the fact that he actually wrote four works, in the titles of which the word *quaestiones* forms a part.

One personal contribution to the question.³ The character of the biblical text employed by the author appears, in the light of study of the manuscripts, to be closely akin in the Gospels to that of the Old Latin Codex Veronensis (*b*), and in the Epistles to that of St. Ambrose himself. Dr. Berger, in a sentence which seems to have escaped general notice,⁴ styles the text of St. Paul's epistles used by Ambrosiaster the Milanese text *par excellence*. This seems to me to point to the fact that the author was brought up, and lived throughout the most impressionable period of his life in North Italy. It would not be fanciful to trace his great love and knowledge of the Bible to a Christian mother. It is the Bible on which one is brought up that one readily quotes and comments on in after life, not that of the city in which one may happen to live.⁵ In the inscriptions of North Italy, if anywhere, I should look with

¹ Hier. Ep. 73, 1.

² Other considerations exclude any idea of Spanish origin.

³ I have made throughout this paper many small personal contributions, which Dom Morin will readily distinguish, but I have not thought it desirable to label each sentence or clause. ⁴ *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 139.

⁵ It is perhaps necessary to remind the reader that there were a very large number of texts of the Bible, varying more or less.

confidence for the names of relatives of our Hilary. To anticipate possible objections: I ought to say that it is well known that Milan was in no way "provincial" in the fourth century, but was in many ways at least as important as Rome itself. As a place of education, it was very notable even before Christ. The author's style shows that he had had a very good education. In his language there is very little to cavil at. I may perhaps be permitted to mention that Father Brewer, S.J., the Austrian expert, has told me that in his opinion the vocabulary of Ambrosiaster indicates North Italian origin. Dr. Berger, Father Brewer, and I have thus arrived by different roads at the same destination. It will not be, in future, all the truth to call "Ambrosiaster" *Roman*. Roman he was by residence and position, but by education, religious and secular, a *North Italian*.

There remains one point more. I have often thought it probable that some other work or works by this hitherto enigmatical person might be lurking in some of our libraries. Such turns out, in Dom Morin's opinion, to be the case. In a manuscript of the sixth century in the Imperial Library of Vienna (No. 2160*) there has been found a fragment of a treatise against the Arians, following on the *De Trinitate* of St. Hilary of Poitiers. This Prof. Sedlmayer had been prepared to publish as a part of the works of St. Hilary, but has now changed his opinion and published it in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy of Sciences.¹ Dom Morin, in an appendix to his article,² has essayed to prove that this fragment and the second portion of a sermon falsely attributed to St. Augustine,³ are both parts of a work by our author.⁴ In favour of this possibility there are three considerations. First, it is not impossible that

¹ Vol. cxlvi. 2 Abh. (with appendix by Dom Morin, who kindly sent me a copy).
² Pp. 125-131.

³ No. 246 of the Appendix in the Benedictine edition.

⁴ I have long thought that the *Carmen contra paganos* (Riese, *Anthol. lat.* I². p. 24) may be by this author.

the addition of the *Contra Arrianos* to the *De Trinitate* arises from a confusion between two authors of the same name. Second, "Ambrosiaster" had written a treatise against the Arians, as he himself tells us at the end of Question 125 (col. 2376) :—

"Hic finis sit. Iam enim in *libello aduersus Arrianam impietatem* digesto reliqua *plene*¹ tractata sunt, quae trinitatis complexa sunt indiscretam unitatem."

Most of us had naturally supposed that this was a reference back to Question 97, entitled *Aduersus Arrium*. Against this supposition we have to recognize that the author in no other case calls a *Quaestio* a *libellus*, that he does not refer to other passages in this manner, but uses phrases such as *sicut supra ostendimus*, and that *digesto* is rather a grand word to use of a short document. But if the reference be to the work of which we have recovered fragments, it is quite natural. The reading *plene*, which I now restore from the old manuscripts, strengthens Dom Morin's argument. The author would hardly say that he had given a *full* treatment of the question in No. 97, but might use this language of a longer work. The reading *plenius* is clearly the conscious alteration of some editor, who was aware that *Quaestio* 97 was not a complete discussion of the subject. Third, the coincidences in thought and language between the *Contra Arrianos* and the *Quaestiones* and commentaries are most striking. On this point, I must reserve my final judgment for my forthcoming book. At present I see nothing against it, and can even add to Dom Morin's arguments in support of it.² Probably this paper will be judged quite long enough already. Meantime let me express my hearty thanks to Dom Morin for the brilliant discovery which he has made.

ALEX. SOUTER.

¹ So six 9th century and two 10th century MSS. read: Migne has *plenius*.

² On p. 130 the two lines on *piaculum* are due to the printed text. The correct text in qu. 114 is *turpia* (not in printed edition).

SCIENCE AND THE FLOOD.

THE tradition of a flood was formerly accepted by most geologists and still finds a few advocates. None indeed would assert, in the literal sense of the words, that "all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered," or the destruction of everything "in whose nostrils was the breath of life," but they would maintain the submergence to have been extensive enough to be fatal to at least one race of men and to several conspicuous species of animals. That was the opinion of both the late Sir J. W. Dawson and Sir J. Prestwich, and it is still maintained by Sir H. H. Howorth. The last-named—particularly in the volume entitled *The Mammoth and the Flood*—displays so much research and learning and such forensic skill in handling his materials, that it would be, I think, impossible to make out a better case for the diluvialists. But I am prevented, for reasons which I will endeavour to explain, from joining their ranks. I admit that they may fairly use the wide prevalence of the historical tradition as an argument in their favour. The story of the flood in the Book of Genesis is a version—and the changes are most significant of a tradition—whether Semitic or Sumerian in origin we do not know—which was already current among the Chaldeans many centuries before the birth of the great Jewish law-giver. This tradition travelled far in Asia, for traces of it may perhaps be found even in China, and is not restricted to Semitic or Turanian races. The Rig Veda contains a deluge-story which assumes more complicated forms in later writings; Greece has its Deucalion legend, and that of the submerged Atlantis may bear a like interpretation. There are traditions, seemingly independent, among the Lithuanians, Welsh and Norsemen; among the Lapps and other isolated tribes of the old world. Nor is the story re-

stricted to this hemisphere, for it is found among the Esquimaux and Indian tribes in both North and South America, on Pacific Islands and even in Australia. Its variations are many and the local colouring is often strong, which, however, may fairly be reckoned as evidence for the antiquity of the tradition. Though not quite universal—no trace of it, for instance, having been found among the Egyptians—it is very widespread, and the principle of no smoke without fire often holds good with a legend, viz., that though its details may be exaggerated, distorted or even false, it generally rests on some basis of fact. So I admit that the advocates of the flood-story are entitled to count its wide prevalence as a point in its favour. But another line of argument seems to me worth very little: citations of scientific writers no longer living are much more valuable as records than as interpretations of facts. Observations may be accurate, and yet inferences from them be erroneous, for the latter are so largely influenced by current ideas. Perhaps, also, the earlier school of geologists, for obvious reasons, were anxious to minimize the discrepancies between their science and the Mosaic record, and thus rather too ready to catch at any inferences from the former which seemed to corroborate statements in the latter. This led them to regard a number of superficial deposits as *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, and some geologists still use the term Diluvial, though to them it is no better than a meaningless survival. So I do not dispute that until about three quarters of a century ago many leaders in geology believed in a universal or nearly universal deluge, and ascribed to its action phenomena which now receive a different interpretation. In like way astronomers once supposed their observations to be favourable to a geocentric theory of the solar system; so that multiplying quotations from the older authors proves no more in the one case than it does in the other. No court of final appeal can exist in Science as it

does for Law, because cases must constantly be re-tried as fresh evidence is obtained, and when a later court reverses the decision of an earlier one this does not imply that the first conclusion was not justified by the evidence then available.

The advocates of a widespread very destructive flood are now generally agreed (and this fortunately limits our inquiry) that it was fatal to Palæolithic man and to several large quadrupeds which were his contemporaries. The mammoth, and perhaps four other species of elephant, two at least of rhinoceros, a pigmy hippopotamus, not to mention more, then vanished from the earth, and others, though they manage to survive, never reappeared in their old haunts. Though it is not asserted that only eight persons escaped, yet, so widespread was the destruction of the makers of rude instruments in stone or bone, that long years elapsed before the parts of the earth best known to science were re-peopled, and when that happened the pioneer race in Europe had learnt how to polish their stone weapons, to make pottery and to domesticate animals. With the Neolithic people, as these are called, the ethnological history of Europe begins, as well as that frequent westward movement of races on the earth's surface, which is not yet ended.

To this cataclysm also the Diluvialists, as they have been called, refer a number of deposits supposed to have been formed by the rush of waters. We have therefore to ask three questions. Does that gap in life-history exist? Are these deposits synchronous with it and were they formed by deluges in the ordinary sense of the term?

As regards the break. Its existence, till quite lately, was rarely, if ever, disputed. But more recent discoveries have shown it to be comparative rather than absolute. Though it seems well marked in Britain, Professor A. C. Haddon¹ writes in regard to Palæolithic man, "There is no reason

¹ *The Study of Man*, p. 81 (1898).

to believe that he became extinct." Dr. Beddoe also believes that "the posterity of the makers of these rudely chipped flint implements still survive in these islands." In France the break is still less sharply marked, according to modern students of ethnology.¹ Some of them recognize four successive types of Palæolithic man, the earliest, or Acheulean, being the makers of the rude flint implements found in ancient river gravels, such as those of the Somme; the latest, or Magdalénien, being inhabitants of the well-known caves of the Dordogne, who not only left better shaped flint tools or weapons but also carvings in bone, ivory and horn, and "graffiti" on the walls of rock, such as might have been made by a race more rather than less skilful than the Esquimaux of Greenland three centuries ago. In their days though the mammoth still existed in Central France, with the wild horse, aurochs, and bison, the reindeer was especially abundant. Prof. Haddon, however, following Dr. Collignon, while admitting the survival of representatives of Palæolithic man, regards these Cave-men of Central France as the earlier Neolithic folk. That opinion is mainly founded on a few fragmental skeletons, but these Prof. Boyd Dawkins² regards as not the true Palæolithic Cave-men, but occupants or interments of the later age. Be this as it may, this instance shows that the existence of the break is not so generally admitted as it would have been a few years ago. But stronger evidence has been obtained near the southern part of the frontier of France and Italy. Caves rich in Neolithic relics are not uncommon on the coast of the Western Riviera, some of which, such as those of the Baoussé Roussé, contain skeletons resembling in character those of Cro Magnon and other places in France, or Paviland in Glamorganshire and Brünn in Moravia; in

¹ De Mortillet, *Formation de la Nation Française*, Troisième Partie, Chapitre V.

² *Early Man in Britain*, ch. vii.

other words, of the early Neolithic or Iberic type, survivals of which, as I have already said, can still be traced in several parts of Western Europe. These are associated with unsmoothed stone implements of late Palæolithic forms, wrought objects of mammoth ivory, but without pottery or bones of domesticated animals; rhinoceros bone and reindeer antler have also been found, with shells pierced for necklaces, and ochre which had been used for a pigment. In some cases they had evidently been buried very near to the surface, yet they are now overlain by from twenty to as much as forty feet of earth and débris. This depth excludes the idea of a second interment, which was advanced as an explanation of the famous Mentone skeleton, so that Mr. A. J. Evans,¹ after a review of the evidence advanced by M. d'Acy and Prof. Issi, is persuaded that we find in this littoral distinct evidence of the existence of a late Palæolithic race, tall and dolichocephalic, whose essential features reappear in the Neolithic skeletons of the same Ligurian coast, though the more characteristic race of that age was short in stature. Thus the existence of the alleged break is very doubtful, yet the neighbourhood of the Mediterranean is just the place where we should expect it to be most complete, if primæval man and the contemporaneous fauna had perished in a deluge. Prof. Dawkins, however, calls attention to the fact the "molar" of a sheep was found at Reilac in the same layer as bones of Pleistocene mammals (hyæna, reindeer, etc.), and in a Mentone cave those of a goat occurred at a depth of about twenty-five feet, so that he interprets some of these apparent transitions between the two ages as due to an admixture caused by later interments among earlier remains, and others as indications of a race which, though Neolithic, represented the first and more uncivilized representatives of that people. But even this view does much to

¹ *British Assoc. Report*, 1896 (Liverpool), Address to the section of Anthropology.

narrow the gap, while the other one, which finds favour with some very competent judges, actually closes it.

We pass on to inquire what deposits are synchronous with the gap in the life-history. Limiting ourselves for the present to Europe, we must reply, All which either contain relics of Palæolithic man or can be shown to be of the same age as these. On this point probably advocates will not be harmonious, but most of them would enumerate among them the ossiferous caves and fissures and the coarse gravels of ancient rivers, with remains of man and an extinct fauna, the loess of north-central Europe, the raised beaches and "head" or "coombe-rock" familiar to English geologists, while some would include even the boulder-clays with their associated sands and gravels as relics of the cataclysm which was the actual foundation of the deluge tradition.

Of these identifications the last-named, though once very generally entertained, now finds but few supporters. The learned author of *The Glacial Nightmare* has said all that is possible in its favour, but his argument appears to me inconclusive. It is perfectly true that a current flowing with a certain velocity can move a granite block of a certain size, and that a paroxysmal elevation to the height of 100 feet from beneath a sea, where it does not exceed 800 feet in depth, might produce a current with a velocity of nearly twenty miles an hour, but we seek in vain for information about the distance to which that velocity will be propagated, what particular area of the earth's surface was thus uplifted, and whether there is the slightest evidence that this area was submerged at the requisite epoch. This flood, or floods (for more than one, if they were produced in this way, would be requisite to overwhelm places so far distant as Europe and Patagonia, or to produce in the former the alternation of boulder-clay and sandy gravel familiar to most geologists) must have been strong enough to transfer heavy materials, and must have

maintained its velocity for scores of miles over a comparatively open country. Therefore, what has sometimes occurred in narrow mountain valleys, is very misleading as a measure of what would happen over such districts as the Eastern counties of England or the lowlands of Northern Germany. However much the extension and the excavating power of ice may have been exaggerated by some glacialists, that does not prove the alternative hypothesis true, and the difficulties of the latter become apparent as soon as we put it to the proof in any particular district. We may take for this purpose the erratics in the northern half of Britain. As the late Mr. Mackintosh clearly showed,¹ one group starting from South-west Scotland is scattered over an area lying between lines drawn roughly south and south-south-east, and coming to an end in the neighbourhood of Lichfield; boulders from the Lake District extend to about as far west on the North Wales coast, but eastwards to the nearer borders of the Pennine range. The peculiar granite from Wasdale crag has travelled northward to a little beyond Penrith, southwards nearly to Lancaster, but eastward as far as the Yorkshire coast, where boulders of it may be found at intervals from Redcar to Holderness, and to reach this they must have crossed hills nowhere lower than 1,400 feet above sea-level, though their highest starting point does not overtop this by quite a hundred yards. Again, erratics from the Arenig district are scattered over a fan-shaped area extending from the valley of the Trent, near Rugeley, to the neighbourhood of Birmingham, and thence to beyond Bromsgrove, in the Severn valley. The Charnwood Hills, and even the basalt plateau of Rowley Regis, are centres of more limited dispersions. Scotch, Lake District, and Welsh boulders mingle together over no small area. But if a cataclysmal rush of water, due to the sudden uprise of each region from

¹ Summarized in my volume entitled *Ice Work*, pp. 151-159.

beneath a shallow sea, hurried away its boulders, the conflict of rushes would have speedily neutralized the transporting force, and the journey of the rocks have come to an untimely end. But how great must that force have been to have carried blocks from North Wales (one of the largest measures about $4 \times 4 \times 2$ feet) right across the Severn valley, and flung them on to the Clent Hills, some 600 feet above its bed, on a place on which basalt blocks from Rowley Regis Hill may also be seen lying. In many spots on Cannock Chase and the slopes of the Trent valley blocks from the three principal centres of dispersion may be found from three to four hundred feet above the lower ground, across which they have been transported.

We may take one more instance, and from another hemisphere. Here the destruction of the mastodon, megatherium, mylodon and other extinct quadrupeds of South America, is imputed to the sudden rise of the Andes from beneath the sea, which sent a rush of water over the lower land, drowned the ill-fated animals, and swept their bodies, which, however, not infrequently had time enough to become disintegrated, into fissures, caves and the Pampean mud.¹ It now seems doubtful whether the mylodon did not manage to survive its other companions; but letting that pass, we naturally expect to find some proof of this sudden upheap of the Andes, and are disappointed at obtaining nothing stronger than the statement that M. d'Orbigny, who travelled there nearly three quarters of a century ago, held this opinion. That man was a contemporary with certain of these extinct animals, as asserted in the same volume,² may be readily admitted, but some at least of the instances mentioned indicate that his representatives belonged to a race "of the same type as the men who were living there when

¹ *The Mammoth and the Flood*, pp. 342-354.

² *Id.* pp. 354-359.

discovered by Europeans.”¹ If so, the more natural supposition seems to be that they escaped the cataclysm—perhaps in many canoes, instead of in one ark.

But let us turn from these extensive demands on diluvial waters as transporters and transformers,² and turn to the more moderate suggestion of the late Sir Joseph Prestwich. He ascribes the origin of the flood-tradition to a submergence and emergence, sometimes rapid, by which two peculiar varieties of drift were formed, rocks were riven into fissures, and these filled with one of those drifts, together with the bones of various animals and human remains.

Of these drifts, one called by Prestwich the rubble drift or “head” is local in character, a mixture of more or less angular rock-fragments, with a variable quantity of mud. It occurs on many parts of the British coast, and he considers it contemporaneous with the noted breccias of the Rock of Gibraltar. It bears a certain resemblance to the mud avalanches of the Alps and Himalayas, and in some cases may be due, like them, to rushes of water caused by the bursting of dams which have temporarily arrested the course of streams, or by an exceptionally heavy local rainfall; but, while it points to conditions of climate different from the present (for it is not improbable that the surface of the underlying ground was then frozen to some depth) I am unable to find in it any proof of a general cataclysmal action. The other, the loess, which for many years perplexed geologists, covers a wide area of central Europe. Beginning on the French coast at Sangatte, it sweeps eastward across the north of France and Belgium; filling up the lower depressions of the Ardennes; passing far up the valleys of the Rhine and its tributaries, the Neckar, Main and Lahn; likewise those of the Elbe (above Meissen), the

¹ *Ibid.* p. 356.

² The mantle of glacial drift is sometimes from one to two hundred feet thick, occasionally even more.

Weser, Mulde and Saale, the Upper Oder and the Vistula. Spreading across Upper Silesia, it sweeps eastward over the plains of Poland and Southern Russia, where it forms the substratum of the Tchernosem or black-earth. It extends into Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, Galicia, Transylvania and Roumania, sweeping far up into the Carpathians, where it reaches heights of 2,000 feet and, it is said, even 4,000 or 5,000 feet above the sea.¹

This sandy clay is not very fossiliferous, but occasionally it contains shells of molluscs, almost all terrestrial, and remains of the mammoth, woolly rhinoceros and musk-sheep, with wild horses, a jerboa, several species of marmot, the saiga antelope, etc. In fact, allowing for some extinct species, the fauna closely resembles that now living in South-eastern Europe and on the South-west Siberian steppes. Man also existed, as is proved by Palæolithic implements. This deposit, if it had been produced by submergence, would require that, as we have already said, to be very great, and Prestwich's ingenious arguments in favour of it, after what I have seen or learnt of the loess, are so unconvincing, that I think Baron von Richthofen is correct in explaining it as a subaerial formation—dust blown about and accumulated by the winds, like those so common in Central Asia and parts of China. Some geologists appeal to the fissures in which bones are found as proofs that the rock has been ruptured. I must say that, while I should admit the possibility of fractures being produced by earth movements, all those that I have seen (and they are many) appeared to have been formed by streams under different conditions of climate, or in a very few cases by the gaping of joints due to a local subsidence² and the materials in these and in caves appear to have been

¹ Sir A. Geikie, *Text-Book of Geology*, Book vi., Part v., Sect. ii. § 1.

² The deepening of valleys must sometimes affect the equilibrium of adjacent rock-masses.

introduced by the same agency when the waters were swollen either by melting snow or by exceptional rainfall. It seems to me impossible to suppose that either the contents of the Dordogne caves, which apparently accumulated while they were occupied by man, or those in Kent's Hole, Torquay, could have been introduced by floods. The conditions of climate at that epoch were undoubtedly very different from the present, but there is little or nothing for which we cannot still find a parallel in some parts of the world. Occasionally facts occur which are difficult to explain, such as the abundance of hippopotamus bones in the caves near the northern coast of Sicily between Termini and Trapani; but Sir J. Prestwich's hypothesis¹ that these animals were driven into a rocky *cul de sac* by the rising waters, and then were drowned, does not seem to me entirely in harmony with Dr. Falconer's description,² and the hippopotamus, it must be remembered, is a fairly good swimmer. The fissures, however, in the Montagne de Santenay, near Châlons-sur-Saône³ are generally quoted as it is in favour of the diluvial hypothesis, so that it may be well to make a few additions from the original papers to those hitherto given. The Montagne de Santenay is a plateau of Lower Oolite limestone, which forms an advanced bastion of the Côte d'Or, rising to a height of 1,640 feet above sea level, and overlooking the valley plain (900 feet below in round numbers), and sloping down rapidly on three sides. Bones have been found at three localities on the upper part, at Pointe de Bois, the Grotte de St. Jean and the Grotte de St. Aubin. The first was discovered in working a yellow sand for glass. It was, if I understand the description rightly, a sort of tunnel which opened out into an irregular-

¹ *The Tradition of the Flood*, p. 50.

² *Quart. Jour. Geol. Soc.*, vol. xvi. (1860), p. 99.

³ Prestwich, *Op cit.*, pp. 37-39. Howorth, *The Mammoth and the Flood*, p. 216. Gaudry, *Bull. Soc. Geol. France*, Ser. 3, vol. iv. p. 681 (1876), with other communications from Didelot and C. Lory.

shaped chamber; the one being wholly, the other, which also communicated with a fissure, only partially filled with an ossiferous breccia, and this breccia seems to have occupied a subterranean chamber, for it is expressly stated not to have been accessible by man or even by animals. The bones were much broken, but not by the hand of man or the tooth of beast. The Grotte de St. Jean is a horizontal gallery, which had apparently been used as a bear's den, for the remains of this animal are abundant, and on the northern or opposite slope of the mountain is the Grotte de St. Aubin. From Pointe de Bois have been obtained remains of the cave-lion, lynx, wolf (abundant), fox, badger, horse, *Rhinoceros Merckii*, wild boar, *Equus caballus* (usually old animals), more than one species of *Bos* (? *primigenius*), and a variety of *Cervus elaphus*. The Grotte de St. Jean contains lion, wolf, fox, stag, as above, one of the *Bovidae* about the size of *Bos taurus* and a bear between *Ursus spelæus* and *U. ferox*. From the Grotte de St. Aubin come large bears, oxen, horse, elephant, rhinoceros, and an antler of *Cervus megaceros* was found in sand outside.

Thus the occupants of the several recesses are not all the same, though perhaps this difference cannot be pressed; but we must not forget that the entrance in one case at least after the deposit of the ossiferous material appears to have been sealed up by sand which we suppose must also be due to diluvial action, and must thus imply a change in the material. In regard to the transport of the bones Sir. J. Prestwich quotes the question asked by Professor Gaudry, "Why should so many wolves, bears, horses and oxen have ascended a hill isolated on all sides?" but does not give his reply (p. 684). "Il faut supposer beaucoup de pluie, ou plus probablement beaucoup de neige pour expliquer l'affluence des eaux sur un monticule isolé," and suggests the possibility of floods being caused by obstruction of the

waters of the Soâne at the epoch when the alpine glaciers extended down to Lyons. Mons. C. Lory also accepts this view, and thinks the inundations caused by this barrage would be intermittent and progressive, driving the wild animals from the lowlands to hills like Santenay, where they would find refuge from the water but insufficient food. These floods would be most likely to occur in spring and autumn, the seasons of the setting in and the melting of the snow, when pasturage is scanty, and the animals most likely to perish. Rivulets of water, swollen by the heavy rains and melting snow, would wash the plateau and carry carcasses into fissures, which might even serve as traps when covered by snow. Of the geologists who studied the locality on this occasion no one appeared to think the phenomenon called for any special explanation. One point, however, is mentioned by Prof. Gaudry which apparently the English authors have overlooked, though it strikes me as important. He says the fauna of Santenay is rather different from that of deposits not far distant, such as Solutré and the Grotte de Germolles, it is also "assez différente de celles qu'on a dressés pour la plupart des gisements quaternaires," for it includes neither man nor reindeer. The bear is peculiar, wolves take the place of hyænas, and *Rhinoceros Merckii* of *R. tichorhinus* (or *antiquitatis*). The large stag, resembling *Cervus elaphus*, differs from the small race of Solutré. These differences lead Prof. Gaudry to suggest that the remains may belong to "le grand epoch glaciaire du 'boulder clay.'" Deposits like those of Solutré, which French archæologists assign to the third of the four epochs into which they subdivide the age of Palæolithic man, contain "elaborately chipped lance-heads, leaf-shaped implements and scrapers," similar to those found in the upper strata of the Creswell Crags caves,¹ and the fourth or Magdalénien, are well represented in the Dordogne caves,

¹ Boyd Dawkins, *Early Man in Britain*, ch. vii. p. 201.

in which the reindeer is very abundant. It may be that this classification of the remains of Palæolithic man is rather too precise, but we are justified, I think, in inferring that "Cave-man" in general shows an advance in art in River-drift-man, and that in the age of the former the reindeer was very abundant, the mammoth and its associates having become rare; thus if the osseous breccia of Santenay were produced by a flood, that cannot have been contemporaneous with the one which closed the career of Palæolithic man.

Several other difficulties in the deluge hypothesis are brought to light on examination of these ossiferous caves and fissures. The débris is often transported into galleries and underground fissures in a manner suggestive of the repeated action of engulfed streams rather than of a single and tumultuous rush of waters, the waves of which, at Santenay, must have been not less than about 700 feet deep, and have risen more than 1,600 feet above sea-level. It would have been difficult for such a wave to transport so much material into the subterranean fissures of Brixham and the galleries of Kent's Hole. Apart from any resistance offered by compressed air, when water had once filled these no more could enter, so the contents must have been transported by the first rush. But if that were so highly charged with mud and bones, the surface of the earth must have been in a very untidy condition, as at the end not at the beginning of a deluge. It is also singular that the deposits¹ show some signs of stratification, suggestive of a time succession. Even an open swallow hole, like that of Windy Knoll, near Castleton, Derbyshire, presents difficulties. In this Prof. Boyd Dawkins² tells us the pipe at the bottom was plugged up with limestone and other débris, and covered by an unfossiliferous yellow loam, about four feet thick; to that

¹ For instance, Kent's Hole, Cresswell Crags and Robin Hood's Cave.

² *Early Man in Britain*, ch. vii. p. 188.

succeeded a yellow clay with rock débris and bones¹ the whole being covered with clayey material, probably rather modern. This spot is 1,600 feet above sea level and would not be easily filled by diluvial waves, and Prof. Dawkins' explanation that it was formerly a pool, lying in the path of migratory herds of deer and bison, which was frequented as a drinking place, and sometimes proved fatal, seems far more simple.

We are told that the position of these ossiferous fissures (as at Santenay), makes it impossible to appeal to the action of flooded streams. But fissures and swallow holes are abundant in every limestone district, and in themselves a proof of rain action; though when we examine them they, like not a few caves, which must have been the work of streams, are commonly quite dry. But in a heavy rain-storm copious rivulets can flow from a small area, and it is generally admitted that during the age of Palæolithic man, rain and rivers, partly owing to melting snow, were more potent than at present as agents of denudation in North-western Europe. The occasional occurrence of the choked-up fissures or chambers on an elevated knoll or plateau is a difficulty with either hypothesis, for if the diluvialist demur when an unbeliever appeals to isolation and other changes wrought by subsequent denudation, the latter may fairly retort that a deluge would sweep most of its heavier débris into the bottoms of valleys, and could hardly bring more than a few inches of mud to the tops of hills.²

Animals, we must remember, perish in large numbers by other means than a flood. Quagmires prove death-traps, as at Big-bone Lick in Kentucky. Probably the imperfectly frozen surface of the Siberian tundra was often a snare to

¹ The animal remains include the bison, reindeer, bear (*U. ferox* and *arctos*), wolf, fox and hare.

² If the mud were already there, rain could do the work as well as a flood.

the mammoth and the rhinoceros. Large numbers of wandering herbivora tumble into open fissures and shafts.¹ Drought as in South Africa, frost as in Patagonia, prove fatal to hundreds of animals which gather around the watering-places to perish when the supply fails.² No doubt floods occurred in the days of Palæolithic man, as they still do; and perhaps for the reason already mentioned, they may have been more frequent and slightly more extensive; but to bring a deluge over the Santenay hill, or Windy Knoll, would require convulsions so portentous that we may reasonably demand very strong evidence before venturing to appeal to them as a *Deus ex Machinâ*.

There is yet another difficulty—the selective destruction of this post-palæolithic flood. Certain creatures were exterminated, we are told, together with Palæolithic man. How then are we to explain the survival of others which were indubitably his companions? How did the lion, the brown bear, the lynx, the glutton, the wolf, the bison, the urus, the reindeer, not to mention others, escape? for all these are, or were, living in Europe, and all, except the first-named, in Britain with Neolithic man. The mammoth, the rhinoceros, and the hippopotamus are clumsy, but their living representatives can travel a fair pace, and the last is amphibious. *Hyæna crocuta* must have been involved with these and man in a common ruin; but had it, with hippopotamus, already established colonies in Africa beyond the reach of this Deucalionic deluge?

I have barely touched upon the difficulties presented by the flood hypothesis so soon as we begin to study the beds which it supposed to have formed. If we include those generally called glacial, we encounter a host of perplexities,

See for a very striking account of these in Kentucky, and the way they lure animals to death, Shaler, *Some Aspects of the Earth*, p. 103.

² See for striking instances, Prichard, *Through the Heart of Patagonia*, pp. 89, 203, 254.

one or two of which have been mentioned in passing ; if we restrict ourselves to the gravels and other deposits containing the remains of man and the mammoth, these are generally connected with existing river systems ; they occur at various levels, from some thirty to over one hundred feet above the present water line, just as they would do if left by strong streams which were gradually lowering their beds, but at the same time dropping *débris* where the water moved more slowly, and the remains found in their drifts correspond with those which occur in the lower deposits of certain caves, where the higher contain better finished implements. These and other relics indicate a progress in civilization of the race or races to whom they belonged, a change in the fauna, perhaps corresponding to some alteration of climate, and a gradual disappearance of extinct, with an incoming of living forms, so that the idea of a universal deluge, or even of closely connected but local deluges on a large scale, cannot, I think, claim any real support from geology.

T. G. BONNEY.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.	
Some Recent Old Testament Literature	236
Rev. Professor T. G. Bonney, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.	
Science and the Flood	456
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
Hostile and Alien Evidence for Christ at Passiontide	417
Right Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.	
A Modern Séance	94
Rev. Professor R. H. Charles, D.D.	
The Rise and Development in Israel of the Belief in a Future Life	49
Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.	
Translations from the Prophets:	
Jeremiah iv. 3-vi. 30	37
" vii. 1-ix. 22	147
" ix. 23-xi. 17	229
" xi. 9-xii. 6	316
" xii. 7-xvi. 9	353
Rev. Professor A. E. Garvie, D.D.	
The Companionship of the Twelve	337
Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D.	
Christianity and Judaism	241
Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.	
The Objective Aspect of the Lord's Supper	180
Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, Litt.D.	
Notes from the Papyri	104
Rev. F. W. Mozley, M.A.	
The Meaning of <i>τοῦτο ποιείτε</i>	370
Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, M.A.	
The Parable of the "Unjust" Steward	273
Rev. E. C. Selwyn, D.D.	
The Late Canon Bright on Montanism	284

	PAGE
Rev. Professor G. A. Smith, D.D., LL.D.	
Studies in the History and Topography of Jerusalem.	
I. A General View of the City	1
II. The Name Jerusalem and Other Names	122
III. The Waters of Jerusalem	208
IV. The Prelude	298
V. The Beginnings of the History	321
Alexander Souter, M.A.	
A New View about "Ambrosiaster"	442
Rev. G. Wauchope Stewart, M.A.	
Wendt on the Fourth Gospel	65, 135
Rev. Professor H. B. Swete, D.D.	
The Teaching of Christ	81, 259, 401
Julia Wedgwood.	
James Martineau and the Heterodoxy of the Past	22
Frederick Maurice and the Broad Church	161
T. H. Weir, B.D., M.R.A.S.	
Some Fresh Bible Parallels from the History of Morocco	426
Rev. N. J. D. White, B.D.	
The Virgin Birth	198
The Johannine View of the Crucifixion	434
Rev. Professor Theod. Zahn, Litt.D.	
Missionary Methods in the Times of the Apostles	387

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis i. 2	46	Joshua iii. 15	320
vi. 9	279	x. 1	323
vii. 21	279	xv. 7	225
xii. 17	54	48-60	42
xxvii. 36	160	Judges xii. 6	425
xxxv. 4	367	2 Samuel i. 24	336
xxxix. 4	275	v. 6	325
xl. 19	275	xv. 21	334
xlvi. 7	353	xvii. 17	225
Exodus ii. 3-6	110	1 Kings i. 33, 38	224
x. 25	371	x. 8	364
xxix. 36-41	371	xi. 12	54
Leviticus xxi. 18	330	xvii. 7	225
Deuteronomy xiv. 1	366	2 Kings iv. 2	320
xv. 14	276	xii. 15	40
xxvii. 15	230	xvii. 32	371
xxviii.	52	xviii. 17	212
xxxii. 22	363	xxiii. 6, 12	210

	PAGE		PAGE
2 Kings xxiv. 1	353	Matthew iii. 5	133
xxv. 7	300	iv. 5	134
2 Chronicles xii. 2	4	24	92
xxxii. 30	223	v. 3	88
xxxiii. 14	210	v. 15	117
Ezra iv. 20	123	v. 17	86
Nehemiah ii. 15.	210	vi. 1	403
xi. 1	134	vii. 28.	84
Psalms i. 4.	368	x. 27	91
vii. 17.	407	xi. 4	405
xxxiv. 19-22	58	xi. 20	92
xxxvii. 7	317	xii. 24-35	283
lv. 13	317	xiii. 23	344
lix. 13	364	xvi. 13	243
lxxv. 12	353, 376	xx. 12.	382
lxxviii. 7	42	Matthew xxv. 5	243
xevi. 10	417	xxiii. 6	83
cxxxv. 2	12	37	133
cxxxv. 7.	231	xxv. 14	87
Isaiah viii. 6	221	xxvii. 5	4
11	364	xxviii. 18-20	270
ix. 9	218	Mark i. 1	90
xxvi. 19	63	i. 14, 21	259
xxviii. 19.	367	i. 15	87, 260
xxix. 1	124	i. 17	339
xlii. 6	242	ii. 7	261
xliii. 24	44	10.	270
xlvi. 2	134	13.	259
lx. 6	44	19.	87
Jeremiah i. 21	128	21.	262
iv. 3-vi. 30.	37	iii. 4	80
iv. 11	8	7.	92
vii. 1-ix. 22	147	13	91
5, 7	53	21	110, 286
30	12	28	273
viii. 7.	426	v. 35	83
ix. 23-xi. 8	229	vi. 2	259
xi. 18-xii. 6	316	vii. 21	261
xii. 7-17	353	26	112
xiii. 24-xiv. 12	354	33	79
xxi. 1	57	ix. 33	266
xxxi. 29	54	x. 23.	88
Ezekiel xvi. 3	337	xi. 18	259
xvii. 24.	318	xv. 40	117
xix. 7	320	Luke ii. 49	113
xviii. 4	55	iv. 10	260
xxiii. 23	128	14	339
xxvi. 2	10	vi. 13	338
xlv. 10, 14	277	vii. 1	402
Daniel xii. 13	241	ix. 57-62	350
Hosea xiv. 6	319	xiii. 34	133
Amos iii. 6.	316	xv. 8	117
iv. 11	219	xvi.	273
viii. 14	333	8	274
Zachariah ix. 3	320	xvii. 20	88
9	243	xviii. 12	262
xii. 10	433	xix. 48	89
xiv. 5	4	xx. 20	267
Matthew ii. 3	133	xxi. 34	109
iii. 2	86	xxii. 19-20	379

	PAGE		PAGE
Luke xxii. 51	114	Romans iii. 12	114
xxiii. 7	133	vi. 6	265
John i. 18	408	viii. 9	93
14	71	27	404
38	83	x. 4	241
ii. 6	262	xi. 12	258
iii. 3, 5	88	25	258
v. 2	133	xvi. 7	397
19	287	xvi. 20	393
36	74	1 Corinthians iv. 1-2	275
vii. 15-24	139	21	112
16	84	vi. 2	113
45-52	141	3, 4	109
49	91	ix. 14	389
viii. 12	141	x. 31	378
46	419	xiv. 11	113
x. 12	287	2 Corinthians i. 2	409
xii. 3	117	ii. 17	456
37	71	iv. 4	278
44-50	141	viii. 23	120
xiii. 12-20	142	x.	107
13	83	xi. 3	393
26	121	5	454
xiv. 26	94	Galatians i. 4	278
xvi. 12	93	13	409
14	94	ii. 4	457
xx. 30	66	19	265
Acts i. 15	113	iv. 13	458
ii. 42	93	25	133
iv. 20	394	v. 18	403
v. 28	133	Ephesians iii. 21	278
vii. 14	112	v. 9	279
47	117	Colossians iii. 3	265
ix. 31	92	iv. 3	398
xii. 4	381	1 Timothy iii. 5	275
10	121	Hebrews i. 1	86
xv. 5	457	12	280
xvi. 7	93	iii. 6	410
xvii. 9	115	x. 34	49
xx. 29	287	1 Peter iv. 10	275
xxi. 39	109	1 John ii. 18	269
xxvi. 22	244	Revelation iii. 16	285
31	117		

