

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

1851

1852

1853



EWALD'S
HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

VOL. VII.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE
HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

BY
HEINRICH EWALD,

Late Professor of the University of Göttingen.

VOL. VII.

The Apostolic Age.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY

J. FREDERICK SMITH.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
1885.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SEVENTH VOLUME.



BOOK VII.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

The Second of the Three Final Stages of the History.

THE PERIOD FROM THE DEATH OF CHRIST UNTIL THE SECOND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, OR THE PERIOD IN WHICH THE GERM OF THE CONSUMMATION REACHED ITS PERFECTION.

	PAGE
The Transition	1
The Possibilities at that Time	12
The Difficulties of the Actual Position and their Removal	18
The Three Chief Phases of the General History of this Time	21
The Sources of this History	23
The Chronology of this History	37

THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS NEW AGE, FROM 33 TO 44 A.D.

I. IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

1. The Resurrection of the Crucified Christ and that of his Church	45
The Narratives of the Resurrection	56
The Narratives of the Ascension, the Nature of Christian Hope and of Christian Faith	78
The Day of Pentecost	88
2. The Complete Formation of the New Church	
(1.) In General	105
Its Works, its Gifts, and its Practices	112
(2.) As to its Members	126
The New Baptism and Sanctification.—Discipline and Excommunication	134
The New Form of Prophecy	140
(3.) As to its Internal Organisation and Administration	
The Apostles.—The Elders.—The Deacons	141

THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS NEW AGE—*continued.*I. IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH *continued.*

	PAGE
3. The Strength, the Weakness, and the Dissolution of this Primitive Church	
Its Strength at Home	146
Its Strength Abroad	149
The Contention amongst the People.—Stephen	155
The Dissolution of the Primitive Church.—The New Elders. James the Brother of the Lord	164
The First Propagation of Christianity amongst Proselytes and Heathen	174

II. AMONGST JUDEANS.

1. The Philosophy and Wisdom of the Judean Scholars of the Time	191
Philo of Alexandria	194
His Studies and his Teaching	202
His System of Allegory.—The Order of his Writings	219
The Messianic or Christian Element in him	231
2. The Prosperous Relations of the Younger Herods towards Rome	235
The Follies of Caligula with regard to Jerusalem	243
His Follies with regard to Alexandria	250
3. The Elevation of Agrippa to the Throne	257
The New Roman Governors: their Relation to the Christian Church	272

THE PROGRESS OF THIS NEW AGE, FROM 44 TO 65 A.D.

I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Paul	276
His Youth	277
His Conversion and Vocation	281
The Earlier Facilities for the Entrance of the Heathen	299
Paul as a Christian Apostle and Writer of Epistles	313
1. The First Labours of Paul	325
His Labours in the East and his First Journey to Jerusalem	326
His Labours in Cilicia and Syria, with his Second Journey to Jerusalem	332
His First Great Missionary Journey	340
2. His Labours as the Apostle to the Heathen at their Climax	
His Third Journey to Jerusalem and the Decree of the Parent Church	351
His Second Great Missionary Journey and his return to Jerusalem for the Fourth Time	361
His Third Great Missionary Journey and his return to Jerusalem for the Fifth Time—The Altered Situation	381

II. JUDEANS AND THEIR RELATION TO CHRISTIANS.

1. Their Position with regard to other Powers	402
The Governor and the People, the Priests and the Herods	409

THE PROGRESS OF THIS NEW AGE—*continued*.II. JUDEANS, AND THEIR RELATION TO CHRISTIANS—*continued*.

	PAGE
2. The Events of Paul's Last Years	
Previous to his arrival in Rome	426
His Stay in Rome	445
The Martyrdom of the Three Chief Men of the Christian Church	
The Epistle and the Martyrdom of James	448
The Martyrdom of Peter and Paul, 64 and 65 A.D.	459
The Epistle to the Hebrews	472
3. The Last Two Governors	479
THE END OF THIS AGE, FROM 66 TO 73 A.D.	486
1. The Beginning of the Delusive Independence	494
The Struggle beyond the limits of Jerusalem	506
The Defeat of Cestius.—The Completion of the Delusion	511
The General Situation of the Nation with regard to the Roman and the Parthian Empires.—The Judeans of Parthia.—The Prophecies	515
The Determination of the Christian Church in these Last Days. The Apocalypse	524
2. The changed Constitution and Administration of the State	528
Galilee under Josephus	531
Vespasian in Galilee	542
Vespasian in the South.—Fresh Great Delusion of the Judeans.	552
3. The Parties in Jerusalem	557
The Learned Zealots.—John of Giskhala	559
Simon, son of Giora, the Popular Zealot	568
Vespasian at the Gates of Jerusalem.—The Priestly Zealots	572
Eleazar, son of Simon	575
4. The Siege and Conquest of Jerusalem	
The Fortifications of the City and the Temple	578
Until the First Serious Defeat of the Romans	589
Until the Burning Down of the Roman Works	595
Until the Conflagration of the Temple	598
5. The Final Struggles.—The Roman use of their Victory	606
INDEX	617

Corrigenda.

Vol. vi. p. 54, note 3, *read* Simon *for* Judas (error in Ewald), and
may *for* cannot.

„ „ 181, line 23, *read* The father, Joseph *for* of Joseph

„ „ 254, note 1, „ 'בָּנָי *for* 'בָּ.

Vol. vii. p. 239, line 2, *read* Livia *for* Berenice.

„ „ 481, „ 34, „ Ananias *for* Annas.

„ „ 483, „ 32, „ Costobar *for* Costoba.

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

BOOK VII.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

THE CONTACT OF ISRAEL WITH THE DIRECT ROMAN RULE IN PALESTINE.

THE SECOND STAGE OF THE THIRD AND LAST ADVANCE OF THE FINAL PHASE OF THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL, BEING THE YEARS FROM CHRIST'S DEATH TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, IN WHICH THE GERM OF THE CONSUMMATION CAME TO ITS FULL PERFECTION.

The Transition.

FOLLOWING the course of this long history, which is now hastening to its end, we paused at the death of Christ. For that moment formed not only a break in the national history of Israel, and a break which was very soon plainly felt, but also necessarily the lasting wall of separation between the whole past and future of human history. And if the only essential thing in the development of the national history of Israel, and of human history generally, had been personal spiritual perfection, with this terrestrial appearance of Christ as now perfected, the entire consummation, which was called for as the true product of the long and circuitous course of Israel's history, would have been already realised. For, in reality, in this life and this death of one person, not only had the highest aim of Israel's whole history been attained as far as it was at first possible of attainment by an individual, but at the same time the great inevitable turning-point of all past human history, and the true commencement of a perfectly new bent and direction of spiritual

life had also been actually supplied for all men and nations. Properly to understand this, however, is in the highest degree necessary, both for its own sake as well as for a comprehension of the final issues of the long national history which now follow.

All that Christ could accomplish by coming into this our world of sense as the object of such a unique expectation, he accomplished by the life, labours, and death which we have already followed. He could not do anything higher, nor could he do anything lower, but he did most perfectly that which was required of him as this expected one, by living, acting, teaching, dying, and fulfilling the Divine Will, and, again, by submitting himself to its guidance to the utmost, in the very way in which we have seen all this was done by him. His work on earth as a man was perfected with the moment of his death. His entire life, teaching, and work, as it had been exhibited in the full light of history from his first public acts to his last suffering and death, was something in itself perfect, most lofty, and wholly unique; it was something which had never before been witnessed in the long course of Israel's history, and still less amongst the heathen; it was a summit to which all the previous history of Israel, in the first instance, and then also all that of the rest of humanity, aspired, which was more difficult to attain, and, at the same time, far higher than any previous conception and endeavour could anticipate. This life, with its highest inward perfection and its brightly radiant light, every smallest trait of which may become eternally instructive, and the smallest reminiscence of which may perpetually serve to inspire and elevate, is precisely, as it appeared in history, the highest thing that the whole ancient world could give to us. As an outward example it is for our lives the great unchanging teaching which cannot be surpassed; as an inward motive and spirit it is the inexhaustible power of the perfect true religion, as it must be perpetually operative in us also till the end of time. Not the least thing that was required for the personal consummation of everything which the true Messiah had to accomplish in the visible world and in the full light of history, was, in this case, wanting. And if the thread of all human history had been, as with one blow, cut short at his death and burial, and the celestial glorification of Christ had then never occurred before the eyes of men, the work of Christ, as far as he himself could prosecute it, would nevertheless have been consummated in all its inner glory, and his glorification before God would not have been less certain. What do men of a later age really wish for further? and what

shall we of this latest age specially desire further than the perfect completion of this one life and death as it is plainly presented in the full light of true history? What can we ask for beyond this absolute personal and inner perfection in the historical Christ, without which all his eternal glorification, which followed as a reflection of the external celestial splendour, could neither have been beheld by the Apostles nor be made still visible to us. Everything which the New Testament and even the Gospels, to some extent, relate of the marvellous glorification and power of the celestial Christ would after all have been impossible without this previous highest perfection in the actual history of his life. Whoever in our day, therefore, is still dissatisfied with this bright historic light, resembles completely those unbelieving people to whom Christ found it necessary to say, in the midst of his labours and before their completion, that they ought to be content with the law and the prophets without the material return of one of the dead.¹ Once only did Christ suffer, and something still higher must not be expected, we read at a somewhat later time in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in language still stronger than Paul's.² We may still use the same words, but must remember that in reality they only mean the same thing which we do here when we maintain the complete sufficiency of the visible—or, in other words—the historical appearance of Christ so far as the effects to be produced are concerned.

But if the work of Christ in the centre of human history was actually thus completely finished with his life and his death on the cross, from that very moment, as the great boundary line of the ages commences the second, higher operation upon the world of its pure effects, the same effects in the midst of which we find ourselves to-day, and which must continue to operate until that perfection which first existed in him alone shall have become the possession of the whole race by conquering everything that is hostile to it. In the case of every man, the pure product of his life-work never begins to operate until the moment when it lies wholly finished before the world, and can no more be altered by the will of the worker himself or of his contemporaries, but just as it is, as a distinct factor, with all its spiritual force and meaning, interacts with the universal Divine work itself, and reacts upon mankind. Everything impure, or everything sullied by the action of time, that may have adhered to his work in the struggle of the world, will now be the more easily recognised in its true nature, separated, punished, and

¹ Luke xvi. 29. ² Heb. ix. 27, 28, comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18 with Rom. v. 18, vi. 10.

destroyed. Everything pure and divine that was operative in it will now, when delivered from the world of sense and its illusions, shine forth with increasing brightness, and operate, when freed from the fetters of the senses, with the greater spiritual force. This is that higher action which commences precisely with death.¹ If this is found in ordinary cases, how much more in the highest and purest one of Christ! There were, however, essentially two different causes, which nevertheless, in this instance, marvellously coincided, that made the higher action in his case necessarily the most powerful and permanent possible, not only at the time, but still in our own day and for all the future.

First, this life, now outwardly finished, had, on the one hand, been in itself the most glorious conceivable, as regards the eternal Divine idea of a human life; and at last, in the long course of human history, that man came, who, uncontaminated and unconquered in the hardest conflict with the errors, sins, and evils of the race when they had grown to a head, had, through all, preserved the purest life, both in healing and teaching, suffering and dying. This life, inasmuch as it was in itself thus finished, and had moreover been thus presented in such a clear light to the world, had now become a lasting and imperishable portion of the general life of mankind on the earth, and had become a powerful element in all human history, as it has, in fact, become an eternal possession for all times and all members of the race without exception. In that brief fleeting moment of the ages during which Christ laboured publicly amongst his people, he had founded within that nation an imperishable memorial, and, indeed, already a new Community, in which his spirit could immediately be perpetuated, and which could itself be bound to him by the ties of strongest love, reverence, and longing. And in the latest times, and amongst the most remote nations, when the genuine picture of this unique life is again revived and realised, if in imagination and thought only, it must, by virtue of its own immortal truth and perfection, always produce again effects similar to those which were produced when it first appeared in the midst of the declining people of Israel, and it is of itself adequate to kindle in all who gaze upon its glory the fire of a life answering to that glory.

Second, on the other hand, this life did not occupy an isolated and separate position, either in the nation or the time

¹ Comp. Rom. ii. 6 sq., Rev. xiv. 13, most expressive passages in this Gospel particularly John xii. 24, and many other especially.

in which it appeared, but it was intertwined, both in the past and the future, most closely with the general history of this nation, whose history was again itself indissolubly connected with that of the other nations of the world. As the life which had long been expected and prepared for in this nation, and yet again as the life which surpassed all expectation, and stimulated others to the loftiest spiritual struggles, it closed, as a final and most exalted member, the long series of the highest endeavours of this nation, and at the same time formed the transition into a still infinitely higher series. It is the painful lot of later generations to suffer much, and even the utmost, for the errors and shortcomings of earlier ones; but it is also their advantage that they are able to make their own all the possessions which their predecessors had fought for and won. This twofold inheritance was Christ's also: we will speak of the first of the two later on. If his life, as the life which at last appeared as the necessary outcome of that great juncture of the ages and of Israel's history, having been, as it were, called forth by the entire previous history, and particularly by the highest endeavours of this nation and of the whole of antiquity, made all these endeavours its own, and yet infinitely surpassed them, it followed that when it now lay before the world in its completeness it became so incomparably significant, by concentrating within itself, as in a bright focus, all the previous glory and greatness, as well as all the previous wisdom and teaching of Israel, transfiguring and glorifying them by its own peculiar brightness. In truth, we may not put a low estimate on all the immortal truths which had arisen as a light in the world, during this incomparably long national history of unique significance prior to the coming of Christ; yet even the brightest of them would at last have been dispersed and obscured again, if they had not finally been gathered up into this purest light that belonged directly to him, and then continued to shine in it. But inasmuch as all previous truth was at last most perfectly taken up and concentrated by Christ's life and work, this life, as soon as it could shine forth as a pure light, in its outward completion, received a still higher lustre than if it had appeared without this intimate connection with that truth. The full lustre of all previous truth, and the teaching of all past history, now shone forth in him with added purity and strength; and if the radiance, peculiar in the world's history to this brief fleeting life, was already of itself perfectly pure and penetrating, as above remarked, all the scattered rays of light of antiquity—in the first instance of this one nation, and then

further of the rest of the world—had likewise been concentrated in him in one compact mass of undying splendour.¹ But again, this life, thus radiating with the concentrated brightness of all past ages, arose at this time and in this nation, and through it in the midst of humanity, only to remind men by its appearance and operation, as well as by its disappearance from the view of the world, of a yet infinitely higher life and kingdom and treasure which ought, and might, now come in this nation, and through it in the midst of mankind generally; and it began with its creative power this higher life itself only, by its violent discontinuance to attract men all the more strongly to it, to arouse the more unquenchably the longing after the perfection which had once appeared in it and then vanished again, to give the true faith and consolation to all who were striving after it, and to alarm all those who resisted it by its actual appearance.

For absolutely perfect as this closed individual life now is in the world, still on the other hand the Divine work itself, which was really what had to be done by it, as well as the absolutely Divine power which accomplishes that work, transcended it in exaltation. It is from the beginning of things the Divine will that only by the previous complete conquest of error and sin any salvation can come, in the first instance for the individual, and then more and more for the whole race, and that thus that kingdom which is first worthy of the name of the Kingdom of God in the highest and purest sense should be gradually consummated after it had been commenced by one who was the first to meet the demands of duty completely and for all time. In this Divine will, operative from the beginning of creation, is involved also the corresponding Divine power; so that whoever but imperfectly responds to it and puts himself under its control, is also led and strengthened by this power, and whatever he does in harmony with it continues operative even the more purely and powerfully after his death, inasmuch as it is taken up by the corresponding Divine power of this immortal Divine work itself; and if he labours thus when this Divine work has already most nearly reached its own perfection, at least as regards its first stage, his labours in harmony with that Divine will may effect the highest and mightiest results possible, when they themselves outwardly cease, inas-

¹ All this is expressed in the New Testament generally in a thousand forms, but the most striking expression of it is the great picture of the appearance of Moses and Elias in light with Christ at the time when his glorification could be perceived with certainty as an inward

fact, Mark ix. 2-8; and the more incontestably this picture can be traced back to the oldest Gospel, the more immediately does it reproduce the earliest impression which the labours of Christ in this aspect of them had produced.

much as they are then the more purely maintained by the Divine power of this work. It is just this which is seen in the case especially of Christ. He appeared, in the view of the whole world, in the one nation of the earth in which the realisation of the perfected religion had long been expected, at least in one individual, and from whom it was expected to make itself further felt; he seemed to those who really knew him to have undoubtedly brought that realisation, and yet just as this was perceived his life was cut short by violence. The consequence was that he left behind him an inextinguishable longing after this perfect ideal that had once been beheld in him, and a desire for him, which could finally be satisfied only by the attainment of his object. Thus, on the one hand he aroused, on the part of all who were attracted to him, an immovable faith in their endeavour to reach his ideal, and an inexhaustible consolation in labouring and suffering for its sake; while, on the other, he awoke just terror and fear on the part of all those who opposed his ideal, although they had been compelled to behold it. And it was by this very destruction of his outward life that these effects were produced, inasmuch as his human and mortal work, by being thus connected with the Divine and eternal work, and incorporated with its irresistible power, became at last infinitely mightier than it was when it was merely a work only just completing itself gradually and under temporal and mortal conditions.

We may call this the higher, eternal action of the temporal work of Christ; that action necessarily and actually began at once with the completion of his visible work, but from that time forth has operated and will continue to operate until its own completion of quite a different kind. We may, however, also call this power of the purely spiritual action of the invisible Christ his glorification. And it is but little to say with regard to this, that the truth which he once in his mortal state proclaimed by his whole appearance, and which men then despised to the extent of slaying its herald, now became notwithstanding even more victorious by virtue of its purely spiritual power. For since this truth is inseparable from Christ and his spirit, he who had been in the flesh most deeply scorned by mankind, was now on the contrary himself truly glorified and raised to an elevation beyond all other created things. But if we look at the work which was founded by him, and which nevertheless towered far above him, as the great ultimate object, we may call this glorification of him likewise the *outward perfecting* of that work. For if his work revealing the Consummation of

the true religion, although wholly ignored by men at last, was nevertheless by his appearance actually existent and finished in his own person, that was not enough. As having been outwardly commenced amongst men, it could be authenticated only by its perpetuation amongst men by virtue of its own purely spiritual power, and without his visible presence, becoming thus the new spiritual life of all after it had been set free from the limitations attaching to all individual and visible existence. But as he was himself in all respects in the highest degree perfect, and his inward perfection was the necessary condition of the corresponding outward perfection, and as the general history and human development itself responded to all his work just because it was the perfectly fitting work, it necessarily followed that this subsequent glorification must forthwith receive the most suitable name, which, having been called for by the history, represents the reality briefly and exactly. For, as we have seen in the four previous volumes, the whole course of historical development, as far as it concerns the attainment of the highest aim of humanity, tended with increasing intensity to the expectation of a celestial king in Israel as the founder of a nobler humanity, who should with irresistible royal power remove the overwhelming mass of evils and thus reign as king of the perfected kingdom of God. This king had now come in the only true way in which his coming was possible; he had founded his kingdom with royal authority in the only way in which that could properly be done; but after he had but just commenced this his work in the visible world, he had been immediately not merely misunderstood by men but also annihilated as far as they could annihilate him. Consequently it was necessary that in his glorification, as it has been above explained, he should nevertheless be regarded as in reality the king and lord, absolutely exalted beyond all limitation and distinction, of the kingdom which he had founded on the earth; and the brief fitting name and the most appropriate idea representing this, presented themselves in this case also. Christ is in his glorification the immortal king and lord who can never again forsake the Community which he has founded in the visible world, who, although now withdrawn from its sight, makes himself at frequent intervals plainly enough felt, and by its means will at last lead the whole human race into the kingdom of his Perfection and his Love. This had necessarily become the fundamental thought in the heart of his work as continued on the earth, and it is the strong indissoluble tie which connects the history of the new time with that of

the old, from that moment which rends all history into its two great divisions. But exalted as this glorification of the Christ who has been received back into heaven again may be, as its true eternal action it must always correspond to his temporal work and its effects as they really and undeniably were; and the law which everywhere holds in a lower degree, that there is a true and corresponding glorification of all terrestrial work, and that it does not begin until the spiritual is separated from the material and physical, holds in this case in the highest degree.¹

Nothing is more liable to abuse than brief names that have once been generally adopted for lofty and influential ideas; and yet the highest things that come to an age, and which it seeks to retain, always find expression justly in new short names. This is now the case at the very beginning of our period with the displacement of the name Jesus by the name *Christ*, which now appears with a lustre such as was never before possible; and this new name becomes the most lasting and expressive representation of the exalted glorification in which alone the recollection of this Jesus continues worthily to move. How many *anointed* persons were there before, and how many since! But it is this one only who bears the name henceforth, and in a sense of infinite significance and power as is universally presupposed. With the name Jesus, which in actual usage became less and less customary, everything perishably human is separated from the idea of him, and there remains in the name of his glorification simply the infinitely inspiring and abiding recollection of the eternal attainments of this Jesus. And this change with regard to the names is effected quite involuntarily at the commencement of this period. Not that the less exalted name Jesus was on that account rejected: it remained in use, without any additions, in the region in which it was appropriate—in historical narrative.² But for the present time Jesus Christ, or also Christ Jesus, is henceforth so spoken of that gradually the simple name

¹ The fact that the entire New Testament everywhere teaches most plainly this complete correspondence of the two effects of the work of the glorified Christ, or of his terrestrial and his celestial work, cannot be kept too constantly in mind. The doctrine begins to be propounded with that *καθόρι* in the first discourse of Peter, Acts ii. 24, and we still find it in that *διδ* of Phil. ii. 9, as well as in the other expositions, which are equivalent in meaning to those introduced by these emphatic

particles. What infinitely important truths and duties are involved for us in this apparently simple relation is too obvious to need further remark.

² As late as the Gospel of John even, and so much so that the addition of *Christ* is met with in it only i. 17, xvii. 3, two passages in which the exception is very natural. But it is the same Gospel which, together with the Collected Sayings, also uses the name Christ in its Old Testament sense very frequently and correctly;

Christ also comes to be used alone,¹ unless for some special reasons still more definite designations of the glory which had now been granted to him are chosen.² Individual speakers and writers may keep to the less exalted name somewhat longer,³ and temporarily also a loftier meaning may now be sought in it;⁴ in ordinary discourse the short name of the glorified one—Christ—becomes in the course of this period the prevailing one; and that name which the world had just refused him during his life, which then already belonged to him as to no other mortal, although he never sought it, and on account of which he was nailed to the cross, has now notwithstanding approved itself as the one proper one to be used in all future time, and is more illustrious than any other human name.

Now, we are still living in the midst of the purely spiritual action and effect of all that Christ once did in the world of sense and outward reality; and we men of these later times are able to know much more precisely and definitely than the early Christians were that this rule of the glorified Christ will in its purely spiritual manner continue with increasing power until it has attained its final object. The whole history of the race is in so far only a history of this higher action from that moment when it necessarily commenced. But we can also in this later age know far more clearly than could be known in earlier times how difficult it is to put completely and for all time into definite conceptions that which is purely spiritual, and which can now only be perceived in a purely spiritual manner; for the acquaintance with this spiritual reality, after the immense development of all historical things, by which it is brought near to the generations of mankind, must, notwithstanding the inner similarity of all men, be made at the same time in infinitely various ways. We are able, and we ought, in our day still to become acquainted with that higher action no less than the Apostles in theirs; but how dissimilar, even against our own will, must be the form in which we make this acquaintance, owing to the vast historical dissimilarity of our present position! Consequently it is the more certain that the manner in

one of the numerous instances in which these two most important Gospels coincide with the original Gospel and Mark.

¹ As it can be observed in the writings of Paul that when his language becomes most animated he speaks most readily of Christ simply.

² As *our Lord*, or more briefly *the Lord*, but at the appropriate place *the Lord of Glory*, 1 Cor. ii. 8, and thence

even still more pointedly *Jesus Christ of Glory*, Jas. ii. 1.

³ The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the John of the Apocalypse, once more use the name with surprising frequency, but yet not in cases where it would be unsuitable, as Rev. xx. 4-6.

⁴ The last author of the Gospel of Matt. i. 21.

which this glorification was felt and conceived by the first Christians might be a very special and peculiar one, conditioned by the nature of that first age, without being on that account inappropriate or erroneous. As the earliest mode of realising it, and the mode which most especially originated in its own peculiar necessity, it naturally appropriated not only the freshest and most original features of the truth, but also those which were most indelible; at the same time we may not overlook the fact that this experience, like all spiritual experience that has to be formed in this actual world, was also conditioned by the special circumstances of the time. And if even the action of Christ himself when it entered the phenomenal world was determined in its details by the special time and the special portion of the race in which it occurred, how much more were the Apostles, notwithstanding all their determination to follow Christ and his will alone, compelled to experience his purely spiritual power when it had become invisible to them in that particular way in which this was possible to them in their special, and in the highest degree, peculiar age. The moment when in Christ himself everything merely temporal and everything purely spiritual were separated, remains on that account none the less the end of all ancient and the beginning of all modern history; and the manner in which the first Christians experienced his purely celestial influence, and learnt to perpetuate Christianity in the midst of the hostile world without his sensible physical interference and help, will remain nevertheless not merely historically of highest significance as the true commencement of the life of a spiritual Community of the perfect true religion when deprived of its visible head, but also an exceedingly instructive and, indeed, necessary future model as long as the same Community continues to exist. The only reservation as regards the latter point being that we must never forget to place Christ himself, as presented in the clear light of history, and his eternal significance, beyond everything else.

Consequently, the first and chief question for us at this point is definitely to discover the exact nature of the various possibilities with regard to the outward completion of the work of Christ, which were presented at that one most decisive moment of all human history. The actual form which those possibilities assumed during these first days and years is a question which can be dealt with only after the previous question has been answered, though for the historical narrative in its widest sense it is most important.

The Possibilities at that Time.

By these possibilities we mean in this general connection everything that had then been already supplied, in a latent or potential stage, as the product of the life of infinite significance just ended, everything which tended to shine forth as wholly new truth and insight, or to become operative as a new energy of life, but which was as yet only latent, obscure, and, as it were, dormant. It is the plentiful seed of the external completion of the work of Christ which now tended, by virtue of its divine impulses, to burst forth, but still lay as if buried under the heavy covering of the hard ground of that period, that we must first become more closely acquainted with if we seek to understand the history of the time before us. And in order rightly to perceive them, we must completely transfer ourselves into the true state of all the circumstances of that time, and further consider what an infinite meaning, not only the life, but also the death of Christ, must then have had. Death in all cases separates absolutely and unalterably the material and sensible from the immaterial and spiritual, the temporal from the eternal, the work which has been prosecuted in time by an individual from its absolute and lasting importance; and if the physical life is much, death everywhere, and even in the greatest instances no less, and although the opposite of life, is fully equal to it in its final significance and consequences. But what did this death divide and separate for ever! And what a significance must it have in this case, and primarily perceptible in the immediately following period! If Christ's life, therefore, was of unparalleled significance, his death necessarily became of equally unique importance; and if in the former there lay the seeds of incalculable consequences, it was no less so in the case of the latter; and at the same time all these hidden seeds must now begin to germinate at once.

In accordance with this idea we must say that, though the life of Christ, which had now appeared in the full light of history, and had already been so deeply impressed upon the hearts of his disciples, was of itself sufficient to create in every one who desired to follow him the power of the same life and death, and thus to form a community of men re-created after his image, yet after all it was in his life and death together that were found the motive and the power capable of transforming the whole world as far as it opposed his spirit, or sought even to destroy it. The world both near at hand and further removed was, before it really woke up to the fact,

mortally wounded by him as regards its entire past condition, just when both portions of it might suppose that they had for ever stopped his work in its very first stage.

Judeanism, as it now existed, or the Hagioeracy, upon the attitude of which everything in the very first instance depended, had, as we have seen,¹ in the obscure yet certain feeling that its entire existence on the earth was threatened by Christ and his work, at once outwardly annihilated him for ever, and had at the same time, as it hoped and calculated, inflicted a mortal blow upon his cause, and the influence of his spirit amongst Judeans and other men. It had brought upon him his death in the most terrible and painful form conceivable, and this not by some accidental course of events beyond its control. He was not slain, for instance, in some sudden rush of popular passion, nor by some secret and underhand means. The guilt of this death, therefore, could not be transferred, as is often done in such cases, to the unruliness of the masses, or to the animosity of an individual, or to other accidental causes. Judeanism had nailed him to the cross according to ordinary legal forms, as publicly and legally as possible, and in doing this had solemnly appealed to a definite sentence of the sacred Law which should necessarily condemn him. Consequently the Law itself had slain him, as can be briefly said with perfect truth; and not even an isolated statute, but the entire Law, as it then existed as the supreme power and authority of the established religion, since all the component statutes and regulations of the Law were regarded as of equal validity, and one could not be taken as an exception from the rest. On this very account everything was necessarily revolutionised in that moment when the horrible deed was done. If the Law, as it had now in the course of time grown into the anathematising and primitive command of the established religion, had slain him who was the absolutely innocent one, who was indeed the one true Christ and Son of God, it had thereby really slain itself rather, and the strongest proof possible had been given that the entire Community of the true religion could not find its highest salvation in this Law in the stereotyped form it had now at last assumed. Everywhere when the sting of punitive correction and of law wounds innocence, it reverts against the correction and the law themselves; and this holds in the present instance also. Not, indeed, that the true religion itself in its eternal laws and truths as they had been recognised even before Christ, must suffer from the killing of him; but the whole form which

it had assumed in detail during the centuries was now called in question. And whether this inevitable reaction took form in the course of time more slowly or more violently, and whether it was Paul who first more fully recognised and more consistently carried out all that was involved in it,¹ it still remains certain that the true internal reaction against the Law of the ancient true religion within its own peculiar and inviolate sanctuary begins at that moment when that Law had condemned Christ and violated the holiest thing itself.

There was thus, therefore, supplied the possibility of resistance on the part of those who were determined not to sanction as just this violation of the holiest thing by the existing Hagiocracy, and this resistance might then assume very various forms in the further development of things, and would certainly be justified.² And if the resistance assailed the entire basis of the constitution of the Hagiocracy, it could be justified as long as the latter remained unreformed. But the resistance might go back, even beyond the origin of the Law itself, to the time before Moses, since with Christ the consummation of the true religion itself had come into the world, and everyone that laid hold of it had thereby, like Christ himself, raised himself already at least in spirit beyond the entire Old Testament.

But when the Hagiocracy, as the legitimate and highest authority of the Community of the true religion at this time, inflicted the severest punishment upon, indeed, cast out of its own sacred association and that of the entire nation, and put out of visible existence, one who was not only absolutely innocent according to the true religion, but who also submitted entirely to its temporal authority, the Hagiocracy itself thereby dissolved the tie which had hitherto bound him and his disciples to it, and created purely by its own fault a schism in the Community of the true God such as could not be more profound or more self-destructive. In all his public labours Christ had kept quite within the limits of the laws of the ancient Community,³ and only abandoned the interpretation and applica-

¹ In this respect Paul gives fullest expression to the thought in such passages as Gal. iii. 13, comp. iv. 4, 5; Rom. x. 4; and if such utterances of the New Testament appear short and summary, it must be remembered that they simply express fundamental truths and views which had long been regarded as self-evident and once for all established, the proof of which was implied in the existence of the Apostolic

Church itself. In fact, Peter uses language of essentially the same meaning from the very beginning, Acts ii. 23, iii. 14, iv. 10, as was indeed necessarily the case.

² From the beginning of the Apostolic time, we meet justly with such simple declarations as Acts iv. 19, v. 29.

³ See vol. vi. p. 236.

tion of them then customary in the schools, when the supreme command of the true religion itself demanded it; a freedom he could claim as a prophet; nevertheless the Hagiocracy slew him, and if it had been consistent and logical would therefore have been obliged also to slay, or otherwise put down, all those who were determined to follow him. But in the same way his followers could not consistently truly acknowledge the Hagiocracy any more after it had put to death their Lord: thus the death of Christ, the guilt of which rested on the Hagiocracy alone, called into existence an impassable wall of separation in the midst of the ancient Community between those who determined to be either his friends or his enemies, and the Cross necessarily became the sign of this irreconcilable schism. Whatever form this schism might assume in the further development of things, it had become an irrevocable necessity from the moment of Christ's death,¹ and a rent had taken place in the ancient Community of the true God solely by the fault of the Hagiocracy, which the nation supported. Moreover, this was a rupture such as had never occurred before, inasmuch as it did not concern this or that particular question, but the inmost nature of the true religion itself; and the one decisive alternative now was, whether those members of the ancient Community who desired, as followers of the condemned and slain Christ, the perfected true religion, could still find a place in that Community or not.

However, the death of Christ had not been accomplished by the Hagiocracy of Israel alone. By the agency of Pilate the power of heathendom had likewise a share in it; and, moreover, this power, as represented by Rome, was at its height. That deed, which this Roman heathenism, as the one chief power of the world at that time, could still have prevented, it had facilitated and ultimately itself executed. Christ's death was further marked by the fact that the two chief powers of the time, which were generally so exceedingly dissimilar, had co-operated with unusual harmony in bringing it about; and the semi-heathen power of a Herod had also taken part in it.² And undoubtedly the heathen world, although at that time more remotely concerned, was, from the very first, not less hostile to the work of Christ than the Hagiocracy of Israel, for the simple reason that it had been far less prepared to under-

¹ A fact we find both simply and expressively declared in the words of Peter Acts iii. 13-15, and it was especially in the very earliest times of the Apostolic Church that this schism necessarily ap-

peared, though some of the consequences of it might still be latent.

² All this is immediately pointed out. Acts iv. 27; comp. 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8. As to Herod, see vol. vi. pp. 343 sq., 435.

stand and to appropriate it than the latter. Far as heathenism was now separated from Judeanism, they had after all only gradually separated more widely in the course of time from what was originally the same religious basis,¹ and could therefore once more combine together; and whatever was done by one half of the race, which, though the smaller half was in religion incomparably the more important, necessarily became of great moment for the other. At the same time, the great and extensive power of heathenism, with its rule throughout the wide world, undoubtedly had no such immediate claims and no such special interests to protect against the new aims of Christianity as the Hagiocracy had; on the contrary, it occupied as yet a more remote position, and overlooked that inward schism which was being made within Judeanism. Nevertheless the Consummation of the true religion in Israel, as soon as it became an independent outward power, necessarily came into sharp collision with the entire world, including heathenism. But if hitherto the Law of the ancient religion, in its later one-sided and stereotyped form, had been the chief hindrance to its spread amongst the heathen, its rule had really been ended by Christ's death, as was shown above. What an entirely new era amid these wider and freer relations of the great nations of the world was therefore now possible!

And there was a special possibility immediately presented by the time, to which we must the more particularly attend, as it is so easy to overlook it. We saw in the previous volume² that if the proper reception had been given to Christ amongst those whom his beloved disciple calls above all men 'his own,'³ Christ would, with prolonged life, have prepared for them also the long-desired national salvation as the beginning of a salvation of all the other nations. He had now been put to death by them, and thereby the only one who could prevent the impending overthrow of the existing Community of the true religion (as the course of history soon showed), and who had so often intensely longed to save Jerusalem,⁴ had fallen. Outwardly and materially he could no more save 'his own' in this sense: but his spirit had not been slain, nor any of the powers pertaining to it with which he desired to save them. And when his spirit soon made itself once more felt in a wholly new and marvellously powerful manner in a small number of those disciples who had become truly his possession, the possibility arose that the work which had been so cruelly and unexpectedly

¹ As has been shown in vols. i. and ii.

³ John i. 11.

² Vol. vi. pp. 277 sq.

⁴ Vol. vi. pp. 365 sq.

interrupted should be taken up again by them in conformity with its primary meaning and object, and prosecuted with fresh ardour. And although the work had now become a thousand times more difficult, it might still succeed if those who had so blindly and mercilessly slain the blameless one, who alone could save them, should now be led through the representations and entreaties of the few who were truly his, to take a better course, and to act under the impulse of sincere repentance. It was at all events an immediate possibility that those few should, as soon as possible, resume in this sense the work of their glorified Lord, and that some of them should only with difficulty resign the hope of being able thus to labour successfully. If this possibility did not become actual fact, others must arise; and, in that case, how many ways were opened!

All these possible new shapes and combinations of the elements of the situation were therefore presented with their infinite solemnity after the finished life and death of Christ; and with the first rays of a new bright day the oscillation of the simple possibilities had necessarily to lead, in consequence of the immense seriousness of the situation, very quickly to some actual necessities. If, therefore, Christ's life on earth had such an incomparably great significance, his death not less involved the most momentous consequences, as will soon be seen in quite a different relation to his disciples themselves. In fact, it is universally the case that death has not a less, though a very different, significance for a man as regards his entire being than his life, and his death is required, whether condemning or glorifying it, to fully complete his life, as corresponding or indeed equal to it. How much more must that general law hold in Christ's case, where the highest life was closed that had ever appeared in a mortal body. Indeed it must be said that during the whole Apostolic age, and beyond it (in a certain sense even down to our own time), nothing great occurred, as regards these possibilities, that had not been already prepared for in that moment of the death and burial of Christ, and that had not necessarily to occur in accordance with the inner necessity which was already discernible by the religious mind.¹ So true is it that the inner perfection of that

¹ We remark this here specially also on account of the great and exceedingly disastrous errors which have recently been put forward, in the name of theological science even, regarding the importance and labours of the Apostle Paul; as if he had conceived and put into practice something quite new in Christianity, which is sup-

posed to have far surpassed the designs and the intelligence of earliest Christianity. By such an unjustifiable exaltation of this Apostle, which these scholars seek to introduce, verily against the will of no one more than this Apostle himself, they have only brought into complete confusion the whole history of this period, while they

highest one to whom this whole national history tended as its true destination had already been realised.

The Difficulties of the Actual Situation and the Victory over them.

The series of possibilities embracing the whole world, and their character, have been described. But what was the position of this inner perfection as regards the whole world, even though it had already been realised so far as its various further possibilities and its characteristic tendencies were concerned? That inner perfection which was alone the true final goal of the long history of Israel had actually come, but only in the form in which it could come according to the strict necessity of the development of human history; it had appeared in one person only, and had appeared in him quite otherwise than it had been from ancient times anticipated and longed for. Indeed, this one man, just as he had revealed himself and his work more fully to the world, had not only been immediately torn again from the circle of his own disciples, but had also been as deeply disgraced before the eyes of the whole world as it was possible for any man to be disgraced by the treatment of others; and the same Kingdom of God which he sought to found as its true king, or Messiah, had, as it were, immediately sunk with himself into the grave just as it had begun to make itself really felt in the great world. Thus at the moment when the whole human race had had presented to it the truest and highest perfection that could appear, it was also confronted by the most imminent danger of immediately losing it again; side by side with the brightest revelation and glorification of human-divine life was exhibited its most shameful violation, degradation, and, indeed (as far as men could effect this), its destruction upon the earth, and just this dark side of the case, as the most recent phenomenon, eclipsed the other; the whole terrible power of the world of that time, as it was represented by the Roman Empire and by the predominant heathenism, and the dazzling splendour, no less than the mysterious terrors, which surrounded the Hagiocracy, were confronted solely by a small handful of plain and simple disciples of Christ, who had only a short time before been gathered together by him, and in whose midst either the deepest grief or the most abject perplexity and helplessness had now so suddenly, and therefore so

have not explained the least thing that may now be obscure to us, and have done the greatest injustice not only to the Twelve, and all the rest of the earliest

Christians, but also to Christ himself and his true history. We mention this here simply that there may be no necessity to refer to it again afterwards.

overwhelmingly, succeeded to the first enthusiasm and energy. The whole world seemed to have immediately annihilated the highest truth and glory which had just risen in it; and truly it did not lack the most serious determination to do this in the future also.

But if this truth and glory which Christ had brought into the human race was really thus incomparably great and intrinsically powerful, and if, further, his death had now ruptured the tie which had hitherto bound his followers to the world as it then was, and thus an inevitable conflict had been commenced, in which the one or the other kind of life and endeavour now possible to men had necessarily either to conquer or completely perish, of course as the Divine truth gains the victory in every other less important case, so in this highest instance that the world had hitherto known it was much more sure to prove victorious. The inward invisible power of the truth, which no human hand could touch, could least of all in this case be permanently repressed or wholly subdued according to the will and the desire of the world. But since the inequality between its present repression and helplessness and the will and the power of the world was so enormous that greater contrasts were undoubtedly never brought together, it was impossible that the truth should once more rise from the paralysis of its grave except under the profoundest convulsions and most marvellous agitations, just as the most violent palpitations of a heart that is on the point of being stopped and broken, is sure to react in consequence the more spasmodically. And if this heart, after it had got free again under these spasmodic beatings and had once more exerted itself against the nightmare of the whole world oppressing it, was filled with the elevation and matchless glory of the deeds of Christ himself, and indeed of his whole spirit, and filled, further, with perfect sincerity and readiness to think out correctly and to execute unweariedly what this particular age required, what an infinite movement and activity was then possible with the view of obtaining that victory which was in this case the only true one, and which must come according to the divinely predetermined idea, if it was fought for in complete accordance with it! It is just this which constitutes the Apostolic Age. It is the full bloom to which the germ of the Consummation attained at the moment when, after it had scarcely seen the light, it had immediately been most heavily oppressed, and was on the point of having its young life again completely crushed. This age is instituted by the marvellous conflicts and victories

of the thirty or forty years which immediately follow the death of Christ; conflicts and victories which, proceeding from the inmost heart of the young community of the perfect religion when it seemed to have been annihilated by his death, very soon make themselves deeply felt in the history of the still-existing ancient community of the people of God, and indeed in that of the whole heathen empire. It is the relatively very short period during which Christianity, after it has just entered the world, and which the world is from the very beginning seeking to destroy, begins without the visible Christ nevertheless to conquer the world in the one true way, and without the latter appearing to pay much regard to its gradual defeat.

But if this, as it were, convulsive action and conflict is the characteristic feature of this age as regards its inmost life, and if the thirty or forty years of Apostolic Christianity are, as regards their most intense conflict and their vast world-transforming work, but as the immediate and strongest re-vibration of the three or four years of Christ's public labours, it followed that the first pulsations and movements must be the most violent and decisive possible, so that this entire period really passed in the acquirement of increasing composure and the regulation of the vibrations which it had itself felt at the first, and the first most sudden and extreme agitations were gradually quieted. Every new advance during this age begins as with a most violent impulsion of this kind, of which each successive one, with all its violence, is still always more refined and, as it were, spiritual, than its predecessor. But the entire period assumed under this process the form of an age which is sustained as by higher powers, such as had never before been felt, an age the marvellous experiences, deeds, and sufferings of which appear not like passing phenomena, but as about to remain always amongst men. The stages in this violent and mighty forward advance, however, are marked by those more violent impulsions themselves.

And although the entire Apostolic movement does not pass irresistibly and with great effect forth into the great world until a more advanced stage of its course, but begins at first without being much regarded and is almost overlooked by the Judean, and still more by the Roman, world, it at once becomes in point of intrinsic significance much more powerful and productive than the life of the ancient Community, which grows gradually more and more estranged from it. In this ancient Community also the convulsions and changes of the situation succeed each other in the course of these thirty to forty years

with much greater rapidity, if possible, than ever before, and for every new movement in the one Community there is a corresponding one in the other, since both are still within the folds of the same ancient and venerated covering, and consequently the young Community, which has only just entered the world, and is apparently so weak, naturally reacts upon the older one as well as the older one upon it. But in the same degree in which every fresh convulsion, however propitious it may seem, conducts immediately in the one to the greater ruin, and the last and most violent convulsion to final ruin, does the other rise with every fresh turn of things, and even apparently the most unpropitious, simply to higher power and to final victory.

The Three Chief Phases of the General History of this Period.

The truly productive and quickening forces of the life of the ancient nation already in this period proceed, therefore, solely from the new power of Christianity, insignificant, misunderstood, and beclouded as it still is in the general history of the world at the time, and little importance as seems to attach to its existence amid the rolling thunder of the evening of the ancient world. For as regards the whole nation under whose sheltering wing the new power which had proceeded from it was still hiding, the one important question above all others was how it could meet the momentous collision with the Roman, or in other words the most mighty heathen power conceivable, which was more and more inevitably in preparation. We saw in the previous volume that this collision was being prepared in a sense and with a seriousness which gave it an importance beyond any previous one, and that though at the very commencement apparently crushed for ever, it was nevertheless renewed again and constantly on the increase. After Christianity has now arisen, the decisive question for the nation is, whether the great majority of it which turned from Christianity is without it able or not to sustain the most trying collision to which everything soon leads. This collision could not fail to come, as it recurs again in Christianity also subsequently with all its terrible features. Whether heathenism or the true religion should now prevail in the world had to be brought at this particular juncture to a decision, inasmuch as both had just reached their highest development and the former had at last become in the hand of Rome a sole and universal power and threatened to remain such for all the

future. The great unuttered question of the time was simply this: How would the vast destructive collision be met and borne by the Community of the true religion and all its individual members when it approached more and more inevitably in spite of all the retarding influences?

In the outward history of the whole nation, in the inmost centre of which the Christian Church is now being formed almost invisibly, that which comes most prominently in view is accordingly precisely this its relation to the Roman empire, inasmuch as it determines the great phases of this period, which, brief as it is, is pregnant with the most tremendous movements. Christianity, which has only just arisen, is exposed to this collision no less than the ancient Community, partly on account of its origination in Israel and its intimate connection with it at first, partly because it must as the perfection of all true religion be really exposed to it more especially. But while at *the beginning of this period* it is still struggling into life in the midst of the ancient Community, and can as yet only with difficulty maintain its place in the world at all, the ancient Community, which we may from this point call that of Judeanism, appears in the rapidly approaching collision by its wisdom and moderation to acquire fresh power, and to have in prospect a new and glorious future; though at the same time it is soon clearly shown that this prospect is most deceptive. Then in *the forward movement of this period*, after Christianity has only just escaped the imminent danger of being destroyed again in the lap of the parent Community, which had a little while before given birth to it, it obeys the impulse to the one proper, bold, and justifiable course of action by which it can escape from the arms of its mother, become an entirely independent Community in the world, and, in fact, learn to conquer the whole world itself of that time. On the other hand, Judeanism, separating itself more and more fully from Christianity, and thereby from its better self, is meanwhile misled by the success of the above collision itself to assume an increasingly arrogant, challenging, and angry attitude towards its own best, tender, and weak child no less than towards its great and terrible mortal enemy, and to cultivate more and more completely the imperfect elements within itself which belonged to it from its origin, and the destructive elements which adhered to it in the course of its historical development. Then at last, after these elements of death in the ancient Community have made that collision fatal through the delusion of greatest success, that Community already to all appearance

destroys itself completely in this mortal struggle, but without being able to involve in its own dying convulsions and destruction the new Community sprung from it, which is *the end of this period*.

These are the three phases of these two parallel histories, which may be clearly distinguished. Inasmuch as the new Community is still lying as in the lap of its mother, all the fortunes of the latter are still felt strongly by it, yet without interrupting or even seriously disturbing its inmost life; while, on the other hand, the more and more decisive separation of the young Community insensibly, and yet at last quite palpably, withdraws from its parent many of its noblest and purest elements. Of these three phases the second is the longest, because it is the most quiet; the first is so short on account of the unusual commotion which agitates both Communities, although each from a wholly different cause; the last comes so quickly to an end, owing to the dying convulsions and catastrophes of the ancient Community.

The Historical Sources for this Period.

Though the history of this period must trace the twin course of Christianity and Judeanism, the two streams are intimately connected almost to the end of the period, and the historical sources are in part simply a continuation of previous ones, and in part quite new ones that lie variously and widely dispersed. Of the latter class we can speak most suitably as they successively come before us. The only continuous sources of a new kind which embrace the entire period, or at all events might easily embrace it, are the Acts of the Apostles.

This work embraces a period of some thirty-one years, and is for this entire history so much the richest and most trustworthy source, that it is exactly at the point where it ceases that we realise its great value. At the same time we must allow that for our object it would have been far more useful still if it had been finished by *Luke*, in accordance with its original plan.

1. But unfortunately it has been left, according to plain evidences, unfinished; and in order to be able to form a correct estimate of the book, we must at starting plainly recognise this fact, which may be done from two quite different points of view.

According to its plain and simple plan the book is designed, as a continuation of *Luke's Gospel*, to show simply how this *Word of God*, or Gospel, or (as we can equally well say) Christianity, which has come into the world, increased out-

wardly, became acknowledged in the world, and spread ever further amongst people of all ranks and all nations. We can, therefore, properly distinguish in it in its present form four sections,¹ which show how Christianity spread from Jerusalem (1), to Antioch (2), advanced thence to Asia Minor and Greece (3), and was then making its way further to Rome (4). But the design of this fourth section is not completely carried out; on the contrary, the book ends without any proper conclusion, as if in the very midst of an account, and just at the point where the expectation of hearing how Christianity at Rome grew triumphantly in the very midst of persecution, had been fully roused. For we know from other sources that great persecutions broke out in Rome soon after the events related at the close of the book; and everywhere the growth of Christianity proceeded from the midst of persecution, as is shown by all three of the first sections of our book, and as they likewise end in every case with a clear refrain² that refers to the one great topic of the work.

It would be in the highest degree unreasonable to suppose that the Acts of the Apostles closed with the year 64 simply because the book was written immediately after that date.³ There is not an indication, still less a proof, in favour of such a supposition, whilst all evidences point to the contrary conclusion. It is true the book was by no means written so late as is maintained with far greater unreasonableness by a modern unhistorical school.⁴ But if Luke did not write his Gospel, as appears from the most unmistakable indications, until some time after the destruction of Jerusalem, he certainly did not compose the Acts of the Apostles for some years after the Gospel, inasmuch as in the latter he had made no announcement whatever of his intention to write the former.⁵ Nothing compels us to suppose that it was written after the year 80, or in any case much after this date;⁶ but neither have we any reason whatever for supposing that it was written much before

¹ As was shown in the *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, iii. pp. 141 sq. [and finally in the author's introduction to his work on the Acts of the Apostles, *Die drei ersten Evangelien und die Apostelgeschichte* (1872) vol. ii. pp. 24 sq., subsequently quoted in this translation simply as *Die Apostelgeschichte*].

[² (1) i. vi. 7; (2) vi. 8-xii. 24; (3) xii. 25-xix. 20, see *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 24.]

³ As still not a few most unreasonably suppose and endeavour to prove, comp.

Jahrb. d. B. W. vii. 167 sq.

⁴ The opinion of the so-called Tübingen school, whose errors and exceedingly injurious tendencies I have on former occasions shown with regard to this point, comp. e.g. *Jahrb. der B. W.* iv. pp. 87 sq.

⁵ Comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. 142 sq. [*Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 47 sq.].

⁶ As we are at present unable to discover a still more definite indication of the year of its composition, we must be content to express ourselves thus generally.

this year. And as a fact about this date the suitable occasion and time for the composition and publication of such a work had arrived. Previous to the destruction of Jerusalem the spread of Christianity was still in a condition too unsettled and fluctuating to favour the idea of drawing up a general history of its progress; but immediately after that event greater tranquillity and a complete alteration in the position of Christianity in the world followed (as we shall see in the next volume), both of which changes strongly suggested the necessity of reviewing its past history and also of describing it once for all in narrative works with considerable fulness. If, however, the Acts of the Apostles was not written before this time, it would be quite unintelligible that it should end with the year 64, and end moreover so abruptly as it now actually does. In that case an incomparably more satisfactory and grander conclusion must have been originally contemplated by Luke, as we may also see from the appropriate exalted close of his Gospel. The only worthy conclusion of the fourth section of his book would have been a description of the most deadly persecutions which broke over Paul and Peter and other Christians in Rome after the two years of apparent tranquillity with which the book now closes,¹ and of the emerging of Christianity nevertheless with even increased power from that vortex of suffering. A description of the preservation of Christianity unharmed amid the great convulsions of the destruction of Jerusalem, and a proof of the fulfilment by that event of the anticipations not only of Christ but also of Stephen and Paul, might then have been most appropriately added. Only by a continuation with such a scope would the narrative of the book have received its appropriately exalted and true conclusion; and if Luke had continued it to this point his work would, with its five sections or so, have been from an artistic point of view as perfectly finished as any one of the present four Gospels.

Further, Rome was for those times, it is true, so much the one great centre of all history, and particularly of the history of Christianity, that we could well understand why Luke might propose to close his work with an account of the fortunes of Christianity in that city.² But it is a wholly baseless view, which has often been expressed in recent times, that the Acts of the Apostles was intended to be mainly simply a history of

¹ Acts xxviii. 30 sq.

² It appears from xix. 21, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 24, how intentionally, not the whole,

but a great part of the Acts points to this, and as the feeling of Paul.

Peter and Paul, or even that it really had Paul alone in view. It is intelligible enough that the book should give great prominence to Paul's history, partly on account of its greater importance, and partly from the peculiar relation in which Luke stood to him, as will appear below; but the plan, no less than the meaning and scope, of the work reaches far beyond such a few individuals of the time, as may be most clearly seen from its first two sections. When, at the very beginning, the Twelve are all significantly mentioned, and when even previously the words are repeated from Christ's mouth that they should be his witnesses unto the end of the earth,¹ we naturally expect that afterwards it will be narrated of each of them, though it may be only with a few words in the case of some of them, in what way Christ's words were fulfilled; and we can infer from many ample indications that by the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and then still more with and immediately after it, Christianity had spread far into Asia and Europe, and also over Africa as far as Spain. Neither does it follow from the plan of the work that it was intended to have only four sections, supposing that the fourth had been completed. Further, in one place,² the story of the journeys of Peter suddenly comes to an end, evidently with the view of its being resumed and completed at a subsequent opportunity. We may therefore quite well suppose that Luke intended, at the end of his work, to speak partly of the travels of the other Apostles, though perhaps only briefly, and partly, but with special fulness, to describe how Peter met Paul in Rome, and both were overtaken there by the same fate. As this was the necessary conclusion of the fourth section, he could propose in a fifth to speak briefly of all the other Apostles.

In these various ways it can be shown from the plan of the Acts of the Apostles that the book has come down to us incomplete. But an entirely different proof is obtained for the same conclusion from a consideration of the text of the book as a whole and in detail. There are probably few books which have undergone so little editing in the higher sense, and expurgation from certain inequalities, smaller discrepancies and slips of the pen, as the Acts of the Apostles,³ although it

¹ Acts i. 8, 13.

² When it is briefly said of him, xii. 17, that he journeyed to another place, the narrator cannot have left this place unmentioned, because it was unknown to him, or because he had shrunk for some reason from mentioning it; neither reason for his silence is conceivable. We can only

suppose, therefore, that Luke preferred not to mention it here for brevity's sake, inasmuch as he meant to speak of it afterwards at a convenient place.

³ A multitude of proofs of this will be given below in detail, so that it seems unnecessary to speak of them further at present [*comp. Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 13 sq.].

proceeded from the hand of one author, and contained, for the most part, original composition. On this point there can be no mistake if we try to understand the instances accurately, and thoroughly grasp their whole meaning. It is true that many of the inequalities have their origin in the loose working-up into the narrative of the various sources of which we must soon speak; but that alone is far from sufficient to explain the phenomena of this kind, since many of the defects of this class are found in passages which Luke himself composed for the first time. Accordingly when we remember that Luke's Gospel is free from such defects,¹ we have the less reason to doubt that they are here due alone to the fact that he was prevented from finishing his later book and giving to it the last polishing. This observation may at the same time convince us that the true conclusion of the book was not lost by some early misfortune; it was undoubtedly never written, and there was no one found to supply it. We see in this only one of the numerous signs that show with what straits and necessities Christianity had still to contend. Yet it is not improbable that Luke died before he could put his hand to the completion of this his later work.

2. Its incompleteness, however, does not detract from the main value of the work; on the contrary, this appears to us more and more clearly in proportion as we seek, on the one hand, to accurately understand it and use it as a source for the history of the time; and, on the other, correctly appreciate the difficulties which Luke had to contend with in composing it. These difficulties were of two kinds. First, the events which he had to describe in this case were far from having an inner unity which could be easily brought into full view like that possessed by that absolutely exalted life, the appearance of which he delineated in his Gospel. Those events extended over the most various localities and times, and concerned multitudes of men, so that it must have been very difficult even to bring together with greatest possible completeness and authenticity such uncommonly various and widely scattered materials. Undoubtedly a lively interest in the unfolding fortunes of the Christian Community, with its thousand branches which were being rapidly formed, continued to be felt by all the separate churches no less than by all the more prominent Christian persons; but more than this interest is

¹ For though it is true that *οὐδὲς*, Luke xiv. 5, or according to an ancient correction *ὄρος*, is probably a corruption of *οὐδὲς*,

it was already found by Luke, most likely in his manuscript and edition of the Collected Sayings.

justly expected from a historian. The second difficulty was, that Luke had, in this case also, to describe times and events in which, for the most part, he had not been personally concerned.

However, in this respect it was of great advantage to Luke that he had been the admirer and friend, and, indeed, also the assistant, and often the faithful attendant, of one of the chief actors in this entire history — namely, of the Apostle Paul himself, and subsequently always recalled this his intimate association with the Apostle with so much pleasure that he impressed all the particular incidents of it most affectionately and faithfully upon his memory. We perceive this plainly enough from the peculiar manner in which, in his description of the life of the Apostle, he sometimes indicates that he accompanied him; he suddenly, without preparing his reader for it, uses the pronoun *we* instead of *he* or *they*, as if under the influence of overpowering personal feeling. When he uses this pronoun *we*, however, he never intends merely himself, and was undoubtedly too modest to think of narrating in this great history anything concerning himself alone, or of in any way extolling himself. On the contrary, he thereby only intimates quite incidentally, though plainly, that he also was, on the occasions in question, attending the Apostle. And when we remember that as one of the attendants of the Apostle he was undoubtedly in a general way well known to most Christians, particularly to those for whom he in the first instance wrote his work (see below), all that is surprising in this sudden change of pronoun is completely removed.¹ We are even able, by the guidance of this slight indication, to ascertain quite certainly where Luke was dwelling when he first made the acquaintance of Paul, or, at all events, when he became his attendant, where he dwelt afterwards, and whether he accompanied the Apostle constantly or not. He was with Paul on his second missionary journey from Mysia and Troas,² but then remained in Philippi undoubtedly as an evangelist³ to the church just founded there, and in accordance with Paul's personal desire.⁴ It was not until Paul returned to Jerusalem upon his third missionary journey by way of Macedonia that Luke again joined him as an attendant, without doubt, com-

¹ A change of persons which is really in this case not so surprising as in some others, comp. vol. i. p. 192. Moreover, it is possible that Luke intended to place, or indicate, his name at the end, for in using the pronoun *we* he never means himself alone, but when he really refers to himself alone uses the singular *I* (Luke i. 1-3, Acts i. 1).

² According to the clear force of the words, Acts xvi. 8-10.

³ Comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* ii. pp. 118 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 45 sq.].

⁴ All this must be inferred from the general character of the narrative, Acts xvi. 11-40 [comp. *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 33 sq.].

missioned to do so by the church at Philippi¹; and in this case also Troas is again mentioned as of importance.² From that point he became his attendant, prepared gladly to serve him in every way, not merely on his journey to Jerusalem, but also in his weary imprisonment at Cæsarea,³ and took ship with him for Rome, where he also arrived with him,⁴ and is mentioned at a later time in the epistles of Paul from Rome as one of his faithful fellow-workers.⁵ In all this there is therefore conveyed the history of an important part of Luke's own life, who was accordingly, without doubt, by previous profession, a physician residing in Mysia, and had probably, according to another ancient account, at a still earlier period, dwelt at Antioch itself⁶; but having been once won by Paul for the service of the Gospel, became one of his most faithful fellow-workers, and could be of great use to him by all kinds of service, including probably those of a literary nature. He was, moreover, a heathen by birth,⁷ and one of the first who, having remained uncircumcised, was, as an author also, so actively employed on behalf of the Gospel.

It naturally followed that he should in other ways also make inquiries with regard to the whole career of the Apostle Paul, and thus qualify himself to write at least this portion of the Apostolic history for the most part with greater independence. And as a fact we feel as we read his book that the history of this Apostle, particularly from the commencement of

¹ This can be plainly inferred from the fact that Luke unquestionably accompanied him from Philippi though in Acts xx. 4, 5 only those attendants are named who were not from Philippi; evidently it was from pure modesty that Luke avoided mentioning his own name here.

² Acts xx. 5-12; the mention of the event vv. 7-12, which would otherwise probably have been passed over, can be thus explained most easily.

³ Acts xx. 13-xxi. 18, comp. xxiv. 23, where Luke undoubtedly includes himself in the ἴδιοι.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 1-xxviii. 15. It follows further from the correct understanding of all the passages that there is no ground for supposing that Timothy or Silas is intended by the *we* of the Acts; both are, on the contrary, expressly distinguished from the *we*.

⁵ Philem. ver. 24, Col. iv. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 11; in the Epistle to the Philippians, iv. 21, he is included amongst the 'brethren.'

⁶ That is, Acts xi. 28, the reading ἦν δὲ

πολλῇ ἀγαλλίασις. Συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν ἀναστὰς εἰς, &c., occurred in ancient MSS. If the reading is genuine the incidental *we* would therefore occur here for the first time; ἀγαλλίασις is elsewhere used by Luke, συνεστρέφειν (to gather together) also Acts x. 41, according to early authorities, and xxviii. 3; and no objection can be made to the sense and connection which is thus produced. The reading was common in the West; it is found in Cod. D, and in Augustine, *De sermone Domini*, ii. 57 (not in the *Sin.*), and though it appears, it is true, to have been early objected to, the objection was not felt in Rome where most could be known of Luke's life. The statement of the ancients (first given in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 4) that Luke was by birth from Antioch, undoubtedly arose from this reading [comp. *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 32 sq., 260 sq.].

⁷ Inasmuch as the Christians who were not from the heathen are taken before him, Col. iv. 10, 11 [comp. *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 13].

his second missionary journey, though to a great extent also from the commencement of the first, has been written by one of the best-instructed contemporaries with the greatest care and affection, although again the narrative of those parts of the Apostle's life in which Luke accompanied him is related most minutely as regards details. At points of the history where Luke was not accompanying the Apostle, his narrative, it must be allowed, is generally so brief that we can often make considerable additions to it even from the Apostle's Epistles that have come down to us. For it is obvious that a collection in the proper sense of Paul's Epistles, which might have been used in composing his history, was not at that time in existence; the life of the Apostle, however, had in detail been so uncommonly full of vicissitude that even some years after his death it required great labour to relate trustworthily only the chief outlines of his great journeys. This Luke has accomplished in this book. In the whole history of the Apostolic age, when at last the endeavour was made briefly to summarise it in great outlines, the important thing was not the infinitely various details of the doings and sufferings of Christians, but the main leading matters. Accordingly a brief narrative of the general fortunes of the Church, a description of the greatest and most marvellous events or deeds in detail, and particularly a prominent mention of the important thoughts and discourses which had been uttered at decisive moments of the history, were necessarily the chief constituents of such a narrative. In like manner we cannot at all expect, even in that part of the Acts of the Apostles which was unquestionably written by Luke with most independence, a narrative perfectly complete in all details. And the Epistles of Paul especially often render us the best assistance in supplying further particulars.

Without doubt, Luke had also long made as careful inquiries as he could with regard to the other parts of the history, and particularly of the earliest Apostolic period. But inasmuch as he wrote the Acts of the Apostles (as we shall soon see) in Rome at a great distance from Palestine, he might naturally deem it best in this part of the narrative to keep close principally to the written documents which he had been able to procure. We know that by the preparation of his Gospel he had already accustomed himself to collect and to work up into his narrative such written documents. Though we have no just ground for supposing that at the time when he began the Acts the history of the Christian Church had already been treated as frequently as the life of Christ, some books upon it might very well have

been then in existence; indeed, to many of the later Gospels themselves some accounts of the first days of the Apostolic age could have been appended.¹ If we compare the first part of the Acts with the second, we find that the narrative in the former, down to chapter xii., is far from proceeding in the same firm order and uninterrupted flow as is the case with the latter from chapter xiii. onwards; indeed, we are still able easily to discern in the first part the sutures where one series of narratives are worked into another.² And if we also observe in such cases the matter and the character of the narratives thus interlaced, we are driven to the supposition that there were two different works which Luke made use of in this first part of his book. One of them traced the history of the Apostles from the beginning in such a way that it kept in view mainly either the things which happened in Jerusalem and Palestine, or what had been accomplished especially by Peter and his fellow-workers within and beyond Palestine.³ This work was distinguished by its graphic and detailed descriptions, was still animated by the genuine spirit of ancient Israel, and probably written in the Hebrew language. The second work traced rather the early spread of Christianity in heathen countries, made the points of its special departure the relation of the Hellenists to the Palestinians in Jerusalem and the stoning of Stephen, and then turned especially to the history of the Church at Antioch and of Paul. It was beyond doubt composed by a Hellenist, and had fewer characteristics of the ancient Hebrew spirit. But both this and the other book had undoubtedly been written subsequently to the death of the two great Apostles, to do honour to whom was one of their special objects. In working up together these sources, Luke evidently made additions of his own, and was able further on easily to incorporate his own account, which gradually became more independent, into the narrative of the second book. But although he reproduced with some freedom his earlier sources, and there appear therefore certain marks of his own characteristic language in the first half of the Acts, it is quite easy

¹ Thus Luke's Gospel already refers to the fortunes of the disciples after the death of Christ more at length than Mark; and the conclusion of another Gospel which has now found a place as Mark xvi. 9-20, notwithstanding its great brevity, bears upon it the peculiar impression of the Apostolic age; reversely, what Luke now supplies, Acts i. 2-14, might just as well have been placed at the end of a

Gospel, and was probably found there by Luke.

² Such sutures, e.g., are found in the words *οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες*, viii. 4, and again equally plainly, xi. 19 [and ix. 31, *A.G.*].

³ Inasmuch as the words xii. 17 (as was said above) point to journeys of Peter beyond the territory of King Agrippa I., i.e. generally beyond Palestine.

to perceive nevertheless that his own language is not exhibited with its full peculiarities until he comes to the second half of his work.¹ Thus it was undoubtedly Luke who first produced a more general and satisfactory history of the Apostolic age; and he overcame the difficulties of preparing such a history so well that his work, although it remained unfinished, was very soon universally approved, and wholly supplanted the few earlier experiments of a similar kind.

But if we look, finally, in this connection, at that which was the highest and, it must be allowed, the most difficult thing for such a book to manage successfully, namely, the description of the miracles of the faith and life of the first days of Christianity, we must acknowledge that the Acts of the Apostles throughout, as we have it, describes them in a way which is very suitable to their original elevation and glory. We can still feel as we read this book that we are making through it a vivid and faithful acquaintance with the unparalleled and marvellously inspiring and productive life of these years; although it may not be described with the first vividness and immediate transparency with which perhaps one of the great movers in this history would have reproduced it from his own personal experience, we still feel that it has been told as adequately as could be expected from one of the first disciples and their friends. At the same time we can observe in this aspect of the book also a certain difference. When Luke himself as an attendant of the Apostle Paul has personally taken part in the exalted and miraculous events that he describes, he reproduces them just as they had indelibly impressed themselves upon his mind, and as if they had been only just passed through; on that account they are related with such transparent clearness that we can still plainly and easily distinguish what was the original nature of the astonishing and miraculous element in them.² It is otherwise with those elevated moments and miracles which are described more

¹ The instances in proof of this may be easily found by the indications given *ante*, pp. 28 sq.

² We refer to such parts of the narrative, of greater or less length, as Acts xvi. 9, 10, 18, 23-40; xx. 7-11; xxi. 8-14; xxvii. 10, 21-25, 31; xxviii. 3-6, 7-10. The genuine Apostolic age is everywhere miraculous, as we shall see; but the way in which its miraculous features are described is in the Acts various. We may say it differs according as (1) Luke relates something on his own authority, (2) or

the first author used by him, for instance, of ch. x.-xii., or (3) the author of ch. ix., xiii., xiv. It is no less remarkable that though Luke refers to miracles which were performed during the interval when he was not attending Paul, xix. 11-19, the reference is very brief, and is not at all of the same character as when he has himself been present, or as when the first narrator, e.g., of ch. xii. or ch. vi.-viii. relates. These differences are exceedingly instructive with regard to the real origin of the Acts.

towards the beginning of the book and towards the close of the first half of it. Historical as they are, the representation of them is not so transparently clear, and it is observable that already some foreign elements have been introduced, with the view of either conceiving the originally miraculous occurrences more in accordance with special exalted characteristics and inferences, or reversely of restoring them by artistic means. This instructive difference must not be overlooked, and is explained by the existence of different documents in our book and the dissimilarity of the times themselves which it describes, it being possible in that extremely agitated age that the divergence between the years and decades should be very great.

3. Moreover, the Acts of the Apostles still preserves completely that characteristic of the first years of the Christian Church of having been written for Christians only, as if quite unconcerned about the wider world. As all Christian literature belonging to the earliest period originated in the depths of purest Christian feeling and experience, and as the Epistles addressed to believing churches, or to persons willing to believe, constitute its primary root, so Luke addresses this later as well as his earlier book to his friend Theophilus, as if he wished to do no more than write for this friend, and as if the non-Christian world or, at all events, the world which had no sympathy with Christian faith, were regarded by him with indifference. But the tone of Luke's dedication of this book to Theophilus, i. 1, is such that we may very well suppose that in the meantime he had become by baptism altogether a Christian; for he already addresses him (i. 1) as one with whom he is on much more intimate terms than is implied in Luke i. 4.¹ Now as this Theophilus, according to the best reminiscence of him preserved elsewhere,² lived in Rome, and as Luke also, according to the earliest accounts which we find of him elsewhere, remained in Rome when he had once arrived there with Paul,³ we may quite well suppose that he wrote the Acts as well as the Gospel in Rome, and that the book gradually circulated thence. The somewhat earlier books which he used as his authorities had also undoubtedly been written outside Judea;⁴ and inasmuch as, in the history of the growth and spread of Christianity, this latter itself, in its intrinsic importance and abiding truth, was, after

[¹ See *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 49.]

² In the so-called *Muratorian fragment*, the reference of which to this point I have discussed, *Jahrbücher d. B. W.* viii. 126 sq.

³ According to the passages of Paul's

Epistles referred to above, p. 29, especially 2 Tim. iv. 11.

⁴ According to the implication of such passages as Acts xi. 1, 29, xii. 19, comp. xv. 1.

all, the chief thing in his mind, he inserted also so many and such long speeches by the principal actors, and, indeed, does not scruple, at all events in such inserted discourses, to recur twice, after he has related it according to an earlier authority, to the conversion of the Apostle Paul which was so exceedingly memorable.¹ On the other hand, he bestows much less labour upon the chronology, as we shall soon see. Though he may have written the book in Rome, his language is always good Greek, particularly when he composed with less close dependence on his sources, and he nowhere permits Latin words to creep in.

If the Acts of the Apostles remained, then, unfinished, we might certainly have expected that probably another more complete work of the same nature would have been early undertaken; but, as far as we know, this was not the case, and the reasons for the omission are not difficult to find.

That first form of the Christian Church which it was the real object of Luke's work to describe completely passed away with the destruction, and in fact with the siege, of Jerusalem, as will be narrated subsequently. With the dissolution of the parent church in Jerusalem, and of the tie which had hitherto closely connected all the separate churches of the earth with the Holy Land, the entire history of Christianity was, for a time, broken up into the history of an innumerable number of small churches which had very little or no connection at all with each other. While he was still an attendant of the Apostle Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem, Luke had seen the parent church, with its activities and powers, but since then every strong and visible bond of unity amongst the whole of the churches had been dissolved. As now an abundance of suffering remained the gift of Heaven to the isolated churches of the world in the days of their infant weakness, each one had almost more than it could do to maintain itself from day to day and to attend to its own affairs; and though a few churches stood in closer connection with each other, the attainment, or continuation, of a general view and history of them all was difficult. It was therefore principally only in the history of the sufferings and martyrdom of certain prominent members or whole churches, drawn up often with great fulness in epistles from church to church, according to primitive Christian usage, that the historical activity of those years was displayed.² But

¹ See below; in this fact also lies a plain indication of different sources.

² From the epistle of the churches at Vienna and Lugdunum (in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 1) to that of the Himyaritic Christians

of the sixth century, which is given in Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orient.* i. pp. 364 sq. and still more plainly in Knös, *Christ. Syr.* pp. 53 sq. The martyrologies have in so far a very good and necessary origin.

with this breaking-up of the first unity was connected further the growth of the exceedingly great independence and freedom of the separate churches. The most dissimilar tendencies, aims, and views of things could therefore the more easily be developed amongst them, leading to the danger of a growing dissolution of the deeper spiritual unity.¹ Accordingly the remembrance of the Apostles and of their first assistants soon assumes very divergent forms; and as every locality or church, or, indeed, sect, desired to boast more especially of one Apostle as its own, the liberty was taken of reviving the remembrance of him in a very free way, and of using his history for perpetually new purposes of exhortation and doctrine, and also of edification and entertainment.² In consequence of this growingly arbitrary treatment, the history of the Apostles and of their times suffered far more and for a much longer time than that of Christ himself.³

Thus the most favourable time for the completion of Luke's work, according to his own intention and his own plan, was suffered to pass unused. It hardly needs remark that a number of important contributions of a detached nature to this history appeared in various books at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century; but the majority of these mostly small books were lost sight of in the times which followed. When immediately afterwards, in the last half of the second century, Hegesippus undertook, so far as we know for the first time after Luke, to draw up a somewhat more general history of the Christian Church, having previously taken many long journeys, and made inquiries in all directions for the reminiscences and traditions of the churches, he evidently was not very successful in his undertaking, so that his work was subsequently lost again, and fragments only of it have come down to us in other books.⁴ It was not until the victory of Christianity in the Roman empire, with the greater unity and outward power which the Church then acquired, that a more

¹ An early feeling of this danger and a longing for the original and strict unity of the Christian Church already pervades the Acts of the Apostles, as we shall see below in detail.

² This was the origin of the numerous *πράξεις, περίοδοι, κηρύγματα, διάλογοι* of the Apostles and their assistants, of which the *Clementine Recognitions (Homilies)* and *Acta Thomæ*, 108, are the longest that have been preserved, and they have in our time been made better known. With regard to the former, see below.

³ Comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* vi. pp. 33 sq. I have discussed the question of the extent to which Cureton's *Ancient Syrian Documents* (Lond. 1864) may be regarded as historically reliable sources for the earliest history of the Church ('from the year after our Lord's ascension,' as is added in the title), in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1864, pp. 1492 sq.

⁴ The largest number and the longest fragments only in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.*, see particularly ii. 23. iv. 8, 21, 22.

pressing necessity arose for a more general view of its history ; but the compilation from earlier works on the history of the Apostolic Age which Eusebius of Cæsarea succeeded in making, in his ‘*Ecclesiastical History*,’ which was in many respects a continuation and enlargement of his ‘*Chronicon*,’ is, in itself, devoid of all higher unity, and otherwise unsatisfactory ; at the same time it is of great value to us, inasmuch as most of the books which he used in compiling it have been lost. With the complete victory of Christianity, it is true, the desire gradually became more and more irrepressible to know the largest possible number of details of the life of each Apostle, so that even collections of biographies of all of them were taken in hand ;¹ but these latest books either no longer supply any clear historical recollection at all, or they are only very loosely compiled from the various earlier books.² With the more reason, therefore, Luke’s work was preserved in the Church generally as the only one of its kind universally treasured, and, indeed, indispensable ; and in spite of its undeniable defects it might well appear to meet satisfactorily the main object desired. For books like the Acts of the Apostles could never acquire such great importance as the Gospels ; but if a clear and, as far as possible, satisfactory representation, on the one hand, of the rise and growth of the primitive Christian Church, and, on the other, a history of the Apostle Paul, giving in a general view as complete a life of him as could well be, were the two chief requirements which had to be met by a general work of this kind on the earliest history of the Church, Luke’s book might be regarded as satisfying those requirements ; and as far as the general convenience of the Church was concerned, at all events, it was better that the book should be left in its original incompleteness than that other works on the same subject of unequal worth should have been attached to it.

As regards quite another side of the history, it might be possible to use as historical sources those works which are now usually called by the Latin name, ‘*Constitutiones*,’ or, reduced to their briefest shape, circulate as ‘*Canones Apostolorum*,’ and are supposed, by later tradition, to be derived from Clemens

¹ Of books of this character have come down to us, in Latin, *Ten Books of Apostolic History*, ascribed to a disciple of the Apostles, of Judean origin, Abdias by name, Bishop of Babylon (comp. vol. i. p. 60). The work itself, vi. 29, does call this Abdias a disciple of the Apostles, but refers the authorship of 10 books of this kind to an unknown Craton, whose

translator into Latin is said to be the frequently mentioned Christian historian (Julius) Africanus of the third century. The last edition of the work is to be found in the *Codex N. T. Apocryphus* of Fabricius.

² Comp. my further remarks on the *Acta Apost. Apocr.*, published in Greek by Tischendorf, in *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iv. pp. 126 sq.

Romanus or even from the Twelve Apostles. They would supply the more acceptable addition, as they describe the internal condition and institutions of the Church in conformity with its principles and laws, and deal particularly with the internal affairs of the already existing Apostolic Church. But they describe these institutions and principles only in the more advanced form which they had assumed after the destruction of Jerusalem, particularly during the course of the second century, and to some extent still later; and they can therefore be used for the period with which we are now occupied only with great caution. We shall have to refer to them again in the next volume. When properly applied, however, they also serve to reflect many rays of true light upon the beginning of the Apostolic Church of an earlier age which is now to engage us.

The Chronology of this Period.

Luke's work proceeds with its primitive and simple confidence, especially in the further respect that it does not attempt to assign to its narratives their place in the general chronology of the history of the world, nor even to introduce a continuous chronology of its own, of which Christians had no thought at all for many years to come. In this respect his work remains exactly like most of the Gospels and the earliest of them. But while in his Gospel, Luke seeks more definitely to fix chronologically the order of the narratives, at all events as regards their commencement, we do not find in this book one such note of time, not even at the beginning in connection with the year of the rise of the Christian Church without its visible Christ. This omission cannot be ascribed to the circumstance that the work was left unfinished by its author; it must be traced rather to the plan of the book itself. On the other hand, we must take care not to attach too much importance to this defect, or to explain it erroneously, as if it affected the intrinsic credibility of the narratives which Luke supplies. For it is perfectly obvious that, if he had considered it necessary, Luke could easily have supplied the deficiency. Even where he combines various narratives into a connected story, he evidently arranges the whole in accordance with a knowledge of the order of time; and in particular cases, where it was very well possible, he gives quite definite numbers or chronological estimates at all events generally correct. All that we can say, therefore, is, that he presupposes as still generally known the time when Pilate, or Agrippa, or Felix and Festus ruled in Palestine. But

as regards some of the smaller events of the earliest history of the primitive Church, it is probable he was no longer in a position to fix the precise chronology.

However, in the case of Josephus also, our second chief source with a continuous narrative, the same defect occurs. It is true that in the case of the infinitely calamitous events of the last war between Judea and Rome, in which he was himself in various ways an actor, he fixes the time, at least of those events which are more closely connected with Roman history, supplying throughout the usual Roman chronology; but elsewhere he rarely refers to contemporary Roman events, nowhere follows a continuous chronological order, and often neglects to supply any note of time at the very points where they are most desirable. As now Josephus wrote his works either about the same time as or not much later than Luke, and differs from the latter particularly in that he composed them from the very beginning for the world at large, we have the less reason to reproach Luke on account of this omission, as if it were to be found in his book only.

For us, therefore, the accurate determination of the time of all the separate events and circumstances of these forty years is attended in some respects with great difficulties. These difficulties are met with even in the case of not a few purely Judean occurrences which really took place in the broader daylight of history; they are still greater when we seek to connect the history of Christian events more clearly with the Judean. Nevertheless, in the case of the purely Judean history, the years of the three phases, which may be distinguished in this period as we have seen, can be fixed with certainty. If from the Christian standpoint we take as the commencement of this general period the Easter of the year 33 A.D.,¹ and fix as the end of the first phase the death of King Agrippa I., in the year 44, we can assign to this phase a duration of from eleven to twelve years. The momentous years of the third phase begin, as we know definitely, with the Easter of 66, and do not quite close until the year 73; we can therefore suppose in this case an interval of just seven years. Between these two intervals lies a space of twenty-two years. Within the fixed limits of these years we must arrange the separate events according as the order of their occurrence demands when we properly combine all the notes or plain indications that can anywhere be collected; and though we may not succeed in restor-

¹ Vol. vi. pp. 152 sq.

ing the order of time in all these smallest details, the principal things in it cannot remain uncertain. We are thus able to fix many events of this period much more certainly than Eusebius formerly attempted to do in his 'Chronicon,' translated by Jerome.¹ Inasmuch, however, as some of the obscurities which exist are so great that many events in the first two of the three sections of this history are in common greatly affected by them, we must, at all events, now examine them more particularly.

If we take Josephus as our authority and make the year 66, as the date of the beginning of the great war, our point of departure with the view of determining the dates of the seven Procurators that ruled in Palestine subsequent to Agrippa's death in the year 44, we know definitely that the last of the seven, Gessius Florus, did not hold his office two full years,² and that the sixth Procurator, Albinus, was present in Jerusalem by the autumn feast of the year 62;³ while at present we see no reason why we should suppose that he came into the country much earlier; at the earliest he did not arrive before the beginning of the year 62. Beginning from the other end of the series, it is certain that the third of these Procurators, Cumanus, entered upon his office in the year 48,⁴ and the fourth, Felix, in the year 52.⁵ But how long Felix retained the government, and when his successor, Festus, arrived in Palestine, is never told us by Josephus, and we have no direct evidence with regard to the date, although it is of great importance as regards the course of the Apostolic history generally. Though we must accordingly find this chronological point by indirect combinations of all the circumstances available from other sources, it can nevertheless be inferred from other indications in Josephus himself that the date we are seeking is the year 60, and that Felix therefore retained his office longer than any of the other Procurators. In the first place, Josephus has much less of a various character to

¹ See also the corrected edition of the *Chronicon* in the *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* of Mai, tom. viii. pp. 374-79; and the new edition of the whole work edited by Schoene (Berlin: 1866).

² The war broke out 'in the second year of Florus,' acc. *Jos. Ant.* xx. 11. 1; comp. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4; now as the war did not begin in earnest until the summer and autumn of the year 66, we may fix 65 as his first year.

³ This we learn from the incidental but very minute narrative in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3. In the case of Albinus Eusebius wavers between 61 and 62, but

places the recall of Felix as early as the year 55.

⁴ 'In the eighth year of Claudius,' *Jos. Ant.* xx. 5. 2, comp. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 1.

⁵ According to *Jos. Ant.* xx. 7. 1, evidently a short time before Claudius had completed the twelfth year of his reign, which also accords sufficiently with the notes of time given in *Tac. Ann.* xii. 54, as we shall see below; the four years of Agrippa's reign over Chalcis, which are mentioned immediately afterwards in Josephus, bring us to the same time.

relate of Festus than of Felix;¹ whence we may infer generally that the latter filled his office much longer. In the next place we know, as regards details, that as soon as Festus came into Palestine the Judean citizens of Cæsarea obtained from him permission to accuse his predecessor Felix, and the heathen citizens to accuse their Judean fellow-citizens before Nero in Rome; and the heathen party attained their object by the assistance of Burrus,² who had still great influence at the Roman Court, and out of regard for Pallas, brother of Felix, who was formerly a favourite of the Emperor; both Burrus and Pallas, however, died in the year 62;³ moreover, the relation of the parties in Cæsarea which was brought about by the success of the heathen citizens over the Judeans, was still quite new at the commencement of the year 66.⁴ We know further⁵ that Festus subsequently permitted the Judeans to send a deputation to Nero in Rome to complain of an erection of Agrippa's in Jerusalem, which was displeasing to them, a matter in which they were successful owing to the favour of Poppæa Sabina, whom Nero had made his wife; now, as she was not raised to this position before the year 62,⁶ the event just named, during the procuratorship of Festus, and the last of which Josephus has to speak, must have taken place about the spring of 62, and we are by it not compelled to put the first year of Festus before 61, or at the earliest 60. In addition to these combinations we have from a wholly different quarter the fact that the rule of Felix is quite accidentally once spoken of as a long one, fully two years before it had come to an end;⁷ and the more purely incidental the agreement of this notice with the above-mentioned indications is, the more important is it as regards its value. But if the year in which Festus became Procurator is thus ascertained, we are able the more easily to fix the dates of the previous Governors between Cumanus and Pilate.

¹ Which is shown most strikingly *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 8—14. 1, but appears also from *Ant.* xx. 7. 1—8. 8, comp. with 8. 9—11.

² Acc. to Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8. 9.

³ Acc. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 51, 65, Cassius Dio, *Hist.* xii. 13 sq.

⁴ Acc. Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4 it might seem as if the heathen party in Cæsarea did not get their victory in Rome until shortly before 66; but the correct details are undoubtedly given by Josephus in his *Antiquities*. We have the less need therefore to go back beyond 61 or 62. It is quite true that the affair may have been

somewhat delayed in Rome by the sudden death of Burrus and of Pallas, and also of Festus.

⁵ From Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8. 11.

⁶ Acc. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 60; Cassius Dio, lxii. 13. When Josephus also speaks elsewhere (*Ant.* xx. 11. 1, *Vita*, § iii.) of Poppæa as the wife of Nero, it is in connection with events which did not occur until after her elevation to the position of the legal Imperial consort; and before this time she could not possibly be spoken of by this name.

⁷ In the open defence of Paul before Felix, Acts xxiv. 10, comp. with ver. 27.

If we now pursue our inquiries by the aid of the Acts of the Apostles as our other continuous authority, we shall do best to begin with it at the end. Much as we must regret the fact that the book was left unfinished, we must not forget that it nevertheless closes with the highly significant statement that after Paul had arrived in Rome he preached the Gospel two whole years *without hindrance*. This statement clearly implies that after those two whole years a great interruption occurred which prevented him from speaking further thus freely in Rome. But the only hindrance which we can suppose to be implied is either the great persecution of the Christians which broke out in Rome at the end of the summer of the year 64, or in any case something similar which befell Paul particularly in Rome, as will be considered further below. As now we know it was in the spring of some year that Paul arrived in Rome, we must accordingly suppose that the year was 62; and as he started from Cæsarea to Rome in the autumn of the year before, after the arrival of Festus in Cæsarea, we must conclude that Festus entered upon his procuratorship towards the autumn or in the summer of 61. We thus get by this entirely different way the same result which we obtained before, and may accordingly regard it as the more reliable. We are able further, by the assistance of the Acts of the Apostles, to carry our chronology back another two years—to the year 59; inasmuch as Luke relates from his own personal experience that Paul was thrown into prison in Cæsarea a few days after Pentecost, and remained there as a prisoner two whole years.¹ But from that point Luke's earlier notes of time become too disconnected to permit us to construct from them alone a wholly reliable chronology. Still, it follows with greatest probability from his indications that Paul despatched his Epistle to the Galatians in the year 56, as will be shown below, and that the great Council of Apostles, described in chapter xv., took place in the year 52.

On the other hand, Paul himself, in a passage of this Epistle to the Galatians, supplies us with two highly valuable notes of time. These are in themselves undoubtedly perfectly reliable, inasmuch as the Apostle is speaking when he supplies them with the greatest deliberation and the most careful recollection of his entire previous life; and they may be regarded as the

¹ Acc. Acts xxiv. 27 sq., comp. with xx. 16, xxi. 15. On the other hand, we have in Luke's narrative of the journey of Paul at that time from Philippi to Jerusalem for this Pentecost, Acts xx. 6 sq., too

few definite indications of the particular days to enable us to safely calculate from them on what day in that year Pentecost, and accordingly Easter, must have fallen, and to find in this way the year.

most important supplement to the notes of time in the Acts of the Apostles. The Apostle is reviewing the whole period of his previous Christian life in order to discover and to say whether and how frequently he has gone to Jerusalem to speak with one or more of the Apostles on certain points of Christianity, and he relates that this has happened only twice, namely, the first time three years after his conversion, and the second time after the lapse of fourteen years.¹ According to all the circumstances of the case this period of fourteen years must undoubtedly be understood to date from his conversion, and not from the three years before mentioned, a conclusion which is confirmed by proofs from various sides.² If the great consultation in Jerusalem, which Paul here mentions as having taken place fourteen years after his conversion, occurred in the year 52,³ he would be converted in the year 38, and his first journey to Jerusalem as a Christian would be in the year 41. These two notes of time become then of great importance with regard to many other questions; for instance, we learn from them in what year the stoning of Stephen occurred, and how long the early parent Church in Jerusalem existed undisturbed in its most primitive form.

The parallel dates of the officiating high priests would also have been of continuous importance in the chronology of our period if Josephus had always mentioned the whole series of them with the exact year and day of their succession, or if

¹ Gal. i. 18, ii. 1.

² First, Paul does not give any intelligible indication (Gal. ii. 1) that he intends the fourteen years to be reckoned from the end of the three years of i. 18, inasmuch as the *thereupon*, ii. 1, expresses no more than that what has to be related took place later than what had been previously related, i. 18, whilst the following words (*διὰ*) *through fourteen years*, i. e., after the lapse of fourteen years, leave the reader free to date this period from some great initial event previously fixed. But this first and supreme event from which Paul dates all the events of his Christian life has been so clearly indicated by him in this narrative from the beginning, i. 15, that we are consequently compelled to understand in both passages the words *thereupon three years afterwards*, i. 18, and *thereupon fourteen years afterwards*, ii. 1, as equally referring to it. It is only with reference to that year of his own conversion, which divided his whole life into two great halves, and which always retains such supreme significance in his eyes, that he counts and recounts everything in this

connection, as he looks upon everything in its light; indeed, even the first *ἐπειτα*, i. 18, must likewise be understood not to refer to the time of the things related, i. 17. Further, when thus understood, it becomes clear that he could omit to mention here the second journey to Jerusalem referred to Acts xi. 29, 30, without giving rise to any misunderstanding; it is true he omitted to mention it here because he had gone to Jerusalem on that journey by no means in order to consult one or more of the Apostles on Christian matters, the sole subject of which he is here speaking; but he would have given occasion for a misunderstanding by using simply the word *again*, ii. 1, if he had not in this case also proceeded solely from the thought of that great event, i. 15, and if his language throughout the context had not naturally borne this sense.

³ That the event Gal. ii. 1-10 is identical with that of Acts ch. xv. will be shown below. We shall see below also that the fourteen years of 2 Cor. xii. 2, on the other hand, are to be reckoned otherwise.

their history had played a great part in that of the nation generally. But after they were arbitrarily appointed and deposed by Herod the Great and his successors, their history had but little significance as regards the great course of events. Consequently, although Josephus mentions them all, it is only as if not to overlook them entirely, and without supplying more definite observations as to the time when each was in office. Nevertheless, in view of more doubtful questions should they arise in this connection as occasioned by the history of a high priest, it is of great importance to note that Josephus gives twenty-eight as the whole number of these high priests who were arbitrarily appointed from the year 37 B.C. to 70 A.D., the total number of their official years being, therefore, 107.¹ It is true Josephus nowhere names all these twenty-eight all together in one connected series, but he really means beyond doubt that if a high priest was appointed twice in succession to the office, he should not be counted twice.²

Meanwhile the use of *coins* becomes in our day gradually of greater value for the chronology of the period of forty years, as the number of those found gets larger every year; and we are already in a position to ascertain with their help many details belonging to these years.³

If we thus seek to trace most carefully the events with regard to their chronological succession also, we shall in this way likewise discover more and more certainly that, with all its defects, Luke's work is based upon reliable historical reminiscences, and was, without doubt, written by that author to whom early tradition ascribed it—a point on which we shall have to speak below at the proper place.

¹ *Ant.* xx. 10 *ad fin.*

² The succession of the twenty-eight is given below in the general view of the time.

³ With regard to the chief work, Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage* (London: 1861), comp. my review in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1864, pp. 1641 sq. In this edition, as compared with the former, I have made only, towards the end, a slight change of the above chronological arrangement, see the Chronological Sur-

vey at the end of the next volume. The only point which is not sufficiently certain is whether the Apostle Paul's liberation from Rome falls in the year 64 (as is supposed in this work) or 63. If the Acts of the Apostles closed with the year 63, the beginning of his second missionary journey would have to be placed in 51 and his conversion in 37.—On the other hand, Patricius (*in Marcum Comm.*, Rome, 1862, pp. 245 sq.) attempts to prove that Paul was imprisoned as early as 53 A.D.

THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS NEW AGE.

(FROM 33 TO 44 A.D.)

I. *The Christian Church.*

THE interval between that decisive event which tended to produce the mightiest movement and divided all human time into two great halves and the first check which succeeded it, is comparatively very short; some eleven years only elapse before its close. But it is a time of extreme commotion and full of mighty impulses to action, both in the ancient Community of Israel generally, as we shall see subsequently, and in the new Community, which was at the beginning apparently destroyed completely and very little noticed, and lay, like the germ of a future flower, hidden far away, most severely smitten down within the stem of the parent Community. But in this Community, afflicted thus extremely, either the higher life, which alone could be its true breath, had at once to wake up and make itself felt victoriously in the world and productively within, or it would have perished for ever, and the death of Christ would have proved the death also of his scattered Community. Consequently these few days, weeks, and years are for the young Church, which is only just publicly appearing in the world, a time of the mightiest inward commotion and activity. This young noblest life, having been just placed in the world in a humble and despised form, puts forth the more its energies just when it is threatened from without with destruction, and its first violent struggle for life is spasmodic and convulsive. We find that, though it is oppressed and bowed down beyond measure, and in itself apparently most weak and fragile, it is, nevertheless, strong and invincible, and becomes the more victorious in proportion as it is oppressed. In this it becomes at the same time a bright example for all coming times. In this first brief interval those three fundamental tendencies which determine, as we have seen,¹ the higher life of this whole period of forty years are in active operation: believing self-possession and calm self-culture amid the storms of this world; the endeavour, by breaking down the immediate limitations of the Community, to receive the believing heathen directly into it, and the firm hope in the Divine completion of the work which was being accomplished by

¹ *Ante* pp. 12 sq.

Christianity. All these tendencies had necessarily now to make themselves felt; and the most characteristic and important significance of this first brief interval is that they all actually operate powerfully thus early.

When compared with the great importance of this first stage of the development of the entire period, we might perhaps lament that only a few of the most general and striking reminiscences of it have been preserved, and that the largest number of somewhat more lengthy narratives connected with it have come down to us through no earlier authority than Luke. But this entire stage of development, although it contained within it infinite issues, and was decisive for all future time, was, in spite of its intense internal commotion, too weak as regards the outward world, and was necessitated with too great effort to work its way from the lowest depth to allow more than the reminiscence of its mightiest movements and convulsions to be preserved for later times. Not until the end of this primary and most difficult stage of development did the entire movement enter irresistibly into the history of the great world. Accordingly only the Church herself preserved within the sanctity of her own bosom a vivid recollection both of the few and more violent and agitating movements of her own second birth—in other words, of the commencement of her existence without the bodily presence of her Lord in her midst, and also of the painfully blissful pangs in which she had first to learn with difficulty thus to exist. Mighty as the agitating convulsions and pangs of this her second birth might be, and deeply as the memory of them must have been impressed upon her, no less great and exalted are the few narratives about them which have been preserved; and the true task before us is to properly understand them, so that notwithstanding all that is eternally true in them, we neither retain anything belonging to them that is baseless and confused, nor permit ourselves to be led into new errors by the very sublimity of the matters of which they treat.

1. *The Resurrection of the Crucified Lord and the Resurrection of His Church.*

It is impossible that a young Community, just in the midst of the first movements of its life, should be more unexpectedly and rapidly, or more profoundly and seriously laid low, or, indeed, according to all human appearance, destroyed in a worse manner than was the case with the young Christian

Church in consequence of the condemnation and crucifixion, the death and burial of Christ. It had been formed only a short time before, and having been referred by its very foundation absolutely to the celestial heights of all thought, effort, and action, it was in the actual world of history still but like an exotic plant without any deep roots and firm supports. Though Christ had chosen the Twelve as a few firmer foundation-stones of his house on the earth, and though he had accustomed them, during his brief stay, to labour with some independence, they had, nevertheless, hitherto looked alone to him as their visible leader. Moreover if they really deemed their Lord to be the promised and longed-for Messiah, they would naturally suppose that he could not vanish from the visible world, inasmuch as the Messianic hope could only and actually did think of him as abiding for ever when he had once appeared.¹ And though he had during his life-time called their attention to the possibility, and indeed the certainty, of his temporal defeat, that must have always seemed to them inconceivable, as the Gospels also still plainly state.² And now came this most shameful death at the instigation of the venerable national magistracy itself, confirmed and deliberately carried out by the dreadful supreme power of the world; and this, moreover, all at once, suddenly, and stupefying by the surprise it occasioned!

Consequently, according to all the reminiscences, even the Twelve, although far from following the example of the one traitor of their number, without doubt, remained on the Friday of the crucifixion and on the following Easter Sabbath, as if paralysed by amazement and terror, and lost in the deepest helplessness and sorrow. They had, moreover, as the most intimate disciples of Christ, the most to fear from the fury of persecution and suspicion; and the Sabbath, on which the first Easter day fell that year, of itself brought greater calm. The Gospel narratives are silent with regard to the Twelve during those two dark days; but this silence is eloquent; and it is plainly significant that, according to the earlier narrative, of the immediate circle of his friends it is only the women who

¹ As the great prophets could similarly never think of him as dying, though as possibly suffering, see vol. vi. p. 381. It is the Fourth Book of Ezra [2 Esdras] vii. 27-29, that first speaks of a dying Messiah. Although this book was not written by a Christian, for it is only the ancient Latin translation which in this passage adds *Jesus*, and the ancient Syriac trans-

lation (in Cerani's *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, tom. i. p. 107) manifestly alters the 400 years of his life into 30, after Luke, still this notion of a dying Messiah could just as little arise amongst the Judeans before the post-Christian age as that of a false Messiah, vol. vi. p. 121.

² See vol. vi. pp. 352 sq.

trouble themselves to perform the affectionate office of his burial,¹ and according to the Fourth Gospel, only John who considers it his special duty to stand not far from the cross.²

But nevertheless he had surely promised to his disciples, and the more plainly and certainly as his end came more inevitably near, that he himself would exist in a new form in power and glory for them and for all the world; and the great separation³ between that part of the ancient Messianic expectations which he had to carry out in the brief period preceding his death, and that part of them which he had to leave to the unknown future after that period and to the will of his Father alone, had no sooner become more distinct to the spiritual eye than he endeavoured, with great distinctness and repose, immediately to make it perceptible to his followers. It was in this connection only a small thing that he taught with such unsurpassable truth, that as the grain of seed must first return into the cold, dark earth before it can produce the desired fruit in its season, so the Son of Man must die before his Divine work on the earth could grow up in full purity and strength, and yield its true eternal fruit.⁴ Neither was it enough that he foresaw and plainly declared that the Holy Spirit itself would come upon his disciples in full power and certainty from above only after he himself had been taken bodily from them, and when the last outward support had been torn from them upon which they could place a false reliance. This prophecy, true as it was in itself, and attested as it was subsequently by the event, and as John further works it out in accordance with his own trustworthily reminiscences of his beloved Master, and with the rich experience he had already enjoyed,⁵ would have been insufficient to fully represent the

¹ As regards the more definite meaning of this fact, which is now related quite plainly only Mark xv. 47, xvi. 1, but far less distinctly in part by Luke xxiii. 55-xxiv. 1, and still less so by Matt. xxvii. 61, we can speak better subsequently.

² This is stated by John himself, xix. 26, so incidentally that it might be overlooked, and with such modesty that we cannot help seeing in it another genuine trait of the peculiar character of this Apostle; comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 170, 182. Neither does John deny the great 'fear of the Jews' which had taken possession of the disciples, xx. 19.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 410 sq.

⁴ John xii. 24.

⁵ John xiv. 14-18, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7-15. The simple meaning of all these truths

as thus expanded, is already expressed by the brief utterance of the Collected Sayings, Matt. x. 19, 20; Luke xii. 11, 12. But in John's case all the kindred truths are brought afresh into the most vivid relation to each other, and the Apostle at the end of his long life commits to writing whatever of Christ's discourses and thoughts had become a part of himself, after they had been endlessly repeated in his own mind and transformed as into a new higher life by the enthusiasm of his own soul, and the fire of his own experience. Consequently, in his Gospel everything shines in a twofold light of unsurpassed glory; and amongst other things we have most beautifully brought to light the way in which the spiritual return of Christ Himself to those that love Him and keep His commandments, is related

great truth itself which was in this case exemplified. On the one hand, the long-desired work of the Messiah far transcended, as something absolutely Divine and necessary, the limits of the perishable life of an individual, and was, by its Divine and necessary nature, one indivisible whole. On the other hand, it was shown with no less Divine certainty that the Messiah, in the form in which his coming and work was alone possible, must leave this earthly body before he had actually carried out the highest and ultimate meaning of the Messianic hope. The consequence of these two necessities was that the Messiah clearly foresaw, and proclaimed aloud, that this Son of Man, whom his enemies desired to slay, and undoubtedly would slay, would no less certainly return, but then would not reappear as now in earthly humiliation, but in that infinite exaltation and glory which can bring the purely Divine continuation and completion of the Messianic work, and which can reside in anything that is purely spiritual. The truth and the necessity of all those Messianic hopes which the Messiah in the flesh could not accomplish in his fleeting life-time and his perishable frame, was not affected by his mortal lot, if their fulfilment had once been commenced in the irrefragably true manner. One sole and indissoluble thread connected in this case all that had been once desired, all that was now accomplished, and all that had yet to be expected; but he, whose entire spirit, life, and being were, as no one else's, identified with that truth and necessity, himself saw and knew clearly that, in spite of all human obstructions and interruptions, no real breaking-off of this thread was now possible; and he saw clearly that he whom his enemies now despised would soon perceptibly return in an entirely different manner to his followers and also to the whole world. But as every profound conception and intrinsically necessary truth of this kind naturally attached itself to a corresponding symbol from the Old Testament, so in this case the small Book of Jonah, with its unattractive and yet profoundly suggestive story, supplied the needed figure. As Jonah, though swallowed by the whale, and, according to the opinion of the world, for ever lost in the horrible abyss of the sea, nevertheless returned at the command of God after three days and nights, and then laboured in the world with far greater effect than before, and necessarily appeared to the people of Nineveh as a twofold miracle; in like manner would he, although outwardly destroyed, soon

to the functions of the *other* spiritual was just this which had not been explained
 Paraclete, namely, the Holy Spirit. It in the earlier Gospels.

reappear, and then in this wholly new form manifest himself as a miracle which none might again ignore and reject. Without doubt Jesus had, on one occasion, spoken thus to his disciples, and this strange figure particularly had evidently remained most vividly in their memory.¹ And when on one of the last occasions he left the Temple, having been misunderstood, and, indeed, already most insidiously watched and devoted secretly by the authorities to death, he broke out in the utterance, 'Henceforth ye shall not see me again until (though then, alas! by compulsion and most likely too late) ye join in the (Christian) triumphal song to him that cometh in the name of the Lord (i.e., as the acknowledged Messiah)!' ² Such concise utterances were in this case most appropriate, and made the deepest impression; and nothing can be historically more certain than that Christ actually considered and expounded the immediate and greatest question of the future in very various ways.

Nevertheless such prophetic conceptions and predictions, however correct and necessary they might be, and though confirmed by the great result, could in no case be of more than a very general nature, being confined to a declaration and prediction of the pure intrinsic truth of the matter. They could not and did not seek to anticipate the actual course of history as it subsequently unfolded itself in all its stern and tremendous reality. They concern most directly and chiefly the great life-work of Christ, give most perfect expression to its truth, and, by the glimmer of the only true and genuine light which could in this case avail, broke through that terrible darkness which then hung over the whole Christian cause. And as having

¹ It can be inferred even from the prominence given to it in the Collected Sayings (comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 284 sq., 331) that this utterance subsequently appeared of very great importance to the Apostles. Its meaning cannot be doubtful: Christ is already in himself a miracle, by the humble way in which he acts and founds the Kingdom of God, a greater miracle than all those which the ignorance of men requires of him; if nevertheless such miracles are still required of him, he can only say that this generation will undoubtedly behold a still greater miracle, namely, his return in his glory after his rejection and death, just as Jonah returned from the depths of the sea, and thus appeared as a miracle to the people of Nineveh; but if the latter repented at the preaching of Jonah, his contemporaries are only so much the more guilty, inas-

much as they ought immediately to repent (for the true miracles are really given by the presence of the true Messiah), and yet they refuse to do so. The original form of the utterance is therefore most fully retained Luke xi. 29, 30, from which the saying Matt. xvi. 4, and still more Mark viii. 12, is abbreviated; the more definite allusion to the grave of Christ, as corresponding to the jaws of the sea-monster in the case of Jonah, and the length of Christ's confinement in it, disturbs the connection at all events in which it is now found Matt. xii. 39, 40, but without doubt did not originate in the more definite shape which the saying received by frequent repetition in the Apostolic times (see below).

² Luke xiii. 35, Matt. xxiii. 39. Comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 406.

flashed from the eye of the Divine faith of Christ in the indestructible nature of his work, they serve, as soon as their intrinsic truth had begun to be confirmed by outward experience, most wonderfully to feed and sustain the same light of faith in the disciples when they recalled them to memory, as we shall see below more at length. They also form a necessary element in the general progress of this unique history, and in its movements of primitive spiritual force. Indeed, they undoubtedly are the most appropriate on the one hand, and on the other the most daring that a true prophet could ever utter, so that we must perceive in them also the absolute exaltation of Christ. But this history itself shows plainly enough how little its special features and particular events were foretold by them; ¹ it is shown, for instance, by the completely bewildered helplessness and despair which seized the disciples from the moment of their Master's death, and by the exceedingly great difficulty of believing in his resurrection which was then exhibited. Moreover, it is John particularly, with his habitual simple honesty, who states quite briefly that the disciples had not known the Divine appointment that their Master would rise again; ² and the same fact is implied elsewhere in the Gospel narratives.³ But just as dismay had at this time seized upon them all with such force, so these prophetic hints of their Master which they had previously often heard but not sufficiently understood, had certainly all but vanished from their minds in those dark hours, and they found no calm moment for recalling them vividly to their recollection.

¹ Which would certainly have been the case if the expression, Matt. xii. 40, above referred to, regarding the necessity of the Messiah being 'three days and three nights in the heart of the earth,' had subsequently been literally fulfilled; or if instead of that the third day had been only quite generally mentioned, as undoubtedly now becomes more frequently the case in the passages Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23, xx. 19 (similarly in Mark and Luke). But in the last-named passages we have beyond doubt in all cases only the more definite form which the actual prophecy assumed quite early in the Apostolic circle. The special proof of this is found in the relation of these words to those of Matt. xii. 39, 40, above explained, which originally corresponded with them; since we cannot doubt that Christ originally spoke as we still see partly from Matt. xii. 39 and partly from Matt. xii. 40. In that case, however, the three days and three nights have been taken from Jonah ii. 1 [A.V. i. 17], but their signification, on

account of the use of a round number, could be understood with as much indefiniteness as in the similar passage, Hos. vi. 2. With regard to the meaning of these three days and three nights, see further below.

² John xx. 9. When it is said in this passage that they had not as yet known *the Scripture* that Christ *must* rise again, the Divine appointment itself is only meant thereby, in accordance with John's habitual view, as appears from other passages of his Gospel; but in this case the phrase bears, it must be allowed, its primary meaning; and below we shall see what passages of the Scripture are intended.

³ E.g. in the constant form of the narrative, that Christ first showed to his disciples from *the Scriptures*, after his resurrection, the necessity of his suffering, his death, and his resurrection, Luke xxiv. 25 seq., comp. with 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

Yet in reality it was impossible that even in these most terrible hours the remembrance of that Master, who, in his life, so distinctly and in such an unparalleled way approved himself as the Son of God, should perish. He had revealed himself, at all events, to the minds of some of the Twelve, as he lived with them, in such a way that they could not forget him. The image of his life as he had lived before them a short time ago in his full greatness and glory, might for the moment be withdrawn by this strange and unexpected calamity into the farthest chambers of their hearts; but there it necessarily remained the more indelibly. When the image of such a life that has once commanded the spirit of a man has been for a moment lost sight of through overwhelming impressions, it often recovers more than its former power as soon as the favourable influence of some fresh perception or deeper reflection removes the pressure of calamity; and such might be the experience in this highest instance. For in that mighty spiritual struggle of that time regarding all Divine-human life, everything had been intensified to the highest degree; and in this case a greater multitude of mightiest hidden energies and motives were concentrated than had ever before been brought together in human history.

If we ask more particularly wherein the disciples were wanting in this darkest hour which had so suddenly overtaken them, we find that it was strictly two things, and these two things were really those in which we later Christians have often been lacking, although our circumstances are infinitely less difficult than theirs in their terrible trial. The new kingdom of the perfect true religion had now been founded by Christ's appearance, most immediately and firmly for this inner circle of the Twelve; none of its fundamental truths was still wanting, and the secure erection in which these Twelve were intended to carry on their work and bring the salvation of the race, was already in existence notwithstanding its humble appearance. But the Twelve lacked Christ himself, who had only just before guided them with his whole spirit, and when he was visibly near to them. They could not comprehend his death, just because they sought to believe in him as the true Messiah; and they regarded his work as completely stopped, because they no longer saw him engaged in it, but, on the contrary, saw him made the ridicule of the world. They lacked, therefore, the faith that their slain Lord nevertheless lived, and, although taken from their sight, was always near to them with his mind and spirit, his will and his power. But they thereby only lacked what even Christians of to-day, after

all their infinitely more convincing experiences, so often lack—namely, that absolute Divine faith in true immortality and in the living Christ, who, in spite of his physical death, may be to us none the less near and eternal, a faith which can overcome all the terrors of death. They lacked, however, further in this sudden bereavement the courage to labour in the world purely on their own responsibility as servants of the work of Christ. For though they had previously been trained to labour for Christ's work independently of his immediate presence,¹ they had nevertheless always been guided therein by his direct instructions, and could always resort to his superior insight and power of action. But now they were obliged either to completely abandon the work of Christ on the earth, or to maintain and continue it without his visible presence and help, and, indeed, instead of him, in the midst of a world that had now become mortally hostile. To do this, they required a courage such as they had never possessed even under the eyes of Christ, and which they completely lacked in these most terrible days. However, in this respect again, they only lacked what is so often wanting in Christians of to-day, even amid incomparably lighter perils from the world. And if in the long line of the subsequent centuries not infrequently a period has recurred when Christ's Church on earth, though not himself, has appeared to be dead and buried, in those dark days when he himself appeared to all the world to be for ever slain, his Church also was sunk with him as into the deepest grave, and seemed to be destroyed beyond recovery before it had formed in the world as much as an independent existence apart from his visible presence.

However, it is the prerogative of immortal works that they victoriously maintain themselves against the determination and expectation of the whole world, and their intrinsic power overcomes all hostile opposition the more irresistibly in proportion as they are hindered and assailed; indeed, in the midst of the straits into which they are brought they become the more productive in resources in proportion as in such moments something is lacking to assure their proper existence. It is as if the Divine spiritual power of such a work, which is as little to be laid hold of by the force of oppression as by the force of despair, must somehow irresistibly find its escape precisely where it is most hopelessly shut in, and as if it then evinced its hidden energies at the call of some most insignificant outward occasion which may be presented to it but accidentally

¹ Vol. vi. pp. 324 sq.

in the course of its special history. The smallest thing becomes then through the spiritual power of such a work an instrument in effecting the greatest result, the weakest of the phenomena of sense becomes the vehicle of most irresistible power, and the most insignificant things the most luminous symbols of glorified truth. And thus this power becomes the author of perfectly new energies in the life of the human spirit, inasmuch as in this conflict with opposition or despair it sheds its power and truth luminously upon the weakest things which are presented to it in the fervid enthusiasm of such an unusual history, making truths manifest which, though before inwardly supplied, had nevertheless been outwardly wanting. This we see most clearly in this highest instance itself. We have here the mightiest truth that could ever seize hold of men already inwardly supplied but outwardly utterly defeated, and it must break forth against the opposition of the world as well as against the fear and despair of its own friends in such a way that it can produce perfect Christians without the visible Christ, and thereby create a wholly new race of men upon the earth. The history now of itself rises to the purest elevation of the work of Christ, even without his life in the flesh. The first miracle now takes place which no longer proceeds from his mortal hand, or from an evanescent breath of his speech, and which yet had never been possible if the thousand miracles of his previous audible speech and his mortal hand had not preceded, and his work had not already been imperishably established in the world. This first miracle had necessarily to be the most powerful of its kind, inasmuch as it was nothing less than the creation of his Church in a form in which it could carry on his work in the world without his visible presence. This new marvellous creation of the Community of the perfected true religion, with Christ alone as its head, but only as its invisible and immortal head, was very quickly accomplished.

But we must be particularly careful not to overlook the fact that we are not in this case dealing with new truths and spiritual powers which had to be primarily received and put into operation by individuals only; these were truths and powers of a kind which could seize upon and guide an entire Community, or (as we may also say) an entire Christian people. And as religion is the more destined to be the possession of the whole of a nation in proportion to its truth, so every truth in proportion to its sublimity must in its own sphere first be brought near to the people by the overwhelming force of the events of its own history, and in proportion to the difficulty

with which the impelling forces of a truth become operative in a people's mind, the more necessary is it that they should arise in its midst by the aid of such overpowering experiences. In all such cases the truth is close at hand in secrecy, as if impatiently waiting for the moment of its full birth; and the corresponding energy of deed which it commands can forthwith impel the people to action when it has only once been aroused. Let there but occur some event capable of electrifying this prepared soil, and the truth already hidden beneath it flashes luminously forth, and its slumbering energies are suddenly aroused. Then from that moment the general truth connects itself with this particular experience, and is represented by it, and indeed, appears to exist simply through it; and yet it is nevertheless an eternal, universal truth which can never be lost again. Now, as all this was illustrated by the highest moments of Israel's whole history, and as in Israel religion generally assumed constantly a truer and more perfect form, simply from the fact that it was always at the same time the religion of the nation, and was connected inseparably with its entire national life, so we find this exemplified again very specially in the case before us. It is the greatest excellence of the religion of the Bible that, although it is the true and finally the perfect religion, it was nevertheless from first to last unfolded only in the heart and the general necessities and joys of the earthly life of a whole nation, whereby alone it became qualified to pass through all its most difficult stages of development and to become the religion of the entire human race. But if in our day we perceive and laud these excellences, we may not, with base ingratitude, ignore the conditions under which it was alone possible for it to establish its existence.

But by whatever experience, and in whatever temporal form, an eternal truth of religion may be first presented to an individual or to an entire nation, it is just and necessary that it should be retained in that form with a simple believing mind; and the more simple this faith is, the better does it serve this purpose, particularly at a time when the truth without such a faith would not become the possession of either the individual or the race. Thus when the great and wise of the age had rejected and, as they supposed, destroyed Christianity, it found in the simple hearts and honest faith of such members of the ancient nation its immediate refuge and its new enthusiastic beginning. These simple believers possessed more than any other that which is the most necessary quality of every nation, and which ought to have been in the people of God

from the very first the chief thing, namely, purity of purpose, receptivity of belief, and sincerity of action. If in point of school learning they were behind the wise men of the time, they were on the other hand, in consequence of the ancient culture of Israel and the recent enthusiasm which had been already kindled by the terrestrial Christ, animated by a simple uprightness, a faithfulness and power of self-sacrifice which was too often wanting in the case of the Biblical scholars. The highest Divine things must always find their firmest basis in deepest human elements; and as in Christ himself,¹ many of the profoundest and most solid elements that lay latent in Israel were concentrated, so now once more both the purest and the most unfailing and mightiest energies that could lie in the spirit of the ancient nation were soon incorporated in the immovable faith, and then in the corresponding wonderful action of his disciples as the pillars of the new Community; and once more the most wonderful heroes proceed from the deepest base of the ancient nation, assuming quite other forms than the ancient heroes of Israel, and yet not at all inferior to them in power to move the world. As once in early times not Moses alone, but also his great immediate successors, had arisen in the deepest distress of Israel in Egypt, and as similarly David and his heroes had arisen in the great national misery of their time, so now we see once more an heroic Israel arising as from the most mysterious depths. But if it required the fifty years of the deepest Babylonian distress to enable a new Jerusalem to arise from the ruins of the first, now it needed scarcely so many days for not only Christ himself, but also his Community, to rise from his grave; for it is here in connection with Christ's life and death that the mightiest power of the entire history of Israel, no less than of the third and last great epoch of it, first attains its full height.

However, the development of this new and highest life of the race after Christ likewise passed through its proper and necessary stages, and after it had received its first impulse only gradually attained to its full and inexhaustible strength. Of these stages we must here distinguish three, as the reminiscences of themselves indicate if we collect them all, and properly understand them. And in closely considering these various reminiscences, we must never forget that the days and hours themselves, in which they originated, were the most intensely active, and the highest that a society formed by the same ideas and motives can very well pass through, and that,

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 129-34.

therefore, all these reminiscences can give us only an inadequate representation of the incomparable excitement and elevation of those days and hours, however faithful and vivid the accounts of them may be. If every birth is difficult, most of all must the birth of a Community such as the world had never seen before be so, a Community which was called upon always to follow alone the living voice of that Master who had nevertheless outwardly left it without leaving behind him so much as a few written words, and which was called upon to contend against the whole world, when it followed in the midst of its utter helplessness solely the voice of this Lord and King whom the world supposed it had annihilated. If a new life was to arise from the collision of these extreme contrasts, it could do so only amid the convulsions of profound agitation and highest enthusiasm; and yet even these tremendous movements had to be purely spiritual, inasmuch as really everything depended in the first instance on the new spirit of the disciples which was indispensable. Such movements of a purely spiritual nature at their origin arise as when a flash of lightning darts through and enkindles a wide dry field, which has been waiting for the kindling fire; we are able in such a case to perceive no more than the effects, or at most the preparations; and they who are affected themselves can only speak of that which they suppose has seized upon them. So that on this account also all the subsequent reminiscences of these days and hours of the birth of the Church of Christ, and the narratives about it, fall far short of the reality, and it is now difficult for us to construct from them a perfectly adequate picture of such mighty movements of the Spirit. Still, this must not keep us from tracing as closely as possible everything that can be historically ascertained.

The Narratives of the Resurrection.

The Divine in its purest and highest manifestation, as far as this is possible in a divine sense, can dawn upon man: in that which is outwardly most insignificant the highest things can appear. This had just been proved, as far as it can be proved to men, by the appearing of Christ himself; but it is now proved afresh, though in an entirely new way, immediately after the outward decease of the Immortal One, as by a mighty re-vibration of the movement which had been started by him, this re-vibration again being itself really only the proper beginning of a higher effect of the original appearance of Christ, which was soon intensified in the highest degree.

We already know how well prepared the sphere was for this re-vibration, whenever it should be possible, like a flash of lightning falling upon hot dry ground; but the smallest occasion would in the excessively sultry time of these few hours call forth a flash of this kind.

Nothing is better established historically than that Christ having risen from the dead reappeared to his disciples, and that this renewed sight of him was the beginning of their new higher faith, and of all their Christian work. But it is no less certain that they saw him again, not as an ordinary human being, or as a shade or ghost rising from the grave after the manner of legends of that kind, but as the only Son of God, as a being already of an absolutely superior and superhuman nature, and that when they subsequently recalled his appearance they could not think otherwise than that everyone who had been permitted to see him again perceived also immediately his unique Divine dignity and ever after believed in it absolutely.¹ The Twelve and others had, however, during his life come to perceive that he was the true King and Son of God. The difference is simply that they now remembered that they had also known him according to his purely Divine side, and accordingly as the conqueror of death. There is, therefore, really an intimate connection between that ordinary sight of the terrestrial Christ, by which he had been so well known to them, and the higher entranced view of the celestial Christ with its profound excitement, so that in these days and weeks following his death they would never have beheld him as the celestial Messiah if they had not previously known him as the terrestrial one.

This deeper connection between the two kinds of sight cannot be too carefully considered, inasmuch as it is obviously in this case particularly of essential moment. This fresh sight of Christ during those first few days of the founding of his Church without his bodily presence, is undoubtedly, according to the entire New Testament, something wholly different from that re-appearance of him at the end of the world for judgment before all his enemies also and against their will, of which we shall have to speak below. During these first days after his death his enemies and the guilty were so far from seeing him that we may on the contrary say that only those

¹ From this fact also we may clearly see how erroneous it is to deny, with some recent scholars, that the idea of the celestial Messiah had been firmly received long

before Christ's coming; this has been previously shown at length, vol. vi. pp. 107 sq.

who had beheld him truly in his terrestrial form now saw him again in his celestial form. The whole of the Gospel narratives, however much they differ in other respects, alike presuppose this;¹ and the brief references to the matter contained in some expressions of the Apostle Paul² do not contradict it. Only in the case of this Apostle it might be doubted whether he had once seen the terrestrial Christ, whom he subsequently beheld in his celestial form so as to be thereby transformed in a moment from being a persecutor into a still more ardent servant. For Paul himself maintains so definitely, and it is in itself so reasonable (as we shall see below), that this vision of Christ which was experienced by Paul, though the last of its kind and considerably later, was substantially of the same kind as that experienced by others, that we have not the smallest reason for denying it. But inasmuch as we possess no express evidence that Paul ever actually, even as an indifferent spectator, saw Christ face to face, in his humble earthly form, his case appears to show that Christ could in this opening period appear to such also as had never seen him, and could form no idea of his physical countenance. If it was, however, thus, Paul's case would only make an exception precisely as a delayed and final one, and could not disprove the great general truth. But it will be shown below that, according to all probability, it really did not form an exception.

If, therefore, Christ now appeared only to his disciples, or in any case only to those who had beheld him in his earthly form, as still the same to look upon in his celestial form, and yet, at the same time, as changed, there must surely have been some overpowering influence which compelled them to see the being whose death they had only just felt to be so incomprehensible as risen from the dead again. But we perceive in this case, the deeper connection of such a possibility, and we know from what has already been said that, really, in such a view of him, nothing occurred which had not necessarily to follow at some time, in some way from the inner necessity of the case. And if we seek to discern the special circumstances of the fact, accord-

¹ It is said most briefly by Luke, Acts i. 2 sq. x. 41 also; but John likewise declares it most beautifully in all his ways of presenting it, ch. xx., xxi., comp. with xiv. 21-24.

² 1 Cor. xv. 5-8; with regard to the 500 brethren, see below. When Paul in this passage, ver. 8, on mentioning the highest favour that a man can experience and that which he experienced, describes himself as τὸ ἔκτρομα, *the abortion*, we must

understand the expression in its strongest sense, according to which it denotes that which is utterly to be repudiated, and to be hidden rather from human sight, as Paul himself explains it, ver. 9; the expression implies neither a reference to time nor to want of form (Iren. *Hær.* i. 4. 1). This expression is explained here more correctly than in my *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus* (1857).

ing to the historical indications, we must above all things remember that, to produce that faith in Christ's resurrection, as it now necessarily at once arose from the higher causes above indicated, not merely one, but several lower and more physical causes co-operated.

If the majority of the disciples were, even on the day of his crucifixion, sadly paralysed by fear and terror, and if on it their dispersion and flight as far as Galilee had already commenced, still some individuals of their number undoubtedly remained close at hand, although overpowered by such dismay that they could not so much as think of burying his body as a duty devolving upon them. In those circumstances two other friends of position in Jerusalem had laid it in a rock-tomb near at hand, where it could temporarily rest without disturbance.¹ This took place towards the evening preceding the Sabbath, when time was pressing; and the two men could not have the intention of appropriating the body as their possession against the claims of others, or even of leaving it permanently in this rock-tomb, unless the owner of it should subsequently give his consent. There were others who had from every point of view a much nearer claim to this precious body, and who could not be finally prevented by the profoundest sorrow and the most forlorn situation from discharging their duty with regard to it.² They might, in the paralysis of dismay, suffer that to be done in that helpless situation and hurried time which they could not prevent, and indeed be in their hearts grateful to the two members of the Sanhedrin who were otherwise undoubtedly but little known to them, for their loving services; but as soon as they had once more recovered only a little courage, they would necessarily go in search of the body, and indeed propose to take it with them to another grave, probably in Galilee. The Sabbath, this year falling on the same day as the first great day of the feast, of itself hindered their actions for a whole day, particularly as they could be quite at ease with regard to the temporary interment.

But what must they do on this evening before the Passover and on the following first Easter day? Should they in their present mood and situation keep the feast with the Judeans, they who had been already excommunicated by the latter?³ Undoubtedly their immense grief found alleviation only in the eager search for their Lord, who had so suddenly been taken

¹ See vol. vi. p. 417.

² As after the execution of the Baptist his disciples discharged theirs, Mark vi. 29.

³ See vol. vi. p. 345.

from them, in the incessant cry for him, and in the most fervent prayer for his reappearance and his help; and this agony and conflict of their disconsolate hearts was greater than we can form any conception of, although it may not be definitely spoken of in our present Gospels.¹ If they had seen in him merely an ordinary man, such an agonising search would have been not less foolish than useless; but we know they had long ago recognised in him the true celestial Messiah and the Son of God, and they knew that he had also promised not to forsake them after his violent end; consequently they were able now to fervently pray with the hope of finding him again in that form only, to call after him in that form only, with the deepest agony of faith, and to entreat at least a sign of his victorious divine power, such as might be expected from the Celestial One that lived before their spiritual sight. At least the divine fruit of things of such a divine character, which the pure spirit seeks to attain by the profoundest exertion of all its energies, can be presented to it: and we know, and shall see below still more, of what hitherto unknown potency Christian prayer became. If, therefore, the Invisible Himself in former days became visible to the prophets and saints of the Old Testament in the fervour of their devotion, and their eye, in the rapture, even with greatest vividness, beheld all things that were at other times beyond mortal ken, how can we maintain that to the agonising prayer of these disciples, that Being whose terrestrial image had just before shone so clearly before them could never appear and come before their longing eyes with irresistible power?

It was, moreover, an ancient and quite natural belief, that the spirit on its separation from the body still moved for a time as between heaven and earth before it entered completely into its rest; that the immortal counterpart of the body could therefore more easily appear during this period.² And it is impossible not to see that this belief plays its part in a suitably exalted manner in the case of these appearances of Christ.³

We cannot maintain that all this was the means of giving

¹ But we can quite plainly discern all this in such utterances as John xiii. 33, xiv. 19-21, xvi. 13-16, 20; and we must connect with this what is said of others, namely, that they would some day seek for him in vain with tears and entreaties, Luke xvii. 22.

² It is by no means an empty phrase, as it might appear to us in these days, when Peter's friends, after they had sup-

posed he had just been put to death, assert that they see his angel only, Acts xii. 14, 15. That belief is found elsewhere also; and the Fourth Book of Ezra vii. 68 sq., 77, 78 (according to the chapters and verses in my *restoration* of this book, Göttingen, 1863) seeks to reduce this mysterious phenomenon to a law.

³ As may be seen from John xx. 17; the passage is explained below.

rise to the belief in Christ's resurrection; but it might be facilitated thereby, and made so natural that even the slightest impulse from another quarter could quickly call it into full existence. It usually happens that the most various causes combine at one moment to produce something new that has been long about to come in accordance with higher necessities. This other occasion had in this case been supplied by the nature of the preliminary interment above referred to; and the historical reminiscences are, as regards this aspect of the matter, too definite to permit us to remain in doubt on the point. As many of the disciples as had remained in Jerusalem¹ had wholly forgotten, during these first hours, what was due from them to the body; but these last services could not be wholly forgotten and finally left unperformed by all those who had been his nearest friends.

We see, therefore, that the women, who are everywhere the last to forget in such trying circumstances the immediate ministries of love—as many of them as had been the most faithful to Christ,² did not neglect their duties even at this terrible time. Before the Friday had gone, two of these Galilean women took careful note towards evening of the place where he was buried; and, though the immediate arrival of the Sabbath prevented them for some twenty-four hours from doing anything further for him, the very next evening they, nevertheless, purchased spices that they might go to the garden early on the Sunday, and on their part also show to the dear body every mark of affection in their power.³ It would be quite natural

¹ On this point also see below.

² According to the original narrative, Mark xv. 40, 41, xvi. 1. there were four of them [comp. vol. vi. 305, 442]; but only Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses noted particularly the place, whilst on the Saturday evening the mother of Joses did not take part in buying the spices. The account, Matt. xxvii. 55, 56, 61, xxviii. 1, has already become less clear through the confusion of the two Marys and making them into one.

³ Luke xxiii. 55—x iv. 1 abridges everything at this point, according to his custom, and consequently transfers less suitably the purchase of the spices to the first evening. But in Matt. xviii. 1 the purchase itself of these spices has been wholly omitted after the words *ὄψε δὲ σαββάτων. τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*, and the acts of the women on the Saturday evening and on the Sunday early are crowded together. That is, the above

clause *on the evening of the Sabbath, on that (evening ἑσπέρα) which grew light*, from the lights which were kindled after sunset, *in view of the Sunday*, can only be equivalent to Mark's more idiomatic Greek, xvi. 1, *διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου*; comp. *לְרִישׁ הָעֶרְבַּיִם* the evening light for, or preceding . . . Mishna, *Pesachim* i. 1. 3, and the Syriac *ܝܘܡܝܢ* which is frequently used in descriptions of time of this kind; and *σαββάτου ἐπέφωσκε*, Luke xxiii. 54, also must be thus understood, comp. *Evang. Nicod.* apud Thilo, p. 600, so that we suppose that Luke still found this reading in his Mark.—Eusebius (in his *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, ed. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vi. [Rom. 1847] pp. 254-68, 283 sq.), while acknowledging the possibility of incorrect readings, seeks elaborately but quite in vain to solve these and other difficulties in the accounts of the Resurrection.

that the mother of Jesus herself should not be present; but Salome also, the mother of the sons of Zebedee,¹ who, next to the mother, had most cause to be overwhelmed with grief, did not before the evening after the Sabbath recover sufficient strength to join the others in their loving ministries.

Early on the Sunday, accordingly, the women, Mary Magdalene with eagerness far outstripping the rest,² hastened to the cavern in the rock already known to them, the difficulty which they might meet with only occurring to them fully on the way; for the grave was closed, after the usual manner of such crypts intended for people of wealth, by a heavy stone rolled before it, and could not be entered until the stone had been removed.³ However, inasmuch as they had beyond doubt informed the disciples of their intention and of the general position of the place, they could go on, in spite of their growing doubt, in the hope that they would at the place itself soon see the disciples arrive and come to their assistance.

How great, therefore, must have been the astonishment of these women and of the two disciples, Peter and John, who arrived shortly after them, when they found the stone rolled away and the vault open; within, however, no corpse, but only the grave-clothes of a buried person, as if he had left the place! And what was to be done when after repeated search they still could not find him? The only thing possible was that which actually occurred; further search of the agonising soul, further reflection under the most intense suspense of longing desire, the recollection that he had promised to reveal himself to them again,⁴ and, above all, the intrinsic power of the truth itself, and then he whose bodily image was so well known to them, whom they had known as the Son of God and immortal Lord, actually presented himself to their sight in his new and

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 181 sq.

² According to Mark and Luke we must suppose that all three or four went at the same time; and if they are reduced to two, Matt. xxviii. 1, this is owing to the cause above indicated. On the other hand, throughout the long account, xx. 1-18, John mentions Mary Magdalene only. However, she appears in the earliest accounts at all events at the head of the others in everything that they did during these three days, and undoubtedly John in his account follows a more correct reminiscence as regards this particular point. But when John narrates that the woman in her great eagerness visited the grave 'while it was yet dark,' this accords

so completely with the *λίαν πρωί*, Mark xvi. 2, and *ὑπὸρον βαθέως*, Luke xxiv. 1, that the clause 'after sunrise' must be an addition by the last editor of the Gospel of Mark.

³ The various forms of the ancient sepulchres near Jerusalem are minutely described in Tobler's *Golgotha* (1851) pp. 251 sq.; with regard to the grave of Christ as described in the Gospels, see *ibid.* pp. 229 sq. It is a fact admitted by all recent unprejudiced inquiry that the grave shown as the Holy Sepulchre since Constantine is not the original one; comp. in addition to vol. vi. p. 440, *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iv. p. 34, vi. pp. 84 sq., viii. p. 233.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 49.

glorified life; and as they had thus seen him again and believed in this his utmost power over death, it must then have been as if the flash of an unseen celestial light darted through their heart. He whose death they had heard of, and in whose death they might find it so hard to believe, by whom they supposed themselves forsaken, and whose greatness and glory had suddenly become so enigmatical to them, but who they had long ago begun to feel might be the incomparable and purely celestial Messiah—him they now on the contrary actually saw once more before their eyes as the celestial Messiah, in order to give them as victorious over death that certainty and power which they could not of themselves find. A single moment and the full truth which had hitherto been beyond their reach rose before their entranced souls as a luminous certainty, because the growing conviction of the celestial nature and the victorious power of their Lord which had during those last two days been acquiring possession of the deepest part of their being, but which was on the point of being completely overborne by the terrible events of the last two or three days, now nevertheless broke through all hindrances the more victoriously and flooded their souls with a light never before experienced. Never before had such rapture followed immediately the most yearning desire of the spirit, such pure and spiritual joy the profoundest sorrow. And, undoubtedly, it was from one person that this entranced vision first proceeded, but his rapture and enthusiasm readily communicated itself to others who were longing in the same way for higher light and explanation;¹ and the certainty of the enraptured sight grew ever stronger with the spiritual excitement. It was soon believed that words from the lips of the glorified one, similar to those which he had once spoken in the flesh, and yet much loftier than those uttered then, had been quite plainly heard. The entire life of those who now again felt themselves in the most close and clear contact with him possible became more marvellously elevated than ever before. Wherever individuals, or a number of them, who had once been intimate with him and were longing after him, now were or went, probably even in the midst of the occupations of ordinary life, they felt themselves suddenly as if electrified by his presence; beheld him in light before their eyes, heard him addressing to them the most wonderful words.

It is, in fact, hardly possible to exaggerate the wonderful features of a state like that which, according to the most

¹ According to a general law which still holds good, comp. e.g. *N. D. Z.* of Sept. 3, 1858.

reliable reminiscences, was continued for some time after that first moment. As amongst other nations of antiquity so also in Israel much was said about appearances and also of voices of the dead; but what we here see originating and running its course as an historical fact is something perfectly unique of its kind, such as had never before been anywhere experienced amongst men, and cannot very well be experienced again in the same manner. Such effects could be produced only by the immeasurable power which lies in the thought that the highest one that can conceivably appear, the Son of God himself, and the undoubtedly true celestial Messiah, in this case actually appeared in his celestial glorification as he had formerly done in his terrestrial disguise, and that, as himself already victorious over death, he touched, quickened, and inspired as directly as possible his followers. Only those who, during this most marvellous time when Christ's soul was felt to have hovered as between heaven and earth, were regarded as having been touched as by the Christ who was about to soar to heaven into his eternal glory, could also be regarded as his true apostles, as we shall further see below. And, in reality, we see in the burning fervour of these days those who had just been the most despairing suddenly changed into the most confident; those who found it hard to believe in the final unexpected lot of the Messiah the most believing, and all who had been baptized in this fire suddenly transformed into men who became for the first time wholly animated by the spirit of Christ himself, and who felt that they were in their own spirits completely transformed and immovably sustained by his spirit. At all times, however, this state was purely spiritual, closely bordering as it might on a sense-perception of Christ's presence.¹

When once faith in the resurrection-power of their Master had been thus called forth, their own intense longing to receive a sign and word of life from him in this their deepest need could afresh play its part. We find in each one of the narratives of those experiences a brief but adequate word of

¹ A fact which cannot be too firmly held in view of the innumerable errors which are in this connection so natural. But erroneous as it would be to suppose that we have here an apparent death, or that any artifices were in any way employed, the question what really became of the body will never be certainly answered, while conjectures on this point are least of all useful. To all such questions we must answer with Christ himself. ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὤφελει οὐδέεν, John vi. 63,

and further remember that inasmuch as, according to Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 42 sq., it is the glorified body only which is immortal, in his view the body of him who was the first to rise must have been immediately glorified, and could appear to his disciples only in its glorified state. If we were in the future to learn certainly what had become of his body, that knowledge would not alter the least thing in our views and convictions in other respects.

encouragement and new direction for the work which was then necessary; and, indeed, such a narrative must always close thus. In any case, therefore, there is something historical at the foundation of the accounts. Moreover, this marvellous agonising energy of prayer was undoubtedly never so intensely fervent and so mighty as in those very first hours and days; and if the Apostle Paul much later relates of himself that he had had visions of Christ, he did not know whether in or out of the body,¹ we are justified in supposing that the intense fervour of united, urgent, and agonising prayer in these first dark and most painful hours was incomparably greater and the result far more wonderful. And, however plain what had to be done by the disciples in the wholly altered state of things might be as regards its inner and logical necessity, they could not rest until they had heard it declared as Christ's own word to them. Their entire being was thus transformed, and a few hours and days of most extreme excitement and entrancement, of the mightiest wrestling to behold his glance once more and once more to hear his word, and of the most blessed composure after the new light had been granted, sufficed to bring to ripeness the new creation, the seed of which Christ had long before sown in their hearts.

When the state of intense excitement and of profound spiritual creation had gradually given way to composure, and the experiences which had been passed through in it were subsequently recalled in thought and narrative, various narratives were formed by degrees, in which, though the experiences received a somewhat more definite shape, their unique nature was retained as decidedly as possible, the narratives giving prominence also to the physical and sensible features which very readily attach themselves to such a sight of a being who has only just vanished from the world of sense. It was just these narratives which assumed very dissimilar and various forms when they had to be further elaborated. But however different those which are now preserved or indicated in the New Testament may be, the purely spiritual foundation upon which they have grown up is everywhere quite obvious. Christ appears in them everywhere acting and speaking as a spirit only, although apparently strongly affecting the sphere of sense; as a spirit he comes suddenly, unobservedly increasing the revelation of himself until he manifests himself completely by some sign; and as abruptly he disappears again without any

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 2-5. In a certain respect of the Day of Pentecost, soon to be considered, may here compare also the narrative.

relation or connection with terrestrial action or suffering; and even when he stoops more decidedly into the sphere of sense, it is really only to make himself known beyond all doubt as the same being who was once present in an earthly form. The signs by which he was supposed to have made himself known were various: particular utterances, either such as were more familiar, but then uttered with the voice which was quite peculiar to him, or such as were of a loftier nature, with a suitable meaning for the wholly new time; marks of blood, phenomena recalling his crucifixion; and reminiscences of the wholly peculiar way in which he had eaten with his disciples, and particularly had celebrated the last meal with them, so indelibly imprinted on their memory.

The Apostle Paul, when he is led by the subject of which he is writing to mention such appearances of Christ,¹ considers it suitable to briefly name all the most important of them in order, because he felt called upon to mention at the end the appearance of the risen Christ which had been granted to him last of all. Thus he says that Christ appeared first to Cephas, then to the Twelve, then to above five hundred brethren at once, then to James, then to all the apostles, last of all to himself—a brief but historically extremely important account, from which we can learn many things which would otherwise be less clear, as we shall see below. The Gospels, on the other hand, had at first no reason for recounting all the appearances of the risen Christ of this kind about which there were narratives; the very oldest Gospels always closed, indeed, as far as we can now judge, with this outlook into the completed eternal glorification of Christ, but to prove this neither all nor many of these narratives were necessary, inasmuch as a single one instead of all the rest, and particularly one of the more complete ones, would have sufficed for that purpose.

The earliest written account which is known to us was the following.² When the above-mentioned³ women found the sepulchre empty, and had entered it in their search, they saw in it on the right (accordingly on the fortunate side) a young man clothed in white, that is a good angel, who, as they were the more terrified at the sight of him, asked them in an assuring tone⁴ whether they sought Jesus of Nazareth who had been crucified, and then declared that he was risen and no longer

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 5-8.

² It has been shown in my *Drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 466 sq., where this earliest narrative is now to be found according to the original Mark.

³ P. 61.

⁴ The description evidently has as its prototyp: pe Dan. x. 5-8. *ἤγγειρε*, Mark xvi. 6, must be interrogative, just as *περίστρεψας*, John xx. 29.

there; and then the angel desired them to say to the disciples, and especially to Peter, that Christ was going before them into Galilee, and that there they would see him as he had promised. Thereupon they were agitated by still deeper amazement and fled from the tomb, and were on account of their fear unable to speak to anyone or execute the commission of the angel;¹ but then Jesus himself appeared to them with his kind and gentle greeting, and when they had fallen at his feet they received from him afresh the same message to his disciples. Having accordingly hastened to Galilee the eleven beheld him upon the same mountain upon which they had so often been with him before; and as some of them still felt a doubting timid awe at the strange and luminous appearance, he came nearer to them, and then quite plainly declared to them that he had now full and perfected authority, laid upon them accordingly the commission to preach the Gospel, which had now been completed, to all the world, and gave them the assurance of his perpetual protection.—And who does not feel that with this narrative, which is as simple as it is elevating, really everything has been said which is appropriate at this point, and that the evangelical history is thereby brought to that lofty elevation from which it commands all subsequent history?

The intensification of such spiritual impressions until they reach a highest and final truth, and the consequent sudden pause and cessation of the extremely intensified excitement, appear also in this single earliest narrative left to us. The same process may be exhibited more prominently in the case of a somewhat more closely connected series of such reminiscences; and the author of the sixth evangelical work² has, in accordance with the general characteristics of his book, a series of narratives of this kind much more fully elaborated.³ As regards their matter they are similar at the beginning and quite at the end to the above simplest narrative, but the larger central portion of them differs from it greatly, and assimilates evidently more to those accounts which the Apostle Paul had

¹ This is evidently the force of the context of the whole narrative, although the thread of it is just at this point abruptly broken off, Mark xvi. 8, and is a little differently continued in an abbreviated form by the last author of the Gospel of Matt. xxviii. 8; the words *great joy*, ver. 8, especially had originally no place in this connection.

² [See Translator's Preface to vol. vi.]

³ It has been shown in the *Drei ersten Evang.* pp. 419 sq., that Luke worked up

this series of narratives in his Gospel, abbreviating them a very little. Similar, and yet in some respects different, and therefore not to be referred to this sixth work, is the extremely abbreviated narrative of the seventh Gospel work now found Mark xvi. 9-11; this is important as a proof that the narrative of the appearance to the two disciples as they walked over the fields belongs to the original stock of such narratives.

heard.¹ (1.) As certain women come early to the tomb and do not find the body, they behold angels and hear them say that Jesus lives; on hearing the report of this some of the disciples go likewise, but simply find the grave empty; it is to Peter that Christ first appears, but not until afterwards. (2.) Before the last fact becomes known, two others of the disciples take their way on some business or other to the village of Emmaus,² situated to the west of Jerusalem, and are engaged in an earnest dialogue about the dark enigma of the time. Then suddenly a third person joins them, taking part in their troubled conversation, and soon censuring their unbelief and proving with superior knowledge from the Scriptures that Christ had necessarily thus to suffer and thus to be glorified. But only after he has at their request turned in with them and breaks the bread with his own peculiar blessing do they fully recognise that it is he, when he immediately vanishes again. They then return quickly to Jerusalem, and discover, when they join their fellow-disciples there, that Peter has nevertheless anticipated them in finding the risen Lord. (3.) But whilst they thus in their reunion begin to reflect upon and realise the great new truth, he himself suddenly appears in their midst, removes bodily as well as spiritually all remaining doubt regarding the full truth of his resurrection, gives them authority to become his Apostles to all the world, leads them forth into the open air, and disappears as he blesses them just at the spot where his last great sufferings had commenced—in the neighbourhood of Bethany.³—In these three pieces of narrative the representation of the sublime fact to be dealt with is quite completed; but it is not difficult to perceive that this narrative has in its details received a much more elaborate form, with the view of exhaustively presenting, as nearly as possible, the infinite truth which is in this case present to faith. If we compare the above oldest and simplest narrative with this, which really after all only presents essentially the same facts, we cannot fail to see that this recognition of the risen Christ, which was at first surely purely spiritual, gradually sought and found support in a physical seeing and kindred reflections.

But in this case also it is John who supplies the most perfect representation; and he does this in complete independence

¹ This appears particularly from the similar mention of Peter, and from the fact that in this series, as in Paul's account 1 Cor. xv. 7, an appearance before all the disciples, i.e., Apostles, and not before the Eleven merely, is supposed. But in other respects, it must be allowed, the appear-

ances indicated by Paul differ greatly from the series of the three pieces here given.

² On this village, see below.

³ If we compare Luke xxiv. 50 with Matt. xxi. 17, we see that Bethany here simply interchanges with Gethsemane, vol. vi. pp. 422 sq.

of both these forms of narrative, surpassing the first in point of elaborate description and approaching the second in that respect, while he is all but completely unacquainted with the details of the second form of narrative. He brings together in his Gospel a series of four such appearances of Christ.¹ The series is distinguished by the excellences that mark John's productions: delicacy of thought and feeling, wealth of matter, graphic clearness of historic representation and uncommon minuteness of detail, peculiarities which appear particularly in the elaborate delineation of the first of these four pictures. (1.) When Mary Magdalene does not see the body, she runs back into the city to Peter and John, complaining that it has been taken away. Accordingly those two Apostles hasten to the garden, and the younger outruns the other and is the first to take a closer glance into the empty tomb, but, restrained by a feeling of awe, does not enter it. The bolder Peter then rushes into it and beholds nothing more than the grave clothes which are still lying there. It is then that John first enters likewise, beholds everything, and acquires faith in the Resurrection—he first, and without any further outward attestation, as he here narrates according to his manner, not boastfully but more by gentle hints, though plainly enough for the thoughtful reader.² (2.) Whilst the two are now returning again to the city, Mary remains weeping by the grave, looks into it as she weeps, and beholds two angels clothed in white as if still guarding the body, but who ask her why she weeps; and scarcely has she mentioned the cause and turned to go, when she really beholds Jesus, who puts the same question to her; then, as she still does not recognise him, she hears him addressing her by name with his familiar voice, and now first knows who it is. And at once she is about to fall at his feet, when he commands her not to touch him because he has not yet ascended to the Father;³ but commissions her, on the

¹ John xx. 1-9; 10-18; 19-23; 24-29; it is of great importance to note that the first piece certainly ends with ver. 9.

² Brief as the words are, John xx. 8, 9, unquestionably all that has been indicated above is involved in them when they are properly understood according to the connection of all four pieces; neither are they in themselves really obscure, and the chief point is that John believed without any outward sense—vision; a fact which accords perfectly with the slight censure of Thomas, ver. 29. The fact that Peter was not the first to believe is thereby stated without any boasting.

³ No passage expresses more plainly

than this the view which lies ultimately at the base of all such narratives, namely, that the spirit of Christ during these hours and days hovered as between heaven and earth, that it first must soar to heaven and to pure glory, that it then again descended often to his beloved followers and touched them as with celestial influence before it finally entered wholly into its higher rest. At that time when Mary Magdalene was about to fall at his feet and to retain him, he had no rest on the earth because he was just about to make his first necessary ascent to the Father, and could not yet receive the celestial worship.

contrary, to go to his brethren to announce to them his ascension—in other words, his glorification thus to be perfected. (3.) After he has this day been thus fully glorified and changed into the celestial Messiah, he suddenly appears with his glad salute on the same Sunday evening to all the eleven, who were assembled with closed doors for fear of the Judeans, makes himself known as the same Master who had just been crucified, and transforms them with his mighty word and spirit completely into his Apostles. (4.) Thomas only was not then present amongst them, and would not believe what he had not felt with his own physical senses; accordingly he appears to them the next Sunday whilst Thomas is with them, permits him to convince himself by physical methods, but does not leave him without a reproving hint regarding his slowness of belief, pronouncing those blessed who believe without such material assistance.

Can anything more adequately set forth with greater depth and force the immeasurable realities which are here concerned than these four pieces of narrative do? Can anything more perfectly praise a pure and glorified faith in the glorified and divine reality than they do in their closely-connected series? Is it not here most plainly taught that although the proof of the resurrection to the senses and the more decided sense-experience may not be unnecessary, still pure and willing faith in the truth, which is, after all, always beyond the reach of the senses, is much nobler? Are we still in these days determined to remain so devoid of delicate feeling as not to perceive what John himself prefers?—Further, according to John's narrative, these appearances occurred whilst the Twelve were in Jerusalem. However, John could also speak of very many more appearances,¹ and of such as took place in Galilee. From the number of the latter appearances the Gospel of John, undoubtedly following a narrative of this Apostle's, for a special reason supplies us in a supplement with a long piece of narration,² which, however, again falls into four smaller pieces after the manner of the former series. In it again we can perceive plainly the advance from the first faint surmise of his appearance to the strongest and most vivid conviction of it. (1.) Seven of the twelve³

¹ As he himself says, xx. 30; for the remark *before his disciples* does not allow us in this case to think, as in the instance xx. 25, of anything else than such marvellous appearances as these, as appears also from xiv. 21, 22, comp. *ante*, p. 58.

² Ch. xxi., with regard to the meaning

and object of which I spoke at length in the *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 171 sq. The proper division of the four pieces is (1) vv. 1-7 as far as *ἔσται*; (2) vv. 7-14; (3) vv. 15-19; (4) vv. 20-23.

³ Ver. 2 just seven are enumerated, but that is probably related with no more

are occupied again quietly in their accustomed way by the Lake of Galilee in fishing, but that night take nothing. Thereupon Jesus stands in the early morning unrecognised on the shore, about two hundred cubits from them, asking them for food as if he were also hungry; and as they are unable to give him anything, he commands them to cast their nets on the right¹ of the boat, whereupon they at once catch such a multitude that they in the boat are unable to pull up the net, and must seek for other means of securing the blessing, whilst John is the first to recognise the unknown man as Jesus. (2.) As yet the rest do not recognise him, but Peter, when he hears John's words, immediately throws around him his upper garment, from awe, with the purpose even of at once swimming as he was to Jesus; whilst the others who remain in the boat have enough to do to bring it with its overladen net to the shore.² When they reach the shore, they see there most unexpectedly preparations already made for a meal, and also hear Jesus calling to them to contribute something from the great draught just taken; and as they now surmise more and more plainly who is near them, but as yet do not venture to approach quite close to him, he himself presents to them in his well-known manner the food, and again the Twelve thus behold him with full and joyous certainty. (3.) But as if even this were but a prelude and preparation for the higher manifestation which is to follow, it is now that the higher discourse and revelation of the Lord first begins; and when Peter is three times asked whether he really loves the Lord and is thus ready to feed his sheep, until he gets troubled at last at the apparent doubt of his Lord as to his love, it is then that Christ manifests to him fully in a prophetic utterance, obscure and yet clear, that if he is willing to be his follower in feeding his flock, he must also be his follower in his crucifixion.³ (4.) And when Peter, having turned round as if in search of another who was better able to fill such an office and meet such a lot, sees John and ventures to propose a question with regard to him, he is checked by a hint concerning that disciple's lot, and only admonished once more to fulfil his own duty.

The last Gospel accordingly attests that narratives of such

premeditation, and no more to be interpreted symbolically than the one hundred and fifty-three fishes, ver. 11, comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* vi. p. 161.

¹ This is probably intended to denote here and Mark xvi. 5 the fortunate side.

² If this is the meaning of the words,

we have here an instance of hearing the Lord's voice from a distance; and this hearing of his voice at first from a great distance is in this case very significant.

³ We shall be able to speak of this passage as well as that regarding John's history better below.

appearances in Galilee also were in circulation ; and nothing is more natural than that his disciples should, in this interval of extreme excitement, behold him most vividly precisely in those regions where they were at every step most strongly reminded of him. That earliest and simplest narrative mentions in a way peculiar to itself this meeting with him again in Galilee.¹ But as early as Luke, the reference to Galilee is put so distinctly in the background that we cannot avoid supposing in his case a somewhat different way of regarding the course of the events of those first days generally ; that is, according to his view of the history, the parent church in Jerusalem itself appears to him as the most important from the beginning, as we shall see below ; accordingly he speaks of appearances of Christ in and near Jerusalem only, as if they only had induced the disciples themselves, as by an absolute command of the Lord, to take up their abode at first calmly in Jerusalem.² This limitation to Jerusalem is connected in the case of Luke with his general conception and account of the formation of the Apostolic primitive Church in these decisive days. But, according to all the indications, we cannot doubt that the number of the reminiscences and narratives of such appearances of Christ which dated from those days of the first painful and joyful birth-pangs of the Apostolic Church was very large and very various, and that many were in circulation which were probably never committed to writing. And if we knew more than we can now merely conjecture from the brief mention of them by Paul, combined with other indications,³ concerning the appearance before the five hundred disciples and the subsequent appearance to James, we should find in them undoubtedly very instructive contributions to a more complete knowledge of this whole history of the first foundation of the Apostolic Church. But, on the other hand, it was justly felt that but little depends on the mere number of such reminiscences and narratives, inasmuch as one or two may be all that are required for the truth which they all represent. It is true the habit might arise of ascribing the great truths which lay in the fruitful womb of this transition period, as hidden fruit for all the future, to the glorified Christ of these days ; they could be conceived as delivered in the form of definite sayings and longer speeches by Christ when in most intimate and mysterious

¹ See *ante*, p. 66.

² This is implied by the whole connection, Luke, xxiv. 1-53, Acts i. 3-11, but particularly in the words xxiv. 49-53,

Acts i. 4.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 6, 7 ; as to the apocryphal story about James, see below in connection with his history.

intercourse with his disciples, and we find the beginning of such representations in Luke's writings.¹ When such a commencement had been made, bolder writers could at length venture to put into Christ's mouth all kinds of arbitrarily-invented and apparently profound thoughts and doctrines, as we know certain Gnostics did.² But in the case of that earliest narrative, and also in the late Gospel of John, we have, on the contrary, nowhere more than certain detached and brief words and sentences, which are as the echoes of words spoken in this excited time by the glorified Christ.³

Beyond doubt all the appearances of Christ (*Christophanies*) which the New Testament relates have much in common with the appearances of God (*Theophanies*), of which the Bible likewise says much, though only in the Old Testament, and in this chiefly at its commencement. As in the Old Testament, notwithstanding His absolute spirituality and invisibility, God at times presents Himself as in a bodily form before men, as it were sensibly touching them, and is recognised by them only when in His disappearance He leaves behind His plainest traces; ⁴ so, in the New Testament, although he is already the glorified and purely spiritual Messiah, Christ appears as with his full corporeal presence, and thus makes himself known to his followers. As in the Old Testament it is narrated of no one who was not really himself a man of God that God had appeared to him, so neither in the New Testament does Christ appear to anyone without his becoming from that moment a completely transformed man and one whose faith in Christ never wavers again. But again, as in the Old Testament it is only in the earliest times, and as at the beginning of all His

¹ Namely, in the passages Luke xxiv. 14-17, 25-27, 44-47, Acts i. 3-8.

² We have a very clear example of this in the *Pistis Sophia*, published in Coptic, Berlin, 1851. In this book eleven years of this mysterious intercourse (lasting accordingly till about the time of Paul's conversion) is supposed [see Anger's *Synopsis Evang.* Index, p. xliii.]; less extravagant and older is the Gnostic supposition of eighteen months, comp. *Iren. Hæc.* i. 1. 5; 28. 7. But this number eighteen is evidently taken simply from the first two letters of the Greek name Ἰησοῦς, as we know from the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. ix., how early a mysterious significance was ascribed to the numerical value of these letters, as an exaggerated form of the practice alluded to *ante*, p. 10. note 4.

³ For however many words of the

glorified Christ are mentioned John xx., xxi., this detached and brief nature is their common feature; and in this respect, too, John again follows the earliest form of the narrative.

⁴ The more spiritual the true religion was from the first, and the more spiritual its God was regarded to be, the greater, particularly in the earliest period, was the longing of Israel, or of individuals of the nation, to feel His approach at least through the veil of the Heaven, or some similar veil, and then to get the sense of being touched as by His power, Ps. xxix., Ex. xix.; and the less He, in His spirituality, appeared able to manifest Himself, the more eager was Israel during the earliest times to have the experience of being touched and led by an angel at least in His place. See further on this point, *Jahob. d. B. W.* xi. pp. 31 sq.

modes of revealing Himself to man that God approaches men most powerfully as with His entire immediate presence, in like manner the glorified Christ makes himself known thus fully and directly to his disciples only at the very beginning of this entire new phase of development. For every spiritual truth, indeed, must first once come to men as with wholly irresistible power, and as in the brightest light and a bodily form, otherwise it will never be profoundly enough recognised, and will always remain hidden from men. How much more, therefore, must every one of the highest spiritual truths at the very beginning appear to men once as in its palpable bodily form! And what truth of remote antiquity was higher than this, that the purely spiritual invisible God, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, exists as certainly and surely as any visible being, and, indeed, far more certainly and surely? And at the close of antiquity and in the transition to a wholly new division of human history, what truth is higher than that Christ, who was crucified and laid in the grave, nevertheless lives? It is only that which is thus presented to the human spirit irresistibly as from heaven, and that which is thus appropriated, that can become the foundation of a conviction which will sustain and cheer him for ever, when it has intrinsic truth.

Thus high, both intrinsically and historically, is the significance of the Christophanies of these days. When the soul of Christ, according to the ancient faith of antiquity, was still, as it were, hovering between heaven and earth, and his unexpected terrible death had most seriously dimmed the light of his appearance before the eyes of his disciples, he then, on the contrary, soon presented himself before their sight with the most irresistible certainty as one who was about to be exalted into glory without parallel, and who had already been glorified, and they beheld him thus in the highest excitement and transport of their souls with a joy and bliss which suddenly transcended infinitely their profoundest sorrow, and, indeed, with jubilation and exultation. In these moments and hours, his spirit and theirs were still in contact, united by ties which had been made stronger and more inseparable by the short separation, as if he also was unable to vanish quite from the visible world without giving them this new and transcendent assurance of the reality of his life. Thus these days are as the most necessary and secure bond which connects the ancient and the new periods with each other; they are themselves possible only through the preceding days of his full terrestrial appearance, and are as the most marked and wonderful repetition of them in a higher

manner; but at the same time they commence an entirely new period, showing that a new mighty life is about to arise under the influence of entirely new movements of a mysterious and powerful nature from the deepest recesses of the spirit. Indeed, earlier or later, it was necessary that Christ should once arise in his full life and light, in spite of death and all the contempt and efforts of destruction of the world, and now shine in purer brightness upon those who had previously begun so firmly to recognise him in his immortal truth and transcendent glory; but that his immortal life and his unequalled glory should thus early appear before the eyes of these who were weeping, and thus marvellously with overwhelming power and abiding certainty, was possible this once only in the history of the world.

For if all Biblical miracles have only a truly spiritual significance, and can only spiritually be properly appreciated, we have here in reality the highest miracle, in the form in which this miracle is conceived, in complete accordance with the nature of the case, by the feeling of the entire early Church. It is true, as was stated in the previous volume, that everything of a miraculous nature that was possible within the range of the development of the true religion and its Community was carried, even during the earthly life of Christ, and by his wholly unique labours, to a climax never reached before. But this miracle, which follows immediately the history of the earthly appearance of Christ, and becomes the first breath which the entire new age draws, surpasses in the magnitude of its effects all the numerous and very various miracles which proceeded from Christ's earthly hand, and is the highest summit of the miraculous which is conceivable in the course of history from its first beginning to its future and final close. It is the product and as it were the most concentrated power of all the marvellous spiritual life that had been stirred either by Christ's recent appearance on the earth or by all the earlier history of Israel; and the highest display of miraculous power in this case is that the miracle no longer takes place directly by his terrestrial labours alone, as proceeding solely from his human will. The earlier Gospels, like the entire New Testament, presuppose as obvious that this miracle took place not through the agency of Christ, but was wrought upon him, and must be traced back to God alone as the ultimate wonder-worker; and John also, who, in this case, states most adequately the profounder aspects of the question, presents substantially the same view. He gives, it is true, greater prominence to the constant

inward uniformity and uninterrupted power of will in this unique spiritual nature of Christ, according to which he voluntarily *lays down his soul* as the good shepherd for his flock, and not compelled by the world to do so against his will, and *takes it up again* as voluntarily; ¹ but at the same time he traces everything back solely to the special will and commission of God which Christ in both cases simply carries out, ² and even his whole Gospel is arranged with a view to proving distinctly that, after all the miracles performed by Christ himself failed to produce true faith in the world, the highest conceivable miracle upon himself had to be worked by God, in order that all who do not believe in it, as it was experienced by the disciples and preached by them, might be without excuse. ³ Thus a spark from heaven easily falls into the field, already hot from the greatest spiritual labours, to kindle the most marvellous light, and to turn men forcibly, and against their will even, to it, which had in reality long existed in a latent form; and thus the occurrence of one overpowering event by one blow completes, without the will and expectation of man, all the great and necessary things, which, although long existing, had remained unperceived through the blindness of some and the fear of others. And thus the deliverance of Israel from the Red Sea had formed the powerful commencement of the ancient covenant, ⁴ being the greatest miracle as regards its effects which the people of that covenant could experience. But if, in that birth-period of the Community of the true religion, it was necessary that that God Himself, by whom it imagined it had been wholly forsaken in its deepest need, should make Himself felt in his entire nature with a power never before experienced, so now in the perfectly similar birth-period of the Christian Community, it was, together with God Himself, the one possible Consummator of the Kingdom of God, whom they had just before in their despair regarded as dead, and now beheld in his glory, to their infinite jubilation. ⁵

¹ John x. 17, 18, comp. xiii. 1, 2, and the best explanation of this passage is the words 'I sanctify myself for them,' xvii. 19; as the animal for sacrifice is consecrated for this sacred, divine purpose, so Christ voluntarily prepares himself for death. No sin, as was the case with others condemned to death, which he had committed compelled Christ to die. The same thought, more strongly expressed, is implied in the utterance Matt. xxvi. 53.

² John x. 18, comp. likewise with xvii. 19.

³ See *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 166 sq., to which article I now add that the five

parts of the Gospel may also be arranged as follows: (1) i.-ii. 11; (2) ii. 12-iv. 51; (3) v., vi.; (4) vii.-xii.; (5) xiii.-xx., each of these five parts falling again into three smaller ones, comp. *Jahrb.* viii. pp. 109 sq. [*Johanneische Schriften*, pp. 21 sq.]

⁴ See vol. ii. pp. 70 sq.

⁵ But undoubtedly as all true, i.e., spiritual miracles are valid to faith only, so above all this one; and when the new higher faith amongst the disciples, instead of perishing as the world expected, from this day not only grew stronger amongst themselves, but even rose to conquer the world itself, and could not be overlooked by

But still it remained always the most memorable fact that this most intense spiritual excitement, together with the corresponding blessed composure, had its surprising commencement on that great Sunday. Many of the Gospel narratives even confined all such appearances of Christ to this first Sunday.¹ And when the utterances which Christ had made before his death, regarding the future of his cause and of himself, were somewhat more calmly recalled, that utterance in which he had made the marvellous history of Jonah² refer to his own future lot necessarily occurred to the minds of his followers just at that time as most surprising: for like Jonah he also had lain in the depths of the earth and risen therefrom most unexpectedly. This passage from the Old Testament, as spoken once by Christ, was accordingly very frequently repeated now at the same time in confirmation of the truth of his resurrection itself, as we see from the oldest Gospel accounts; and inasmuch as in the narrative of Jonah *three days and three nights* are mentioned as the duration of his imprisonment in the horrible abyss,³ this period was also repeated in the utterance of Christ when he applied it to himself.⁴ It was considered of no importance, in comparison with the great fact itself, that he was not really three days and three nights, but only two nights and a little more than one day in the grave. Still it soon became the custom to say more briefly, and more strictly according to the event, that Christ had foretold his resurrection on the third day;⁵ and the

as its mighty effects appeared, we know from the New Testament that it became an object of general ridicule amongst both Jews and heathen (see especially Acts iv. 1 sq., xvii. 32, xxv. 19). It is evident that at this somewhat later time hostile Jews first began to seriously consider how the opinion of the resurrection of Christ could arise; and since they neither carefully followed the history nor were capable of comprehending the spiritual truth, they inclined more and more hopelessly to the conjecture, which harmonised with their own low habit of thought, that the disciples themselves had probably stolen the body in the night, and thus the grave had been found empty and the whole story of the resurrection had arisen. From this conjecture there then soon grew a legend which was pretty widely spread amongst the Jews, as we know from the last author of the Gospel of Matthew, xxviii. 15; Christians also must have heard early of this legend circulated amongst their enemies; but as it was discussed amongst them, the ingenuous Christian mind justly raised the objection

that if the members of the Hagiocracy had cause to fear anything of that kind from the disciples, they might surely have requested from Pilate a Roman guard and closed the grave with their Government seal. It has been shown in my *Dreiersten Evang.* i. pp. 447 sq., how then from that treatment of the legend the narrative arose of a Roman guard at the sepulchre, which was more closely interwoven with the oldest narrative by the last editor of Matthew. Comp. above p. 66 sq.

¹ As that in Luke, ch. xxiv., which, however, did not satisfy him when he subsequently wrote the Acts.

² See *ante*, p. 48.

³ Jonah ii. 1 [A.V. i. 17].

⁴ Thus in the Collected Sayings, Matt. xii. 40, the only passage in which the original form in this respect has been faithfully retained.

⁵ Mark viii. 31, we have still the most original form '*after three days*;' but ix. 31, x. 34, Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23, xx. 19 [not xxvii. 63], 1 Cor. xv. 4, and in Luke always '*on the third day*.' These differences are not unimportant, and can-

mention of the third day, having had this origin, was ever after retained, although, apart from the origin of the expression, the fact referred to could have been differently represented. But when once through the most impressive experience the great truth had been brought home to the disciples, that, as against Christ and his cause, Death had been deprived of his prerogatives, and that he having conquered death was already immortally present with God in his glorified body and purely celestial power, many other passages of the Old Testament received a wholly new lustre in the light of this truth, and, in accordance with the feeling of that age, the second strongest proof of the truth was thereby supplied. Probably, in the full stream of that first excitement, such passages from the Scriptures as might be appropriate were also immediately suggested to them by the refraction of this new light that had risen upon them, and even after those unparalleled moments remained fastened in their memories with indelible distinctness; so that the narrative also arose that the risen Lord had in those exalted days shown to them in detail from the Old Testament generally, how, according to the Divine will, all those things had necessarily taken place.¹

The Narratives of the Ascension of Christ.

The Nature of the Christian Hope and Faith.

We must therefore suppose that an undoubted characteristic of those first days of the Church was an altogether peculiar state of extreme suspense and most intense excitement on the part of the disciples. When once it had been

not be understood otherwise than as above indicated. So much the more certainly it appears from this that actually three days and three nights did not intervene between the Sunday of the resurrection and the day of the crucifixion, comp. vol. vi. p. 418 sq., further, that before his death Christ really applied that passage in Jonah to himself. I have always maintained that in the description of the death of the Two Witnesses, Rev. xi. 7-11, details were borrowed from the history of Christ; but nothing but a superficial reading of the description can lead to the supposition that every detail, and particularly the three and a half days vv. 9, 11, was taken from it, comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* viii. p. 255. Eusebius again offers attempts of too slavishly scrupulous a nature in explanation of the three nights, in *Mai, Nova Patrum Collectio*, iv. p. 287.

¹ The many passages from the Old Testament that are meant Luke xxiv. 27, 44-46 (comp. the more simple phrase *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, 1 Cor. xv. 3.) are not, it is true, quoted in this passage, yet we can supply them generally from the examples, Acts ii. 25-36; and probably the mention of the reanimation on the third day, Hos. vi. 2, belongs especially to their number. An actual prophecy of the passing of the Messiah through great suffering, but not through death, was supplied, Isa. vii. I leave this entire essay on the resurrection in this edition (1868) essentially as it was when first published (1858). With regard to the mistaken views of Schleiermacher and Bansen, see the *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1866, pp. 806 sq. I may further add that I presented the view here published in my lecture as early as 1833.

developed, this state of mind continued for a considerable time in consequence of its own inherent strength: the individual that was conscious of having been looked upon by that celestial eye, and addressed by that Christ-voice, and, indeed, even touched more powerfully still by His hand, undoubtedly remained for some time under the influence of overpowering emotions. Moreover, the entrancement communicated itself from one to another, and how must this state have been intensified to one of most extreme strain and excitement, when the five hundred disciples above referred to¹ felt themselves simultaneously thus carried away! We may safely suppose that in those days and weeks there was no Christian who had not shared more or less this state of mind, and did not afterwards recall it in some such form.² It follows of itself that such a state of mind could not be suddenly interrupted or put an end to by any arbitrary act of men. As it had been rapidly intensified to its highest pitch, so its vibrations became gradually more regular and quieter; but it was continued in gradually weaker vibrations for several years, and indeed for decades. It was a most powerful after-vibration of this earliest and most creative movement which in the year 38 changed the persecutor Saul into the Apostle Paul, as we shall subsequently see; and the numerous visions which Paul experienced later in his life, at times in such a way that he did not know whether he was *in* or *out* of the body;³ and, indeed, that overpowering vision which the author of the book of 'Revelation' beheld, and which became to him a source of light and strength for the revelation which he had to describe in his book,⁴ are, with so many other marvellous phenomena of those days, only like gradually weaker after-vibrations of this most overpowering original movement.

At the same time we know that the more powerful any mental excitement is, the less can it continue very long with the same degree of intensity. Were it to go on increasing in intensity, it would soon either destroy the body as the vessel in which it was kindled, or lose itself in complete extravagance and infatuation. Just as it is the sign of the indelible impression made by the life of Christ on his disciples, and of their faith in him as the celestial Messiah, that they beheld him as risen from the dead; so, also, it is the characteristic mark of the

¹ P. 72.

² As the Apostle, 1 Cor. xv. 6, states so definitely that we have not the least ground for doubting the fact.

³ According to 2 Cor. xii. 2-5, comp.

my commentary *Schilderungen des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 304 sq.

⁴ As is so plainly described, Rev. 10 sq.

supreme gladness, composure, and satisfaction of their minds produced by his religion, that after this extreme excitement they so soon recovered greater collectedness and calm self-possession. And in the case of individuals, what purpose would a repetition of this highest experience under the profoundest emotion of the whole soul really serve, if they had not already been sufficiently brought by the first profound agitation of their inmost nature to genuine faith in the incontestable truth of the immortally glorified life of Christ? ¹

Every experience of such overpowering excitement necessarily ended, therefore, by the Glorified One vanishing again into his eternal glory with God from the vision of the beholder. As the spirit which had hitherto been confined to the body and the things of the earth could be conceived as for a time lingering near it, so also the conception, referred to above, ² arose, that the immediate friends of the risen Master had at first been able to behold him as about to soar upwards to his own glorification: but when he was felt in his full power as the Lord delivering his commands in an entirely different tone for the opening age, it was then the fully Glorified One already with God, whose unexpected coming in light was felt, and who was seen to vanish again at the same moment into his eternal glory. This ascension of the Glorified One into his unapproachable elevation at the right hand of God, after he had made himself most distinctly known to the minds of his disciples, was taken for granted in all these narratives to such an extent that in the earliest one ³ it is not mentioned at all. In like manner John considers it superfluous to give a narrative of it; and, indeed, it is as if he feared to give a physical form to a spiritual fact by detailed descriptions of it. ⁴

However, the reflections and narratives of the Gospels in this respect tended towards a more definite conclusion. It was justly only the first hours and days which appeared more and more, as time went on, to have been the wonderful period of this closest contact of heaven and earth; and if in somewhat later times, on looking back into that exalted interval when heaven and earth appeared connected by the closest bonds, the Church loved to think of the exceptional glory which had shone upon

¹ Similarly the people of Israel after they had heard the thunder of the divine words of the Decalogue, desire to hear it no more in that manner, vol. ii. p. 104.

² *Ante*, p. 69.

³ *Ante*, p. 66.

⁴ That is, we must always read the

narratives John ch. xx., xxi., in close connection with the exalted utterances, xiv. 18-20 (comp. xvi. 16, 22 and also xiv. 3), which gives the truer and higher explanations of them, if we desire to properly appreciate them according to the design of his Gospel itself.

so many of its first pillars who were fast being removed by death, the desire was nevertheless felt to delineate more definitely the conclusion of this unparalleled period. The first evangelical work that carried out this desire was that which I have called the sixth, and which is used by Luke. It does not as yet fix definitely the time of the Ascension, but in this respect is more like the earliest narrative, inasmuch as it connects the Ascension with the first complete appearance in the presence of all the disciples. On the other hand, it does not, like the earliest narrative, limit the number of the disciples to the Eleven, but extends it, we may say, so as to include the Seventy,¹ and narrates how the glorified Master, after he had fully made himself known to them, himself led them out of Jerusalem to Bethany,² and there blessed them and separated from them. The seventh evangelical work, following in many particulars the sixth, closed the great story of Christ's life with the brief, but more definite words, that after his last utterances to the Eleven, the glorified one was received up into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God.³ But the narrative had received a much more developed form when subsequently Luke wrote his Acts of the Apostles. In the first place the duration of this mysterious and exalted interval had been fixed as exactly forty days: for a special reason to be considered below, it could not well be further extended; while the traditional sacred number appeared amply sufficient for the full instruction of the disciples in the truths of the Gospel, as they had become intelligible to them after his glorification, and which it was now supposed the glorified Lord had himself communicated to them.⁴ But in the next place the moment of the separation itself was described with suitable sublimity, and if the Old Testament presented in the description of the ascent of Elijah and of the vain search for him by his disciples, a model for this purpose,⁵ in the case of Christ the description is in both respects not only much more sublime, but it is also incomparably more simple in its sublimity, as the sublimest things

¹ It appears clearly from the indications Luke xxiv. 13, 18, 33, and from the whole context of the subsequent narrative until its conclusion vv. 48-53, that more than the Eleven are intended. Acts i. 2-11 also the Eleven are not strictly distinguished from the rest, but are not exclusively intended before ver. 13. And inasmuch as Luke elsewhere speaks of the Seventy, he may have here had them in view; in fact, we have in this work undoubtedly the source in which he found

the Seventy mentioned. It must also be added, that we must suppose that by *all the Apostles*, 1 Cor. xv. 7, more are intended than the Twelve mentioned in ver. 5.

² See *ante*, p. 68.

³ Mark xvi. 19.

⁴ On the other hand, the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. xv., still puts the resurrection and ascension on a Sunday, although not exactly upon one and the same Sunday; comp. below p. 90, the *Const. Edess.*

⁵ See vol. iv. pp. 109 sq.

can always be the most simple. In Christ's case no chariots and horses of fire are required, as in Elijah's. East of Jerusalem, on the Mount of Olives, he was taken up in sight of the disciples, and a cloud received him from their gaze.¹ And if Elijah's disciples must first seek in vain for their master, the disciples of Christ as they are gazing after him immediately behold two celestial visitants, exhorting them not to gaze vainly into the heavens, but to expect with calm composure the future return of the glorified one from the same heavens.²

The thought of the certainty of his ascension, and that of his seat at the right hand of God, which is inseparably connected with it,³ sprang from the calm assurance of his eternal and unchangeable glorification, and his supreme dominion over his followers, and has in this assurance its eternal and necessary truth.

But as soon as the immense excitement of this period, which we shall soon see repeated on the Sunday of Pentecost in a similar manner, though arising from a wholly different cause, began to subside and clarify itself in this calmly happy thought and faith, another conviction was necessarily immediately connected with it as its inseparable counterpart. As Christ was now regarded as having entered completely into his celestial rest, and it was looked upon as wrong should his disciples importune him with their violent or impatient challenges, and disturb him in this his blessed repose, so, on the other hand, the hope arose the more necessarily and certainly, that in the same glory in which he was now exalted into heaven he would descend from it again to the earth, and for the first time as absolutely victorious king, clothed with final judicial authority, in order to accomplish at once all that remained unfinished in the work of the outward Consummation, manifesting himself at the same time to the whole earth in his full glory and victorious power, and accordingly quite otherwise than when he appeared in his terrestrial perishable body. With this hope the more elaborate

¹ The cloud, Acts i. 9, is undoubtedly, according to the weighty words with which the whole description closes, ver. 11, from Dan. vii. 13, comp. Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64. The two men in shining garments, vv. 10, 11, are not meant to be simply the two guardian angels, or merely angels, as John xx. 12, but Elijah and Moses, who are very appropriate here according to the earlier narrative, Mark ix. 4, which undoubtedly forms the basis of this.

² [In his later commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (pp. 58 sq.), the author introduced a slight modification of the above

treatment of Luke's two accounts of the ascension, taking Acts i. 3 as a parenthesis, and explaining the events narrated vv. 1-2, 4-5, as having taken place on the proper ascension Sunday, that is the next Sunday after the crucifixion, while the parenthesis ver. 3 speaks simply of additional subsequent reappearances to the Apostles.]

³ Mark xvi. 19, Acts ii. 23, with the expression everywhere borrowed from Ps. cx. 1, as is plainly enough said this time, Acts ii. 34, 35.

narrative of the Ascension closes,¹ as it is re-echoed, we may say, through the whole New Testament in a thousand forms; and inasmuch as the work of Christ can receive the external Consummation which it still lacks only from himself as its originator, and from him as the glorified one only, this hope was based upon the firm and unalterable truth of the matter. For a work that is in itself neither the highest nor the exclusively true one may be improved and finished after the death of its originator by another, and perhaps more capable agent; but when a work like that of Christ is the one true one, and from the very first perfect in its limited sphere, it can be brought to its final outward completion only by the glorified spirit of the same author who commenced it; and it is just this final outward completion which first brings his highest glorification after his physical death. We saw in the previous volume² to what extent utterances and thoughts of Christ himself previous to his death could give rise to such a hope; and unless such words, which the disciples could now recall, had been then actually spoken by him, the hope could not have been so quickly and certainly formed. But having been kindled by former utterances of his, and by the intrinsic truth of the case itself, the fire of the hope at once burned most brightly in these first moments, and was constantly kept up with unvarying ardour in the hearts of his early followers.

This hope, however, was not merely in itself most ardent, but the period of its fulfilment was beheld as quite close at hand. In fact, the most ardent hope will always behold its fulfilment as near as possible, because it is so certain; and often in previous centuries the fulfilment of the Messianic hopes were expected to be quite near in proportion to their certainty.³ But at this time there was an additional cause of a very special nature which led to the intensification of the hope of the immediate appearing of the glorified Lord as the triumphant Consummator of the kingdom of God. For however much the disciples learnt to compose their eager desire to see their Lord again,⁴ and thought of him as in his glorified rest with the Father, they still all along felt his immediate presence with their whole souls, just as if he must return every next hour, in order to appear in his full glory and to complete his kingdom. The most intense and vivid sense of his life and of their fellowship with him continued all along to vibrate

¹ Acts i. 11*b*.

201 sq., v. p. 39.

² Vol. vi. 410 sq.

³ According to the expression Luke

³ Comp. e.g., the instances vol. iv. pp. xvii. 22.

powerfully within them; and the very struggle to possess themselves in faith and patience might at times make their longing the more fervent, and their recollection of him and his certain nearness the more restless. To this were added reminiscences of certain utterances of their Lord, to the effect that the victory of his cause would soon come, even before that generation passed away,¹ before his Gospel should have been proclaimed everywhere in the land,² and whatever other form such strong utterances of his assumed; promises the exact meaning of which will have to be considered below at the proper place. They accordingly accustomed themselves to think of Christ as of one, for mysterious reasons, only temporarily absent from his terrestrial Community, and soon to be *present* in it again; and as their thoughts were always directed with absorbing intensity to the time of the still expected external Consummation, they spoke constantly of the absence or of the *advent* and the second *presence*³ of their glorified Lord, learning to bear the first in patience, and looking for the second with joyful expectation. But whether this end of the existing world should come earlier or later than they imagined, they always heard ringing in their ears the utterance of the glorified Christ with which one of the earliest Gospels closed, 'Lo, I am with you always until the end of the world.'⁴ And it was this utterance above all which could always serve to reduce the rising restlessness of the expectation to the proper composure and patience.

It is true there was in the midst of this great hope particularly one firm conviction which might easily have disturbed again the composure of the expectation, and have proved the lever of much evil and unfounded pride. This was the conviction that the world was devoted to impending destruction, while those who should follow Christ and whom he had inspired with his spirit would be saved by him when he came as the judge of the world.⁵ As regards its substance, this con-

¹ Matt. xxiv. 34, comp. xii. 41, 42, xxiii. 36 (Mark xiii. 30, Luke xxi. 32, comp. xi. 30, 31); see on this point *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iv. p. 151.

² Matt. x. 23, after the Collected Sayings in all cases.

³ *παρουσία*, but not *return*, because it is only the presence of the glorified Christ, not of the Christ who had formerly appeared in his earthly humiliation, which is always expected; hence the term *ἐπιφανεσία* interchanges with it at times, which never answers to our word *appearance* [Germ. *erscheinung*] in its lower and

commoner sense. We can also well understand that the parables which refer to this *parousia* should be popular and frequently repeated, Luke xviii. 1-8. But it is John's Gospel which here again first glorifies the lower truth, as we shall see below.

⁴ Matt. xxviii. 20 from Mark's original book.

⁵ It appears from all historical indications, and is thus quite properly presupposed, Acts ii. 40, 47, iv. 12, that this expectation at once determined everything at that time.

viction is only the highest climax of the anticipations which had formerly been uttered by the greatest prophets of the Old Testament¹—namely, that only the few who were quite faithful to the word of the true God would be able to stand in the vortex of a final decision the approach of which those prophets foresaw. The conviction, therefore, was invested with all the sacred force of the ancient Messianic expectation, with this difference only, that the latter had now received an immovable foundation and, at the same time, a Divine ardour hitherto unknown. The growing corruption which, in the time of the prophets, bounded the sphere of their vision, had really only now reached its climax, in that now, in addition to the condition of heathendom, all the corruption which existed in Judeanism had reached the stage of its fullest operation. And if it could now with more justice than ever before be said that the world lay in wickedness,² so, on the other hand, during those few hours and days that Community, which felt that it had in its celestial head the certainty of victory over all this corruption and ruin, gathered around him in full assurance. But what commotion of life in the midst of such an evil time, and what a dangerously eager hope of an immediate end of everything belonging to it, might everywhere arise from this conviction! If it nevertheless led to such evil effects only occasionally, and if the dangerous restlessness was immediately checked again when it tended to exceed due bounds,³ we must remember that the model and the requirement of the most perfect Divine-human life had just been so deeply-impressed upon the disciples that it now necessarily exerted afresh its dominant influence when they calmly recalled the memory of it; and inasmuch as the condition of salvation from the destruction was naturally the same perfect life sustained by the spirit, the model of which Christ himself had just given, a new purity and, at the same time, vigour of life generally were demanded such as had never before been required. Thereby every evil desire was necessarily checked, and all impatience was put down; and to the composure of happy hope was added the most intense effort to fulfil its new and difficult conditions. And in the strength of fervent believing prayer, with which they first became truly familiar in those days, the power of

¹ First Joel iii. 1-5 [A.V. ii. 28-32]. Comp. vol. iv. pp. 138 sq., 148, 168.

² Acc. to 1 John v. 19, and many other texts with a similar meaning.

³ Comp. the instances 2 Thess. iii. 6-12, 1 Cor. vii. 18-29. In our time an

exaggerated idea has been formed of the restlessness and withdrawal from secular affairs of the Christians of this first period, and fresh and still more serious errors have arisen from this exaggeration.

which seemed able to draw down the Holy Spirit itself upon them as their immediate helper and *assistant*,¹ the bond of fellowship with the celestial head was formed by them in such a way that this Spirit could soon itself be regarded as that pledge of his own celestial presence and strength which Christ had given to his followers for the time of his withdrawal from their sight.²

Thus in these few days the complete spiritual transformation of the disciples was effected. The absolute celestialisation of the same Christ whom they had just beheld amongst them, living under the same physical conditions as themselves, the glorification of Jesus as their purely celestial Lord, whose commands they must obey, was now accomplished in their experience. During his life on earth it was not possible, and at that time he had not desired it from them. But now they realised it with irresistible force in the briefest period, inasmuch as it had either to take place in the deepest darkness and straits of these few days, or it could never have been effected. It is true, as we saw previously,³ a celestial Messiah had been expected before the appearance of Jesus as the historical Messiah; and as he himself acted under the influence of that previous expectation, in like manner without the previous belief, the firm faith of the disciples in him as the celestial and glorified Christ would never have been formed so rapidly, and with such assurance as was actually the case. In this respect we can only recognise here a final and powerful beat of the waves of the whole previous history of Israel; and as Christ had now appeared really in the one true and salutary manner (as we saw in the previous volume), this faith in him as the Celestial Messiah who had already appeared was likewise perfectly just and salutary. If the plain and certain truths of religion must always be esteemed by men as the will and the word of God, to which they have simply and absolutely to submit themselves, in like manner that man who has proclaimed to them most perfectly this will and has caused them to hear most effectively this word, may be regarded by them as the eternally living Son of God as no other man, or indeed (as far as is reasonable) as in the place of God Himself; in fact, such a man must be so regarded if he actually performs all

¹ Although the name *ὁ παράκλητος* is first introduced by John and used of both Christ and the Holy Spirit, the idea represented by it was implied much earlier in such passages as Rom. viii. 26 sq.

thus expresses most forcibly was previously fully implied in the history of the primitive Church with which we are now occupied.

² Vol. vi. pp. 107 sq.

³ That which Paul, 2 Cor. i. 22, τ. 5,

this. And in the case of Christ all this holds so perfectly, that to recognise in him such a man and to believe in him, is of itself the highest blessing, and not the slightest external compulsion need be applied to produce this recognition and this faith. The obscure notions, errors, and mistakes which could undoubtedly take their rise from this faith, were not developed until a later period, under wholly different circumstances, and they then proved very injurious; but during this first fervid period of the youth of Christianity without the terrestrial Christ, and above all during the ardent moments of its birth, those subsequent errors found no place. For the present it was only necessary that the fact should be recognised and believed that the man who had appeared in the flesh as the Christ was, in spite of all appearance to the contrary, and of all the false conceptions and contempt of the great Judean and heathen world, the eternal celestial Messiah that had been so long expected; and firmly to maintain this against all the world, not only in faith but still more in action and in the hot conflict, was the heroic feat and immortal work of this period.

A firm faith of this kind in the unique transfiguration and glorification of the Christ, who was now reigning with God in heaven, was attended by the further good effect that it precluded every inefficient and misleading imitation, or outward repetition of the temporal and physical elements in his life. All imitations may so easily prove erroneous; after Christ had now been elevated to become the head of a new race of men in the world, there soon arose wholly perverse and, indeed, most unworthy imitators and false copyists of the exalted features of his work or of the story of his life. When it is more clearly examined, the history of the forty years before us presents numerous traces of these base imitators, who contributed in no small degree to the irremediable ruin of the time; the *Goetes*¹ become surprisingly more numerous. Pseudo-Messiahs are now met with for the first time, and the species of such false imitations become again themselves very various in proportion as the original phenomenon which gave rise to them was rich and sublime. The true exaltation and glory of the historical Christ appears in the fact that he had himself clearly foreseen this possible degeneracy of the true Messianic conceptions, and had uttered his warning against it;² but there was no more appropriate means for preserving the dis-

¹ Comp. vol. vi. p. 225.

² Mark xiii. 22, Matt. xxiv. 11, 24-28, vii. 22, 23, John v. 43, 44.

ciples and others against it than this faith in him as one raised into an absolute and unique heavenly glory, who required of men that they should follow him, but only in their entire life and sufferings, and whom no man could follow unless he believed in his exaltation.¹

The First Whitsunday.

It is true that first and most intense excitement of the disciples, who themselves also had been as it were raised to new life, was now followed by a certain degree of calm elevated composure. However, this entire revivification during those first days, with its new immeasurable joy and elevation, had been primarily experienced by the disciples alone; and though it was attended by the most enraptured blessedness, it remained after all only a purely inward and subjective experience. Now, such an experience can never be quite satisfactory for long; and least of all could it long suffice in the case of those who had really been collected and educated for the purpose of proclaiming the truth of Christ to the world, and of preparing everything for his final consummation.

But probably never in human history did any men come publicly before the world in more difficult and dangerous circumstances than the disciples of Christ in these days immediately following his crucifixion. It is true they had been, as we saw above,² trained by him to undertake somewhat more independent labours in the world as the Gospel might eventually require; but those practical instructions which he had given to them had been carried on for but a brief period, and while he was with them they were always able to obtain his direct advice or his decision and help whenever any special difficulty arose. But now they were called upon to labour in the wide world without any such visible assistance from him, and to take up a completely independent position with regard to a world in which they had formerly scarcely made the first essays to labour as his disciples. And if they now came publicly forward, they must defend a cause and propagate a new life which had only just been most solemnly condemned and put down by the world. Accordingly they were unable to speak and to labour any longer in the same way as they had formerly done; but as they were the only living defenders of this cause amongst men, wholly new difficulties of the most various and serious description immediately started up in their way. After

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 21 sq., John xv. 1 sq.

² Vol. vi. pp. 324 sq.

Christ himself had met with such a fate at the hands of the legal authorities, nothing but imprisonment, crucifixion, and death awaited everyone who determined publicly to continue his work. For the representatives of the Hagiocracy had put Christ to death mainly with the view of intimidating his adherents and of checking the course of the new doctrine at its very commencement; and if for the moment they now sought to overlook his disciples, and, if possible, avoid all further commotion amongst the people, it was nevertheless perfectly well understood that anyone who publicly declared himself in favour of the cause of the crucified Jesus incurred the same legal penalty, should the law be enforced, and had always reason to fear it.¹

And, as a fact, we see the disciples, many weeks after their master's crucifixion, as if wholly avoiding any appearance before the public. Even when the first alarm and fear had been succeeded by the new spiritual elevation; even when this most intense rapture had been followed by a still higher composure, we see them confining themselves strictly to themselves and to their house, as if the motion of a celestial hand restrained them from appearing publicly in the world as the defenders of the cause of their crucified master.² And thus they would have remained in their retirement—perhaps too long—if a wholly unexpected event had not suddenly, as if against their will, called them forth into public life. This event is at present known to us only from Luke's brief narrative, and may accordingly at first sight appear to modern readers as something absolutely inconceivable. But it has left the deepest traces in the whole subsequent history; and, if we at the same time properly read and appreciate the latter, we may still perceive fully and certainly the real nature of the marvellous event itself.

The first day of Pentecost following that great Easter arrived; the disciples were still in complete retirement, and it might already seem to the world as if the cause of the crucified man had really been obliterated with his death. The disciples, whether they had remained in Jerusalem or had come thither again (for they were all or almost all of them Galileans), had assembled in full numbers for keeping the feast; nevertheless neither did they on this day venture as yet to go into the

¹ In order to properly understand the Apostolic age generally, we cannot keep this too fully in view.

² As Luke narrates, Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4, 8, it is true long after the events

and with reference to them, but quite correctly as regards the matter itself, that the glorified Christ exhorted them to remain quietly in Jerusalem until a 'spirit from on high' should come upon them.

Temple,¹ as they would otherwise have done undoubtedly in accordance with ancient usage and the habit of Christ. Accordingly they assembled in a house which they were then accustomed to regard as their place of general resort in Jerusalem; probably the same house in which Christ himself had kept his farewell supper on the evening before his crucifixion,² and which was on that account such a peculiarly consecrated place and the scene of the most sacred memories. As they did not venture to appear openly in the Temple they determined to keep the feast in this house, and with the feelings and in the circumstances of those days, it could not be doubtful with what desires and prayers they had to keep it in memory of the Master who had now departed from them. But that year the Feast of Pentecost fell on a Sunday;³ it was the seventh Sunday after the crucifixion and the first day of the Easter feast, but since the complete transformation and re-quickening which the disciples experienced on that first Sunday,⁴ this day of the week, a lengthened celebration of the ancient Sabbath, had become generally to them the most memorable of days, upon which they longed perpetually to revive again that first experience of higher life in all its rapture.⁵ We may, therefore, imagine with what added fervour they kept particularly this Whitsunday, how the ardour of their desire, the full stream of their prayers, and the wrestling energy of their souls increased; how in the crowding through the inward fervour of the one was kindled to a mightier flame by that of the other, as if the ground were agitated beneath

¹ Though Luke does not distinctly say this, it is implied, partly because he says nothing of the Temple, Acts ii. 1, 2, comp. ver. 44, partly because in all that precedes, Luke xxiv. 13-53, Acts ch. i., the city of Jerusalem is spoken of, and the relation of the disciples to it, but the Temple is nowhere mentioned, and partly because it is afterwards, Acts ii. 46, that attendance at the Temple by the Christians is spoken of and then special importance is attached to it.

² According to Mark xiv. 12-16, comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.*, i. p. 424 sq. This is always presupposed in ancient narratives, for instance in that one which Cureton published in his *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 24. It is another question how far the locality and even the house of the Last Supper, which was subsequently shown upon the hill *Sion*, and at a distance of only 30 ft. from which 'the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples' (comp. Theodoricius, *De locis sanctis*, p. 55,

ed. Tobler, and the anonymous writer quoted in the same work pp. 117, 121 sq., 136), were genuine; but even according to that tradition the Temple is not mentioned.

³ In due succession, that is, if Christ was really crucified that year, and on that Friday *before* that first day of Easter of which we have spoken further in the previous volume, vi. pp. 390 sq. It is true that Luke does not expressly say that the feast of Pentecost fell this year on a Sunday, but he omits to say this simply because he presupposes it as known from Christian usage. In the oldest ecclesiastical law of the Constitutions of Edessa, ii. 9 (*apud* Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 25 sq.), the Ascension as well as Pentecost fell upon one Sunday; in that case this was probably the same appearance to the five hundred, or rather to *all the Apostles* (not the Twelve alone) which is mentioned, 1 Cor. xv. 6, 7.

⁴ See *ante*, pp. 59 sq.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 69.

their feet.¹ Though they could not seek by the wrestling energy of their desire to call forth the last appearance of Christ for the judgment of the world, they might endeavour to obtain an appearance similar to those which had been previously frequently granted;² but on this Sunday it seemed as if he would not appear to them; they could have desired to call for him with ever-increasing fervour and urgency, but from fear of the enemies who were about them and came up in unusually large numbers to the feast, they dared scarcely to lift up their voices. They desired, as was suitable to a great feast of thanksgiving like Pentecost, to join in a hymn of thanksgiving, suiting their mood of mind, for the resurrection and the eternal reign of Christ,³ and that also was not permitted to them.

When the fervour of deepest desire and most ardent enthusiasm in such a situation nevertheless breaks through all obstacles, it must expand itself with all the greater vehemence; and this finally happened in the present case somewhat early on the morning of the day of Pentecost. We are now no longer in a position to say exactly what physical impression brought about the change; in such extreme tension of the minds of so many persons in a crowded assembly, even the most accidental sudden movement in the air may call forth the deepest commotion and a complete change of feeling; and the disciples were at this moment most intensely expecting from heaven some sign of the Divine will. Something of a physical kind, which they felt was sent to them from heaven, must, in any case, have formed the decisive cause of the change in their feeling; probably it was a sudden strong gust of wind in the early morning, upon the wings of which they now heard the celestial answer to their hushed prayers, borne from the place where they knew Christ was remembering them by the Father,⁴ and whence he had promised to send them the assistance of the Holy Spirit in their deepest need.⁵ Whatever that outward occasion was, they felt compelled in an equally audible manner to reply to that audible voice from heaven, and thus on that morning the fire of enthusiasm at last burst irresistibly through all hindrances. They did not behold the risen and

¹ Just as similar experience is described, Acts iv. 31.

² See *ante*, p. 64.

³ As we can infer from the indication, Acts ii. 11.

⁴ It is implied in the nature of the case itself that an external impulse played its part; and the celestial *φωνή*, Acts ii. 6, was heard, according to the general

recollection of this decisive moment, by the other people in Jerusalem also. Neither in this instance either can men become familiarised with spiritual realities without the aid of physical accompaniments!

⁵ In words like Matt. x. 20, which John subsequently further works out in his Gospel.

glorified Christ; but that higher composure of their minds which they had now obtained with regard to him, as was above explained, manifested now for the first time the noblest effects by which it was accompanied. For when that form also of beholding him, which had still something material about it, now ceased, the fire of enthusiasm, which had been restrained under that oppressive covering, for the first time broke forth in them with the greater purity. As the prophets of the Old Testament felt at times that they were addressed by the plainest and clearest voice of God, and were seized by His mighty hand, so that they were compelled to say and do what they had thus irresistibly perceived to be the will of their God;¹ and as previously in the Old Testament the inspired enthusiasm of men of like feeling most rapidly communicated itself from one to another;² so those who were here assembled, whose spiritual fervour must have been vastly more intense (according to the early account), heard ‘suddenly from heaven the sound as of a rushing mighty wind, beheld it filling the whole house with light, appeared to see as it were tongues of fire parting asunder out of it, and the fire plant itself upon the tongue of each of them, became full of holy spirit, and began to reply as the spirit gave them utterance.’ And we can easily perceive that that moment of most unique character in the history of the world is here described without any pride or desire to make a boast of it, and yet bringing out its profound significance. It is narrated in these words as in the joy of jubilant recollection, and after the manner of such exalted narratives, and with very much the same truth with which Isaiah, for instance, describes similar exalted moments of his personal experience.³ It was thus not only always retold in the Apostolic age with reference to this its higher significance, but the vibrations of it continued to be felt most strongly, and it was repeated in a thousand similar forms, though never in the same way. The most difficult and eventful step had now been taken, most unexpectedly

¹ According to Isa. v. 9, viii. 11, xxii. 14, and similar passages.

² As an illustration of which 1 Sam. xix. 20-24 may be quoted. If this infection is possible in the case of lower forms of mania (see examples even in recent times in the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, 1851, pp. 565 sq., and the *N. D. Z.* 1858, Sep. 3), how much more in the case before us!

³ Just as Luke, Acts i. 3, gives his reader to understand by the expression *ὄπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς* that the appearances of

the risen Lord were really only spiritual, so he intimates by such particles as *ῥοπερ*, *ῥοσεῖ*, Acts ii. 2, 3, plainly enough that such things must not be interpreted in a gross material sense, and that human language is really inadequate to describe them perfectly. The *fire* which planted itself upon the tongue of each, ver. 3, is really only the same which is mentioned even in addition to the Holy Ghost, Matt. iii. 11, when it comes into the world with its utmost power.

to the world, and most of all to the disciples themselves; they and the rest of the adherents of the crucified Jesus had for the first time come before the world with their outspoken rejoicing and their new confession, and all human fear had been for ever overcome by the overpowering force of purest Divine enthusiasm. For that their great rejoicing at having found eternal life and victory over every error, in the crucified One, should now make itself heard in the world was that higher necessity which, in the co-operation of the profoundest human effort and of the eternal Divine will, in this instance found free course in order that the first thing might be done which was now required. In consequence of human sin at its height, the world had sought, by the formally legal death of the one true leader to immortal life, to destroy the spirit of this life itself; and now this same spirit, in hundreds of disciples of whom it had taken possession, went forth into the world all the more irresistibly and armed with more terrible power, not according to human purpose, or after an express agreement amongst the disciples, but purely by virtue of its own immortal energy.¹

But if the spirit now compelled them in spite of all the world to utter before all men that which had long profoundly agitated their inmost souls, in what way were they to utter it? Probably in that age of highest zeal for the ancient Law it was already the custom to sing on Whitsunday hymns in commemoration of the giving of the Law on Sinai;² but the disciples were certainly in no state of mind to strike up of their own accord such a hymn; and they were not in the Temple amongst the assembled multitude of the adherents of the old faith (for at this very time a new faith was being separated from the old one), making it possible for them to be carried away with their psalms. They could only desire to sing the praises of their risen Christ and of Him who had raised him to Himself; they could only long for him to come as the final judge of the earth, and in spirit already to behold his arrival from heaven for judgment. But all these thoughts, perfectly as they accorded with the exalted mood of this festive day particularly, had been hitherto closely shut up, and, as it were, lying unborn in the depths of their souls; as yet they had

¹ Notwithstanding all the dissimilarity as regards the nature of the two religions themselves, we may compare as very similar the immediate effects of the crucifixion of *Mani* on his adherents, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1862, p. 667.

² Comp. the remark in my *Antiquities*, p. 369, *note* 2; as the sacred Law began to be esteemed so highly in the time of *Ezra*, we may suppose that this Feast received somewhat early a reference to it.

never sung such a hymn of praise, nor expressed before the world their feelings at the thought of his approach as the judge of the world. The earnest and agitating thought of the nearness and certain coming of the Judge of the world in the immediate future is able at any time to carry the minds of men as if beyond themselves; how must it have seized those disciples as they remembered that the same Christ who might come as the final Judge of the world at any moment, had been slain by this very world while he had just been as a man in such exceedingly close relations with themselves!

But if they were, as urged by the spirit, obliged now at this moment, for the first time in spite of the world, to give utterance to the tremendous implications involved in this thought, it is intelligible enough that the stream of their out-breaking feelings might become a stammering language of a marvellous character, and never before heard, rather than a discourse flowing forth along the usual lines. It was the lisping and stammering with which the Christianity of a whole Community without the visible Christ entered as an infant just born into the world; it was the loud cry with which it for the first time drew its deepest breath in this world in opposition to the heavy pressure of the atmosphere of the earth, so as to be able to live further under it; and it was also the first outburst of the endless energy and gladness of life which had long been secretly accumulating within it, and with which it now for the first time overflowed. And much as the world opposed this child with its grievous oppression, it rather turned its face, as it made its first loud cry, upwards to heaven, whence, as regards its hidden spiritual nature and the tendency of its soul, it drew its origin. The joy of having Christ and in him the judge of the world as its lord and friend, the longing to see him come down from the skies again for judgment, the praise of God as his Father and the ultimate Judge of the world, thanksgiving for having been saved from the approaching destruction by Him and His messenger, enthusiastic hope of the eternal victory with Christ,—all these and kindred feelings found a way of utterance in loud and ever louder tones. They were not uttered in the words, hymns, and prayers which had hitherto been customary, nor even in the modes of speech and languages of men which had till then been used, but as in new tongues and languages such as had never been heard and had a wholly foreign sound; not in the regular contemporaneous speaking and singing together of individuals, and yet from this common spirit and irresistible

impulse of all; not in the premeditated thoughts and idioms of one language, but as in a sudden confluence and fresh reconstruction of all previous languages; not in detail intelligible to the world, and yet, as coming from one spirit and one irrepressible impulse, sufficiently intelligible to it as regards the ultimate aim and meaning. It was as if the spirit in pouring itself forth in its deepest fervour towards heaven had forgotten the world around, and as if no warning of human reason could any longer restrain the flow of its absolute dominance.¹

All this took place thus only through a higher coincidence, without any intention or arbitrary choice of men, and therefore the more irresistibly, and with the greater originality and force, and the more influentially and typically, inasmuch as it was all based upon powers and truths which must at some time find utterance. Every form of true spiritual life must procure for itself a new language, though it might at first be but as the lisping and stammering of a child or the unintelligible cry of greatest excitement. It is only the highest instance of this which we meet with at that moment when Christianity, as no longer the cause of the one visible Christ, but of a Community confronting the oppression of the whole world, as with one mighty stroke of its pinions, breaks through all hindrances, by the infinite truth and the uprightness of its inmost spirit. And really the only thing which thereby found its triumphant expression was the fundamental truth of all Christian knowledge and all Christian life after Christ, namely, that Christ was the judge of the world, and would thus manifest himself to the world in his full glory, together with the great longing and hope which were properly connected with it. But after the exalted and memorable moment of this Whitsunday *speaking with other, strange or new tongues*, or as it was subsequently called more briefly, *speaking with tongues*, was considered for a long time as the distinctive sign of the full birth of Christianity in the great world, and as the most characteristic mark of the most profound movements of the Christian spirit in its endeavour to attain the final Consummation. This unrestrained lisping and jubilation with which Christianity in its infancy looked up to heaven was soon repeated in a thousand forms; and in the case of those who afterwards became Christians, speaking with tongues was regarded as the most

¹ To use here Paul's distinction between the πνεῦμα and ῥοῦς. 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16. Acts ii. 4, the early Coptic translator interprets ἀποφθέγγεσθαι properly as to *reply aloud*.

complete and evident birth of the Christian spirit.¹ In hours of solitude and strong desire individuals also seem to have again and again produced in themselves this loftier mood of soul, and to have abandoned themselves to the rapture of the fresh experience of such dread emotions.² And inasmuch as this speaking with tongues was soon regarded as a miraculous mark, never before witnessed, of infant Christianity,³ it was soon developed into an art, individuals claiming a special faculty for producing such moods of soul and forms of utterance, and appearing before the assembled congregations for this purpose.⁴ In this there is a good deal that is obscure to us, owing to the want of more particular information; but we must especially keep in mind the fact that the phenomena of this kind were similar to those of the first Whitsunday, although assuming gradually weaker, and in some individuals probably degenerate, forms. There appears to have been at first absorbing occupation with the simple thought of the approaching judgment of the world, and of Christ being the Judge; the next stage was one of silence and self-restraint; and finally, with the belief of being his and of seeing him coming in his glory, there followed a vehement outbreak of all the latent feelings and thoughts in their most immediate overwhelming force. Such was without doubt always the mental process of this phenomena of speaking with tongues as the most characteristic manifestation of Christian inspired enthusiasm,⁵ in the forms which it was now about to assume and to be continued in the world; and in trying to realise it we must imagine the tremendous power which was involved in the thought of being in contact with Christ as the judge of the world at the time when this thought was still quite new. Nothing depended on the language of the schools and ordinary education; even the words of all dialects, which were otherwise most remote, which were most rarely heard, and which were the most uncommon, forced their way from the liberated breast; the synonyms of various languages were in the vehemence of excitement thrown together in unusual amalga-

¹ As appears from the instances, Acts x. 44-47 (comp. xi. 15), xix. 5, 6; where, however, it must be observed that in these cases also the speaking with tongues is heard amongst a multitude of believers.

² As we are particularly told by the Apostle Paul himself, 1 Cor. xiv. 18, comp. xiii. 1 sq.; and he was undoubtedly not the only man with this faculty.

³ As appears also from Mark xvi. 17,

in which passage this gift is reckoned, quite in accordance with history, as the second Christian sign after the power of exorcism which had been exercised by the disciples during the life of Christ, see vol. vi. pp. 325, 333.

⁴ According to 1 Cor. xii.-xiv.

⁵ See my *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 188 sq.

mations ;¹ and many a word which had once been heard from the lips of Christ himself, now probably fell upon the ears of the first disciples with a thousandfold increased force in such moments of holy awe,² so as, when it was received into the vortex of their own discourse, to increase the vehemence of their rapture. The rapture of knowing that Christ the coming Judge was their Lord, and of being able on that account to defy all the world, became a vehement exultation, the praise of God for sending him to the earth,³ became a lisping, stammering hymn never heard before ; the longing for the speedy appearing of the glorified Lord reached the fervour of unutterable groans,⁴ and the whole experience of such moments ended in such a mighty utterance of wrestling and agonising souls as the world had never witnessed before. The Old Testament prophet, too, before he was able to speak with due force and clearness, was probably often moved and agitated by the most overpowering feelings ;⁵ but as soon as ever this new form of inspiration made its appearance in the world, it at once surpassed all the older forms in point of force, frequency of occurrence, and the effects produced.

Finally, the subject-matter of the thoughts which obtained this vehement utterance could really be very various ; and it necessarily became so in proportion as this new form of inspired enthusiasm grew into a custom.⁶ And although the thoughts and words which thus found vent might often remain quite unintelligible to others than Christians, so that they were mainly astonished and recognised solely this purely wonderful aspect of the phenomenon,⁷ or even regarded those

¹ As ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ, Gal. iv. 6, Rom. viii. 15, which may have often occurred in the 'tongue language' of this Apostle; further *raî ἀμήν*, Rev. i. 7 (comp. iii. 14), and similarly xxii. 20, according to the improved text, precisely at the beginning and the end of the book, for greater solemnity; in the middle of the book, xiv. 13, xvi. 7, it is otherwise.

² As the above ἀββᾶ, which Christ himself used, according to Mark xiv. 36 (where the addition of ὁ πατήρ is an ordinary explanation in Mark's manner of the Aramaic), and which the disciples had undoubtedly often heard him utter. The words *μαρὰν ἀθά*, i. Cor. xvi. 22, also may have been first heard amongst the Greeks in this 'tongue-language' and thus have become a mysterious Christian password amongst them also.

³ This 'praise of God and his works' is plainly distinguished, Acts ii. 11, x. 46,

as the chief subject-matter of these speeches in other tongues, and such a subject-matter is rich enough.

⁴ We are supported in this speaking by Rom. viii. 26, 27, inasmuch as the Apostle plainly alludes in these words to the phenomenon of speaking with tongues, and every prayer could easily assume in its fervour this form; in this respect also this description of the Apostle's is very instructive.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 73 sq., also *Jahrb. d. B. W.* viii. pp. 31 sq. Further, many points connected with this gift of tongues have been discussed in *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 239-71.

⁶ This follows from 1 Cor. xiv. 13-17, comp. ver. 2, according to the proper force of the words.

⁷ Which Paul likewise so forcibly remarks, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 21-33, comp. Acts ii. 7, 12.

who thus spoke as beside themselves,¹ it still cannot be denied that the meaning of such a speaker could easily be guessed, and then interpreted as it were, by an immediate acquaintance who was familiar with his dialect and his general characteristics.² But the happiest issue was if the language of one or more such inspired speakers which appeared to the ordinary hearer meaningless, at last of itself subsided into elevated words which could be understood by all, though of a lofty prophetic character,³ or if it finally became clear and powerfully persuasive eloquence, as was the case at the feast of Pentecost now under consideration.

Twenty or thirty years later this marvellous feature of the birth of Christianity had undoubtedly greatly degenerated in certain localities, in Corinth for instance, where it learnt to adapt itself, with its striking and peculiar characteristics, to the liking of the Corinthian church for fresh sights and sounds. Individual members were proud of it as a genuinely Christian art; and it was undoubtedly the common opinion that whoever could occupy himself absorbingly with the thought of Christ as the Judge of the world and then calmly wait the moment of inspiration would be seized by the whirl of a speech of this kind. In these circumstances Paul was already obliged to caution the Corinthians against the degeneration of the gift, and to endeavour to prevent its running wild by imposing due limitations on its exercise; and he particularly required that such a speaker should never address a public assembly unless an interpreter was at hand. But on that Whitsunday, when this jubilation and mighty desire of Christianity, as it was still quite strange in the world, for the first time made themselves heard amongst men, this feature of it was so marvellous as regards its inward force and excellence, the number and unanimity of those who shared it, and finally its fruits and subsequent effects, that all the later repetitions of it, including the most powerful of them, could only be as the distant reverberations of thunder. Moreover, we have an historical description of this first instance of speaking with tongues only, a fixed and frequently repeated narrative of it as part of the history of the entrance of Apostolic Christianity into the world being an obvious necessity; and though every word which was

¹ According to 1 Cor. xiv. 23; Acts ii. 13-15.

² Hence Paul makes the immediate interpretation by a capable interpreter the very condition of the public appearance of such speakers, 1 Cor. xiv. 13 sq.; an

entirely new requirement which he only could make and enforce.

³ A case of this kind is presupposed, Acts xix. 6, which we are only unable to trace as regards the particular details and circumstances.

uttered by those who were then present may not have been spoken exactly as is now represented by Luke, we have no reason to doubt the general correctness of his narrative.¹

When the people in Jerusalem, attracted by the loud noise in the air and of the inspired speakers (who were sitting perhaps on the flat roof of the house), assembled around the house, probably some individuals of them, on recovering from their first astonishment, began to ridicule the phenomenon, but on the whole it produced a marvellously impressive and elevating effect upon those who had come together. Very many immediately felt the profound and holy seriousness of the apparently intoxicated disciples, observed that really these enthusiastic people were only seeking to sing what seemed to be hymns of praise to God; and, marvellously strange as this language sounded to them, they were so enchained, as by an irresistible charm, by its deep feeling and fervour, as well as by the higher harmony of such a large number of voices, that every one supposed he heard his own language in the strange new tones of these Galileans, and felt a strong desire immediately to join his voice with theirs. And the larger the number of foreign Judeans² who had come from the various countries of the earth to the feast, or were staying for a time in Jerusalem, was on that day, it was the more wonderful that all the various foreigners supposed they heard their native tongues in this new one, as if the Gospel were the language in which every man might join by using that which was most truly his own and familiar to him.—It is particularly this feature of the apparent disappearance of all the differences of language and thought in this one new tongue,³ which the narrative evidently dwells

¹ There is no reason whatever for misconceiving and denying the historical truth of the event recorded, Acts ii., as is done by some moderns. It is true, if other narratives in addition to this of Luke were at our service, we should perhaps be able to discern some details more clearly, but we really still perceive from Luke's narrative plainly enough all that is most essential; and Luke shows, even by the special importance which he attaches to this narrative, that he justly regarded the event as of high significance. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæc.* v. 6. 1, and Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* v. 8, continue to speak of the matter quite like Paul in a favourable sense, as if it was in their time still well known; comp. *Constit. Apost.* viii. 1, 2-5.

² In the long list of the strangers, Acts ii. 9-11, which is intended to include briefly all the countries in which Judeans

were then dispersed, advancing from the east to the west and then turning back again, the name Judea appears quite inappropriate, particularly as we should expect the larger country Syria to be mentioned instead; it is true the antithesis to Galilee (Matt. xxvi. 73) appears to give some countenance to the word, yet on the other hand we should not expect to find Judea between Mesopotamia and Cappadocia: perhaps therefore Syria has been omitted after Judea. But the mention of proselytes, v. 10, shows that we cannot suppose that a Judean language common to all, but differing somewhat with the various countries mentioned, is presupposed.

³ There is in these words, Acts ii. 5-11, no foundation whatever for the gross misunderstanding (which is also opposed to the whole New Testament) which was subsequently connected with them, namely,

upon with special delight, as this trait in fact describes most beautifully and plainly the effect which the new language of the spirit produced upon the best of the spectators. And undoubtedly there can scarcely be a more elevated scene for eye and ear than the outburst of the fervent enthusiasm of such a number of assembled people, when the intensity of the inspired enthusiasm combines all the most different voices of the inspired individuals in one accord again, when the purity of the enthusiasm is so great that in the midst of the highest excitement a still loftier uniformity and symmetry of movement arises, and the enthusiasm itself is so irresistibly powerful that no one can well venture to disturb its operation, and all witness it as if enchanted. And this scene has undoubtedly been hitherto wholly unique in the history of the world.

The flocking to them of an increasing crowd of people must have very soon reminded those of the world who were, as it were, oblivious of its existence, and have snatched them from the vortex of their inward rapture. But it was precisely thereby that the confessors of Christ stepped forth into full publicity, through the irresistible impulse of a celestial power which had hitherto been unknown to themselves, and that they were hurried forwards a tremendous step which they could not again retrace. And as if the same celestial power of the pure confession of the highest truth, by which they had been so suddenly seized in the face of the world, were not in their subsequent cooler moments to forsake them, but to remain constantly with them, Peter at once confronted the multitude with the force of clear and decided speech. He showed with overpowering eloquence how far it was from being the case that those who were assembled there were drunken in the bad sense, and that what had really taken place was simply the fulfilment of that Old Testament prophecy of the abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Messianic times; he proved that the man who had been crucified through the fault of the nation must have been this promised Christ, both by virtue of his own greatness and according to Old Testament prophecy; and, pointing to this enthusiastic inspiration itself, which none but the risen and glorified Lord could have imparted, he closed with the most urgent exhortation to

that the Twelve (but in this passage all the Christians of that time are meant), were able from that moment to understand and speak all foreign languages. The proper historical miracle as it is here indicated is already great enough, and

Ezekiel iii. 6 had already begun dimly to anticipate the possibility that even the differences of language should be no real hindrance in the way of the teaching and work of the true prophet.

the multitude to reflect more deeply upon the true state of the case.¹ If, therefore, the first outburst of that inspiration had been great and elevating, this fluent and eloquent discourse, as its immediate fruit, was not less marvellous for its exceedingly great boldness and its admirable wisdom and moderation.

And very soon the immediate excellent effects of both the inspiration and its fruit in Peter's discourse were seen to develop themselves. It had now been sensibly manifested before all the world, at the central place of the Community of the ancient true religion and likewise on this solemn feast day, that Christ's cause had not perished with his crucifixion, but on the contrary had all the more wonderfully revived again in consequence of it. A burning contention of thoughts and words was unexpectedly enkindled; the eloquence and fiery zeal of Peter were undoubtedly supported by all his colleagues; and if very many of the first spectators and others who subsequently flocked to the scene remained in their unbelief, others were unable to forget either the sight of such inspiration or the words of Peter. Moreover, the recollection of Christ which had scarcely faded from memory, and of his unique character, was revived again in the case of so many who had known him more intimately without becoming exactly his disciples; and again, the fear of a speedy end of the world was widely spread. In short, on the same day, according to Luke's narrative, some three thousand souls were baptized; and the firm foundation for a considerable church in the great metropolis itself was thereby laid.

But without doubt the happy results were still greater as regards the internal development of this growing church of Christ without its visible head. If they had just before felt restrained by human fear in that time of terror from appearing in public and openly confessing their Lord, they had now, without their own human seeking, been thrown by the divine force of the cause of their Master itself suddenly into the midst of the public world. They were now unable to retreat, and the same moment which had carried them irresistibly into the public arena had not only released them from all the fetters of fear but had also filled them with such a daring and gladness in view of the success of their new work that from this day forth they were like men who had been completely regenerated by the higher spirit. To the representatives of the Hagiocracy also their relation had now been changed as by one blow. They no

¹ These are the three main sections of Peter's discourse, Acts ii. 14-21; 22-28; 29-36.

longer confronted these rulers as a few isolated individuals ; unexpectedly to all, a great church had gathered around them as by magic ; and the representatives of the Hagiocracy had time to seek first of all to consider their proper attitude towards this new state of things.

This unique interlude in the history therefore closes with the event and the still greater effects of this first Whitsunday. It is now that the Community of Christ, as it is able to live and work in the world without him as its visible head, first makes its public entrance into the world, in order that from this moment it may continue the work of Christ himself in his spirit and without his visible presence until that work attains the proper end to which it was from the first destined. This, his Community had previously existed, having been founded and trained by Christ himself ;¹ but, as his violent death seemed to have exterminated his church again from amongst men, so now his Community rose again with him likewise to a higher life. And, in like manner as the day of the baptism of Jesus became the natal hour of Christianity on the earth,² in the form in which he was able to found it for all time when present in the flesh, so this Day of Pentecost is the true natal hour of Christianity as it exists and is perpetuated on the earth without the presence of Christ in the flesh. But, like every manifestation of true healthy life, this new-born Community, as the highest stage of life, had sprung without any human artificial help purely from the action and combination of the purest divine energies and necessities raised above all the arbitrary acts of men, and it took the world by surprise before it had even suspected its approach, so that, having once entered the world, it might pass through a boundless course of further development.

And brief as the history of this interval is, and hidden as it is from the world generally until the moment of its magnificent close, it is no less certain that within the limits of these few weeks the germs of the entire subsequent history of the Apostolic and later Christian Church lie concealed, and that in the apparent stillness of this period the most magnificent life was being secretly developed, which from that time onwards filled the world. The higher life which Christ had called forth in the world had necessarily to be perpetuated in another manner after his crucifixion. For this purpose during these few days it gathered together its energies, as in its lowest foundations and hidden from all the world, that from

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 296 sq.

² *Ibid.* p. 194.

this day of Pentecost onwards it might, no longer dependent on the mortal Christ, continue his work in an entirely different manner and yet in essentially the same spirit. The profound sorrow and the retirement of the disciples during the interval was also necessary in order that the power of this life might be again restored within them and re-established in an entirely different manner than before; and when subsequently the necessary stages of this development were looked back upon, there was soon introduced into the other narratives of the words of the glorified Christ the statement, as we have seen,¹ that he advised the disciples to remain quietly in Jerusalem until they should receive, *put on* (as a new enduring garment, or a new eternal ornament) *a power from on high*.²

Neither is the circumstance that this complete transformation of the disciples was effected exactly within the fifty days, which, according to the ancient arrangement of the feasts, close the opening period of the new year which began with the Passover, purely accidental, but this interval was in itself a distinct period, ending with a joyous feast, which could not well suffer the disciples to remain in their first isolation, oppressive fear, and complete retirement. But what an entirely different course of experience both in their own midst, and in the outer world at last, did the disciples in this case pass through in comparison with all the other members of the ancient Community! And if the seven weeks between the Passover and the day of Pentecost were not marked by any essentially progressive movement within their course, the history of the corresponding days of this year, on the other hand, passed through those three essentially different stages which have been described above, inasmuch as the intensely exciting vision of the risen Christ had necessarily to be first followed by the calm contemplation of his eternal glorification, in order that then at last the experience of the Day of Pentecost might spring out of it.

On the other hand, as regards these three stages, the history of the entrance into the world of the ancient Community of the Old Testament has great similarity with the corresponding event in the history of the Community of the New Testament. As Israel, when led by Moses to the Red Sea, steadily endured the greatest mortal terrors in the hour of sudden peril, in like manner the Community formed by Christ had first to experience and with divine patience to overcome all the bitter trials con-

¹ *Ante*, p. 72.

Gospel xxiv. 49 and Acts i. 4, in a some-

² According to Luke, both in his what different form.

nected with his death. As Israel by the Red Sea, submitting in the midst of their mortal terrors and most horrible darkness to the guidance of Moses, saw suddenly the light of God Himself shining around them, and were thus marvellously strengthened for victorious endurance, so likewise this Community, in the midst of their profound terror and apparent destruction in the world, found again the light of their risen Lord, and learned in this light to find the strength of a new life. And, as in the former case, the higher spirit which animated Israel, thus strengthened by deepest trials, entered triumphantly into the great world through the unexpected overthrow of the Egyptians, an event which became the moving force of the whole following history,¹ in like manner the wholly unlooked for event of the Day of Pentecost became for this Community the hour of its full birth in the world. In the first case, we have the most extreme stage of complicated danger, then a long period of intense suspense, and finally, the most sudden and rapid deliverance. In the case before us these stages are similarly passed through, only the process is incomparably more spiritual and powerful. But in both cases such a surprising and triumphant issue was possible, only because the highest powers of true religion had, long before this utmost danger and darkness, been producing an indestructible life, and on that ground only could those two moments of history become the full birth and commencement of an endlessly advancing movement in the first instance of all true, and, in the second, of all perfect true religion.

Of such unique importance was this Day of Pentecost. And yet we should interpret Luke's narratives² erroneously and much too one-sidedly if we inferred from them that the Holy Spirit came that day for the first time upon the disciples. On the contrary, as soon as ever the disciples had convinced themselves of the certainty of the resurrection of their Lord they were necessarily, as was shown above, possessed by a new spirit which was by its very nature the same Holy Ghost. And it is as if the Apostle John had desired in this matter also to expressly counteract the one-sided opinions which prevailed, when he narrates, that on the very first occasion that the glorified Christ appeared to his disciples, he breathed upon them and thereby enabled them to receive the Holy Spirit.³ The Day

¹ All this accords with what we saw Pentecost in his mind, and alludes to it above, vol. ii. pp. 70 sq.

² John xx. 22, where the language can

³ For in the passage, Luke xxiv. 49, he so brief because the matter had previously been spoken of at length, xiv. 16 sq.

of Pentecost, therefore, brought nothing new beyond the daring and at the same time the great results of that first public preaching and working, for which it undoubtedly required a strength and inward feeling of the Holy Spirit such as had never before been experienced by the disciples.

2. *The Shaping of the Christian Church.*

1. *In General.*

A MARVELLOUS life now arose in that Community which found itself thus suddenly driven forth into the world by a higher power. From this moment it was compelled to seek to make for itself a home in this world; and it gradually accomplished this, difficult as it was, on account both of its own inmost sensibilities and the hostility and persecuting spirit of the world which were aroused in a fresh manner.

It may be safely said that in the whole history of the world never had a whole Community through a course of many years lived so exclusively with all its thought as in heaven as that primitive Community of Christianity without a visible Christ actually did. Every moment awaiting the coming of its celestial Lord and the sudden arrival of the judgment of the world, and with the most intense longing desiring nothing but this one great event, it was conscious of being constantly allied with him alone by all its thoughts and endeavours, its gaze directed ardently simply to his appearing, while it listened in deep suspense only for his mighty word of command from heaven.¹ It was only for a short time that he who was inexhaustible in his love to his followers and able to deliver from all evil, while, on the other hand, he was, as the last Judge, the all-powerful Lord, seemed hidden behind the clouds of heaven, to come forth upon the earth most unexpectedly in his full glory; and often he already appeared as in the most mysterious shocks to break through this darkness at least for brief moments, and to comfort and assure his followers of his hidden power, even though it might be only by the marvellous influences of his spirit. When he should at last appear in his full glory, he would take his followers to himself, reduce his enemies, who

On the other hand, the Seventh Gospel work (see *ante*, pp. 67, 81) follows at this point the same source as Luke, inasmuch as the speaking with other tongues, Mark xvi. 17, is evidently treated by it as identical with the gift of the Holy Ghost,

Paul's language also presupposing this, *ante*, p. 96. In John's writings there is nowhere any reference to the gift of tongues.

¹ See my note on 1 Thess. iv. 16. *Sandschreiben des A. P.*, p. 17.

crucified and derisively mocked him, to the most bitter wailing over their own infatuation,¹ and, as Judge of the world, establish his universal and outwardly completed kingdom. These and similar thoughts and expectations were always vividly present to the minds of the little flock of believers, and kept their attention constantly directed to those regions whence alone a completion in this manner of all that had been begun amongst them could be looked for. Expectation thus often grew to the deepest longing, and such longing to the most eager demand. And though Paul in the later period of his life still vividly retains this hope, within due bounds, and John, the author of the Book of Revelation, at the end of the period before us, revives it afresh and, indeed, transforms it into the most urgent prayer² when it is on the point of flagging, it must have been the most intensely fervent during the first years, and have formed alone the most powerful motive-force of this Community while it was still so weak and wholly strange in the world.

Nevertheless greater composure of life in the midst of that world necessarily followed, as was shown above; and this was the more possible in proportion as the impression of that Pentecostal event, with its immediate effects, had been great and influential. Indeed, we may justly say that every day and every week, from one Sunday to the next, which made this Community with its burning desires hold out in the midst of such a cold scene, necessarily had the effect of making it by degrees more patient and calm and habituated to the coldness of this earth; otherwise it would have soon imperilled its own life again by the constant intensification of its inward fire. Patience and calm self-possession were, in this case, a difficult acquirement, particularly as serious provocations soon arose from without, and persecutions of all kinds were set in motion; these virtues had nevertheless to be practised, and in addition to the above hope itself they formed a second element of the strength of the characteristic spirit of this Community. And it was very soon brought into a series of the most extreme trials, so that necessarily, if it did not succumb, it became proportionally noble and strong. But the longer the Church

¹ According to the expression, Rev. i. 7, borrowed from Zech. xii. 10-12; and inasmuch as the passage Gen. xii. 3 concerning *all the tribes of the earth*, was also gradually connected with the above expression, the *κόσμοι* with *ἔθνη* in the description, Matt. xxiv. 30, arose as

by a paronomasia, the reading being so far correct. The thing intended is itself identical with Luke xvii. 22, John vii. 34.

² The entire Apocalypse, but particularly the conclusion, xxii. 17-21, may be quoted in this connection.

learnt in patience and composure to accustom itself to its position, the more calmly it recalled to memory all the earlier sayings and teaching of its Master; and if in the time immediately following his death it was chiefly the last great prophetic utterances of Christ which then made themselves heard in its ears, now it was undoubtedly the infinitely soothing and consoling remembrance of the whole way in which Christ had once taught and laboured in the Community founded by him that came before its spirit more and more prominently; and by degrees the habit was acquired of continuing to live, even at this time in this world, with greater composure after the model of those earlier busy but happy days.

By the interaction and combined effect of these two wholly different but highest powers and motives the purest spiritual life by which any community can be animated was accordingly constituted. Every moment awaiting the celestial Judge and yet calmly taking part in all the duties of each new day, with the whole heart bound to heaven alone, and yet embracing the brethren and all men upon the earth with the purest love, bearing the greatest suffering of the earth at the hands of men, and yet maintaining always a lofty patience and cheerfulness—all these most practical movements of the life of the perfect true religion were exhibited in this case, not by this or that individual, but by an entire Community, and tended to become the eternal life of this Community itself. The same higher life which had a little while before appeared in the mortal frame of Christ himself was now about to be perpetuated in this entire and constantly increasing Community, to extend ever further with its extension, to continue for all time on the earth with its continuance. And if the visible glory of the Lord of the Community was now hidden, and it was regarded as sacrilege to demand as by force his coming, this Community nevertheless, since that day of Pentecost, felt the power of the Holy Spirit, as his substitute, as it were, still always hovering over its head as in a bright cloud of mysterious nearness, making itself felt also more strongly with its marvellous power when the Community was assembled in fervent prayer in the hours of intense longing and trouble.¹ Where had there previously ever been a Community on the earth with such a burning zeal for the will of God as it had been clearly declared to it, and with such calm

¹ What has been said above as to the Holy Spirit appears from the entire book of the Acts as the certain feeling of the primitive Church; it appears likewise from the writings of the Apostle John,

although expressed in them in a very different way; and differently again, and yet none the less certainly, from the Epistles of Paul and the Apocalypse.

self-possession, with such an anxious desire to keep far from all the errors, allurements, and sins of the world, and yet remaining in the midst of the noise, the commotion, and the bitter hostility of the world in order to draw the world to itself after its Lord's example by gentleness and love, despised by all the world as well as forsaken by its visible Lord and all outward help, and yet conscious in itself of all the Divine powers operating so mightily and so close at hand? Verily in this Community, weak as it was, that Israel which had passed through the most trying ordeal, if it could ever appear at all in the world, had now actually appeared; this was the Israel which had been the profoundest longing of the most exalted prophets of the Old Testament, that chaste bride waiting for the coming of her bridegroom,¹ or by whatever other similes the eager imagination sought to give a more fixed form to that which really surpassed the power of human and temporal images to represent. But on that account, in spite of all the troubles and difficulties of the time, there dwelt in that Community a pure joy and divine cheerfulness which seemed inexhaustible, and it remains long after these first days the characteristic mark of this period of the youth of Christianity.² Nor could this joy be described with greater brevity and expressiveness than that it was 'the joy of the Holy Ghost.'³

And it was shown, by the first resolution of considerable importance which the Community had to make, how little it had forgotten the necessary things of the earth, notwithstanding the fact that its Lord and its one true treasure was in heaven. For it had long been quite obvious that it must remain an established society amongst men on the earth; but with regard to the locality where it might most advantageously be fixed for the present, difference of opinion could arise. However, although its essential nucleus was purely Galilean, the Church resolved to remain in Jerusalem, and to make the capital of the ancient national Community its one principal seat also; and we find it continuing quietly there for the comparatively long period of some five years, which was at last interrupted by outward force, and after the expiration of

¹ ἡ Νύμφη. Rev. xxii. 17, comp. with xix. 7, xxi. 2. The figure was not so much suggested to the Apostles by the Old Testament (Isaiah' lxii. 5) as supplied directly by Christ himself, Luke xii. 36. Matt. xxii. 1-14, xxv. 1-13, comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2.

² We need only observe how this is expressed not only quite spontaneously

throughout the Epistles of Paul from 1 Thess. ii. 20, iii. 9, v. 16, to the late Epistle to the Philippians, and also of John. 1 John i. 4, 2 John ver. 12, but also variously in the narratives of the Acts, and in like manner also John xv. 11, xvi. 20-24, xvii. 13. Luke xxiv. 52.

³ 1 Thess. i. 6. Rom. xiv. 17, comp. Phil. iii. 1, iv. 4, 19.

thirty-three years we shall see it leaving Jerusalem only under the compulsion of bitter necessity. We do not now read of deliberations being held in the midst of the rising Community on this question; all such points settled themselves almost as matters of course in consequence of the motive-forces of these first years. At the beginning, when they had assembled again after their dispersion,¹ the disciples may have remained in Jerusalem as by a spell, because they expected to see the Lord appearing in his full glory especially on the scene of his crucifixion and death.² They knew, too, that he had during his life, himself always sought in Jerusalem, the final decision with regard to his cause, as is so plainly represented in conformity with the history in the Gospel of John; and particular utterances of the Lord which admitted of this interpretation were undoubtedly soon in the mouth of many.³ Moreover, after they had been so unexpectedly driven forth on that Whitsunday into the midst of the great capital, and had been made so strong, as by one touch of the wing of the Holy Spirit, that they no longer feared any of the punishments with which the Hagiocracy threatened them, especially in this its chief seat, it was one of the necessary consequences involved in the general development of the case that they should now least of all depart from this great central position. They could now again appear publicly at the central seat of the ancient true religion, and visit once more those localities in the Temple where their Master had only a short time before his crucifixion so often been. We find them accordingly from this time forth visiting the Temple with all the greater regularity and gladness.⁴ They had reason to fear, as the disciples of their crucified Lord, not only exclusion from the synagogues, but also from all participation in the sacred rites and institutions of Israel: with all the more zeal and publicity they now adhered to these sanctities of Israel, immediately under the eyes of the members of the Hagiocracy, as, indeed, these sacred things had existed long before the Hagiocracy, and were of far higher sanctity. They had reason to fear being expelled from all the wide-spread branches of the entire Community of the ancient true religion;

¹ According to Mark xiv. 27, 28. xvi. 7. John xvi. 32. xx. 21. xxi. 1 sq., such a general dispersion as far as Galilee, the memory of which first disappears in Luke, must have undoubtedly taken place during the first days after; in Justin, *Tegp.*, c. lvi. *de opor.* it is even of the disciples on that account is mentioned.

² See *ante*, pp. 68, 81.

³ For instance, that utterance Luke xxiv. 49. Matt. xxiv. 15 sq.

⁴ See Acts ii. 46, iii. 1 sq., v. 20, 25, 42, comp. xxi. 26 sq., Rev. xi. 1, 2, and *ante*, pp. 89 sq. It will be seen below how important this fact becomes in the history of Paul.

with the more persistency they therefore established themselves in this its great centre, as in expectation of great future events which would soon be decided on that spot particularly.

For undoubtedly we cannot fail to see that the infant Church first of all sought to find in the ancient national Community an established centre, in order, notwithstanding its own special features, to find support upon its bosom, and not to be separated from it. And indeed it could not be otherwise. As Christianity is according to Christ's own intention only the completion and glorification of the ancient religion, his Community is only the perfection of the ancient one. Having been taken by Christ from the ancient Community alone, and appointed by him in the first instance only to conduct it to the same perfection which it already contained within itself, the infant Church, as soon as ever it became at all independent in the world, necessarily leaned as closely as possible upon the mother-Community, to be able at all to create for itself a more settled form somewhere in the world. It did thereby nothing more than obey the natural instinct of the child of this parent-Community. For just as Christ was from Israel, and in the first instance laboured for Israel only,¹ so the Messianic hopes, the fire of which continued to quicken the nobler life-blood in the heart of this nation, had likewise sprung purely from Israel. And if Christ even during the last days of his life on earth always kept the salvation of Israel primarily in view,² as the disciples knew, how could they do otherwise than now resume the work of Christ himself, although it had in the meantime been so greatly interrupted and made a thousandfold more difficult; and if they were unable to speak to the heads of the Hagiocracy with his power, must they not endeavour, by entreaty, representation, and adjuration, to conduct them to the same goal which their Lord had had in view? The Twelve at all events, as the heads of the new Community, could not well think of and strive after anything else for the time.

It must accordingly never be forgotten that the infant Church, although produced by the entirely new spirit of Christ, was nevertheless in other respects wholly of the flesh and bone of the ancient Community and as a child born from it. The tender child, which has only just been thrust out into the world, seeks in its unexpected fatherless condition naturally the protection of its mother, and leans lovingly upon her, although immediately turning towards her with such reproaches

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 235 sq.

² *Ibid.* pp. 377 sq.

as the love of a child inspires. Before the mother as much as properly recognises her child, however, it is thrust away by her, and yet it is unable and unwilling to keep away from her, but seeks, with the justest reproaches for her hard-heartedness and blindness, to obtain at least a measure of esteem and recognition in her eyes. For its own sake also the child needs this protection of the mother, while it awaits the unfolding of the future, the hope of which has been supplied to it by its very life. Accordingly it cleaves as closely as it can to the heart of its mother, not with the view, as an ungrateful child, of effecting her ruin when it has become of age, but in order, as an affectionate child, which has early grown serious and wise, to warn her of the certain ruin which is imminently threatening, and, if possible, to save her from it. If this young Church knew that Christ himself, in spite of all his most severe words and dark forebodings, had never ceased to care for Jerusalem and to honour the Temple, why should not it, remembering his conduct in this respect, turn with fresh efforts of earnest affection to the mother-Community in spite of all the terrible things which had in the meantime occurred?

Thus in the metropolis of the ancient Community, preserving most carefully its connection with the Temple and all its sacred usages, and in that respect transgressing, as far as it knew, in no way against the example and the will of its Lord, the Church sought further to retain and to perpetuate in its circle solely those things which it had received from its Lord in the way of doctrines and ideas, or of art and skill, or of customs and organisations of life. And the more limited the time, and the more intensely the gaze of the Church was fixed on the early appearing of the Lord in his glory, with the greater care and, indeed, scrupulous solicitude, it perpetuated as far as possible everything that it had seen the Lord institute, do, and teach. This adherence to the external aspects of the life of its Lord, with a completely domestic and childlike piety, can scarcely be conceived as greater and more zealous than it really was; and it becomes now a chief motive-force in the immediate development of this history. But in this respect there was scarcely anything that proved more productive than the fact that the disciples had been, during the earthly life of their Master, trained by himself in various ways to labour independently for the Kingdom of God.¹

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 324 sq.

The labours, the gifts, and the customs of the Church.

It is true the labours and the customs of the Apostolic Church could now be no longer kept within those narrow limits within which the society of the disciples had formerly lived and moved under the eyes of the visible Christ himself. This Church had now increased from that first small number to thousands, and almost daily its adherents multiplied. Men of the most dissimilar occupations in life entered the society of the purer life and lofty hope of Israel; in fact, it must have been one of the deepest desires of the Church to attract all men into it as soon as possible, in order that its Lord might appear the sooner in his glory, and rejoice the more over this his Community.

The work of extending the kingdom of the perfect true religion which had been founded, necessarily now became, as formerly under the protection of the visible Christ, the first and chief care of the Church; and this, just as in the former case, by the twofold means of teaching and of active healing and rendering assistance.¹ But for this work there were only a few who were thoroughly capable. It was only the Eleven whom Christ himself had initiated in all the truths, the skilled labours, and the powers of this kingdom, who were the most capable for this work; and after them only those whom they introduced to such tasks, and to whom they entrusted them.

The doctrine with which the Apostles now appeared publicly before the world was necessarily, in many respects, new, and they had at first to make themselves more perfect in it by degrees. They had to proclaim Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah who had actually appeared, who would soon appear as judge of the world in all his glory. That he, whose wonderful life they had beheld as his immediate witnesses,² could be no other than the promised Messiah, they proved by the simple narrative of his words and deeds, and in doing this they found it necessary themselves to establish further, in various ways, the truth of the doctrines which they had heard from him. But the other part of their teaching was no less important—namely, the transition from the proof that he was slain without just cause and from their experience of his resurrection and of his immortal power to the staggering proclamation of his early coming as Judge of the world in his full glory, closing with the

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 249 sq.

iii. 15, iv. 33, v. 32, x. 39, xiii. 31; but

² As Luke everywhere so emphatically states, Luke xxiv. 48. Acts i. 8, 22; ii. 32.

likewise John xv. 27, 1 John i. 2, iv. 14.

exhortation to an immediate conversion from the sins of the world. Their discourse and teaching were occupied with this simple series of declarations; ¹ but they came forward with this teaching with all that boldness which true faith inspires, appearing publicly, as a rule every succeeding Sunday, before all the people in one of the spacious Temple porticos (which was called Solomon's portico ²), because it was usually visited by orators and eager listeners. The very novelty of everything that was preached by the Apostles must have attracted many; but they also spoke with such unusual force that soon a certain feeling of reverence for them was created amongst the masses of the people, and no disputations antagonist ventured to mingle in the crowd in order to interrupt the speakers. ³ The Apostles, however, soon despatched fit men to spread the knowledge of the new doctrine, particularly the historical portion of it, beyond the limits of Jerusalem. Men of this kind, who were well furnished with the requisite talents and zeal, received the name of Evangelists; ⁴ and as one of the earliest and most zealous of their number we meet with Philip, a different man from the Apostle, and we shall have to speak of him more at length subsequently.

The various kinds of curative deeds of power which Christ was in the habit of performing, ⁵ and in the performance of which he had endeavoured to instruct his disciples, were now continued in his Church; ⁶ and we know from the accounts of the later part of this entire period that they were continually put in practice, and were regarded as one of the most characteristic spiritual gifts of the Church, and indeed as a sign of the mysterious power latent in Christianity. ⁷ Undoubtedly special skill and ability in this respect were handed down by constant

¹ This can be seen quite plainly in many of the discourses of Peter, which the Book of the Acts supplies from ch. ii. onwards; and it is their peculiarity, which was obviously derived from a good source, that they all have essentially only this subject-matter.

² This portico, mentioned Acts iii. 11, v. 12, was the same in which (as the disciples well knew) Christ himself had taught just before his death, acc. John x. 23, comp. vol. vi. p. 360.

³ The words, Acts v. 12 *b* and 13, can only refer to the Apostles, not to the Christians generally, which would yield no sense at all, in spite of the fact that *ἡμοθυμαδὸν* in this passage reminds us of ii. 46, as if the passage before us were an echo of that. For from v. 12 to ver. 42

it is the Apostles only who are spoken of, as also iii. 11. The verb *κολλᾶσθαι*, ver. 13, can, according to the context, only mean to cleave to anyone in a *hostile* sense, to set upon him, with the view of interrupting him; and it may be a provincial expression with the force of the German *nüt einem anbinden*.

⁴ See with regard to the Evangelists *Jahrh. d. B. W.* ii. p. 180 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 46 sq.]

⁵ See vol. vi. pp. 220 sq.

⁶ Acts ii. 43, iii. 1-10, v. 12-16, and other indications.

⁷ In this respect the indications 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10, 28, 29, and particularly 2 Cor. xii. 12, are very instructive, comp. my *Seuchschreiben des A. P.*, p. 309, the *Gemara* upon *Aboda Sara*, ii. 3.

use, the best virtue of which was due to the Christian spirit with its characteristic fear of God, its pure courage, and its inexhaustible love and pity. But it is not difficult to perceive that this ability to perform such deeds of power was allotted to a far smaller number of persons, and that only a few were distinguished in its exercise. It must have been looked upon as a more personal gift; and we can only be surprised that it was nevertheless so long and so tenaciously preserved in the Church. It was expected in the first instance of the Apostles; and particularly during the first period of the rise and the fresh youthful energy of the Church did it display great activity, and evidently contributed in no small degree to attract the attention and admiration of the world, as well as to increase the number of converts; as if in this respect also Christ had now risen again with all his saving love and wonderful power. According to the later recollections of this time, 'they carried out the sick into the streets (where the Apostles were expected to pass), and laid them on all kinds of beds, in order that when Peter particularly went by, at least his shadow might bring cooling refreshment to one or another of the languishing sufferers. From the cities round about Jerusalem also people flocked with all kinds of sick persons and demoniacs, and all were healed.'¹

As suitable spiritual endowments and capacities must always precede successful and difficult labours, so in this young Community a multitude of gifts such as had never appeared before either in Israel or elsewhere, or at all events in such a form, began to be exercised. Fired by the purest and most powerful ardour of that Divine love which had now entered the world through Christ, the most various works of beneficent love were performed, including those of greatest difficulty above referred to, as well as such in which even the simplest member of the Church could take part. But the thoughtful and inquiring spirit was aroused anew with equal power and as never before; and there was no object of examination and knowledge, according to the whole condition of the Church, which must immediately come more under this new spirit than the sacred Scriptures; and there soon appeared in the Church men, being full of the new Christian experience, who dealt with and applied them in quite a different way from the prevailing

¹ According to Acts v. 14-16. The whole manner of the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles indicates that this zeal was abated later, but at times when zeal is increasing it may easily become as intense as we find it here actually described.

schools. As we have seen,¹ the gift of tongues belonged to their endowments, as an exaltation and utterance of the Spirit such as had never before been seen, and therefore of the most wonderful nature. Again, there were others who could boast of the ability to bear and to overcome the most hurtful things.² Accordingly this Community, though rejected by the world and very soon severely persecuted, took up its position in the world not only with marvellous assurance and joy, but also with a multitude of wholly new powers and talents, and was able to boast not only of the unique character and work of its Lord, but also of this abundance of new powers and gifts which it so actively exercised. Already it began to be the habit to enumerate such gifts briefly in a connected series.³ But it was more in conformity with the deepest feeling and consciousness of this new Community to regard and to denominate them simply as *gifts of grace* (*charismata*),⁴ as the Church could never forget that all these gifts had arisen in it simply through Christ himself in his former visible appearing and his present spiritual influence, as if sent from heaven, and that thus their existence and operation were to be ascribed solely to Divine grace itself.

But that all such members of the Church as were not conscious of possessing any capacity for the higher spiritual labours should not be disturbed in the ordinary occupations of their former life, but should rather be encouraged in the calm and zealous pursuit of them, in case they were not opposed to the Christian spirit itself, became the more necessarily, from the very first, a fixed principle, the more essential, as we have seen, a tranquil daily life was, and the more the Church had to contend with privations and necessities of all kinds on the outbreak of the hostility of the world which soon followed.

While, however, from the beginning, the labours and the ordinary occupations of the individual members of the Community were very dissimilar, they were all the more closely united again by that elevated faith of possessing in Christ the celestial consummation of all the past and all the future, and of finding the eternal salvation of their own life in faithfulness to him and his word. It is true, this is just the same faith which we also still require, and in the firm maintenance of which the members of the primitive Apostolic Church supply the eternal

¹ *Ante*, pp. 91 sq.

² For instance, to take up serpents, to drink poisonous things, Mark xvi. 18.

³ In the later Gospel, now Mark xvi.

17, 18, and in still later writers.

⁴ 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., i. 7, Rom. xi. 29, xii. 6-8, comp. i. 11.

model. But during those first days the members of the Church cleaved to one another with an affection and warmth such as was never found again afterwards. In other circumstances a new aim and hope in life may bind the spirits which see their salvation in it most firmly together; how much more must the new and most exalted hope of this time and the faith in this Lord then link most closely together those who were devoted to him amid the hostility of the world! But in reality this Community was only seeking now, under its invisible Lord, to perpetuate the same affectionate and brotherly fellowship which he, whilst still visibly living on the earth, had established between himself and the Twelve;¹ and scarcely had it been deprived, by the brutal violence of the world, of its visible Lord, when, under the mysterious influence of the spirit and the power of the same Lord, its members all the more necessarily gathered together again in closer union against this hostile world, as if under his celestial view they must be only the more intimately bound together by the pure love which he had desired and brought into the world. Accordingly the community of material possessions which had been formed under Christ's own eye,² was subsequently developed and perpetuated; and as now the most wonderful zeal for the cause of the crucified Master suddenly took possession of so many hearts, so that impulse of purest love, which had once come with such power into the world, for celestial things and boundless self-sacrifice, that glance into the approaching end of the existing world, which so quickly raised them above all fear of worldly loss, and the infectious example of the custom which seemed to have been sanctioned by Christ, all combined to establish quickly a community of material possessions, which soon surpassed in extent and influence everything that had arisen under the eye of the Master when on earth. 'All that believed were together, and had all things common; but they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as anyone had need.' And still more: 'As many of them that believed (and their number soon increased greatly) were all of one heart and soul, and not one called anything of the outward possessions his own, but they had all things common. There was no one in want amongst them; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses brought the proceeds of the things sold, and laid them at the feet of the Apostles; and distribution was made to each one as he had need.'³ In such inimitably

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 229 sq.

² *Ibid.* pp. 305 sq.

³ Acts ii. 44, 45, iv. 32, 34, 35, comp. v. 1-11, vi. 1-6, Mark x. 28-30.

appropriate words is described a condition of the new Community which, after a few years, from causes to be subsequently mentioned, again disappeared, so that it became the custom to look back upon it as a charming ideal which had irretrievably passed away.

It appears from its very origin that this community of goods had no intrinsic relationship with that introduced amongst the Essenes,¹ and was still less borrowed from the model of theirs. The Christian Community did not, like that of the Essenes, seek to withdraw from contact with the world, but to subjugate the world to its spirit. And each of its members gave up his possessions for higher interests only when and as far as his personal zeal prompted him, in order that the sacrifice might be perfectly sincere. Therefore just as the primitive impulse of Christian love led at once, in obedience to powerful special inducements of the time, to this peculiar form of church-life, in like manner this form of it could, after a few years, disappear again without the decay of that primitive impulse with its necessary products in this church-life, as we shall see below. But as long as the institution was in existence it undoubtedly continued to increase the charm which surrounded the young Church, and contributed, in no small degree, to the rapid growth of its numbers. The poor man found in this society affectionate assistance; and the rich man, who shared with his poorer brother the same faith in the one way of salvation at the approaching destruction of the world, parted the more easily, under the influence of this faith, with his worldly goods. And as long as the Apostles managed all the affairs of the Church, the use made of the superabundance of the rich was solely for the actual relief of the necessities of poorer brethren.

Whilst thus practical mutual love, more briefly called *fellowship* or *brotherhood*,² in conformity with the exalted life of those first years, found its most emphatic expression in this surrender of all outward possessions to the Church, the state of mind from which it flowed was undoubtedly that in which every true sacrifice ought to be presented—the aspiration of the soul towards heaven in lofty desire and gladness. Every religion, as soon as it becomes an actual power, requires a

¹ See vol. v. p. 373.

² Acts ii. 42, *κοινωνία* is identical in meaning with *ἀδελφότης*, *brotherhood*, which pervades the whole New Testament, although under this new name it is first found 1 Peter ii. 17, v. 9, and only in this Epistle of Peter; and it depends simply upon the context whether *κοινωνία*

is meant to have this general signification, as Acts ii. 42, or is to be applied to a special case, as Rom. xv. 26. The word itself was first fully naturalised in the Christian vocabulary by Paul in place of the word *brotherhood* more after the Hebrew idiom; it is subsequently constantly used, as in the Epistle of Parnabas, ch. xix.

sacrifice appropriate to it; and scarcely has the religion of love appeared publicly amongst men, when already it has thus its characteristic sacrifice. And as a sacrifice this glad surrender of the outward possessions of life in the promotion of the kingdom of God might the more naturally be held in high esteem, inasmuch as definite words of Christ himself could justly be appealed to in support of it.¹ But there was from the first an element of special sacredness in addition by which this sacrifice necessarily received a further and incomparably higher significance, by which, in fact, it formed the transition to that sacrifice of Christianity itself which was permanently necessary as an outward symbol.

We saw in the previous volume² how the last meal of the Lord together with his Twelve Apostles arose, and the significance which it bore. But its repetition in the manner which was now possible, and by which it at once became the most sacred practice of the new Community, received an entirely new meaning. As soon as the first vehement longing to find again the Christ who had disappeared from their sight had been allayed,³ and the new enthusiasm of the feast of Pentecost had restored to their hearts, in the midst of the succeeding lofty composure, full animation and courage, the Twelve undoubtedly at once recalled with ardent feeling that meal of love, as Christ had kept it with them under the dread sense of his approaching death, how he had thereby devoted himself to them as with his whole being, and had desired that they should always keep it as if together with him, until at last he could bodily also partake of it again with them. That he would be with them until the end of the world,⁴ is the great animating faith which can now strengthen his followers every moment; but in the common meal of love repeated under the sense of his love and of his institution of it, the Community feels most strongly this his promised eternal presence in spite of his invisibility; it finds in the bread and wine as *he* presented it the food as of his own spirit and life still presented by him, beholds in the bread at the same time his flesh, and in the wine his blood as it was shed through the sin of the world, reviews more particularly the entire connection of his work, and hopes more intensely that he, who was once visible but has now departed, will in future

¹ Such utterances as Matt. xix. 21, 29, and many similar ones had undoubtedly been immediately circulated widely during those early days, and contributed in no small degree to create this form of Christian life.

² Vol. vi. pp. 413 sq.

³ See *ante*, pp. 78 sq.

⁴ According to the last utterance, Matt. xxviii. 20, and its further elaboration, John xiii. 31-xiv. 31, and in another form still further, ch. xv.-xvii.

at the end of the world come again amongst his followers and finish his kingdom in his glory, as certainly as he is now present in spirit with them. And thus in this Christ's meal of love, as it was now afresh taken up with wholly new joy and longing, and became the heart-beat of the practical love of the Community, all the highest life of the Community was concentrated: the calmest and yet most immediate and vivid recollection of Christ's whole character and life, particularly of his holy will and his infinite love, the most living and complete fellowship with all the members of the Church and with Christ himself, the glad certainty of the nearness and presence of the invisible Lord, and the renewed, impressive, and pure reception of him who can never be sufficiently received by the whole soul in the two forms of food which he himself once presented and continues still in will to present, and the elevating feeling that this glory and holiness, the invisible influence of which was in this institution brought as near as possible, was once actually existing on the earth and will be present again at the end of the world with incomparably greater power. The sacred act which is constantly repeated by all, and in which the whole life of a religion is most powerfully concentrated, is *ipso facto* its sacrifice: and thus with the breaking of this bread and the drinking of this wine the truest sacrifice had been supplied that was possible in Christianity. No sooner has Christianity without its visible Lord entered the world and public life, than it already possesses a sacrifice which is perfectly suitable to it, simple and easy for everyone to present to a greater degree than any that had previously existed, and yet requiring from men the highest offering they can present to God, namely, their own souls freed from the impurity of the world and longing for the consummation of the Kingdom of the love of God, supplying them thus with the highest blessings which they can receive in this fleeting world from God—perpetually fresh satisfaction and nourishment of their souls through the greatest possible participation even now in this Kingdom with the certain prospect of that consummation through Christ. And if this sacred feast of love came originally only as by an irresistible impulse to restore impressively in the world fellowship with the departed Christ in daily life, as far as this was possible, without anyone at the time thinking of a sacrificial act, still less of the introduction of a new form of sacrifice, the meal nevertheless soon became to the Christian consciousness what it had necessarily to become—the Christian sacrifice.¹

¹ It meets us as essentially this sacrifice, Jewish sacrifices, 1 Cor. x. 14-18; xi. 17-34; and we must bear this in mind, in

In that earliest period, when the desire and longing for the vanished Christ, though appeased, was still very intense, this meal was undoubtedly observed most zealously and constantly. After that day of Pentecost¹ probably not a day passed on which the members of the new Community did not regard it as the highest joy of their new life to revive the true feeling of their fellowship with each other and with Christ by the use of this means;² and it is easy to imagine what reminiscences of Christ's whole life and appearing on the earth were on such occasions referred to, and how this meal generally became the strongest bond of the perpetual living fellowship of all the members of this Community which was so strange in the world of that day. If not in the morning, at least in the evening the meal was regularly solemnised when the principal meal was taken, so that it could well appear as if these believers lived upon no other food than this which constantly opened heaven, and could no longer do or experience anything without it, indeed, as if they constantly took their nourishment and lived and breathed with Christ. As formerly in the earliest times when human sacrifices first took their most expressive form, no food appeared to have received its proper consecration until a portion of it rose to heaven in fire,³ so now in the early Church much more does the simplest food serve to lift the spirit of man itself, in the fire of true repentance and true love, to heaven. Finally, it is easy to understand that the two simple constituent elements of this meal were always kept strictly apart from the rest of the food; the act of partaking of them was suitably introduced by an Apostle or his representative; the bread was broken and presented by him after thanksgiving in the peculiar manner received from Christ; the wine, in connection with which godly hosts, even before the time of Christ, were in the habit of pronouncing a special blessing amid repeated thanksgivings for such Divine refreshment, was then at once presented and drunk,⁴ and the whole ceremony began and closed

spite of the immense and injurious errors and perversions which were subsequently attached to the sacrificial idea of the meal and which made it at last a great means of corrupting Christian life.

¹ If we compare Acts ii. 42, 46, with i. 14, it would seem that Luke himself derived the first introduction of the custom of 'breaking bread' from that day of Pentecost; and this derivation of it is quite probable from the nature of the thing itself.

² In the Epist. of Barn, ch. xix, we read

at all events, ἐκζητήσεις καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων.

³ See *Antiquities*, pp. 28 sq., 65 sq. The same idea is retained particularly in the practice of the Hindoo ascetics, *Mannu*, vi. 12.

⁴ This is at all events the most obvious significance of the 'cup of blessing,' or of special thanksgiving, 1 Cor. x. 16, comp. Ps. xliii. 5, cxvi. 13, to which probably reference was then always made; and εὐλογία expresses more than εὐχαριστία, 1 Cor. xi. 24; although both words can

in accordance with the great significance of it, as the first participants in it in those early days were so fully conscious of.

Thus this simple meal soon received the highest significance that anything can have in religion : and it soon became able to take the place of all the earlier meat offerings, even those of the Old Testament itself, little as this substitution was originally contemplated. It was by this meal that the constant nearness of Christ in the midst of his Church was more strongly realised than by any other means : a fact which is shown in very various ways, even in the manner in which not only the history of the institution of the meal but also all the other instances of his formerly feeding his followers in a similar way and thereby communicating himself to them were thought of and dwelt upon with a loving and glowing memory.¹ But as this meal arose at first from the most indelible impulse of profound living fellowship, and perpetually served to keep up this fellowship amongst all the members of the Church and of the whole Church with her Lord, so particularly as a sacrifice it became at once connected with that special sacrifice of outward possessions which was described above.² That offering also, proceeding as it did from the first enthusiasm of those times and being made with wonderful zeal, was a sacrifice of loving fellowship, and thus related to this meal notwithstanding all its dissimilarity in other respects. But it was only as by accident, and only by a few members of the Church, that a considerable amount of outward wealth could be given as an offering,³ whilst all sacrifices of that kind are after all not of the highest kind, and are not equal to that simple spiritual sacrifice which must be presented by every member without exception. Accordingly, sacrifices of outward possessions were made by all who could make them, and also in order that the elements required for that sacred meal of love might be therefrom supplied for all the members, including the needy and the sick ; and then the sacrifice of outward wealth met with the highest and holiest application of which it was capable. For the purpose of holding the meal of love many undoubtedly brought very soon

easily be used interchangeably, Mark xiv. 22, 23, Luke xxii. 17, 19; but in those early times (as the description plainly shows) both elements of the meal were never blessed together and then presented together. If one element is to be made more prominent than the other, it appears, from 1 Cor. x. 16, that the wine had a somewhat higher significance, particularly as being also symbolical of the blood of Christ; but the wine is also always im-

plied as a matter of course where, as in the book of Acts, the bread only is spoken of for the sake of brevity.

¹ Comp. *ante*, p. 66, and vol. vi. pp. 337 sq.

² *Ante*, pp. 116 sq.

³ We can see very plainly from 1 Cor. i. 26-28, Jas. ii. 5 sq., that the majority of the members of the Church remained all along of the poorer classes.

bread and wine. All these contributions in the form of food brought by their givers as sacrifices were on every occasion consecrated at the beginning by a common prayer to Christ himself, that he would accept them as an offering of love and himself dedicate them to that higher object which alone they were to serve. Thus the thanksgiving before every meal was extended in this sense, and only when the elements had been thus consecrated did they appear in their true character, as given from love to Christ and his Church, accepted by the love of Christ and consecrated by it, partaken of in loving fellowship and loving longing of the Church after her invisible Lord.¹ Thus appropriately, therefore, that special sacrifice of outward possessions became allied with this general and highest offering. Hence the sacrifice of outward wealth, even when it lost its original and most comprehensive significance (as we shall see it did), was perpetuated at all events for this special object, and it really finds its primary and most desirable application when used with it in view.

As now Christ had not put upon bread and wine this very special significance until towards the end of a meal with his disciples, Christians also could at first connect this sacred meal with the ordinary meal time. We must at all events suppose this most natural possibility to have been the case; and, although we have no express statement with regard to it, there are many indications that are in its favour. They certainly held the sacred meal daily at first;² for that reason they could the more easily connect it with the ordinary meal of the day. Moreover, as long as all outward possessions were common, all the chief meals might also most easily be in common. And if in later times the so-called *agapæ* or love-feasts were ordinary meals with simple kinds of food, which were furnished by common contributions, or which probably rich Christians also gave to their poor brethren, or even to whole churches,³ still

¹ It is evidently in this sense that Paul speaks, 1 Cor. x. 16, of the 'cup of blessing which we bless.' The proceedings are more particularly described as regularly observed in Justin Martyr in his *Apol.* i. 65-67 and in the *Constit. Apost.*, particularly ii. 57, v. 19. But it must be allowed that it follows from a more particular comparison of the various reproductions of the so-called 'Apostolic Constitutions' that the name *θυσία* in this sense is not used directly for the Lord's Supper until somewhat late; for v. 19, 4 also, the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Lips. 1854) p. 93, 22, has simply

ⲓⲟⲩⲓⲛⲓⲟⲩⲁⲟⲩ ⲁⲛⲓⲟⲩ for *προσενέγκατε τὴν θυσίαν ὑμῶν* (which is found also in Bunsen's *Analecta Antenicæna*, ii. pp. 185, 320), therefore merely *προσφορὰς ὑμῶν*. [But see now *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*, ed. Bryennius (Constantinople, 1884), ch. xiv.]

² This is implied in the words, Acts ii. 46, and in the nature of the case; but as early as in the description, 1 Cor. xi. 18 sq., a daily partaking of the Lord's Supper is not indicated.

³ The *cibus promiscuus et innocuus*, for which the Christians of Bithynia assem-

following an impulse of earlier usage, they had evidently only in the course of time become separated from the original sacred meals of love, inasmuch as the latter had then grown already into a distinct sacred institution. But without doubt, with the cessation of the Christian community of outward possessions, the distinctly sacred part of the original meal of love was at the same time separated from the rest of the meal, that it might be preserved in its special purity. As early as the time of Paul, the Lord's Supper had already taken this separate form.¹ This had also its advantages: the more sacred the meal became, and the more distinctly it received the character of a true Christian sacrifice of highest significance, the more worthily and with marks of greater dissimilarity from ordinary meals it had necessarily to be observed. The decrease in the frequency of the observance of it also is connected therewith. From that time it appears to have been kept more rigidly separate from all other meals, and to have been regarded as the one meal of the Community; it seems also to have been gradually confined to Sundays and similar festivals,² and to have been more and more exclusively transferred on such days from the hours of evening to those of the early morning.³ But then those *agapæ* were, as an imperfect and gradually decaying portion of it, separated from it; and it was only the voluntary gift of wine and bread, on the part of the richer members, which remained for a longer time more closely connected with its solemnisation.

Now, when once such a supremely sacred observance has been established in a society, a multitude of new ideas and customs often attach themselves to its primary meaning. In the observance of the Lord's Supper, the Church became conscious of her living union with her invisible head; but, as regards her Lord himself, there was nothing to which she

bled only on Sundays towards evening, according to Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97, was undoubtedly this congregational meal, in other respects distinct from the Lord's Supper, but still held according to the custom of earliest times. On the other hand, the other kinds of food and gifts which were offered on Sundays together with the materials of the Lord's Supper, according to Just. Martyr. *Apol.* i. 67, are regarded only as means of supporting the needy members. But a perfectly distinct separation of the ἀγάπη as a mere δόχη, from the προσφορά or θυσία occurs for the first time in the *Constit.* *Apost.* ii. 18. 1, 2, comp. with ii. 57.

14; iii. 10. 1; v. 19. 4.

¹ According to the plain utterances, 1 Cor. xi. 20-22, 31, though we see likewise from these passages that at that time it was still more difficult to carry out this new arrangement.

² There is still no trace in Paul's description of the limitation to the Sunday, but it is quite plainly supposed as the existing arrangement in the above passages in Pliny, Justin Martyr, and the *Apost. Const.*

³ As appears from the weighty evidence in Pliny, Justin Mart., *Apol.* i. 65-67, and the *Apost. Const.*

attached so much importance as his glorification and his victory over death and all corruption,¹ a victory in which she firmly hoped to participate. If taking part in the Lord's Supper is partaking of his bread and wine, and as it were partaking of his glorified flesh and blood, and therefore of himself as it were in his glorification, then the mortal frame of the person partaking in true faith of this bread and this wine might appear to be transformed by this glorified food as into the glorified body of Christ, so that only they who had thus received into themselves this food might hope for the eternal glorification with Christ. Thus this meal is at the same time the means of the transformation of the mortal body of believers into the glorified Christ-body itself. But certain as it is that this view appears even in a connected series of thoughts during the first half of the second century,² and certain as it is that it was finally developed from various less connected ideas, which began to be expressed early in the apostolic age, it is nevertheless foreign to the primitive simplicity of the earliest Christian hope, and cannot be found even in the writings of the Apostle Paul.³ How and why it was subsequently thus definitely developed will be discussed below. But another custom, which is accidentally not mentioned in the New Testament, undoubtedly arose during this very earliest period of the apostolic age, namely, that portions from the Lord's Supper which had once been dedicated were immediately sent to all such members of the Church as could not themselves be present owing to sickness or other weakness.⁴ This arrangement was logically involved in those strict ideas of the closest fellowship of all the members of the Church amongst themselves and with Christ, which were most vividly realised precisely during the primitive period, and were also very influential for a considerable time;

¹ See *ante*, pp. 82 sq.

² In Justin Martyr, in his *Apol.* i. 66, according to the true *force* of his apparently obscure language, which means, however, 'As Christ, who became incarnate by the Creator's word, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so the food consecrated by the Word (the word of dedication *this is my flesh and blood*, as Justin himself everywhere explains, 65-67), as repeated in the prayer of dedication, is flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus, and by it our body (flesh and blood) is nourished by *transformation* (accordingly in such a way that it is thereby changed into a Christlike body, i.e. a body capable of resurrection),' comp. also, *Tryph.* cap., 117. This ingenious series of thoughts is based, as regards its

separate component members, upon the Gospel of John, and was undoubtedly first constructed from it. The *water and wine*, i. 65, 67, instead of simple wine, points to the same source, and the addition of water must at that time have been usual in certain churches from a reference to John xix. 34 (as if to produce in this way also the Trinity).

³ Otherwise Paul would have appealed at least, 1 Cor. xv. 29, 30, to the Lord's Supper instead of to Baptism; but we see elsewhere also that everywhere in Paul's writing Baptism has just obtained for the first time its almost excessive importance.

⁴ As is mentioned as regularly instituted in Justin's *Apol.* i. 65, 67.

moreover, older precedents could also be produced for this usage.¹

Every new Sunday the Church, after that first Sunday of the Resurrection² and then that of Pentecost,³ was in the habit of recalling to memory afresh, with special intensity of feeling, her Christian hope and all her divine possessions. Indeed, we are justified in supposing that particularly after that first Whitsunday no Sunday passed which did not afresh inspire all Christian feelings with higher fervour. If the first fire of these feelings and hopes, in spite of all their intensity and depth, was somewhat checked in the growing noise and stir of a return to ordinary life, the recurrence of this day, with its two higher reminiscences, fanned it to a new flame; and soon wherever Christian faith had extended, nothing was regarded as so much a matter of course as that the *Lord's day*, as it was soon called,⁴ should be kept at the beginning of every new week with quite special fervour. It was as if the ancient Sabbath, with all its ancient observances, so little satisfied those whose hearts were fixed on Christ, that on the morning of the very next day they once more, with all the greater fervour, looked upwards to Him whose coming in glory was their one highest desire; and the more closely this day was connected with the ancient Sabbath the more easily could it be observed.—The meetings of the Church could be most easily held on this day;⁵ the *Lord's Supper* also was by degrees placed particularly upon this *day of the Lord*, and the custom above referred to, of keeping the Sunday with specially fervent prayer, followed by the Lord's Supper, was gradually formed.⁶ We can form an idea of the nature of the prayers which were offered on such days from the words with which Paul was in the habit of introducing his epistles, as well as from John's reference to Christ as the intercessor with God.⁷

With this observance of the Sunday and the above sacrificial meal, the new Community might have had the ample bases for the construction of a distinct religious ceremonial of her own. But the ties which at this early period still bound her to the outward framework of the ancient Community were too strong to permit this;⁸ and so we see arising in that primitive Com-

¹ Comp. Neh. viii. 10, 12; Esther ix. 19, 22; 2 Chron. xxxi. 19.

² See *ante*, pp. 62 sq. 70.

³ See *ante*, pp. 90 sq.

⁴ I showed as early as 1827 [in his *Commentarius exegeticus et criticus in Apocalypsin*] that this name in Rev. i. 10 must be thus understood; on the other

hand, the earlier name is still found, 1 Cor. xvi. ; 2, Acts xx. 7, but with just the same new meaning.

⁵ As appears for the first time, 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

⁶ E.g. as early as Acts xx. 7, 11.

⁷ 1 John ii. 1, 2.

⁸ See *ante*, pp. 108 sq.

munity in Jerusalem a combination of old and new usages, the power of which was destined to last a considerable time longer, and the end of which we shall have to notice subsequently. Every day, in the early morning or at other hours of prayer, as many assembled in the Temple for prayer and teaching as had time or the special call for such duties, while in the evening they met in their own houses for renewed and special worship and the observance of the Lord's Supper;¹ the three times of daily prayer, which had long been customary with the Judeans, were also observed.² As the Church accordingly observed also the annual feasts of the ancient Community, it is the more intelligible that the Lord's Supper, observed on the evening immediately before the great day of the Passover,³ should, in the Christian view, coincide with the Passover itself, and that this connection should subsequently influence the form of the constantly repeated narrative of the last days of the Lord.

Corresponding to the depth and intensity of the love, which was one of the great and pure forces that had created the Church, was the kiss which the members of it exclusively gave to each other when they met, especially in hours of holy consecration, and which, undoubtedly after Christ's example in the first instance,⁴ was long retained as a peculiarity of this Community.⁵ Several brief and expressive utterances, originating in the profoundest endeavour and faith of the Community, such as that watchword *The Lord cometh*,⁶ also became very early the true passwords of the members of the Church, wherever and in whatever circumstances they might be living; and they were perpetuated with their meaning, which was known only to the initiated.

2. *Its Members.*

It is of great importance in its bearing on the progress of the history of the Church to carefully observe of what members it was composed as it gradually grew in numbers.

¹ According to the general description, Acts ii. 46, comp. ver. 42, and *ante*, pp. 108 sq.

² As appears from Acts ii. 15; iii. 1; x. 3, 10, 30; comp. with *Constit. Apost.* ii. 59. 2; vii. 24. 2. In earlier times (as we see from Ps. cxli. 2, v. 4), the devout were accustomed to pray morning and evening at the time of the daily Temple sacrifice (see *Antiquities*, p. 116, and *במנה* with the signification of *at evening* in Mishna *מעשר ימי* v. 10), but the custom of praying three times a day, derived probably from Ps. lv. 18, was most likely introduced in the third century B.C., ac-

ording to Dan. vi. 11, ix. 21; on the other hand praying six times a day is not met with until later, in the *Constit. Apost.* viii. 34. 1.

³ See vol. vi. p. 418.

⁴ According to Mark xiv. 44, 45.

⁵ According to 1 Thess. v. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16, and with a somewhat different turn of language, 1 Pet. v. 14, and the same thing is almost a prescribed form, *Constit. Apost.* ii. 57. 12.

⁶ See *ante*, pp. 82 sq. 97, comp. *Sendschreiben des A. P.*, pp. 222 sq.

Now, it is one of the fairest signs of the marvellous exalted and noble spirit which took possession of this Community immediately after Christ's death, that his own brothers now became at once members of it. We saw in the preceding volume¹ that though these four brothers had not been absolutely hostile to him during his earthly life, they still maintained towards him almost an attitude of indifference and suspicious watchfulness; and undoubtedly he was the last man to endeavour to draw them to his side by mere persuasion. His earthly end was naturally adapted to have completely estranged them from his cause; but the same spirit of profound sorrow, followed by the highest enthusiasm, which took possession of the Twelve,² in such a way that they saw their crucified Master as their risen Lord bodily before their eyes and heard his voice, in due time seized James also, the eldest of his brothers. This is told us in the oldest narrative which we now possess.³ And the example of the eldest brother at once told upon the other three.⁴ They now joyfully perceived the unparalleled greatness of their departed brother; all those earthly elements which had formerly bound them to him, and again separated them from him, because they were too weak to follow his Divine heroism, disappeared as in a moment when they perceived his Divine significance; and from that time no one was more faithful than these his natural brothers. We shall see below what faithful persistence in convictions, once arrived at, the eldest of them particularly exhibited in his whole subsequent life, and what most important services he immediately rendered to the Church.

While these four brothers of the crucified Christ now enter his Church as believers in his matchless truth and greatness, his mother Mary naturally became now at last inseparably connected with it. During the earthly life of Christ, although constantly watching his career with loving solicitude,⁵ she appeared unable to separate herself from her four younger sons. It was only on the last procession to Jerusalem that she accompanied him, as if foreboding the threatening calamity, and took up her station by his cross.⁶ But inasmuch as his four

¹ Vol. vi., pp. 306, 358 (179).

² See *ante*, p. 64.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 7.

⁴ According to Acts i. 14, before the Day of the Pentecost even all his brothers with their mother are members of the Community.

⁵ See vol. vi. p. 314.

⁶ It is true this is now found mentioned only as by accident, John xix. 25-27, but the earlier Gospels do not generally

pay such particular attention as John subsequently does to these merely family relations of Christ, just as in the Acts again we find no subsequent reference to them after i. 14. All such merely domestic relations appear, in comparison with the great Christian cause and Christ himself, as insignificant; but for reasons which are quite intelligible, John everywhere makes in this respect an exception.

brothers were still at that time not members of his Community, he commended her the more naturally to the loving care of his bosom-disciple, as to the son who was to take his place; and undoubtedly she remained subsequently always in John's family, even after her sons had entered the Church, John declining to resign the consoling duty of caring for her. We need not be told¹ that she was ever after greatly esteemed by all members of the Church, and often questioned regarding her recollections of the previous life of Christ. But she does not appear to have survived the death of Christ many years.²

At first sight it appears uncertain who the 'five hundred brethren' were to whom, according to Paul's narrative, Christ showed himself at once, and who were most of them living, though some had fallen asleep when Paul wrote.³ But they are certainly not to be thought of as present in Jerusalem and its immediate neighbourhood at the time when the Lord appeared to them. The number of the faithful who assembled in Jerusalem before the day of Pentecost was, according to an express reminiscence, not so large; they were only some hundred and twenty men, including the four brothers of the Lord,⁴ whilst James did not enter the Church until after the five hundred. We cannot, therefore, do wrong in regarding the five hundred as Galileans whom Christ had brought in Galilee itself, during his earthly life, to the knowledge of the truth; who had not followed him on his last journey to Jerusalem, and must therefore have been profoundly shocked and overwhelmed by the sudden report of his crucifixion, until, having assembled in fervent prayer around that hill where Christ had formerly lingered most when in Galilee,⁵ they beheld Him in his glory, and their deep sorrow was changed as quickly into the most rapturous joy. But probably the Twelve also were all, or nearly all, present with them; and we thus have a confirmation of the state-

¹ Though this is implied by such passages as Luke ii. 19, 51.

² We may infer this as altogether probable, from the silence of the N.T. with regard to the history of her later life. According to the little book of the Theban Hippolytus, *Χρονικὸν σύνταγμα* (published in Tischendorf's *Anecdota sacra et prof.* Lips. 1855, p. 22), which was not written until quite late, Stephen's martyrdom took place seven, Mary's death eleven years after the death of Christ; the same year of her death is found in the Arabic *Assumptio Mariæ* (ed. Enger. 1854), p. 106; but others have instead the 15th, 16th, 21st (for which 2nd appears to be a corruption),

and 24th year. See Tischendorf's *Apocal. Apocrypha*, pp. 114, 125; xxxviii and xlvii sq.; Wright's *Syriac Apocrypha*, pp. 41 sq. But all such statements rest upon unreliable authorities; although Epiphanius, *Her.* lxxviii. 11, intentionally increases the uncertainty.

³ 1 Cor xv. 6.

⁴ Acts i. 15. The very addition of the word 'about' shows that the account is purely historical, and that the number 120 did not arise in some such way as that indicated, vol. v. p. 169. Comp. also the remarks, *ante*, pp. 58, 90.

⁵ See vol. vi. p. 297, and *ante*, p. 67.

ment regarding the departure of the Twelve into Galilee during the very first days after the Resurrection.¹

But these five hundred were undoubtedly men of simple life and habits, who remained for the most part in Galilee, and formed there the nucleus of a Christian church. It was quite otherwise with those to whom, according to this early account, the Lord showed himself after his appearance to James. They were 'all the Apostles,'² a description which seems to us strange, but which becomes plain enough when we look at it in its proper connections with both this short account generally and the other historical indications. That is, if we take a general view of all the apparently very dissimilar cases in which the New Testament speaks of 'Apostles,' we find that there are after all only two main classes of them: apostles of Christ himself (to give them this brief but definite name), and apostles of the churches. First of all were those who could boast of having been directly sent out into the world by Christ himself as the heralds and preachers of his truth and his will, just as Christ was sent by God Himself as the first preacher of the glad tidings from heaven of the consummation of the Kingdom of God, and is accordingly in elevated language called the Apostle of God or of the Christian faith.³ It was, therefore, only the Twelve whom Christ had himself chosen and trained for their calling, as we saw in the preceding volume, who were regarded as such apostles in the primary sense. Prior to Christ's death we do not, in the more strictly historical accounts, meet with any other apostles, and they alone retained the highest authority throughout the age which we now call the Apostolic, as we shall see subsequently. But it would be foolish to deny that many others as well as Paul could, in addition to these Twelve, call themselves Apostles of Christ, and boast of having been directly called by him to their apostolic vocation. Indeed, Paul himself could scarcely have claimed such a vocation and honour if he had been the only one besides the Twelve to do so. We must therefore suppose, that only those men who had seen the risen Lord could consider themselves called, in addition to the Twelve, to be his apostles, and be regarded as such in the world. Not that all who had seen the risen Christ during those first days were necessarily on that account apostles; the five hundred remained simply 'brethren.' But the agitation

¹ See *ante*, p. 57.

² 1 Cor. xv. 7.

³ Heb. iii. 1; but one who was himself an apostle like Paul would hardly have thus applied this name. The name

'Apostle of Jesus Christ,' by which Paul describes himself solemnly, in headings e.g. is abbreviated into 'Apostle of our Lord,' Jude ver. 17 [?]. Comp. also vol. vi., p. 216 sq.

and the full birth to new life which followed that vision might be so overpowering that the man who was conscious of having been shone upon by the full light of the risen Lord, and of having been called by his voice, felt from that moment that he had been called for his whole future life to be a herald of the truth and glory of Christ. Men of this kind could also be regarded as apostles, as we shall see subsequently. The second main class were 'Apostles of the Churches.'¹ A church entrusted to one or more Christians a special matter of interest and importance to the Christian cause, to be attended to in a distant place, and Christians with such commissions were sent by a church as its messengers. They also were men distinguished by their ability and love of the Christian cause,² and deserving in a high degree public confidence. But it was only the spirit of a church that had committed to them such a commission of possibly temporary nature. They did not become possible save in the more advanced circumstances of somewhat later times, whilst the apostles of the first class necessarily arose in that primitive period when the glory of the risen Christ was still felt as somewhat nearer to the earth; and if they also were distinguished by the name of 'Apostles,' which had become so significant, they were nevertheless apostles only of the second degree, unless some one of them who was conscious of being directly called by Christ consented to undertake such a special commission.³

If the above is the correct view of the words 'all the Apostles' we may very well regard this considerable number of Apostles who, according to Paul, saw the risen Lord after James and before himself, as identical with the seventy Apostles whom Luke mentions in his Gospel.⁴ For it admits of no doubt⁵ that these men who beheld the risen Lord and followed his call (if not all of them before the Day of Pentecost,

¹ According to the appropriate term, 2 Cor. viii. 23, another example is Epaphroditus, Phil. ii. 25. On the other hand, the apostles of the first class must *have seen the Lord*, 1 Cor. ix. 1; only on that condition are they ἀπ. κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or briefly, apostles of Christ. In so far, therefore, James the brother of the Lord could be regarded as an apostle, Gal. i. 19.

² As appears from the examples just referred to, and from the nature of the case itself.

³ As Paul at first with Barnabas undertakes a commission of this kind, Acts xi. 30, xiii. 2, comp. below. In the case

of some whose careers are less known to us, therefore, it is possible to doubt whether they were apostles of the first or of the second degree, e.g. Andronicus and Junias, Rom. xvi. 7; but probably Paul classes these two amongst those of the first degree, inasmuch as he calls them Apostles simply, and adds that they had become Christians before him, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 7, 8.

⁴ See vol. vi. p. 299; the narrative Luke x. 1 undoubtedly supposes that the Seventy were not sent out by Christ until the approaching end of his life.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 58.

yet certainly) long before Paul's conversion had known Christ when he was on the earth. The idea, therefore, might arise that Christ himself had appointed them Apostles a short time before his death; and we find Luke, following some later narrative work, adopting this idea in his Gospel, whilst in the Acts he never mentions the Seventy. They had probably come with Christ in his last procession to Jerusalem, and most likely all belonged to the one hundred and twelve men who constituted the parent church before the Day of Pentecost. The account of Paul does not imply that they, like the five hundred, saw Christ all at one time, but rather the contrary; they were probably like James, and then Paul, seized one after another by this highest movement, but all a considerable time before Paul. We do not possess an early and trustworthy list of all, or even of the chief of them,¹ but we can give the names of some of them at all events with some probability. Perhaps Levi, the son of Alphaeus,² belonged to them. To judge from his state of mind, his zeal and his place of abode during those decisive days, and his vision of Christ, Cleopas, or Clopas (Cleopater), the son of the Mary mentioned in the previous volume,³ is still more plainly described as one belonging to this group;⁴ and his companion on the way to Emmaus would in that case be undoubtedly also of the number, only unfortunately we do not know his name. Further, that Joses, whose Galilean mother, like the mother of Cleopas, was in Jerusalem during those days, and who must have been so distinguished that his mother was called after him simply,⁵ we are justified in placing amongst them. Andronicus and Junias also may be of their number, whom Paul praises and to whom he sends greetings from his imprisonment in Rome;⁶ they were like himself of

¹ Later writers preferred to call them simply the Seventy *μωθηται*, contrary to the express evidence of Luke x. 1. Thus Clement of Alexandria already mentions them often, and puts amongst them a few men mentioned in the New Testament (the Cophas of Gal. ii. 11 actually!), but in the time of Eusebius there was still no complete list of them, as he expressly states, *Ecc. Hist.* i. 12. Nevertheless later writers put together irrational lists of seventy such names (see the appendix to Fabricius's edition of *De vita et morte Moysis*, p. 474 seq., 507. In Clement's *Hom.* ii. 1, sixteen names are mentioned. Comp. Wright's *Syriac Apocrypha*, p. 32 (61), and Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Mon.* p. 33, 141.

² See vol. vi. p. 277.

³ Vol. vi. p. 305.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 13-14, comp. *ante*, p. 68, and vol. vi. p. 305. It is nothing more than a later conjecture that he was a brother of Joseph, and thus related to Christ (Epiphanius *Hæc.* lxxviii. 7).

⁵ See the passages explained vol. vi. p. 305. We might, therefore, raise the question whether this Joses was identical with that Joseph who became so famous under the name of Barnabas, Acts iv. 36, 37, and of whom we must speak below. But according to the sense of the narrative, Acts iv. 36, 37, this Joseph was probably not converted until somewhat later, and was moreover not a Galilean; we might rather suppose he was identical with the Joseph of Acts i. 23, comp. below.

⁶ Rom. xvi. 7, comp. the remarks just made *ante*, p. 130.

Judean blood, became Christians and apostles before him, and at the same time that Paul was suffering imprisonment in Rome they were suffering a like penalty in Ephesus for their great zeal in spreading Christianity. With regard to Matthias, see below.

All these members of the church in Jerusalem were probably without exception Galileans, who had come thither with Christ on his last journey to the feast, or came thither during the days immediately following the great event of his death. And it was a rich blessing to this church that the near relatives of the glorified Lord all connected themselves so unanimously with it and remained so faithful to it.

But after that Whitsunday the number of the believers continually increased; indeed, there is every reason to suppose that the largest number of members was added precisely during the next weeks and months, while the new spirit was so active and influential. And no doubt everyone whose faith appeared certain was received into the fellowship without reference to position and property. But no one thought of receiving heathen, so closely was the ancient Community adhered to, and so decidedly in this respect also was the thread of the development of the new Community firmly re-united just at the point where it appeared to be completely severed by the crucifixion of the Lord. It may, however, be regarded as an indication of the powerful nature of the movement of that time that forthwith a comparatively large number of men of the priestly tribe joined the new Community;¹ thus perfectly did the same blood of true nobility which had flowed in the veins of this tribe from the time of Moses, and which had always quickened its circulation at least in individual members of the tribe in times of decisive importance,² continue to display its virtues on this great occasion. To these Levites belonged particularly a man who was born in Cyprus but was then living probably with his parents in Jerusalem, and who became subsequently one of the most able and indefatigable of the Apostles. His name was Joseph.³ He possessed an hereditary field, but sold it, laid the price at the feet of the Twelve, and thereby set a shining example which was greatly applauded; for Levites on entering this new Community were undoubtedly always obliged to resign also their advantageous position in the older one, for the reason that the excommunication which had been sus-

¹ Acts vi. 7, comp. iv. 36.

² As has been shown in the earlier volumes of this History. How much

better in this respect were the Levites than the Brahmans of our time!

³ Acts iv. 36, 37.

pended over Christ and his disciples¹ was naturally regarded as in force after the Master's crucifixion. If an extended sphere of activity for such a man was not found at once, the power of the exhortations and consolations with which he stimulated all the members of the primitive parent church to higher faith were immediately so profoundly felt that the Twelve even gave him the name of *Bar-naba*, or *Consoler*,² as from involuntary admiration, at a moment when they were powerfully impressed by his words. This name, in its Greek form Barnabas, he always retained, so correctly had one of the Twelve expressed the appreciation of the new Apostle which was felt by the Church generally, and we shall see below how fully he justified it in his subsequent life.

The immense and rapid addition of so many wholly new members necessarily brought into the Community which had only just been formed a multitude of completely new impulses and tendencies. Though all were unanimous with regard to such chief matters as their faith in Christ, their condemnation of the proceedings of the Hagiocracy against him, their hope in the early external consummation, yet in such a new society in which all the members were conscious of being brothers under their one invisible head, and enjoyed great freedom of life and thought, the previous habit of thought and education of each one necessarily made a great difference in his bearing. For as every great convulsion of old views and institutions, with the consequent prospect of new things, naturally brings together the most dissimilar minds for the formation of a new tendency and party, and, as the greatest variety of previous vocations and positions in society had already existed amongst the Twelve on a small scale,³ so now the name of the glorified Christ soon united men of the greatest dissimilarity as regards their rank, education, and country. The most scrupulous Judeans found a place in this Community, when it had so modestly, as we have seen,⁴ put itself again under the shelter of the ancient sanctuary. But many Hellenists, that is, Judeans of Jewish or heathen blood that had received a Greek education, particularly such as had settled again in Jerusalem after returning from heathen countries, adopted the new faith the more easily, inasmuch as

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 292 sq. 345.

² Literally *Son of Consolation* (as Luke himself explains), like *בן יִצְחָק* *rich in fat*, Isa. v. 1, comp. *Lehrbuch der Heb. Spr.* § 287 *f.* The corresponding Semitic name is not *בן נְבוּאָה* (son of prophecy), which would be wrong in etymology and

signification, but *בן נְבִיעָה*, since *הַבִּיעַ* in the sense of *to teach*, or more specifically *to admonish*, is suitable as regards the meaning, and a substantive *נְבִיעָה* can easily be derived from it.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 300 sq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

by their whole position and education they were more independent of the spirit of the Hagiocracy of Jerusalem and were in the habit of looking at everything from a freer standpoint.¹ Indeed, a very great proportion of the 'brethren' soon consisted evidently of Hellenists, the peculiar attraction of soul which many of them felt towards Christ even when he was on the earth,² meeting now more easily with its satisfaction in another way.

The New Baptism and Sanctification.—Discipline and Excommunication in the Church.

Still, however various the individuals were who were thus brought together into a new Community, it was by no means merely a few indiscriminate convictions and expectations which united them, but, above all, one common movement of soul, independent of all personal differences, which connected them closely together, and properly to understand which is at this point most important. This common movement of soul goes back into the earliest period of the great general movement in which Christianity arose, but it had now taken a much more definite shape. Whoever might be received into the Church, baptism remained for everyone the most indispensable medium of transition into the perfect purity of life which Christianity required. For Christianity was never able to separate itself from the baptism of John as its own deepest and firmest basis, as was shown in the previous volume.³ And now the rite easily received a new significance by being brought into close relation with the death of Christ himself. If the Christian is called to follow Christ in all things as his head, so that Christ's painful death also shows him that he must die to the errors of the past world and rise with Christ to new life, baptism, which was in its primitive form such a powerful submersion into the dark depths of the water and emergence from them, can be regarded by him as a similar immersion into the death of Christ; a thought which Paul was the first to work out in its place in the whole connection of his Christian views,⁴ though as a separate idea it was natural enough as early as the period before us, and shows in any case what a high significance continued to be attached to baptism all along.

But after the Day of Pentecost especially, that wholly new power of the Spirit had descended upon the disciples, which

¹ See vol. v. pp. 255 sq.

² See vol. vi. pp. 402 sq.

³ Vol. vi. pp. 197 sq.

⁴ Rom. vi. 3, 4, comp. Col. ii. 12.

was regarded as first completing the Christian life: it was necessarily considered communicable to every Christian, and without it no one could be regarded any longer as a genuine Christian. It is only he who has been touched by the power of the spirit of the glorified Christ, and made deeply to feel it with its plain characteristic signs, that is a Christian in the complete sense, that can bear witness to the full power of the glorified Lord, and, as guided by him in all things, lead that life of miracle which raises him above the world's errors and sins. This was the logical and consistent view which had now to adapt itself more and more completely to the whole life and thought of the Church, and which produced many important changes. If it is the communication of the Holy Spirit from the full heavens of the glorified Christ which first brings the complete Christian life in all its power and independence, baptism in the form in which it has hitherto been practised has no longer its unique and great importance. It could not, as was remarked above, be omitted, but it had now to adjust itself with regard to the higher power which this period of the glorification of Christ himself and its influences alone could bring. This process of adjustment, however, could not be effected in a moment. Only those who had in those first days of the resurrection experienced the influence of the Holy Spirit in its full power were regarded as able to hand on to others its power by the ancient sacred sacrificial ceremony of the imposition of hands.¹ Consequently there arose in the first instance a twofold process of introduction into the full life of Christianity: new members were received as formerly after baptism administered by some Christian of position in the Church, but baptism was now followed by the further ceremony of the imposition of the hands of an Apostle.² And this twofold process was retained for a long time; mere baptism was rather committed to the care of subordinate teachers, and Paul in his time still personally baptised but a few, as he himself says,³ whilst he considered the communication of the Holy Ghost as of the highest importance, and undoubtedly took a more spiritual view of this communication, conveying the Holy Ghost to a large number of persons, either baptised or about to be baptised, without laying his hands on the head of each individual. At some time every new church, after its members had individually received or intended to receive baptism, must under the power of the Christian spirit which flowed from Paul have felt the characteristic influences of

¹ See *Antiquities*, pp. 42 sq., 132, 313.

² As is so plainly described Acts viii. 12-17, comp. Heb. vi. 2. ³ 1 Cor. i. 14, 16.

the Holy Spirit itself directly and in their own happy experience, or such a church was not regarded by him as having attained to Christianity; a fact which appears plainly in all his Epistles. But when these two introductions to full Christianity had not as yet gone hand in hand and been amalgamated as in one consecutive act, the earlier form of baptism might still be continued alone and appear to suffice when detached from its proper complement. This is met with somewhat late in the first period, and it was then called the baptism of John simply, in the form in which the disciples had administered it during Christ's life.¹ Those who had been thus baptised were not disciples of the Baptist, for although his disciples were to be met with here and there throughout this period of forty years they withdrew more and more completely into the deserts, continued to attach to their garments from the bark of trees and their coarse food the highest importance, suffered their baptism to assume the form of frequent bathing in cold water, and consequently accepted as disciples those who sought to submit for their lives, or for a period, to penances which far surpassed those of the Essenes in point of rigour.² Those who had been simply baptised as Christians were quite different from these disciples of John; they were really Christians, and it might be even zealous Christians, but (as was subsequently related briefly) knew nothing of the Holy Ghost.³ We may say more definitely that they could most fervently expect the immediate coming of the crucified Christ in his full glory, but they did not feel strongly and vividly the eternal glorification of Christ and the overpowering and yet blessed and serene power of the Holy Ghost proceeding from that glorification; and to that extent that which was now most necessary and glorious in Christianity was, after all, absent in their case.⁴ Consequently a more intimate connection between those two constituent portions of the transition into full Christian fellowship had gradually to be formed, and the indispensable truth of it is most briefly and most pointedly expressed finally in the statement that the glorified Christ himself gave to his disciples after his resurrection the wholly new command *to baptise in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*⁵

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 262 sq.

² We should not have known these particulars if the memory of them had not been so clearly preserved in the special instance described by Josephus in his own *Life*, ch. ii.; comp. on this instance below, in connection with Josephus's life.

³ According to Acts xviii. 25, 26, xix. 2-7.

⁴ If we do not correctly comprehend this essential difference, we cannot understand the Acts of the Apostles, nor therefore the New Testament generally.

⁵ Matt. xxviii. 19, comp. as to the meaning of this phrase *Jahrb. d. B. W.*

For it was baptism in the sense of this brief formulary which differentiates the Christian from the Johannean baptism, inasmuch as it brings the subject of it not merely under the government of the Son, and of course of the Father, but also of the Holy Ghost, and requires that the latter as well as the former shall henceforth rule over the person with its whole impelling force and enlightening influence.¹ If, moreover, under the influence of such an Apostle as Peter, for instance, the operations of the Holy Spirit manifested themselves somewhat earlier in a convert by their evident signs, baptism might come afterwards;² or if the Holy Spirit rested with all its fervour, as it were unconsciously, without any laying on of hands, upon one who had been already baptised, it was enough to simply explain to him the true state of the case;³ and it is easy to understand that those who had seen Christ during these first days without having been baptised scarcely needed afterwards to undergo the ceremony, as, for instance, James, the brother of the Lord. But notwithstanding unimportant exceptions of this kind, baptism remained necessarily the principal and established means of entrance into the Christian brotherhood; and we shall see in the next volume what important consequences were, on the fringe of this period, connected with the *new baptism* which had thus been made into the most perfect instrument of Christianity.

The exceedingly serious nature and the purely spiritual tendencies of the new genuinely Christian baptism led to the result that it was very soon freed from the unduly pronounced physical features of the original baptism of John. Just as the clothing of skin, or even of bark,⁴ and the coarse sustenance of

vii. p. 159, viii. p. 179 sq. We have thus in the history a plain proof as to the way in which such an utterance of the glorified Christ arose, and how absolutely necessary the meaning is which it has; for if the utterance had come to the disciples in those very first days in the form of a command in the common historical sense, such events as those narrated Acts viii. 12-17, xviii. 25, 26, xix. 2-7, could not have occurred, and we should be unable to understand the history of the Apostolic period. But the pure higher truth of the above utterance was called for as a Divine necessity from the first day after the resurrection, and it was necessary that it should in due time be heard by all the Apostles as a pure command of the glorified Lord from heaven.

¹ It was this baptism only which was regarded afterwards as *the seal of the*

Lord impressed upon the person who had undergone it, according to a figure from which at last a higher term for baptism sprang, though the term began to be used early; but the figurative terms *illumination* and *anointing* interchange with it; comp. Eus. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 23. 8, 9; Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 45, Bar. Apoc. Aeth., p. 9, *note, last line*, and elsewhere often. The mixing of salt and water, on the other hand, was symbolical (Land's *Ancient Syr.*, p. 9 sq.).

² As is beautifully related in the instance, Acts x. 44-48.

³ For it is not even presupposed that Apollon had first to receive the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands.

⁴ Exactly as in the case of the Hindoo ascetics, see Mann's *Lives*, vi. 6. Reports of the extraordinary habits of the Hindoo ascetics, as they are described in the

the disciples of John found no place in Christianity, because they were not sanctioned by Christ himself, so Christian baptism gradually let drop the use of flowing water¹ which was essential in the baptism of John. Indeed, amongst Christians, the habit grew up in many places of performing the rite of baptism as close as possible to the graves of great departed Christians, as with reference to the nearness of the general resurrection of all who had died in Christ, and to the truth that baptism must be the death of the old man, that the new man may be glorified together with Christ and all those who have already become perfect with him.²

As now it was understood that everyone who had thus entered into fellowship with the glorified Holy One of God,³ was determined never to become unfaithful to him, and still more that the influence of the Holy Spirit, which was felt in this Community as it had never been before, rested upon the whole Church, never far removed from it, always ready to make itself more sensibly felt at the proper moment, it followed that there had now appeared unawares upon the earth a race of men who were conscious, as men had never been before, of being *saints*, and who could also apply this name to themselves on proper occasions.⁴ Not that every individual might claim this title, but the whole Church might and ought to have this consciousness, and to call itself by this name when it realised its purest thoughts and highest aims; and if the whole Church could do this, so might every individual church in its measure. And what a hallowing thought it was for every individual that he was a member of a vast Community, in which nothing but the divine holiness of all life must be supreme! With this idea of the *saints* the same name was revived which had not been without its good meaning in the primitive condition of the ancient Community, and which that Community had subsequently endeavoured to retain;⁵ and other inspiring names of this exalted nature derived from that ancient time and its lofty

sixth book of Manu's *Laws*, had at that time been long known in Palestine, and may have contributed something to the habits adopted by the disciples of John, (*ante*, p. 136); but the baptism of John is too closely connected with the system of the Essenes, according to what we saw in vol. vi., and that was too thoroughly Israelitic, to permit us to derive it from India.

¹ [See now *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ed. Bryennios (1884), ch. vii.]

² According to 1 Cor. xv. 29, where *over the dead* is said briefly instead of *over the graves of the dead*; comp. my

Send schreiben des Paulus, p. 213.

³ As Christ, even when he was still on the earth, could as the Messiah be called, Mark i. 24.

⁴ On proper occasions, *e.g.*, the Christians of any church might be so denominated in dedications; but in ordinary discourse Paul applies the name to the members of the parent church only, who are still thus denominated, Heb. vi. 10, comp. on this point below.

⁵ Comp. vol. ii. pp. 136 sq., and my note on Ps. xvi. 3 (*Dichter des alten Bundes*, I. b, p. 247).

endeavours were now revived in the Church with a marvellously fresh power and truth.¹ But in this instance also we meet with the first true consummation of the ancient idea, and thus the close of this history had to repeat its beginning.

But in proportion to the purity and exaltation of the new life, to which baptism was meant to be the introduction, and the more vigilantly for a long time this purity was guarded, or, to use a frequent figure of this period, the more jealously it was sought to present the whole Church as a pure virgin to her constantly expected Lord,² the more strictly was the discipline of love exercised in the body itself, the ban, or even complete excommunication, being employed, if no other disciplinary measures availed.³ Without such a strict discipline, the new Church, in its condition of weakness in the world, would not have been able to establish itself; and as its members were collected from the great world as the *elect*, and were all bound to have been actually *sanctified* at some time by the power of the Holy Ghost, this Community could, without difficulty, put back into the common world any member who appeared to sully or even, it might be, to rend in pieces that holiness and purity which hung over the Church like a luminous cloud of light. The right of the ban, in the form of a simple exclusion, had previously been exercised by every Judean Community even amongst the heathen, and, in fact, most of all amongst them; this custom was therefore the more easily continued by the Christian Church; but, in conformity with the Christian spirit and the new Christian ideas, it was modified in such a way that when the discipline had to be the most severe the higher power of Christian love and desire of human salvation still prevailed.⁴

A similar feeling induced the Church to settle differences which had arisen amongst its own members by arbitrators from its midst if possible. Every community which is placed in the midst of men of lower views and habits, and which is determined to follow alone the principles and commands of a higher religion, naturally adopts such a method; the Judean com-

¹ The expressions 1 Pet. ii. 9, Rev. i. 6 being only a re-echo of Ex. xix. 5.

² See *ante*, p. 107.

³ We can follow the course of procedure in such passages as Matt. xviii. 15-18, 1 Cor. v. 1-8, and the simple fundamental principles of it were laid down by Christ himself. Comp. my notes on 1 John ii. 1, 2, *Johanneische Schriften*, I. pp. 461 sq. The later controversies with regard to the re-admission into the Church of those who had apostatised, as they

are first raised in the *Shepherd of Hermas* (see the next volume) and afterwards in connection with the Roman Bishops Zephyrinus and Callistus in Hippolytus, *Philos.*, ix. 7 sq., do not properly belong to this period: they arose from the fear, on the one hand, of the serious insinuation of non-Christian elements, and, on the other, of too great losses to the Church.

⁴ See on this point my *Sendschreiben des Paulus*, p. 151 sq.

munities amongst the heathen had long observed it,¹ and their various offices were arranged in accordance with the institutions which sprang out of it. But the Christian Church was much more retired and exclusive in this respect; where the purity of holiness and inexhaustible love were intended to dwell far more than in the Community of the ancient true religion, there might least of all be absent that mind of sincerity and love which most easily arranges such private differences.²

The New Form of Prophecy.

Just as the baptism of John, as the most recent manifestation of the spiritual power of the Old Covenant, was transformed in the manner above described, so the oldest and most original spiritual power of that Covenant—prophecy—was renovated in the marvellously productive soil of these first days of infant Christianity. Prophecy in Israel had centuries ago disappeared as an immediate power in the State;³ but just as in Christ himself its immortal character was once more revived in its purest and highest form,⁴ so now a multitude of prophets arose most unexpectedly in his Community. It is true, prophecy could not again exercise the sole rule in the Community as it had once done at the commencement of this long history of Israel; in fact, in Christ himself it had been only one amongst the other powers of his spirit and his work. But it was renovated again all the more influentially and salutarily as regards its eternal power and significance, its immediate unflinching glance into all times, and its divinely and indubitably sure utterance of Christian conceptions and truths; and this period was in itself sufficiently straitened and hardly beset on the one hand, and sufficiently exalted and excited on the other, to call forth all the prophetic power which was possible in it. In Paul, for instance, we meet with genuine prophetic elements, though they are only of a subsidiary character. But members of this Community also arose who, having been likewise chiefly influenced by the models of the Old Testament, revived the ancient prophetic discourse, and distinguished themselves in the use of it particularly.⁵ However, though the wholly new Christian spirit

¹ See vol. v. p. 242.

² According to 1 Cor. vi. 1–11, Rom. xii. 9 sq., and so many other passages of a similar force; somewhat later, James ii. 6, already speaks from less ideal experiences, but with reference to the interference of the Judeans. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, supplies a later instance

of an arbitrator appointed for such differences, according to the *Sneksår* in Dillmann's *Christ. Aeth.* p. 21. 7.

³ See vol. v. pp. 174 sq.

⁴ See vol. vi. pp. 233 sq., 452 sq.

⁵ Acts xi. 27, 28; xiii. 1; xxi. 10, 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; xiv. 29–37; Rev. i. 3; xvi. 6; xviii. 20, 24; xxii. 9; Eph. iii. 5;

was able in this department also to display its energies, its activity really always remained a good deal confined, precisely because its manifestations were chiefly a simple repetition of the ancient prophecy, and only what was perfectly suitable for that initiatory period ; and it is not accidental that we have in the New Testament but one Apocalypse. Nevertheless, prophecy manifested itself in the early Church also in such new and various forms that in all its species it could share the ornamental wreath of Christian gifts.¹

3. *Its Internal Organisation and Government.*

The Apostles.—The Elders.

Though it follows from what we have seen above, that the greatest variety of minds were brought together in this Community, and that there was thereby ample opportunity given for future provocation and disagreement, on the other hand the strongest bond that can bind men together existed in their case. This bond was the acknowledgment, combined with the purest love, exalted awe, and intense expectation, of the same glorified celestial Lord ; a bond which at first and for long afterwards bound them all together so firmly that the internal organisation and government of the growing Church took shape almost of themselves. In this society there was as yet no contention for power and rule ; with regard to those who were best qualified to rule all were generally of one opinion ; and as the office of government in this community only involved greater labour and responsibility, so all were conscious of being separated from the world and sustained by the spirit of their invisible Lord as well as of living in the closest contact with him.

It was at all events at first taken as a matter of course by the believers, that the Twelve remained the firmest pillars and at the same time the best leaders of this Community. They knew best how Christ had in all cases acted and how his work could be continued ; and if they had thus all along the most severe labour, they were nevertheless at that time everywhere met and assisted by a greater degree of respect. And if all the rest of the world confronted them with its unbelief, and very soon with its open hostility, even this their completely exceptional position, in addition to their personal heroism of faith, might come to their aid. Of returning into the ancient Com-

iv. 11 ; comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* viii. p. 108. Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* v. 17, enumerates, after a book of Miltiades, certain

prophets of this kind, some of whom are otherwise quite unknown to us.

¹ See *ante*, p. 115.

munity as it then was, they had and could have no serious thought; and all the future of Christianity lay before them as yet quite unclouded and unobstructed by any experiences in the Church itself. Their whole purpose and action had thus the most definite direction, and the most unlimited, freest, and untroubled future; whilst they knew that they must conquer or fall. What buoyancy, and what unwearied ardour of spirit were imparted to them by the very peculiarity of this their position in connection with their whole past history!¹ Even the defects which still adhered to their labours in view of their time—for instance, its elaborate Biblical learning—became, for the moment at all events, less obvious and less detrimental.

The ranks and degrees amongst themselves which had grown up under Christ's own eyes and with his approval,² were likewise continued; but in fact their labours took now forthwith a twofold form. On the one hand, they had to continue what they had once commenced under the eyes of Christ,³ their distinctive office being that of heralds who had to spread the Gospel by deed and word in every place where this was possible and advisable, within or beyond Jerusalem, and to be prepared always and everywhere to give an answer also before the enemies of the cause of Christ. But in this their immediate and proper apostolic vocation, they now soon found a considerable number of associates and helpers in those men who could claim to have seen the risen Lord close at hand, and to have heard his voice with perfect distinctness;⁴ for these men, when they were conscious of being moved by the spirit, could likewise speak as direct messengers of Christ himself, as ambassadors who have heard the will and the commissions of their King from his own lips, and are responsible to him alone for everything which they say and do. On the other hand, after Christ's departure the Twelve were obliged to take charge of the general affairs of the Community and to become its heads by managing them, as far as men can in Christ's Community rule under Him as its one immortal head. This is the *ministry* which, willingly or unwillingly, they were now obliged to take up, just as Christ had previously converted the true rule over men into a self-sacrificing service of the cause of God, and had pronounced

¹ If the narratives bearing on this given in Acts i.—xii. accord with Christ's promises as recorded in the Collected Sayings, Matt. x. 19 sq., and in John xiii.—xvii., the latter must not be regarded as having originated in the experiences of the Apostles; but it must be admitted that after these experiences everything in

Christ's words which harmonised with them was re-echoed in twofold clearness and strength when it was again recalled.

² See vol. vi. pp. 301 sq.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 324 sq.

⁴ See *ante*, pp. 57 sq.

that form of ruling the only proper one.¹ And this office of the direction of the affairs of the Church was never called in question during their subsequent lives; and undoubtedly it was it chiefly which kept them all, or at all events some of them, in Jerusalem, or brought them back again thither whenever it was possible.

As the functions of the Twelve were therefore of a twofold nature, and as they now became from the commencement the principal leaders (or heads, *elders*) of the parent Church, it was intelligible that after the apostasy of Judas the traitor, and his early death, their number should be again definitely fixed. Upon the proposition of Peter, all were ready to receive into their number a twelfth member; and they properly felt that the man who should be raised to equal honour with themselves must likewise have been as fully acquainted as possible with Christ in his life on earth. At the same time they felt as clearly the impossibility of choosing him in an ordinary manner; for if he was to be really not inferior to themselves, the same higher power which they knew had chosen them must also choose him. They therefore selected in the first instance two disciples who were both personally eligible, a certain Joseph (Judas) Barsabas, with the surname Justus, and Matthias, prayed that one of them might be chosen, and then left it to the lot to decide between them, and it fell upon Matthias.² This took place, according to Luke, a short time before the day of Pentecost, and has in reality full significance only for that first period. To seek to have a fixed number of apostles simply, in the stricter sense of this word, would be foolish, inasmuch as their office required the entirely personal activity of one or two for a definite object, just as Christ had formerly sent them forth two and two;³ but as pillars, and at the same time heads of the Church, their number must have been fixed, just as Christ had formerly chosen them twelve in number, even as simply members of a Community; and at this time particularly

¹ *Διακονία*, Acts i. 25, compared with Matt. xx. 28, 1 Cor. xii. 5; but these words *διακονία καὶ ἀποστολή*, Acts i. 25, show at the same time that the Twelve had really a twofold vocation and very various offices, amongst which the *διακονία* is here properly placed before the *ἀποστολή*.

² The narrative, Acts i. 15-26, is derived from the source named, *ante*, p. 31, and its purely historical basis can be readily perceived. The words ver. 17 must have come from some apocryphon

which is no longer known to us. It is also quite intelligible why the lot should have been resorted to; subsequently the lot was disused, inasmuch as the entire apostolic office itself ceased, as we shall soon see.—If we compare the much more definite passages, xv. 22, 27, 32, with i. 23, it is obvious that only Joseph, or rather, as is found in the best authorities, *Jose* or *Judas*, can be the original reading; however, ch. xv. is also taken from another source, comp. further *ante*, pp. 131 sq.

³ See vol. vi. p. 326.

they still occupied a perfectly distinct position as pillars and heads of the Community.

The Twelve accordingly at the commencement filled all the administrative offices of the Church; and in this aspect of their general labours they were the directors, or, to use the ancient Hebrew expression, the Elders (Presbyters) of the Community. And if the name and idea of an Apostle in those times were much higher than those of an Elder, so that the Apostles were not naturally called Elders, there were still times and cases when the Apostles might consider it appropriate to give prominence to this their lower office of Eldership, particularly as it was always understood amongst them that they were Elders of the parent church and thereby of the entire Christian Church. But on this point we must speak subsequently.

The Assistant-Ministers, or Servants (Deacons).

But after the Day of Pentecost the parent Church rapidly increased and soon numbered many thousand members. This increase had necessarily the effect of adding to the various administrative labours of the Twelve to such a degree that the vast power of work of even a Peter could no longer meet the requirements. It was especially the subordinate duties of management which now most frequently suffered from the great pressure, and this was the more the case, the more the fellowship of love of those early days¹ comprehended the application of outward possessions and assistance, and the more special regard, in conformity with the fundamental principle of Christianity, had to be paid to the necessities of the numerous poor and unprotected members. Accordingly an outbreak of dissatisfaction very soon presented the occasion for the creation of a subordinate office of management, which was nevertheless quite independent within its sphere. The Hellenists complained of the Hebrews, or native Judeans, that their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations, or the distribution of the provisions; and, though this injustice was probably only in a small degree actually committed, and was due to the subordinate agents without the knowledge of the Apostles, the latter nevertheless at once seized the opportunity of providing against such complaints in future which might be raised against themselves by the creation of a new office. They at once declared at a meeting of the Church that it was not fit that they should

¹ See *ante*, pp. 115 sq.

spend their time, which ought to be primarily devoted to the proclamation and administration of the Gospel, in directing the distribution of food and the other necessary provisions; that the Church should choose from its midst for these public duties a number of men of good report whom it regarded as the most capable in respect of spirit and wisdom; and they proposed at the same time that the number should be limited to seven (as answering to the necessities of the time).¹ It was naturally understood that to these new officers, whose duty it was to apply the money and resources of the Church with special reference to the more needy members, belonged also the care of all the income of the Community, and that they became therefore its proper treasurers. And few things deserve greater admiration than that the Twelve correctly perceived that the chief authorities of a church do best to leave the entire management of its outward possessions to a separate body of men who enjoy its confidence—a wise and fundamental principle which, though taught by the Apostles themselves at the very commencement of Christianity, is still wholly ignored, or, at best, but reluctantly followed by those in power in so many Christian countries of our own day.—Such an institution in the Community must not, of course, take a position above the law and the spirit of the Community itself, thereby falling into an arbitrary course and seeking to escape its responsibility to the governing heads and the whole Community. Accordingly when the seven men chosen by the church had a special sphere of labour referred to them in which they were for the future to work with full independence, they were still on a certain day publicly presented by the Twelve to the church and consecrated by the laying on of hands in accordance with the ancient prevalent custom in such cases.² The number seven was likewise fixed in accordance with its ancient sacredness.

The choice of the Seven which the Church made at that time appears, according to all indications, to have been excellent. These men were not simply well qualified for taking charge of the outward possessions of the Community in accordance with its object, but they were also filled with the true spirit of Christ, as we shall further see from the example of the two at their head, named Stephen and Philip. Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch, is mentioned as the seventh. It is evidence of the strong love of justice in the church that it put confidence in a man who was formerly a heathen and had removed from Antioch to Jerusalem. Of the rest, one or another

¹ Acts vi. 1-6, comp. xxi. 8.

² See *ante*, p. 135.

may have been a Hellenist in the sense that although of Jewish blood he was born or educated amongst the heathen ; but according to the express remark in the list of the seven this Nicolas, mentioned last, was the only one of heathen blood.

The natural division of the management between these two offices, of the *Elders*, who take the supreme direction of the Community and the general oversight, and of the *Deacons*, or assistant ministers, who are entrusted with the management of the outward possessions of the Church, we find perpetuated in subsequent times and imitated in every new church.¹ And, as the Community enjoyed formerly under Christ himself² the special activity of devout women and widows, so now we find as a distinctive mark of a Christian church individual women, who were specially qualified and ready, entrusted with the care of the Christian service of love in their circle and actively engaged in support of the deacons, and we find them also divided into two classes.³ We shall see below how all these first stages of an organisation of the administrative activity of the Church are further developed, and how for the Twelve particularly wholly new relations and arrangements arose.

It may be remarked finally that some of these deacons could very well take charge of other ministries which brought them again into closer connection with the Apostles ; for instance, the ministry of the *Evangelists* above mentioned,⁴ the related ministry of those who administered baptism,⁵ and that of the exorcists who treated the demoniacs ;⁶ the above-mentioned Philip supplying an example of this which we shall meet with below.

*The Strength and the Weakness and the Dissolution of the
Original Form of the Community.*

Its Strength Internally.

But simply and suitably as all these various institutions and practices were called into being, in this Community the spirit of Christianity itself, in the form in which it can act without the visible Christ, was raised high above them all and in its fresh

¹ The two offices are named together, Phil. i. 1, comp. with 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, 8-10, and 12, 13. But the two are named together and distinguished in the reverse order, 1 Cor. xii. 28, as *ἀντίληψις*, *assistance*, and *κυβέρνησις*, *government*.

² See vol. vi. p. 305.

³ Examples: Phœbe at Cenchrea, Rom. xvi. 1 ; Tryphena and Tryphosa

and Persis at Ephesus, Rom. xvi. 12 ; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 11, and, thereon, the next vol.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 113.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 135.

⁶ *Ante*, p. 113. Comp., with regard to the exorcists, Lagarde's *Reliquiæ Juris Ecc.* p. 9. 1-6, Eusebius, *Mart. Palæst.* (Syriac), p. 5, ad fin., Cureton's ed.

full power. In this Community Christ had himself as it were risen from his grave, and was making his presence felt amongst men with all his higher gifts and operations; and as he made himself felt sensibly through these first years just as he had lived and ruled when on the earth with all his marvellous works of love, his thoughts, and his desires, so now we see him re-living in hundreds and thousands by the reproduction in them of his various powers and deeds, inasmuch as really all the exceedingly dissimilar persons that collect together in his name are again most closely united by the fear of him as the Son of God and Judge of the world and by the glorifying hope of his great and immediate salvation. Amongst these thousands, who, though engaged in the infinitely various occupations of secular life, are nevertheless inseparably connected, without any outward compulsion, simply by the one transcendent cause of Christ, there is in fact realised thus early that figure—which only subsequently became quite familiar—of a mystic body which connects all its numerous members in one inseparable unity without a visible though surely existing head;¹ or that figure of the lofty and widely extending house, the walls of which no one can see, but the pillars of which are immovably planted, and which, inhabited by an innumerable number of those who seek in it protection and sustenance, reaches with its open roof into the heavens.² And, although the one Lord of this Community had departed into the invisible world and delayed to appear in his outward glory, those who were faithful to him nevertheless always felt the nearness and power of the Holy Spirit which had been sent in his stead, like a transparent and protecting cloud of luminous splendour above their heads; and a marvellous clearness in perception and anticipation, as well as power and confidence in action, guided all their steps. Formerly the Twelve had been to the very last moment of the earthly life of their Lord unable to cast off a degree of uncertainty and unworthy fear, but now they, with Peter at their head, were entirely delivered therefrom, both during the more monotonous course of the months and years and also amid the most various sudden and trying events; and as if Christ were now in his glory living within them with twofold power, they move and act upon the field which they have once adopted, and which field though limited is every-

¹ According to the figure which is first worked out, Col. i. 18, ii. 19, and reproduced from this passage, Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 15, 16.

² According to such first applications

of this figure as we meet with in the phrase, Gal. ii. 9, compared with 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17 (the latter repeated in the piece, 2 Cor. vi. 16).

where beset with innumerable dangers, with a spiritual assurance and certainty which is only increased from stage to stage by the experience they gain.

A memorable event, which must probably, on account of its unique character, have produced a lasting impression, supplies peculiar evidence of the growth of this confidence and power in the internal life of the Church.¹ A certain Ananias felt so strongly the attraction of the new life of the Christian Church that he desired to become a member of it; the community of goods may also attract some persons by virtue of the certainty of a life without care which it seems to promise; and those persons who, under the cloak of holiness, are chiefly seeking freedom from temporal and material uncertainty, are, even when they desire to be really zealous, unable to be so without some *arrière pensée*. Ananias was a man of this kind. He sold a field,² but kept back part of the price, laid the rest at the Apostles' feet, and then, boasting of the sale of the field, demanded to be received into the Church, everything being done with the knowledge of his wife, Sapphira, who, however, was so astute as to let her husband make his statement first by himself. Now, undoubtedly neither Peter nor another of the Twelve had got to know anything about the exact circumstances;³ but Peter, with his penetrating glance, saw in the man, as he appeared before him with his request, the dishonesty which he desired to practise with sacred things. Previously it had been well known to all that only he who desired sincerely and gladly to sacrifice outward possessions, and in that way also longed, as a completely regenerated man, freed from all worldly cares, for the divine salvation, could hope to receive it, and was qualified to become a member of the perfect kingdom of God; and the sacred veil of the new spirit of glory, which after the day of Pentecost had covered and enclosed this Community as with its celestial brightness, had as yet never been torn and rent by such an act of dishonesty. At that moment, therefore, the deeply injured spirit of this Community, as if embodied in Peter, revolted against this hitherto unknown wickedness as in self-defence; and after a

¹ Acts v. 1-11, a narrative the historical character of which it is folly to call in question.

² We may infer from the fact that in this case, unlike iv. 37, it is quite definitely stated that he sold *a field*, as if he had more, that this community of goods was not compulsory: just as Christ himself never required that everyone should give up all his possessions, the demand, Matt.

xix. 21, being addressed only to the young ruler, and to him only in special circumstances.

³ Although this is not expressly stated, it follows almost of itself as the meaning of the narrative, and indeed, just because it is not stated, we may consider that according to the force of the narrative the Apostles had no information.

further examination of the case, the true nature of which he had only too correctly surmised, Peter concluded with the awful, but not too strong, sentence, 'Ananias has lied not unto men but unto God.' And it is nothing else than a sign of the marvellous power of the glory which still surrounded this young, pure Community that Ananias, smitten by the truth of Peter's sentence and his own evil conscience, suddenly fell down, as if struck by a divine blow, and shortly afterwards died. In amazement and dread at the divine judgment which was revealed in this case, the man was immediately buried in accordance with the custom of the time. Some three hours after this occurrence the wife also appeared, undoubtedly simply because her husband had been too long absent; for in the wholly different part of the city where she probably dwelt she had heard nothing of the occurrence. As she repeated the request of her husband, Peter asked her pointedly whether they had not received a higher price; not until she had expressly denied this, and the lie was therefore complete, did Peter remonstrate and ask her how she could have agreed with her husband in such a lie; and then immediately referred her to the event which had just taken place without her knowledge. Accordingly a still worse shock befell her than had befallen her husband, and she also fell down dead immediately. The spirit of the highest holiness appeared thus, in this case, exercising its power to correct also, and protecting the Community which, as left without any human protection, put confidence in God alone, and was determined to adhere firmly to nothing else than the truth and holiness of Christ. And as Peter was not taken by surprise even at the two fatal judgments, which had not been desired nor humanly caused by himself, so neither was he rendered presumptuous by them as by the human results of his labours as an Apostle and Elder of this Community; but 'great fear came upon the whole Church and upon all that heard these things.'¹

Its Strength Externally.

As the Community maintained with such strength and compact unity its distinctive character with relation to its internal affairs, it is intelligible that it should be able for a long time happily to escape the dangers which threatened it on

¹ A similar occurrence belonging to the early days of the ancient Community is therefore that which is referred to, vol. ii. p. 179. In many respects the narra-

tive of the death of the two eldest sons of Aaron, Lev. x., is also similar, comp. *Antiquities*, p. 270.

all hands from without. Its entire existence and all its action and endeavour were opposed to the Hagiocracy; and if this power resolved to be thoroughly consistent, it could not for a moment tolerate the Church as a community acknowledging the crucified Jesus, but must at once either crucify everyone who too openly confessed him as the one Messiah, or punish him in some similarly fatal manner; and an indescribable amazement must have seized its heads when they heard that a new Lord had arisen in this Community, and that the crucified one was this its Lord exalted above all human vicissitudes. But the higher courage of the Twelve, which after that day of Pentecost never abated again, the unfailing and overpowering eloquence of Peter and other faithful disciples, and the united and exceedingly peaceful and devout attitude of the Church, on the one hand, and, on the other, the uneasy conviction of the representatives of the Hagiocracy that they had really done Jesus an injustice, produced together the effect that the new Community, even in a serious conflict with the old one, could not for a considerable time be greatly injured, and that even the threatening collisions of this kind could only contribute to the greater strengthening and confirmation of the young Community and its wonderful faith. The Acts of the Apostles has preserved for us the memory of two instances, related somewhat at length,¹ which place very clearly before our eyes the situation of the Church in those days, and the advance which was made in this respect.

As Peter went with John on one occasion at the midday hour of prayer² to the Temple, a man lame from his birth, who was daily brought to the Gate Beautiful³ to beg, besought Peter for an alms. After Peter had convinced himself that his help would not be bestowed upon one unworthy of it, he promised the man, instead of gold, of which the Apostle had none, a better gift; and, calling upon the name of Christ, raised him up with such a mighty hand that the cripple immediately walked firmly with his feet and ankles.⁴ As this cure of a man of more than forty years of age at once made a great noise, and as the man himself, as a new convert whose heart was full of gratitude, persisted in following the Apostles, a continually

The first, Acts iii. 1-iv. 31; the second, v. 12-42; it follows from the intermediate narrative, iv. 32-v. 11, that the second occurred at a considerably later time.

² See *ante*, p. 126.

³ On the eastern side of the Temple,

see vol. vi. p. 360 note.

⁴ The similarity of this case generally of a miracle of healing at the Temple with that of John v. 3 sq., comp. ix. 1 sq., is only such as is involved in the very nature of the cases, and could not be otherwise.

increasing number of men collected about the two Apostles, and would probably have even worshipped them as thaumaturgists. Thereupon Peter declared, in a fiery oration, that, in this case of healing, everything on the contrary must be referred solely to the power of the risen Christ and the faith in him which was possessed by both the healer and the healed; faith in that Holy and Righteous One whom they had so wickedly and unjustly slain. To this declaration he added the urgent exhortation that they would in faith receive him after they had now perceived who it really was whom they had put to death, in order that the Messianic salvation might actually come to them as it had been promised: for as certainly as Jesus was really the promised Messiah, that great salvation, foretold in the Old Testament, was after all in the first instance meant for them.¹ Faith in the risen Lord had not since that first Whitsunday been proclaimed with such distinctness and eloquence, and moreover with such effect. Many priests, always most on the alert at the gates of the Temple, had listened, and before the end of the day, with the assistance of the priestly chief-overseer of the Temple² and his guard, they took the two Apostles prisoners. As in similar cases, the Sadducees were very active in connection with this arrest, partly because the high-priest Caiaphas, who was still in office, belonged to this school,³ and partly because the doctrine of a risen Christ must have seemed to them far more doubtful and ridiculous than to the Pharisees.⁴—The next morning the heads of the Hagiocracy assembled for the first time in the Sanhedrin to pass judgment upon the disciples of the crucified Jesus—Annas and Caiaphas, who had already stained their hands by his crucifixion, John

¹ The discourse of Peter iii. 12–26, falls accordingly into the three main parts, vv. 12–16; vv. 17–21; vv. 22–26, of equal length. When it is said, ver. 17, that the Judeans, the people and their rulers, had slain Christ in *ignorance*, this can only mean that after the crucified Jesus had manifested his glory by palpable deeds, and had approved himself as the celestial Messiah, it was undoubtedly much easier to recognise him as the true Messiah than it was in the days before he had been thus glorified, and ignorance with regard to his true character was then more excusable than now. When thus understood, the words convey a just meaning; and according to the connection they can have no other meaning.

² Ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, Acts iv. 1, v. 24, 26; any captain of the armed guard of a town or a temple was thus called in

those days; in Jerusalem he was that priest who commanded the strong Temple guard, the third in rank after the officiating high priest, and he is thus named Jos. *Ant.* xx. 6. 2. We meet with a certain חנניה or חנניה as חנניהם. *Pirge Aboth*, iii. 2, and the other last *præfati templi* are found in the *M. שקלים* iv. 4, v. 1.

³ Which is not only stated Acts v. 17, but is also very probable, inasmuch as the son of his father-in-law, likewise named Annas, was, according to Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9. 1, a Sadducee, and the old scholastic sects were now, according to many indications, kept up principally in the different families. This fact is not mentioned in the Gospels, because the Pharisees were also concerned in Christ's condemnation.

⁴ See vol. v. p. 278.

and Alexander, two men likewise belonging to high-priests' families, who happen to be mentioned here only, and many others of the same rank. But when the question was put to the two Apostles, Who had given them authority to perform such deeds and to publicly speak as they had done? they could not, without denying their Christian faith, do otherwise than, with all modesty and simplicity, make such an enthusiastic reply that their judges hesitated to inflict upon them a severe punishment. They could not well punish them for curing the man who stood before them as a witness; and as they easily perceived that the two disciples were without the current learning of the schools,¹ they suspected that the sympathy of the people with them, which was just then excited, would probably soon subside. So they let the two Apostles go, charging them to abstain in future from speaking publicly of Christ as the risen Messiah and Lord; and simply threatening them more sternly when they declared that in this matter they had no choice but to obey God rather than men. Amongst their believing associates, who were at the time assembled and anxiously waiting for them, their safe return called forth such intense delight, that the place where they were met seemed to be shaken by their fervent thanksgivings and other prayers, and the inspired enthusiasm reached almost the same height as that on the day of Pentecost.² Nor was the Church willing that the Twelve should suffer themselves to be bound in their public labours by the threats of the Hagiocracy, but on the contrary besought God for the continuance of rich blessing upon them in their twofold work of love.

The Apostles continued, therefore, if with some caution, to devote their services of Christian love to the poor and needy, and to proclaim the risen Master as the one true Christ; whilst the masses of the people, as from thankfulness for such benefits, and from the involuntary feeling that something mysteriously divine must surely be implied in the zeal of such innocent men, continued to be favourable to them.³ After the high-priest Caiaphas had long been an unwilling observer of this procedure, which must have seemed to him contempt of the prohibition of the Sanhedrin, he resolved, relying chiefly upon his Sadducean following in the Sanhedrin, to take more decided steps, and he put all the Twelve into prison. It was subsequently related that during the very first night an angel opened the doors of the prison and commanded them to teach

¹ See vol. vi. p. 189.

² See *ante*, p. 90.

³ According to Acts iv. 33, v. 13, 26.

again immediately in the Temple in their accustomed manner; and when, the next morning, the Sanhedrin had assembled to sit in judgment on their case, and commanded to have them brought into court, the officers of the court were not less astonished to find the prison safely shut, though empty, than the Sanhedrin to learn that the Twelve were at the time teaching again in the Temple; however, the Twelve then suffered themselves to be quietly led back to the Sanhedrin by the captain of the Temple-guard, who acted with great caution.¹ Similar narratives occur again on other occasions in the history of those embroilments; ² as if, in this case, the true instinct of the people, that it is precisely in such situations that celestial powers most of all come to the assistance of innocence against brutal force, could not be repressed. Neither can we doubt that an actual occurrence once gave the occasion for the formation of all such narratives; in the higher mood in which a Peter constantly lived at that time, and which must have been intensified to the highest pitch at such a moment, it really seemed to him as if an angel conducted him into liberty to the duties of his proper vocation, and everything of a lower, material, and accidental nature was transfigured for him, and all of like mind with him, into a purely celestial form; so that neither are we able to say anything further about the matter, inasmuch as the knowledge of the more particular circumstances is not at our command.—But when the Apostles were placed again before the Sanhedrin, they were called upon to explain how they could, against the express prohibition of the Sanhedrin, proclaim again more publicly than ever their teaching, unless they had the intention of provoking the popular revenge against the Court for having crucified Jesus. To this the Apostles could only reply, that the crucified Jesus was then in his glory raised far above all earthly influences, but not without the participation of the Sanhedrin—that he had been glorified only in order that a further brief respite for repentance and forgiveness might be granted to Israel; and inasmuch as it was the perception and truth of the fact which alone urged them, they were obliged, as its preachers, to

¹ Acts v. 19–26.

² Acts xii. 4–11, comp. xvi. 23–40. The second of these three narratives in chaps. v., xii., xvi., is much more circumstantial, clear, and purely historical than the first, so that the conjecture is natural that we have here an instance of the reduplication of a tradition like those quoted, vol. i. pp. 16 sq. In fact, the deliverance of all the Twelve from their prison as it is narrated, v. 19–26, stands in very loose

connection with its present context, inasmuch as it is followed by no results of any kind. And if we compare the third of these narratives, we see how greatly the entire character of such accounts was altered again as soon as the subject is no longer Peter, or the circumstances of the primitive Church at the time before us, but Paul and his time. Such differences may neither be overlooked nor denied.

obey God more than men. Such bold outspoken answers could only still more provoke the anger and murderous propensities of the Sanhedrin; but while many of them gnashed their teeth in rage, the distinguished Pharisee, Gamaliel, rose to demand a secret consultation after the accused had been removed. We shall have to speak of this Gamaliel below; in this case he spoke simply as he, a man of repute for his wisdom, and, moreover, a Pharisee placed in difficulties by opposition to the prevailing school of the Sadducees, was compelled to do; and the general scope of the counsel which he persuaded the Sanhedrin in the secret sitting to adopt, could not, on account of the issue of the case, be doubtful to the Twelve and other Christians, even if the consultations of such a body could long remain otherwise unknown. A wise man might at that time as easily foresee, as the masses of the people in their unprejudiced sincerity had long ago foreseen, that there was much of a wholly mysterious and obscure nature in the cause of Christianity, as it had now, even after the crucifixion of Jesus, revived again, contrary to the expectation of the majority of the members of the Sanhedrin, and, undoubtedly, of Gamaliel himself; no proper crime could be charged either against Christ or the Twelve; and a man familiar to any extent with the spirit of the Old Testament could not seriously propose to put down either spiritual freedom or the Messianic hope. Moreover, the death of Christ had been especially sought by the ruling sect of the Sadducees, although the Pharisees had likewise been most hostile to the doctrine and method of teaching of Christ, and had gladly seen his death; but the Pharisees could not share the special repugnance to the new idea of a resurrection which had influenced the Sadducees. Consequently Gamaliel's advice was to wait to see 'whether the work was of God or not;' advice from which we can only see how far this Gamaliel was from being a man who could have become a Paul; for undoubtedly the distinguished and wise schoolman did not give himself the trouble to examine to the bottom the whole matter which appeared to him also mysterious, and only formed a judgment like an ordinary lawyer and politician who looks at a case without passion, and sees no particularly urgent cause for the moment why he should go deeper into a question which is as yet a matter of indifference to him.¹ The Sanhedrin

¹ We may remark that the language of Gamaliel, Acts v. 35-39, is evidently put into a form such as a member of the Sanhedrin, with some repute for his wisdom, was accustomed to use; it was well remembered, and of course Christians

carefully noted and repeated over and over again the general substance of the utterance of Gamaliel. With regard to Judas of Galilee, ver. 37, see vol. vi. pp. 48 sq.; with regard to Theudas, ver. 6, see below.

adopted Gamaliel's advice; for the majority had probably a secret dread of repeating the crucifixion of Christ in the case of all his followers. But in reality the Sanhedrin thereby thus early declared its previous sentence against Christ as precipitous and unjust; the shallow and frivolous Caiaphas was obliged to make the best of the unpleasant situation, and even in this high court the victory, although at present in opposition to the will of men, begins to incline to the side of Christ. Though, therefore, in order to save the appearance of magisterial dignity, the Sanhedrin resolved not to let the Twelve go without a corporal castigation for not having observed the earlier prohibition, and to repeat the prohibition at the same time, it was natural that the Apostles should see in the undeserved dishonour for Christ's cause simply a divine distinction, and should joyfully thank God to be counted worthy of the honour of thus contending and suffering for the holy cause. And we can easily imagine what must have been the feelings of all the members of the Church after this collision with the Hagiocracy.

The Contention amongst the People.—Stephen.

Thus the early Church maintained its position for a period of some five years, constantly growing in strength inwardly and outwardly, in confidence and the organisation of its members, and in the respect of men without.¹ Christianity learnt, in the midst of this limited and trying sphere, to exist in the world without the visible Christ; indeed, it familiarised the world around it with the thought that there was something hidden behind the phenomenon of that crucified Jesus—a thought which was dreadful to some, while to others it pointed, at all events, to an unsolved mystery; and in this most trying initiatory period the faithfulness, no less than the wisdom and moderation, of the Twelve had been fully evinced. It is true the sphere in which the new Community still moved was the most confined in extent, but the conflict upon this immediate, narrowest, and hottest field continued to be the most trying. Once more the challenge and the admonition to seize the perfect true religion, even after the terrible rent which the crucifixion of Christ had made, came in this new form as directly and as modestly as possible to the members of

¹ The number of male members was 5,000, Acts iv. 4, and afterwards soon increased from the 3,000 and upwards on the day of Pentecost to some constantly further, v. 14, vi. 1, 7.

the Hagiocracy, as if, amid the entreaties and prayers for justice of the young persecuted children of their own kindred, and as if by the mysteriously reviving voice of the man who had recently been unjustly slain, and yet with a lofty confidence and decision as if he himself were still speaking and labouring in their midst. An outcast and grievously ill-treated daughter cannot cling more humbly and entreatingly to the bosom of her mother than this young Church, whose celestial Lord has been torn from her, to the mother who had helped to tear him from her, while he ought really to be the mother's Lord and Saviour no less than the daughter's. And in this attitude the young Church, much as she has to suffer, is, after all, strong enough not to submit to be destroyed or even so much as entirely cast forth by the ancient Community: we saw how little the Sanhedrin was able to accomplish against the Twelve.

But inasmuch as the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem, with all its power and learning, and its great influence with the people, persisted, nevertheless, in the course it had pursued, the profound antagonism which was involved in the general relations of the ancient and the new Communities to each other could not long remain inactive. The new Community had, as it were, by prayers and entreaties, clung to the ancient one and its sanctuary, and was nevertheless scarcely tolerated, and so grievously ill-treated in the persons of the Twelve; yet the new Community was conscious of possessing within its secret bosom all the truth and the perfection, and, indeed, more than sufficient power to enable it to suffer and to contend for Christ's cause, and daily its first full confidence in the matchless glory of the crucified Messiah rose higher. Under the sultry confinement and compulsory reserve of these first years there had already been formed in the young Community a new, strong, and marvellous faith, which constantly grew more intense and strong in a growing number of the most genuine, uncorrupted, and powerful spirits of the time, in addition to the Twelve and those who were immediately about them, and a faith which could hardly keep itself under restraint. The larger the number of the members of the new Community had already become in proportion to its earlier members, and the more peculiar their general character and their faith, which had now long been everywhere spoken about, were, the more frequent and ominous must the occasions of contact, the movements, and the provocations between them and the adherents of the ancient Community become. And if on their part the Twelve, as they were bound to do, as the Elders of the Church

continued to act with prudent caution, there were others who might feel less occasion for such reserve.

To the latter belonged Stephen, whom we have already met with at the head of the newly-chosen deacons.¹ His very office involved him more deeply in the general pursuits of the masses of the people; he was, however, not merely exceedingly active as a deacon, but he soon rivalled the Apostles in eloquent defences of the Christian hope, and in the successful practice of miraculous cures and other mighty deeds of Christian love, so that the divine grace and power seemed to operate in him as in an Apostle. Having thus become generally known to the people, he found himself in a dispute with some who considered themselves the most liberal-minded and educated Judeans, though they refused to believe in Christ. These were Hellenists belonging to two of the principal synagogues which then existed in Jerusalem together with many others. One of these synagogues had its name from the *Libertines*, or the descendants—who had now come to live in Jerusalem again—of the Judeans who had formerly been removed to Rome as prisoners, and had subsequently gradually received their freedom.² This synagogue was called after the *Libertines*, because those who had come from Rome took in those times everywhere a certain precedence, but Cyrenians and Alexandrians, as likewise coming from the west, belonged to it with them. The second synagogue was that of the *Cicilians*, to which the other Judeans coming from Asia Minor also belonged.³ The disputes arose at first, undoubtedly, almost accidentally, from no fault of Stephen's; but as he in every case defended the cause of Christ with such zeal and ability, and worsted his first assailants more and more completely, they made their personal cause one of the whole synagogue to which they belonged, circulated the notion amongst the common people that Stephen was speaking blasphemy against Moses and God, and stirred up all sections of the people that did not yet believe in Christ. The heads of the Hagiocracy had already been long in a hostile mood to everything Christian, or, in any case, in great dread of any commotion amongst the people. But now this commotion grew in consequence of the bitter hostility of those who felt themselves aggrieved by Stephen, of the evil reports in circulation, and of the generally doubtful position of the Christians in Jerusalem, and soon became an irresistible storm; and in the vehement

¹ *Ante*, p. 145.

² *Comp.* vol. v. pp. 240, 242, and *Philo. In Flacc.* § 13. *Legat. ad Caium.* § 23.

³ According to the sense of the words.

Acts vi. 9. we can understand in this passage in any case only two synagogues of this comprehensive character.

haste of such a commotion the innocent man was seized, and the Sanhedrin was called on to sit in judgment upon him.

Consequently that which the Twelve had to that time always striven to avoid, and had so far successfully avoided, had now taken place most unexpectedly. The contention regarding the right of Christianity and its Church to exist had been suddenly raised, under great excitement, in the midst of the populace of the capital, who were easily inflamed, and dependent on the will of the rulers; and the repetition of the horrors of the condemnation of Christ himself was imminent. When the danger which might at any moment prove his death first threatened him, Stephen, for his part, was conscious of being more marvellously than ever before filled with the power of the Holy Spirit, under the conviction of the goodness of his cause; and when in the solemn sitting of the Sanhedrin the witnesses against him were called, and he heard that they could bring nothing further against him than they had heard him say Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the Temple and change the Mosaic-Judean customs,¹ his face, just while his judges were most intently watching him, was, as it were, transfigured into the purest celestial glory, so that they might have taken it for the face of an angel. For even these most unfriendly witnesses could not now repeat the reports which had been maliciously circulated amongst the people regarding him; and that which he had said, according to these witnesses, he had not said by any means either in the bad sense or in the unintelligibly disconnected and perverted form in which they now alleged it, so that if he had cared to contend about words merely he could easily have shown that they were false witnesses. But, like a flash of lightning, the thought seized him that by briefly and accurately repeating before this learned Court the truth which he had before spoken, of which this accusation contained only the sullied and untrue reflection, he could most keenly strike his present judges themselves, and, indeed, *must*, if in that decisive hour he would not be unfaithful to himself and his Celestial Lord. And undoubtedly it was this sudden flash of thought which in a moment transfigured his face, and, in spite of all mental agitation and repressed zeal, inspired him with that marvellous repose and persistent self-possession with which he commenced and continued his long defence, until at the right point it could unexpectedly and yet logically and neces-

¹ The accusation before the judges, vi. 13, 14, is therefore much more specific than those evil reports put in circulation against him, ver. 11—a point to be noted

on account of the general judicial procedure at that time. Further comp. vol. vi. pp. 256 sq., 431 sq.

sarily change into the most unsparing and yet most just condemnation of his own judges and persecutors of every rank.

It is only just that Luke should supply this discourse in as full and unabbreviated a form as was possible, since the momentous turn in the entire history that now followed depends upon it and its immediate consequences. And we have no ground for doubting that it was, at all events substantially, delivered in the form in which Luke received it;¹ for both immediately after the serious consequences of the discourse, and also subsequently, Christians will have very frequently most carefully inquired as to what Stephen had really said and intended, they will have most earnestly collected whatever anyone could communicate of his speech, and thus have retold it with substantial accuracy amongst each other. The nature of the case required that the speech should seek to reach its ultimate object especially by historical exposition and proof, because it is only the true relation of the old state of things to the new one, and above all, therefore, the proper understanding of the ancient history, that can satisfactorily establish the duty and the sin of the present generation which it is the real purpose of the speaker to show; and accordingly, in the contentions which Stephen had before had with his learned opponents it was also undoubtedly principally the question of the true—that is, Christian—understanding of the ancient history of Israel and the moral condition of the nation of that time which was in dispute. By this peculiarity the discourse also obtains that higher repose which characterises its commencement, and then its longest and principal section, and which was, as we have seen, an essential feature of it. And if Stephen introduced into his lengthy historical exposition several particulars which did not strictly belong to the most essential subject-matter of his defence, a peculiarity which the discourse in its present form obviously seeks to reproduce, he was led to do that evidently by the natural desire to show in the presence of the Sanhedrin that he was no stranger to their scholastic learning; just as Paul, in the presence of the arrogant Biblical scholars of the ancient school, subsequently not unwillingly, and as if in rivalry with them, displays his Biblical learning on every proper occasion. For ever since the first days of the rise of the

¹ Acts vii. 2-53. We might seek to prove that we have here only a free reproduction of the discourse from the fact that the passages from the O.T. are quoted from the LXX., even in those cases in which wholly characteristic interpre-

tations follow; but that Stephen spoke Greek before the Sanhedrin can hardly be questioned in these days. This language had indeed an influence, *yr.* 42, 43, comp. Amos v. 25-27, upon the present connection of the words even.

Church in Jerusalem the Sanhedrin might have been under the impression that Biblical scholarship continued to be as little possessed by Christians as Peter and John seemed at that time to have it ;¹ it was well, therefore, that by the present bearing of Stephen the Sanhedrin should on this point also be undeceived. If by this display of learning the speech becomes somewhat long, we must remember that Biblical learning and historical proof from the early times of Israel were then very popular everywhere, both within and beyond the Sanhedrin, and that it was only just to one who was under such a heavy accusation to grant him ample time for his defence. And after all, the subject itself was so vast and difficult that the speaker, even in a discourse upon this extended scale, could only give prominence to some of the chief points of special importance.

He begins accordingly to recount all the most important events from the call of Abraham and the beginning of the history of Israel down to nearly the time of the death of Moses.² He appears to touch on this long history, contained in the Book of the Law, only with reference to the well-known events and according to the more definite form which they received at that time in the learned schools ;³ but before his hearers had any suspicion of it, he has in this historical sketch specially brought out three of the plainest and most striking examples of disobedience to the will of God and the Holy Spirit which the ancestors of the present nation exhibited even at that early period ; namely, the bitter jealousy with which the ‘ Patriarchs ’ themselves betrayed their brother Joseph, the great ingratitude with which the people in Egypt compelled Moses, during the first third of his life, to leave Egypt as a refugee, and the much blacker ingratitude which the people displayed in the last third of the life of Moses both against this its great deliverer and against God Himself.⁴ With these three or four striking examples, which are taken from the most sacred history of the ‘ Fathers ’ themselves, and are therefore the less to be contradicted, the speaker had in fact already proved how great the stiffneckedness, rebelliousness, and cruelty of the nation was ; and without its being expressly said to them, his hearers

¹ See *ante*, p. 152.

² Vv. 2–43.

³ The departures from the ordinary Pentateuch and the additions to it are so many from ver. 2 onwards, that we must suppose the speaker follows a later compendium which was then much used in the learned schools, and contained dissimilarities from the Pentateuch ; just as

the same thing is met with in the case of the Laws taught at that time in the schools, see *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 264 sq.

⁴ These three passages of most importance here are vv. 9, 10 ; vv. 25–28, 35 ; vv. 39–43 ; the emphasis which the speaker puts upon them particularly must not be overlooked.

were obliged to infer the application to the similar, but much higher case of Christ whom they had crucified, particularly as the speaker does not fail at the right place to point to the striking passage of the Pentateuch which the Christians of those days (as the Sanhedrin even might know) interpreted as the prophecy of Moses concerning Christ.¹ This suppressed and yet eloquent reference to Christ is made complete by the fact that the speaker at the last of the three examples confines himself to it alone, in order to prove the truth of the reference by a passage from the Prophets, which also points already to the necessary final punishment.² And thus the speaker is already urged to pass on to make the plain application, when before doing that, as if remembering that it was especially on account of blasphemy against the Temple that he was charged, he lingers a little, and by a happy turn connects with the history of Moses that of the Ark of the Covenant, instead of which Solomon erected the Temple, which he does not despise, though, in conformity with the words of the Old Testament itself, he cannot attach such importance to it as his opponents did.³ And thus he might have passed from the time of Solomon to the subsequent history, and shown at the same length how then the hard and indeed sanguinary rebelliousness against the true prophets only increased from generation to generation. Whereupon, as if those examples from the earliest history were already more than enough for attentive hearers, and as if he were weary of illustrating further such obvious truths before this assembly, a lofty and uncontrollable indignation suddenly presses from his lips, in the briefest and boldest form, the terrible utterance which has all along been burning in his heart. The calm, deliberate defence has suddenly changed into the most violent accusation against both his accusers and judges, and there stands before the Sanhedrin a man in whom the slain Christ himself as it were had with flaming sword risen again.⁴ And whilst his judges now start up, scarcely knowing what to do first for terror, his enthusiasm increases to the utmost pitch, and he exclaims aloud, like a prophet of the Old Testament, that he sees the heavens open and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of the Divine Glory. At that point they rushed upon him

¹ Ver. 37, Dent. xviii. 15. Stephen mentions further the change in the history of Joseph and Moses from misunderstanding and rejection to great glory, vv. 10, 35, manifestly as types of Christ whose exaltation before the whole earth was to follow.

² Vv. 39-43, comp. Amos v. 25-27, in

the LXX

³ Vv. 44-50; comp., as to the meaning of Stephen's discourse, my *Jahrb. der Bibl. Wiss.* ii. pp. 88 sq.

⁴ Vv. 51-53. The continuous sense and object of the entire speech is thus plain, and it could not be more finished in its kind.

in madness, as upon an open blasphemer, and sentenced him at once to be stoned, according to the ancient Mosaic law.¹ Inasmuch as the stoning could not be carried out except in accordance with the prescribed regulations, beyond the city and with a certain amount of ceremony, a brief respite for the victim, and a greater measure of reflection on the part of the judges might have been possible; but the excitement was too great; and, on the other hand, the Sanhedrin had, in the case of Jesus himself, received from the Governor permission to execute anyone who had been found worthy of death according to their laws; moreover, the peculiar nature of those times as a kind of *interregnum* might seem to excuse their precipitate and rash procedure.² Accordingly there was no further delay. The same day Stephen was stoned, with the observance of the outward forms of the Law; whilst to the last moment he remained faithful to his celestial Lord, and in the very act of death, following his Master's example, besought God to forgive his murderers.

Thus the first martyr for the Christian faith had fallen: that which the heads of the Hagiocracy desired to avoid, and no Christian deliberately desired to bring about, had nevertheless taken place through the advancing operation of the power of the great new truth which was superior to all the human agencies of the time, since, while, on the one hand, it continued to be denied and indeed persecuted, on the other, it was the more firmly maintained amid the greatest trials. The first blood had been shed not merely for Christ's cause, but also for him as the new celestial Lord of his Church, and that purely through the obdurate infatuation of the same human power which had put Christ to death. For no one occupies, either in point of time or as regards the charge against him, a position nearer to Christ, for whose cause he fell, than Stephen; as if really the whole conflict and the earthly destruction of Christ had been repeated in his case first of all. Just as Christ was charged with having uttered a bold word against the Temple—a word which was in itself only too true, however much it was perverted to meet the accusation—and he was accused of violating the

¹ Comp. *Antiquities*, pp. 312 sq., 315 sq.

² See vol. vi. pp. 433 sq. It is an erroneous idea that this stoning was wholly illegal and carried out only by a popular rising; the narrative, Acts vii. 58, itself shows how orderly and lawful the proceedings were; and if the Roman Governor was not previously consulted (as it appears), the Sanhedrin could produce in their justification the permission which

had been granted by Pilate in the case of Christ himself, John xviii. 31. For the fact that the Sanhedrin did not in this case seek to repeat the Roman punishment of crucifixion is easily explained. Moreover, the stoning took place in the year 38, when, after the departure of Pilate and of Vitellius, an *interregnum* might occur, which gave to the Sanhedrin greater freedom, as we shall find was the case with the execution of James the Just.

exist : but those struggles really took at the same time the form of simply a conflict of one nation with another, or of family with family ; it was the martyrdom of a few great prophets and other devout heroes soon after the time of Isaiah.¹ which arose from their purely spiritual conflicts for the preservation of true religion, that first presented anything of a similar nature, though at the time of Stephen no clear recollection of these earlier instances had been preserved. On the other hand, the Maccabean times not only produced similar struggles, but were in every respect sufficiently similar to those of the early Christians ; and the writings, full of glowing ardour for the death of martyrdom, which commemorate them, soon fed the fires of Christian enthusiasm likewise, and were, in fact, subsequently preserved only in Christian hands ;² but the end of this volume will show how great was the degeneracy by which those Maccabean conflicts was succeeded. In this respect also we must, therefore, say that Christ was needed to make that which, if it once become divinely necessary can be regarded as the highest sacrifice of a mortal, a most powerful means of preserving and propagating true religion, and to form a long unbroken line of such devoted heroes of the purest divine hope. As Christ fell, and from the one perfect consummation which the world first saw in him necessarily fell, in order that it might thereby be shown clearly that the true religion which he brought would not be checked by even the most violent means which its enemies could employ against it, so Stephen had to fall at the head of this long and illustrious host that the world might finally learn that its utmost means of destruction must remain fruitless against his truest successors.

The Dissolution of the Primitive Church.

The New Elders. James, the Lord's Brother.

At that moment when Stephen fell, however, all that at first became perfectly clear was that the Christian Church in the form in which it had till then existed was wholly defenceless and outlawed in the world. All the humble clinging of the new Community to the ancient one had been of no service ; and if the heads of the Hagiocracy, under the influence of a certain consideration and caution, had so far delayed to widen the chasm which the crucifixion had caused, in the hope that

¹ See vol. iv. pp. 210 sq.

² See vol. v. pp. 299 sq., 485.

it would soon be closed again, they were soon rudely enough roused from this dream by Stephen. On the other hand, it never occurred to a Christian to seek protection from a heathen magistrate, for instance; heathenism was looked upon by Christians no less than Judeans as the unholy empire to which they must submit simply from necessity; nor would a heathen government have willingly interfered in this internal feud of Judeans. Accordingly, on the part of the representatives of the Hagiocracy, a fierce persecution of the whole Church broke out with scarcely any hindrance. Everyone who, like Stephen, regarded Christ as the Lord of present and future salvation was to be called to account before the Sanhedrin; if he persisted in his opinion, he was to be punished with imprisonment and stripes, and finally to be threatened with death. This was evidently the plan which was now resolved upon in the Sanhedrin, and for the execution of which vigorous, and to some extent voluntary, assistance was offered. The persecution (as is implied almost in the nature of the case) fell most heavily upon all who were in any way governing and managing officers in the new Community, particularly the associates of Stephen in his benevolent ministrations,¹ one of whom, Philip, we shall find always living afterwards away from Jerusalem. But besides every house in Jerusalem was searched in order to drag to judgment men or women who would not renounce the Christian faith; and the fugitives who were dispersed through the district of Judea and Samaria, or still further even, were sought after by the officers of the Sanhedrin, that they might be brought before the court.² Thus the Church was completely broken up, scattered, and practically destroyed in the form in which it had hitherto existed.

It is true that even at the immediate spot of its first outbreak this persecuting rage was met, on the part of many Christians, by a constancy, fearlessness, and faithfulness which here for the first time evinced their power most wonderfully. Stephen's body was, in spite of the dangers, carefully looked after and buried with all honour by devout men.³ And the Twelve resolved at all costs not to depart from the neighbourhood of the ancient sanctuary or from Jerusalem itself;⁴ so

¹ See *ante*, p. 145.

² Acts viii. 1, 3, 4, ix. 1-3, Gal. i. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 9.

³ Acts viii. 2: as it is not merely the kindred of Stephen who are here intended, we may best understand by the *devout men* not Judeans (for those who are named, Acts ii. 5, were soon for the most

part converted), but Christians.

⁴ We must thus understand the words, Acts viii. 1. In several ancient authorities the additional words were found 'except the Apostles, *who remained in Jerusalem.*' The added clause renders the meaning more completely, and it is not difficult to regard it as original, as in the Acts we

great was still the influence of that faith above referred to¹— that the appearance of Christ in his glory for judgment would take place, and the nucleus of his faithful followers must therefore await him, at Jerusalem. And the example and the opinion of the Twelve continued to exercise the greatest influence; and it may be said with truth that, at that time, where the Twelve were, there was also the Church generally.

Nevertheless, when the first rage of the storm was spent and the Twelve ventured gradually to come forth from their hiding-places before the public, the Church could not, as it sought to recover itself, become again exactly the same Church that it had been, neither internally nor in its relation to the world; and this was perceived by none more clearly than by the Twelve themselves. If a nucleus at least of a Christian Community was to remain in the neighbourhood of the ancient sanctuary and close under the eyes of the Hagiocracy itself, or was to be gathered together afresh, as far as it had been temporarily broken up, this Church as it rose again from its ruins would be compelled to avoid everything that could in any way afresh provoke the anger of the members of the Hagiocracy, or even in any way excite their suspicion; and it would be obliged still more than in its previous form, as far as ever this was at all compatible with its Christian conscience, to cling to the hem of the wide garments of the ancient Community, and indeed to seek by means of certain outward signs a degree of actual fellowship with it. As this change and reconstruction was only gradually and insensibly effected, Luke does not bring it distinctly forward, and at this point also presupposes a good deal as known to his readers; but we must seek as far as we can to supply this omission.

From the nature of the case the Twelve could not remain the heads of the Church in the same way as they had been before; in that position they would have had every moment to fear the most rigorous supervision and correction on the part of the heads of the Hagiocracy. And really they no longer stood in need of this outward honour, inasmuch as their substantial lead remained wholly uncontested amongst all Christians. Consequently other heads were now appointed who looked after the ordinary duties of management, and represented the Church elsewhere when that was required. The Twelve remained, of course, heads or Elders in a broader

have so many various readings which all cases carefully examine.
 have to some extent been preserved from
 the earliest times, and which we must in

¹ *Ante*, pp. 108 sq.

and higher sense; and subsequently there were occasions when for special reasons they attached importance to the humbler name of Elders.¹ Their voice and counsel continued to be valued within the Church and amongst Christians everywhere as highly as before; and least of all did those who had previously been of greatest repute amongst them ever cease to be the 'pillars of the Church.'² In relation to the other churches the church at Jerusalem was represented by the Elders, who were in that capacity not necessarily Apostles;³ but as regards the more important internal affairs, the description continues to be used, 'the Apostles and the Elders' (with the frequent addition of 'the Church'), from which it must be inferred that the Elders were in so far distinct from the Apostles (that is, the Twelve).⁴

We are able still to supply the name of one of these new Elders of the Church, and to give a more particular account of him; for everything favours the conclusion that it was at this time that James, the eldest brother of the Lord, first became one of the Elders of this Church. Like the rest of the Lord's own brothers, he did not become a believer until after the resurrection;⁵ and although 'the brothers of the Lord' undoubtedly always received in the Church high honour and distinction,⁶ it is still in itself improbable that even the eldest of them was then immediately made one of the heads and leaders. But now the time had come for this; and in the actual circumstances no choice was more suitable or successful than that of the eldest 'brother of the Lord' as a member of the Council of the Church. This James is known to us, as regards the characteristic features of his nature, in part from the Epistle from him preserved in the New Testament,⁷ of which we shall have to speak more at length subsequently, and

¹ To this connection belong the passages, 1 Pet. v. 1, 2 John ver. 1, 3 John ver. 1, for the interpretation of which comp. *Jahrb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 181 sq. [and now the author's commentaries, *Sieben Sendschreiben des N. T.* pp. 59 sq., and *Johanneische Schriften*, i. p. 507]. The meaning which Papias attached to the word *Elder* will be explained in the next volume.

² Gal. ii. 6-9.

³ According to the passages Acts xi. 30, xxi. 18, which are in that respect important.

⁴ See Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4. Although therefore Luke nowhere tells us the event and the circumstances of the creation of these new Elders, we can

nevertheless gather something as to the matter from the fact that previous to ch. vii. he speaks only of the Twelve or of the Apostles of equal rank with them, while afterwards his language soon undergoes an obvious change. We are led to the same conclusion by everything which Luke and other writers intimate concerning James the brother of the Lord, as will be shown immediately.

⁵ See *ante*, pp. 127 sq.

⁶ According to 1 Cor. ix. 5 compared with Acts i. 14.

⁷ That this Epistle and that of Jude were written by two of the Lord's brothers I have always perceived and taught, see *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. p. 258, and my *Comment. in Apoc.*, 1827.

in part from some references, mostly of a very incidental and detached character, to his life as an Elder of the Church.¹ And if we carefully glean all these traces of his memory, we can still form a fairly complete and reliable idea of his character. We see that he was a man of unusual calmness, firmness, and religiousness, in whose mind the old and the new religions tended to permeate each other and find mutual reconciliation. After his mind had once deeply felt the living truth of the glorification of Christ,² through all his subsequent life until his martyrdom he adhered with unchangeable faithfulness and steadfastness to this image of the glorified One, and to the faith that in Christ the highest truth and the perfect law of life had appeared, and that at his immediate appearing in glory as Judge none would be able to stand but those who had been regenerated by that truth and that perfect law.³ His sudden conversion must have been a profound and intensely serious change; how greatly had he now to reproach himself with his previous indifference, and with what additional care and painstaking must he seek to do penance for his former errors and shortcomings! But now after his conversion, when in his calm and steadfast mind he had turned with the greatest decision to all the former words and wishes of Christ, and regarded these words as commands and the arrangements made by Christ as inviolably sacred, probably the utterance of Christ which had most deeply entered his soul was that one, that no jot or tittle of Moses or the Prophets should perish until he himself should appear in his glory as Judge of the world. It was particularly this view also which came to prevail in the Church when its members collected again immediately after the crucifixion and took up their abode in Jerusalem;⁴ and it is not surprising that it obtained a firmer hold in no one than in this earnest-minded James, who entered the Church just at that time. With his strong faith in Christ, he accordingly devoted himself at the same time to the most rigid form of life and the most profound penances, after the manner in which the ancient religion had for some centuries

¹ The accounts outside the N.T. are principally those of Clement of Alexandria and Hegesippus, which have been preserved in Eusebius, and the substantial agreement of which Eusebius expressly attests, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23, comp. with ii. 1, 5. And we have no ground for doubting the general trustworthiness of these accounts, since they really most instructively corroborate the indications of the character

of James which we have in the N.T. It follows from the reference to him in Josephus (see vol. vi. pp. 138 sq.) that this James became a very important man in Jerusalem.

² See *ante*, p. 127.

³ To refer here only to a few of the principal passages of the Epistle of James, ii. 1, 12, iv. 11 sq., 13 sq.

⁴ See *ante*, pp. 108 sq.

required them; but he supposed apparently at the same time that the Law and the Prophets must be the more strictly kept in proportion to the greater holiness of life which Christ required; and probably it seemed to him particularly as if the Spirit urged him amid such severe penances to implore from God the forgiveness of the sins of the people and a merciful judgment.¹ It was as if something of the rigorous life of penance of the Baptist had been transmitted to him;² and just as the Baptist sought to call forth the Messiah, who had then to be waited for, by persistent penance and prayer,³ so James appeared to try by similar asceticism to hasten the coming in his glory of him who had already appeared in the flesh, whilst at the same time the profoundest sorrow on account of the continued impenitence of the nation which had crucified Christ weighed heavily upon him, and he prayed incessantly to God to forgive the people its sin. As his mother was of priestly family,⁴ and he thus stood in more than ordinarily close relation to the Sanctuary, he now the more naturally adopted completely the life of a Nazirite of the most rigorous class, who appear from early times to have enjoyed free access to the priests' court, inasmuch as they were really far more pious than the Levites by birth;⁵ there he loved to pray to God daily for the nation, and people said that his knees had grown hard like a camel's from his habit of kneeling. Combining thus, as far as it was at all possible, the old and the new, with a mind turned in upon itself, and of taciturn habit,⁶ he shrank from boasting of Christ before the world as his brother by the flesh, and indeed from speaking very much about him at all;⁷ and if modesty in this respect naturally

¹ 'He drank no wine or *sikera* (as Luke i. 14), nor ate any animal food; he did not shave, anoint himself, or bathe, and wore no woollen but only linen clothes.' comp. *Antiquities*, pp. 84 sq., 278. But that he was from his birth a Nazirite, as Hege-sippus states, is purely legendary; likewise the confusion of the Rechabites with the Nazirites. It is enough to suppose that he consecrated himself for his life and publicly declared that he had done so.

² In accordance with this reminiscence of his life of penance the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* related that after the Lord's Supper he had sworn that he would eat nothing until he should see the Lord risen from the dead; and that then Christ after his resurrection had to present to him bread, see *Jahrb. der Bibl. Wiss.* vi. p. 38 [*Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 142]. The

other narratives of the resurrection in the Apocryphal Gospels are of a similarly grossly material character, as was above intimated.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 167 sq.

⁴ See vol. vi. pp. 185 sq.

⁵ Although other evidence of this is wanting, the thing is in itself quite probable. Moreover, the *πέταλον* as well as other characteristics of the priesthood, is ascribed to him as well as to John, Epiphanius, *Her.* lxxviii. 13 sq.

⁶ As we may gather from his own counsels, Jas. i. 19, iii. 5 sq., 4, 11; in the utterance of his in Hege-sippus, and even in his speech, Acts xv. 14-21, we may also recognise his unusually laconic habit.

⁷ As his Epistle shows in the most memorable way, comp. on this point below.

became him, the fact that he was not converted until after the crucifixion was felt by him as too humiliating to his human feeling to permit him to boast of his human relation to Christ. And if he had formed all these habits before the martyrdom of Stephen, the subsequent events could only have strengthened more and more his peculiar characteristics and tendencies.

A man of this kind was most fitted to enter now into the Council of the Church. Who amongst the adherents of the ancient faith could reject such a humble, ascetic and zealous supplicant in the Temple? Even if the heads of the Hagio-crazy knew that he was a Christian, it seemed to them impossible that he should look upon the Temple and the ancient laws as Stephen had done; but he seemed rather to give them a pledge that perhaps all Christians would by degrees come to fully acknowledge the Temple again. But he did not on that account deny Christ when it was necessary to confess him; and if anyone, employing a phrase which was then undoubtedly much in use, asked him 'What was the door of Jesus?' that is, the way to come to and understand him, he was accustomed to answer briefly, 'That he was the Saviour,' or that in this faith was involved the commencement of coming to and understanding him.¹ It also gave undoubtedly great comfort to many Christians to know that he was thus praying daily in the inner court of the Temple. He appeared to be a symbol of a reconciliation and the guarantee that Christianity had still a share in the sacred centre of the great ancient Community; whilst the very fact that 'the brother of the Lord' was thus praying in the Temple, might restore the courage of many in such an evil time. Thus, this James enjoyed everywhere growing veneration, and whilst during his life he was regarded, probably from an allusion to his surname Obliam, as a 'wall of the people,' after his martyrdom (on which see below), he received universally the epithet of 'the Just.'²

¹ The brevity of this answer is extremely characteristic, and the meaning of it is not doubtful. The figure of the door (*háb*) has recently been repeated in Persia, though in an entirely different way, in the case of the new Mohammedan sect of the *Bábis*.

² According to Hegesippus he was called *δικαίος καὶ ὀβλίαις*, which Hegesippus says signifies in Greek 'the defence (*περιοχή*) of the people is righteousness' (for the better reading, according to the text of G. Syncellus, omits *καὶ* before *δικαιοσύνη*), as the prophets declare concerning him.' These words are in many

respects obscure. Probably (to distinguish him from others of this name), James had always the surname *הַבְּלַיִם*, which might in Greek be pronounced *ὀβλίαιμ*, and easily assume the form *ὀβλίαις*, and which in his later years was frequently interpreted as if it meant the *bond* or the *enclosure* and defence of the *people*, inasmuch as it was customary to regard him as a wall (*τείχος*, as we find in Epiphanius. *Her.* lxxviii. 6) of the people (Christians); for *הַבְּלַיִם* and *حَبْل* may in a good sense also signify something

We do not now know how large the number of the new Elders was, but may suppose that it was again made up to twelve. But James the Just was soon regarded as occupying the first position amongst them, having particularly to represent the Church in its outward relations; ¹ hence later writers call him the first Bishop of Jerusalem. And if of several Elders one will most naturally become the principal director, so in the Christian churches, particularly during the days of greatest trial and suffering, the Council early assumed such a form of strict unity. In periods of greatest danger and conflict it is a happy thing to have one invincible leader; and it became early a very prevalent view that every church must have at least one such representative and mediator, ² a view which was probably confirmed by nothing so much as by this example of James.

Under James, therefore, and the other new Elders, the church in Jerusalem, which had been so grievously visited, and indeed apparently annihilated, once more gradually rose from its ruins. And if it was preserved, as the highly esteemed parent church of the young and tender plant Christianity, through this entire period in spite of all its storms and calamities, this was owing in a very special way to James, the brother of the Lord. He remained for twenty-four years in his position; quite untouched until his martyrdom, ³ he was the first outside the ranks of the Twelve to bring to high honour the office of the chief of the Church Council (in later terminology the *bishop*), and his 'throne' was subsequently often shown. ⁴

But just as the Church now presented a very different form in its external relations, so internally it was by no means able to recover simply its previous constitution. It is altogether probable that that first form of the social life of the Church,

of that kind. If Christians therefore thus looked upon him during his life, it is not surprising that after his death they searched the Scriptures for a passage which was specially appropriate for him; they then no doubt came upon the passage Isa. iii. 10, which is rendered in the LXX. *δήσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον*, which they could the more naturally apply to him as the idea of *binding* can be found in one part of the surname Ὠβλίας. This passage from the *Prophets* led to his being most frequently called *the Just* after his death, which we find him called in all ancient Christian books. The earlier surname Ὠβλίας, on the other hand, fell gradually out of use, but is still found in the above ancient account in Hegesippus, together with the other surname in such a close and euphonic connection that we must infer that the

words are taken from a lamentation upon James just after his martyrdom. For then the two surnames could very appropriately be again placed together in the new form *περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ δικαιοσύνη*. Comp. Abdias' *History of the Apostles*, vi. 5, 6.

¹ According to Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18, and the narrative of his death, see below.

² As we see from the Apocalypse (see *Jahrb. d. B. W.* ii. pp. 123 sq.) and other indications to be dealt with subsequently.

³ It is not correct that he died, as Epiphanius states, *Hær.* lxxviii. 14, just 24 years after the Ascension; but if this number is taken as referring originally to the duration of his office, it accords with the facts.

⁴ According to Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* vii. 19.

which was above described,¹ did not survive this tremendous shock, and was not amongst the things which were renewed on the reconstitution of the church. By the community of goods, and the constitution of those first years which was based upon it, the Christian church in Jerusalem formed a society completely closed towards the outside world, and an absolute rupture with the ancient Community must have arisen therefrom in the end. Stephen, through whom the devastating storm arose, represented as a zealous deacon and steward of the common property particularly this wholly new system of things, which, thus firmly coherent internally and externally, threatened the existence of the ancient Community. But by the dissolution of the church this community of goods, with all the institutions based upon it, was destroyed; and it was the deacons upon whom the persecution had fallen most heavily. It is not surprising that the heads of the Hagiocracy opposed most rigorously at all events the restoration of the Christian community of goods, and, under this condition only, tolerated James as the devout head of the Christians, who were recovering from their severe calamities. But in reality what was thereby broken up was only a too straitened constitution. The community of goods had in the very first days of Christianity arisen from an excessive anxiety to adhere closely to one form of the work of Christ when on the earth, and if it had been too long kept, it would have hindered the independent and free movement of Christianity. And whilst the community of outward possessions ceased, the essential elements of Christian love amongst the members of the church remained unchanged: a loving regard for all the poor and weak in the church, and the obligation of the whole church to care for them from motives of purest Christian love. This activity of true church-fellowship was not only at once restored in the church in Jerusalem, but was immediately manifested in every church that had been founded anywhere else,² being an irrepressible impulse and a necessity of Christianity. Accordingly deacons were undoubtedly soon reappointed in Jerusalem, although their duties must have now been far more limited than before, and they could now only be regarded as little more than guardians of the poor. According to all indications, it was now that the *office of widows* (which will have to be dealt with in the next volume), first arose. A respected widow, first of all, perhaps, the mother

¹ Pp. 115 sq.

² We see this even in the misunderstandings and abuses which arose very early in certain churches upon the basis

of this necessary institution of Christianity, see *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 30 sq. 46 [the author's notes on 2 Thess. iii. 10 sq.; 1 Thess. iv. 9-12].

of Christ (if she was still alive), took now her place in the meetings of the church like an altar of God, for the purpose of receiving the voluntary gifts it was desired to lay upon that altar. A collection in this form of benevolent gifts for the good of the church could not even now be prevented.

But although the nucleus of the Christianity of that time tended, in spite of all the heaviest of such calamities, thus to re-establish itself, amid these reconstructions, in Jerusalem permanently, and, as a fact, really maintained itself there again with great pertinacity for a time, this church after all never succeeded in regaining at this earthly spot its former freedom and firm hold. It became at this time, in the strictest sense of the term, only a tolerated community, under some such name as that of a 'Synagogue of the Galileans,' in the same way as many other distinct synagogues might exist in Jerusalem; and it was compelled at once to make up its mind to suffer fresh persecution in case one of its members should again assume the daring of Stephen. But at present no member of the church so readily ventured to utter the word of truth in full publicity at the place of danger; and undoubtedly the boldest of the former members did not venture to enter Jerusalem again. Quite contrary to the will of the heads of the Hagiocracy, this dispersion of so many members brought the great advantage to the good cause that Christianity was propagated everywhere all the more rapidly by many of its most enthusiastic confessors; and great as was the suffering which the forcible destruction of that first confined constitution involved at the time, it could ultimately be productive of still greater benefit. But the first charm of Christianity without the visible Christ had been broken on the earth; those first days of brotherly church-life in its simplicity had irretrievably gone by; Christ, in his glorified appearing, continued to be in vain expected; and in what form Christianity, after it had thus been hunted from its first childlike repose and dispersed through the wide world, was to be maintained, and to make further advance in it, was still involved in thick darkness. Never had Christianity since that first Whitsunday, when its existence was like that of an extremely tender and fragile exotic plant sent forth into the world, been so helpless and imperilled amongst men as it was now, although with the new greatly humbled constitution of the Community the first rage of persecution soon subsided very much, and for some time a degree of external peace and a certain amount of tranquillity arose.¹

¹ According to Acts ix. 31, comp. with xii. 1.

The First Propagation of Christianity amongst the Heathen.

There could at that time have been but one means of removing this heavy pressure from without and the stagnation and chilling of all the best life-blood of the community which it threatened, namely, a decidedly free vent and fresh channel for the powerful energies and impulses of Christianity, conducting them beyond those first and increasingly limited confines out into the wide world, and therefore amongst the heathen. In this wide, freer, and moreover wholly new field it would have had to exercise and give free course to its powers in the way in which they required it according to the peculiar nature of Christianity, and therefore in many respects in a new way, and this the more as, by its very nature, it was designed for all men alike; and, in possession of the fresh power obtained in that new field, it would then have been able to react the more successfully upon the soil of its own origin, which was suddenly becoming so unfruitful in its hard ingratitude. This advance was from the first involved, as by superhuman necessity, in the origin and nature of Christianity, with the same certainty with which even the religion of Israel had from the very beginning the tendency to become the universal religion, and was limited to Israel only as restrained by temporal circumstances,¹ so that now, with the consummation of the true religion, it was only that which had from the beginning formed a more conscious or unconscious part of its tendencies which was about to be fulfilled. Moreover, during the long course of the development of the religion of the Old Testament it was repeatedly on the way to pass beyond the national limits which had for the time become necessary; it was often about to do this during the second great phase of the national history;² this was still more the case at the beginning of the third great phase, so that, now it is approaching its end, only that which had been previously recognised as a higher necessity was about to be actually realised.³ It is true that after that which at the beginning of the third general phase of the history was as distinctly as possible, at least in prophecy and effort, recognised as necessary, had been discouraged by the pressure of the times, this religion under the Hagiocracy became thenceforward only still less capable of adaptation to and propagation amongst other nations, so that the endeavours to convert the heathen, which were nevertheless all along made, were attended by no results

¹ See vol. ii. pp. 118 sq.

sq., and elsewhere.

² See vol. iii. p. 159, iv. pp. 86, 102³ See vol. v. pp. 43 sq.

of any consequence (as will be shown subsequently). But just because of this growing stagnation, which became increasingly dangerous to all true religion, the nobler germ, which was most deeply hidden under the shelter of the nation's life, put forth at last its energies the more vigorously to break through the ancient and repressive limits. The perfect true religion, as being the only true one for all men and nations without exception, had been taught by Christ, and its qualifications were evinced before all the world; he had most decidedly opposed the stereotyped inflexibility of the Judeans in the form it had then assumed, while on the right occasions he manifested the fulness of his love to Gentiles, and often declared that they might be more worthy and prepared for the kingdom of God than the Judeans, and, indeed, had foretold that they would ultimately enter it much sooner than his own people.¹ But after he had been slain by the same blindness and inflexibility, and it had thus been most plainly shown that Judeanism, as it then existed as a power in the world, was determined to know nothing of him and the perfect true religion which was then as a fact inseparably connected with him, there was at last involved in this the final and most manifest, and, we may say, irresistible challenge to his followers actually to break through the ancient and repressive limitation, and bring to the heathen also, or, indeed, in the first instance, that salvation which had been so shamefully rejected in those quarters where it ought to have been first received. Hence that utterance of the glorified Christ immediately after his resurrection to his followers, according to the oldest tradition, '*Go ye and teach all the nations,*' belongs to the few and infinitely important sayings, piercing to the very bone and marrow, which he then delivered. And just as the higher or celestial issue of the earthly appearance of Christ could soon not be conceived otherwise than as if he had already commanded his followers to administer the new and complete Christian baptism,² so likewise this utterance regarding the conversion of all the heathen finds a permanent place in the very earliest Gospels at the glorious end of his earthly history, and is, in fact, most closely associated with the utterance regarding the new form of baptism.³

If thus the impulse to take the gospel to the heathen was irresistibly implied in the first necessities of Christianity without the visible Christ, and if that command of the risen Lord

¹ According to Matt. viii. 10-12, xxi. 33-46, and the other proofs given in vol. vi.

² See *ante*, pp. 136 sq.

³ Matt. xxviii. 19.

reverberated thus powerfully in the ears of the Apostles, it is at first sight surprising that they did not at once obey it. The cause of their delay cannot lie in a prohibition to carry the gospel to the heathen, which Christ might have given in the midst of his life on earth; for the command not to enter heathen and Samaritan territory which he gave to his disciples on the occasion of their very earliest experiments, had not, as we have seen,¹ this meaning. But the fact above observed in connection with the command of the new baptism,² we find confirmed in this case: the command of the risen Christ was only one of the great and most irresistible final consequences of his completed earthly life, and it expressed most forcibly only one of the inevitable demands of this period, and one of the necessary final duties of the Apostles, while it was not one of the ordinary utterances, or one of the numerous commands of Christ, which had been heard by the outward ear and were more easy of execution. Consequently in this case, as in that of the new baptism, some time elapsed before the full significance of this thought became clear to all the Apostles; and if that new baptism could be easily connected with the older one, it was incomparably more difficult to satisfy that celestial utterance of Christ's. In fact, there were other utterances of the glorified Christ reverberating through the welkin of those years, and utterances which could be interpreted as advising rather to stay quietly in Jerusalem for a time. For in that first terrible distress, dispersion, and confusion following upon Christ's crucifixion, the first thing was, as was shown above, to find again an appropriate and settled place of reunion, and to connect afresh the thread of Christian life, so suddenly and violently broken off by the Hagiocracy at that point where it had been snapped by the climax of all human sin; as, indeed, another command of the risen Lord³ circulated among the Apostles, instructing them to remain near the Temple until 'a spirit from on high' should descend upon them. It is true the spirit came with the first Whitsunday; but at that time the new church was itself still in a far too unsettled condition; and if even at the time before us the conversion of the heathen were thought of, the question, which had not yet been cleared up, whether after their baptism they would be subject to the ancient laws

¹ Vol. vi. p. 325.

² See *ante*, pp. 136 sq.

³ See *ante*, p. 72. It is only a later and more definitely developed form of this command when it is related (according to Apollonius in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* v. 18, 14)

that Christ commanded the Apostles not to depart from Jerusalem for twelve years; as a fact (as will be shown below) the first journey of Peter into heathen countries took place about twelve years after the year 33 A.D.

of Israel, would arise; for on this point express instructions from that Commander whose voice alone had authority were wanting. Moreover, the heathen countries really lay before this little flock of Galileans, in the first instance, as the great wide world, wholly dark and unknown to them, which they were unwilling at once to hurry through without a plan; and as in those first days the Church was hourly awaiting the coming of its Lord for the external completion of his kingdom, it was possible on that ground also to take up a position of reserve with regard to this question: Christ's own final decision as to this most obscure problem was waited for.

While the Church preserved this attitude of waiting reserve, those five years of the first marvellously glorious internal development and repose elapsed; but the serious problem remained unsolved, and some individuals of a more ardent temperament might, perhaps, already foresee that it was wrong simply to wait for the coming of Christ in his glory. Then came the violent breaking up of the first Apostolic Church, and the unavoidable dispersion of many of its most capable and zealous members, which necessarily tended, in spite of all opposing difficulties, to a more decided bursting of the new barriers between Christianity and heathenism which were about to grow up after the manner of the Judean rigid narrowness. For the gist of this whole question was really, when strictly looked at, whether the Christian life, with all its characteristic energies and gifts, as they showed themselves in the Apostles and men like them, could be enkindled and continue to burn amongst the heathen also; as soon as this was shown by experience the proof of its possibility had been supplied, inasmuch as in Christianity everything in the end depends solely upon the activity and operation of these energies and gifts which were then new in the world, and if experience had once demonstrated this possibility, that which had once taken place in the case of one or more heathen might likewise take place in the case of all. But as that which must come according to the laws of a higher necessity, when it is delayed by human shortcoming, may very frequently spring forth in wholly isolated instances, as if spontaneously and to the surprise of men, so now in this great and difficult matter it is at first only a few isolated cases that arose as by miracle, scarcely credible and admitting of explanation to men generally, and yet as true and divinely necessary as possible. Neither could it very well be otherwise than that the first of these instances occurred less under the agency of the Twelve, who, in fact, remained at first somewhat

retired in Jerusalem; ¹ while they were necessarily, on account of the continued decisive weight of their activity for the whole Church, made to take part in the new work as soon as it had been actually set in motion.

According to Luke, it was Philip who first preached thus and made converts amongst the heathen; not the apostle of this name, but one of the Seven Deacons in Jerusalem, ² who, after the martyr Stephen, was undoubtedly the most capable and indefatigable of these officers. He was just then compelled as a Deacon to flee from Jerusalem, under the sentence of never being allowed to enter it again. His first office in the service of Christ had been brought to an end, but, unsubdued by the heavy blow, with quick decision he took up a second, to which he remained faithful from that moment to his death, ³ and of which, according to all appearances, he was the first founder. As he could no longer fill the office of a Deacon, he resolved to proclaim the gospel independently in any way he could, at a distance from Jerusalem but within the limits of the Holy Land. He had not himself seen Christ (as we are justified in supposing); accordingly, in harmony with the feeling of that time, he did not seek to be an Apostle, even in a wider sense of the term; and he did not lay claim to the higher powers of the Spirit. But he considered himself authorised to proclaim and to expound the gospel, to baptize, and to practise the healing arts, in some such way as the Apostles themselves had learnt to do this while Christ was still visibly with them. ⁴ The work of producing the Christian life in its highest activities, with the communication of the gift of tongues, he left to those who were masters in that field, namely, the Apostles. For his office the name of an *Evangelist* at once became customary; ⁵ and as everything Christian still continues to spring as an original activity from its higher necessities, so Philip became undoubtedly the first of the numerous Evangelists. The office demanded especially a life of itineracy; ⁶ but though shut out from Jerusalem, Philip confined himself, in accordance with the ideas of that period, to the ancient limits of the Holy Land. But being, within these limits, hated by the Judeans from Jerusalem, he was again, almost against his will, driven to the popu-

¹ See *ante*, pp. 145 sq.

² It follows from the whole of the previous narrative from vi. 5 to viii. 1, as well as from that which follows, that the Philip of Acts viii. 5 is the Deacon, inasmuch as he is in ch. viii. never described as an Apostle, but is, on the contrary, ver. 14, expressly distinguished from them.

³ Acts xxi. 8, 9; comp. on this passage, and on Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 31, the remarks below.

⁴ See vol. vi. pp. 324 sq.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 113.

⁶ An instance accidentally mentioned is that in 3 John vv. 6-8.

lations of mixed nationality, to attend upon his office amongst them or in other ways amongst the heathen whom he might meet with. Accordingly he went in the first instance to Samaria, and found in the capital¹ as well as elsewhere in the country, so many prepared to believe his words, and so many who were soon successfully cured by his gifts of healing, that a great flocking to his baptism arose. This new phenomenon soon attracted so much attention in the parent church, and excited so much sympathy, that the Apostles despatched from their midst Peter and John to complete the Christian work by prayer and the imposition of hands.² Thus the first barriers had been broken down, at all events for Samaria. But although the Samaritans were often classed as on an equality with the heathen, they were after all only semi-heathen; and in the circle of the disciples it might be well remembered that Christ himself had stayed amongst the Samaritans, teaching them and receiving them into his fellowship, and had often spoken well of them.³

But in this Samaritan country the two Apostles, and particularly Peter, who was always ready to contend for the purity of Christ's cause, were destined to meet with an entirely different experience. In the capital a certain *Simon*, whose native place was the small Samaritan village *Giltón*,⁴ had for some time previously been very active in an entirely new manner. He was evidently a man of great original endowments, immense energy, unflinching adroitness, and great indefatigability. He was destined from this moment to play a part for a considerable time with or against the Apostles, and he would probably have been able to play a better part if he had cared more for the truth than the appearance of things and his own personal

¹ *πόλις τῆς Σαμαρείας*, Acts viii. 5, is intended undoubtedly to mean the capital, as in the case of *πόλις Ἰουδα*, Luke i. 39; it is not difficult to perceive why the Greek name *Sebasté*, which arose in the time of Herod the Great (see vol. v. p. 430), is not chosen.

² When it is said, Acts viii. 16, that by Philip's baptism the Holy Spirit had not as yet fallen upon them, it is not intended thereby that only the Twelve were able by the imposition of hands to effect this, since according to Acts xix. 6 Paul amongst others was competent to effect it; but it is only the difference between simple Evangelists and Apostles in the wider sense, as it was then arising, and became for a long time established, that is intended to be indicated.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 264 sq., and Luke ix. 52, x. 33, xvii. 16.

⁴ That is *Little Gath*, formed according to *Lehrbuch*, § 167; the simple *Γαθ* is always *Γέθ*, or at most *Γίττα*, gen. *Γιττῆς*, Joseph. *Ant.* vi. 1. 2, and appears thus to be distinct from *Γιθᾶ*, or rather *Γιθᾶν* = *Γιθᾶν* in the passages mentioned, vol. v. p. 415. Nevertheless these names were very much confounded, and *Γιττᾶν* may be treated in all these passages as a *gen.*; he is called also *Γιττηνός*, Hippol. *Philos.* vi. 7. We get this particular information about his native place from his own fellow-countryman Justin, who, in his *Apology*, i. 26 speaks of him further; comp. also Clement, *Hom.* i. 15, ii. 22; Epiph. *Her.* xxi.

ambition. We saw in a previous volume,¹ that in the Greek age the Samaritans constantly sought to rival the Judeans in art and learning, and often excelled them. During the last hundred years they had come into closer contact with the Judeans, who had, particularly in the most unfavourable circumstances, shown still greater zeal in the study and defence of the true religion. They were compelled to acknowledge in various ways the superiority of the Judeans in spiritual things, and nevertheless endeavoured, partly from good reasons, in opposition to Judean onesidedness, and partly from ancient jealousy and vanity, to assert again and again their own independence and to take up some position of their own. We shall see below what an unusual mental activity was the result of this endeavour, particularly after Christianity added its influences, and what a number of various schools and churches began to arise in Samaria. But Simon of Gittôn, who was now destined during his whole subsequent life to come into such close contact with Simon Peter, and to be as it were the caricature of him and of Christ also, brings before us most plainly this powerful, but turbid and extravagant movement. He had undoubtedly, like Philo (see below), been initiated into all the Greek wisdom of the time, had sought, like Philo, to set up a system of his own on the basis of the Sacred Law; and, like the Alexandrian, trusted too much to the ingenuity of the understanding in reducing the divine powers into rank and order, and discovering ultimate principles.² But unlike Philo, he really sought with all his knowledge and labours only honour and influence in the world. Accordingly when he had perhaps heard of the wonderful cures of Christ, and learnt that, worshipped by his followers as the Logos, he still performed them, it occurred to Simon that he might imitate Christ; so he claimed to be ‘the great power of God,’ as if this power in its miraculous operations were embodied in him. Probably, in his treatment of men, he actually exerted himself to the utmost, as if he could really be something of that kind; and by his sorceries in teaching and action produced no small excitement amongst the Samaritans.³ But when in the meantime true Christianity spread into the district of Samaria through the labours of Philip, and the astute man readily perceived that wholly different powers than he had previously recognised and appealed to were operative in it, he adopted everything, including bap-

¹ Vol. v. pp. 279 sq.

² See further below.

³ Comp. the remarks *ante*, p. 87; and

if it is not said expressly, Acts viii. 8–11 whom he imitated, it is easy to gather this.

tism even, and saw when the Apostles arrived what a marvellous spirit the imposition of their hands produced. But he would not have their hands laid upon himself, unless they promised to impart to him the art of performing the same thing with equal effect in the case of others, and with this object in view he offered to them money for the communication of the art.¹ His real purpose was therefore simply to add to his acquirements in magical arts a new one, which he probably deemed the Christian ecstacy to be, in order that he might then continue his sorceries more easily and with greater effects; and as he himself regarded money as the highest good, he supposed that the Apostles would sell everything for it. So completely did he misapprehend the nature of all spiritual things, and so grievously did he confound that operation and communication of the spirit which flows from the purest, and therefore the freest, divine impulse, such as must be present in all Christian action, and especially in its highest forms, and can never be gained by external means and treasures, with another operation which is artificially produced for wholly different and base objects.

If this had been merely an error on the part of Simon, which he had at once given up on being admonished by the Apostles, the matter would soon have been set at rest. But instead of this the man became angry, and sought on his part to cast suspicion on gifts which he did not understand as well as the simple unlearned Apostles who employed them. Before this occasion the Apostles had never met with a similar case, but Peter at once perceived that one of the worst temptations had been put before them.² Thus a violent contention arose. Peter justly charged him with having no proper idea of the Christian life, with the deep repentance and sincerity before God which it demands; with not seeking to promote Christianity, as he pretended, but only the attainment of his own desires; and the Apostle maintained that that which can only be obtained as a gift of God by means of the earnest prayer and struggles of the soul, cannot be bought by money; that if Simon continued in this course he would sink ever deeper into destruction, as indeed he was already about to become the prey of the most bitter resentment and a perfect mass of un-

¹ I have in this case only expressed a little more plainly what is really implied, Acts viii. 12-19, and in the nature of the case. Further comp. as to Simon, vol. vi. p. 70, and the next volume.

² A temptation for the Apostles on the

one hand, and for the Samaritans on the other, as bad comparatively as the third and last of Satan, Matt. iv. 8, 9. In the O. T., Balaam's example would be remotely similar, see *Jahrbücher d. B. W.* viii. pp. 7 sq.

godliness of all kinds.¹ Peter's indignation was also kindled at what had before been to him wholly incredible; in an outburst of holy zeal he scorned the sorcerer's money and delivered himself from a destructive association with him, while he foretold his destruction unless he repented. As a fact, we are here at the parting of the ways of all right and wrong Christian thought, teaching, and action; and it was not to no purpose that this violent contention at once arose in those days. And the powerful and serious reproaches, exhortations, and threats of Peter made such an impression upon the man, in his fundamental perversity of long standing, that his courage failed him, and with trembling he begged the Apostles to pray to the Lord for him, that those evils might not befall him which they had foreseen and foretold as hanging over him. But there is no trace, according to this narrative either, of a real reformation in the man's character; and if the two parties in the contention now separated from each other in peace, and a somewhat deep impression was temporarily made upon the Samaritans, we shall see below that this contention broke out again with increased violence.²

By this very first step of Christianity beyond its immediate boundaries a great danger which it had to meet in heathen countries had been illustrated. This artificial construction of lofty edifices of thought with the view of being able from their elevation to possess and dominate the truth as by magic, might be at that time a favourite habit in the schools and religions of the heathen; but it was quite foreign from the simple and honest aims and endeavours of the primitive Church. The notion that the mysterious and unfathomable powers of the Spirit which made themselves felt in the early Church could be gained by imitative arts, or indeed by money, in the same way as in the great heathen world of the time everything had undoubtedly degenerated into mere form and semblance, and even the best things seemed to be offered for money, was no

¹ The meaning of the words *εἰς χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας ὄρω σε ὄντα*, Acts viii. 23, can be no other. But all these words point to the fact that we must suppose, according to the sense of the narrative itself, that a violent outburst of the contention arose, which is simply left without any lengthy record; we shall have to take this matter up again in the next volume. [The author's paraphrase of these words in his commentary upon the Acts is, 'I see thee (in spirit, if I look into the future) becoming

a gall of bitterness against thy supposed enemies, and a mass (Bündel) of unrighteousness against them and other men, if thou continuest in thy present course without amendment.']

² As this is incontestably implied by the words, ver. 24, and the entire narrative really closes very abruptly with this verse, it follows that Luke intended to revert at some subsequent place in his book to the relation of the two Simons to each other, and to narrate how the same contention then became still more violent.

less foreign to early Christianity. When the true disciples of Christ for the first time, and quite unexpectedly, came into contact with such views of Christian matters and with such endeavours to pervert it for base earthly ends, a profound horror must have seized them; and the narrative which the Acts of the Apostles gives us at this point can be nothing more than a faint representation of their true feelings.

Philip, however, without being interrupted in any way by this contention in the higher regions of the Church, pursued his own course on humbler ground in the plainly indicated tracks of pressing duty; and whilst the Apostles, after having made many conversions in the district of Samaria, returned to Jerusalem, he felt compelled, as by the power and the distinct voice of an Angel, to go in the exactly opposite direction to pursue his mission south of Jerusalem; and he felt that he must rather take the most retired road thither, as in contrast to that noise in the Samaritan district. As he was thus travelling upon the little-frequented road from Jerusalem to Gaza, which had once been Philistine territory, in the south-west,¹ he was overtaken by one of those rich magnates who, attracted in those times from distant lands by the fame of the Judean Temple and its religion, not infrequently came to Jerusalem to present sacrifices there and to inquire as to all the strange things which they had heard. He was a powerful courtier and the treasurer of the Ethiopian queen Candace,² was just returning from Jerusalem, and was occupied upon the quiet and unfrequented road in reading the book of Isaiah. Thereupon Philip felt irresistibly impelled to approach him upon this road so free from the noise of men, and to ask him whether he understood what he read; and when the princely traveller, immediately recognising in Philip a man of unusual zeal, invited him into his carriage, Philip expounded to him the passage Isaiah liii. in which Christians then found the type of both the sufferings and the glorification of Christ in its bearing upon the history of Christ himself and the Christian hope, with such convincing truth that the Ethiopian believed and

¹ This is the meaning of the words, Acts viii. 26, see *Jahrb. d. B. W.* v. 227. The road did not become desert until it was approaching Gaza; the desertion was due to the fact that the population of Philistia continued still to dislike the Jews and preferred to have intercourse with the Egyptians on the south and other heathen. Comp. *Tobler's Dritte Reise*, pp. 199 sq.; Sauley's *Voyage en Terre*

Sainte, t. i. pp. 161 sq.

² A powerful queen of this name made war during the reign of Augustus with his Egyptian governor, Cass. Dio liv. 5, Strabo, xvii. 1, 54; however, independently of Eusebius's assertion also, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 1, regarding his own time, Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vi. 35, states that in those centuries Ethiopian queens constantly reigned and were thus named.

sought baptism in the first running stream which they came to on their way. But instead of thinking of receiving any temporal reward from the rich man, Philip felt compelled, after this duty had been performed, to leave him the more quickly to himself and his newly-found celestial Lord; and it was as if the spirit of this Lord himself carried him from him to other ways, whilst the new convert, absorbed in his celestial rapture, scarcely took any notice of his departure. So completely was this Evangelist unlike, not only the ancient prophet's disciple Gehazi,¹ but also the above Samaritan Simon; as if it must be here at once shown in actual life how far the latter stood, not only below the Apostles merely, but even below the Evangelists.

From Gaza Philip quickly departed northwards to Ashdod, and then passed more slowly northwards through all places on the sea coast as far as Cæsarea, fulfilling the duties of his office everywhere. In Cæsarea, which was then such a large city and inhabited chiefly by heathen, he took up, with his wife and children, his more permanent abode, with the view of making the place the centre of his evangelistic labours.² We find him in the year 59 A.D. still dwelling here: at that time he had four grown-up but unmarried daughters living in strict virginity, who were under the influence of the Christian prophetic spirit in a way worthy of their father, and, as such prophetesses, were greatly esteemed.

But the basis of further labours outside Jerusalem and beyond the strict Judean territory had thus been acquired; and as the Twelve³ had now more leisure for such activity, we find especially the enterprising Peter, even without any direct call, soon advancing into those districts where Judeans and heathen lived more or less intermixed.⁴ Still, like Philip, he continued to confine himself strictly within the boundaries of the ancient kingdom of Israel: it is also remarkable that he now took his way westwards to the maritime districts where Philip, so far as his first labours extended, had prepared the soil; neither had Peter at first by any means the intention of receiving the heathen into the Church; on the contrary, his purpose was mainly to visit the scattered Christians and to strengthen them by the exercise of his full apostolic powers. Thus he came in the course of his mission to Lydda, at that time a very populous⁵ place on the Saron, or the line of coast

¹ See vol. iv. p. 128.

² According to Acts viii. 40. comp. with xxi. 8, 9.

³ See *ante*, p. 166.

⁴ According to Acts ix. 31-43.

⁵ Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 6, iii. 3. 5, *Ant.* xx. 6. 2; subsequently called Diocæsarea, and then still more populous, comp. Euseb. *De Mart. Pal.* p. 29. 1-3, Cureton's edition.

west of Jerusalem, where several Christians already dwelt and where in the case of a certain Æneus, who had suffered a paralysis of his feet for eight years and was brought to him upon a bed, he effected a cure, by the efficacious Christian method, and which aroused great attention. At this place some messengers from the Christians, who were already dwelling in the large neighbouring seaport and commercial city of Joppa,¹ sought for him with the request to come to them, that he might put forth his apostolic efforts on behalf of a Christian woman named Tabitha,² who had recently died after a short period of weakness. His coming and Christian prayers and call, at that boundary line where the last spark of life can scarcely linger in the human frame, gave her life again, as if that voice which she had hitherto vainly longed to hear, and that hand to which alone the power was given, had made themselves felt with quickening power; and the act of mercy could not have been shown towards a more worthy object, inasmuch as she had done so much good to widows and orphans with the industrious labour of her hands, and they now surrounded her dying bed in deep sorrow.

But after he had thus arrived at Joppa and had stayed a little while there with a rich tanner of his own name, Simon, a much more unexpected message and invitation was sent to him. A centurion of the Italian cohort quartered in Cæsarea, of the name of Cornelius,³ who had with his whole house a long time before become devout, and had connected himself as a friend with the ancient true religion, had therefore long ago likewise heard much of Christianity, and could have been informed of Peter's journeys along the coast, still remained undecided whether he should seek his closer acquaintance or

¹ See vol. v. pp. 336 sq.

² Simply because Luke everywhere avoids as much as possible the use of other than Greek words, he subjoins in this case the Greek translation *Dorcas* of the name; it is also possible that in a sea-port, where Greek must have been better known, Tabitha actually bore this name likewise. It may also be remarked that she is by no means described as so very young. The same proper name occurs in Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3, 5.

³ The Governor of Palestine had under him also such divisions of the army as had been taken from non-Judean districts of Palestine (for the Judeans still retained their privilege of immunity from military service, explained in vol. v.), e.g., Samaria, or the district belonging to Cæsarea; these troops therefore were

called *Sebastenians* (from the Samaritan capital *Sbaste*) and *Cæsareans*, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 4, 2; 12. 4; *Ant.* xx. 6. 1; 8. 7; but this governor had also a genuinely Roman company, as his staunchest men, which he used in cases where the above-named companies could not be relied upon, and this cohort is called, Acts x. 1, the *Italian cohort*, and, xxvii. 1, as equivalent, the *Sebastian*, i.e. *Imperial cohort*; comp. in inscriptions *legio Augusta (tertia*, inasmuch as there were several) in the *Annuaire Archéol. de Constantin*, i. p. 39, iii. p. 169, iv. p. 175, Renan's *Mission en Phénicie*, p. 35. Similarly there were later several *legiones Antoniniane* distinguished by numbers. With regard to the above Cornelius, Clem., *Hom.* xx. 13, has subsequently much to narrate.

not. In this uncertainty, as he was one day, about three o'clock in the afternoon,¹ after a protracted fast and fervent prayer, shone upon as by a light of celestial assurance and instructed as by an angel's voice, he came to the determination to invite Peter, wherever he might be, at once to his house; however, he was convinced that the Apostle was at Joppa, and so he sent a soldier with two of his servants to invite him to come to Cæsarea. The distance between Cæsarea and Joppa is along the sea coast more than a day's journey; accordingly the deputation, although they left the same day, did not arrive at Joppa until about the same time in the afternoon of the next day. But just as they arrived, Peter himself had also in spirit beheld and experienced at the same hour (this strange coincidence in point of time being subsequently much insisted upon in narratives of the incident) one of the most wonderful visions. He had retired to the roof of his house for prayer; but in the midst of his urgent supplication he seemed suddenly to see a tablecloth laid and let down from heaven by its four ends, covered with all kinds of animal food, and he seemed to hear a voice calling upon him to satisfy his hunger therefrom; indeed, it was as if the same cloth, when he had twice refused to eat of the unclean food, were a third time let down before him, and food, pure as in the sight of God, were set before him. Undoubtedly, therefore, the thought, at all events, whether a Christian may not eat of 'every good creature of God' had previously occupied his mind; but it had never been able to get the hold of a divine thought upon him until at this moment it manifested itself in a bodily form even from heaven and took irresistible possession of him. And yet even this most powerful symbol would have again vanished before his sober reflecting thought without being at once recognised as highest truth, if that deputation from Cæsarea, with their equally unexpected invitation to the heathen house, had not arrived at Peter's abode almost simultaneously. In these circumstances the divine call, having the same meaning and object and coming to him from this outward world through the mind of another man, appeared to him to fully coincide with that call which he had heard in his own soul, and all further doubt seemed to him to be sin; and if, shortly before, he longed that God might send him from the outward world a confirmation of an inward vision of this kind, and as it were a visible sign of its truth, and if he in his longing soul felt a presentiment that that also would be granted

¹ The reason why this hour is so much 3, 9, 30. appears from the remarks *ante*, referred to in the whole account, Acts x. p. 126.

by God, he now saw this presentiment and desire fulfilled, so that the simple vision of the spirit was immediately followed by the firmest faith.

Peter accordingly gladly received the deputation, and got ready to comply with the invitation the next day. As six companions and assistants joined him,¹ and there was a desire to call upon some Christians here and there upon the road, the journey was made so slowly that it was not before the following afternoon, about the same hour, that they arrived at the place where this heathen soldier had four days before arrived at his determination. When Peter approached, Cornelius would have fallen at his feet, but the Apostle prevented him, saying that he was only a man; he spoke affably to the company which had been invited by anticipation to celebrate his arrival, and remarked, with reference to the food which was already placed before them,² that hitherto, as they knew, it had been forbidden to a Judean to have any close intercourse as a guest with heathen, but that God had shown to him that he might call no man 'common or unclean.' When the matter itself for which he had been invited was then entered upon, and the heathen had explained his desires to the Apostle and the occasion of them, Peter openly confessed that to God and Christ every man, without distinction of nationality, must be acceptable if he only fear God and practise that righteousness which He had had proclaimed in Israel through Christ in his gospel of peace.³ But when thereupon he began to expound at length, and much in the same way, this Christian history and doctrine, as he was in the habit of doing in converting the Judeans, all the heathen around him were so deeply impressed by the force of his words and the Divine truth of the matter itself that they, according to the most unmistakable signs, experienced the most complete Christian enthusiasm and ecstacy even before their baptism, and were Christians in essential spirit before anyone could anticipate it. This wholly unexpected phenomenon, which had never previously occurred even in the case of Judean converts, occasioned no little astonishment to the companions of Peter even; but Peter calmly remarked that the water of

¹ What is plainly said xi. 12 was previously quite passed over, x. 23. The two passages as they now stand simply confirm the above statement (pp. 26 sq.) that Luke was prevented from making the final revision of his work.

² It follows from the character of the words themselves, x. 28, as well as from ver. 24, xi. 3, that this reference to the food

is presupposed.

³ Acts x. 35, 36. The sentence τὸν λόγον ἔν. . . is simply explanatory of the previous δικαιοσύνην, comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iv. p. 228. The omission of the ἔν in Lachmann's text appears to make the construction easier, but it simply destroys the whole connection of all the clauses.

baptism must then necessarily follow the spirit as the more powerful agent, and that surely no one would desire to prevent their baptism. Accordingly, without any hesitation, he commanded them all to be baptized; and when he had returned to Jerusalem with his assistants subsequently, he defended so convincingly, from the plain development of the history which was beyond his control, his entire procedure, and particularly the fact that he had been a guest in the full sense at the table of heathen, that those who were astonished and doubted were soon put to silence.

This is that event, the narrative of which was justly, according to what we saw above,¹ so often retold in later times, and which still occupies such an important place in Luke's book. And as it was probably felt from the beginning that the serious hindrance which lay in the way in this connection could only be removed as by God's immediate interposition, the signs of marvellous coincidence which appeared to have been shown variously in the course of the history, were evidently followed with very special attention, and were subsequently a very favourite point in the story.² Thus a truth which higher necessity requires seeks to force its entrance contrary to the knowledge and will of men, even before it is fully present in the broad light of day, being discernible thus early on certain beacon heights, and ever afterwards being most plainly recognisable on those shining heights, for all those who fail to see the light because of its very amplitude.

The proof that heathen also might become Christians had now been supplied by the irresistible force of experience itself; and it was nothing short of the actual acquirement of a particular experience of this kind, which had been brought about by higher necessity, and, as it were, against the will of man, that sufficed to bring one of the Twelve to do what seemed impossible. But after this one example had been supplied and had not been repudiated by the primitive Church, there was no reason why it should not at once meet with imitation in a thousand other instances. And as a fact while the main body of those who had been dispersed after Stephen's death, went northwards towards Phœnicia and Cyprus and Antioch,³ and turned with their evangelising zeal chiefly to Judeans, some of them (who were subsequently well known, and

¹ *Akte*, pp. 177 sq.

² Although most of them are just as well omitted, so far as the essential matter is concerned, in the shorter account, xi. 5-15.

³ Probably because in those years the report of a severe treatment of the Judeans in Egypt by the Governor Flaccus was widely circulated, see below.

recognised as Judeans from Cyprus and Cyrene) addressed themselves in Antioch with the same zeal to Hellenists, or heathen, and converted many of them. When the parent church heard this, it sent the above-named¹ Barnabas thither, to inquire into the matter; but when he had examined it, he found only cause to rejoice greatly at 'the grace of God,' which was plainly displayed, and simply exhorted all to remain steadfast in their faithfulness.²

However, although that necessary step in the progressive development of Apostolic Christianity seemed now about to be taken, the difficulties that stood in the way of it were really likewise made apparent by the first instances of progress; and the difficulties soon showed themselves to be so uncommonly great that those instances remained very few and isolated. If we desire properly to appreciate the difficulties and the entire situation of the time in this respect, we must above all things carefully observe that if the course of progress was to have been different, there were only two possibilities: either very many heathens must now have voluntarily followed the example of Cornelius, and then in the parent church the voice of God would have been easily recognised as in favour of the innovation, and Christianity would have become especially the heritage of the heathen; or at this early date a Paul must have appeared; but no one could at will call forth such a man, and so that possibility also remained, as a fact, unrealised. For the wall of separation which had hitherto divided the Judeans from the heathen had particularly at this time of the highest development of the Hagiocracy itself become more impenetrable and frowning than ever before. The Hagiocracy, according to the interpretation of the Law then in vogue, had in this respect also multiplied and increased vastly the rigour of the ancient laws which were now at all applicable, *e.g.*, the laws regarding the Sabbath, eating, and circumcision.³ And both the scrupulous conscientiousness of the more pious and the national religious pride of the majority had combined to produce the result that rigorously separatist laws of this description had during centuries been permeating the whole thought and customs of the nation. The first Christians, as having proceeded from the ancient Community, and, indeed, as not externally separated yet from it, all lived quite according to those laws, and could only with difficulty think of a cessation

¹ Pp. 132 sq.

² Acts xi. 19-24.

³ Comp. on this point below, in con-

nection with the passages in Paul's life, and the story of the conversion of the Prince of Adiabene to Judeanism.

of them, inasmuch as Christ also ¹ had generally continued to live and move purely in conformity with them. If heathen were now to become Christians without first becoming Judeans, two kinds of Christians, wholly different in a thousand habits and customs, could have at once arisen; and as this was not to be allowed, it was necessary that either a new truly Christian set of customs, of a kind superior to all previous national and religious separations, should be formed, some of which might be adopted from Judean and others from heathen customs, according as they suited the new spirit, or Christianity would have to pass away again. But during this initiatory period, both sets of customs came most rudely into collision with each other; and it was difficult to determine what part of the Judean or the heathen practices should remain, and in what way the higher Christian spirit should keep together both the heathen and the Judean Christians. As yet no one had clearly enough perceived this, or successfully carried it out when it had been perceived; and Judeans by birth, particularly the most conscientious of them, were the less inclined to make any change in their deeply-rooted customs; so that even in the case of Peter it needed nothing less than the coincidence of the most unusual experiences to bring him to the first stages of a common social life with a heathen family for a few days. But the difficulties in this respect became really greater when the attempt was made to establish a permanent form of life and co-operation between Judean and heathen Christians. Moreover, the entire position and toleration of the Judeans in the Roman Empire became uncertain in case they should not remain faithful to their 'national customs and laws,'² a fact which they had carefully to consider, or which they could at all events always produce as an objection to all such innovations.

Consequently the primitive Apostolic Church could the more easily take up for a time a waiting attitude. As we have seen,³ it had thus far been gathered together and constructed principally upon the assumption that its members should quietly collect in and around the Holy City and the Temple, and there await the coming of the Lord; indeed, it appealed

¹ See vol. vi. pp. 235 sq.

² It is as noteworthy with what emphasis this *φυλάσσειν τὰ πάτρια* is now everywhere mentioned, and also as a condition in the public instructions of the Roman magistracies, Joseph. *Ant.* xix. 5. 2. 3; 6. 3; probably there is already involved

in it a reaction against Christianity, which the Judeans, particularly before the Roman magistracies, accused of having introduced innovations; and in that case we have here one of the earliest evidences on this point.

³ *Ante*, pp. 108 sq.

in justification of this to express words of its Lord. Had this assumption been now destroyed? And if heathen desired to become Christians, which, surely, could hardly be prevented, ought they not to comply with the customs of the parent church until, with the Parousia, the end of the existing state of things generally, and the beginning of the outward Consummation of all Christian hopes should come? Evidently in the case of many, this transitional state might give rise to doubt and hesitancy, which it would be difficult to remove; and that would be the more the case in proportion as the bad effects of a precipitate blending of heathen and sacred Israelitic customs had to be feared. Accordingly those early heathen conversions remained very few and isolated, and even little more than partially effected; the abundant energies of life possessed by infant Christianity found no easy outlet; and to the inward calamities which befel it, this outward stagnation was now added. Nothing could produce a more wholesome effect upon Christianity in the condition in which it then found itself, or really be more welcome and acceptable in every respect to its leaders at Jerusalem, or, indeed, be for all Christians a greater proof of its victorious power, than this its spread amongst the heathen and its influence amongst them; as, in fact, we then read in one passage that great joy was felt in Jerusalem at such conversions.¹ But this joy was, nevertheless, doomed to soon pass away again amid the multitude of still greater difficulties which arose.

II. *Judeanism.*

1. *The Philosophy of the Judean Scholars of the Time.*

WHILST infant Christianity, just as it has begun, without the visible Christ, to assert itself in the world, thus feels its first earthly foundation shaking, and has to look forwards into a most uncertain future, Judeanism finds itself in various ways strengthened and confirmed, so that it may boldly anticipate a prosperous future. Thus the parts in the drama of the time assigned to the two distinct Communities, into which the ancient Community of the true religion is now more and more inevitably being divided, appear to have quite changed hands. Just when, according to the human view, it is expected that

¹ Acts xi. 18. According to what we have seen above, there can be nothing more perverse than the attempt made in our day to treat the narratives of Acts x. and xi. as unhistorical. It is only superficial minds that can remain suspended in idle doubts on this point, or even go so far as to deny all historical facts.

the guilty rejection of the celestial truth and glory of Christ, the crucifixion of the Innocent and Holy One, and the fresh outbreak of the sanguinary persecution of his followers, will speedily bring down the judgment of God upon the ancient Community, that Community, on the contrary, becomes more and more successful and honoured in the world, and evidently lightly bears the grievous wrong which it did to Christ, and continues to inflict upon his followers; and that Community, which already has within it the highest truth, finds itself, just when it ought to prevail everywhere by virtue of that truth, persecuted, without any mercy, by its own mother, and scarcely even tolerated anywhere upon the earth.

And if we look for the causes of this new favour with which the times smile upon the ancient Community, we find that they are by no means simply of the nature of accidentally fortunate circumstances, although the latter are not wanting, as the history, to which we shall soon come, of the last Herods will show. On the contrary, the vigour of the ancient nation itself, still occupying its native soil, continued to be very considerable. The nation was still, on the whole, sincerely devoted to its ancient sacred religion, felt itself in the course of time still more and more alienated from heathenism, and still showed little general sympathy with even the new indigenous schism of Christianity, being in the latter respect prevented especially by the perversity of its sacerdotal rulers. If the spread of Christianity had proceeded with the same rapidity with which it began on the first Whitsunday and a few other days of like elevation, this schism would very soon have produced much more palpable consequences; but after the first zeal had been checked by the martyrdom of Stephen, with its consequences, and Christianity had been compelled to hide itself still more humbly than before under the wings of the great mother Community, Judeanism generally continued still to confront heathenism with unbroken ranks, and was in a position, should it be necessary, even to defy the power of Rome. For its chief strength against that power now lay in the fact that by the calamitous experiences of the past it had at last taken serious warning not to seek again deliverance by the method of desperate revolts. Immovable in its faithfulness to the sacred religion of the fathers and its laws as they were interpreted at the time by the Hagiocracy, jealous and perpetually watchful lest they should be violated by the dominant power of heathenism, and in case of a violation relying upon the invincible power of incessant and increasingly urgent

supplication, and always prepared, even without weapons of war, to die for its country--this was the prevailing attitude of the nation during this period. By an attitude of this kind it had now enjoyed, since the last restless times of Judas the Gaulonite, a long peace, had, in the meantime, evidently increased in numbers and prosperity,¹ and had just, under the governorship of Pilate, accomplished more by the miraculous power of persistent entreaty than it could probably have effected by the most sanguinary conflicts;² it was also resolved to maintain the attitude of vigilant tranquillity in the future.

But a firm attitude of this kind with regard to the dangerous heathen empire could not have been either taken up or maintained by the whole nation, unless the heads of the powerful learned schools, both in Jerusalem and Alexandria, had, in this respect, led the way by their teaching and example. According to all available information they did this. As we saw in the preceding volume,³ learned schools had long flourished in Jerusalem; and their most illustrious teachers had now long known quite well how to combine zeal for the ancient Law and its application with that cautious peaceableness, without which, as they plainly felt, the prosperity of the nation under the Roman Government could not be maintained. We saw above⁴ the astute worldly wisdom of Gamaliel; he may be regarded as a model of all these scholars (Rabbis), and was, according to all reminiscences, the most important and influential of them at that time. However, we are not in possession of sufficient historical sources to enable us to trace all this in detail; the great catastrophe which shortly followed, with the destruction of the entire ancient nationality, so completely swept away all clear and vivid recollection of the teaching of these schools in this respect, that we have nothing more than the most sporadic and feeble traces of it preserved in the Talmudic writings. Gamaliel, the son of Simon, often distinguished from his grandson, who will be referred to below, as the Elder,⁵ was, according to the Talmud, a grandson of Hillel,⁶ and continued to teach in a similar spirit to that of his more illustrious grandfather. The Talmudic writings mention some of his legal decisions; but the information which we get from these later books regarding him is scarcely sufficient to enable us to form a very clear idea of his general mental and

¹ A fact which Philo justly refers to in his *Leg. ad Cæum*, § 31 (ii. p. 578).

² See vol. vi. pp. 65 sq.

³ Vol. vi. pp. 9 sq. 87 sq.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 151.

⁵ רבן גמליאל הזקן *M. Sotah* ix. 15, and elsewhere.

⁶ Vol. vi. pp. 9 sq.

spiritual characteristics.¹ All that we know is, that in subsequent times he was regarded as one of the last great scholars of the sect of the Pharisees. It would be much easier, as we shall see below, for us to form a distinct conception of his son Simon, who witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem; at all events, of his characteristics as a man if not as a scholar. We still know as one of Gamaliel's contemporaries, and as a man without doubt spiritually very unlike Gamaliel's son Simon, another Simon who resided in Jerusalem, and also enjoyed, like Gamaliel, the highest reputation as a teacher of the Law, but the two men belonged to opposite schools.² This Simon presents, in these times, the model of a zealot of the Law even in his attitude towards the secular government, and is thus a plain witness that the school of Judas the Gaulonite,³ was still represented, although in a repressed and milder form, even in this altered period; but we shall see below how little, for the time being, it accomplished.

Philo the Alexandrian.

On the other hand, we know much more of a Hellenist of this time, Philo, the large number of whose preserved writings may best enable us to form a more distinct conception of the general spiritual condition especially of the most educated and respected Judeans of those days, and to perceive more exactly what they really were while remaining uninfluenced by the Christian spirit. The fact that such a large number of the works of this Alexandrine have been preserved is due to the same calamity which destroyed the contemporary writings of the Palestinians; for the same blow which, with the destruction of Jerusalem, immediately swept all the Palestinian Hebrew writings of these last years into oblivion, delivered Christians from the yoke of the ancient Community, and in their hands the Hellenistic Greek writings were preserved all the more intact, as must be shown more fully below.

By virtue of his peculiar aims, the course of his education, and his outward fortunes, Philo is a very remarkable man; and in his energetic and enterprising life and character generally he

¹ Jost's account and estimate of him in his later work, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. pp. 282 sq. 423, gives us no vivid idea of him; and Derenbourg also, in his *Essai* i. pp. 239-46, allows that, according to the Talmudic reminiscences it is difficult to clearly distinguish him always from a

grandson of the same name who again became more famous (with regard to whom see the next volume). Later Christians, even the *Recog. Clem.* i. 65, foolishly attributed even Christian faith to Gamaliel.

² See *Jos. Ant.* xix. 7, 4.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 50 sq.

may be regarded as representative of the best attainments of the Judeanism of that age before it came into contact with Christian influences. It is true that we do not possess a continuous and complete narrative of the history of his life and endeavours; but as regards his life, excepting a few very brief accounts in Josephus,¹ we must simply glean everything from the extremely scattered and incidental observations which he lets fall in various writings, and of which there are not many, since it is only on appropriate occasions that he likes to speak of himself, and the matters about which he wrote supplied such occasions but infrequently. However, by the aid of all the indications of this kind, we are able to discover the chief features of his life with sufficient completeness. He was by birth and education a genuine Alexandrine, and remained such to his death at an advanced age; and in his writings accordingly he speaks of no country more frequently than of Egypt, and describes no nation's customs so minutely, and often so graphically, as those of the Egyptians of his day, even when he prefers not to speak of them by name. He sprang from an honoured Judean family which had then dwelt probably for some centuries in Alexandria, and was connected by a thousand ties with its prosperity. Whether this family was, as later Church fathers definitely state,² of Levitic descent, is doubtful; inasmuch as we possess no plain earlier evidence on the point, although, according to several indications, it might be very probable.³ But a family dwelling out of the Holy Land, even if it were of Levitic descent, possessed no privileges and lasting advantages of any kind by virtue of its pedigree; consequently Philo's family had for the most part had its attention directed purely to secular pursuits, and by its wealth, respectability, and influence was one of the first families in the luxurious and rich commercial city of Alexandria. He had a nephew, probably not much younger than himself, named Alexander, the son of a brother.⁴

¹ *Ant.* xviii. 9, 1, comp. with xix. 5, 1 and xx. 5, 2. Eusebius' incidental references to Philo, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 17, 18, are based upon erroneous suppositions of a certain class of Christians.—We quote the works of Philo published at Venice in Latin, after the Armenian translation of them, by Aucher's efforts in 1822 and 1826, the former as *Auch.* i., and the latter as *Auch.* ii.—With regard to Philo's writings and the MSS. *Mai* made some more recent observations in his *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (1853). vi. 2, pp. 67 sq.

² Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 4, does not state it, but Jerome in his *Catalog. Scrip.*

Eccles. ch. xi. On the other hand, the preface of an old Armenian translation in *Auch.* i., p. vii., expressly leaves it uncertain to which of the twelve tribes Philo belonged.

³ It is true we do not meet with a single passage in his works in which he claims such a descent; but it is not his habit anywhere to bring forward his own person; and he everywhere lays great stress upon the high dignity and vocation of the Levites, as, for instance, *ἱερεὺς ἐστὶ λόγος κληρὸν ἔχων τὸν ὄντα*, etc., i. p. 103, 33 sq.

⁴ According to *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 8, 4, he

This man filled the very important office of the Alabarch¹ of the Egyptian Judeans, had in his youth been a considerable time in Rome, and had there won the friendship of Claudius, the subsequent Emperor, managed the property of Augusta Antonia, whom we shall meet with below, lent his assistance to Herod Agrippa, as we shall see, and succeeded in retaining the unbroken confidence of his fellow-believers in Egypt. This nephew also remained faithful to the ancient Judean religion, being subsequently very highly spoken of in contrast with his degenerate son, Tiberius Alexander, subsequently the Governor at Jerusalem,² and voluntarily contributed the necessary gold and silver for the ornamentation of the new temple doors in Jerusalem;³ while he also took the most lively interest in all learned matters, and was himself not a stranger to literary effort. But although Philo gladly conferred with him even upon the most difficult matters of the philosophy and learning of the time,⁴ it is evident that Alexander's tendencies were of a more worldly nature than his uncle liked; and the learned book in which he sought, partly upon the basis of a multitude of very uncommon observations and experiences of his own, to prove that there is as much reason in animals as in men,⁵ shows what was the direction of his thought, such a position being totally opposed to the entire philosophy of things which his uncle taught. The men who loved money and the world, even amongst the educated Alexandrian Judeans of that time, pan-

would have been Philo's brother, but the re-discovered essays, *Auch.* i., pp. 44 sq., 123 sq., 161 sq., show plainly that he was really his nephew, and that the name 'brother' in Josephus is therefore used in a loose sense. Further, as according to these newly-discovered passages, a nephew of this Alexander, to whom he gave the hand of his daughter, was named Lysimachus; and, on the other hand, Alexander himself also bore the surname Lysimachus, according to *Jos. Ant.* xix. 5, 1, the genealogical tree of this illustrious family was probably as follows:—(1.) An elder brother of Philo was named Lysimachus. (2.) This brother had two sons, the elder of whom, whose name is unknown, was the father of the younger Lysimachus, and the Alabarch Alexander. (3.) The latter had two sons: Marcus, who died early, and Tiberius Alexander, who became Governor of Judæa. We may infer from *Opera* ii., p. 572, comp. with *Auch.* i., p. 152 (see below), that the Alabarch Alexander was younger than Philo.

¹ See vol. v. p. 242. [Schürer, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*

(1874), p. 627, doubts whether the Alexandrian Alabarch was identical with the Ethnarch, and that he was the head of the Judean community of the city. In *Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1875), pp. 13–40, he shows that the Alabarch was identical with the Arabarch, and that the last-named officer, often a Jew, was the supervisor of taxes in Arabian Egypt, and a Roman officer.]

² *Jos. Ant.*, xx. 5, 2.

³ *Jos. Bell. Jud.* v. 5, 3. A reminiscence, though very obscure, of this has been preserved in the Talmudic writings even, see below on *M. יסקלין* vi. 3.

⁴ This appears from the work *De Providentia*, in which Philo communicates his conversations with him, or rather the instruction he gave him; of the books of this work, a fragment only of which was preserved in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 14, we have now two preserved entire in an Armenian translation, but an intermediate book appears to be wholly wanting.

⁵ As we see in the work of Philo *De Animal.*, likewise preserved in an Armenian translation, *Auch.* i., pp. 124–172.

dered to such superficial philosophical views, under the appearance of desiring to retain and value the religion of their fathers. Nevertheless this rich man, who occupied himself to some extent with philosophy and gave it his patronage, was all along able to maintain a position of such influence that one of his sons, named Mark, could make an offer of marriage to Berenice, a daughter of Herod Agrippa; he died, however, before the marriage was effected.¹

It is all the more deserving of acknowledgment that Philo, from his early youth, spurned all love of the world,² devoted himself with his whole soul to the pursuit of philosophy in whatever way it could then be followed, and with the same sacrifice of material advantages remained to his advanced age faithful both to severe philosophy and the pure love of the religion and the welfare of his own nation. All possible intellectual pursuits of the most various kinds had at the time of his youth been followed by the Hellenistic Judeans. Adherents of the more frivolous Greek schools of philosophy and men who despised the Sacred Scriptures had likewise arisen amongst them in considerable numbers, and had sought to produce an effect by means of literature. We learn this most completely from Philo's own writings, inasmuch as he often alludes to such opponents, and endeavours to refute their views, although (with a single exception, to be explained below) he never gives their names, and everywhere observes a very dignified attitude.³ Moreover, he not only studied from his earliest years all the various branches of learning and philosophy with the most intense pleasure and self-sacrificing zeal, but from the different Greek schools of philosophy which flourished in Alexandria he selected those which by their more serious spirit were most in sympathy with the Judean faith. Consequently he early undertook with fresh zeal the task of amalgamating Greek and Biblical learning, and of defending the latter by the aid of the former, the same task which had for a long time occupied the best of the Hellenists and undoubtedly many Palestinians also;⁴ and in this endeavour he accomplished, by his public teaching and his assiduous literary labours, the greatest results that a Judean had ever attempted. From the nature of his whole spiritual tendencies, as they were from his early years gradually developed and established, the opinions and habits of the Essenes

¹ This follows from *Jos. Ant.* xx. 5, 2.

² We have only to see how unaffectedly he himself speaks of this at times, i. p. 530, ii. p. 299 sq.

³ Of which a very plain instance occurs

i. p. 587, 30 sq.

⁴ See vol. v., pp. 255 sq.

had necessarily most attraction for him, as was shown in an earlier volume.¹ But, much as he admired them, he hesitated to join them altogether, mingled freely with all classes of people,² and took to himself a wife. It was related of his wife that when she was asked on a certain occasion, in the company of a number of women of position, why she alone wore no golden ornaments, she replied immediately that the virtue of her husband was ample ornament for a woman.³ He took up his permanent abode amongst his fellow-religionists in Alexandria, but on one occasion, probably early in his life, visited the Temple at Jerusalem, to present prayers and sacrifices there,⁴ and on this journey acquired a minute acquaintance with the Holy Land generally and its various peculiarities.⁵ He lived thus in Alexandria for a long time in learned leisure, when the tranquillity of his meditative life and labours was gradually more and more seriously disturbed by the differences into which his fellow-religionists came with the Roman Government. But during the later half of the reign of Tiberius, the requirement to work on the Sabbath, made, probably on the proposal of his advisers, by the Roman Governor of Egypt, which was imposed upon those Judeans who obtained their livelihood in any way by working for the Government, caused serious anxiety and ill-feeling in the Judean community. The governor had already compelled a few Judeans to submit, and in reply to the remonstrances of the Judeans of position, represented to them that it was ridiculous that the same people who, when their lives were in peril, did not hesitate to violate the Sabbath, should be unwilling to break it at the imperative command of the Government; still he was at last compelled to withdraw his order.⁶ Under the reign of Caligula the jealousy between

¹ Vol. v. pp. 375 sq. Comp. also *Auch.* i. p. 118, and the praise of those who eat no flesh. pp. 156 sq.

² Visiting, for instance, the Greek theatres, that he might understand the nature of the drama, i. p. 384; and he describes admirably from his own experience, i. pp. 81 sq., 118, of how little avail the mere search for solitude is, although undoubtedly society may prove very dangerous.

³ According to the story from Antonius in Mangey ii. p. 673, *ser.* 123. It appears plainly from such language and descriptions as ii. p. 673, *ser.* 135, i. p. 665 sq., that he constantly spurned riches and luxury of all kinds; a dissembler could not speak thus.

⁴ According to an incidental remark in the work *De Providentia*, which has been preserved in Greek in Euseb. *Præp.*

Evang. viii. 14, in Mangey ii. p. 646, but which is erroneously translated in the Latin rendering of the Armenian version, i. p. 116.

⁵ As we see in numerous passages of his works, although he never intentionally writes geography in the proper sense.

⁶ The Roman Governor whom Philo, i. p. 675, refers to without giving his name, can hardly be the Flaccus whom we shall meet below, since Philo in his controversial writings against him accuses him of all manner of things, but not that he tried to interfere with the Sabbath, and for the further reason that he had no ground for not giving his name, as he died as early as the year 40-41. This Governor was therefore probably the predecessor of Flaccus, and was most likely still alive when Philo referred to him.

the Egyptian Judeans, and the Romans and other heathens, having once been aroused, continually increased, as will be shown more at length below. In these circumstances Philo got more and more seriously mixed up with public proceedings and disputes of this kind; for he had then long occupied the position of a well-known and eloquent defender of Judeanism, who was greatly respected by his fellow-religionists, and enjoyed the confidence of the majority, while he had personally too much love for his faith and his co-religionists to withdraw from public affairs. We shall see below the public part he thus played under Caligula down to the year 40–41 A.D.; and subsequently his endeavours of this kind were again called into request. We find him, in the opening words of a new learned book which he desired to publish, breaking out into loud complaints at such secular interruptions, and longing for the happy tranquillity of earlier days, when he devoted himself purely to philosophy; nevertheless he made a strong effort¹ and continued his labours in both directions, and, as far we can see, vigorously until his death. The year when this occurred is now as unknown as the year of his birth; but in the year 40 of our era he was probably some 60 or 70 years of age, his nephew, the Alabarch, towards 50, and the son of the latter, Tiberius, the subsequent Roman Governor, towards 30. Although a somewhat older contemporary of the Apostle Paul, he paid no attention to Christianity, even in his late years; for as Christianity became by degrees better known in the world, he was already an old man, who had formed his philosophy, and was living upon his own fame and great reputation; moreover, he was living geographically too far from the birthplace of Christianity to have found himself compelled to pay any special attention to the Baptist, even in an age which was constantly becoming more and more restless and agitated.

As we can honour him for his life, which was so absolutely and steadfastly devoted to the highest things that he knew, his books likewise were for their time the best thing which a mind still uninfluenced by Christianity could produce, and they are also in our day to some extent worthy of admiration, and are at all events historically very instructive throughout. Numerous and various as the treatises² are which he published, in all of them he starts from elevated thoughts and, almost without exception, from the noblest intentions. The only thing he is and seeks to be in the world is a philosopher, taking this

¹ We have only to look, as regards all from his inmost heart, ii. pp. 299 sq. this, at his beautiful language, springing

² Συντάξεις, βιβλαιοι.

word in its noblest sense; accordingly, with the exception of the few controversial writings on public affairs, his various books have a genuinely philosophic character and style, some of them indeed being so purely philosophic that a non-Judean might almost have written them. Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Socrates, Plato, and then the best of the Stoics, are the models whom he emulates so far as this could be reconciled with his Judean faith. But although in several treatises he dealt with abstract and universal truths apart from this special faith, particularly when they were connected with the true religion, which was dearer to him than anything else, it was really the exposition and defence of his national religion,¹ and of this in its divine sublimity and sacredness, which constituted the one ultimate object of all his labours and literary effort; and, inasmuch as close thinking and eloquent exposition had from his youth become his most favourite occupation, floods of no less learned than eloquent treatises flow from his zealous and indefatigable industry, and, various as they may be as regards their immediate object, they all really prosecute the one ultimate purpose just mentioned. There are especially three kinds of opponents against whom he defends, on every occasion, the one true religion in that sublimity in which he conceived it: namely, the scoffers from the midst of the Judeans of his time themselves; the admirers of what was then very generally called the Chaldean philosophy, or of astrology and divination, as this philosophy spread influentially in those times, from the interior of Asia, over Egypt and the various countries of the Roman Empire;² and finally, most of all the ordinary heathen, as representatives of whom he regarded the Egyptians especially, whom he, in fact, everywhere chiefly and most unreservedly attacks, because he knew them most intimately and could moreover suppose that under the strong rule of Rome he had no great cause to fear their hostility. And it is remarkable that the bitter antagonism between Egyptian and Israelitish characteristics, which from the earliest times constituted one

¹ For it is as the national religion of Israel and not as the absolutely true one, which accordingly occupies a height above all times and nations, that Philo, like Josephus afterwards, usually conceives his religion; a point which is in many respects very characteristic, and the exact opposite of the view of the N. T.

² Against this *genethliologia*, as he also calls it, Philo contends especially in the first book of *De Providentiâ*, *Auch.* i.,

pp. 36 sq., but elsewhere also, as i., p. 464, ii., pp. 442, 602; comp. *ἡ γένεσις* Clem. *Hom.* iv. 12, xiv. 3-12, xx. 21. It is the same philosophical religion which looks upon the Hermetic Books as sacred, and which was called by the Arabians subsequently the religion of the Sabians; comp. Shahrastâni's *Elmilal*, pp. 203 sq., ed. Cureton (1842), and Chwolson's *Ssabier*, ii. pp. 4 sq., 25, 403.

of the moving forces of the entire history of Israel, and which Philo also found so pointedly represented in his Sacred Scriptures, is now towards the end of the long history once more, particularly by the medium of those Scriptures, intensified in Egypt itself and presented in a more irreconcilable form than ever before, as if the end of this long national history tended in this respect to repeat its beginning. Philo's language is like that of the most cultivated Greeks of his time, coloured even by what were originally purely heathen forms of expression, so that he does not scruple, for instance, to use Olympic terms as equivalents for the divine generally.¹ His style, in conformity with the Greek and Roman habit of that period, is excessively rhetorical, redundantly descriptive, handling its subjects rather with elaborate art than simply, more suited for philosophically schooled than ordinary people, but always dignified and uniform, generally not difficult to read except when he indulges too much in allegory, at times rising to purer heights and captivating his readers by the force of profoundly felt truths. Accordingly it is not surprising that his works were much read and highly valued, even in the same century in which they were written; a fact which we can gather from Josephus's reference to Philo; neither is it surprising that after the rapid destruction of Hellenistic literature generally, many educated Christians in the second and third centuries of our era read them with an entirely new and special interest, particularly as so much in them appeared to be, or really is, of a genuinely Christian spirit, as we shall shortly see.² Similarly it seemed to those Christians as if Plato also had re-lived in him, so that very early the saying rose amongst them, that either Philo was Platonic or Plato Philonic.³ It also contributed greatly to the admiration which the Fathers of the Church entertained towards him, that the opponents whom he controverted so eloquently were the same against whom they had still to contend; and, further, they supposed that they could accredit him with a good knowledge of Hebrew.⁴

¹ In which respect his language is similar to that of the latest Apocryphal books of the O. T., a sign that those books were written about the same time, or, in any case, not much earlier. On the other hand, how much more chastely Hebrew is the language of the Book of Wisdom, and how little does it openly censure Egyptian characteristics!

² It is writers subsequent to Eusebius and Jerome who first say that Philo became a Christian; however, by his

baseless assumption of a meeting of Philo with Peter in Rome at the time of Claudius, and by the still more baseless assumption that Philo regarded the Therapeuties (see vol. v. pp. 375 sq.) as Christians, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 17, Eusebius supplied an occasion for such an unfounded idea.

³ Which is first met with in Jerome, *Catalog. Script. Eccles.* ch. xi.

⁴ According to Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 18, 7, a work explaining the Hebrew names in the Law and the Prophets was

Thus the learned Christians of those centuries appreciated him duly, or indeed too highly, inasmuch as, in point of time, they followed him too closely, and were in many things too dependent upon him. If in these days we take a retrospective glance at his labours and aims generally, we cannot avoid discerning in them the most unmistakable signs of the same ultimate confusion and dissolution to which Judaism, as far as it had not been influenced by the Christian spirit, was then inevitably hastening. Even in those quarters whither the influence of the school of the Pharisees and of the Gaulonite did not directly reach (for Philo shows scarcely any trace whatever of the influence of Phariseeism, the Hellenists generally suffering but little from it), there is in the end nothing of a more permanent and eternal nature to be discovered; and even the last great Hellenist is no longer strong enough to produce anything original, which might destroy the errors and permanently overcome the opponents against whom he contends.

Philo's Studies and Doctrinal System.

In order to form a true idea of this part of our subject it is especially necessary to look beyond the discordant dualism of his education and studies and his general labours. He was a Greek philosopher, and he was also a religious and learned Judean. But if we ask whether he was not really one of these pre-eminently, we must say that as regards his inmost feelings and resolves he was a Judean only, and put on the Greek language and culture, as completely as he knew how to employ them, only as a convenient robe, because that was still the honoured robe of state in his time. Moreover, as Judean, and accordingly, as was natural in that age, as a reverent student of the Sacred Scriptures of the time particularly, he neither understood nor applied them in the way in which they ought to be understood and applied, but only as they appeared to him, according to the tradition and most esteemed scholarship of his age, to be most intelligible and to admit of most useful application, while he misunderstood their deeper meaning as well as their ultimate purpose, overlooked the teaching of true history generally and particularly of Biblical history, and worked under the influence of traditional and injurious prejudices. It is here that we come upon the ultimate basis of all that is either unsatisfactory

ascribed to him; and, as a fact, these numerous passages scattered through his *ἐπισημῶται* were probably gathered from the works.

or positively erroneous in Philo, by which the same man in some respects borders so closely upon Christianity that there seems to be no longer anything which separates him from it, while in others he is separated from it *toto caelo* and remains more like one utterly foreign to and incapable of apprehending it. At this point it is a matter of prime importance to understand this.

Now, on the one hand, no one can more highly appreciate the Sacred Scriptures, more decidedly revere every section and indeed every particle and letter of them, and defend more zealously their entire subject-matter, than Philo those Sacred Scriptures—the present Old Testament—which were in his possession. The powerful tendency to regard certain books as sacred which pervaded all the last centuries of Israel's history and took possession of all the more serious minds, had probably, previous to the predominance of Christianity, laid hold of no one amongst the numerous scholars of those centuries more deeply, occupied no one more continuously, and compelled no one through a long life to more zealous speaking and literary labour than our Philo. The Sacred Scriptures are to him so immediately divine and holy, that he consistently finds in them simply the divine word rather than scripture, and therefore really everywhere speaks less of the *Sacred Scriptures* than of divine oracles,¹ of which they are wholly composed, or, when he desires to designate them briefly as a whole, of *the sacred and divine Word*, as if the same Logos, of whom he speaks so much elsewhere, were symbolised and incorporated in them for all time, as far as that is possible in a book.² It is true that in the case of the general subject-matter, of the Pentateuch for instance, he makes a certain distinction, inasmuch as some of the Oracles come to the Prophet, as a mere interpreter, directly as from the presence and voice of God alone, while others are

¹ *χρησμοί, λόγια.*

² 'Ο *ἱερὸς* more rarely *ὁ θεῶς λόγος*, likewise *ὁ ορθὸς λόγος* (e.g. i. pp. 308, 27; 681, 17; comp. especially ii. p. 163, 44) is the expression which he constantly uses in this case; comp. especially i. pp. 676, 37 sq.; 677, 12. It must be confessed that the new expression, *θεόπνευστος*, 2 Tim. iii. 16, is intended to signify pretty much what Philo meant, but was unable to express in such a short, forcible, and precise form. For *θεόπνευστος* must (like *εὐπνεύστος*, properly *well-breathed*) signify *god-breathed* or *god-inspired* [gott-begeistet], and convey ultimately in a concentrated form, according to the short

and precise manner of Greek compounds, the sense of words *spoken by the spirit of God* or by God-inspired men, after the thing itself had been very frequently spoken of in such a way as we find 2 Pet. i. 21. This remark is intended as a correction of what I have said *Jahrb. d. B. W.* vii. pp. 88, 114. At the same time there is implied in this word, 2 Tim. iii. 16, rather a simple characteristic of Holy Scripture than a clear description of its origin, whilst the circumlocutions of the Latin (*a Deo inspiratus*) and the Lutheran (*von Gott eingegeben*) versions are much too definite in one direction.

revealed to him by God in answer to his interrogation, and again, others have their origin in himself when in an inspired state of mind.¹ But he makes this threefold distinction simply because he found it in reading particular passages of the Bible, and not with the view of further reflecting upon it and drawing inferences from it. On the contrary, he regards and treats all the sentences and words of the Scriptures as on a perfect equality, and teaches expressly that Sacred Scripture must be interpreted and applied as forming, even to its smallest particles, one inseparable whole.² Accordingly, every word, every letter, and, indeed, every position or omission of a word in the various passages is, in his view, equally divine, in itself holy, and full of divine meaning or of divine mysteries; and all this he regards as so certain and as of such serious importance that he even rejoices at the sudden and shameful death of a man who had found such a view of the Scriptures ridiculous and spoken contemptuously about it.³ Philo, therefore, occupies in this respect the same level which both the Pharisees and the Essenes desired to remain upon; although it must be allowed that, both by his own personal gentleness and the freer position and the general culture of the Hellenists, he was saved from the practical consequences which the Pharisees drew, as far as they could prevail, from this principle, and in this respect was in much greater sympathy with the tendencies of the Essenes.

As the Holy Scriptures were thus placed by our philosopher so high that they could for him take the place of the invisible God Himself, and as they were regarded by him as thus strictly of the same authority in all their smallest particles, the question as to which books in particular belonged to them necessarily became of the greatest importance. Although we do not now possess an express answer of his to a question which undoubtedly much occupied him, we can still discover from his preserved writings the way in which he prosecuted this inquiry. In accordance with previous traditions the Pentateuch was regarded by him as the especially holy book, to which from the very first he devoted almost exclusively his assiduous meditations, and from which he liked to draw proofs of everything. It is as if he had in his youth devoted absorbing

¹ See the chief passage, ii. pp. 163-179, where Philo explains himself at length.

² Comp. especially *Auch.* ii. pp. 170, 212 sq.; in other respects comp. i. p. 554, 14, and many other passages of a similar character.

³ i. p. 587, 22 sq., comp. *Auch.* ii. p. 212. Philo therefore already stands on the same level as the Rabbis; and we see that the Rabbi Aqiba presents little that is new in this respect; comp. the next volume.

attention to it alone, and had, indeed, for a time considered it all that he wanted. But scarcely had he thrown his whole soul into Jeremiah, for instance—who then became a very favourite author—than he learnt to look upon him with equal veneration, as he honestly narrates on one occasion.¹ It is only the books which we now find collected in the Hebrew Canon which he regarded as holy, and he was both sufficiently learned and careful not to rank all the others which were at that time gradually appended to the Greek Bible upon an equality with them.² And although he uses, and generally in the order in which they are now found in the Hebrew Canon, the other books much less *gradatim* than the Pentateuch, their authors are nevertheless considered by him as of equal holiness and divinity with Moses. And inasmuch as from his whole view and treatment of the Scriptures he can attach but little importance to their authors as authors, or to their names and temporal circumstances, he likes to call them all simply friends, or associates, or disciples of Moses, or prefers still more to quote the passage to which he refers simply as a sacred song, sacred word, &c.

But if we ask how far he was capable of understanding this sacred book which he thus revered, even as far as the language of it is concerned, we can at first sight scarcely help being astonished. It is only the Greek Bible of the time that he everywhere and without any hesitation uses as his text, quite without concern as to its correctness, never comparing the Hebrew original with it, or correcting its occasional errors by the aid of the Hebrew. It is true he had undoubtedly at hand a Hebrew Bible, and could probably read Hebrew easily; indeed, he had probably sought to learn Hebrew, as far as it could then be done, from a learned man from Jerusalem itself. For he endeavoured to explain by the Hebrew at least the names of all living or dead creatures, of men, God, and gods, of animals, places, &c., to the extent to which he found them simply transcribed in Greek letters in his Bible; and he takes so much pains to do this, that it is easy to perceive that at that time it was amongst the qualifications required by the Hellenists of a Biblical interpreter, that he should be master of the Hebrew tongue. Indeed, he bases many important views of a general nature upon his interpretation of Hebrew proper names, and derives from them fundamental truths which, having been once adopted by him, constantly recur.³ But in

¹ i. pp. 147 sq.

² See on this point the next volume.

³ For instance, he constantly calls Israel, as a man and a nation, the *Videns-*

reality he understood scarcely anything of Hebrew, as if in using the Greek Bible nothing had troubled him but his ignorance of the signification of these proper names, and he had simply endeavoured to get a knowledge of them, under the notion that if every word and every letter in the Bible were holy and full of divine mysteries, holiness and mystery would lie hidden in the proper names. It is true the high veneration in which the Greek Bible was then held¹ in Egypt, and indeed amongst all Hellenists, and even in Palestine as a country which had become Græco-Roman, might be a partial excuse for him, as well as the fact that at the time when the Græco-Roman as a language appeared to be all that was required in all the countries of the civilised world, the desire to learn Hebrew had greatly declined. But it is obvious that his entire treatment and application of the Bible necessarily became in the highest degree defective and false in consequence of his ignorance of the Hebrew language.

On the other hand, the same Philo that exalted the Bible beyond everything, as if it were God, really prized Greek philosophy and culture, as would appear at first sight, not less highly. He had grown up in the midst of it in Alexandria, and it continued still to be the mistress of the world as far as this had an ear for philosophy and its persuasive power. He had therefore very fully made his own the whole circle of the various branches of learning as they were then taught in the schools of philosophy; and they were already taught with the same fulness of range which we find subsequently perpetuated in the Middle Ages.² He made himself quite familiar with the various phenomena of the world and the arts of men, and was able to enliven his discourse most pleasantly and instructively by means of figure and proof derived from them. In the science of numbers and geometry³ he rivalled the Pythago-

Deum, and lays great weight upon the vast significance of the name, deriving it from מַן *man*. רָאָה *to see*, and אֱלֹהִים *God*.

It is desirable that all his interpretations of the Hebrew should be collected, and the traces of them should be followed in the Church Fathers.

[Professor Carl Siegfried has now made further contributions of great value to the study of Philo generally, and particularly to the branch of the subject referred to in the above note; see Siegfried, *Die Hebräischen Worterklärungen des Philo und die Spuren ihrer Einwirkung auf die Kirchenväter*, Magdeburg, 1863, and his exceedingly valuable work, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten*

Testaments, Jena, 1875, pp. 190-196.—Tr.]

¹ See vol. v. pp. 249 sq.

² Philo occasionally describes very minutely these encyclopedic sciences which were in subsequent times, even down to our own, of such importance, particularly in his treatise on Hagar, i. pp. 519-545; they are to him the ἐγκυκλικαί, μέσαι (between the στοιχεῖα and Philosophy=Theology) and δόδαι. [See Siegfried, pp. 258-265.]

³ Unfortunately it was the custom to mix up in this way much that was incapable of proof and superstitious, so that the passages which are often very lengthy, in which Philo introduces them, contain much that is drearily unedifying;

reans, whose philosophy he generally greatly admired; and he likes to interweave with his positions and arguments the longest expositions of the more obvious or mysterious truths which are apparently or really involved in numbers and dimensions.¹ He cultivated assiduously the arts of rhetoric and dialectics particularly, in the form in which they were then taught, as far as they appeared to him in no way to offend against the fundamental commandments of the true religion; and he adorned his discourse with their flowers. He likewise made completely his own 'Grammar,' as it was then cultivated, and borrowed from it his proofs; although we can learn from his case how extremely defective and false linguistic and literary science was at that time.² He had also completely mastered the Pythagoraic-Platonic system, which was supposed, as 'Philosophy,' to occupy a position above all these various sciences, and to embrace the whole circle of them; and he handled this philosophy with marvellous skill.

But the great mischief was, that all this command of the Greek sciences and rhetorical arts was regarded by him simply as a means of explaining and defending the true religion, or rather the Sacred Scriptures, as he understood them in accordance with the traditional Judean views and schools. The letter of the Sacred Scriptures, as he understood it or supposed, according to his foregone conclusion regarding its sacredness, he must understand it, was in his view, without any further doubt or independent examination, absolutely divine, both as pure truth and absolute duty, as the light of all knowledge and of all life. There is here an inner contradiction and a most dangerous error, which he did not apprehend, just as in our day so many Christian scholars do not perceive it in spite of the New Testament, with its entirely different teaching. It is not permissible to assign one thing a position as absolutely holy and beyond all examination, and to expose another thing to every kind of examination, simply because it is not this one thing the holiness of which is presupposed. It is not permissible to subordinate certain branches of knowledge as base menials to another branch, as of inviolable and absolute authority, and

see, for instance, i. pp. 10 sq., 21 sq., *Auch.* ii. pp. 57 sq., 63-65, 79 sq., 207 sq., 230, 266, 359, 527.

¹ Clement of Alexandria accordingly calls him constantly too concisely a Pythagorean (*Strom.* i. and ii.); but i. 21, p. 337 ed. Syllburg, probably Philo Presbyterus is intended, as our Philo hardly wrote a book on the Kings of Israel with a chronology.

² Philo sometimes explains even names that are quite foreign to the Greek, from the Greek, e.g., the Euphrates is said to derive its name from *εὐφραίνω*, the Phison from *φείδισθαι*. It appears from i. pp. 591, 597, 633, e.g., that he was also wholly ignorant of Egyptian. Neither did he give any heed to such matters as the various readings of the LXX.

yet after all to use these menials solely in the sacred service of explaining and defending that indolent mistress that has grown sluggish and immovable. On the contrary, if science or philosophy is to be an indispensable human possession at all, all matters and subjects, not excepting the most sacred, must be equal before it, in order that everything that is holy may authenticate itself by its own truth as holy, and support and preserve all the innumerable sciences in their relation to each other. If this is not done, even that which must be necessarily regarded as holy does not influence as it ought all knowledge and life; and, on the other hand, everything that ought to support it from below and sustain it before the world, is unable to fulfil this proper function. But, on the contrary, by the employment of false expedients there arises an outward embellishment and excessive adornment of sacred things, which for a time dazzles the eye until it falls into decay, involving the sacred things themselves in its ruin, and bringing about general confusion. For it often happens in such cases that the various branches of knowledge are pursued and cultivated only as far as they are supposed to be the handmaids of sacred things in their misunderstood sense, and are rejected, regarded with horror, and anathematised when they appear to hinder the attainment of that object.¹

It is true Philo was in his time more naturally to be excused for having fallen into this disastrous error. For the reverence of Holy Scripture was during these times generally too much in its first most necessary, primitive, and at the same time most undeveloped force, to preserve it from assuming an extravagant and dangerous form in all other earnest spirits of the time (excepting Christ), essentially the same as that in which it appears in Philo. Moreover, the secular branches of knowledge, which were intended to serve as means for the understanding of Scripture, were, in so far as they were to serve this end, far too imperfect, even in the Greek schools themselves, to enable them to contribute what they might have done to a correct interpretation of the Scriptures. Philo, as well as antiquity generally, lacked particularly insight and ability for historical inquiry and reflection, inasmuch as men were then too little separated from their own past; to which we must add that, as a philosopher following the habit of his time, he had no correct appreciation

¹ An unintelligent contempt of the pursuits of physical science is involved in the way in which Philo desires to see the $\gamma\omega\theta\iota$ $\sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ of the Greek philosophers

applied, particularly as he represents the application of it he desires as the intention of Holy Scripture; see particularly i. pp. 525, 27 sq. 628, 638 sq.

of history generally.¹ But the immediate consequences followed, as they necessarily must do, upon the basis of a procedure which was for the most part erroneous.

For philosophy itself, and with it everything that was in Philo's case and in the case of a large portion of the world deserving of all respect, of chief moment, took that form which it necessarily assumed under all the influences of this kind when operating upon his zealous and laborious mind. And numerous and various as those influences were, they ultimately came simply from three rich sources.

The first of these sources was not simply the Old Testament, to the extent to which he understood it, which was limited as we have seen, but also the tradition of the school which had then been long in existence. For, on the one hand, it is quite true that in making use of this purely Judean source, Philo was very cautious, and in this respect rather did too little than too much. He took as his basis, as we have seen, the Pentateuch, after this the Psalms chiefly, next the Prophets,² but Job scarcely at all;³ probably because he did not at all understand the profound depth of this book, and thus deprived himself of the use of a portion of Scripture which is most important for a knowledge and a philosophy of true religion. But, on the other hand, owing to the simple fact that he had no sufficient historical and linguistic knowledge of the Scriptures as a whole, and did not sufficiently distinguish between their contents and later ideas, he could not dispense with the views and doctrines which had arisen in the schools apart from them, and which had already the dazzling glitter of great age on their side; but, on the contrary, he applied them wherever they appeared to him to be appropriate. Thus he everywhere presupposes, for instance, the idea of the Logos, which is of such extreme importance and yet of purely Judean origin, and he presupposes this idea because it had long been traditional⁴ in the general thought of the time as well as in the schools. And in connection with the life of Moses, for instance, though he never appeals to other books than the Pentateuch, he still supposes that much was related in the schools about it from

¹ It is not infrequently that Philo maintains, even with great earnestness, that it is far beneath the dignity of Sacred Scripture to desire to narrate mere history, e.g., i. pp. 525, 27 sq., 628, 31.

² But they are, however, so rarely used that it is not surprising that the books of Ezekiel and Daniel are never quoted; still there is an allusion to the

Book of Daniel in the *Orat. d. Jona*, c. 24 (*Auch.* ii. p. 592, but on the genuineness of this discourse see below).

³ *De Mat. Nominum*, § 6 (i. p. 585). Of the Proverbs it is only ch. i.—ix. that are used, the words *Quæst. in Gen.*, lib. iv. § 129 (*Auch.* ii. p. 341) do not refer to Prov. xix. 11.

⁴ See vol. vi. pp. 117 sq.

early times, in addition to the text that was written and publicly read, and he uses this traditional matter as additions made by the *Elders* or by the revered ancient philosophers.¹

From a second source he drew the treasures of ancient Greek culture and philosophy, the sayings of Homer and other poets, the doctrines of the philosophic schools, and other useful acquirements. And he was the less troubled by any doubt as to the possibility of amalgamating and reconciling such wholly different treasures with the Old Testament, the more he was convinced, with many of his predecessors,² that the ancient lawgivers and philosophers of the Greeks had borrowed the best part of their views from Moses and his associates, and only refused openly to acknowledge their indebtedness.³

Now when Philo sought to bring together and to amalgamate as far as was possible those two exceedingly rich but very dissimilar classes of material, by means of the inquiries, the acuteness, and the zeal of his own mind, as the third of these abounding sources, a system of ideas and doctrines was developed which he makes everywhere the basis of his various expositions, and in which his mind learnt more and more exclusively and persistently to move and work. It is true a full and true amalgamation of such absolutely different ideas and modes of expression as those of the Biblical and of the Greek authors was exceedingly difficult and in fact impossible, especially as Philo penetrated too rarely to the real essence and eternal meaning of the former; still the philosophy which was then cultivated in the schools presented a number of expedients for bringing conceptions of a very different kind at all events into some outwardly striking connection, and throwing around them an elegant garment. It is especially certain significant numbers, into the magic circle of which Philo seeks to gather his ideas. The commencement of this art had long ago been made in the Judean schools through the influence of the so-called Chaldean⁴ philosophy, which had been in other respects so emphatically rejected by him.⁵ Moreover, the Pythagoreans, whom he so greatly revered, also affected a magical use of significant numbers.

¹ Of which he plainly speaks, *Vita Moysis*, lib. i. § i. (ii. p. 81); comp. also the fragment in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 7, 6. We find here the traditions of the *elders* spoken of quite after the manner of the *Mishna*, and also of Matt. v. 21 sq. It is certain that much more was related in connection with the Bible than was found in it; but with these oral comments there was very much introduced that was at first found only in later books. [See

on Philo's relation to the Tradition of the Rabbinical Schools, Bernard Ritter's work, *Philo und die Halacha*, Halle, 1879.]

² See vol. v. p. 255, note 6.

³ As Philo says chiefly in his *Questions* (*Auch.* ii. pp. 83, 178, 359 sq., 373, 503), his earliest book, see below; comp. also i. p. 251, and most generally and directly, ii. pp. 80, 81.

⁴ See vol. v. pp. 183 sq.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 200.

Accordingly he abandoned himself most willingly to this strong tendency of the time to seek a strictly systematic arrangement and concentration of ideas by means of mysterious numbers. Another expedient for obtaining apparently profounder knowledge used by Philo was the differentiation, and then again, the rearrangement of two ideas by the distinction between the masculine and feminine sex, the progenitor and the progeny, and other such primitive physical relations of created things.

In this way he constructed for himself a system of ideas which he handled with ease, and which as regards both its origin and its dazzling unreality became the true prototype of the Gnostic systems which very soon followed. Nor have we any reason to doubt that his system was essentially his own original production. For though he had several predecessors¹ in his general philosophical tendencies and character, they undoubtedly had not worked out the details of a system in anything like such a subtle and perfect form as that in which Philo's system appears; and, moreover, he expends such an amount of zeal and industry upon the exposition of many parts of his system, that it is impossible to suppose that he was not their original inventor. It is true we do not now find any book by him in which he expounds his system in a concise and connected form, and probably he never wrote such a book, inasmuch as he undoubtedly preferred both in his oral and literary efforts to treat all his subjects in a rhetorical manner rather than in the form of concise and strict argumentation. But in his various works he supplies occasionally so many portions of his general views and system of knowledge, and he is throughout them all comparatively so uniform in this respect, that we can clearly enough discern, in its essential parts, the general system which was present to his mind. We must now describe this system, at all events briefly. Unimportant variations in the philosophical principles of Philo are the less surprising inasmuch as he undoubtedly wrote his numerous works at periods far apart, and these variations concern us but little here.

In the first place it is almost too obvious to need remark that Philo teaches the same pure and exalted truths concerning God as were found so fully in the Old Testament previously that scarcely anything remained to be added to them. On every occasion he further expounds these truths, and they are the strongest weapons with which he contends against both the heathen and unworthy Judeans; these expositions too are precisely amongst the finest passages of all his works: still

¹ See vol. v. p. 257.

we do not find in them anything other, still less anything higher, than what the Old Testament presents. On the contrary, on this point he puts forward a new principle, which is not taught at all in that way in the Old Testament, and which must be regarded as the commencement of numerous and serious errors. That is, he teaches everywhere that man is indeed able to apprehend the *existence* of God, partly by the study of the world as God's work, and thus by 'the method from below upwards,' and partly by special divine revelation, as had been specially illustrated in the case of Moses,¹ but that he cannot perceive and comprehend the *manner* of His existence, because God is without attributes and limitation, wholly separated from the world, not less infinitely exalted than absolutely inaccessible to man and the human soul.² This is a fundamental principle of Philo's thought, and is not in him original; for religious awe and a philosophical hesitation of applying any limited and physical predicates to the true God had long ago arisen in many circles, as well as the belief that the true name of God was ineffable,³ whence it was easy to draw the further inference that the true God could not possibly exist, inasmuch as God could not, like other created or individual existences, have particular attributes and therefore limitation beyond and beside Himself. However, probably no one had previously laid such stress upon this principle and defended it so earnestly as Philo, who supposed that he had found in it the most important fundamental principle for all his meditation and doctrine, and did actually make it for a long time a predominant principle in the opinions and doctrines of mankind.

With this fundamental error as to the nature of God he associated another, which he found already prevalent in the ancient world generally, and particularly amongst the Greek philosophers. This was the principle of the existence of an original chaos in addition to God, or the principle of the independent and inexplicable existence of pure matter: a principle which he might undoubtedly find retained in certain expressions and passages of the Old Testament, and which he actually found there, but without observing and understanding that it had already been retracted in the Old Testament itself.⁴ Thus

¹ This twofold method is very correctly distinguished and described at length *De Præm. et Pen.* §§ 6, 7 (ii. pp. 414 sq.).

² The most concise expression for this is, that we can know *ὅτι ἔσται, οὐχ ὅς* or *ποῖός ἐσται*, according to which distinction God is called *ἄπειρος*: see on this point and on the inferences from it, i. pp. 50, 53,

258, 280, 570, ii. pp. 414 sq., and elsewhere frequently. The principle is contrary to the entire Old Testament; but Philo likes, above all, to call God *τὸ ὄν*, in accordance with it, appealing to Ex. iii. 14, according to the LXX.

³ Comp. vol. v. pp. 199, 259.

⁴ As I have shown at length in

persistently had this principle been perpetuated down to this late age in the schools of Greek philosophy, and so lamentably had the best truths which they might have found in the Old Testament been lost in the case of Philo and so many other Judeans!

Having firmly adopted these two fundamental principles, there was nothing left for him but to fill up the yawning chasm between such a chaos and such a God in a way similar to that which in the earliest times the philosophers of India, and subsequently those of Greece, had attempted in order to comprehend the possibility of the origin of the world. Various divine powers (*δυνάμεις*) must be supposed as intermediate beings that are employed in the work of creation, or rather of permeating and transforming the Chaos; the only further question is what is the nature of these powers, in what order do they succeed each other, and whence do they come? At this point Philo has the great advantage over all heathen philosophers—both Hindoo and Greek—that he can derive them all from the true God and invest them with all the glory of His nature. But inasmuch as in other respects he amalgamates as far as it could well be done the ideas inherited from the religion of his fathers with those of the Platonists and Stoics, he gets the following system of thought.

That God, who can be known to men simply as existent, and who is absolutely separate from the world, is in his view, according to Platonic phraseology, identical with the pure unchangeable reason which is absolutely and eternally self-contained.¹ As by an irresistible impulse of determination not to leave the Chaos as it is, reason itself comes forth from Him in order, in the first instance, to create the purely rational or spiritual world,² as the archetype and the original productive force of the sensible world, which has infinite variety in a corresponding infinitude of separate archetypes (ideas), which again permeate, fill, and form upon their own model, formless matter (Chaos), and thus produce the visible and sensible world. But this view at once receives higher life by being brought into con-

Jahrb. d. B. W., I. pp. 77 sq. [See now the author's latest treatment of this point in his work, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, §§ 238–241.] Comp. Philo, i. pp. 5, 162, 491–95, ii. 603, 613, and elsewhere. It is a fatal circumstance that he is compelled to describe both Chaos and God with the same term *ἐποιος*: to such an extent do these diametrical antitheses again become equivalent in his thought, and so little does he rightly understand

the nature of God!

¹ It is an advantage which the Greek word *νοῦς* has over the German word *Vernunft* that it is masculine; and it would be better to use in German the masculine article *der Wort* instead of *das Wort* when it occurs after the manner of *Alter Ego*.

² *Νοητὸς κόσμος* as the opposite of *αἰσθητὸς*.

nection with the genuinely Hebrew idea of the Logos. The Word¹ is not so much quiescent, like the reason, but is by its nature active and powerfully operative; but at the same time it must be traced back to the hidden depths of the mind by its nature and the thought it conveys; and inasmuch as it is thus as a pure thought something subjective and inward, and as an active operation something objective and outward, it can be distinguished as a mysterious being of a twofold nature. When used of the highest conceivable being, this idea of the Word of God therefore serves to represent most vividly the above connection between the absolute God and the visible world, as if in that first moment when God, according to Gen. i. 3, uttered the creative fiat, there at once went forth with this Word the whole mind and thought, and, indeed, the whole power and the whole love of God, as the spiritual, rational world, by the action of which upon the Chaos the sensible world was then created, whilst at the same time this world, as it now is, is for ever embraced and maintained by the same spiritual power which formed it; and, again, this spiritual power, though it has entered the world, nevertheless rests eternally in the unsearchable depths of God, and though it operates in the world has its eternal home in Him. In the case of men, it is true, the spoken word² is often very unpremeditated and injurious, and it is only when it is, as it were, still remaining in its position of order and repose within his soul³ that it may contain the efficient cause of all divine thoughts, resolves, and actions. But the Logos of God, inasmuch as he came forth from God, can be the Representative of God Himself, the *second God*, although for men, who come to know God through him only, the God whom they can *first* behold;⁴ and so far as he has actually come forth from Him in and with time, he is the creator and the eternal conservator of the world. And just as when the word and thought of man become operative they stream forth in a number of separate words and thoughts,

¹ It appears, from many clear indications in Philo, that the Logos must always in the first instance be understood as the *Word*, comp., e.g., i. pp. 488, 490, 631. 11 sq.; on the other hand, this is not incompatible with its being sometimes interchangeable with *νοῦς*, as i. 679. 21, ii. p. 418.

² That is, the *λόγος προφορικός* or *λόγος προφορά*, with the similar expressions, is commonly used by Philo of human *eloquium*, and is in meaning equivalent to *ῥήμα*: see i. pp. 412. 50, 559. 46 sq., 574 sq., comp. p. 588. 45, and the

dangers of it are also often described by him.

³ *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, which name, however, Philo but rarely uses; see i. p. 598. 21 sq.; God Himself, on the other hand, is *ὁ λέγων*, *Auch.* ii. p. 516; comp. *Auch.* i. pp. 12, 127.

⁴ The name *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ δεύτερος* is pretty frequent, e.g., i. p. 82. 15 sq., where it must be read; ii. pp. 625, 630. 32 (where *πρὸ* must be read for *περὶ*), *Auch.* ii. p. 147; and Philo teaches, i. p. 656. 45, that the Logos is the God who is first seen by men.

which, however numerous and various they may be, are all connected by the primary word and thought, so with the *Logos* an infinite number of distinct *Logoi* appeared as the rational archetypes and productive forces of the various visible things of the world, these *Logoi* having similarity to the angels of the Old Testament as well as to the Platonic ideas and the divine beings of Greek and other heathen mythology.

In this vast region of speculation Philo's mind luxuriates with boundless delight, aspiration, and surmising; whatever is borne to him by the Scriptures and the early faith of his fathers, or by Greek philosophy and sacred traditions, receives from these his speculations concerning the relation of the world to God, new life, and serves him both for their embellishment and their elucidation. But above all, it is the *Logos* itself, the glory of which extends to the whole world and eternally embraces it, that occupies his mind, and of which he loves to speak on every occasion that offers. By means of this doctrine he finds a satisfactory explanation of all the passages of Scripture in which God is spoken of in what seems to be a material manner, or in which the introduction into the world of great Divine powers of salvation is described. In Philo's view the *Logos* is the first of the three celestial men who appear to Abraham,¹ the angel who manifested himself to the patriarchs and others,² and also the manna in the desert, as well as the rock from which Moses brought forth the water.³ And the eternal Law of God is allied to this eternal Word of God,⁴ inasmuch as the eternal Word established it by Moses as the law of the nation, or, from another point of view, it originated as something *holy*.⁵ In relation to God the *Logos* is often described as the image, or the *exemplar lucis* of God, and also as His representative.⁶ In relation to the world, the *Logos* is the most ancient existence in point of time, and likewise (as his cessation is inconceivable) an eternal existence;⁷ he is also described (originally likewise according to Messianic ideas probably, see below) as the *eldest son of God*, the second son being

¹ *Auch.* ii. p. 615, which comp. with 515 sq., i. 173; as elsewhere in ordinary discourse God, even as the τὸ ὄν, and the *Logos* are not distinguished.

² E.g. i. pp. 655. 33 sq., 656; 139, 144 sq., 165. 10 sq., 574. 3, 591.

³ E.g., in the passages i. pp. 82, 213, 566, 617 sq., which is so important on account of 1 Cor. x.; for the wisdom, which the Manna and the Water resemble, flows directly from the *Logos*.

⁴ *Comp.* ii. p. 604; but Philo does

not dwell upon this further in relation to the Pentateuch, comp. ii. p. 417; for i. p. 330. 40 we must, according to p. 332, read λόγος instead of νόμος.

⁵ See *ante*, pp. 203 sq.

⁶ *Auch.* ii. p. 4, i. p. 6. 42, and elsewhere often; i. p. 632. 13 sq.; ἐξάρχων or ὑπαρχος Θεοῦ i. pp. 308, 30, 413. 41, 656. 50.

⁷ i. p. 121. 44 sq., 562. 25 comp. with 332. 32; *Auch.* ii. p. 507 and elsewhere often.

the world, to whom, according to the privileges of primogeniture, the right belongs of remaining immediately with God as his father.¹ It is the Logos who from the beginning of time, or rather before time was, gave separate existence and distinct form to everything in both the purely spiritual and the visible world,² and who at the same time encompasses and sustains all things immutably,³ and who can therefore be regarded both as the creator and ruler of the world as well as its true all-embracing *place*,⁴ and again as the seal and *vinculum*, and the limit and end of all visible things.⁵ With special reference to men, the Logos is the dispenser of the various intellectual gifts and advantages of individuals and nations, which he imparts in the course of human history, taking circuits through the earth.⁶ He is likewise the mediator between men and God, their interpreter and high-priest with God, who brings their petitions to Him and represents them before Him,⁷ though only for those to whom he is joy and gladness, and as it were meat and drink.⁸ Thus inexhaustible is Philo's thought and language with regard to the Logos, as if in this respect also he were not one of the founders, but already the finished representative of the purest final outcome of all Judean inquiry regarding the highest things of man and God.

When a new idea assumes this prominence, it often happens that related ideas are thrown somewhat into the background. Thus Philo speaks less of the Spirit of God in comparison with this all-embracing masculine Logos;⁹ and to Wisdom, which he already found¹⁰ in the Scriptures as likewise ancillary to God in the work of creating and preserving the world, and to which he necessarily, therefore, as a philosopher ascribes great importance, he only assigns, when the thread of his discourse makes it easy, a becoming place by the side of the Logos.¹¹

¹ According to the chief passage, i. p. 42, 186, 33 sq., 489, 44 sq., 269, 438, 443, 277.

² *λόγος τομείς, δημιουργός, &c.*, i. pp. 256, 492, 503 sq.

³ *Quest. in Exod.* ii. p. 655, and elsewhere often.

⁴ i. pp. 547 sq., 630, 640 comp. with i. p. 4, 42 sq. The occurrence in the Rabbinical writings of the corresponding Hebrew term *מקום*, the *place*, as a circumlocution for the name of God, is hardly to be traced to Philo's works only, but points to the older school which Philo himself followed in so many respects.

⁵ *Auch.* ii. p. 548, i. p. 505, 16, 547, 49 sq., 562, 35.

⁶ i. p. 281, 30 sq., 298, 36.

⁷ *λόγος ἀρχιερέως*, i. p. 308, 21 sq., 128,

⁸ E.g. as is described, amongst other passages, *Auch.* ii. p. 497, i. pp. 617 sq., 455, 6, 501 sq.

⁹ Comp. e.g., i. pp. 265 sq. with pp. 491, 563, less with reference to the precise terms used than to the general argument.

¹⁰ See vol. vi. p. 117.

¹¹ On the one hand, he says that the Logos separated (*ἕτεμε*) Wisdom as one of his powers, i. p. 82, 10 sq. or that the Logos is the source of Wisdom, i. p. 560, 33; on the other hand, he often speaks of Wisdom as the mother in conjunction with God as the Father, and describes it

Similarly the Platonic *Nous* is, as a rule, distinguished, as the pure inactive reason of the absolute God, from the *Logos*;¹ but, in fact, the two often interchange in animated discourse, only that Philo generally prefers to speak of the *Logos* most.

But as this creating and preserving intermediate being, the *Logos* is again immediately subdivided into a connected series of intermediate beings, each of which contains within itself the full operative power of God, which, in each case, operates in a particular direction only. In this way the special attributes which cannot be ascribed to the absolute God² are again restored; and inasmuch as Philo seeks, on this point, to set up a systematic view according to sacred numbers, and to prove it from the Scriptures, he draws up the following scheme. In addition to the *Logos* is placed, on the one hand, the *creative power*, and on the other the power which *governs* all created things; the first power, according to Philo, is described as *God* in the Scriptures, and the second as *the Lord*. Creating and governing is, it is true, especially the function of simple power, but inasmuch as the creating activity of God cannot be conceived without the motive and the strength of His goodness, and strength and goodness form in Him the inseparable pair of highest powers, beneath the creative power is the *gracious* or *beneficent* one, beneath the ruling power the *legislative* or *punitive* one. These five constitute, with the absolute God and the *world* of the intellectual archetypes of all human and other existences, that proceeds from and is sustained by the five, the great septenary of intellectual existences or ideas.³ We meet here with the first attempt to reduce the numerous and various attributes of God into a specific and connected series. But since, in the case of our philosopher, the mystical use of numbers played a part, we find him in other writings, when the line of his thought led him to do so, distinguishing six highest powers and attributes. He arrives at the number six by placing the *Logos* between the first two powers,⁴ especially as he is regarded as being like Wisdom, and then by placing the legislative power, as the emanation of Wisdom, between the

in terms which, in their real significance, could as well be used of the *Logos* if the word had been of the feminine gender, e.g. i. p. 201 sq., 361 sq. It must be allowed that the Wisdom which proceeds from the *Logos* is only human-divine, but we thus see how little these ideas are kept distinctly separate. [Comp. Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, &c., p. 222.]

¹ τῶν ἄλων τοῦς (or, as we find less

accurately, ψυχῆ, i. p. 62. 18) ἔστιν ὁ Θεός; comp. especially i. pp. 93, 436 sq., 487. 45 sq., 498. 43 sq., 204, 209, 215, 244, 362.

² See *ante*, p. 212.

³ According to the clearest exposition, *Auch.* ii. pp. 515 sq., compared with *De Cherub.* sect. 8, ed. Grossmann (1856)

⁴ [That is ἡ ποιητικὴ and ἡ βασιλική.]

beneficent and the punitive powers.¹ With this enumeration of six powers we might count the spiritual or imminent Divine world as the seventh. When it was preferred, the idea of archangels and their definite numbers, which had at that time been long established,² would be used in this connection.³ The Greek name of the *Charitai* was also appropriate.⁴ Besides, there is a countless number of subordinate *Logoi*, comparable with the angels of the Old Testament, and often ranked with them.⁵

As the Logos proceeded immediately from God, so man proceeded immediately from the Logos; he has within him, as no other creature, Logos and Nous, and therefore the whole ideal world in miniature,⁶ and is thereby able to raise his mind freely and boldly beyond all the limitations of the visible world, as Philo often describes with impressive force. But inasmuch as Philo conceives God alone as truly active and doing everything, while the world, as well as man, is in the strict sense only passive,⁷ he is unable to explain human freedom, although he allows it, and he derives sin simply from the *ἡδονή* of the first parents.⁸ In his anthropology also it is one of his principal aims to arrange and describe everything according to certain round numbers, speaking constantly, for instance, after the example of Plato, not only of four fundamental human virtues, but also of four *πάθη*; the world also, according to him, consisting of nine parts, to which God must be added to make the perfect number ten;⁹ compare vol. v., pp. 480 sq.

The above is a brief summary of Philo's system, which, at the time of its first origin, was rapidly accepted by many scholars, or was further developed and altered, exercised a powerful influence upon Christian Gnostics, and found its continuation in the later Jewish Cabbala, whilst, like so many of the systems which have succeeded it, even amongst ourselves, it labours under presuppositions of various kinds which could never be established, and for that reason, if for no other, it could not have a purely good effect.

¹ See the chief passage, i. p. 560 sq., comp. 618. 48 sq., and many similar expositions. He obtains the number five also in other ways.

² See vol. v. pp. 184 sq. [See now the author's essay on the angelology of the O.T. in his last work, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. 272 sq.]

³ E.g., i. p. 644. 18, the ἀρχάγγελος κύριος is spoken of in a passage where the Scriptures seemed to require it.

⁴ As Philo occasionally uses it, especially i. pp. 81 sq.

⁵ E.g., i. pp. 631, 638.

⁶ We can easily observe the whole matter as Philo conceives it, and seeks to prove it from Scripture, in such passages as i. p. 505. 22 sq., pp. 207, 106. He is the first to lay so much stress upon the erect posture of man, as if the image of God were involved in it, i. pp. 207 sq., 332.

⁷ As he discusses this point, i. p. 153, and elsewhere.

⁸ According to an absolutely arbitrary and poorly worked out allegorical interpretation of Gen. iii. [i. 79.]

⁹ i. p. 531.

His employment of Allegory.—The order of his writings.

But at this point there arises a further and serious want of true philosophy, that Philo seeks to find this his system, as well as all its direct or indirect presuppositions, expressly presented in the Sacred Scriptures, and to substantiate it from them, and by means of a learned exposition of them. As a fact, his system is composed of truths found in the Scriptures as he understood them, as well as of many materials from elsewhere; but inasmuch as he had not, from the very first, taken sufficient pains to acquire a true and deep understanding of the Bible, and then, in addition, sought nevertheless to establish the premisses and doctrines of his system by an interpretation of the Scriptures, he was obliged to resort to the use of an allegorical interpretation, and to search by circuitous methods for what he could not find by direct and natural ones.

This disastrous art of allegory had existed in the Judean schools¹ for a long time before Philo, and had already met with opposition.² Accordingly Philo often defends it on occasion with fresh zeal, and seeks in a few places to prove its necessity.³ And without doubt there was no one before him who had adopted it with such passion and skill, and had carried it through on such a magnificent scale, with such dazzling ingenuity, such nicety of thought, and such eloquence. It is not merely certain words, or sentences, or sections of the Bible which he considers admit of or require an allegorical sense; everywhere he detects a higher sense than the literal one, and prefers to reach this mysteriously hidden sense alone, which, like an enigma, is accessible to the inquiring eye of the philosopher alone, and retreats before the common faculties of sense. Thus he allegorises both poetic and prose passages, narrative as well as poetry and prophecy, and even the words of laws; the latter, however, with the express remark that the keeping of the laws in their literal sense must not thereby suffer.⁴ Seeking thus to interpret the whole of the Scriptures in a sense which seemed to him appropriate to their sublime

¹ See vol. v. pp. 257 sq.

² Comp. the expression, 'the Allegorists,' i. p. 677. 35.

³ Not infrequently Philo states openly enough the reasons for the use of allegory, and if we compare such utterances as i. pp. 83, 134, 209, 221; 226 sq., 235, 292, 320, 324, 334, 378, 397, 525, 587 sq., 628, 634 sq., 691, 698, we can easily under-

stand what led him to avail himself of this method.

⁴ i. p. 450: in this absolutely mechanical relation did the lower and the higher sense of the Scriptures stand to each other according to his view; and so far was he from venturing in any way seriously to lessen the authority of the traditional customs and practices!

character, or, rather, to the nature of God Himself, and gradually intensifying in his own mind this requirement of a sense which would be worthy of God, he necessarily often came across no small difficulties, such as were calculated to tax his whole mind to the utmost, until, perhaps, suddenly he supposed that he had, as by a higher illumination, discovered the true interpretation. He sometimes tells us in his writings of his own experiences in this respect.¹ And when he had discovered a magnificent series of thoughts by allegorising the literal sense of a passage, this art itself appeared to him, as he used it with a skilful hand, able, like a wise architect,² to fit together the most sublime truths from the Sacred Scriptures into one connected series, and to execute the most beautiful structures of such interpretation.

His allegorising of the laws was in so far of but comparatively little consequence that Philo did not dispute the validity of them in ordinary life, but, on the contrary, subjected himself completely to the precepts of the Doctors of the law of the time. More dangerous was his allegorising even of purely historical names, deeds, and events, which he carried through with the utmost freedom, and in which he had excogitated even a magnificent continuity of thought, which he constantly applied in detail. It is his general habit to find representative and universal conceptions in various ancient names. Thus he very constantly calls Moses *the prophet*, because he is the model of all prophets; or *the hierophant*, following an Egypto-Greek term taken from the mysteries; or, again, *the theologian*. Aaron, on the other hand, he regards as the model of spoken prophecy simply; ³ Egypt is the symbol of the merely physical body, Chaldea that of mistaken science, &c. At the same time he sought, particularly in the whole narrative of Genesis, to preserve a great connection of thought; thus Adam is the pure human reason [*νοῦς*]; Eve the senses [*αἰσθησις*]; the serpent is desire [*ἡδονή*]; Enoch is the symbol of the man that retreats in penitence from the world to God; ⁴ Noah is the righteous man; Abraham is virtue won by means of higher wisdom; Israel, virtue inherited by nature; Jacob, virtue as it becomes perfectly established by practice and conflict; Lot, on the

¹ E.g., the particularly instructive account, i. p. 143. 35 sq., comp. also p. 178. 26 sq., p. 441. 19 sq., p. 482. 33 sq., p. 692. 8 sq.

² σοφῆ ἀρχιτέκτων, i. p. 660.

³ That is, of the λόγος προφορικός, in contrast with the νοῦς, as Moses is pro-

bably also called.

⁴ As Philo often explains; but this is an idea which is quite peculiar to him and which he did not devise from any such source as ancient traditions, but simply from his view of the meaning of the passage, Gen. v. 21-24.

other hand, is the man of the senses; Ishmael the sophist; Laban the administrator of the bodily powers; Esau the wooden man, and rebellious from his coarseness; Sarah and Leah are likewise virtues; Rebecca is patience; Rachel, physical beauty; the Hebrews are pilgrims from the world of sense to that of spirit; the ark of the covenant is the symbol of the intellectual world; the two cherubs above it the symbol of the two chief Logoi next to the Logos,¹ &c. In this way this entire sacred history re-lives under his hand, and he is indefatigable in explaining, in detail and connectedly, in a thousand ways, at every place that appears appropriate, the mysteries which he supposes that he has thus found in it. In fact, however, the simple literal sense of the Sacred Scriptures and the entire ancient history evaporate in the process; and though individual names and men are immeasurably exalted, others are, the more unjustly, greatly lowered. And it is as if Philo had no idea whatever of the great danger that the Bible, instead of being more revered and made more intelligible by his allegorical art, must become really more contemptible and obscure; so dear is it to him as that wise architect with the help of which he raises the lofty air-castles of a philosophy which he seeks to found upon the Bible.

However, the great works themselves which he wrote may best be compared with lofty erections which he constructed by the aid of this favourite art. It is in our time, it is true, somewhat difficult to quite accurately rediscover and describe his works as he wrote them, particularly those of them which are constructed upon a larger scale. For, notwithstanding the large number of his books which have been preserved, it appears plainly from a closer examination of them that many have been either wholly lost or preserved only in a mutilated form, while those which have been preserved and more recently re-discovered² are still imperfectly edited and their proper order left unascertained. The great extent of his works undoubtedly itself acted quite early injuriously upon their complete preservation, inasmuch as they began in various ways to be

¹ See *ante*, pp. 217 sq. [Siegfried has handled Philo's use of allegory most learnedly and fully in the essay and the work above referred to, p. 206.]

² The history of the gradual rediscovery of Philo's works to the extent to which it has hitherto been successful is no less instructive than consoling; as the newest publication of this kind appears just now, the *Anecdotes grecum de Chenu-*

biis, ed. Grossmann, Lips. 1856, which appeared as early as 1826 in an Armenian translation in the *Questiones*. [At the end of the last volume of this work Ewald adds (1868) a reference to Tischendorf's *Philonea inedita*, Lips. 1868, and to the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 1852 sq. Siegfried's important work was not then published.]

abbreviated; some parts, particularly where allegory was seen to be insufferably free and the frequent prolix and excessively ingenious expositions gave offence, were probably the first to be frequently omitted: further, the large works were early broken up into a number of separate books with special headings, to which probably certain precedents of Philo's own hand gave encouragement.¹

Thus his writings have come down to us in a very mutilated and disarranged condition, and probably with ungentle ones incorporated with them. Nevertheless, it appears to us, after careful examination, not impossible to ascertain again what Philo's genuine works were and to re-discover their original connection and meaning as well as the chronological order of their succession.

According to all indications Philo wrote three works each of which was on such a large scale that it might have occupied him entirely through a long life. As the earliest of these three we are justified in regarding the work which he called *Questions concerning the Law and their Solutions*,² and of which numerous and large fragments have been preserved in an Armenian translation, and a smaller number of shorter fragments in the original Greek. In this work Philo handles the entire Pentateuch³ in the order of its sentences, discusses mostly in the first place only the literal or lower meaning of the various sentences, but then passes from this to the discovery and exposition of their higher sense, and generally dwells more at length on this, only rarely adding an exhortation. It is just this starting simply from the separate passages and from the possible twofold sense, this treatment first of the literal meaning and this endeavour only just to establish everywhere the higher meaning, according to his peculiar mode of understanding it, which marks the book as a first work in which Philo began to labour at his great art of allegory;⁴ and we are

¹ The writings of Philo were substantially in this condition even before the time of Eusebius, as may be very plainly seen in the long list of them in his *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 18 (Jerome's *Catalog. Script. Eccles.* cap. xi.), only that this list shows that they then existed more completely in their original Greek than they now do.

² τὰ ἐν νόμοις ζητήματα or ζητούμενα καὶ λύσεις or ἐπιστάσεις καὶ διαλύσεις, as the title is found three times varied in the list of Eusebius.

³ According to Eusebius' list, the work extended over Genesis and Exodus

only (or, as this latter book is still called, *Exagoge*); the Armenian translation contains fragments of these two books only, and the fragments in Greek authors are confined to them; but we once find also a fragment from Leviticus, printed in *Scriptorum Veterum nova collectio*, ed. Mai, tom. vii. 1, p. 604, where there are numerous other fragments of the work also in Greek. The division of the *Questiones in Genesin* and of those in *Exodum* into various books or *Sermones* is found early, but it can have been made only for convenience' sake.

⁴ When Philo, *Quæst. ad. Gen.* iii. 22

justified in saying that this work is everywhere pre-supposed by the following one, while, conceived as written after it, it would have no proper purpose. Moreover, regarded as a first work of this kind, notwithstanding many beautiful passages, it is quite easy to understand why it was subsequently much less read than the two following ones.

For there followed next undoubtedly a book in which he proposed exclusively to further expound and to extend and apply, in all its remotest consequences, the idea which he best liked to trace, and which he had generally established, according to his peculiar view of it, in the previous work, so that he could call this book briefly *Allegories of the Sacred Law*.¹ As a matter of form he still adheres, in the composition of this work, as in the previous one, completely to the order of the words and sentences of the Pentateuch, beginning with it and then gradually advancing farther; but in this book this order which has once been adopted as necessary is only like an indication of the various propositions or truths upon which he has to speak; and upon the basis of each proposition he unfolds very extended expositions when he thinks well, treats everything of a kindred nature at great length, and thus brings together his allegorisings of the most dissimilar passages of the Pentateuch, or even of the Scriptures generally. Accordingly this extended allegorising of the Law, at which he everywhere works with the greatest freedom and pleasure, soon falls, in the course of the work, naturally into something like distinct essays on given propositions; and instead of dividing this work, which evidently assumed under his hands an unmanageable extent, into separate books with successive numbers, he subsequently began himself to name the various essays according to their subjects,² which strictly carried out would necessarily have led to a twofold description of each particular section or book of the general work. But precisely this unusually extensive plan and execution of the work, getting larger and larger as it did in the process of composition, appears to have become a hindrance to its completion. If we pay careful attention, we see that Philo, according to the parts of the immense work which have been preserved, continued it only as far as the 20th chapter of Genesis;³ and yet it is

(ii. p. 669), says *ὡς πολλάκις ἔφη*, he can quite well refer to passages at the beginning of this work which have now been lost; still the *πολλάκις* is wholly wanting in the Armenian translation, *Anch. ii. p. 37*. In any case, therefore, this expression does not necessarily point to a different early work.

¹ *νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*, according to the list in Eusebius; the plural *νόμοι* is usual in Philo in the case of such titles.

² As appears from the opening sentences of the essays, i. pp. 329, 357, 404, 473, 620, 659.

³ As we may easily infer from the subject of the five books, *De Somniis* (of

especially at this end of the work that no principal part appears to have been lost ; it is true, however, that in the parts that have been finished he deals with very many sentences and sections of the subsequent portions of the Pentateuch. Neither could it be a matter of great moment to him to continue this unusually extensive work, inasmuch as he had probably already expounded the most important of his views and opinions in the essays which had been finished, and the parts of the whole work rather resembled so many homilies or sermons, in which the speaker expounds his views in the most unrestrained manner upon the basis of a given passage of Scripture. And, in fact, we must regard the essays which compose this work as sermons which were delivered to the most cultivated and learned section of the Hellenistic-Judean world of that time, and were heard with the greatest attention. Philo does not write in this case for all kinds of readers, and never appeals to a heathen audience ; on the contrary, as amongst the heathen select circles collected around the Mysteries and the orations which were delivered in connection with them, so he writes his work simply for the educated Judeans as those who alone understand the true religion with its Mysteries, and accordingly at times addresses them expressly as those initiated in the secrets of the Law, as he declares in this work, perhaps to an astonished world, that he has heard them.¹ It is also quite apparent that Philo laboured at this the chief work of his life with the greatest pleasure and generally in undisturbed leisure ;² and the work accordingly contains many exceedingly fine and impressive speeches, and not a few admirable expositions of his doctrine. Consequently it was afterwards constantly read more than the previous work, and large sections of it have been preserved. Still, it was probably early found to be so diffuse and, particularly in the case of long-spun allegories, so wearisome, that it was repeatedly abbreviated and cut up into any passable number of separate essays, which were subsequently often distinguished by new and arbitrary names. Accordingly it has been preserved only in a very mutilated condition.³

which three, including the first, have been lost), according to Eusebius's list, and their relation to the foregoing essays.

¹ The address *ὁ μύσται*, with similar phrases, e.g., i. pp. 131. 5 sq., 146. 38 sq., 558. 32 sq., 573. 6 sq., 649. 47 sq., as well as that two classes of men are thus distinguished, i. pp. 280 sq. And once, i. p. 675. 27 sq., we find a very instructive description, in the mouth of a heathen, of the strong desire to hear such mysteries,

with which the Judeans often sat in the synagogues ; comp. on this point also Philo's description in the fragment in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 7, 12-14.

² Only the end of the present second book, *De Somniis*, speaks so strongly against the Egyptians, that we seem to hear Philo using the language of his later years.

³ I consider, therefore, that all the essays which are found in Mangey's

In this way, however, the principal work of the great allegorist likewise retained from the very beginning an element of incompleteness, inasmuch as it had not, after all, brought the whole of the Pentateuch under the operations of its art. Undoubtedly Philo himself felt this; and, furthermore, the work was not designed for the world at large, but only for initiated readers, whilst by the experiences of his later years he had been increasingly made to feel the necessity there was of defending Judeanism boldly against the entire heathen world, and particularly vindicating before all the world the unique truth and grandeur of the sacred Law as the deepest foundation of Judeanism. Consequently he undertook a third great work, and once more a work intended solely to interpret and magnify the sacred Law, but written for wholly different readers and accordingly in another manner; and, inasmuch as it had less than the two earlier ones a purely philosophical purpose, it was from the first arranged upon a plan which could admit of its presenting its extensive matter, not only in eloquent and elaborate discourse, but also in a well-arranged and complete form. This work he successfully completed in later life, although he was necessitated to work at it amid serious and protracted interruptions.¹ And it is in fact the most matured and generally the most instructive and attractive of his works. It was accordingly always read more than the rest, and has been preserved in the best condition, though not without some *lacunæ*. Moreover, certain parts of it also were at such an early period severed from it, or removed to unsuitable places,² that it now requires all our care to re-discover its earlier plan and arrangement. The earliest name of the whole work was also early lost in this process of the separation of its principal parts; but we may infer from many indications that it bore the title *Concerning the life of Moses and his laws*.

It is true this heading reminds us very little of the feeling

edition, from p. 43 to the end of the first volume, belong to this work; in addition probably the fragment which has been preserved in the Armenian translation, *Auch.* ii. pp. 613-619, with the title *De Deo*, which is, however, an allegorical interpretation of Gen. xviii. 1 sq., belonged to the same work. The great mutilations which the work has suffered are apparent to every attentive reader; the beginning also, i. p. 43, which now commences with Gen. ii. 1, is mutilated, and after the later arrangement of Philo's books (see below) could most easily thus suffer.

¹ As we see most plainly from the

passage, ii. pp. 299 sq., referred to above (p. 199), especially if we compare with it the conclusion of the essay *De parentibus colendis* (published by Mai, 1818, p. 35 [Richter's ed. vol. v. p. 60 sq.]), which undoubtedly originally stood immediately before that essay.

² Extracts of the best utterances of Philo with a more general meaning were also made at an early period; Tischendorf has published some of them from a MS. of the tenth cent., found at Qähira, in his *Anecdota sacra et profana* (Lips. 1855, 2nd ed. 1861), pp. 171-174.

of the ancient true religion, inasmuch as we saw, in an earlier volume,¹ how greatly in that religion Moses as a man retires into the background in comparison with the will and Law of God, and how far that Law is from being called after him. However, this entire work was intended more especially for the heathen as a defence of Judeanism. Inasmuch therefore, as amongst the heathen at that time every legislative system was valued especially as bearing the name of the ancient sage to whom it was ascribed, so Philo sought especially to magnify Moses as a man, and in the Judean schools also the prevailing tendency of these centuries sanctioned his procedure.² Accordingly he composed, as the basis of this work, a *Life of Moses*, in which he magnified him from every point of view as the greatest of all legislators,³ and in doing this gave likewise an interpretation of a considerable part of the Pentateuch.—Passing to the interpretation and defence of the Laws and of the book containing them as to his principal subject, he distinguishes three kinds of *oracles*, which this legislator had committed to writing both as an introduction to and an explanation of his Laws, and in accordance with this divides his own exposition also into three parts of very unequal length. He deals *first* with the narratives of the Pentateuch, beginning with the Creation, because they are placed at the opening of the book.⁴ He then conceives, *secondly*, the entire previous history, or the history of mankind after the Creation as it is described in Genesis, as an immediate preparation for the legislation of Moses, supposing that the heroes of that previous period were the most instructive examples of the way in which men ought or ought not to act in life, and supposing further that the greatest of them especially were, in their whole lives, the best explanation of the divine Laws that still remained unwritten, and the loftiest illustrations of the divine rewards of virtue. Philo had long been in the habit⁵ of regarding the human figures of the primitive ages as they are described in Genesis, simply as ideal symbols of so many eternal truths, and of allegorising all the narratives in this sense, and also of seeking in their order of succession a higher significance in accordance

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 32 sq.

² See vol. v. pp. 57 sq.

³ According to vol. ii. p. 225 this work was intended to be divided into four sections; but Philo was able to combine the last three in one book, so that he divided it into two books of equal bulk; and it must be allowed that it can be best thus divided according to Philo's purpose,

but we must then read *δυσί* instead of *τρισί*, ii. p. 481. where he refers to it.

⁴ This is the essay, *περὶ τῆς Μωσέως κοσμοποιίας*, i. pp. 1-42, comp. with ii. pp. 1 sq. 408; neither in the earlier work has *κοσμοποιία* any other meaning, comp. i. p. 237. 21 sq., 265. 34, 342. 23, 556. 15.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 220.

with his system. Presupposing all this as he had explained it in his earlier works, he selects for his present purpose, with his love of round numbers, just seven heroes of that primitive age, that he may show in the narrative of their history, that the same laws which were subsequently committed to writing by Moses for the people, previously arose as in living forms in the divine lives of its great ancestors, and still shine forth in their fullest truth as exemplified by them. These seven are Enos, Enoch, Noah, as the first trias; Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as a second and higher trias, and finally Joseph as preparing the transition to the latter times of Moses; ¹ a succession and mode of regarding such heroes by which Philo supplies again a powerful precedent for numerous similar efforts on the part of the Gnostics. ² It is now that he first comes, *thirdly*, to the interpretation of the actual Laws, ³ and it is at this point that his exposition reaches its greatest copiousness, since to prove that the laws of Moses, as regards their meaning and value, were the best that had ever arisen amongst men, was the ultimate purpose of this entire work. In proving this he starts from the Ten Commandments, and as a philosophic writer seeks to bring higher unity into the great number and variety of the rest of the Laws, by reducing them all to these ten as the summary of which they are the expansion, ⁴ but the endeavour is not sufficiently successful. As, moreover, after the manner of Platonic and Stoic philosophy he likewise lays the greatest stress upon the virtues—the four usually presented as the highest, as well as the others—(although they are not at all mentioned in such a way in the Pentateuch): he weaves them into his entire exposition, describes, particularly towards the end,

¹ Of this section of the work have been preserved the two essays, *De Abrahamo* (in which he speaks at the beginning of the three earlier patriarchs) and *De Josepho*, ii. pp. 1-79; the portion of the Pentateuch from which the most important illustrations only are taken by him in this work is, as a whole, called τὸ ἱστορικόν, ii. p. 408; it is only an immaterial difference, from which, however, we can infer that the preceding *Life of Moses* was written somewhat earlier, when we find the history of the Creation in it, ii. p. 141, likewise comprehended under this name, while the history of the earliest men is described as τὸ γενεαλογικόν, because, as we know, there is one genealogical line from Adam to Moses.

² [See on Philo's treatment of these seven patriarchs, Siegfried's work, pp. 257 sq.]

³ To this section belongs, therefore, all the essays found in Mangey ii. from p. 180 to 407; we must now add the two essays published by Mai, 1818 [Richter's ed. vol. v. pp. 48-61.] *De festo cophini* and *De parentibus colendis*, which are imperfect at the beginning, and which must be inserted before p. 299 [The first of these essays as given in Tischendorf's *Philonca inedita*, pp. 69-71, contains a better description of the Feast of Baskets. Ewald's note in vol. vii. of the *Geschichte*]; undoubtedly also the two short fragments of an essay, *περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ* in Mai's *Scriptt. vet. nova coll.* vii. i. p. 103.

⁴ According to the general sketch, ii. pp. 205-208. The same thing, we know, has been attempted by many since Philo's days, but it cannot be carried through without artificial means.

how they are most sublimely taught both in the various Laws and in the narratives of the Pentateuch, and further elucidates also several other Laws in this way.¹—At this point the chief part of the work was quite finished; but, inasmuch as the laws and narratives in the Pentateuch speak much of the divine rewards and punishments, and again often end with prophecies, Philo handles these two subjects at the close, and shows in the first place historically what rewards were allotted to the six godly men, to Moses and to the people of Israel, who had been selected as models, and what punishments to the wicked, and then what the blessings and the threatenings for all the future are of that God that speaks in the Laws.²

The above are the principal works of Philo, which though they all centre in the Pentateuch only, were nevertheless first in later times, undoubtedly by Christian hands, not merely mutilated, but also mixed up together and re-arranged in a deliberate manner, that it might appear as if they were only treatises expository of the first two books of the Pentateuch.³ It is true his ready pen wrote various other small essays which have no immediate connection with the three works above described. He wrote essays upon questions of a purely scientific or philosophic nature, for instance the books above-mentioned,⁴ *De Providentia*,⁵ which probably belongs to his earliest writings; the books *de Mundo*, of which the first part only has been preserved;⁶ and the book *de Animalibus*, with the heading *Alexander* also, on which see below. Books of this kind he composed partly in the form of dialogues after the manner of Plato.⁷ The smaller works which he wrote at the call of circumstances, in defence of the Judean faith, and also of the Judean community in Alexandria, are of greater value. Of these smaller works probably the preparation of the two kindred books, dedicated

¹ This is the section from ii. p. 358 onwards; according to the beginning of the essay in Mai, p. 8 [*De parentibus colendis*, § 1, ed Richter v. p. 51], he had spoken concerning the duties of *εὐσέβεια* and *δοσιότης* in connection with the first commandment; concerning *φρόνησις*, e.g., in that essay, Mai, p. 33 [Richter, p. 60]; but the essay, *περὶ τῶν τριῶν ἀρετῶν*, of which Eusebius speaks, is now probably lost, and would have naturally had a place before p. 233 sq.

² These are the two incorrectly divided and named essays, ii. pp. 408–437 [*De premiis et penis* and *De execrationibus*]; the end of the first and the beginning of the second has been lost at p. 421.

³ As appears from the list in Eusebius,

only that further errors of another kind have crept into this list. The second and the third works particularly were in the first instance worked up together, which explains the loss of the beginning of the second, according to *ante*, p. 225.

⁴ P. 200.

⁵ *περὶ προνοίας*: see on this work *ante* p. 200.

⁶ ii. pp. 601–624; the same part now appears enlarged by a later author under the title *De incorruptibilitate mundi* in Philo's works, ii. pp. 487–517.

⁷ Even the Biblical heroes he sought to introduce thus as taking part in dialogues, as he himself indicates incidentally, i. p. 394. 5; at all events it is not easy to understand these words otherwise.

to a certain Theodotus who is otherwise unknown to us, was most pleasing to his own feeling and taste. In these two books he sought to prove that every bad man is a slave, and every virtuous man is free; a proposition, however, which he specially defended with such eloquence only in order to use this occasion for eulogising the Essenes;¹ and in an appendix he went on to eulogise the Therapeutæ also far more at length, as being so well known to him.² Rather early, evidently, he wrote a book with the express object of defending the Judeans against the attacks of heathen philosophers; inasmuch as it would have been superfluous after the third of his great works above described had been written; moreover, it was of very dissimilar character in respect of tone, language, and even the line of proof adopted. Accordingly he gave this book the title: *Conjectures concerning the Judeans*.³ It was a very animated production, but only a few larger fragments of it have been preserved.⁴ It was not until quite in his advanced years that he composed, in the midst as it were of the whirl of public contentions regarding the position and rights of his nation, a series of books in its defence and against its enemies; and these books have an immediate importance for the history of those years, and we shall have to speak below of their number, subject-matter, and value.⁵

In none of these smaller writings could he make use of his favourite art of allegorising the sacred Scriptures, inasmuch as the subject required plain writing and arguments such as everyone could appreciate. Neither in the third of his larger works could he frequently apply it, because it also was intended rather for a more general class of readers; still in this work he not only appeals to the results of his allegorisings, but also uses the art itself at times in new applications.⁶ This art, therefore, remained in greatest favour with him his life

¹ The second of these books, *Quod omnis probus liber*, is found in Mangey, ii. pp. 445-470; only we must read at the opening πάντα φαῦλον εἶναι δοῦλον instead of πάντα δοῦλον εἶναι φαῦλον. The fragment which is now found under the title, *De nobilitate*, ii. pp. 437-44, is, according to its thought and the general features of its style, undoubtedly a fragment of the first of these two books.

² See vol. v. pp. 376 sq.

³ Ἱποθετικά according to Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 5, 11, περί Ἰουδαίων according to his list, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 18, 6; but we can quite well write the two names as forming one title.

⁴ That is, I do not doubt that the fragments preserved in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 5. 11-7. 20 are from this book.

⁵ All the genuine writings of Philo, as far as they have been yet recovered, have been above referred to; the two *Orations*—*in Sampson* and *de Jona*—which are given, Auch. ii., after the Armenian translation, betray by every indication their later origin, although no clear sign of a Christian authorship can be discovered in them.

⁶ E.g. at the beginning of the third chief section, II. p. 180, he expressly remarks that he proposes to take this course.

through, and he was unable to conceive an apt and satisfactory interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures without it. By his eloquent writing he invested it with such a charm, that mainly through him it was greatly in favour with succeeding teachers amongst Christians also, and even in our own times many scholars continue to be influenced by it. But precisely because he pursued it most assiduously with the utmost zeal, we can already observe most plainly in his case all the errors which necessarily flow from it. We may admire the nice acumen with which Philo examines the Bible, and find that he often came with his clear glance upon enigmas in it which in our own time so greatly occupy scientific criticism;¹ still his allegorical art does not show him how to resolve such enigmas; leads him to overlook, and, indeed, to obscure, the historical sense of the Bible and with it the basis of its entire eternal significance; misleads him often to lay the greatest stress upon what is in itself most unimportant and empty, and to draw the same inferences indifferently from any given text; and compels him by its consistent application not infrequently to debase the best things in the Bible and to do the most cruel injustice even to the loftiest.² We are unable, therefore, to observe in it more than the first attempt to meet the difficulties besetting the commencement of a serious and profound interpretation of the Bible. The complete original meaning of the Bible was lost in the course of the previous centuries, just when it was supposed to be sufficiently understood. All that was remaining was some obscure notion and a strong presupposition of the incomparable value of its meaning. It was on this basis that they who desired to understand it now sought to attain their object simply by the aid of allegory, as the means closest at hand, and thus a highly developed art arose, which in spite of the fact that Christ himself³ wholly scorned it, and that the Apostles were but little influenced by it (see below), was nevertheless in this first childhood and helplessness of exegesis perpetuated down to late times as a great power, though it could never be of any real service. If allegory could ever have done valuable service, Philo would have accomplished all that could be obtained by it; nevertheless, in accordance with its arbitrary nature it subsequently found its way under other forms into Christianity also, and at last revealed itself with

¹ E.g. i. p. 342. 23, he already remarks that God is always called Elohim only throughout the narratives Gen. ch. .

² This can easily be shown anywhere in his writings, see, e.g., i. pp. 477 sq., 485 sq.

³ See vol. vi. p. 234.

increasing plainness in the Christian Church as a misleading *ignis fatuus*. In fact, inasmuch as Philo hardly ever made a serious effort to understand larger and connected passages of the Bible, but got no farther than separate words and sentences,¹ his entire interpretation of the Bible, with that of his followers, necessarily became in the highest degree precarious.

The Messianic, or Christian, Element in Philo.

If, in the last place, we now look at Philo in his relation to the highest possible attainment of his age, which was actually realised towards the end of his long literary career, neither in this respect are we able to discover that he had in his mind either clearly comprehended or even distantly surmised the one thing which could then have laid the foundation of the true salvation of his people.

When we read his writings, which are so universally animated and interwoven with the most attractive judgments and descriptions, we are not infrequently surprised by thoughts and sentences which verge almost upon the New Testament, and could, we might almost suppose, find a place in it. They show us, however, nothing more than the spiritual culture to which the Judeans in the highest circles of society had at that time attained, and what a field of spiritual seed was everywhere ripening for Christianity after the productive accumulations of the last sultry centuries. For instance, how are we fanned, as it were, by the air of the New Testament when we find Philo teaching that man has what he has really only from the Logos of God;² or when in his manner he teaches with great stylistic elaboration, and seeks to prove from the Scriptures that men must not only go in search of the old truths and traditions, but must not neglect constantly to find and to appropriate new and recent thoughts and truths.³ With regard to oaths also he passes a rigorous judgment,⁴ but combined with the superstition that the true name of God is really ineffable,⁵ and that accordingly it is better to swear by

¹ Philo rarely attempts to make observations and remarks of a more general nature, and when he does they are rarely just; thus he correctly notes, as we have seen, the unexpected continuation of the name Elohim for God in Gen. i.; but he does not explain it correctly; i. p. 85. 14 he once remarks what seems to him almost the one chief matter of the lyric,

Ex. xv.

² i. pp. 119 sq., and elsewhere he refers at times to this, comp. *ante*, pp. 215, 218.

³ i. p. 177. 41 sq., comp. vol. vi. pp. 234 sq.

⁴ i. p. 128. 37 sq., 181. 18 sq., ii. 194 sq., 203, 270, comp. with ii. p. 597.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 212.

the earth, sun, stars, heavens, and the whole world than by God. And as his use of allegory at times conducts him to purely spiritual views and ideas which verge upon the highest of the New Testament, and like the latter reach a height far beyond all conceivable material things, which is one of the signs in that age of the highest culture in this respect;¹ in like manner he not infrequently, as a genuine sage, utters principles of the purest resignation and self-sacrifice which very much resemble those of the New Testament.² Even the use of the name Father for God, which is quite customary with him,³ reminds us strongly of the New Testament; likewise the principle that true wealth lies hidden in heaven,⁴ as well as the description of the ease with which the poor may be the righteous;⁵ or again the saying, 'the things a man hates let him not do.'⁶ It is no wonder that Christians also early learnt to read him with pleasure, and that those of a little later time put him almost on an equality with the Church Fathers.

However, we can see most plainly from the manner in which he regarded and treated the Messianic hopes how little, though living in such a spiritual atmosphere, he truly comprehended what needed to be done in his day to obtain the acknowledgment of the religion of the Old Testament in the world at large, and to disperse the dark clouds which once more in the later years of his life gathered more thickly around his people. These Messianic hopes really lie remote from his spiritual nature; his understanding of them is slight, and he has not much to say about them. In so far he belongs to the cautious and prudent men of those years who, having been warned by the severe misfortunes of their country in the past, and from a paralysing fear of the Roman government, felt doubt and hesitation with regard to every serious movement in Israel, as

¹ Thus the conception of Isaac by Sarah is represented i. pp. 147 sq., 203, 251, 365, 455, 571, 598 sq., as if it took place simply by means of the Divine will, an idea which is really something similar to the higher narrative, Matt. i. 18-25. But Philo gets from Gen. ch. iv. the idea that Cain's punishment was never to die, i. pp. 224 sq., and elsewhere.

² Thus the sentence, 'Every wise man is a ransom for the wicked man,' i. p. 187. 9, notwithstanding that its form betrays the philosophic school, really reminds us by its meaning and its figure very much of New Testament truths, and in any case is widely different from Prov.

xxi. 18.

³ See vol. v., p. 483, comp. further Philo, ii. pp. 436, 609 sq. The reason is clear: as soon as the Logos was conceived by him as the *second God* (see *ante*, p. 284), and was, moreover, made equal with the Messiah, it was quite appropriate to call God, who all along remained the ultimate Creator, the *Father*; it is true Philo also often strongly insists on His *goodness* and *love*, yet he regards Him more as the *Father of the world* only.

⁴ ii. p. 425.

⁵ ii. p. 198. 6 sq., *Auch.* i. p. 46.

⁶ In Enseb. *Præp. Evang.* viii. 7, 6, comp. vol. v. p. 210.

we saw more at length in the last volume.¹ His residence at the seat of advanced Greek culture and his profound participation in it tended likewise to withdraw his mind very much from meditating upon the hopes of his people, which seemed at that time to be exceedingly remote; whilst, on the other hand, he saw nothing to find fault with in the rules and institutions of his religion as they were then taught in the schools,² and just because he was contented with them could not be very susceptible of Messianic consolations. Moreover, inasmuch as with all his wisdom and skill in the use of allegory he had no real understanding of the Bible generally, its prophecies also remained the more obscure to him; and the more he sought in the Bible merely for the philosophic principles of his school, and endeavoured to exalt them, as he supposed he had there discovered them, he was able the more easily to put into the background the prophecies. Yet although he inclined in so far to pay less attention to the prophetic books, and perhaps sought to interpret them allegorically only, the Pentateuch nevertheless contains prophecies which he was compelled, because they were in this book, to consider more particularly, and the sense of which is to some extent too obvious to allow him merely to allegorise them. Moreover, the Messianic hopes in their deepest sense were really inseparable from the Judean faith in any form of it. Accordingly, in his third great work, though it is only in the closing portion of it, inasmuch as the plan of the book made it necessary,³ he really enters upon a consideration of the meaning of the prophecies in the Pentateuch; but though he deals with this matter at length in his manner,⁴ he really never reaches the heart of it, does little more than repeat in a formal way the meaning of the words, occasionally robs the prophecies of their point by the use of allegory, and hushes up anything of a national character. The fact that he elevates the Messiah, identifying him with the Logos, and describes his coming for the deliverance of his people after the idea of the Logos,⁵ is quite in accordance with the faith which had long ago assumed this form in Israel;⁶ but

¹ Vol. vi. pp. 53, 373.

² See *ante*, p. 220.

³ *Ante*, p. 228.

⁴ ii. pp. 421-37, mutilated at the beginning as we saw *ante*, p. 220.

⁵ In that exposition it is only at the end, p. 436, that he first comes to the Messiah and describes him exactly as he does the Logos, as if the Logos would then appear again as he had formerly appeared (*ante*, 215), as the irresistible deliverer and leader of the nation by the

Red Sea under Moses. But it appears quite plainly from i. pp. 414, 598. 21 sq., *Auch.* ii. pp. 544 sq., that he identified the Messiah with the Logos, exactly as the Messiah was then regarded as intended in such passages as Zech. vi. 12, Ps. ex.; and on that account he could easily call him Christ and Son of God. In the passage Deut. xviii. 15 sq., however, he justly does not find the Messiah, ii. p. 224 sq.

⁶ See vol. vi. pp. 116 sq.

inasmuch as he goes no farther,¹ he transfers the fulfilment of all hopes of this kind absolutely to heaven without at all comprehending how they could be realised on the earth and in history. For him, therefore, and all who are like-minded with him, the Messianic hopes are practically dissipated; and instead of his being able, with such tendencies and habits of mind, to understand Christianity, he would not even have been able to comprehend and heartily approve the Baptist's work.

Indeed, in spite of his philosophic tendencies, he relied in his reflections on the future, and in his Messianic hope more upon vague speculations and expectations than upon clear knowledge and actual deeds. According to his view,² the Judeans have with God three great intercessors³ and helpers, from whom they may expect the final realisation of their hopes: namely, the kindness of God himself; the holiness of the Patriarchs who intercede with God for their descendants; and the personal repentance and change of mind on the part of the latter, which Philo demands as the necessary condition of this realisation and the general commencement of which he hopes for in the future without comprehending how it can come and without working himself, like the Baptist, for instance, for its appearance. If we separate in this instance the peculiar language and mode of thought of Philo as a philosopher from those things which he received as an already established national view, it is evident that faith in the intercessory power of the Patriarchs is the sole basis of this his general view. This national reliance on the pre-eminent merits, and therefore on the intercession, of the Patriarchs, had, it is true, grown up during the last centuries before Philo, on the basis of the general veneration for antiquity, and it was constantly growing during all that time; the godly had long been accustomed to call Abraham 'our father' with the greatest reverence, and boasted of being his children, forgetting how wrong this faith is, according to the Scriptures themselves.⁴ But that even the wise Philo should share this false

¹ For even the passage, Num. xxiv. 17, he interprets to a considerable extent allegorically, ii. p. 424, and here as elsewhere lays great stress upon the *bloodless* victory of Israel in former times. And, yet again, he might so easily have arrived at the thought of a human Messiah, inasmuch as he says, i. p. 427. 1 sq., 'though no one has hitherto deserved to be named Son of God, yet everyone must endeavour to be like the Logos,' and again, i. p. 584. 3 sq., 'the perfectly wise

man is probably already in existence, but is concealed from us in our wickedness.' Even the high priest is in one respect to him a kind of intermediate being between God and man, i. p. 683 sq., comp. 562, 689. 2, ii. p. 562.

² ii. p. 436.

³ *παράκλητοι*, the same term that recurs in the language of the Apostle John, comp. ii. p. 520.

⁴ Particularly 'Isa.' lxiii. 16.

reliance about the same time as it was justly oppugned by the Baptist,¹ and did not guard against an error which appeared harmless only because it had become national, is a phenomenon which condemns the entire pedantic character of men boasting of philosophy, and is one of the plainest signs of the unintelligent security in which their minds were wrapt.

And after all it was not to be expected that Philo's general philosophic tendencies and labours should be able universally and for long to please even his own age and all in his own circle, greatly as it charmed and provoked many to imitation for the very reason that it thus dealt tenderly with the national beliefs. In his old age he was not spared the pain of finding his own nephew and former pupil Alexander writing a book to prove, wholly against his doctrine, that animals also are endowed with reason. He then published, probably not till after Alexander's death, an essay, in the form of a dialogue with his grandson Lysimachus, in refutation of this view, which seemed to him impious.² But we shall have to describe specially below his labours for his people, and primarily for his co-religionists in Alexandria, during the public disturbances of his last years.

2. *The Later Herods, under the favour of Rome.*

Thus tranquilly, therefore, in these times were the training and brightening of the mind by occupation with philosophy and literature cultivated in the ancient nation, no less than the pursuit, in lower spheres of life, of agriculture, industry, trade, and commerce. But what avail these two forms of occupation in a nation or a great community, if in the end it must serve an alien power, as at that time the Judeans had to serve Rome? In such a case an inner antagonism or contradiction must be developed which, though at best hidden and repressed for a time by nobler pursuits until it has become complete and full grown, at last, when an occasion is presented, breaks out perhaps with all the more destructive force. In such a case, however, mere accident may often produce an overpowering effect, proceeding from the alien power and overcoming the native forces and parties which are weaker than it. And accordingly it was at that time the caprice of passing Roman favour, in the first instance, which once more smiled

¹ Matt. iii. 7-9.

² This is the book above mentioned (p. 228) which Aucher (i. pp. 123-172) has published in Latin after the Armenian

translation. Alexander's book has been incorporated into this dialogue, and at the end only a short refutation of it is given.

on the ancient nation which was already in spiritual antagonism with Rome ; and this fitful humour was powerful enough for a time to disguise everything of a profoundly antagonistic nature.

The occasion of this was supplied by the later Herods in their relations to the Roman princes. Dependent and helpless as the Herods were, as compared with the princes of Rome, they were still likewise of princely rank ; whilst the few members of the Roman reigning family, according to ancient Roman customs, still continued so isolated in the midst of the eternal city that they probably often gladly sought intercourse with other men of princely rank, and often conferred upon them more distinction than they personally deserved. However insignificant, or even unworthy, a Judean prince might be, some of that mysterious glamour which at that time more or less surrounded the whole nation of the true religion in the estimation of many Romans was reflected upon him, particularly at a time when the Sacred Scriptures had already become better known and such great writers as Philo laboured incessantly by means of books, which easily circulated amongst the heathen also, and gave them some idea of the wonderful dogmas and ideas of the Judean religion. Moreover, just at that time the communications between the princely families of Judea and Rome were accidentally, for a considerable period, more than usually frequent and close. Thus the purely personal pursuits, idiosyncrasies, and caprices of contemporary princes may often ripple the surface of the history of two nations, without being able in the long run to change anything in the deeper nature and course of their affairs ; and in the ancient world that was never easier than at the time when the Roman people appeared to be gradually becoming simply wax under the hand of the Cæsars, and the Judean to have resigned, subsequent to the days of Herod and the Gaulonite, all thought of independence. We must at once pass in review the chief points of the relationship of the royal houses.

The two sons of Herod the Great, who had been executed by their father himself¹—Alexander and Aristobulus—of Asmonean blood on their mother's side, left behind them several children ; the sons of the former, Alexander and Tigranes, were, immediately after their father's death, given up, on his demand, to their maternal grandfather, Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and under his education were converted to heathenism ; so that, as far as this history is concerned, they

¹ See vol. v. p. 438 sq.

practically disappear.¹ On the other hand, the three sons of Aristobulus—Herod, Agrippa, and Aristobulus—Herod the Great, as was his custom, ordered to be brought to Rome shortly before his death, that they might be educated in the neighbourhood of the Imperial court. Of these three brothers the second, Agrippa,² was in many respects much superior to the others. He was of a very quick, versatile, and highly ambitious nature, not unlike his grandfather, whom he also resembled in his mastery of the arts of clever speech and flattery. It was only the cunning and cruelty of Herod which he did not inherit, but something of the Asmonean nobility of his grandmother originally flowed in his veins. Although in money matters he displayed great thoughtlessness, he seemed to bear the Roman name Agrippa simply in order indefatigably to seek his fortune by clever adulation of Roman magnates; and the noble faithfulness of his extremely energetic wife Cyprus, another grandchild of Herod and the Asmonean Mariamme by Salampsio,³ the daughter of the latter, rescued him from many of the worst consequences of his levity in pecuniary matters; and he was much indebted during his boyhood in Rome to the love of his mother Berenice.

Born about the year 10 B.C., and, when he had come to Rome, a playmate of Drusus, the son of Tiberius, he likewise early won through his mother the regard of Antonia, the wife of the elder Drusus and mother of the subsequent emperor Claudius, an advantage which was destined to be of great value to him his life through. After his mother's death he got deep into debt, and was, moreover, as one who had been a friend of Tiberius's deceased son Drusus, no longer a *persona grata* at court. He accordingly retired to his hereditary castle Malatha, in Idumea,⁴ in great dejection, and, indeed, meditating suicide. His wife Cyprus came to his rescue by writing an urgent and

¹ Tigranes and Alexander's son Tigranes are met with as Roman vassal-kings of Armenia under Tiberius and Nero, and Alexander, a son of this second Tigranes, marries Jotape the daughter of Antiochus, king of Commagene, and receives from Vespasian a small piece of Cilicia, see Tac. *Ann.* ii. 3, vi. 40, xiv. 26, xv. i., *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 5. 4. But it is true that Moses of Chorene does not count Armenian kings of this kind that had been forced on the people.

² We may probably confidently infer from their names and other indications, that Herod, and not Agrippa, was the eldest.

³ The name, probably simply a Greek

form of שְׁלֶמֶת another vocalisation of שְׁלֵמִית, see vol. iii. p. 204. *Cyprus* (taken from the beautiful flower [כַּפְרִי, *κύπρος*, A. V. 'camphire'] of Cant. i. 14), was often repeated in this family after the first mother had borne it, vol. v. p. 397.

⁴ The name appears to be identical with Mōlada, a southern border town in the direction of Idumea, which is mentioned as late as Neh. xi. 26, as inhabited by Judeans, but could nevertheless be connected with Idumea at a later period. Robinson supposes that he has re-discovered it in the present place *el Milh*, see *Bib. Res.* ii. 201.

successful request for help to the Herodias who had just become the wife of the tetrarch Antipas.¹ With the aid of public support he could now live in the city of Tiberias, on the Lake of Galilee, which was then newly built and rapidly flourishing, and received in addition the office of a principal inspector of the markets (*agoranomos*) in that city. But he did not find life there endurable long, and fled, in consequence of a dispute at a banquet with his benefactor, into Syria, where one of his Roman acquaintances, Flaccus, had just been made governor.² He found his brother Aristobulus, who had married Jotape—a daughter of Sampsigeramus, king of the Syrian town Emessa, on the north of Palestine—already staying with Flaccus, however; and it was precisely with this brother that he had long been on bad terms (see below). There was therefore no possibility, with his habitual levity, of a long stay there either. On the occasion of a dispute between the Sidonians and Damascenes about their frontiers having to be decided by Flaccus as arbitrator, Agrippa was imprudent enough to suffer himself to be bribed by the Damascenes to speak to Flaccus for them and against their opponents. For this he was complained of to Flaccus by his brother Aristobulus, and having been dismissed by Flaccus once more came into great difficulties. In his straits he resolved nevertheless once more to go to Rome as his last refuge, but was unable even to pay his passage. His freedman, Marsyas, succeeded, it is true, in inducing a certain Peter at Ptolemais (Acco)—a freedman of his mother's, whom his mother had left as a legacy to Antonia, the wife of the elder Drusus, and who was thus under a double obligation to him—to advance him a respectable sum of money under hard conditions; but scarcely had he arrived at Antedon,³ where a ship was just ready to sail for Rome, when the Roman governor of the neighbouring city Jamnia, to whose jurisdiction this seaport belonged, caused him to be put under arrest upon the ship, because he owed 300,000 silverlings to the imperial treasury of Rome. For this small district belonged to the Empress as her property,⁴ and she administered it at

¹ Vol. vi. p. 77. There is likewise in all this further confirmation of the conclusion that the marriage of Antipas with Herodias and his difficulties with the Arab king Aretas, really occurred as early as the time supposed in the previous volume.

² This Flaccus, surnamed Pomponius, is quite a different man from the Egyptian governor whom we shall soon meet with,

and died, according to Tac. *Ann.* vi. 27, in the year 33 A.D.; it is known from Suet. *Tib.* ch. xlii. how closely connected he was with Tiberius.

³ See vol. v. p. 431.

⁴ See vol. vi. p. 71. Just as the Sultanness-Válideh of Constantinople, in our time still possesses certain districts of the empire, which are administered expressly for her.—It may be remarked further, that

her own cost; and Agrippa might be largely in Antonia's debt, as the heiress of Berenice, from the time of his residence in Rome. But the same night he got away secretly and went to Alexandria, and tried to borrow there a large sum of money from Alexander the Alabarch.¹ Alexander lent it to him, not at his own but at his faithful wife's request, and under humiliating conditions. Whereupon he took ship for Puteoli, and his wife and her children returned to Palestine.

But scarcely had he sent from Puteoli his request to Tiberius for a hearing, and been most graciously received by him on the island of Capreae, when the Emperor learnt by a letter from Herennius Capito,² the Roman governor of Jamnia, the more exact nature of the circumstances and history of this princely vagrant, and forbade him access. Not until Antonia had promised to answer for him and his debts did Tiberius receive him into favour again, and introduced him to his great nephew, Caius Caligula, with the permission to accompany him on all his excursions. And now Thallus, a rich Samaritan freedman of the Emperor's,³ freely granted to him loans from his treasures, so that he was able to bring whatever expressions of homage he desired to the presumptive successor of the aged Emperor. He was now quite in his element, flattered the young Imperial heir most skilfully, and often called for him with his carriage. The members of the Cæsarean family were not favourably situated, inasmuch as they could not have intercourse on equal terms with independent princes, and therefore they sought the more to associate with dependent princes, by whom they could consequently be the more easily taken advantage of. However, on one occasion, when the Judean prince was dining alone with Caligula, he flattered him too publicly, and went so far as to express the wish that Tiberius might soon die, that Caligula might put his grandson Tiberius, still a child, out of the way, and enjoy with himself the government. Unfortunately his freedman and driver, Eutyclus, overheard this, and some time afterwards, when for other reasons he felt himself injured by Agrippa, he gave notice of his desire to accuse him before the Emperor of high treason. However, Tiberius had long before reached the period when he conducted all public business very languidly and found it difficult to attend to more than

Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 6. 3, 4, tacitly corrects the error he had committed, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 5, as if Agrippa went thus early to Rome to lay his complaint against Herod the Tetrarch.

¹ See *ante* 196.

² We shall meet him again in connection with another matter; so that the passages *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 6. 3, 4, and *Philo Contra Flaccum*, ch. xxx. mutually illustrate each other.

³ *Comp.* vol. vi. p. 82.

usually weighty matters. So for a time he simply ordered the accuser to be imprisoned, whilst Agrippa earnestly expressed the wish that he might only be heard. When at Antonia's instigation, Tiberius at length granted this hearing, he nevertheless commanded the frivolous prince, wholly contrary to his expectation, to be again put under arrest.¹ At this sad change of his fortunes, a slave of Caligula's, named Thaumastus, commended himself so much to the unfortunate man, that he subsequently made him his closest confidant, and even at his death his faithfulness was continued.

He was then confined six months in prison, the severity of which was sensibly relieved by the maternal friendship of Antonia alone, until the death of Tiberius in the year 37 A.D. On his accession, Caligula felt that he was the more bound to show his gratitude to his lively friend who had on his account so severely suffered the displeasure of Tiberius; he released him, as soon as decency allowed, from his prison, and granted him the tetrarchy of Philip,² which had been vacant about three years. Agrippa liked to relate afterwards, that the Emperor presented him at the same time with a golden chain of equal weight with the iron one which he had been wearing, and he subsequently caused it to be suspended at the entrance of the Temple in Jerusalem as a votive offering.³ As Pontius Pilate came to Rome about the same time⁴ to defend himself before Tiberius, Caligula, under the express disapproval of Pilate, despatched Marullus,⁵ otherwise unknown to us, as the new Governor to the Palestinian province. Agrippa himself, whose elevation to the tetrarchy was not readily credited in Palestine, did not receive permission from Caligula to leave Rome and to visit his principality until a year later. On the advice of Caligula he travelled by way of Alexandria, where a few years before, as we have seen, he played such a miserable part as a moneyless fugitive. On this occasion he determined not to stay long in that city; but as he appeared with an imposing bodyguard, which he had hired in Rome, he was on that account publicly

¹ Josephus. *Ant.* xviii. 6. 5 sq., relates in this place many particulars which have no significance whatever for the higher bearings of the history; in fact, he tells the story of Agrippa's life generally with great minuteness just at those points where it touches the history of Rome, because Agrippa was subsequently so memorable as the last Judean king, and probably still more because he wrote his book particularly for Roman and Greek

readers, who, as he might suppose, would take greatest interest in these passages of his long book particularly.

² See vol. vi. p. 72.

³ Gold chains in the Temple are also referred to in the Talmud *M. מְדוּת*, iii. 8, but their donor is not mentioned.

⁴ See vol. vi. p. 70.

⁵ He is met with only in *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 6. 10. He is not the same man as *Marcellus*, vol. vi. p. 70.

ridiculed by a great part of the heathen population; in such a refined way, however, that the Roman magistracy was compelled to let it pass in the great city, inasmuch as just at that time (as we shall see at length below) an exceedingly dangerous animosity had broken out between the heathen and the Judean population.¹

As Tetrarch, Agrippa now raised his new capital Cæsarea, to which was usually added the surname Philippi, by some kind of temple which he founded in it and by Imperial privileges, to the rank of an asylum,² as if he meant it to rival even Jerusalem. But in general, like all the Herods, he observed the principle of advocating Judean customs and usages as against the heathen, and also, as far as it was very well admissible, as against the Roman administration, and of playing in the great world the part of the protector of his race with superior airs. He supposed he should reap an advantage in his government, and most likely was not deceived in that respect; and was able, by thus considering the heads of the Hagiocracy, to permit himself other indulgences with impunity. He soon found (as we shall see below) opportunities of showing himself both a zealous and a successful protector of his co-religionists, and of making himself, as an instrument in their hands, popular with the heads of the Hagiocracy. But he did not forget at the same time in all his public transactions to think of himself, even at the cost of his princely relatives, not excepting those even who had previously out of compassion helped him.

No one, for instance, was more surprised at the sudden promotion of the former swindler, or more wounded in her self-love, than his own intriguing sister, Herodias, now the wife of Antipas, the Tetrarch of Galilee, of whom we have spoken before.³ She had, as we saw,⁴ only a few years previously assisted Agrippa; now she saw the ungrateful man even honoured above her own husband; for Caligula had conferred on his bosom friend the royal title likewise, and thereby certain privileges to which a mere Tetrarch could lay no claim. She accordingly endeavoured to persuade Antipas, her husband at

¹ Josephus passes over this entire episode at Alexandria, although at other times he likes to bring together in this connection as many stories as he can. Philo, however, who refers to it at length (*Contra Flaccum*, ch. v. sq., ii. p. 520-22), maintains unjustly that the Roman governor in Alexandria ought to have punished such harmless expressions of popular ridicule, or in any case to have put them down. In derision the people

called the straw effigy, which was made to represent Agrippa, by the Syrian name *Mâri*, i. e., *Monsieur*, a sign that the Aramaic word, which was frequently used in Palestine, was well known in Egypt also.

² *Καίσαρεια ἄστυλος* on the coin in Eckhel's *Doct. num. vet.* i. 3, p. 491.

³ Vol. vi. pp. 77 sq.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 238.

the time, to make a journey with her to Rome, to obtain there at least the same honour. Antipas was already advanced in years, was of a timid and cautious nature, loved comfort above all things, and therefore withstood her urgency for a long time, but at last submitted to her persuasions. No sooner had Agrippa been apprised of their departure for Rome than he forthwith projected the boldest counter-scheme; and inasmuch as, in addition to his freedom from all scruples, he likewise knew better than his opponents the field where his laurels were to be gathered, he was almost certain to be successful in all his designs. For the time, he prudently remained at home, but despatched his Roman freedman, Fortunatus, to Caligula, with presents and a written accusation against Antipas. In this accusation he charged Antipas with having in the past conspired with Sejanus, who had then been put to death some years (namely, in the year 31 A.D.), against the Emperor Tiberius, and at the time with a conspiracy with the Parthian king Artabanus, for which object, he said, he had arms in his armories for 70,000 hoplites. By accident the princely pair from Galilee were granted audience of Caligula on the same day on which this document of Agrippa's was handed to him. When, therefore, Antipas answered in the affirmative the Emperor's question, whether he was in the possession of so many arms, Caligula at once deposed him without regarding his munificent presents, banished him to Lugdunum in Gaul, and conferred on Agrippa his tetrarchy likewise. On learning that Herodias was a sister of Agrippa's, he desired at least to leave her in possession of her private property; but when she declared that she would not be separated from her husband, he banished her also to Gaul.¹ Such was the mournful, though in itself not wholly undeserved, end of the magnificence of this princely pair.² We shall soon see how Agrippa's Roman good fortune,

¹ Josephus. *Ant.* xviii. 7, tacitly corrects many particulars given by him in his *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 5; comp. also Philo *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xli. (ii. p. 593), whence it likewise appears that Antipas was at the latest banished towards the middle or the end of the year 39 A.D. Coins of his are known with the forty-third year of his reign and with the inscription ΠΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩ (Eckhel, *Doctr. num.* vet. I. 3, pp. 486 sq.), both of these points in the inscription are important—the year, inasmuch as it must supply the date of the last year of his reign, and the unusual dedication to the Cæsar, inasmuch as it shows what adulation towards Rome he then regarded as suited to his situation;

his earlier coins do not as yet exhibit this adulation, but those of his brother Philip, who was then dead, do, because Philip generally flattered the Judeans less (see vol. vi. p. 72). The year of his reign serves likewise as a proof that the death of Herod the Great really occurred four years before the commencement of our era, according to the ordinary chronology, and thus supports the other proofs of the actual year of Christ's birth given in the previous volume, vi. pp. 149 sq.

² A later legend, which is ascribed to Clement, about Antipas's death, has been preserved in Malalas's *Chronograph.* (Bonn), pp. 239 sq.

on the other hand, continued to rise higher still. The Romans, however, loudly complained about this time that Agrippa and the Syrian Antiochus of Commagene,¹ who were both often staying with Caligula, were the true instructors of Caligula in the vices of tyrannical government.²

Caius Caligula's infatuated conduct towards Jerusalem.

It will be subsequently recorded how this capricious turn of Roman favour continued for a considerable time to smile upon Agrippa and the last of the Herods in very various ways. Previously, however, there arose most unexpectedly from the same quarter, which seemed to smile so graciously upon the later Herods, a black storm threatening their holy city and the whole nation, and a storm which suddenly brings new life into the history of the people also, and threatens most alarmingly to put an end to the tranquillity, the extended wings of which appeared at that time to be about to stretch permanently over this nation. It was the puerile follies of Caligula which gave rise to this storm, and therefore, as it seemed, only another freak of the same accidental fortune which at this time comes from abroad and to a certain extent dominates the history of the people. But this unfavourable mood of fortune had after all its far deeper occasion in the character of the nation at the time. There was in it incontestably something so singular, or even defiantly provoking, that it might well give rise to an outburst of a Cæsar's capricious wrath; and if such mad follies as the young Caligula, who had been spoiled beforehand, committed soon after his accession to the throne of the world, against other nations no less than against the incomprehensible Judeans, came into collision with the self-possessed and calm attitudes which this nation now assumed,³ the issue of the collision was not difficult to foresee.⁴ We have now ample knowledge of the nature and history of these follies; indeed, few events are so well known to us by means of immediate and complete records as these, in which the nation of the ancient true religion won as it were its last unspotted victories on the earth.⁵

¹ This king also was at that time young, and after the death of his father of the same name (Tac. *Ann.* ii. 42, Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2. 5) stayed in Rome.

² Dio Cass. lix. 24.

³ See *ante*, pp. 192 sq.

⁴ We need only compare the almost

involuntary judgment which Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xlvi. (see below) passed immediately after his audience of Caligula.

⁵ In addition to the account Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 8. 2-9, which corrects in many particulars that in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10, we have the much more extensive one in Philo's

It was almost a necessity that Roman Cæsarism should, in consequence of its origin and its position towards the world, produce such monsters as Caligula and Nero. For after all restraints of law had been broken down, as it seemed, for ever by it, where were the limits of this purely military power, which had become a law unto itself, to be drawn? How a Caligula, or an Antoninus, would determine to rule, was purely accidental, and the difference simply this, that the first could suppose that he might with full impunity pluck the sweet fruits of this Roman *monarchia*. In this particular Judean case the action of Caligula may be half-excused in comparison with other instances of arbitrary folly. When he had been raised by general acknowledgment, and as it might seem by law, to the summit of all power, and looked around him through all the countries under his dominion, it necessarily surprised him to see in Judea only no statue of his Imperial Majesty set up; and he had long before heard enough of the idiosyncrasies and proud claims of this nation. But Agrippa had always shown him the most submissive homage, and as a reward for it had been crowned by him; must not Agrippa appear to him as the representative of all Judeans, so that he might suppose that they also, when more severely warned, would be equally obedient to him?

However, we know that a particular event was the immediate occasion of the actual outbreak of this emperor's mad demand.¹ To the ancient Philistinian town of Jamnia (Jabne), where a special Roman governor resided,² increasing numbers of Judean settlers had resorted, particularly after the whole of Philistia had been subjugated by the Judeans³; and the town was now accordingly regarded as half-heathen and half-Judean. Towns of this kind with such mixed populations always supplied abundant occasions in the Holy Land for serious quarrels, even from numerous cases of doubtful law; the Judean population sought to have everything decided in accordance with the laws of their own religion, but the heathen population resisted such presumptuous arrogance as soon as ever the government was, as in the present case, itself heathen. When under Caligula's

Legatio ad Caium, ch. xxxi.-xlii. (ii. pp. 577-96); and undoubtedly the one account may always be advantageously used to complete the other. But in general Philo's report is more ornate and rhetorical, and is based much less upon accurate historical inquiry. Both reports insert long speeches and documents, especially Philo's, but a comparison of the two sets of pieces

together, shows that at least most of them are free creations of rhetorical art. In Josephus most of what he gives is of more historical character.

¹ We learn this from Philo's *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xxx. (ii. p. 575).

² See *ante*, p. 238.

³ Vol. v. pp. 391 sq.

reign therefore the report soon spread through the world, that this young Emperor liked to have divine honours shown by the erection of public statues to him, the heathen part of the population of Jamnia determined, in defiance of the Judean portion, to erect a statue of this kind, and hurried the matter forward so greatly that they put up a somewhat worthless one. Having seen their religious convictions thus violated, the Judean inhabitants destroyed this statue; but Herennius Capito, the Roman governor, the same man who had an old grudge against Agrippa¹ and disliked the Judeans, sent a report on the matter to the Emperor in Rome. Caligula felt that his honour had been so greatly insulted that he resolved to take bitter revenge on the Judeans generally, and immediately thought of nothing less than their famous Temple at Jerusalem as the object on which to display it, craftily calculating that if he conquered their stubbornness there, they would be sure not to refuse to pay him divine honours elsewhere. An Egyptian named Helicon and a certain Apelles from the ancient Philistine city of Ascalon, who were then in great favour at Caligula's court, were his daily advisers in this matter; and the contemporaneous troubles between the Egyptians and the Judeans, to be soon described, added fuel to the fire.

Caligula accordingly instructed his Syrian governor, Publius Petronius, whom he had sent thither in place of Vitellius,² to place his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem; and it was said that the Emperor authorised him, in case of resistance, to use even half the Eastern forces against the rebellious people. This was in the early spring of the year 40 A.D., about a year before Caligula's death.³ At that time the statues of an emperor were universally objects of divine honour; accordingly the Community of the true religion, apart from the excessive dread of every image which had long prevailed, could not in any case sanction the erection of one in its sanctuary.⁴ This was known in Syria; and the recollection of the similar purpose of Antiochus Epiphanes, with its ill success,⁵ was vividly preserved there. The cautious Petronius had from the very beginning no proper desire to make himself the executor of

¹ *Ante*, p. 239.

² See vol. vi. pp. 79 sq.

³ We get this date from a consideration of the points indicated by Philo in his *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxviii. sq. (ii. pp. 572 sq.), and a comparison of all the other notes of time with them.

⁴ Popular wit, particularly in Egypt,

and in conformity with Egyptian notions, said therefore that the Temple at Jerusalem was intended by the Romans now to be called *Ἰδὸς ἐπιφανοῦς νέου Γαίου*, Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, capp. xxix., xlii. (ii pp. 573, 596.)

⁵ See vol. v. pp. 293 sq.

this imperial command; but the Roman provincial council, before which he laid the matter for consultation,¹ was of opinion that the commands of the Emperor might not be opposed.

Accordingly, without any great haste, Petronius began to carry out his instructions; artists from Sidon were to prepare the statue, which itself took a considerable time. He then gradually advanced with a great army towards Ptolemais, to the extreme south of the Phœnician frontier, and made an appointment with many of the Judeans of position to meet him, that he might prepare them for what was about inevitably to happen. But whilst he was still in treaty with them, one morning he found himself almost unexpectedly surrounded by an immense array of suppliant Judeans, who hastened hither, as if in response to an understood signal, from Jerusalem and all parts of the country. They planted themselves before him in due order, and in far-extending multitudes, of both sexes and all ages, quite unarmed, and, indeed, with their arms behind them, like victims hunted to death supplicating protection. But they had not come to entreat for their lives; they were prepared to surrender them; they entreated for the preservation of the unspotted purity of their sanctuary; and when Petronius represented to them that it did not depend on his will at all but on that of the Emperor, they begged permission to send a deputation to Rome to the Emperor himself, with the request that he would recall his command. Such earnest persistence, combined with so much calm self-possession and moderation, made the deepest impression upon all the Romans present, and particularly upon Petronius himself. Still he did not at once make known any final decision; but on the contrary, with his Roman retinue, departed through the midst of Galilee for Tiberias, which had already become the capital of that province. The state of affairs was thereby rendered very serious, and in addition to the Roman legions with their appendages, many bands of the neighbouring allies already waited for the moment when they might vent their petty wrath upon the arrogant Judeans. But similar hosts of suppliants now hastened to Tiberias also, incessantly besieging with their prayers the powerful Roman whose nod could bring instant death into unprotected ranks, as, indeed, had actually happened formerly on a like occasion.² He found himself

¹ The *σύνεδροι*, or *φίλοι*, of a governor, called also *ἡγέμονες*, whom he could consult without being bound to adopt their advice; they are not infrequently mentioned, Philo ii. pp. 582 sq., *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 16,

1, *Ant.* xx. 5. 4. Τὸ συμβούλιον, Acts xxv. 12, the *præpositi et procuratores provinciæ*, Suet. *Galb.* ix., xii., Tacit. *Hist.* iv. 50.

² See vol. v. pp. 410 sq.

already forty days thus besieged; but no delay and dallying of the Roman exhausted the patience of the supplicants; even the most essential labours of husbandry (for it was already the late autumn, and therefore the seed time of the year 40) suffered seriously under this general disturbance, and in consequence a famine threatened to intensify the despair of the extremely distressed people.

At this dangerous stage of the collision of Judean and Roman stubborn self-will we may once more perceive the pitiable moral character of King Agrippa, who, when the conflict had already raged at least six months, still delayed to interfere, although it concerned him as a Judean, and an intelligent and at the same time decided word from him to Caligula at the right moment might have averted much misery. But this man of the world, who was dependent on the favour of Imperial Rome, probably foresaw from his interference in the matter nothing but danger to his worldly prosperity. It deserves all the more acknowledgment that his brother Aristobulus, with whom he was on unfriendly terms,¹ who was, however, evidently a sincere and generally a better man than Agrippa, now interested himself actively in the matter at this complicated stage, and contributed in no small degree to its successful settlement. Other members of the Herodian family seconded his efforts, particularly a certain Alexas (that is, Alexander, a Greek form of the ancient Hebrew name Helqia), son of Alexas, the friend of Herod and husband of his sister Salome,² who had married Cyprus, the daughter of his elder brother Antipater, and was at that time advanced in life but highly respected.³ Other men of great repute amongst the people likewise dared to make, in conjunction with Alexas, another attempt. Petronius was once more most urgently entreated to consent to represent the matter to the Emperor in a full report, and to seek to procure the withdrawal of the Imperial command, and meanwhile not to proceed further

¹ See *ante*, p. 238.

² See vol. v. p. 445.

³ The above is the most probable account of this *elder Alexas*, Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 8. 6, compared with xviii. 5. 4; this Alexas was then called *the elder* (*ὁ μέγας*) probably only because he was much older than a Herod, who was likewise then living, viz. Alexander, son of Salamption, the daughter of Herod (*ante*, p. 237). But in Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 4, there is great confusion in the reference to this Alexas (Helqia), which hardly admits of any other solution than

supposing that after the death of this *elder Alexas* Antipater, the elder brother of the younger Alexander above mentioned, married the widow Cyprus, and that their child again received the name Cyprus. Only on this supposition does the subsequent language concerning the two childless brothers of this Antipater become intelligible; and, inasmuch as the name Antipater has just been mentioned in another connection, the copyists could easily fall into this serious error.

until a final decision should arrive from Rome. Petronius now really yielded so far that he, with his Roman council, promised to report once more to the Emperor upon the whole matter. He announced this formally to the assembled people, at the same time commanding them to go quietly home and to attend to the affairs which had already been too greatly neglected; and a heavy downpour of rain, which took place after a long drought just at the close of the Syrian governor's address to the people, seemed to them, in conformity with their ancient faith, the most auspicious foretoken of the success of his intercession with the Emperor for them.

If Agrippa learnt at this point that matters had already progressed thus far, it is easy to understand why he should now consider it the opportunity for him to hasten to Rome to Caligula, in order if possible to do something now in favour of the national cause, and then in any case to get for himself the greatest advantage from it. Our two chief sources of information agree in stating that he also was at last occupied with the matter, and that it ended by the Romans yielding everything, but in details the two sources differ considerably from each other.

According to Philo, Petronius, with the concurrence of his council, had, without making complaint against the Judeans, simply reported to Caligula the reason why the statue had not yet been set up and could not well be set up immediately: namely, that it was not yet finished, and that the Judeans when once provoked and exasperated might destroy all the approaching harvest of the year, which would be the more serious as the Emperor himself proposed to visit those districts soon, and in that case a great scarcity might arise through the concourse of vast numbers of people. But Petronius could have written thus to Caligula at latest only in the spring of the year 40, about the time when he was at Ptolemais. Philo pays no regard to these chronological and geographical points in his account.—At that time, Philo's account proceeds, Caligula, from prudential motives, restrained his indignation against Petronius, and simply commanded him to set up the statue in any case after the harvest. But soon after this, King Agrippa came to Rome and found his Emperor most unexpectedly in an angry mood; and when Agrippa heard him at last begin to speak of the obdurate rebelliousness of his own fellow-countrymen, he was seized with a violent fainting fit. He was carried from the Emperor's palace to his own residence, but did not recover his consciousness until late the next day, and then imme-

diately prepared and sent to the Emperor a very elaborate and eloquent petition on behalf of the Judeans. We find no difficulty in believing that on this occasion Agrippa was most profoundly affected by the first ungracious glance of his Imperial master, and, perhaps, he may subsequently, after the Emperor's death, himself have published the elaborate memorial to Caligula which Philo introduces at this point,¹ if we are not to suppose that Philo composed it entirely himself. The issue, according to Philo, was that Caligula for the time yielded to Agrippa's representations, and wrote to Petronius that he need not set up the Sidonian statue in the Temple, but that he should not hinder anyone in the district of Judea from dedicating such sacred statues if he desired to do so; but at the same time Caligula intended to have a golden colossal statue prepared in Rome which he could take with him on his Egyptian expedition,² and after all suddenly set up in the Temple at Jerusalem. But it is quite plain that these are only various national legends, which may have circulated in Alexandria with regard to the issue, and which can have for us no historical value.—According to Josephus, on the other hand, Agrippa resorted in this case also to his usual expedients. He had long known the best way of influencing Caligula. Accordingly he prepared for him in Rome an extremely sumptuous banquet, and took care that none of the basest forms of adulation should remain unused. When at this banquet Caligula was in his happiest mood and called upon Agrippa to ask from him a favour, the king with the greatest caution made known his most modest request that the Emperor would graciously allow the statue not to be erected, a request which could not in the circumstances be well refused. But, Josephus proceeds, just when Caligula had issued accordingly his favourable instructions to Petronius, the report of Petronius himself arrived announcing the dangerous rebellion of the Judeans. Thereupon, resolved to finally subdue the defiance of the Judeans, and suspecting Petronius of having been bribed by them, the Emperor returned such an angry reply to the governor that, according to the code of honour prevailing at the time amongst Roman magnates, there was nothing left for Petronius but to commit suicide. But, fortunately for Petronius, this letter was delayed

¹ *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxxvi.—xli. (ii. pp. 586-94), the only piece in Philo's account which resembles an original document, of which therefore we may make the above conjectures, since Agrippa was the man to subsequently boast of his heroic act.

² According to Suetonius also, *Caligula*, ch. xlix., Caligula all along intended in the last year of his life to go to Alexandria, and the same thing may be inferred from *Jos. Ant.* xix. 1. 12.

so long by accidents on the sea that winter, that the report of Caligula's murder, in January 41, reached him before it, and his life was thus saved. An account which has the appearance generally of being much more credible than that of Philo.

The great result, however, is historically established; it was so great that even an Agrippa was determined to pluck the fruits of it for his own advantage. By the simple but irresistible power of its persistent entreaty¹ the nation had won a victory of a kind that could not be surpassed, had made the mind of a young Emperor yield, and moreover an Emperor who was the most selfish and mad tyrant conceivable, and had before all the world defied the Roman omnipotence while it was still in unbroken force. And it was the fact that the nation had won this victory, not for its material advantage and its national prejudices, but purely for a spiritual possession and for the honour of that religion under the influence of which it lived as no other nation had done, which first encircled its brow with a wreath of most radiant glory and elevated its spiritual self-consciousness higher than anything that it had done or suffered for a long time past.

His similar Treatment of the Judeans in Alexandria.

Whilst national feeling and confidence amongst the members of the ancient true religion in the Holy Land itself increased with wholly new vigour, as thus promoted by the follies of Caligula, very similar infatuations of this ruler tended to produce the same effect amongst the Judeans of Alexandria. For, although the occasion of contentions between Romans and Judeans was in Alexandria at first quite a different one, the contentions themselves nearly coincided in point of time with those above described, concerned some of the most important questions, and in the end came to a very similar issue.

Large as the number was of the Judeans who had then long lived dispersed through all countries beyond Palestine, nowhere else did so many reside as in Egypt and particularly Alexandria. Philo estimates their number in Egypt at this period as a million,

¹ Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 9, with his laconic words *arma potius sumere*, maintains more than the facts justify, and probably is simply confounding the Judeans of Palestine with those of Alexandria.—A recollection of the great significance of this result has been preserved in the *M'gillath Taanith*, described vol. v. p. 381, according to which the 22nd Shebat, i.e.

Feb., was to be kept as a day of rejoicing, because on it 'the work (of art—statue) rested, which the enemy determined to bring into the Temple,' as Derenbourg, in his *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine*, i. p. 207, correctly explains the words. On February 22nd, therefore, the first report of the death of Caligula would have reached Jerusalem.

and describes how they inhabited mainly two of the five parts of the city of Alexandria.¹ Although in former times in Alexandria, as everywhere else, all kinds of dangerous contentions often broke out between these Hellenists and the heathen, the causes of which were referred to in a former volume of this work,² during the sixty years and more of the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius tranquillity had always been maintained even on this most dangerous soil; at least generally,³ for neither at that time were small disagreements absent. The Egyptians, no less than the Judeans, boasted of the most ancient culture, and were at that time not less active than the latter in spreading their religion; their jealousy of the civil privileges of the Judeans had long ago been excited, and in Alexandria too much commercial envy and wealth, on the one hand, and on the other too much poverty confronted each other to leave any want of material for dangerous contentions and conflicts.⁴ Nevertheless, Avillius Flaccus,⁵ sent as governor to Alexandria by Tiberius five years before his death, had maintained tranquillity during the whole of that time, and during the first year of the reign of Caligula he still succeeded in preserving it. But in the course of that year the unlooked-for crimes of Caligula, who was at the beginning so universally greeted with admiration, divided the Roman world into two camps, just because everything in it then depended on the breath of the Cæsars. In Alexandria, also, the hostility of the two national parties, which had long been secretly fermenting, manifested itself in this open expression of feeling for or against Caligula;⁶ and the Egyptians

¹ Philo *In Flaccum*, capp. vi., viii. (ii. pp. 523, 525).

² Vol. iv.

³ When Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xlv. (ii. p. 597), asserts that tranquillity had not been disturbed for four hundred years, he means by that since the foundation of the city itself, though his language is of too rhetorical a nature.

⁴ Yet according to *Jos. Contra Ap.* ii. 5 *ad fin.*, it had not been unobserved that *Germanicus* on his journey in Egypt had not ordered any grants of corn to the Judeans in Alexandria, although from the time of the Ptolemies they had always had the superintendence of the mouth of the Nile (probably with the receipt of the customs). The passage exists only in a Latin translation, and even that is full of errors.

⁵ This is, there can hardly be any doubt, the same man who is called in the edict of Claudius, in *Jos. Ant.* xix. 5. 2, Ἀκύλας (*Aquila*) by a copyist's error: we

must write instead Ἀούλιος; for the name is elsewhere written also with one *l*.—Flaccus is also mentioned in inscriptions by the full name of A. Publius F., comp. Letronne's *Inscriptions d'Égypte* i. p. 88, and Lauth's *Les Zodiaques de Dendera*, pp. 73, sq.; and the name Ἀβίλιος is preserved subsequently in Alexandria in other connections (*Euseb. Ecc. Hist.* iii. 14, *Constit. Apost.* vii. 46, 1).

⁶ In this connection Philo's lengthy account, *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. x. (ii. pp. 555 sq.), of the arguments of those who continued to defend Caligula's action, is very instructive. But in general, both in his work *In Flaccum* and in this *Leg. ad Caium*, Philo is too much the rhetorician and party advocate to permit him to present a clear picture of the origin and basis of the Alexandrine contentions and sanguinary atrocities. We are necessitated to draw this picture for ourselves, as far as we can, from the various traces left, inasmuch as we have now no further

who heard of Caligula's mania for his own divine honour, and were quite disposed to pay such honour to anyone, assumed greater airs towards their Judean fellow-citizens, who, as they were aware, could not consent to take part in such dedications. At this juncture there occurred upon this electric soil the arrival of the newly made and ridiculous King Agrippa,¹ and the smouldering hostility to the Judeans flamed out in public derision. But the Judean community had already prepared a complaint to be laid before the Emperor against forwarding which the governor made difficulties, which, however, Agrippa forwarded in his own name.² All this was only fuel to the fire. Scarcely had Agrippa continued his journey into his new kingdom, when the heathen population of the city loudly demanded that the Judeans should place the Emperor's statue in their numerous synagogues. When the rulers of those synagogues refused to do this, the tumult against the detractors of the Imperial Majesty broke out with irrepressible fury, and, under cover of defending the honour and deity of the Emperor, images of the Cæsars and gods were taken by force into the synagogues; several of the latter were at the same time laid waste and destroyed, many Judeans were most barbarously handled, their houses and treasures plundered, the defenceless victims were hunted forth or even tortured and murdered, some were even burnt at the stake, and those who had fled from the city to the banks of the river were still pursued.³ This entire outbreak of long-repressed heathen popular fury appears to have been the work of a moment and to have surprised the governor himself so greatly that he lost all power of deliberation, though he probably felt that, as a Roman and an Imperial servant, he could not quite openly take the part of the detractors of the Imperial Majesty. When the first furious outbreak was over, it is true, the governor appears to have recollected that it was his duty to protect the safety and the rights of all subjects without distinction; but it is obvious that he was not quite equal to his position in such a time of commotion, and resorted to means which were little suited to repress the mischief. Yielding

accounts of it, beyond the brief words in *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 8. 1, which must be supplemented especially by those of the edict of Caligula xix. 5, 2.

¹ See *ante*, pp. 240 sq.

² That is, we cannot doubt that the visit of Agrippa to Alexandria, which is described in *Flaccum*, capp. v. vi. (see *ante*, pp. 240 sq.), is the same as that to which Philo only incidentally alludes, cap. xii.

(ii. p. 532), and in his *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxviii. (ii. p. 572), and yet plainly enough indicates.

³ We have here very briefly stated what may be found described at length, with endless verbosity and rhetorical art, in Philo, *In Flaccum*, capp. vii.-ix., and *Leg. ad Caium*, capp. xvii.-xx. (ii. pp. 524 sq., 562 sq.)

evidently too much to the cry of the victorious heathen multitude and his own heathen prejudices, he brought up thirty-eight of the rulers of the synagogues that were to be found, and charged them with being obstinate deniers of the divine majesty of the Emperor, and condemned them to the ignominious punishment of being beaten with rods, whereby he violated the privileges which had been granted to the Judeans in Egypt and maintained by previous kings and emperors; ¹ and this treatment was the more cruel inasmuch as it fell, as it appeared, by an intentional coincidence on the great public celebration of the birthday of Caligula at the beginning of September in the year 38.² After he had thus, as he supposed, satisfied the demands of the enraged heathen population and the injured majesty of his Emperor, Flaccus commanded the weapons of both parties which had been engaged in such fatal hostilities to be taken away; but whilst they were being taken away from the heathen it became really manifest, through the strict domiciliary visitation, that the Judeans possessed no arms at all, and, even after they had been subjected to terrible atrocities, had not procured any surreptitiously.³ So prevalent was the higher faith amongst the Judeans of that time in Egypt as well as in Palestine, that earthly weapons must rather be avoided in conflict with the dominant heathen; a fact which the heathen governor had not even so much as observed.

Flaccus was shortly afterwards recalled, just when the Judean community in Alexandria was keeping its Feast of Tabernacles; and he took ship for Rome at the beginning of the winter. The procuratorship with which Tiberius had entrusted him had long ago expired, but the complaint of the Egyptian Jews which Agrippa had forwarded and the unpleasant reports of popular tumults in Alexandria might contribute much to prejudice the Emperor against him; his recall came at all events with unexpected suddenness and in a most disagreeable form. In Rome he met Egyptians also who laid complaints against him. He was consequently banished by Caligula to the island Andros, in the Ægean Sea, and was soon afterwards executed at his command.⁴

As soon as this governor had been removed nothing prevented the Judean community in Alexandria from themselves laying their complaints regarding the wrongs they had suffered,

¹ See vol. v. pp. 242, 436 sq.

² According to Suet. *Calig.* cap. viii.

³ See further *In Flaccum*, capp. x. xi.

⁴ All this thus described by Philo in his book *In Flaccum*, capp. xiii.-xxi. (ii.

pp. 533 sq.), with too copious rhetoric.

and their request for a renewal of their ancient privileges before the Emperor in Rome itself, inasmuch as no special Imperial decision had been given in reply to the petition which they had sent through Agrippa. The community accordingly chose three of the best and most capable men from its members as its deputies. They carried with them an elaborate memorial to the Emperor, and had also been so selected that one of them, as a skilful and highly polished speaker, might act as their spokesman before the Emperor. This man was Philo, who is still so famous as the greatest Judean author of that time, of whom we have already spoken at length¹ as a model of the Hellenistic learning and philosophy of this period. He was well adapted, by his aristocratic birth, his love of his nation, and his high culture, for this position; and probably he understood Latin sufficiently well to enable him to rival in Rome the most clever speakers and advocates of his time. The deputation took ship in the mid-winter of the year 39, without fearing the tempestuous seas of that season of the year, sought an interview with the Emperor in Rome, and found him not fully prepared at the time to hear them; they were then sent after him into Campania, and finally obtained a hearing at one of the Emperor's country villas there. But when he at last granted the hearing, Caligula had already been strongly prejudiced against the Judeans by their enemies, who had only too cleverly touched his weak side by their complaints regarding the nation, which worshipped exclusively a God whose name it could not utter, and persistently refused all divine honours to the Emperor; and these enemies of the Judeans had further skilfully sought to make them ridiculous in the eyes of Caligula as a nation which refrained from eating pork. Philo mentions some of these enemies by name; but the head of the counter-deputation of the heathen Alexandrians, the learned Apion of whom we shall have to speak farther on as one of the most notable writers against the Judeans, he does not mention.² Moreover, Caligula was at the time very angry that no statue had yet been erected to him in Jerusalem.³ Philo describes, in almost humorous language, the course of the interview with the Emperor: he at once set upon the deputation with the most violent language, so that they were kept all the time in mortal terror, heard them without paying any attention to what they said, and, indeed, without the slightest dignity, vented his

¹ See *ante*, pp. 194 sq.

² Undoubtedly from literary consideration, Apion being still alive; but Jos.

Ant. xviii. S. 1, names him in this connection.

³ See *ante*, pp. 245 sq.

ridicule at their customs and religion, and dismissed them with a few words of pity at their stupidity.¹ It was not until the reign of the next Emperor, Claudius, that the just complaints of the Alexandrians and other Hellenists could find any remedy; for the time the Alabarch, as one of the deputation, was imprisoned, on which point we shall have to speak below.

But in this way reverence for the majesty of the emperors was most profoundly shaken amongst the Hellenists also; and the writings of Philo himself still show us plainly enough how boldly afterwards, under Claudius and Nero, the pride of the confessors of the ancient true religion asserted itself against all the 'enemies of the Judeans.' This author, who was at that time advanced in years,² and whom we may still regard as the wisest Hellenist of his time, wrote within the next ten or twenty years several books, really with the design of defending Judeanism, with all the weapons of rhetoric and learning, against its despisers and persecutors. However, it is only heathen whom he has before him as its opponents; he probably regarded himself as too old to take any notice of Christianity, which he most likely also deemed unworthy of his attention. So he wrote especially books against certain prominent Roman magnates, with the view of showing at the same time, from the history of their fall and ruin, that hatred of the Judeans continued to be always bitterly punished in this world. One of these books was against Sejanus, the powerful favourite of Tiberius Cæsar, who had probably zealously advocated the punishment of many Judeans in Rome.³ This book has perished.⁴ Another, which succeeded it, was written against Flaccus, and has come down to us. In the book against Caius Caligula, which has been preserved, he rises to a loftier height, and at the end of it announces a second, in which he undoubtedly described the Emperor's terrible overthrow in all its details, as a counter-sketch to the impious self-deification of this contemptuous enemy of the Judeans.⁵ Although we may

¹ All of which can be seen at length in Philo's *Leg. ad Caium*, capp. xxviii. xlv.-xlvii. (ii. pp. 572 sq., 597 sq.)

² It is true we do not know with sufficient exactness when Philo was born, but it appears quite plainly from his own remarks in his *Leg. ad Caium*, capp. i., xxviii., that at the time of the deputation he was already advanced in life. He was accordingly born probably some ten or twenty years before Christ, and survived Caligula probably some ten or twenty years at most.

³ See vol. vi., pp. 83 sq.

⁴ It is alluded to at the beginning of the book against Flaccus, ch. i., and again in the *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xxiv. (ii. p. 569).

⁵ The book was intended to be called *The Palinodia against Caius*, and was therefore to contain what the Judeans in return might, as it were, sing at his overthrow as their answer to his insults. According to Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 5. 1, five books of Philo's against Caius were, as a fact, counted amongst his works. The argu-

rejoice at the courage with which a Philo speaks, while still living under emperors of the family of Augustus, against such powerful Romans, it is nevertheless impossible to avoid seeing that these works but little meet the requirements of a religion based upon deeper foundations. While they aim at rhetorical ornament and artistic persuasion, in spite of some excellent principles, they are wanting in anything like a profound consciousness of the distinction between true and false religion, in any frank and undisguised utterances against the prevailing heathenism generally, and in superiority to the impressions of the moment and the acts of individual contemporaries. This philosopher, who endeavours to take a position of superiority to the world, and who preaches a religion of gentleness and love of enemies, is too sadly under the influence of hatred towards individuals, and looks at everything from such a prejudiced point of view that he is blind to the vices of his own nation; as if there were hidden under this smooth surface only too much misconception and suppressed wrath; and the worst thing is that most likely his philosophy itself is intended to conceal and adorn this misconception and wrath.

It is easy to imagine the effect which books of this kind would have upon those who admired not only their artistic features but also their subject-matter. And we have good reason for believing that Philo was not the only author belonging to the ancient Community at that time who thus laboured; we have already ¹ met with other writings of this period which breathe an entirely similar spirit, notwithstanding their outward dissimilarity and the very peculiar and painful experiences in which they originated.

It is true this nation's lofty calmness and noble reserve, which then won such glorious victories, were by no means so exclusively prevalent as appearances might lead us to suppose. After the rising of the Gaulonite ² too much profound animosity towards the Roman government had remained in the deepest recesses of national feeling to permit it easily to vanish through any accidental change of public affairs. There were undoubtedly all along many individuals who desired to bring the strained relations with the Roman rule to a sanguinary breach, and to whom the amicable issue of these threatening

ments which have led some recent scholars to conclude that the *Leg. ad Caium* was not written by Philo, are not valid. There are people who like to ascribe everything

which does not please them to Christians.

¹ Vol. v. 468 sq.

² See vol. vi. pp. 50 sq.

struggles was a very undesirable event; we shall soon meet with individuals of this kind. But, for the present, over-zealous spirits could not get their way, and an event now followed which was still more unfavourable to their aspirations, namely—

3. *Agrippa raised to the Throne of Herod the Great by Caligula.*

This was an unexpected event, which still further damped the enthusiasm of the over-zealous, and favoured far more the cautious attitude towards the Romans on the part of the dominant party, and, indeed, seemed once more, in these last Judean times, to be destined to fully bring back the former power and confidence of the best days of the nation. And yet this elevation to royal power of Agrippa, who was nothing more than fortune's favourite, was from the very first only a continuation of the same freak of Roman favour which had, contrary to all human expectations, nearly four years before raised him from his hopeless position.¹

For Agrippa, who we saw² was with Caligula in Rome at the beginning of the year 41, was still present there in January of that year also, when the Emperor was murdered by Charea Cassius and the other conspirators, and could then further stay close by the great wheel of fortune of that time at a juncture than which none could be more favourable for him. But nothing could be more characteristic of him than the part which he played during the two days of the interregnum which preceded the accession of Claudius.³ On the first report of the assassination of the Emperor he sought his body, that he might evince his grief, for which truly of all men in Rome he had most cause; but, in order in the first place to keep down the prevailing feeling of insecurity and uncertainty, immediately thereupon spread the notion amongst the Imperial guard that Caligula was still alive, and that he would fetch physicians for him. But as soon as he heard from those soldiers that they had carried off the silly Claudius and had determined

¹ See *ante*, pp. 240 sq.

² *Ante*, p. 249.

³ The detailed narrative of the events of this *biduum* (Suet. *Claud.*, cap. xi.) which Jos., *Ant.* xix. 1-4, supplies, is for us still extremely instructive, inasmuch as it is the only account of that kind, and serves especially to show how easy it would have been even then for the Germans, if they had been united, to overrun the entire Roman empire; but it has evidently been given by Josephus,

partly in order to supply his Greek and Roman readers with something worthy of being read from their own history, and partly because Agrippa plays a part in this connection of which he was compelled to speak (as he had already done more briefly, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11, 2-5); yet to Roman historians, on the contrary, the part which Agrippa played seemed so insignificant that Suetonius does not add a word about it; Cass. Dio, however, briefly mentions it, ix. 8.

to make him Emperor, he perceived at once, with his habitual astuteness, the part he had to play in the matter. For he had long flattered Claudius likewise and won his friendship. He accordingly made his way quickly to him just as the Senate had given their decision against him, and advised him in his hesitation to accept the choice of the soldiers, quite correctly calculating that the power of the military was supreme in Rome, even against the Senate. But scarcely had he returned to his house when he received from the Senate the summons to appear before it, the Senate knowing his influence with Claudius and having heard of his visit to him. He then actually made his appearance before the Senate, protested before it likewise his 'faithfulness unto death,' although intimating that the army was the great hindrance in the way of inducing Claudius to retire, and received from the Senate the commission to do his utmost for it with Claudius. Instead of doing that, he described to Claudius the distress of the Senate, and most strongly urged him to accept the election. Claudius very shortly afterwards actually took the decisive step by administering to the soldiers the oath of allegiance to himself, and Agrippa did not return to the Senate, but meanwhile, as he supposed the indignation of the soldiers would be too perilously directed against the Senate, went once more to Claudius to persuade him to restrain them, correctly perceiving that a wholly inconsiderate treatment of the Senate, when it had yielded sufficiently, might injure the cause of the Emperor.¹ So cunningly did this professedly Judean prince play his part between the Roman parties, all along meditating his own advantage alone, and bent on obtaining it, only with all possible precaution.

He soon obtained, too, the reward of his crafty services. For no sooner was Claudius fully established in his imperial dominion, than he most promptly bestowed on him whatever he could give and his donee could under any pretext expect. In addition to that part of his grandfather Herod the Great's dominions which he already possessed,² Claudius bestowed on him all the rest, and thereby brought back the two principalities of Judea and Samaria, by withdrawing the Roman governor from them, under the rule of the Herodean dynasty. He added further Abila, the capital of the former principality of Lysanias, together with the districts in the neighbourhood

¹ The account of these proceedings which Josephus gives in his *Antiquities* is more accurate than that in his *Jewish War*; but in the *Antiquities* also he regards the base double game which Agrippa played as admirable and excellent.

² *Ante*, p. 241.

of Lebanon belonging to it,¹ so that towards the north Agrippa's dominions extended further than those of his grandfather Herod the Great; and even the important city of Beyrout on the Mediterranean he regarded as belonging partly to his territory.² And as Claudius had a passion for everything of a formally ceremonious and antique nature, he condescended to confirm this donation to his good friend and supporter from Judea by an alliance with him, solemnly concluded on the *Forum Romanum* in accordance with ancient usages.³ He also deigned to give him a public commendation in the transactions of the Senate. Before, however, the new king hastened into his dominions, so unexpectedly enlarged, he took advantage of the moment of the Emperor's warm favour to promote the interests of his immediate relatives and his fellow-religionists, as far as this seemed to accord with his own personal designs.

Of his brothers he had long been on bad terms with the youngest, Aristobulus: but to the elder, Herod, who had married Mariamne, a daughter of Olympias, daughter of Herod the Great and of Josephus, a nephew of Herod the Great, he wished well as a man of similar principles to his own, kept him with him in Rome, and desired for him from the Emperor the donation of the small principality of Chalcis, near the northern Lebanon,⁴ with the title of king. This principality had previously belonged to another princely family, probably of Judean extraction,⁵ so that it could not seem unjust that it should now pass as vacant to a Judean of royal birth. To this Herod the Emperor granted also the customary pratorian, and to Agrippa the consular rank, and gave to both the permission to frequent the Senate and to speak Greek in its

¹ See vol. v. pp. 149 sq. Abilene was most likely only an inherited portion of the original Chalcis, vol. v. p. 404; comp. *Abilene of Decapolis* in the *Corpus Ins. Græc.* iii. p. 234. Josephus' statement, *Ant.* xix. 5, 1, of the contemporaneous donation of Commagena and part of Cilicia to the Antiochus above mentioned (p. 243) is unintelligible, but may be corrected by Cassius Dio. lx. 8, comp. lix. 8. Josephus makes special reference to this Antiochus, because he had been a long time with Agrippa in Rome (see *ante*, p. 243), and shared many of his adventures and because Agrippa at last betrothed one of his daughters to Antiochus son Epiphanes, *Ant.* xix. 9, 1.

² As may be inferred from *Jos., Ant.* xix. 7. 5; 8. 1, but comp. xx. 9. 4, see below.

³ This circumstance follows from the brief remark, *Jos., Ant.* xix. 5, 1, compared with the express statement of Suetonius, *Claud.*, cap. xxv., as to this passion of the Emperor's; and we know now that that event was immortalised by coins representing it. See Madden, *Hist. of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 109 sq. [2nd ed. (1881)] p. 136 sq.]

⁴ The situation of the principality has been recently re-discovered in the ruins of *Andschar*, it is supposed (Robinson's *Researches*, iii. pp. 497 sq.); but this is as yet only conjecture, inasmuch as the connection of the name with Chalcis in Greece would still be unexplained. Comp. *Vita Hieronymi*.

⁵ See vol. v. p. 404.

proceedings.¹ As Agrippa's old friend and former benefactor, the rich Alabarch of Alexandria, was still languishing in prison² in consequence of Caligula's follies, it cost Agrippa but a word to procure from Claudius his release; but he now betrothed his daughter Berenice to Mark, the son of this rich man, apparently living at the time in Rome; as, however, the young man died before the marriage was consummated, he then gave his daughter to his brother Herod, whose wife had died, leaving a young son Aristobulus.³

But in Alexandria the long repressed rage of the Judean population against the heathen, had in the meantime broken out into open revolt, immediately after the report of the murder of Caligula; indeed, the Judeans had then resorted to arms, against which Philo had always warned them.⁴ In these circumstances help from Rome was required quickly: but the two brand new Judean kings, who were still in Rome, succeeded in persuading the new Emperor to issue an edict very favourable to the Judeans of Alexandria, in which he afresh confirmed to them all their earlier privileges dating from the time of the Ptolemies, ascribed the cause of the contentions to the other inhabitants of Alexandria, and publicly commended the two Judean kings, while at the same time he strictly commanded both parties in Alexandria to lay down their arms. Anything more favourable for themselves the Judean community in Alexandria could not expect; and the precedent in the case of this important community must have a very favourable influence far and wide on the condition of Judean affairs in the Roman empire generally. But the two kings obtained from their imperial friend at the same time a similar edict addressed to all magistrates directly or indirectly dependent on Rome, in which they were directed to lend the Judeans everywhere the protection of the law, as far as their subjects endeavoured to live according to their national laws, and the governments were commanded to treat them in Greek cities in accordance with the same privileges which the community in Alexandria possessed; on the other hand, however, the Judeans on their part were admonished to show themselves worthy of this imperial

¹ Dio Cassius, ix. 8.

² See *ante*, p. 255.

³ This follows from the disconnected remarks of Jos. *Ant.* xix. 5, 1, compared with xviii. 5. 4. In the first passage Immanuel Bekker seeks to simplify the double name of the Alabarch, *Alexander Lysimachus*, by the erasure of *Lysimachus*, which he may very well have borne, ac-

ording to p. 196 *ante*, since it was at this period only an imitation of the Roman custom; but the textual arguments are hardly sufficient to justify the change. It is also incorrect when he seeks to connect *παρθένον λαβών* with *τελευτᾷ*, with which it is impossible, according to the context, to connect them.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 253.

favour by their compliant conduct, and not to treat with contempt the religion of other nations.¹ Undoubtedly the precedent of his ancestor Augustus, who had always confirmed the privileges generally enjoyed by the Judeans, contributed largely to the very favourable form which Claudius gave to these directions, as he himself intimates in both edicts; for Claudius liked in all cases to follow in the steps of his great grandsire, and undoubtedly the two kings did not neglect to remind him as emphatically as possible of the example of Augustus.—In Rome itself the Judeans had at this time, after the earlier restrictions,² greatly increased in numbers again, and Caligula appears to have had in his last days their expulsion in view; Claudius did not at first banish them, but prohibited all meetings of those who did not live according to the ancient customs,³ which plainly refers to the Christians, who were then an entirely new sect.

It is not difficult to imagine with what intentions the new Judean king, whom Claudius had supplied with the best recommendations to all the Roman magistracies for his journey, now made his entry into Jerusalem. He determined now, as immediately following Archelaus,⁴ to be the true successor of Herod the Great, as if the Roman interregnum had never existed; and the people liked to call him King Herod.⁵ And not only did the Herodians, previously described,⁶ soon revive with fresh zeal, but their best reply to infant Christianity was to declare and teach that Herod was himself the Christ foretold in the Old Testament.⁷ As he liked to adhere in general closely to the ancient national religion, after his entry into

¹ Both edicts, as given by Jos., *Ant.* xix. 5, 2, 3, show in every line the signs of genuineness and are the most important documents for our knowledge of the period. With regard to Ἀκύλας, mentioned in the edict to the Alexandrians, see *ante*, p. 251. The edict of the Syrian Governor, addressed to the heathen, *Ant.* xix. 6, 3, is written with extreme respect and caution: 'care must be taken that the Judean people do not, under the pretext of self-defence, assemble and undertake anything wildly extravagant.' What a very different tone is heard afterwards at the beginning of the great war under Nero, when the principle is expressed, that: 'against the Judeans nothing was impious (unallowable), *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10, 10. Such words and sentiments help us to realise most plainly the immense change which took place during the next twenty-two years.

² See vol. vi, pp. 83 sq.

³ Cassius Dio, lx. 6, where *οὐδ* must be inserted before *χρωμένους*, the words being otherwise meaningless.

⁴ See vol. v. p. 456. This follows from the remarks on Epiphan., *Her.* lxxviii. 10, which are at first sight so strange, namely, that he was the son of Archelaus and was in his twentieth year at the time of the Crucifixion, that is, in the twentieth year of his reign after the removal of Archelaus; the same thing is still more plainly stated in another passage, *Her.* xx. (i. pp. 48 sq.)

⁵ Acts xii. 1 sq.

⁶ Vol. vi, pp. 73 sq.

⁷ That is, the assertion in Tertullian, *Adv. omnes Her.* cap. 1, is, according to all indications, the product of these early times. The flatterers sought to derive their view from Gen. xlix. 10, as appears from Epiph., *Her.* xx. 1.

Jerusalem he presented first of all magnificent thank-offerings, and, in accordance with a popular custom of the age,¹ gave the necessary money for many Nazirites who had to bring their thank-offerings; the golden chain, equal in weight to his own prison fetters, with which the Emperor Caligula had once honoured him,² he likewise had suspended in the Sanctuary as a votive offering. Afterwards also he caused a daily sacrifice to be presented on his behalf.³ To the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who had given him such a good reception, and who now received many advantages from his constant residence amongst them, he remitted the house-tax, which had probably been first levied by the Romans.⁴ However, the force of circumstances compelled the man, who above all things sought his own pleasure and glory and was but little influenced by any higher and nobler ambition, really to rule in substantially the same way as his grandfather had done so many years, save that Agrippa, in conformity with the altered times, placed before him quite different aims from those of Herod the Great.

It is true he continued very jealously to take the side of the Judeans in all contentions between them and the heathen. Soon after his arrival a difficulty of this kind arose in Dora, a small flourishing maritime town in southern Galilee, which was, however, considered to belong to Phœnicia,⁵ and on that account remained immediately under Rome. The same commotion which, we have seen,⁶ arose in those days in so many towns with mixed populations, agitated this place in a similar way; and, as if in exuberant joy that, although so near to the Judean frontier, they still remained immediately under Rome, some heathen young men carried a statue of the Emperor into the synagogue of the Judeans, with the view of compelling them to worship it, an act by which the religious service of the Judeans was for the moment interrupted. Thereupon Agrippa, animated by the greatest zeal, hastened to the Syrian governor, Petronius, and defended the rights of the Judeans so cleverly that the governor at once issued an edict addressed to the chief men of Dora, containing a strong censure, in which he mentioned King Agrippa with praise and the recent decision of Claudius in favour of the Judeans of Alexandria, demanded the surrender of the guilty for punishment, and concluded with threatening words against any future transgression of the kind.

¹ See *Antiquities*, p. 87.

² See *ante*, p. 240.

³ *Jos. Ant.* xix. 6. 1; 7. 3.

⁴ *Jos. Ant.* xix. 6. 3.

⁵ *Comp.* vol. iv. p. 331, note 5. It may now be seen from the great Sidonian in-

scription that the town became Phœnician again as early as about the twelfth century, B.C., *comp. Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 142 sq.

⁶ *Ante*, p. 244, 250.

This was the same governor who sought only the year before to bring the statue of the Emperor even into the Temple at Jerusalem; ¹ but, not at all disconcerted on that account, he remarked parenthetically, that it would be ridiculous to seek to remind him, after the recent imperial edict, of his former orders. ²

But even in the purely arbitrary appointment of high-priests he followed only too closely in his grandfather's footsteps. No sooner had he established himself in Jerusalem than he deposed Theophilus (one of the sons of Annas, ³ who had likewise once been high-priest), evidently quite without cause, inasmuch as he intended subsequently to restore him; and he selected in his place Simon, surnamed Canthera, undoubtedly only because he was a son of Simon (the son of Boethus), who, as we have seen, ⁴ had married a daughter to Herod the Great. But as this grandson appears to have been very unworthy, he soon desired to restore the above-named son of Annas again, and, when Theophilus had declined the honour in courteous terms, was pleased, on his recommendation, to accept his brother Matthias; for whom after a time, however, he substituted a son of Canthera, named Elionæus, ⁵ who might seem, as a man related to his family, likely to be more compliant.

Josephus, who honours in Agrippa the memory of the last king, boasts, it is true, that he was far more humane and benevolent than his grandfather, and did not, like Herod the Great, think only of the heathen when he constructed his magnificent buildings. However, he was only too much like his grandfather in his immoderate passion for building, and for the pleasures of the heathen also he squandered immense treasures. In Beyrout, which was mostly inhabited by heathen, and which, as the great maritime commercial city, was undoubtedly of great importance for the inland, ⁶ he built particularly theatres, amphitheatres, baths and porticoes in the most magnificent style, when they were dedicated gave the most splendid feasts, and provided the finest theatrical performances, accompanied with music, in the theatres. While in this respect he imitated his good friend Caligula, he did not blush even to copy in this amphitheatre the most cruel things that he had

¹ See *ante*, pp. 246 sq.

² *Jos. Ant.* xix. 6, 3, where the edict of the Syrian Governor, which is undoubtedly genuine, is given in full.

³ See vol. vi. p. 64.

⁴ Vol. v. p. 441.

⁵ *Ant.* xix. 6, 2, 4; 8, 1. Eljônai is abbreviated from עֲלִיּוֹנָי, with regard

to which proper name, see *Lehrbuch d. Heb. Spr.* § 274 b.

⁶ We might even conjecture from *Jos., Ant.* xix. 7, 5; 8, 1, that this city belonged to his territory; but for other reasons this is not probable, and is expressly denied in the case of his son, xx. 9. 4.

seen performed in the presence of his Emperors in Rome. Seven hundred gladiators had to fight against seven hundred others in a pitched battle until every one was slain, said to have been all of them criminals who might otherwise have been condemned to die. By these and other princely pleasures and buildings, the man who was in his youth a prodigal¹ involved himself again in debt, although, according to all accounts, his income was extremely large.² We see that in this respect he was only one of the Cæsars of his age after his own fashion.

And with all this he was nevertheless astute enough to perceive, after all that he had seen in Rome with his own eyes, upon what weak foundations the immense Roman Empire then rested, and how soon wholly different times and masters of the world would in all probability arrive; in which case he would then certainly have left his Imperial benefactors in the lurch without any scruple. On his coins he called himself, like his brother Herod, Cæsar's Friend, and even Claudius's Friend,³ and Herod dedicated them even to Claudius; but public demonstrations of this kind were meant by these Herods to have significance simply for the world. It is, however, remarkable to see what enterprises of a more serious nature he had in his mind, but also with what cowardice he abandoned them on any earnest remonstrance from Rome. For the promotion of trade he resumed the plans of his grandfather; on that account attached great importance again to Cæsarea-by-the-

¹ See *ante*, pp. 237 sq.

² This fact is specially mentioned by Josephus in what is otherwise such a concise report, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11. 6; further comp. on this matter generally *Ant.* xix. 6. 3; 7. 3, 5; 8. 2 *ad fin.*; according to the last passage he had 12,000,000 drachmas annual income. Everything of a doubtful nature in this respect Josephus seeks to gloss over or to smother up; but it is well that he speaks of it much more at length in his *Ant.* than in the *Bell. Jud.*

³ Φιλοκαῖσαρ and Φιλοκλαύδιος, Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* i. 3, pp. 492 sq. Further, a coin is known of the town *Tiberias* with the head of Claudius, and the added clause ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἀγρίππα (in Eckhel, *ibid.*); this coin of Tiberias, therefore, having been struck as by an almost perfectly free city; and a similar one is found in Eckhel, p. 491, of ΚΑΙΣΑΡΕΙΑ ΑΣΤΑΟΣ; i.e., Cæsarea Philippi [see *ante*, p. 241], with the head of Caligula. [See Madden's *Jewish Coinage*, 2nd ed. p. 136.] On the other hand, the frequent coins of the years 5 (6) and η (8), with ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ, with an erect umbrella and three ears of

corn, which De Sauley, *Num. Jud.*, pp. 148 sq., and Cavedoni, with hesitation, in the *Biblische Numismatik*, part ii. (Hannover, 1856), pp. 35 sq., ascribe to this Agrippa, cannot be from him for the reason that he would have called himself distinctly Βασιλεὺς μέγας. Other coins with his name, see in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1862, p. 272, 1865, pp. 207–209. It appears also from a coin which Mionnet published first in his *Supplement*, viii. p. 364, then in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1862, p. 68, that Anthedor (see vol. iv. p. 431), which may now have more proudly borne its new name Agrippias, struck coins with the name of this *rex magnus*. [See on these coins of the years 6 and 8, Madden's 2nd ed. pp. 132 sq.]

[Since the author wrote the end of this note (1868) Le Bas and Waddington published in their *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines*, vol. iii. n. 2365, an interesting inscription, which was found at Se'a in the Hauran, giving the full title of the Agrippas I. and II. See Schürer, *Handbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* p. 297].

Sea, and had coins, with quite a heathen appearance, struck with its name.¹ Following the example of his grandfather, he beautified Jerusalem likewise and its surroundings.² Jerusalem, however, as the great metropolis of the Judeans of all countries and the goal of their pilgrimages, as well as the seat of their flourishing University, had greatly increased during the last eighty years of tranquillity, while in consequence of the nature of its site the extension had been made on its northern side only, and as early as this Roman period a *New City*, which stretched in an extended circle around the hill Bezetha, had grown up in that quarter. Before Agrippa's time this suburb had begun to be connected more closely with the ancient city by means of some walls; but being fully aware that the northern side of Jerusalem was the weakest in case of a siege, he immediately commenced there a magnificent line of wall, extended the circumference of the walls much further, and likewise raised considerably the height of those which he left standing. This is the third city wall, called also Agrippa's wall; and it was afterwards said, that if it had only been completed according to this king's plans, Jerusalem could never have been taken. But no sooner had he fully set to work in the erection of this wall, than the Syrian governor, Marsus, who had in the meantime succeeded Petronius, made a report to Claudius as to the dangerous nature of this undertaking, and a command from the Emperor at once put an end to all further circumvallation.³ Thus we find that what had once happened under the Persian rule at the rise of the new Jerusalem,⁴ was repeated again in this case; but in the present instance it was a Roman vassal with the name of a *rex magnus*, who at once yielded to the first word of a Claudius, in spite of all the power and splendour which he endeavoured to display.

This Marsus, moreover, as a vigilant Roman, kept from that time a close eye in other respects upon Agrippa's stealthy steps, the king having really only taken the place of a former Roman governor of Palestine, and remaining, therefore, officially subordinate to the Syrian governor in Imperial matters. In the third year of his reign in Jerusalem Agrippa brought about a meeting in the new city of Tiberias in Galilee,⁵ which had in

¹ See the figure on the coins in Madden, pp. 106 sq. [2nd ed. pp. 133 sq.] The figure of the woman holding a rudder points necessarily to this Cæsarea.

² The *Gardens of Agrippa*, by the south-eastern wall of Jerusalem, which are still mentioned in the *Third Book of Baruch* (for we may thus appropriately

call the Apocryphon published by Dillmann in his *Chrest. Ethiop.*), p. 3. 20; 4. 7, and elsewhere, are probably from him and not from Agrippa II.

³ *Jos., Bell. Jud.* ii. 11. 6, v. 4. 2; *Ant.* xix. 7. 2.

⁴ Vol. v. pp. 185 sq.

⁵ Vol. vi. p. 75.

the meantime grown very large, of all the Roman vassal-kings of the northern countries that were at all friends of his, ostensibly as an occasion for royal pleasures. As a fact, in addition to his brother Herod of Chalcis, four other kings met there, Antiochus of Commagene, the most powerful of them, Samsigeramus of Emesa,¹ Cotys of Armenia Minor, and Polemon, the last vassal-king of Pontus. The meeting of the crowned heads and their enjoyment of the festivities, however, had not lasted very long (and who knows what had been agreed upon in the exhilaration of the occasion in the event of the fall of Claudius at Rome, which was then not improbable), when Marsus suddenly caused himself to be announced. The Judean seeks to receive him with all respect about seven stadia from the city, but, not without a certain degree of arrogance, drives to meet him in his grand royal carriage with his royal guests, compared with whom the Roman makes his entry in mean equipment. The friends of Agrippa subsequently ascribed the disfavour of Rome to this offence;² but the Roman had undoubtedly stronger reasons for showing himself displeased, and at an intimation from him all these kings at once departed for their respective countries. It is easy to imagine how greatly Agrippa would thereby be depressed; and it will soon appear that this depression found its expression in quite different quarters.

As regards his good nature and magnanimity, which were so much lauded, it is true he was not, like his grandfather, of a perfidiously sullen temper, almost without exception, towards all who were subject to his rule: the disastrous lessons of the last forty years could not have been wholly thrown away upon all the Herods; moreover, he was by nature of a more frivolous temper, and was not much more than in the initiatory and tentative stage of his wider rule. A teacher of the law, named Simon,³ who at that time enjoyed great popularity in Jerusalem, dared on one occasion, when Agrippa had gone to Cæsarea, to say in a public assembly (probably in the Temple), that the king was really an unholy or heathen man, who had no claim to admission into the Temple, and that the homage shown to him there as king ought to be refused. And if this bold man had ventured to say this after Agrippa had given those theatrical performances at Beyrout, and still more when in the last days of his life he proposed to give in Cæsarea those com-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 81.

in *Jos., Ant.* xix. 8. 1.

² As may be inferred from the manner of the description of the vexatious incident

³ See *ante*, p. 194.

pletely heathenish performances of which we must shortly speak, he would have been justified from the standpoint of the Sacred Law in his assertion. When Agrippa had his attention called to Simon's utterances by the prefect of the city, he had the speaker brought to him at once to Cæsarea, and into the theatre itself, where he was at the moment, commanded him to take a seat near him, and asked him in a calm, gentle voice, 'What was being done there contrary to the law?' And when the bold speaker's courage forsook him, and he could say nothing, the king sent him home safely, and even gave him presents.¹—But what is this one instance of apparent good nature compared with the way in which the king persecuted his most faithful servants! A certain Silas, otherwise unknown to us, had served Agrippa most faithfully and self-sacrificingly from his early years, had not forsaken him in all his dangers and humiliation in Rome,² and was as a reward made prefect of his army when Agrippa entered Jerusalem as king. He was not a freedman, with whom Agrippa, like the Cæsars of the time from Caligula onwards, liked most of all to surround himself, but a Judean, probably from a small town in the country. No unfaithfulness of any kind could after his elevation to high office be charged against him; but the friend was too strongly desirous of maintaining his earlier candour towards the man who had become a king, and made himself thereby troublesome to him. In consequence the man, whose good nature is eulogised, grew so increasingly indignant with his faithful friend, that he not only deprived him of his office, but also sent him, in ignoble chains, to his little native town to stay there in prison. Subsequently, on occasion of his birthday, he desired to restore him to favour; but the ill-treated man distrusted him, and preferred to remain in prison rather than live by the favour of such a king.³

Thus far had matters come with Agrippa in the first three years of his reign; and undoubtedly if he had reigned many years he would have ended no better than his uncle Archelaus,⁴ if not so bad as his grandfather. But his unexpected and sudden death saved him from this worst fate. Towards the end of his career he grew increasingly ill-humoured and peevish; and in this state of mind two troubles of a very different kind came upon him.

The first was that of the Christian Church. For extremely

¹ *Jos., Ant.* xix. 7. 4.

² See *ante*, p. 240.

³ *Jos., Ant.* xix. 6. 3; 7. 1, comp. with

xviii. 6. 7, and xix. 8. 3.

⁴ Vol. v. p. 456.

cautious and reserved as the Church had been¹ after the first great blow which had fallen upon it, the representatives of the Hagiocracy and their friends in Jerusalem saw, nevertheless, that it had not broken up or dispersed as they supposed, but, although made to retreat more into retirement, existed all along and looked with undiminished hope to its Christ; and the accounts which they received from a distance showed them even,² that Christianity was the more active abroad in proportion as it seemed to have become quieter in their immediate neighbourhood. While, on the one hand, a new collision was necessarily thereby prepared for, on the other, the assurance of the Hagiocracy and the pride of the nation generally were not a little revived by the new and constantly growing power of Agrippa. The simple fact that a Judean was once more honoured by the Cæsars, and then especially that he once more received the ancient dominion in its full extent, necessarily greatly flattered many, since the party of the Herodians, as we saw above,³ now became very powerful again amongst the people. And that Agrippa completely adopted, at all events outwardly, the ordinances of the Hagiocracy, and took up the cause of the ancient true religion in relation to foreign powers with great decision and energy, must have been highly pleasing to the whole nation, and might be satisfactory to the priests and scholars with their prevailing sentiments. There were some, no doubt, amongst them, as Simon's example shows,⁴ who saw through him and disapproved of his deflections from the true religion; but this very example shows likewise how little influence the few men of this kind possessed; and we can still perceive very clearly, from the manner in which Josephus describes his life generally, how favourable towards him the general feeling was. Consequently under his reign the self-consciousness and the confidence of the nation generally were in a short time greatly increased; and if previously the heathen feared the, to them incomprehensible, activity, restlessness, and bold arrogance of the Judeans, and the Roman rulers even shut their eyes to many things in their conduct, lest, 'by seizing an opportunity they should, under pretext of defending themselves against a wrong done to them, collect together and get into a frenzy,' as is said in an official document,⁵ this proud national sensibility was neces-

¹ See *ante*, pp. 164 sq.

² *Ante*, pp. 178 sq.

³ *Ante*, p. 261.

⁴ *Ante*, pp. 194, 266 sq.

⁵ The edict of the Syrian governor in the passage previously referred to, *Ant.* xix. 6. 3.

sarily now constantly on the increase. Accordingly this entirely new and exuberant Judean pride under the rule of their king was soon exhibited towards the Christians, who were gradually recovering from their first persecution, particularly as the Twelve also were beginning to be more active in public. For every new and less reserved appearance of theirs before the world might be at once punished by the heads of the Hagiocracy with death, if they received from the new ruler the requisite permission;¹ and Agrippa, whose mind had long before been too much blunted to permit him to understand any true religion, much less the Christianity of his time, and who above all things desired to stand well with the heads of the Hagiocracy, whom he secretly feared, found no difficulty in giving the required permission. At first some of the unknown Christians suffered severe penalties; then, when one of the foremost and boldest of the Twelve, the elder James, had probably spoken only too publicly, Agrippa caused him to be put to death; and soon afterwards he threw Peter into prison, with the view, inasmuch as the Passover of that year had already begun, of having him condemned and executed immediately after the expiration of the festal week; a purpose he was, however (as we shall see), happily not to carry out. If Luke mentions all this with great brevity, and does not state particularly what the special offence was with which they were then charged,² he does this simply because it may be understood of itself, from all that he had related before,³ that it was only somewhat free and unreserved discourses concerning Christ's greatness which were so severely punished. Unlike his brother John in this respect, the elder James had probably still much of his hasty vehemence, which Christ once rebuked in both brothers;⁴ and as he was always one of the most zealous and honoured of the Twelve, he might at this time have most actively and openly taken the part of the persecuted Christians. We may well suppose that this was the sole cause of his execution, and that Agrippa, when he may have learnt

¹ See *ante*, p. 162.

² Acts xii. 1-4. The surprising brevity with which James's execution is announced can only be explained on the supposition that Luke does not here follow the same sources from which he proceeds to narrate Peter's history, but only inserts here the oral account of James's end which he had received.

³ Particularly Acts v. 20, vi. 8-viii. 1.

⁴ See *vol.* vi. p. 302. Eusebius's ac-

count, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 9, following Clement of Alexandria, of the informer against the Apostle, who after he had heard the Apostle's confession of faith was forthwith converted and then executed with him, bears on its face too plainly the marks of a later legend. The accounts in the Book of Abdias concerning this James are again much later imaginations still, which it added to those few materials in Luke and Eusebius.

that Peter and not James was the real leader of the Twelve, then commanded the former to be arrested.

With all his frivolity, Agrippa took a more serious view of the difficulties into which he came with the people of Tyre and Sidon. We do not now know the particular occasion of these difficulties;¹ but in consequence of the ill-humour into which the Syrian governor, under whom the Phœnician towns were placed, had thrown him, the least want of cordiality on their part—for instance, in acknowledging the trade duties which he demanded—might bitterly provoke him; for he appears to have immediately prohibited practically all commercial intercourse between the Phœnician towns and his country, in consequence of which they necessarily suffered very seriously, inasmuch as they naturally drew their corn and other necessaries of life from Palestine.

But, however it might be with Christian and Phœnician towns, he determined at all events not at present to lose the favour of the Emperor, or even represent it before the world as doubtful. At the beginning of the previous year, after the revolt of the year 42 against the rule of Claudius had been suppressed, he might have celebrated public games 'for Cæsar's welfare': on that occasion he had neglected to do so, and determined now to make good the omission, as Claudius had just solemnised his victory over the Britons.² Soon after the Passover of the year 44 accordingly he went to Cæsarea on the Mediterranean. This mainly heathen city was, as we have seen,³ greatly favoured by Agrippa, and in the residence of the previous Roman governor, he now found ready for him a royal palace and likewise expensive buildings for arranging magnificent public games. It was here he determined to hold theatrical spectacles 'for the welfare of Cæsar,' and he invited to them a great number of his civil and military officials, amongst whom there were undoubtedly many heathen. Early on the morning of the second day of the performances (they were generally kept up four or five days), arrayed in a brilliant royal robe of silver, he advanced to his special regal seat in the theatre, just as the rising sun threw its first rays upon him, and he thus shone with twofold splendour in his silver robe. As if suddenly overpowered by the glorious sight, his flatterers, official and other, broke out into a loud cry of delight, that Heaven had exalted

¹ In fact we know nothing of them except from the brief words, Acts xii. 20, 21: but these words have a genuinely historical appearance, and, indeed they contain a plain hint as to the reason why the Phœnicians preferred to yield, and as

to the way in which Agrippa caused them to feel his displeasure.

² This is probable according to what Cassius Dio relates regarding both points, ix. 14-16, 21-23.

³ *Ante*, pp. 264 sq.

their king to itself, that, henceforth he would be to them a god, and might he be propitious to them! and whatever form such language of deification may have further assumed on the lips of base officials and other flatterers. The deified mortal uttered no word of disapproval, still less of indignant horror, as we are expressly told; we may therefore suppose that he was inwardly pleased with the flattery, wholly forgetting that he as king of Israel had thereby become a complete apostate from all true religion, and, indeed, fully resembled Caius Cæsar; and that he most deeply violated the same national feeling which had shortly before triumphantly risen up against that Emperor, and the justice of which he had himself officially defended against the Cæsars and the Roman magistracies. At that moment, when he was just about to raise his head as if towards the sun, he beheld an owl sitting before him on a rope stretched across the theatre, was most violently terrified, and felt immediately pains piercing his very heart. For when formerly he was in base chains in Rome,¹ and leaned his weary frame upon a tree, an owl (as the story went) sat over him there also, and one of the German soldiers in Rome, observing the bird, had interpreted the omen as a certain prophecy of his early liberation and great power and happiness; but the German likewise added, that if the owl should appear to him again he would die five days afterwards. Agrippa had ridiculed this prophecy as long as he lay in prison, but believed in it more and more firmly as his prosperity increased. It is not therefore surprising that at this moment when he was in various ways so excited, he should, as a profoundly superstitious man, be overtaken by horror and alarm at the sight of the ominous bird, as if he really saw in it the messenger of his death,² and that a stealthy disease rapidly carried him off. He then requested to be carried quietly to his palace, ridiculing his flatterers, but exhibiting no repentance with regard to his frivolous life; and, amid the loud lamentations of many mourning people, really died five days afterwards of a very painful disease of the bowels, in the fifty-fourth year of his age, a few weeks after the Passover of the year 44 A.D.

As even Josephus, therefore, cannot avoid mentioning the horribly shocking nature of Agrippa's death, we need be the less surprised that the Christians who had been so severely

¹ See *ant.*, p. 240.

² *Jos.*, *Ant.* xix. 8. 2, comp. xviii. 6.

7. The narrative of the prophecy of the German in Rome has a sufficiently historical ring, when we remember the belief of

the ancient Germans in the ominous character of owls; at most we could only call in question the definite prophecy of the five days.

treated by him kept up no better reminiscence of it. The brief tradition of the king's death which Luke communicates from this entirely different source¹ is, indeed, in some respects less shocking. It does not speak of heathen theatrical performances which Agrippa was seeking to give in Cæsarea, but supposes, with much more simple-hearted national loyalty, that he had gone thither in order that in his contentions with the Phœnician towns² he might be nearer at hand. These towns had then sent to him a joint deputation, that peace might be concluded with him, 'because really their country had to live from the king's;' and the deputation had persuaded Blastus, the king's chamberlain, to get them a hearing with the king. When the king, on the day appointed for the hearing, took his seat on his throne in his royal robes, with the view of opening the transactions with the deputation, and had begun his oration to them in the public assembly, the people shouted that what they heard was the discourse of a god and not of a man, and an angel immediately smote him (who gladly listened to such impious flattery), so that he died devoured of worms. We see pervading this account throughout substantially the same reminiscence; the disease of worms is only a popular conception of that of the bowels;³ and it is possible that flatterers may have uttered similar blasphemous phrases in connection with the transactions with the Phœnician deputation, which was certainly historical and took place in Cæsarea.⁴

The New Roman Governors : their relation to the Christian Church.

Agrippa had accordingly died not too late for his fame, at all events amongst the generality of the Judeans of the time. But in Rome the reports regarding him which the Syrian governor had sent had hardly been forgotten, and soon fresh bad accounts came from Palestine. For the death of the frivolous child of fortune let loose there in some quarters very various desires and passions. Before his death had become generally known amongst the people, his brother Herod, king

¹ Acts xii. 19-23.

² See *ante*, p. 270.

³ It is true that it is likewise narrated of Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Macc. ix. 9 that he died of worms, but the language there is so turgid that it would be foolish to think of deriving this simple narrative, Acts xii. 23, from it.

⁴ The Talmudic writings also have much to say about **המלך הנרפם**. for instance, *M. בכורים* iii. 4; but the matter they supply is of little importance, and it suffers under the uncertainty whether Agrippa I. or II. is intended; the latter was then much nearer historic memory.

of Chalcis, and the above-mentioned¹ Alexas, who had been made the successor of Silas on his deposition,² and who were both at the time in Cæsarea, dispatched a confidential servant to kill Silas in his prison, alleging that Agrippa had commanded it,³ but in reality, undoubtedly, in order at once to render a man harmless who might make known their own or the late king's recent deeds and thereby injure the Herodean family. And no sooner had the death of the king become fully known than in Cæsarea itself and in Sebaste (i.e. Samaria⁴) it was received by the soldiers—who were mostly heathen—and others with the wildest and most brutal rejoicing, so that even the statues of his three young daughters were insulted; many soldiers also deserted for their homes.

The weak-minded Emperor Claudius, at whose court the only son of the late king, likewise named Agrippa (afterwards Agrippa the Younger), then seventeen years old, was staying, could now, it is true, have easily appointed him the successor of his father; but his advisers represented to him that the government of such a manifestly difficult country could not be entrusted to so young a man. Consequently he appointed temporarily a Roman governor once more, but commanded him to punish those who had been guilty of indignities at Cæsarea and Sebaste, and supposed that it was due to the memory of his late friend not to allow the Syrian governor, Marsus, to instal the newly appointed governor of Palestine in his office and to proceed on the occasion according to his pleasure. We may suppose that all this took place in the same year, 44 A.D.⁵

This phantasm of a new independent kingdom of Israel had therefore rapidly disappeared again, inasmuch as it had been evoked almost solely by the humours of the Cæsars. Still, the Judeans obtained even through an Agrippa many advantages in the world which might survive his death; the national self-consciousness had once more recovered full strength; and, for a somewhat remote future at all events, the rule of another Agrippa, if nothing better, could be expected. Moreover, through the writings of a Philo and others amongst their scholars, a new art and aptitude had been developed in the defence of the

¹ *Ante*, p. 247.

² *Ante*, p. 267.

³ *Jos.*, *Ant.* xix. 8. 3, probably suppresses here also more than he communicates.

⁴ See vol. v. p. 430.

⁵ *Jos.*, *Ant.* xix. 9. 1. 2: Tacitus,

Ann. xii. 23, in his compressed style, inaccurately places the time of the restoration of Judæa under the direct administration of Rome in the year 50, because he connects it with the absorption of Trachonitis into the Empire after the death of the king Sohemus.

ancient true religion, which contributed in no small degree to revive the confidence of the nation generally wherever it then dwelt; and for the masses of the people a similar literature was being rapidly developed in various forms, particularly in the Greek language, which was then so easily read everywhere. The nation thus learnt, both by discourse and literature, to defend itself most forcibly against the lords of the world, and might thus more easily bear the change in the outward form of government.

Every fresh increase of confidence on the part of the ancient Community in relation to the dominant heathenism, however, strengthened throughout the whole of this period still more its assurance and boldness with regard to infant Christianity, which was seeking within the bosom of Judeanism to develop and extend itself in conformity with its own genius. And at the present time, accordingly, the new spurt which Judeanism made, concurred, in the most dangerous way, with the intimidation and persecution which the Christian Church had to endure after Stephen's death,¹ and which, though it had been somewhat less severe during the last years, might at any moment break out again, as we have just seen.² It is undoubtedly true that a Roman governor had less temptation, and probably also less personal inclination, to meddle with these internal disputes of non-heathen subjects than a Judean king, particularly when the latter desired to favour the Hagiocracy; a Roman governor occupied a position of greater indifference towards both parties, and he might even exercise towards both a more equitable judgment. Still, the precedent of Pilate in the case of Christ,³ and afterwards that of the case of Stephen, had never been reprobated, and was binding on a future governor; and if he took care not to confirm a sentence of death so inconsiderately as Agrippa, the Christians still remained in other respects all the more exposed to the unhindered tortures which the heads of the Hagiocracy could inflict upon them in the name of their Sacred Law.

¹ *Ante*, pp. 162 sq.

² *Ante*, p. 269.

³ For the legend, which appears first in Tertullian, *Apol.* cap. v., and then copied in Euseb., *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 2, that Tiberius was indignant with Pilate for having crucified Christ, and that he had proposed, though unsuccessfully, in the Senate, the acknowledgment of the deity of Christ, was derived from an apocryphal Gospel only as its first source, as we can see from its further development in Philo's

Cod. Apocr. pp. 813 sq., and Tischendorf's *Evang. Apocr.* pp. 426 sq., 432 sq. (comp. also his *Apocalypses Apocr.* pp. lvi, lxi sq., and particularly the later work, Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 160 sq.) To this connection belong also the addition in Rufinus's Latin translation of Euseb., *Ecc. Hist.* ix. 6, and the so-called Hegesipus, *De Bello Judaico*, in the *Anakephalosis* ad fin.; *Jahrbh. d. B.W.* vi. p. 49 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 155.]

It is true we do not possess much detailed information with regard to the condition of Christianity in the land of its birth during the next ten or fifteen years, which is to some extent a good sign, inasmuch as we can infer therefrom, that the new outbreak of the severest persecutions was at least kept down to a considerable extent, thanks to the Roman government. But we learn plainly enough from all indications, that the parent church at Jerusalem remained all along in a condition of great poverty and destitution; of which we shall have to speak below. And in one case we learn incidentally ¹ that even all the churches dispersed through Palestine were severely persecuted by the Judeans in the year 52, the Judeans having undoubtedly succeeded in obtaining from the Roman governor the most painful restrictions and punishments against the Christians, who had come forward more publicly, though not commands for their execution. Consequently, infant Christianity continued in this respect also to be as severely checked as Judeanism, on the other hand, was lifting up its head with fresh assurance throughout the wide world.

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 14; ver. 14 refers to this period, the following verses, 15, 16, less so.

THE PROGRESS OF THE NEW AGE.

(FROM 44 TO 65 A.D.)

I. *The Christian Church.—Paul.¹—His Youth.*

IN these circumstances it was one man who, when he had been quite unexpectedly converted to the truth of Christianity, wrested the young Church, as by an irresistible power from God Himself, from the serious confusion and stagnation into which it so soon threatened to relapse again. This one man of marvellous force was Paul—a man whose labours exercised from this time forth for a period of upwards of twenty years, an influence upon the Christian Church and its relation to the world generally, which was at first insensible and then increasingly powerful, and most of all so after his death; one of the greatest men of all times, in whom an uncommon measure of the spiritual greatness that had lived in Israel from the earliest period was concentrated, and yet thus great simply from the fact that he most correctly discovered, and maintained most faithfully with the greatest consistency and self-sacrifice until his death, exactly what had at the time to be found and to be done with regard to Christian truth and the Christian Church in the circumstances.

Paul derived his descent from the tribe of Benjamin, but was born in Cilician Tarsus. We might naturally suppose that in this great capital he was likewise educated from his earliest youth, as any other Hellenist, in all the Greek sciences and philosophy which then flourished. For the ease with which he uses Greek in speaking and thinking, whether it be the language of everyday life or of philosophy, shows that it must have been practised by him from his youth and have become a part of his mental life. Moreover, owing to the special rivalry of its principally Greek population, all Greek branches of learning and arts of rhetoric so greatly flourished in Tarsus at that time,² that a youth of capacity was necessarily introduced to their method, and made familiar with them almost as

¹ In this chapter I presuppose much that I have referred to more at length in my translation and exposition of the *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen, 1857).

² Which is known from Strabo's *Geog.* xiv. 5. 13.

a matter of course. For, although Paul did not by any means cultivate a perfect Greek style—like Philo, for instance, his somewhat older contemporary—and undoubtedly read far more books of Judean than of Greek origin, the basis of his language nevertheless continued all along to be good Greek, being tinged only to a small extent by the Cilician dialect or by the influence of the Hebrew idiom.¹ He was also accustomed later in life to speak with some pride of his birth in Tarsus.² However, he must have left Tarsus for Jerusalem somewhat early in his life, as he considered that it was in the latter city that he *received his education* in the strict sense.³ We know also that he could speak Hebrew quite well.⁴

We do not now know with certainty why his parents had gone to Tarsus.⁵ Perhaps earlier ancestors than his parents had settled in this flourishing commercial city, and had there obtained the right of Roman citizenship by their respectability and wealth; for he had inherited that right, although he availed himself of it only in cases of necessity.⁶ But he was neither himself in the possession of wealth—on the contrary, he sought, probably from his early years, to obtain a living by the occasional practice of a trade⁷—nor does his father appear to have been very rich in outward possessions. With all the greater faithfulness did this family cling to its Judean origin and the land of its forefathers: Paul himself considering it lawful to boast on the proper occasion of his descent from Benjamin,⁸ and undoubtedly not because he had himself made careful inquiries on this point. Neither did this family by any means find, like other Hellenistic Judeans, pleasure in the imitation of Greek habits and customs; the son of the house, notwithstanding his inherited Roman citizenship, con-

¹ That Jerome (*Ad Algasiam. Quest.* 10) states that he had learnt that *κατα-ραπιδῶν* (2 Cor. xi. 8, xii. 13, 14), *e.g.*, was from the Cilician dialect, is hardly without some foundation.

² Acts xxi. 39, xxii. 3.

³ Acts xxii. 3; those who subsequently put such words into his mouth undoubtedly knew that he was accustomed to speak thus in actual life.

⁴ Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2; comp. xxvi. 14.

⁵ The tradition in Jerome (*Catal. script. eccl.*, cap. v.) that he (or rather his parents) had come to Tarsus from the Judean (*i.e.* Galilean) town of Giscala, after it had been taken by the Romans, is remarkable; however, it appears in too abrupt and unintelligible a form.

⁶ The latter circumstance should be

carefully noted; as regards the right of Roman citizenship, see vol. v. p. 364.

⁷ The word *σκηνοποιᾶ*, Acts xviii. 3, is best understood to signify a *tent factory* (see below, p. 377), as a multitude of tents were constantly required by the Roman soldiers, for instance, and they could be most advantageously made in great factories; and we likewise see from this very passage, Acts xviii. 3, that Paul always worked in such factories only. The story in the Syriac Assumption of Mary (published by Dr. W. Wright in *Journal of Sacred Lit.* for the year 1865), p. 15, 11, that Paul's father had been $\int \Delta \Omega \Delta$ (*i.e.* probably *Locarius* transcribed), has no historical value.

⁸ Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 4, 5; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 22.

tinuing to bear the purely Judean and Benjaminite name of Saul. For we shall below see on what occasion he subsequently changed his name by a slight literal modification into *Paul*. In fact we know definitely that Paul's forefathers belonged to the sect of the Pharisees.¹

We do not now know exactly when during his youth he came to Jerusalem and took up his permanent abode there. As, however, we subsequently meet with the son of his sister as a regular inhabitant of Jerusalem,² the whole family, perhaps following the impulse given by its religious zeal, appears to have permanently transferred itself to Jerusalem, whilst the son had hardly got beyond the years of his early youth. But though the whole family may then have removed to Jerusalem, as so many others did in like circumstances, many of its friends and relatives still remained in Tarsus, since we find Paul subsequently always glad to return thither and stay there for a time.

We possess no early information with regard to the year of his birth. The fact that Luke calls him a young man at the time of the stoning of Stephen³ does not prove that he was then very young: so far as this expression goes, he might then very well be thirty years old. If we bear in mind that, before he became a Christian, he must have made himself completely master of all the learning of the learned schools in Jerusalem, and, on the other hand, that about the year 63 A.D., he describes himself as an aged man,⁴ he may very well have been somewhat older than Peter, and have had no reason to consider himself as in point of age inferior to any one of the Twelve. We may also suppose as quite certain, since the subsequent history shows it, that his parents had removed to Jerusalem before the crucifixion of Christ. Accordingly there is further no reason for denying the possibility that the eager and inquiring young man may have once, or more than once, seen Christ himself during his last stay in Jerusalem, or that he may even have occasionally followed him from motives of curiosity. Indeed, we meet with certain indications which render it more than probable that

¹ Acts xxiii. 6.

² Acts xxiii. 16-22. It appears, from the way in which this nephew is introduced into the narrative, that Paul had no other son of his sister in Jerusalem; and the entire account of the book of Acts shows that Luke refers to him here not as to an ordinary attendant of Paul who had come with him to Jerusalem.

³ Acts vii. 58. If we compare all the passages in which Luke speaks of *νεαρία*

or even of *νεαρίσκου* (for both terms are evidently used by him as equivalents), it does not follow from them that very young men are meant; and the LXX. very often use the first word for the Hebrew *בְּחֹרֶר*, which denotes generally a man able to bear arms.

⁴ Phil. ver. 9. From Acts xiv. 12 it follows at most that Barnabas was in appearance older than Paul.

he actually saw him in the flesh during those last days. For in one of his later epistles he speaks on one occasion, in a passage in which he compares the glorified eternal nature of Christ with his perishable earthly appearance, just as if he had formerly known him in this his 'flesh,' though he lays no stress whatever upon this fact, still less boasts of a knowledge of this kind, being convinced that every Christian must know him after his glorification in quite another way than that in which he, for instance, may have once known him.¹ It will soon appear how far it is from being a matter of indifference with regard to the entire future development of the young Saul, whether he had seen Christ in the flesh or not. For of the numbers who had seen him moving about Jerusalem, working, suffering, and crucified, during those last days, there were several who believed in him at once or very shortly afterwards,² while others remained indifferent or became the more bitter enemies of the confessors of the crucified Jesus, who were to them only less comprehensible than their Master himself; but amongst the latter class there was no one who subsequently had such a marvellous history as this young Pharisee.

The first quiet and apparently unimportant acts of the Christian Community without its visible Christ left the son of this Pharisaic house, who had just reached his maturity, indifferent. There was not much apparently to attract him, just fresh from the learned schools at Jerusalem. He had thrown himself fully into the learning of the Pharisees, and was finding his national pride satisfied in the study of the Bible and the ancient history of Israel; his acute and subtle intellect was agreeably exercised by the allegorical interpretation of the Bible, which then prevailed in the schools, and his lofty ambition was fed by the practice of skilled disputation with other schools and sects as well as with the heathen. Moreover, the conception of a crucified Christ was as alien to his mind as to that of the majority of the learned and rich people in Jerusalem. Still his soul was thus early as fervidly stirred and as open to all the deepest impressions as we find it subsequently after the great change which in other respects he underwent. And though in his later years he was not indisposed to boast of having in early life sat at the feet of the famous Gamaliel,³ his mind was really far more in accord with

¹ 2 Cor. v. 16. Comp. my *Send-schreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 276. If Paul had not, in this passage at all events, included himself, he would not have

spoken thus.

² See *ante*, p. 128.

³ Acts xxii. 3. comp. *ante*, p. 193.

that of the above-mentioned Pharisee Simon,¹ for instance. According to his own intimations,² he joined the straiter sect of the 'Zealots of the Law,' or (as he liked to call them by a stronger name) 'Zealots of God,' who having been formally put down and outwardly destroyed³ in the person of their leader Judas the Gaulonite, as far as dangerous inclination to rebellion against the government was concerned, sought now to maintain themselves within the older Pharisaic school, and giving up all thought of a revolt against the Romans, directed all the more fervidly their zeal to the most rigid interpretation and defence of the Law within the ancient Community itself, and to the new internal revival and reunion of the Community which they hoped thereby to effect.

It was then that that first violent contention arose in Jerusalem regarding the claims of Christianity without the visible Christ, a contention which, as we have seen,⁴ owed its origin in the first instance chiefly to the Hellenists, but soon spread to the entire population of the city. As Paul undoubtedly belonged to the Hellenists, by virtue of the origin of his family, and attended their synagogues chiefly, he might from the very beginning get involved in this contention. Perhaps he was then some thirty years of age, and was probably at that time already married, or was already a widower after an early marriage; for we may infer, from plain indications, that he had married in early life, but when he had entered upon his higher vocation as an Apostle remained ever after a widower.⁵ But whatever his domestic circumstances then were, in this unexpected contention he most zealously and actively advocated the Pharisaic cause, which he had made his own, and which he regarded as the cause of God Himself. Even when the contention suddenly reached its greatest height through Stephen's temerity, his inextinguishably fiery zeal was not less than that of Stephen; and whilst the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, which had taken in hand the punishment of Stephen and all who were like-minded with him, appeared to find no one else

¹ P. 266.

² Acts xxii. 3, his education simply at the feet of Gamaliel is plainly distinguished from the sect of the 'Zealots of God;' and we can see further from Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 6 how definitely Paul describes himself as having belonged to the latter. The frequent use of words and ideas connected with these 'zealots,' in which Paul indulged when in his later life he looked back from his Christian elevation upon the 'zeal' of his untaught

youth (as, e.g., Gal. iv. 17, 18; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Rom. x. 2) is thereby explained. Comp. also vol. vi. p. 304.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 51 sq.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 157.

⁵ See my *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 161. Early ecclesiastical traditions also state that Paul was married; comp. Solomon of Bassra's Syriac-Arabic work, *Die Biene* (ed. Schönfelder, Bamberg 1866) ch. 50.

amongst the younger men so docile in their service, he on the contrary was all along actively engaged with all his independent ardour. He was not only present at the stoning of Stephen close at hand, but when the witnesses, who had, according to traditional usage, to stone the condemned person, bared their arms for their horrible work, he took their clothes in charge. But as it soon appeared how far this stoning of the one man Stephen was from checking the hopes and endeavours of the Christians, Paul went after those in their houses who seemed to him to be equally guilty with Stephen, and delivered them up to prison for further examination and punishment. And when he became aware that precisely the most zealous Christians had for the most part fled from Jerusalem, but remained all the more steadfast to their faith in their retreat, he persecuted them also; until at last he requested from the high-priest and Sanhedrin an introduction to the Judean synagogues in Damascus, and authority to hunt out Christians there also, and to bring them prisoners to Jerusalem. The severe persecution which at that time overtook the Christians was thus for the most part his work; and his zeal, which no difficulties could restrain, in this horrible work was of only too long duration.¹ It is only too certain that many Christians were also put to death in consequence of his accusations, whilst he compelled many who were less steadfast to make a public recantation by reviling Christ.²

His Conversion and his Vocation.

But horrible as the share was which the young Pharisee, no less compliant than fervid, took in this persecution, he really up to that time did everything precisely as the docile learner of a system of doctrine, or indeed, of a general tendency of life, which had been for centuries predominant in the nation of the ancient true religion, and without which this religion itself seemed no longer able to exist on the earth; and he did everything not from any selfish motive, or from a love of severity and cruelty, but, as he supposed and as he had been taught, from the purest zeal for the true God and His cause. If a man's conduct follows from the purest motives, without any

¹ With a view of indicating the considerable length of its duration Luke inserts the two narratives, Acts viii. 4-10, between vii. 58, viii. 1, 3 (comp. xxvi. 9) and ix. 1. But Luke by no means describes this persecution in stronger language than Paul himself in his Epistles,

when he has occasion to speak of it, *e.g.*, Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 9.

² Both facts follow from Acts xxvi. 9-11, a passage which narrates all the details more accurately than that above referred to, or than xxii. 3-5.

mixture of evil personal desire, he habituates himself thereby to a sincerity of thought and an uprightness of life which is in itself an invaluable blessing, and which may continue unchanged, or even become still stronger and nobler, even though the man should later in life, whether gradually or by a sudden revolution, arrive at exactly opposite views. And never before could this be so remarkably the case with any other man as it was with Paul, since in the previous history of all true religion two fundamentally different tendencies never came into such violent and absolute collision as they then did, and two tendencies the more recent of which could be only with such difficulty properly known, while the earlier one was, in spite of all its temporal imperfections, holy and pure as regards its ultimate origin and its final goal. The ancient religion in that form in which alone it seemed possible that it should be perpetuated on the earth, and the new religion—both are ultimately but two simple, although infinitely momentous, thoughts which may closely confront each other in the mind of the sincere man, and for a long time make themselves felt even without any severe conflict, until one powerful impulse separates them for ever. And it is an impulse of the divine will and divine power which then in such a mind causes the higher truth in a moment to shine forth as in the brightest fire, and which chases away all the darkness that is hostile to it.

By his zealous occupation with the work of completely destroying Christianity, if possible, this religion itself was for the first time brought under the close notice of Paul, and he was thus made more closely acquainted with it than he had intended. He had thus been compelled to look more narrowly at the principal doctrines of these incomprehensible innovators; he had closely observed these Christians in all circumstances of life, had been a witness of their prayers and their sufferings, had heard the forced recantation of some from their quivering lips as well as the mighty cry of others for Christ as the approaching judge of the world and the avenger of innocence, and seen others besides Stephen suffering and dying with angelic countenances beaming with joy. Moreover, it was still that period when Christ was generally believed by his followers to be as near the earth as possible, and was expected to appear suddenly from his celestial secrecy—the time when the atmosphere seemed still electrified with the thought of his instant coming and appearing in his glory, and when on all hands the approach of great events was involuntarily anticipated. If a certain degree of composure was felt in

Christian circles after the first Whitsunday,¹ by Stephen's death and its immediate consequences that calm had again passed away, and once more the heavens and the earth which surrounded the early Church were as profoundly agitated and full of commotion as in the first weeks of its existence without the visible Christ. Moreover, Paul also had seen Christ in the flesh some years before.² Accordingly another Apostle of Christ, of a different type and form from those first Apostles, and yet as much like them as possible, proceeded from this later repetition of those first sultry spring days of Christianity, which was obliged to learn to subsist without the visible Christ as well as to live under most troubled skies. As we have said, this new Apostle was unlike and yet like his predecessors, inferior to them and yet again their superior. He subsequently compared himself to a last and difficult birth,³ which, after other stronger and healthier births, comes into the world weak and misformed and generally despised, because he strongly felt that he was 'the least of the Apostles, and indeed, scarcely worthy of the name of an Apostle.' And yet after all (as a misformed difficult birth may by divine grace live and live for God), this was an Apostle who could boast of himself that he 'was by God's grace what he was, and that His grace had not come upon him in vain, inasmuch as he had laboured more than they all.'

The very atmosphere which surrounded everything that was Christian, and also everything that came into close hostile contact with Christianity, was accordingly still vibrating most violently with the expectation of great pending appearances of the glorified Christ, and with fear of his coming as the world's judge; and the eye and heart of a true Israelite might well still earnestly expect from heaven itself the visible signs of tremendous movements and phenomena of this kind. As in much earlier times the people of Israel, with its eager watching for the invisible God, was the more naturally powerfully affected by the phenomena of the heavens,⁴ so now the

¹ See *ante*, pp. 102 sq.

² See *ante*, p. 278.

³ After all, the word *ἐκτρομα* in the description, 1 Cor. xv. 7-10, can be probably most appropriately taken in this sense: after many other healthy births, as also in other circumstances, the last late one is often the most difficult, and resembles, as it were, an abortion, as is sometimes said in proverbial language. As a fact, it is probable that a proverb was in this instance present to the Apostle's

mind. For though the case of Benjamin, Gen. xxxv. 16-18, is undoubtedly similar and would be most appropriate with reference to the Benjaminite Paul, it is probable that it was not exclusively in the Apostle's mind. [*Comp. ante*, p. 58.]

⁴ This fact, which was of very great importance as regards the entire earlier period of the Old Testament, was remarked upon above, vol. ii. pp. 127 sq., and it retains its significance also with regard to the development of the true

hearts of many were similarly moved on account of the immense spiritual commotions and restlessness of the last days. Consequently we cannot doubt that it was really a no less unexpected than terrible celestial phenomenon which overtook Paul on the road to Damascus, as he was breathing out his hot desire for Christian blood, and which gave the first irresistible impulse to a complete change in the direction of his mind. We cannot now with certainty ascertain its exact nature, but we cannot doubt that it was something external and visible that in this case came to the assistance of previous mysterious inward experiences. It may have been a sudden violent storm with thunder and lightning, or more probably a deadly sirocco, which at noon on a sultry day, and in the midst of the desert on the way to Damascus, and not very far from it, hurled him and his fellow-travellers with overwhelming force to the ground, in such a way, however, that at the same terrible moment a storm of wholly different thoughts rushed through his mind from those which occupied his attendants, inasmuch as he had already become inwardly a different man from them. The celestial phenomenon, borne upon a high cloud, hurled all to the ground with its dazzling brightness;¹ but as Paul fell to the ground it was he only who in this violent agitation of his inmost heart suddenly, as by a tremendous change, saw the same Christ whom he had once seen in the flesh coming down upon him from heaven in his glorified form, and he only, having been seized by terrible fear, heard Christ addressing him, as he lay on the ground, in overwhelming tones of thunder. At least, as soon as in this awful moment he had somewhat regained his consciousness, it became clear to him that it could only be Christ himself who had come thus terribly near to him in his glorified form;² and yet in this hour of mortal peril he felt that he had not been wholly annihilated; and if he was as it were completely paralysed and unable to eat anything, blinded and unable to walk alone, and if he remained in this condition a considerable time, still his friends

religion in these late times under review; comp. *ante*, p. 73.

¹ This important circumstance is quite appropriately mentioned in the narrative, Acts xxvi. 14, whilst it is wholly passed over, Acts xxii. 6-9, and in the third account, ix. 7, is very nearly contradicted. In the same way the statement that the attendants did not hear the voice from heaven, Acts xxii. 9, is undoubtedly more authentic than the contrary one, ix. 7. It is improbable, in consideration

of the great difference in other respects of the two accounts, that this kind of narrative was simply taken from such descriptions as Dan. x. 5-7.

² It is plainly expressed in all three accounts, Acts ix. 5, xxii. 8, xxvi. 15, that it was not until the commencing return of consciousness, and as if after the sirocco had gone by, that it became clear to him who it was whom his mind saw and heard.

led him by the hand to Damascus as one who had risen from the dead, until there, in closest privacy, first earnest prayer, and then the exhortation of Ananias, one of those who after Stephen's martyrdom had fled to Damascus, raised him up from the grave of his former life. And then, when he had attained to clearness of knowledge, he sought baptism, was by divine grace soon fully restored, and felt strengthened for the work of his new life.

The event of this sudden and complete transformation of Paul can be thus, at least generally, clearly enough recognised as a historical fact. It was an experience similar to that which was previously passed through in the case of prophets of the Old Testament, who felt themselves suddenly seized and prostrated by the mighty *hand* of the true God, in such a way that when they rose they were conscious of having within them a wholly new spirit, and of being able from that moment to act under its influence; as is shown, for instance, particularly in the case of Jonah, of whom the Old Testament relates, that it was the last terrors of death that first led him to take the right way and to boldly pursue it. But this event was attended by far greater consequences in this period of infant Christianity, and in the case of this unique man Paul; and Luke, in the Acts, justly gives prominence to it as of such express importance, by giving even as many as three accounts of it in appropriate places; accounts which, though in the main accordant, differ so much that we can plainly see from that fact how various the narrative itself gradually became through its frequent repetition. Moreover, this event is very different from those of a similar kind which occur elsewhere in Paul's history. For Paul's nature was subsequently predisposed to receive the most wonderful visions, in which, indeed, early Christianity was generally so rich; so that he was subsequently conscious of having been translated into the third of the seven heavens, or of having been rapt away into Paradise and of hearing there unutterable words, not knowing whether he was in the body or out of the body,¹ and celestial visions of this kind came upon him the more naturally in proportion as his mind had once become absorbed in divine things. But of an entirely different character was this first occurrence, at a time when he had not yet become a Christian and had not given his mind, which was first aroused in this way under Christian influences, to visions: he was at his conversion surprised by them in the midst of the actual everyday world, and in a moment trans-

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 1-4; comp. the other instances, Acts xxii. 17-22.

formed by them, and, indeed, was first as it were forcibly driven by them to take the path of Christianity.

And the great fact itself, as regards its inner necessity and the preparation for it, occupies an elevation far above the particular event by the instrumentality of which it was finally brought to completion, and it might probably have been accomplished by other means. We never find Paul himself subsequently speaking much in any of his epistles of the event, still less boasting of it: the one important and decisive thing to him is that it pleased God to cause His Son to shine as a light in his soul; ¹ and it is only rarely, when quite specially called to do so, that he mentions, and then only quite briefly, that he had seen the glorified Christ. ² Evidently it was only when it appeared to him quite necessary that he spoke somewhat further of the particulars of the event; so that we find Luke seizing two opportunities of introducing Paul's own account of it. ³ Undoubtedly others spoke far more than Paul of the wonderful event, so that it was soon related again very variously as regards its details, though in general with substantial agreement. Moreover, it was manifestly not until after the Apostle's death that it was most often related with reference to his finished life, and, as then retold, the narrative was naturally re-animated by the general review of his completed career, whilst at the same time those phrases were by preference made use of which it was known Paul had himself often employed. It is when it had received this higher colouring that we first receive the narrative in its threefold form in the Acts of the Apostles, although in two of these passages only ⁴ it is completed to the end. According to these accounts the first word of the celestial Jesus was, in his own native, that is, Hebrew language, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' Another narrative contains the appropriate addition, 'It is hard for thee to kick against the goad,' like a young restive bullock, which really only thereby wounds itself, as if the Divine pity itself would turn him from his infatuated course. When the dazzling form then became recognisable, the Divine voice, it is said, proceeded: 'Arise, go to Damascus, and there it will be told thee what has been appointed for thee to do;' or, according to another account, still further, 'For to this end have I appeared unto thee, to choose thee for a servant and witness of all that thou

¹ Gal. i. 15, 16.

² 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 7-10.

³ Acts xxii. 3-16, xxvi. 9-18.

⁴ That is ch. ix. and ch. xxii. only; in xx vi. it is evident that Luke inten-

tionally avoided repeating the entire story. In itself the last account, xxvi. 9-18, is in other respects the most detailed and accurate.

hast seen and of what I will reveal to thee, taking thee out of the people (Israel) and the heathen to whom I send thee to open their eyes.’¹ ‘Ananias,’ a Christian then dwelling at Damascus and greatly esteemed there (the narrative proceeds in its own manner and in the elevated style which was so specially suitable for this occasion) ‘was in a vision commanded by the Lord to inquire, in the so-called Strait Street at the house of a certain Judas,² for Saul, who was praying and already, as by a higher impulse, expecting him; and when Ananias at first declined to inquire for a man of Saul’s reputation, the Lord further commanded him to go to him without fear, as he was a chosen vessel to bear the Lord’s name before the heathen and kings and the children of Israel; the Lord would show him how much he must suffer for his name.’³ So Ananias went to him, laid his hands upon him after the Christian manner of blessing, and he was then filled with the joy of the Holy Ghost.⁴

But whatever may have been the actual details of that event and its immediate consequences,⁵ the great fact itself, upon which everything at this point depends, is placed beyond all doubt. For since that day when Paul on his journey to Damascus, and when he had already come within view of this great city, underwent the most complete transformation of his inmost soul, which all human language must find it difficult to describe, through his whole life it remains with him an unalterable fact, as though it had been written in characters of fire before his eyes, that as the last Apostle, and yet not less than the others, he has seen, close by, the Lord in His celestial glory and heard His overpowering voice—that he has received from Himself the irresistibly powerful call to become His Apostle, and that from that time he has endeavoured, and must henceforth endeavour, never to prove unfaithful to that call. It is to him a call from heaven as clear, as certain, and as irresistible as any true prophet of the Old Testament ever felt that he had received, as if with this one blow the greatest power of true religion would once more make itself felt in its most immediate strength and absolute certainty, and ever after he

¹ Etc., Acts xxvi. 16–18.

² These details are evidently based upon careful historical reminiscences or inquiry. According to recent inquiry a street of this name still exists in Damascus (see Wilson’s *Lands of the Bible*, ii. pp. 345, 351; Petermann’s *Reisen in Oriente*, i. p. 98); [but comp. Stanley’s *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 412]; but unfortunately even this house itself is still shown.

³ An evident allusion to the whole life of the Apostle, even to its violent end.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 135. In the second account, Acts xxii. 12–16, this allusion to the subsequent life of Paul is wholly wanting, and everything there is in a more simple style.

⁵ It appears, however, from all the above considerations, that the narrative has really been handed down with comparative distinctness and fulness; and it may in fact serve us as a model for so many similar narratives in the Bible.

has received it, he constantly moves over the earth in its light wherever he may go or stay. But it is not, as in the case of the prophets of the Old Testament, God Himself whom he has seen spiritually close at hand, and whose clear voice has arrested him; it is Christ alone whom he is more firmly conscious than of his own life that he has seen and heard stooping from his celestial glory, and it is only through Christ that he beholds and hears God. Although in point of time last, he has nevertheless, as this man of a wholly different type, seen and heard him in a more impressive manner, if possible, than even the earlier Apostles, inasmuch as he would never have seen or heard him at all if the circumstances had not been far more overpowering. Accordingly for the rest of his life he performs his pilgrimage with a certain agitation and trembling, as with never-resting foot, and yet with a loftier joyousness, assurance, and clearness than any of the Twelve, although he has really seen only the glorified Christ and heard his thunder-voice; for if he once caught a passing view of the terrestrial Jesus, and could therefore the more easily see the celestial Christ without mistaking him, he had after all never stood in such close relation with him, and heard the words which fell from his lips on earth as the Twelve and others had done. Indeed, we are justified in supposing that he would never have beheld the Lord as he did, and as he subsequently recalls the event, if the narratives of the visions of Him by the Twelve and others had not reached him, and if the thought of such a possibility, in the electric celestial atmosphere of those days, had not at some time flashed through his heart. And yet in this sight of the Lord and this hearing of His voice he was so far from being merely an imitator of the older Apostles, that the entire history of the Apostolic age is from that moment changed and a new phase of it arises, the powerful influence of which very soon extends to the Twelve and all the large number of other earlier Christians. For, in reality, in Paul's conversion and divine call, as well as in all the circumstances which accompanied it, two things were involved, which, different as they were in themselves, nevertheless most completely concurred in his case, and in their coincidence constituted his entirely unique destination.

On the one hand, Paul was conscious of being, no less certainly and no less immediately than any other of the earlier Apostles, called and empowered to become a direct human instrument for proclaiming and propagating the Gospel.¹

¹ In my *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 14 sq., 52 sq., I have shown that he so purposely and strongly at once insists on this at the opening of his Epistle to the Galatians and all the later epistles.

Indeed, as we have seen,¹ it had long before his time been regarded as an undisputed principle, that anyone who had directly seen and heard the Glorified One in his whole truth and power, might be called to become his direct servant and ambassador on earth, that he might continue his work amongst men, until he should himself appear visibly to all as the judge of the world. Paul had, undoubtedly, previously often heard this principle from the lips of Christians and non-Christians; by the celestial vision and the celestial power of that one moment he now felt himself irresistibly struck by the light of Christ and overtaken by his personal call; indeed, as soon as he had recovered his proper consciousness, he felt himself impelled by all his inmost thoughts and powers to serve absolutely this true celestial Lord, as his most special and immediate instrument. For undoubtedly it was necessary that such a tremendous moment of agitation should be succeeded by greater rest and self-collection, and he had still to learn to comprehend fully the new Christian life, and to attain its sober mind and its power: and it is this necessity which was subsequently so admirably represented in the reminiscence of the service rendered by Ananias in Damascus.

On the other hand, he was again so extremely different from all previous Apostles, inasmuch as it was only after such conflicts that he felt himself transformed into a Christian and an Apostle, even though he had practically seen only the glorified Christ, and though he bore in his heart, at most, only a recollection of the physical, not the spiritual, Christ who had walked the earth. The image of the infinite goodness and the mild earnestness, of the unique speech and action generally of the terrestrial Christ, had not been engraven on his heart; still less could he, like the other Apostles, constantly recall vividly to mind the utterances, and views, and usages familiar to those who had actually lived with Christ, and, when it seemed necessary, appeal to them as to decisive precedents and models. It is true that he undoubtedly supplied this want, as far as he could, during the first period of quiet and self-collection. Ananias will have instructed him before or after his baptism; in the great city of Damascus and the neighbourhood there were besides, undoubtedly, not a few older Christians than himself with whom he now had intercourse; and although during those first years the oral tradition of Christ's life continued to be beyond comparison most prevalent, so that Paul also, when it seems to him needful, always appeals only to that

¹ *Life*, p. 112.

which has come down to him from Christ, we may infer, nevertheless, from certain indications, that the oldest-written Gospel belonging to this first period was and always remained at his command.¹ However, all this could not supply the greater advantages which the earlier Apostles enjoyed in this respect; and accordingly we find him, three years after his conversion, actually going on that account to Jerusalem, again to inquire of Peter with regard to various points of importance connected with Christ's history.² He had beheld the glorified Christ only, and yet he had undoubtedly beheld him in an incomparably more profound way than the earlier Apostles, inasmuch as he was in an entirely different position from them. Accordingly, it was only the image of that Christ which ever moved before the vision of his enthusiastic spirit. And instead of this being a disadvantage to the cause of Christianity at that time, it became, in conjunction with the other wholly peculiar circumstances of this Apostle, an unmixed advantage, and the inauguration of the great and happy turn which the Apostolic age now took.

The man that has seen the glorified Christ only, or who resolves to know and appropriate him alone, must, for that very reason, simply seek and hold fast that which is eternal and purely divine in Christ, so that for him all the utterances and deeds belonging to Christ's terrestrial life are radiant only with that light which answers to his eternal significance, and have only that value and authority which are consistent with that significance. Amongst the founders of religions, Christ stands alone in being thus regarded and revered exclusively in his celestial glory. In the case of no one else was it attempted at the right moment, or it was in itself impossible. In the case of Zarathustra, as in that of Moses—although, in both instances, from very different reasons—it was not attempted until very late times, when it was no longer easy to obtain a purely historical conception of them. With Confucius it is impossible, inasmuch as, in connection with him, the idea of God has no full and proper meaning; with Buddha likewise, inasmuch as he has been put in the place of all the Gods; and with Mohammed it is impossible, not because he performed too

¹ Comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* ii. pp. 194 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 62 sq.], ix. pp. 243 sq., *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 427. The notion that when Paul appeals to something which has come down from Christ he refers only to his own visions, is so absolutely groundless

and unjust that I have never considered it worthy of a refutation. On the contrary, it may be seen that he had often before him a Gospel in cases where he does not appeal to a tradition from Christ, see *Sendeschreiben*, p. 48 and elsewhere.

² Gal. i. 18.

exalted things (for even the most exalted acts may serve as examples), but because he did much that was too degraded, and which can in no wise be counted as exemplary; so that in his case we must even distinguish those of his acts and habits which his followers may imitate from those which they may not.¹ In the case of Christ it was possible immediately after his disappearance from the visible world; and precisely at the time when Paul was converted, the proper moment had arrived for recognising the celestial side of Christ, independently of his earthly life, and for correctly comprehending it with all its necessary consequences. It is true that as soon as the first disciples had arrived at a deeper knowledge of the appearing of Christ it was always regarded amongst them as of celestial nature;² indeed, it was only under this view that Christianity came with Christ himself into the world;³ but the consequences involved in it were not fully perceived by quite the earliest Christians; and, on the other hand, certain words of Christ, as we have seen,⁴ which could have only a temporary and passing significance, had obtained in their minds a meaning and importance which finally presented serious hindrances to the progress of Christianity in the earth. Paul, however, compelled from the first to take the purely celestial view of Christ's coming, was able to pursue it most exclusively and unrestrictedly; and it was he who, though by his previous history in need of help and humbly docile, was, by the character and the training of his mind, sufficiently capable of properly following up the view in all its necessary consequences. It is marvellous to see how, by this one view and its logical application both to his own perfectly unique condition and also to the relation of Christianity to the world of the time and to all history, he was necessarily, as with one tremendous impulse, delivered from his own tormenting feelings, and also conducted to the most surprisingly correct views regarding his own duty and that of all mankind.

As soon as he had come to better knowledge, Paul became profoundly conscious of having grievously sinned against Christianity. No one could be more deeply humbled and rendered more unhappy than he on account of his sin. The sanguinary persecution to which he had devoted himself with his whole soul, and his own naturally tender conscience, which had become infinitely more tender after his conversion, combined

¹ A fact which in the legal schools and law-books of Islam occasioned a good deal of minute inquiry and discussion, and also numerous controversies and divisions.

² See *ante*, pp. 64 sq.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 120 sq.

⁴ *Ante*, pp. 199 sq.

to fill him with a deep sense of guilt. Through all his later life, too, when he had done more than all the earlier Apostles for the extension of Christianity and its firm establishment in the earth, the image of his profound unworthiness and grievous sin from the days of his youth, stands most vividly before his eyes; and he never disguised from himself or others the full truth on this point.¹ But if Christ is the purely celestial beginner and consummator of all human-divine life, who, appearing in the world as the true Messiah, gave to all men one true pattern of life, while, according to his eternal nature, he attracts all who believe on him to himself, and through himself to God, and to the true kingdom of God, then there is no error or sin of a man's previous life that can be so great that it cannot, by divine mercy, be forgiven him, when converted by this faith in Christ, and this faithful imitation of him in a life fully answering to the most exalted pattern. For it is this life upon the *way*² newly opened by Christ which is the absolutely perfect life, being altogether what God requires from man; by which life, therefore, the man that follows it becomes righteous before God, or, at all events, may confidently hope to become righteous through His grace and love; and which is in itself so powerful that before it, or rather before the divine grace and righteousness which are powerfully operative in it, all previous errors and sins disappear. And if, together with the divine righteousness, the divine mercy and love likewise eternally confront all human errors and sins, it justly appeared to Paul, when he more closely examined the whole appearing of Christ, that it was precisely in it that the highest proof of the love and grace, no less than of the righteousness, of God had been given. For he considered that God had not only, in His righteousness, been compelled to send no other than His own son into this sinful world and to death for the cancelling of all the terribly accumulated sins of the pre-Christian world, but that He really did this in order that, after the son had suffered obediently unto death, not for his own sin but for that of the world, and had satisfied eternal justice, the fullest divine grace might, after the removal of all previous sins, manifest itself by his resurrection and glorification towards all those who hence-

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13.

² It is true Paul himself scarcely uses this figure of a way at all (comp., however, 1 Cor. xii. 31 as remotely similar); but it appears from Acts ix. 2. xix. 9, xxiv. 22. comp. ver. 14, xviii. 25, 26, xvi. 17, that it was in very common use gene-

rally in the apostolic age, so that Christianity itself could as a man's manner of life be called simply *the Way* (his *method*); the way of the Pharisees is opposed to it, Acts xxii. 4. Thence is derived at last the phrase John xiv. 6.

forth follow him and his life alone in all their life.¹ Thus, with a penetrating glance, and with the most earnest desire, Paul appropriated most vividly everything that was involved in a veiled form in the great enigma, and particularly in the final climax, of the entire earthly history of Christ, which only waited for the true glance that had to open it up. His first happy purity and righteousness, his glad eagerness for all noble activity, and his wealth of genuine enthusiasm and power, he was now conscious of recovering; or rather, it was now that he felt their sway as never before; and, at the same time, the stone of stumbling, which had before been most of all the occasion of his fall—the humble exterior and the crucifixion of the Messiah—had been removed. Consequently, inasmuch as just that which had been to him, as to all the world hitherto, the greatest ground of offence, appeared now, on the contrary, to be the mystery, which faith could penetrate, of the highest divine wisdom and the purest love of God, he proceeds in all his thinking and speaking, mainly from it, so that the figures connected with it are also, in endless variety, woven into all his utterances. To die and to be buried with Christ in order to rise and be glorified with him; to suffer with him in order to reign at last with him—in these thoughts and phrases he is as original as inexhaustible, and no one else has given such currency precisely to these most exalted thoughts with their most direct opposites, and no one else has so marvellously ennobled things that are apparently most ignoble and repulsive, and taught men to embrace them with such profound love. As Christ had previously, in his earthly life, so drawn his followers to himself by his love that they could never become really unfaithful to him again, so in the case of Paul it was as if even the glorified Christ alone exercised the same magic power of affection, and, indeed, of an affection which was, if possible, still purer, inasmuch as in this instance every accessory sense-element was altogether absent. Consequently, the purest and highest love, as victorious over all defects and errors, became, in Paul's life and thought, the highest thing in Christianity; whilst faith necessarily acquired in his case, as one who had attained to the highest blessing of his life by a purely spiritual process, a far greater importance and power than in that of the earlier Apostles; but his hope had been

¹ As this fundamental view recurs in all the Epistles of the Apostle, it is unnecessary to bring special proofs for it; it is only when a special occasion urges him

that he expounds it more at length, and yet then only so far as the occasion requires, as 2 Cor. v. 14 sq.; Rom. ch. iii., Phil. ii. 5 sq.

supplied by Christianity itself, and its depth could only increase with that of his faith and love in the exalted sense in which he embraced the former and understood and practised the latter.

Paul's conception of Christianity was therefore based upon his vision of the celestial Christ, and a sincere and deep acquaintance with his own inmost spiritual condition and his own past painful experiences. He conceived it as the summons to embrace immediately and boldly the perfect divine life, and the power, surely given from heaven, of righteousness and of divine salvation. He thus showed by the first great example that a clear upward glance at the glorified Christ was able of itself to beget the highest activity and truth of Christian thought and action, and to transform every man into a genuine Christian. It was at that time, of course, well known from other sources what the history of Christ had been; and just as Paul after his conversion proceeded in every matter with the greatest simplicity and sincerity, he left it to others, who were better qualified, to point in detail to the model life of the historical Christ, and in all his Epistles intentionally avoids referring to it.¹—But this same upward look to the glorified Christ and his true and full glory supplied Paul, in an entirely new way, with the proper view of the relation of Christianity to the world generally of his day. If Christ really occupies as the celestial Messiah such a lofty eminence, and if there is certainly but one true God and Creator of all men—the God who sent Christ as his own and dearest son amongst men—then surely all men must be equal before him, if they only follow him alone in pure faith and desire to embrace the salvation which has been prepared by him. The distinction between Judean and heathen therefore vanishes of itself in the unique elevation and glory of the celestial Christ, particularly as soon as it appears beyond all dispute that the Judeans, notwithstanding all their historical advantages, have in reality no less than the heathen come short of the true divine life which Christ brought into the world, and have, indeed, sought ever to oppose and destroy it. Moreover, there was probably no man then living, whether belonging to the parent church or to be found anywhere else on the earth, who had more profoundly perceived, or more painfully experienced, than Paul the unsatisfactory character of the Judeanism of that time. He

¹ It is not accidental that such references to Christ's earthly life as 1 Pet. ii. 21 sq., iii. 18 sq., 1 John i. 1, never occur in Paul's Epistles. We perceive also from this that such Epistles as those of John

and the first of Peter, although other indications show that they must be traced to the Apostles themselves, must all the more certainly be regarded as proceeding from them.

had once risked his whole life and soul in its defence, but as soon as the light came to him he saw the more completely and undeniably its indefensibility. He had sought to gain righteousness before God and peace in his own soul by his violent and daring combat on its behalf, but at that one moment of terrible fear and distress had only too deeply learnt that he still lacked all higher consolation and all pure divine assurance, and that there was nothing but suffering for him because he resisted Christ. It is possible that other Pharisees were converted before Paul, although we have no definite information on this point, and at all events there was no man of importance amongst them;¹ and of all men then living there was certainly no one who had been made so altogether of one piece as he, who could be with his whole heart and without the slightest fear of man either a Pharisee or a Christian, and, after the purer light had risen upon him, perceived with the fullest inward conviction and intelligence the wholly untenable nature of Phariseeism, and therewith the defects of all past Judeanism, and was able in conformity with this better knowledge to live and act simply with greatest decision. But in this respect also, he found himself most perfectly in accord with the historical Christ, although he had only seen him in glory, and the glance of the glorified One, annihilating in its severity, and at the same time so gentle and reassuring, had only too unerringly in this also overtaken him.

And as Paul had seen the exalted Christ only, but had seen him as no one else had done, in his full incomparable glory, he was able also the more easily and perfectly to take a wide general view of the various course of the ages, and the relation of Christ and Christianity to them: and his learned acquirements and intellectual ability would be of greatest service to him in making this review. In this respect also he was original; and having been brought by a sudden change to Christianity, it was as if, with the purpose of familiarising himself the more fully with it, he liked to indulge his spiritual vision, which had just been purified by the sight of Christ's glory, in permitting it to range over all distant spaces and times, and to find that glory always reflected back upon Christ again in twofold splendour. It need scarcely be remarked that he everywhere proceeded from the higher or purely spiritual view of Jesus as the celestial Messiah, inasmuch as any other view than this had not as yet arisen amongst Christians at that

¹ Those 'zealous for the law,' Acts only; comp. what has to be said on this xxi. 20, are not necessarily Pharisees passage below.

time, and Paul simply applied it in a more profound and thoroughgoing manner. When he thus looked back from the terrestrial appearing of Christ into past eternity, he beheld him, who had appeared in the fulness of the times as the son of David foretold by the prophets, as existing with God before all time, with regard to his eternal being and substance, and as acting with God on behalf of the world, and revealing himself spiritually in it.¹ And it was undoubtedly nothing more than a certain reserve and shrinking, together with the want of skill and practice of those first years, which prevented his applying the name of the Logos itself, which had to that time borne a more scholastic character, to Christ. The writings of Philo had not yet come under his notice,² and besides the Old Testament it was only such writings as the Book of Wisdom,³ the figures and language of which could be familiar to him as already current. But what an inexpressible joy must it have been to him, when for the first time he perceived, as he thoroughly worked out his general view, that the Son of God, therefore, when in his eternal nature he was infinitely rich in celestial power, purely from obedience towards his Father's divine will became a man and surrendered all his divine fulness, indeed, appeared amongst men in poverty and suffered even the death of the cross, in order that he might make them rich in divine things and by his profoundest humiliation himself attain to his highest glorification; and with what rapture must he thus have discovered in this appearing of Christ the highest model, and indeed, the method and way of all true religion!⁴ When he then looked at the Old Testament with its Law, he could only regard it as the divine preparation for the New, the real end of all the divine education of humanity, and he could only look upon the great severity in some respects of that Law as serving to educate mankind for the much freer, though, in this greater freedom, much more rigorous, Law of the New Testament.⁵ Or, when he looked back beyond Moses into all previous history, he found, as he glanced at its bright side in the times of the patriarchs, a much simpler condition, and yet one that was already enlightened

¹ According to 1 Cor. viii. 6, 2 Cor. iv. 4, and so many other passages; for this view of the Celestial Messiah pervades all Paul's discourses so completely that all his utterances are likewise evidences of it; and nothing accordingly could be so perverse as the idea of denying it in our day.

² As may be seen from the entirely different case of the Epistle to the

Hebrews; see below.

³ Comp. vol. v. pp. 479 sq. The great affinity which this book has with Rom. i. 20 sq. was long ago remarked; and we may very well suppose that Paul read books of this kind, if not as sacred ones.

⁴ This is all presented at once, especially 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 6 sq.

⁵ According to Gal. iii. 19 sq., 2 Cor. iii. 6—v. 21, Rom. v. 20 sq. *et al.*

by divine truths, with the greater simplicity of which condition Christianity could, notwithstanding its higher illumination and spiritual culture, be connected.¹ But when he glanced at the dark side of that earlier time, his eye which had been illuminated by Christ's light beheld from the time of Adam, as the august forefather of the whole human race, onwards really nothing but an ever deeper descent into error and sin, in spite of so many warnings and fresh efforts at amendment, until with Christ, as the second Adam, or the forefather of humanity as once more reconciled with God, that great epoch arrived which is to renew and restore everything to its original glory.² Glancing thus also into the future, he saw in Christ, as it were, the whole plan of God regarding the world opened and the profoundest problems of his mind, as it longed for Divine enlightenment, fully resolved; ³ and it is amazing to see how his mind, though now proceeding from an entirely different point of view and following wholly different lines, nevertheless, often meets with utterances of Christ's, of whose existence he undoubtedly knew only to a small degree anything definite.

All this knowledge and these views of Christ undoubtedly flowed in upon him in the period immediately after his conversion. For though we have now no epistle of his that was written during the first years of his Christian labours, all the traces of the latter which we can in any way discover show that, as a Christian and an Apostle, he began at once to work constantly upon the immovable basis of the fundamental convictions which were formed in connection with that first most painful convulsion and the consequent new persuasion of his mind. His entire subsequent life resembles a movement which, commencing with an intense convulsion, becomes nevertheless calmer and more regular with all the waves of strong agitation that continue to follow⁴; still, everything that is truly new and original in him springs alone from the fruitful soil of that first overpowering agitation of his inmost nature; just as such a bright fiery spirit need only to be brought into the right way by one convulsion of that kind, purifying his whole inner being, and he remains in it ever after.

If, therefore, under the influence of the splendid light of such views and ideas, as we find them presenting themselves to his mind in greatest abundance, he could easily have become by

¹ Gal. iii. 6, 15 sq., Rom. iv. 1 sq.

² 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22; Rom. v. 12 sq.

³ Of which Rom. ix.-xi. presents the greatest example.

⁴ It is also very noteworthy that, ac-

ording to such evidences as 2 Cor. xiii. 1-4, Acts xxii. 17-21, the profoundest agitations of his nature by visions occur in the first years after his conversion.

their studious pursuit and rapturous delineation a Christian Philo, and in addition the first of such a new class of philosophers and writers, resembling in some respects his friend Apollos, whom we shall afterwards meet with, his mind, on the contrary, as soon as it had been turned to Christ and had then found in him its new repose, compelled him to go forth once more into the midst of the most restless and toilsome life. After a few days of rest and reflection, he at once arose in Damascus itself to proclaim Christ to the Judeans with all the power and fervour of a new convert; and the same synagogues in that city, which was then inhabited by so many Judeans, and in which he had intended a short time before to humiliate, or even to have convicted and punished as criminals, the Christians who had been violently dragged thither, now re-echoed with his enthusiastic proofs that Jesus was the true Messiah, and with his fiery exhortations to immediate conversion, just as he himself had been converted.¹ But when it very soon appeared what a stout, and indeed invincible, resistance he was to meet with on the part of almost all the Judeans, either on account of the general contempt which just at that time weighed depressingly on infant Christianity,² or because Paul himself (who had just before acted and spoken so differently), was bitterly reproached with such an inexplicable change, suddenly like a flash of lightning the thought passed through his soul, that perhaps after all it was more in accordance with the divine will to proclaim Christ the more zealously to the heathen wherever the Judeans rejected him, and with equal rapidity he began to carry out most steadfastly and persistently what thus appeared to him to be the word and command of his Lord.

Therewith, the general outline of the fundamental ideas of his new life was completed; and, as if borne by as many angels, he had rapidly attained the destination which very soon proved really to be his one proper and exalted vocation, and by which he obtained his high position of incomparable importance in the entire subsequent development of Christianity when it was yet almost too young and tender for the rough world. There were many things which might on his very first essays have deterred him from this course. To convert heathens must have appeared more difficult than to convert Judeans, who might surely have been in a thousand ways better prepared to acknowledge the Messiah. And hitherto hardly anyone had led the way in this attempt, since the isolated instance in the case of Philip³ probably occurred about the same time, and the other

¹ Acts ix. 20-22.

² See *ante*, pp. 164 sq.

³ *Ante*, pp. 178 sq.

in the case of Peter,¹ probably somewhat later, whilst Paul did not know much of either. But like an ancient prophet of Israel he willingly obeyed the divine call which he had heard too powerfully and too clearly within his soul to resist. For undoubtedly he followed in this matter only the irresistible impulse of his spirit, as it had been overpoweringly moved by Christian truth and necessity, and not long, wearisome considerations and worldly reflections; but the eager fervour which he felt to carry the Christianity which the Judeans had despised to the heathen was really only the same impulse which Christians generally then obscurely felt² to break through the narrow limits which were in danger of fettering Christianity too much, in order that the wide world might be filled with its power. Thus a great internal necessity which lay in Christianity generally at that time came to the aid of Paul's personal inward impulse; and as regards his past development and position, there was no one so destined by heaven as he to undertake this new enterprise with its endless difficulties. For of the scruples against an immediate appeal to the heathen, which were felt in the parent church,³ there was none which affected him, inasmuch as he had not been in any way educated in it, nor was he under any obligation to observe its peculiar local apprehensions and hesitations. Consequently, even the fact that he could not, at all events for some time, well return to Jerusalem, where the hatred of the Judeans against him as such a notorious apostate was still in its first fierceness, proved to be for the world's weal. He found himself led by all personal and outward reasons to obey his burning desire at once at that great distance from Jerusalem, and to proclaim the gospel in complete independence of the parent church.

The Earlier Facilities for the Admission of the Heathen.

If Christianity was now to be brought by Paul, or by apostles of the same way of thinking and possessed by a similar enthusiasm, to the heathen generally, and if this was to be made a special vocation, means and facilities had previously been discovered which could greatly assist the attempt. For the ancient true religion, the purest and most perfect bloom of which was destined to be now forthwith conveyed to the heathen while it was still in its first fresh unfolding, had for centuries past been brought increasingly near to them in very various ways; in

¹ *Ante*, pp. 184 sq.

² See *ante*, pp. 174 sq.

³ See *ante*, pp. 188 sq.

fact, already the strong and not wholly unsuccessful effort was being made to make it more accessible to them. Everything was in favour of such an endeavour; the increasingly wide dispersion of the Judeans, and then of the Samaritans also, amongst the most various heathen nations, new institutions which that dispersion gave rise to, the nation's ancient Scriptures which were becoming constantly better known to the heathen, the continuous stream of new books of a like spirit, and above all the growingly powerful movement and impulse of an age which, consciously or unconsciously, hastened to attain a higher destination.

In a former volume¹ the wide extent of the dispersion of Judeans and Samaritans amongst the heathen centuries before was indicated; and we saw above² the way in which it was customary at the time under notice to arrange the nations in brief summaries. It was only in the last century or two that the emigration to Arabia appears to have become at all great,³ when the Syrian and afterwards the Roman wars and the persecutions of Herod estranged so many from their native country, who were nevertheless unwilling to flee either to the east, or the west and north, whilst it was only in southern Arabia and Ethiopia, it seemed to them, they could remain free from the Roman and the Persian rule. But it is now impossible to name all the places where Judeans, in even considerable numbers, were then living amongst the heathen; and the great tranquillity which had generally prevailed for almost a century in the Roman Empire had particularly contributed to bring about this extensive dispersion. Wherever now throughout the civilised world a Judean set his foot, he could readily find fellow-religionists in greater or smaller numbers, and, except perhaps in wholly alien and most remote countries, nowhere as slaves, but everywhere dwelling as free citizens or freedmen.⁴

¹ Vol. v. pp. 237 sq.

² *Ante*, p. 99.

³ The earliest history of these Judeans of Arabia, which are mentioned last Acts ii. 11 also, is very obscure. In his preface to his Syrian *Chrestomathie*, p. 116, Michaelis supposes that Judeans had settled in Arabia from the year 129 B.C.; but this cannot be inferred from Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orient.* i. pp. 359 sq., and the Mohammedan accounts in the historical work of Hamaza of Ispahan (pp. 130 sq. ed. Gottwald) and similar ancient accounts, or such as, e.g., De Sacy communicates in his *Notices et Extraits*, ii. pp. 366 sq., or Caussin de Perceval in his

Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes, i. pp. 92 sq. do not furnish a secure basis with regard to these early times. The Judeans of Yemen, who became powerful there after the third century A.D., came from the Hig'az; but the communities which dwelt there were probably not founded before the destruction of Jerusalem, and by those who refused to surrender to the Romans. But it is certain that many Judeans dwelt in southern Arabia, near Sinai and elsewhere, before Christ, and it may be they who are here intended. This point I discussed as early as 1825 in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, pp. 253 sq.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 157, and vol. v. p. 242.

Moreover, those who were scattered abroad as individuals, and those who had long before found a settled home amongst the heathen, remained during these times for the most part faithful to their religion, inasmuch as just then it was in the world generally often regarded with a certain awe, and the Hagiocracy of Jerusalem became so universally acknowledged that it was better able without difficulty to keep even its scattered believers firmly together. Of the educated, undoubtedly but few passed over to the heathenism of Rome so completely as Tiberius Alexander above mentioned,¹ although many of them were very indifferent, as we have seen,² to the higher truths of their religion.

Inasmuch as the Judeans, therefore, had thus long since come into very various and close contact with the heathen, it might have been expected that their religion would on account of its intrinsic truth have thereby obtained the complete victory over heathenism, and that the heathen would have chosen to adopt it in great numbers. For though heathenism continued to be the religion of the empires of the world, it is involved in its very nature that the further it is developed the more it loses all higher truth; and at this time it had already everywhere lost that truth, at least in the countries of the more civilised world, whether under Roman rule or not, and perpetuated its existence more by the sluggish inertness of long habit and by the charm of the language of its poets, orators, and philosophers, in which little anxiety was shown for the well-being of the people, than by its intrinsic power and living reality. Heathenism had everywhere, but particularly where Greek and Roman culture predominated, long been ripe for its complete overthrow, and even itself unconsciously longed for a transition into a better condition. Consequently it often felt prophetically that even in the fundamentally different religion of the Judeans there might perhaps be something better than itself mysteriously hidden; and it often assumed towards Judeanism, as has been seen in the course of this work, an attitude of gloomy respect, or at all events of sufferance and toleration. The general doctrines of this religion had long been sufficiently well known to the heathen; partly by the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, and by so many other books which had been prepared and circulated by the Judeans for the very purpose that their religion might be recommended to the heathen in most various, and, if possible, most attractive forms; and further, by actual and more or less

¹ *Ante*, p. 196.

² *Ante*, pp. 196 sq., p. 200.

learned, oral instruction, which so many heathens often sought for with great eagerness; facts which we have described at length in the two previous volumes. In the Hellenistic literature there had been gradually more and more perfectly developed during the last three hundred years an entirely new hybrid class of writings, which formed a ready means of communication between the people of the ancient true religion and the heathen. This class of literature grew gradually more and more abundant and various,¹ the assiduity and skill displayed in its production increasingly great, and in our period showed no decline. The effect it produced upon many heathen was also obviously increasingly powerful.² Moreover, the number of the Judeans who were settled amongst the heathen and stood thus in many ways in closer relations to them, had been constantly on the increase in the all-absorbing Roman empire, partly on account of the blessing of indefatigable energy and activity, which is the natural effect of all true religion and was still perpetuated in this nation, and partly because the Roman empire presented in its wide and tranquil dominions such a large and convenient field for trade and business of all kinds. Besides, it cannot be denied that long since the tendency of the times had been in favour of callings for which the Judeans were adapted by their learning and other mental qualities, and callings which could be used to the disadvantage of the heathen. Inasmuch as this tendency could almost everywhere in the vast countries of the Roman empire be gratified easily, the number of the Judeans that permanently established themselves in them had hitherto always been on the increase. It follows accordingly, as a matter of course, that very many Judean scholars resided amongst the heathen.

However, substantially this state of things had now existed for upwards of three centuries, and yet no general conversion of the heathen was found to take place. Just, therefore, as if it had been felt in the hearts of the representatives of the Hagiocracy that at last time was pressing, and that without a greater accession of the heathen Israel itself could not longer exist with honour and influence in the world, actual

¹ It included (1) hortatory and prophetic works, comp. vol. v. p. 261; (2) strictly poetical works, *ibid.* p. 260; (3) scholarly, philosophical works, comp. *ibid.* pp. 257 sq. and *ante*, pp. 194 sq.; (4) historical works, comp. vol. v. pp. 464-473. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the growing assiduity that was displayed in

producing a literature of this class.

² As Virgil's 4th Eclogue (comp. *Göttingische Nachrichten* 1858, pp. 172 sq.), Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and other indications prove. This tendency amongst the heathen spread to Rome mainly by way of Alexandria.

missions had recently been instituted in Jerusalem, which extended their operations into all parts of the better known world;¹ and after the rise of Christianity a fresh and increased activity must, from motives of rivalry, have been exhibited by these. Apostles educated especially for this purpose, and supplied with credentials or even with introductions from the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem, went forth into the most distant countries, that they might bring over as many heathen as possible to the true religion; but although they converted individuals, and a good deal was made particularly of one more important instance to be mentioned subsequently, it was nevertheless abundantly shown that neither did this mean prove, down to the close of the period before us, to any considerable extent, successful. Whence, therefore, came the real difficulty and the great obstacle which in this matter also always in the end prevented any progress? We cannot be wrong if we find it in the original limitations of the ancient true religion itself, which were described in the second volume of this work, and again most of all in the Hagiocracy itself, and in the manner in which it now ruled, making it seem as if the entire existence of the true religion in the earth was inseparably connected with it. It was shown above how this religion at the last great crisis of Israel's history, six hundred years before, by retreating into itself and its own antiquity, because it could not attain its own consummation, gradually assumed more and more the stiff and stereotyped form of the Hagiocracy. After the Hagiocracy had now been developed during six centuries to the highest pitch, it appeared most plainly in the illustration before us how little it was adequate to meet the higher designs of true religion generally. All the infinitely sublime truths of this religion are, as it were, hidden under the covering of the Hagiocracy, and as it were fettered under its compulsion; and even though they are most zealously taught, as far as they are still known, they fail to inspire their confessors with any clear insight or true inspiration; whilst, on the other hand, all holiness and importance is more and more ascribed to the most minute observance of the numerous laws laid down by the Hagiocracy, and particularly to various ancient sacred usages. These laws, particularly those regarding circumcision and unclean food, were in them-

¹ The fact which is only incidentally indicated, Matt. xxiii. 15, is confirmed by such instances as that one which is narrated in detail in *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2. 4 (see below). We are justified in saying that

the early Christian apostolic mission, as it will be described below, could not have been so rapidly and perfectly developed if there had not been previous precedents to look back upon.

selves alone an almost insuperable obstacle to the spread of the ancient religion, unless they were to be enforced with the sword, as had in fact occurred a century and a half previously in the case of the Idumeans and others.¹ But even if a few individuals from the heathen submitted voluntarily to the severe compulsion of these laws, and even did not shrink from circumcision, in order that they might by submitting to this rite, as the mysteriously rigorous entrance into the new life of the true religion, be regarded as full members of the Community of God, all those who looked deeper could nevertheless perceive that it would remain always impossible in this way to convert very many heathen by purely voluntary means.²

Of all the ancient views and usages which the Hagiocracy had now revived and zealously maintained there was none, however, which was more prejudicial to the attempt to convert the heathen than the idea that the people of the ancient true religion must always remain in relation to all the heathen, that is, all other nations, a separate body to themselves, and the great sanctuary at Jerusalem their one eternal centre. We saw in the second volume of this work how formerly the true religion, when it took living shape by virtue of its own inmost truth, connected itself most closely with the national peculiarities of the one people in which it first arose, simply on account of its own weakness at the time, and, indeed, sought its most powerful and immediate representatives within this nation in the members of an hereditary priesthood; in the third and fourth volumes, how then when it was threatened in the middle period of its history by a thousand new dangers, it had sought to collect its forces most closely and firmly around the Sanctuary at Jerusalem; and in the fifth volume how at the commencement of the last great epoch of the history all this was afresh reasserted and established, although the true religion was even then urged to break through these its most direct limitations. What had grown up in earlier times only from the necessities of those times themselves had now been made by the Hagiocracy an iron and compulsory law, based upon ancient custom and isolated utterances of the Pentateuch; as if even now the true religion were still unable to exist in the world except under these national limitations. Indeed, with

¹ See vol. v. pp. 350 sq.

² The ridicule of the circumcised which had long been customary among the heathen of these times is well known, the *separati cupulis, discreti cubilibus*, Tac. *Hist.* v. 5 (which may supply an explana-

tion of the *κλιῶν*, Mark vii. 4); and even Augustus was pleased with one of his nephews because, although he sailed along the coast of Judea, he felt no desire to present sacrifices in Jerusalem, Suet. *Aug.*, ch. xciii.

the more vigorous development of the Hagiocracy generally these limitations had been rendered constantly narrower or more numerous. The times when a sanctuary rivalling that at Jerusalem arose in Egypt, with which the Ptolemies could equal the Seleucidæ, and where they could direct their subjects to present sacrifices,¹ had now passed away; the Hagiocracy had since then attained its greatest strength in Jerusalem, the one Roman rule did not favour such local peculiarities, and the Egyptian Temple was now kept up, according to every indication, only as an institution that had once been founded by rich endowments, and which there was no desire to disturb. All Judeans, wherever they might dwell, were now bound to bring their sacrifices to Jerusalem alone, either personally or by deputies, and to practise the laws of their religion solely according to the directions of the Hagiocracy residing there. Consequently all the Judeans who were dwelling amongst the heathen were the more absolutely *aliens scattered abroad* in proportion as they were zealous in their religion, inasmuch as they had to look upon the Holy Land only with its great Sanctuary as their true country.² But in this way all converted heathen were obliged to look to Jerusalem only and its commands, and thus, practically giving up their own country, submit themselves to this new nationality which had to be revered as holy. In this lay necessarily the most serious obstacle to the spread of the true religion. But the Judeans by birth also preferred on that account to remain, the better their circumstances were, at all events in the wide Roman countries, unsettled amongst the heathen even; they sought accordingly amongst the heathen, wherever it was possible, rather those worldly treasures which were themselves fluctuating; they followed amongst them by preference only trade and arts of gain, as became customary in the Roman empire, and in the end returned very gladly for a long time, or even for the rest of their days, to Jerusalem, whereby that city especially became now very populous. Only those Judeans who had settled at a much earlier period in the eastern countries beyond the limits of the Roman empire could now be regarded as more permanently established, although the heads of the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem were jealously vigilant in endeavouring to bind them as closely to their metropolis as possible.

¹ See vol. v. pp. 354 sq.

² This idea had for some centuries been so firmly established that even the Christians of the early Church took it as the basis of much of their thought,

although they put upon it a freer interpretation, as may be seen from Jas. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1 sq.; comp. with regard to this *Diaspora* what is said below.

Their own true religion, therefore, remained all along a wholly foreign thing amongst heathen nations, and it was precisely their best treasure that the latter were least able to recognise.

But even if individual heathen began nevertheless to perceive, or at all events to get an inkling of the glory of the true religion which was in this way disguised, when, forgetting their own nationality, they looked to Jerusalem alone, and voluntarily determined to subject themselves to those rigorous laws, not excepting even circumcision, what did they gain as the reward of so much self-denial and sacrifice? Undoubtedly there was still no lack of individual Judeans of most earnest and pure life; but the life of the majority and of the direct representatives of the Hagiocracy had long been very far from what was to be expected according to the requirements of the true religion.¹ The heathen had long ago observed this as a general fact: their satire regarding circumcision and pork reached far beyond its gross literal sense; and the false security, together with the perverse pride which so readily adheres to a Hagiocracy, was little adapted to make its most active agents into such heroes of pure motives and actions as this age required if its proper destination was to be attained. And although the victory of the true religion, as it had now been clearly portrayed for all time in the Sacred Scriptures, over heathenism generally was by a higher necessity so certain that only, as it were, one small thing appeared to be all along wanting that it might be secured, the entire ancient religion, in the form it had assumed in the Hagiocracy, must nevertheless always remain unable to bring forth from its midst this one thing which, small as it seemed, was still all-decisive; this fact had long been proved.

It is true that during the last centuries a more lenient view was often started regarding the measure of obligation which was to be imposed upon converts from the heathen. In that first happy period of the Ptolemies, when the most friendly and fruitful understanding between the adherents of both religions appeared about to be established for subsequent times, a Hellenist, under the disguise of the ancient gnomie poet Phocylides, had formally propounded to the heathen, in no less considerate than conciliatory language, as it were only the most necessary and unchanging requirements of all

¹ The intimations of Paul, Rom. ii. 17 sq., of Christ, and of the rest of the New Testament writers on this point, are so fully confirmed by this entire history that no one can deny their truth; we have but

to read carefully Josephus's own life, or what he mentions incidentally but definitely enough, *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4, and we shall see only too clearly the state of the case in this respect.

true religion, as if he had desired to construct for them an easy passage to his religion, and to show in detail the basis upon which they, no less than the Judean nation already known to them, might obtain the richest blessing of life.¹ And even at this later period the opinion was expressed by one of those missionaries, at all events with reference to a heathen prince, that circumcision was not absolutely necessary for admission to the full blessing of Judeanism.² But such opinions, and the corresponding missionary efforts based upon them, remained very exceptional, and they gradually disappeared in this later period, in proportion as the relations between Judeans and heathens grew increasingly strained, inasmuch as they were wholly incompatible with the inmost life and tendencies of the Hagiocracy, and originated rather in an undefined feeling than in a clear perception of the consequences of such innovations.

Yet, on the other hand, the impulse to spread the true religion amongst the heathen had long been too powerful to admit of its being at this time wholly repressed by such hindrances; the longing, too, on the part of many heathen to share in some way its blessings had become too sincere and imperative to permit it to continue finally unsatisfied. Consequently, long before this time an entirely new institution had arisen, which, of all the new institutions that sprang into life during the course of the last general epoch of Israel's history and that belonged purely to its pre-Christian period, became beyond dispute the noblest and the most consistent. This is the institution of at least a partial admission of any heathen seeking salvation to all Israel's sanctuaries.

Immediately after the first restoration of Jerusalem from its ruins these sanctuaries had been of two wholly different classes. From the time that sacrifices could be offered only in the great Sanctuary at Jerusalem,³ smaller temples elsewhere became a general necessity in the case of a living religion, temples in

¹ It was long ago easy to surmise that the 225 or 230 hexameters of this gnomic poem were derived from a Judean source, from the mere fact that almost half of them have in most MSS. been incorporated into the second book of the Sibylline poems. They have great similarity with those of the Erythraean Sibyl, fragments of which have been preserved in Theophilus, *ad Autolyceum* ii. 3. 36, but are probably older than the latter, since they are besides so exceedingly simple in art and arrangement, and transfer us at once into the times when the happiest relations

subsisted between Judeans and Egyptians. Moreover, it is obviously not from forced caution and prudential considerations, but from intelligence and conviction, that this Hellenist confines himself to the most essential requirements of the true religion according to the teaching of the Pentateuch. I regard the address, long known, of *Isocrates* to Demonicos, which is now published in a Syrian translation (Lagarde's *Anal.* pp. 167-177), as likewise a work of this kind.

² *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2. 5 (see below).

³ See vol. iv. pp. 238 sq.

which that sacrifice which was of all others the smallest in appearance, though it was essentially the greatest, was offered, the sacrifice of the Sabbath¹ and of the prayers of the community of the locality that were heard on that day. A simple *house of prayer* (*proseuche*) of this kind could easily be erected anywhere,² might, according to circumstances, be of a more or less permanent structure, simple or more elaborate and ornamental, but might in no case contain an altar, which had to be confined to the one great Sanctuary in Jerusalem. A favourite site was near a flowing stream, in which the hands could be washed before prayer.³ In localities where a community of some size existed, a prayer-house of this kind could easily be called a synagogue, and take the form of a magnificent building; in that case not only was the Law expounded and prophetic passages read⁴ on the Sabbath in addition to the prayers, but addresses, based on a passage of the Law or the Prophets, were delivered, sometimes by a succession of speakers. A good copy of the Scriptures, a special pulpit or seat for the speaker, and seats for the congregation were parts of the necessary furniture of a house of this kind. And though houses of this nature were always regarded as sacred⁵ on account of the public prayers which were held in them, this was only in a very general sense, and they were by no means sacred in the same sense as the Temple in Jerusalem. Of such houses of prayer many arose formerly amongst the exiles after the destruction of the Temple; after its restoration also the whole land was filled with them in consequence of the revival of zeal for the ancient true religion; and they soon received new importance as the centres of the communities dispersed through the Greek and Roman empires, in proportion as the legal privileges which were granted to the communities were extensive. The heads of the communities naturally administered the civil rights granted to each community, appointed umpires in case of differences amongst their members, inflicted minor punish-

¹ See *Antiquities*, pp. 108 sq.

² Hence Acts xvi. 13, a place is spoken of which *was as was supposed* (*ἐνομίζετο εἶναι*) a *place of prayer*, inasmuch as it had not the appearance of an ordinary synagogue, and which it could not well be called. Comp. further the remarks, vol. v. p. 243.

³ As we are justified in inferring from the indications mentioned, vol. v. p. 23, compared further with Philo, *In Place*, ii. p. 535; Acts xvi. 13; *Juven. Sat.* xiv.

104.

⁴ Luke iv. 16, 17; Acts xiii. 14, 15, xv. 21: whence it appears further that the selections from the Pentateuch continued to be the chief thing, to which those from the prophets could be easily added. Nor have we reason to doubt that singing was also customary in the synagogues.

⁵ The oldest and most appropriate name is therefore that taken from the poets מוֹעֲדֵי אֱל (Ps. lxxiv. 8).

ments upon their own people,¹ and liked to appropriate to themselves once more as many rights as they could. But in consequence of the constant and extremely busy intercourse of the communities of the Diaspora with Jerusalem, and inasmuch as many members of the ancient nation often returned with their families to live in retirement in Jerusalem, several synagogues for the foreign countries had arisen in this one city alone, synagogues in which the Roman, or the Cyrenean, or other foreign Judeans chiefly assembled.² Thus at the time before us hundreds of sanctuaries without altars had arisen within and without the Holy Land in addition to the one great Sanctuary, which was in sole possession of the altar and the sacrifices of the altar, and with which the seat of the Hagioeracy was exclusively connected. Priests by birth were not necessary for the superintendence of the prayer and other exercises of these places, which were appropriately called synagogues, while in the chief Sanctuary they were indispensable. And, in fact, the latter alone continued to be called in ordinary language the Sanctuary, inasmuch as the former were regarded only as indispensable places of preparation for the higher offerings and mysteries and of the preliminary exercises for the Learned School of Jerusalem. Whether they had not really become already something more than this, could only be shown by great unforeseen events; and the difficulties in the case of the Judeans in Egypt above referred to³ showed that there was a determination to preserve them from desecration.

However, it was as by a higher necessity, which, little as it was then heeded, became at last of growing moment, that at the very beginning of the last general epoch of Israel's history the heathen had to be admitted at least partially to both these exceedingly different classes of sanctuaries, a fact which might plainly have shown the great truth that this religion, even as early as the destruction of the first Temple, had had laid upon it the duty to pass to the heathen also.⁴ Since foreign kings ruled over Israel, it became an immediate necessity with the foundation of the new Temple to present sacrifices for them too; and there arose a third or outermost Temple-court, where such sacrifices were presented for the heathen kings, and where every heathen could have sacrifices offered for him. By the very act of presenting prayers and sacrifices for the heathen ruler the ancient religion overstepped its primary limits; and if

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25; Acts xviii. 17, passage, *ante*, p. 157.
and other instances.

³ *Ante*, p. 252.

² Acts vi. 9 and the remarks on this ⁴ See vol. v. pp. 27 sq.

a distinguished heathen sought to have sacrifices presented for him, he thereby really acknowledged this religion to a certain degree, although it was in such cases only allowable to present the whole burnt-offering, as that of the most general nature.¹ These sacrifices continued to be still allowable, and those of a voluntary nature amongst them were at times greatly increased in number; and it created general surprise when, at the beginning of the last great war, it was determined to present no more sacrifices in the Temple for the heathen.² But in the case of both the great Sanctuary and the smaller ones, after the return from the Captivity heathen were gladly admitted simply as auditors desirous to be taught, inasmuch as more intimate intercourse with them had become customary in the Captivity; their zeal as *God-fearing* and *devout* persons³ was witnessed with delight, and they were also probably regarded as a third or lowest class of confessors of the true religion, after the priests (and Levites) and the ‘people of Jahveh’ in the strict sense.⁴ In the Holy Land itself, it is true, the relations between Judeans and heathens were soon once more so much less friendly that only a few individual heathens joined the synagogues.

But the Judean synagogues were in these later times the more widely opened in Greek and Roman countries to all studious heathen, so that a separate class of such *devout heathen*, or semi-Judeans, was formed. The Hagiocracy itself facilitated this partial admission of heathen in their own countries, occupied itself with new laws for the fresh class to be formed, endeavoured, from a proper perception of the importance of this inclination on the part of many heathen, to bring them into the most salutary relation, and at the same time took care above all things not to forget its own objects. But if it was sought to establish this relation by means of the Pentateuch, the only laws available for this purpose were those regarding the partial citizens, or the vassals of other nationality—that is, the *Proselytes*.⁵ It is true, those laws pre-supposed that Israel was a nation with its own independent government, which was now no longer the fact; but as they extended the protection of Israel to all heathen who desired to submit to the necessary

¹ Vol. v. p. 173; *Antiquities*, p. 49.

² Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2 (comp. below).

³ Thus in Psalms of that period, see *Dichter des Alten Bundes*, i. b. p. 397 (3rd ed.), and later again Acts x. 2, 7, 22, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, 17, xviii. 7; whence we see that Luke prefers, when the narrative is his own original composition,

to use *σέβασθαι* rather than *φοβείσθαι τὸν Θεόν*.

⁴ This is the case at all events in the first beautiful songs of the restored Jerusalem, Ps. cxv. 9–13, cxviii. 1–4, comp. cxxxv. 19, 20.

⁵ See *Antiquities*, pp. 235 sq. The LXX. translate *ἡ* by *προσήλυτος*.

conditions of dwelling with them, so it was supposed that heathen could now be admitted under this name of Proselytes (*To-comers*) into a closer association with the communities if they kept, at least, the most general commandments of the true religion. Inasmuch, therefore, as they could be regarded as preparatory disciples for a subsequent full entrance into the true religion, it was preferred to select the commandments to be imposed on them as far as possible from the laws of the Pentateuch belonging to pre-Mosaic times; and, since the favourite habit of the schools at the time was to reduce everything to the number seven, the following conditions were made: (1), avoidance of idolatry; (2), of blasphemy of the true God; (3), of shedding and eating of blood; (4), of eating things strangled; (5), of fornication; (6), of stealing; (7), acknowledgment of the court of justice. They were the laws which were then called the *commands of Noah*,¹ as being mainly based upon Gen. ix. 1-17. All those who pledged themselves to obey them were regarded as partial members of the communities, were entitled to attend the religious services regularly, and were by preference greeted as *devout*, or *God-fearing*, persons, and were probably generally called by these names in ordinary life. But afterwards the endeavour was made to lead them by degrees to further stages; at first, perhaps, to the observance of all the regulations regarding food, and finally to circumcision.² It was only those who had been circumcised who were addressed as *righteous*, they being supposed to be righteous before God, as having observed all the divine laws and institutions.³ Still it was found that it was women rather than men who made up their minds even to the first stage of conversion.⁴

¹ Just as the Talmud often calls men who live righteously *sons of Noah* generally. The more definite form of the idea was accordingly, that while these laws had been given for all men since Noah's time, they must be regarded as essential in the case of the Proselytes; comp. the Gemara on *Aboda Zara fol. ii. ad fin.*, and on v. 1.

² This gradual advance is admirably described, *Juven., Sat. xiv. 98, 99* also, and we shall have to speak of it further below.

³ The distinction was accordingly now made between גְּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק, who however were also in ordinary discourse always called προσήλυτοι still, and גְּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר, *Proselytes of the Gate*, although the latter name, as taken simply from Israel's earlier civic life, was now wholly unsuitable, and

though used in the schools of the Law never occurred in common life. In ordinary life, on the contrary, it was only a complete proselyte who was called by the name. In the above-mentioned verses of Phokylides, on the other hand, the simple keeping of the more general commands is called δικαιοσύνη, ver. 229, which is not therefore in agreement with the opinion of the schools of the Pharisees, but points likewise to the earlier age of these verses above mentioned. Comp. vol. vi, pp. 23 sq. The frequency of the partial entrance is shown by the newly-coined verb הִתְנַקֵּר *to become a proselyte*, *M. פאה*, iv. 6.

⁴ Acts xiii. 50, xvi. 13. *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 20, 2, *Ant.* xx. 2, 4, and many other instances; in Christianity all this assumed an essentially different form.

It is certain that this partial Judeanism contributed greatly in those days to the spread of the true religion, and that many of these proselytes came really under the influence of genuine devotion,¹ but it is no less clear that such a partial and undecided relationship could not possibly be permanent. For Christianity, however, as it had now to be brought to the heathen, the best means of transition had been thereby provided. Whoever now travelled into distant lands as a Christian Apostle would often meet everywhere with a certain acquaintance with the fundamental principles of true religion, and, indeed, with Messianic hopes and kindred aims as connecting points for his work; and the majority of the partial Judeans appeared only to wait for the moment when they might be delivered by Christianity from their unsatisfactory intermediate position, and become full children of the true religion, as the history of Paul will soon show. Undoubtedly, individual novitiates of this kind would sometimes hold to Judeanism much more scrupulously, and became embittered enemies of the new Apostles; still, in general amongst the institutions of the world at that time there was none more favourable to Christianity than this partial Judeanism. The general hindrances to the conversion of the heathen to the true religion could in Christianity be removed; and the heathen could in Christianity obtain, not merely full equality, but with it the perfect true religion, which hitherto they had never been able to find even in Judeanism. In the institution of the synagogues, too, Christianity found a basis and a model for its own places of worship, when they should become necessary.

On the other hand, however, nothing could be more helpful to a man who was about to devote his life to the work of carrying Christianity to the heathen than to hear that the news of Christianity had already been long since carried by the Judeans themselves into all heathen countries, and that the heathen had by that means been made not a little desirous to learn more particulars about it. From the first Passover very many Judeans, believing and unbelieving, friends and enemies, had undoubtedly, as we have seen,² immediately begun to spread the news of Christ and of a community called by his name to Rome and other heathen cities, and the annual journeys to the feasts at Jerusalem had kept the tidings alive. The details of this are no

¹ Philo's observations in his manner on this point, ii. p. 406, comp. p. 258, are undoubtedly not wholly baseless; the name too had in his day already been some time used, since he probably employs ἐπηλύτης

ii. p. 257 sq.; comp. pp. 219, 677, instead of it, where he also acknowledges a circumcision not of the flesh but of the heart.

² *Ante*, p. 99.

longer preserved to us, but it is undeniable that in the chief cities, such as Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome, there at once arose much contention between the Judeans concerning Christ and his cause, that individual believers separated themselves from the others, and proselytes could connect themselves with the latter, and that the first nuclei of Christian churches were early formed in heathen countries. We observed above ¹ that immediately upon his accession Claudius assumed a more vigilant attitude towards the Judeans in Rome, or rather Jewish Christians. If by this time the first enthusiasm of the day of Pentecost had in many places more or less subsided, the beginnings of Christian faith amongst individual Judeans that were dispersed everywhere presented to a Christian Apostle who was determined to devote his life to the conversion of the heathen various threads of connection which he could skilfully use, although the main work had still to be done, inasmuch as the conversion of the heathen generally had yet to be attempted.

Paul as a Christian Apostle and Writer.

Yet what would have been all these helps and facilities, as they came to the assistance of Paul as a Christian Apostle, partly from the Ancient Community, partly from the first widely-dispersed followers of Christ, if he had not borne in himself far mightier resources to enable him to obtain, in a matter of such manifold difficulty, that which was now involved in the necessary progress of Christianity. If a Christian Apostle is, in opposition to the errors and sins of the world, and in the midst of men who are new and strange to him, to attain great results, the full possession of a number of rare talents will be required by him, or that in which he is lacking in this respect must be made up in other ways by the highest advantages. And inasmuch as Paul was, from his youth up, highly educated in all Hellenistic as well as Judean wisdom, he might in that respect have had many not inconsiderable advantages over the Twelve. But Paul had at the same time, as an apostate Pharisee, to contend with the bitterest enmity, especially from the most zealous Judeans, and, soon, as firmly carrying out Christian liberty in quite a new way, with a great and, indeed, increasing number of timid Christians likewise; and whilst his toils and labours, as well as the exposures and dangers of his life, thus grew from these sources alone to an incredible height, he very soon set before himself in addition

¹ *Ante*, p 261.

the most comprehensive and far-reaching aim of an apostolic life-work conceivable. For this aim very soon appeared to him to be no other than that of leading the whole heathen world to Christ, as will have to be further explained below. But in proportion to the difficulty and height of the task, the courageous determination to become wholly equal to it grew within him; with the misunderstandings and enmities of men, only the zeal of purer and more definite action; with the multitude of obstacles which surrounded him, and the dark clouds which he saw rising in the distant heavens, only the untiring endeavour, with all prudence, modesty, and foresight, to attain his aim as quickly as possible. In all this no one else is so great a hero as Paul; and as that which he strove after as the sole aim of his apostolic mission was indisputably right and divinely necessary, his courage and zeal and his wholly wonderful activity were necessarily at last accompanied by those equally wonderful results which we see appearing more and more evidently in the following history. But all the more instructive is it to ascertain more particularly the means by which he attained such great results.

It would, indeed, be improper to speak of the particular means which he used as of arts a man laboriously acquires and craftily applies. Everything with him flowed from one impulse and from one fact which he perceived and believed. In Jesus Christ has appeared the one being who, by showing to perfection the human life intended by and well-pleasing to God, raises all those who follow him to their highest destination, while he destroys all who despise him: this fundamental thought, which, by its constant use, has to-day lost so much of its original power with many, though it can still fill everyone who fully and vividly conceives it with inexhaustible enthusiasm, took possession of him in its first and most ardent fire just as it entered the world, and in the brightest form in which it could enter it. It took possession of him at the moment when the future seemed limited to the shortest respite, when the whole world as it then was seemed to be destined soon to pass away, and all who were not converted in due time seemed to be lost. And moreover it seized upon him as one who had been converted to it with difficulty and after so much resistance, and thus he was most powerfully urged by it, by offering his utmost personal toil and labour, to compensate for the grievous errors which he now so deeply repented of. He chose, accordingly, to work, not as a simple Christian, but (which was much harder and a thousand times

more laborious) as one of the Apostles sent by Christ himself to the world. He early recognised this as his most special divine calling, and soon for the rest of his days he could think of only one high joy in his life—namely, that it might be granted him, when sooner or later Christ should reveal himself as Judge of the world in all his glory, not to appear before him alone, merely as one of his most sincere servants, but likewise to lead to him the greatest possible number of individuals or of entire churches, converts like himself and possessors of the same hope;¹ this being, as he felt, the best way and that most pleasing to Christ, in which he could make up for his former sins against Him and His Church. As now everything combined in this unique and intense manner in his case, his whole life and labour from that moment onwards was directed solely to the one end of responding as absolutely as he could to the divine call which he had recognised as appointing him; and every single thing which he did or left undone, which he strove after and which he attained, flowed from this one impulse. He belonged now no longer to himself or to any merely human relation, though it would in other respects have been the most sacred; he felt at every moment of his life that he was bound by no less indissoluble ties to Him who was now invisible, before whom he formerly trembled as before his Judge and the Judge of the world, lest he should not be able to stand, and before whom he nevertheless now always rejoiced again, and felt the deepest inward assurance. He knew of no sacrifice in the form of labour, of weariness, of suffering, of patience, of accommodation, of compliance, of docility, and of persistent self-improvement, which he would not at once joyfully have brought, as far as it was needful and as far as it was consistent with the Christian spirit. No obstacle, however great, or experience however bitter, subdued his zeal, no enmity his inextinguishable love for the pure cause of Christ, no amount of misconception his goodwill. But if he constantly lived thus exaltedly and exceptionally, as if with Christ himself, and as if in heaven, and was also, like all the more imaginative Christians of that time, disposed to be carried away with celestial visions and ecstasies, and lay for hours as if entranced, yet he really never forgot his just relation to every present reality with its peculiar requirements and necessities, but preserved for it continually the same clear insight; still less did he allow himself, even after he had had some brilliant successes, to be led away

¹ To which Paul often alludes, from ii. 19, to his latest, Phil. ii. 16, Col. i. 23; his earliest Epistles, 2 Thess. i. 7, 1 Thess. see especially 2 Cor. xi. 2.

into any kind of exaggeration or excess. Precisely this clear vision and wise moderation always guides his whole action from the very first.

As an Apostle of Christ he always knows clearly, above all things, on what a height he stands and must stand. Christ indeed is now become invisible, but whoever will be one of his Apostles in this age must so act and so speak *for him* as if God Himself were through him exhorting the men of this generation to believe, must incessantly labour by exhortation, entreaty, adjuration, counsel, healing for his cause and for his kingdom in the same way as in the things of a human kingdom an ambassador acts for his king.¹ Thus Paul acts and speaks everywhere from his pure, celestial elevation, and all his words overflow, when he has before him men generally, or even a church, with an inward certainty and assurance which could not be greater. He seems to speak and labour quite like a prophet of the Old Testament; and yet it is not God alone, to whom he stands or falls, like one of them, and by whom he knows that he is sent; it is with the history and the word of Christ that his deep personal assurance first takes its rise, knowing both as he does from the surest source,² and having heard as he had his call itself in its overpowering force; and if he is behind other Apostles in his knowledge of the particulars of the history, and to many of its details attaches no great weight, because of his prevailing tendency to seek the exalted and universal idea, he still possesses all the greater certainty as regards the main facts and main sayings which he knows regarding Christ and which he makes the basis of his work. But though he speaks everywhere with divinest certainty, and when it is required gives decisions and passes sentences also, issues decrees and founds institutions, he at the same time knows no less clearly in every instance, that as a Christian and in the age when the love of God makes itself felt equally towards all men through Christ, he must always proceed quite differently from an Old Testament prophet, that he is only one of the thousands of brethren already redeemed and to be redeemed by Christ. Accordingly he exhibits everywhere again the most affectionate, modest, and human condescension; and it is precisely this combination of apparently incompatible characteristics—this divine elevation and incisive judgment and this

¹ 2 Cor. v. 20, 21, this is once expressed most plainly.

² I have proved in my introductory essay to the *Drei ersten Evang.* [i. pp. 62 sq.], and then in my commentary on the *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus* [e.g. p.

47 sq.], that Paul had before him a written Gospel, and, indeed, the earliest one now recognisable by us, and the fact is, in spite of all the doubts raised against it, beyond dispute. Comp. *ante*, p. 290.

human attachment, gentleness, and humility—which, however, in his case flow from but one impulse and one force, and are always found co-operating, that constitutes the peculiar greatness which commands our admiration of him as an Apostle. He looked upon every man only as a brother to be won for Christ, and although he communicated and talked with all whom he thus won as an Apostle, it was still as with brothers in the full sense. But if his sincere intentions, and thereby the nature and object of the apostolic office of Christ himself, were misconceived, he was equally able to maintain his dignity; not that he deemed it very necessary to defend himself before men, but he was led by the true feeling that the apostolic office was a great necessity in the world, and that being necessary its objects and its true dignity must be defended.¹

However, even thus early a large and motley multitude of teachers of religion, teachers of law, thaumaturgists, magicians, and the like, of Judean origin, had for some time been wandering through the countries of the Roman empire, apparently from compassion for the heathen, really for the most part from the most selfish motives alone, or at all events in such a way that they did not sufficiently guard against the suspicion that that was the case.² Paul was aware of that fact, and when he now for the first time confronted the vast and unknown sphere of those labours to which he had resolved to devote his whole life, and more than his merely earthly life, he involuntarily felt that, unlike those missionaries of doubtful sincerity, he must in this respect cast no human shadow of any kind upon the progress of the purely divine cause of the Gospel, but must always strive in every possible way to preserve its perfect purity by all material and bodily sacrifices. Accordingly he accustomed himself everywhere to labour for the Gospel without expecting or accepting any human reward of any kind, preferring to earn his scanty daily bread by the labour of his hands; not that he supposed that a labourer for the Gospel was not permitted to accept any human reward; on the contrary, he was aware of Christ's word on this point, and on the appropriate occasion quoted it.³ It was not, therefore, in order

¹ It is to such occasions that we owe the exceedingly instructive passages in his Epistles, in which he lays bare, as if against his will, and yet in obedience to higher necessity, the inmost motives of his heart, 2 Cor. i. 12, ii. 17, iv. 2, 12, v. 20, 21, x. 1–xii. 19, particularly as he had once before, as if he had forgotten himself, spoken on this point to the same church upon another provocation, 1 Cor.

iv. 9–13, ix. 1–27, x. 33 sq. Subsequently again Phil. iii. 3–17.

² See the examples, *ante*, pp. 179 sq., vol. vi. pp. 83 sq., and others to be mentioned below.

³ As we can plainly see from the earliest passages of this kind, 2 Thess. iii. 7–9; 1 Thess. ii. 5–7, 9; further, 1 Cor. ix. 7–11.

to censure others who accepted reward when gratefully offered, but simply because he thought that he himself could thus remain most easily independent of all obligations to men, and also thereby work most untrammelled in his divine vocation. At first, too, he was influenced by the desire to show that a good Christian must not live upon the means of his fellow-Christians, to which many were only too much inclined through misunderstanding the Christian doctrine of a community of goods.¹ In fact, this was only one small, although constant and very obvious, sacrifice amongst many others and larger ones, to the joyous presentation of which his mind had long risen. And we can properly realise that the sacrifice was from a human point of view by no means insignificant only when we observe that Paul had very often Christian men in his immediate neighbourhood and company, for whose necessities he was compelled to provide.² But when subsequently Apostles proceeded from the parent church, who desired, entirely without reason, to cast suspicions upon and to wholly supplant him, although they received ample payment for their injurious labours in the very churches which Paul himself had planted, he was justified in referring to this difference between himself and them.³ And if he thus acted from purely voluntary self-sacrifice, he could on the proper occasion make an exception from his rule when very special circumstances made it necessary.⁴—Similarly, it was his voluntary sacrifice that he did not marry again, although Peter and most of the other Apostles, as well as the brothers of the Lord, had wives and probably took them with them on their journeys.⁵

It was a similar consideration which induced him never to carry the Gospel where it had already been preached by others. Why should he interfere with other men's labours, since the whole heathen world was open and could not find gospel-labourers enough? It was easy for him to find work enough everywhere when everything had to be begun quite from the beginning, and work difficult enough to suit his enterprising spirit; and he never sought conflict with other workmen. The more justifiable, therefore, was his displeasure when subse-

¹ As we may likewise easily perceive from 2 Thess. iii. 7-9.

² As may for instance be seen from the incidental remark, Acts xx. 34 (*τοῖς ὄσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ*). From this fact we see how in Gal. i. 2, at a time when Timothy was accidentally not with him, he could still consult *with all the brethren*

with him, and write to a church in their name.

³ 2 Cor. xi. 7-15, xii. 13, 14.

⁴ In the case of the church at Philippi, see below.

⁵ To which he properly refers in a similar connection, 1 Cor. ix. 4-6.

quently others from impure motives interfered with him in his harvest-fields.¹

When he entered one of the thousand virgin fields which lay before him, he sought at once, by narrating the great Christian truth, by living proofs of it, by exhortation, by prayer, and the freest communication of all the feelings and exercises of his spirit, to call forth in all those who heard him that spirit itself which bore upon it the unambiguous marks of the influence and working of the Holy Spirit; and with all his patience he had no rest until he beheld this blessed fruit of his toils. Before this was accomplished weeks might often elapse, particularly as his labours would be quite unhindered only on the Sabbath and the Sunday; but when at last his spiritual eye perceived that the new power of the Holy Ghost was thereby extending itself over many, or over few, the hour had arrived when, as with the sacred fire of his hands, he impressed the seal of the Holy Spirit upon those heads which were, as he could hope, already divinely touched by it, and from that moment he regarded them as having passed into that higher condition in which they would only by their own fault chase away from themselves the enlightening presence and the marvellous power of the Spirit.² The administration of baptism, however, he generally left to others.³ But when he left a Church which he had thus founded, he had undoubtedly already so far organised it that it could develop itself independently. In such cases he generally left behind a *teacher* who could continue to serve it with instruction, and whom it could consult with regard to difficult questions, as, for instance, Luke at Philippi.⁴ These *teachers*, of whom Paul particularly speaks as of important members of Christian societies,⁵ and who were obviously appointed especially by him, are substantially identical with the original Evangelists,⁶ but are from this time distinguished from them in that they laboured more permanently in one church. He further undoubtedly furnished each of the churches founded by him with a copy of the brief gospel which necessarily constituted for him and for them the outward basis of all Christian work, and which at that time possessed no significance at

¹ 2 Cor. x. 12-16; Rom. xv. 20, 21.

² If one will more distinctly realise the general conception, as gathered from the numerous scattered indications presented by the Apostle's own words in all his Epistles, and by the reminiscences of the Acts of the Apostles harmonising with them, it will take the form above given. With regard to the act of the imposition

of hands, see also Heb. vi. 2, and *ante*, pp. 135 sq.

³ See *ante*, p. 135.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 28.

⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; comp. Eph. iv. 11; Acts xiii. 1; the name Evangelist, on the other hand, is not found in Paul's writings.

⁶ See *ante*, p. 113.

all without the living Holy Spirit. Of course every church had also either the whole or a part of the Old Testament. And Paul everywhere still retained, as he was bound to do, the existing connection with Israel so firmly, that in every town he first visited the synagogues of the Judeans, and sought to make them the basis of his labours amongst the heathen.

But he never left one of the larger or smaller churches, which he had thus founded under a thousand difficulties, without continuing to bear it in his heart as a father his dearest child; and, on the other hand, undoubtedly most of these his children remained unchangeably faithful to him. With the most affectionate heart and also with the keenest eye, he watched the changing condition and history of these churches, even when the number had already become so uncommonly large, and grew daily larger through the labours of his disciples. From these also the weightiest questions, or even complaints and demands of all kinds, constantly reached him; and wherever he was in subsequent years, 'the care of all the Churches'¹ was no light burden upon him, increasing the weight of all his other incredibly numerous and profound anxieties and pains. An uncommonly rapid exchange of epistles was thus occasioned, which gradually increased with the extent and duration of the Apostle's labours; but he perceived that he must be no less active and unwearied in this epistolary department of his labours, and he did not try to escape his duty in this respect. The composition of an epistle of this kind to a church, or even to a leading member of a church, was always with him an important matter. He consulted beforehand with one or two of his most trusted associates, and also with friends known to his readers, or with other 'brethren,' as to the main contents of the letter, and then composed it in their name also, as if it came not from himself alone; despatched it thus in the spirit of common Christian brotherhood as a work not proceeding solely and arbitrarily from himself alone, and was thus able on that very account to expect on the part of its receivers a more careful reading and consideration of its contents. But as every one of his letters bore the most unmistakable marks of his own characteristic mind, and in the midst of the full flow of his thoughts, he permitted himself to speak most freely for himself alone, they are evidently all no less the offspring of the

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 28. A hint of this kind is found in this passage only; it is as if it had on this one occasion involuntarily escaped the Apostle, as is the case with

many other particulars in 2 Cor. x.-xii., but comp. immediately afterwards 2 Cor. xi. 29.

moment, composed amid endless occupations, toils, and cares, in their style undoubtedly for the most part only reflections of his oral discourses, yet all, without exception, the outcome of the activity, of the inexhaustible, profound, and marvellously bright mind, which was most affectionate and yet most powerful and candid, and were, therefore, epistles such as no one before had written or could write. And who, when they were being composed or despatched, would have thought that they (as far as they have been preserved) were destined to become the lasting memorials of the most exalted and purest life and thought that were making themselves felt during these forty years for all the future ?

As, therefore, Paul's power and influence as a Christian Apostle could thus make themselves felt in the composition of epistles, and as his epistles gradually effected so much in the immediate present, as his own experience might teach him in his later years, he was naturally thereby induced subsequently to write to churches which had not been founded by him, of which class, we have the one great example in the Epistle to the Romans, or to address himself to churches founded by his pupils, to which class the Epistle to the Colossians belongs. Great as he was as a Christian Apostle, he became equally great as a Christian writer ; and original and productive as he was in the first capacity, he became almost more so in the second. For though it would be very incorrect to say that he became the first Christian author, inasmuch as the entire literature of the Gospels arose in entire independence of him and had been commenced before his time,¹ he still founded that Christian literature which, as a special kind of literature, is still more than the Gospels genuinely Christian, and becomes one of the most important means of the entire development of Christianity until late in the following times. It is true the custom of writing epistles was in itself nothing new either in the Greek and Roman world of that time or in the ancient Community of Israel. Long before the Greek supremacy the great public affairs in the Eastern countries had led the acknowledged heads of a nation to address themselves in epistles to distant fragments of the nation, and one community in this way exchanged with another its thoughts and desires with regard to common affairs ; and thus long before Paul a literary habit and art of the kind had been developed in those circles with which he was more familiarly acquainted.² It had also

¹ Comp. my essay on the *Ursprung ersten Evang.* i. pp. 1 sq.
und Wesen der Evangelien, in *Die drei*

² For instance, Jer. xxix., the instances

long been the habit to write works in the form of the confidential and cordial language of epistolary correspondence with merely fictitious persons. But as Christianity everywhere originated in the closest and most domestic cordiality and the labours of the most brotherly love, but was soon driven from its first and nearest home and scattered without any outward unity over all countries, epistolary correspondence, with all the cordiality, sincerity, and frankness which it allows, could now become the most appropriate means of exhortation and instruction; and even without Paul it must have been developed. It retained this high importance after Paul's time, as late as the second and third century, being further developed in very various forms. Still it was Paul who first made this art the most perfectly pliant servant of the Christian spirit, and invested it with the marvellous charm of the profoundest Christian thoughts. It was he who first gave it this purely exalted character and this most appropriate form; and almost all the innumerable epistles that followed his were either occasioned by his, or follow more or less closely his precedent. Most of them are only copies of the model which he first supplied. Still even in the New Testament itself, some epistles have been preserved which exhibit features that are quite independent of him, and which also proceeded from men upon whom his mind exerted very little influence.¹

But if he was the Apostle whose general characteristics we have thus seen, it is easy to understand that even the defects and imperfections under which he might suffer, would be certain soon to vanish before the exalted excellence which distinguished all his labours. His opponents, even among Christians, objected to him, that his language was not sufficiently pure and polished,² that his oral discourse was timid and mean, that his presence generally was in actual life feeble, and that in his letters only was he powerful.³ But in this we only find repeated in his case what had been shown in that of Moses at the beginning of this entire history⁴; that such defects even as would entirely prevent smaller men from accomplishing lofty labours of this kind, cannot stay the course of the exalted energies of the purely divine spirit when once it is fully operating in its chosen human instrument. Moreover,

in 1st Macc., the whole 2nd Macc., with its two prefatory epistles, and the book by Aristæus are proof of this.

¹ That is, the Epistles of James and John, the genuineness of which is shown in this respect also. Neither a James nor

a John followed as writers of epistles in Paul's steps.

² 2 Cor. xi. 6.

³ 2 Cor. x. 9.

⁴ See vol. ii. pp. 52 sq.

even the serious ailments of his body from which he often suffered,¹ his divine patience and heroic faith overcame so fully that they were for him only another inducement to pursue all the more zealously the one object which always remained immovable before his eyes.

And it is equally certain that his entire labours, in spite of the immense difficulties of every kind with which he had all along to contend, and which only increased in the course of his work, necessarily became in their deepest effects more and more successful and himself the Apostle of unequalled greatness, who said but little of himself when he subsequently boasted that, though the least of the Apostles, he had laboured more than they all.² It is true, it is incorrect to think of Paul as the first Apostle to the heathen, as we have already seen³; and Christianity had undoubtedly long before him spread here and there amongst the heathen. Immediately after the revolutionising events of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection and the first Whitsunday, the name of Christ and of Christians for the first time echoed far and wide through many cities and countries; individual Christians were from the beginning, and before Stephen's death, scattered about through adjacent countries;⁴ and according to the most evident indications, churches early arose, without any action on the part of Paul or of his disciples, in the most important cities of the West—Rome and Alexandria—where communication was at the time most frequent.⁵ We have now too little information with regard to the labours and journeys of the above-mentioned⁶ earliest Apostles, although it cannot be denied that they were various and important. Yet Paul nevertheless immediately surpassed all who had attempted anything of a similar nature before him, inasmuch as he was the first to recognise the conversion of the heathen themselves as the divinest necessity of the time, and also the one true way of bringing the Gospel to them, as well as so perfectly and so magnificently to carry out the work. The successful turn in the fortunes of Christianity generally, which was accomplished during these forty years, was thus mainly his work; and it was not long before a more or less distinct feeling of his value spread through the entire

¹ According to such indications as Gal. iv. 13, 14; 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8.

² 1 Cor. xv. 10.

³ *Ante*, pp. 178 sq.

⁴ Which is indicated by Luke, at all events Acts ii. 9–11.

⁵ With regard to Rome, see below. In Alexandria Apollon may already have

been a Christian, as it is evidently a mere makeshift of later historians when they suppose that Mark was the first founder of the Church at Alexandria, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 16, 24; comp. below in the last volume.

⁶ *Ante*, pp. 130 sq.

Christian world. For even all the various hesitations, and, indeed, enmities and bitter divisions, which his entrance into the field and his labours more and more occasioned, gradually all disappeared, although in part after his death; whilst no one else knew so well how to enchain the hearts of numbers and to make of individuals who were more closely connected with him the most faithful friends and servants, not of himself, but of the great cause which he regarded as the only true and saving one.

And all this he accomplished amidst the innumerable toils, sufferings, and mortal dangers of all kinds, which were constantly increasing, whilst he was always facing, as it were, death, and at last met it as a martyr, before much more than a quarter of a century had elapsed since his conversion. Only a hero like Paul could victoriously surmount the immense difficulties which had at that time to be overcome in connection with Christianity; and he overcame them, as it were, without knowing it, simply by faithfulness to the duty which he had once perceived was his. There is, therefore, in the development of his Christian life and labours a clear advance, and, notwithstanding the greatest outward vicissitudes, such an inward regularity and consistency that it is most truly instructive to study closely all the details of them in connection with their great general scope. As regards his fundamental Christian ideas, he is the same man from the commencement to the end of his course; and yet it is at the end, as the hero who had been made perfect by all he had passed through, that we first perceive and revere his full greatness; and his whole life is thus one great advance to ever purer heights. Our information regarding the course of his life is also comparatively rich, the memory of his brilliant career having soon almost eclipsed that of the earlier Apostles. Nevertheless, if we seek to collect all the details of his history, we have still to lament that so many of them have probably been lost beyond recovery¹; and beyond doubt rarely was a human life during the course of a quarter of a century so full of extreme vicissitudes, so rich in uncommon deeds, essays, and enterprises, and so intercepted by the profoundest sufferings and privations of all kinds; while, nevertheless, at the beginning this life was for a long time spent in comparative retirement, and only gradually passed irresistibly into the full light of history. If, however, we seek carefully to collect all the traces of this life as they are still discernible, we cannot

¹ We can appreciate this loss most plainly by means of such passages as 2 Cor. xi. 23-29; 1 Cor. xv. 32, in which

Paul himself alludes to numerous details of his history, which we are no longer able to perfectly elucidate further.

remain very much in the dark either as regards the chief epochs in it or its most important details, but, on the contrary, shall be able with perfect certainty to discover them; whilst the earlier passages of this life that are for us more obscure are also important enough to deserve the most minute examination.

1. *The Beginning of the Apostle's Labours.*

CERTAIN as it is that as regards Paul's profoundest perceptions and resolutions he was the same man from the first moments of his conversion that we find him in the general history of his time down to his death, it is no less evident that the period of the commencement of his labours before they reached their highest development and power, was very long and trying. For he had been suddenly and in an isolated manner led to undertake his entire Christian work; moreover, the immense undertaking itself to which he had devoted his whole life had scarcely any paths already prepared along which it could move forward, so that he was obliged himself first of all to begin and to attempt almost everything *de novo* amidst the most difficult toils and labours. Thus, thirteen or fourteen years of most intense effort elapsed before his work reached its proper elevation in the effective progress of all the outward labours and the inward powers which had been once put in motion. This is by far the longest of the three very dissimilar periods of the general labours of the Apostle-to-the-Heathen, and his work generally is during this period of a more simple and uniform nature; nor did he as yet reap the ripe fruits, of imperishable duration, which his most active and highest labours brought forth in the following period in all directions. But this period is not only the most protracted but also the most replete with exceedingly difficult labours and toilsome experiments of all kinds; and only the superabundant energies of a vigorous youth, sustained by one absorbing thought and aim, were adequate to undertake these exceedingly various and difficult experiments which occupy the entire period.

This first period is not only the most protracted, but it is also comparatively the most obscure. Not a single letter from Paul's own hand has been preserved from it, although towards its end the epistles of the Apostle, whose labours were growingly successful, must have increased in numbers. Inasmuch, however, as the work of the Apostle to the heathen had not yet been fully developed and the highest complication in the general effort and labours of his life had not yet arrived, his

epistles of this period cannot have been so uncommonly full of matter and instruction as we shall find them gradually becoming in the following period, for even in this following period an advance in this respect is observable. In so far it is the more easy to console ourselves for the loss of the earliest epistles of the greatest apostolic author.

In the remaining documents sufficient material has been preserved to give us a correct idea of the general course of Paul's labours during this longest period; and if it is no longer possible to fill up this picture with minute details, there is still no need to remain in doubt with regard to the matters of chief importance. The most important point, however, which we may at once state, is that these first and most difficult experiments of the Apostle, which occupy the whole of this long period, by no means follow each other disconnectedly and at random, but display an inward advance towards a more and more forcible and correct attainment of the ultimate object. There were in general three great experiments, each of them occasioned by a powerful impulsion, and each of them directed with increasing boldness and success to the ultimate aim of all his labours.

His Labours in the East and his First Journey to Jerusalem.

38-41 A.D.

As soon as Paul, as a Christian, found higher peace in Damascus, he was conscious also of being strengthened to labour at once as Christ's Apostle; he did not turn beforehand to any other man whatsoever, not even to one of the Twelve in the parent church, to obtain his counsel or assistance or sanction for the work which he found marked out for him as by God Himself; nor did he previously select by prudent calculation some place in the earth which might be at first the most fitting and safest for his purpose, but the nearest place he deemed the best. Nevertheless the Spirit did not at once move him to preach Christ's salvation immediately to all men without distinction; we have every reason to suppose that he confined himself for the present to the Judeans.¹ It was the Judeans to whom he was in every way first bound; whilst the interval which still separated the Christianity of that time from heathenism was so great that it required, even in the case of a Paul, a further powerful inducement to disregard it.

If we had only Luke's narrative, we should be obliged to

¹ As follows from Acts ix. 20-24, and also from Acts xxii. 17-21.

suppose that he at once appeared in the Judean synagogues of the great city of Damascus itself, and laboured for some years there only; but, happily, a brief remark from his own hand¹ supplements our knowledge. It was probably a justifiable human shyness which kept him from appearing publicly in Damascus itself at once; he went directly into Arabia, in these Eastern countries travelled constantly farther from the Roman empire itself, and visited the Judeans, who were scattered in considerable numbers throughout those distant regions, that he might preach the true Messiah to them. It was as if the spirit would involuntarily drive him constantly farther from Jerusalem into the wide world, from the great centre of all the culture of the time into its remote boundaries, and, indeed, from his own native city Tarsus still further into the East.

For the most remarkable thing in this connection is, probably, that these Arabian districts, and even Damascus itself, stood then in unfriendly relations with Palestine, and were only in a remote way connected with the Roman empire. Though we have but extremely small and scattered information as to the history of those countries during this period, we are still able to conjecture with considerable probability the course of the main facts. We know from Paul himself² that Damascus belonged at that time to the territory of an Arabian king, Aretas, and we learn the same fact quite independently from coins of Damascus which have come down to us;³ but under Tiberius, and then again under Nero, it was directly under Rome. When now we remember that this Aretas carried on a war with Herod Antipas, which proved extremely disastrous for this *protégé* of Tiberius,⁴ that the Syrian governor, Vitellius, was prevented in 37–38 A.D., by the death of Tiberius, from immediately punishing the victor, but that Caligula at once brought everything to a decision in conformity with his liking for Agrippa,⁵ the enemy of Antipas, we have no difficulty in supposing that the arrangement which the new emperor concluded for ending all these quarrels contained the twofold condition that Aretas was for the future to be the ally of Rome and friend of all Roman vassals, the ‘Arabs’ having, as

¹ In the words Gal. i. 15–17.

² 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33. The name Arétâs is حارثة, or as is written in Nabataean הרתה , and many Nabataean kings bear it; comp. *Jahrbh. der bibl. Wiss.* ix. p. 131; *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1861, p. 363.

³ Damascene coins with the inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΡΕΤΟΥ ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝΟΥ

might also be from an earlier Aretas, but the decisive point is that Damascene-Roman coins are found probably belonging to the times of Augustus and Tiberius and then of Nero, but not of Caligula and Claudius, see Eckhel, *Doctr.* i. 3, pp. 330 sq.

⁴ See vol. vi. pp. 78 sq.

⁵ See *ante*, pp. 240 sq.

a fact, from this time supplied the Romans with auxiliaries,¹ while, on the other hand, he should retain Damascus (which he had probably conquered) for the rest of his life; another Arab, Sohem,² probably a general or relative of his, most likely received through the same treaty Ituræa, or the country to the south-west of Damascus, to which Antipas made claim after his brother's death, and was publicly invested with it at Rome itself by Caligula on a suitable occasion in the year 39.³ But as, after his death, Claudius connected Ituræa again with Syria in the year 50,⁴ Nero likewise appears to have placed Damascus directly under the Syrian governor again after the death of Aretas. If Aretas accordingly was in possession of the great city of Damascus from that time, he would undoubtedly the more jealously protect the Judeans who already dwelt there in large numbers, and whose ranks could be easily swollen in that period by refugees from Palestine. We thus obtain also an explanation of the fact that Aretas granted to the Judeans dwelling there a special Ethnarch, after the example of the Alexandrians,⁵ whom they elected from their midst, and who took charge of all their affairs probably throughout the entire territory of the king.⁶

It was undoubtedly chiefly this territory of the king Aretas, which was almost entirely independent of Rome, that Paul now travelled through, and which he subsequently briefly called 'Arabia.' We are unable to ascertain whether he travelled beyond its limits farther to the east and south. But we may confidently maintain that, like the ancient prophet Elijah,⁷ he then saw Sinai, and then gathered that close acquaintance with the condition at that time of this country of

¹ As in the instance referred to by Tac. *Hist.* v. 1.

² *Sohemus*, Σόειμος, or as Josephus writes, Σόειμος, is probably

دوس ستهيم; the man intended is undoubtedly the same whom Josephus, *Vita*, ch. xi., calls ὁ περὶ τῶν Δίβαρον τετραρχῶν, and whose relative Varus (erroneously called Νόαρος, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 6) lived as the representative of king Agrippa in the Jewish war; an earlier Sohem lived in Petra, according to *Jos. Ant.* xvii. 3. 2. The Ituræan Sohem at the court of Herod, *Ant.* xv. 6. 5; 7. 1, 4, and the king of Emesa xx. 8. 4, as well as the Sohem of Sophene, Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 7, *Hist.* ii. 81, v. 1 were not the same men.

³ Cassius Dio, lix. 12.

⁴ Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23. When Tacitus

makes Judea also, in consequence of Agrippa's death, come again this year under the province of Syria, he has simply, from regard to brevity, brought together two different events, the latter having taken place five years earlier. Such comprehensive summary statements, with the confusion which arises from them, are not infrequent in Tacitus.

⁵ See vol. v. p. 242.

⁶ The 'Ethnarch of the king Aretas,' mentioned 2 Cor. xi. 32, was undoubtedly, as the name itself shows, a prince such as the Judeans had then long had in the great cities of Alexandria and Antioch, in some cases with the same name, see vol. v. p. 212; but probably it was this king who first appointed such an officer in Damascus.

⁷ See vol. iv. pp. 107 sq.

hoary sanctity which he incidentally displays subsequently in one of his epistles.¹

But after he had laboured there some two years perhaps, he felt a call to go back to Damascus; for a vague feeling probably admonished him not to remove too far from the two centres of all the higher culture of the time—Jerusalem and the Roman Empire. So he returned first of all to Damascus, but, this time, appeared publicly in all the Judean synagogues of the city, and taught constantly with the greatest zeal, seeking to prove that Jesus was the true Messiah. The opposition and obstinate resistance which soon arose against him in the great and wealthy city had only the effect of increasing his zeal; and it was not infrequently that, by the power of his oratory and the superiority of his mind, he put to confusion the opponents who came forward against him. At last the excitement and indignation against him became so dangerous that he was obliged to conceal himself amongst his friends from the plots which were publicly made to destroy him. In these circumstances the powerful Judean Ethnarch, who dwelt in Damascus, invested with great authority from the Arabian king, and was hostile to Paul, sought to have him arrested and brought before his court of justice, and for this purpose caused the city gates to be carefully guarded for some days lest Paul should escape. Neither can we doubt what would have been the fate of the Apostle if the Ethnarch, who was in such a matter free of all responsibility to a higher authority, had succeeded in securing him. But faithful friends were watching over his life, and he narrowly escaped this great danger, being put by his friends in a basket and then let down by a cord through a hole in the city wall.²

This was the first of the numerous mortal dangers which Paul was destined to meet with during the course of his labours as a Christian apostle. But, however many dangers of the most serious nature he had to meet with in his after-life, this first one always remained to him specially memorable on account of the perilous means which had at the end to be applied to effect his escape, so that many years afterwards he incidentally speaks of it.³

¹ Gal. iv. 24, 25, compared with more recent remarks in *Jahrb. d. B. W.* viii. p. 200, and further with *Chron. Sam.* ch. xlvii. p. 237. Comp. also *הַקֵּר* as name of a locality, *M. גִּיסוּן*, i. 1.

² Paul's own reference to the matter, 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33, is in sufficient harmony

with the account Acts ix. 23–25, though the latter was undoubtedly written without reference to the former.

³ For it is only thus that the special mention of this particular instance of deliverance, 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33, is explained.

After he had escaped beyond the reach of the power of the Arabian king, he might have gone to his native city Tarsus, to live there thenceforth in safe concealment. It was quite otherwise that he acted. The Spirit now urged him to go direct to Jerusalem into the midst of the parent church; and at that moment nothing could be wiser than this step. Three years had now elapsed since he became a Christian and began to labour as Christ's messenger; in Jerusalem he had become more of a stranger, Christians could now have learnt to know him better, the Judeans might have abated somewhat of their first indignation at his apparent betrayal of them. Yet it was wholly different considerations from these which determined his course. Great as was the personal independence and confidence of victory with which he had laboured from that first moment when he heard the inward call of God, he was still conscious of a certain want when he thought of his relation to the parent church. Was he to remain permanently a stranger to it? Must he not as soon as possible come to an understanding with it on all points? And if he already knew enough of the life and work of Christ upon earth and of the special aims of the Twelve, must he not, as soon as it could be, make enquiries, as carefully as possible, with regard to all these things by means of a closer intercourse with the Twelve? He did not feel himself superior to all these human necessities; and he felt specially a strong desire to know Peter personally, and to question him on many points, for whose bold and powerful decisiveness he had a high and sincere respect even before he knew him.¹ Thus his flight from Damascus became at once in reality a blessing, since but for it he would probably not have visited Jerusalem so early. For it could not be his intention to remain there any length of time: but any closer communication with the parent church must now, as soon as he had come to a full understanding with it, prove of greatest use to himself and to the great cause which he served.

Yet he found much in Jerusalem that was different from what he had hoped. It was the time when King Agrippa ruled there, and the Christians had once more greater cause to fear: accordingly Paul found a great deal of reserve amongst them when he visited the public church gatherings; moreover, they had probably received little information about his doings in those districts of Arabia, which were then almost completely

¹ Paul's own statements in this respect, Gal. i. 18-20, must be regarded as more precise than Luke's, Acts ix. 26-

28, that he had intercourse with the disciples generally.

separated from the Roman Empire; and, in fact, his entire character seemed so strange that the majority of them continued to fear and timidly avoid him, rather than seek his acquaintance. In these circumstances it was that the honest Cypriot Barnabas,¹ who more correctly discerned his true character, interested himself most kindly on his behalf, and introduced him to Peter. On the same visit, in the company of Barnabas, he also saw James the brother of the Lord, but, undoubtedly, only as the head of the church, whom proper decorum required that he should visit.² It was not like him to visit many and press himself upon them; but to the few with whom he came into closer intercourse he spoke with such freedom and persuasiveness concerning the events and experiences of his life as a Christian that they soon came to trust him fully. With their sanction he then appeared publicly in some of the synagogues of Jerusalem as a witness for Christ; he did not desire to provoke the heads of the Hagiocracy directly, and as he had previously turned more and more to the Hellenists,³ he chose the gatherings of his own more immediate fellow-countrymen and old acquaintances, that he might in them proclaim his Christian convictions.⁴ But amongst them even he met immediately with such violent opposition, which was made the more bitter by what seemed to them like apostasy on his part, that he might well have despaired completely. However, when on one of those days he visited the Temple in serious despair and was engaged in earnest prayer, it seemed to him suddenly that he heard the resistless voice of the Lord commanding him to forthwith leave again the obstinate city which he had only just entered as a Christian; and his own conscience assented and told him that it was really quite natural that those Judeans should decline to hear the man whom they had a short time before so well known as the fiercest persecutor of the Christians.⁵ Accordingly the Lord's voice resounded again—only the more powerfully—that he must rather go to the heathen to preach Christ. With that the mission of his life was once for all fully determined; and if inwardly everything had long been prepared for such a designation, it was only one moment of fresh and overpowering agitation that could lead him to it in such a way that from that time forth he never again wavered as regards that which the Divine call required

¹ See *ante*, p. 132.

² Gal. i. 19.

³ See *ante*, p. 280.

⁴ Acts ix. 29.

⁵ The words vv. 19, 20 in the narrative Acts xxii. 17-21, must be thus understood, and they then suit the connection perfectly.

of him as his altogether special duty. These last experiences were also required to give to him his true and final appointment; and henceforth, like an ancient prophet whom the Divine call exceptionally urges to go amongst the heathen for once, he is prepared to follow alone the Divine commission which he has at last so clearly heard.

Meanwhile the report had spread in the city that Paul's life was seriously in danger. Accordingly his Christian friends also advised him to leave Jerusalem at once; and as he felt so powerfully the impulse to go westward amongst the heathen of the Roman empire, he readily adopted their advice that he should for the time go to his native city Tarsus. To promote his safety those friends accompanied him as far as Cæsarea on the Mediterranean,¹ from whence the ancient Phœnician district was soon entered. His stay in Jerusalem had extended over fifteen days only.²

*His labours in Cilicia and Syria, with his second journey to
Jerusalem. 42-47 A.D.*

The first expedition of the Apostle to the heathen, as the commencement of this work, was necessarily of decisive influence as regards his subsequent labours. For the first time he now proceeded from the parent church itself, and went forth, at all events not without their knowledge, to preach Christ, and for the first time he went out with the heathen mainly in view, the heathen of the Roman empire, moreover, being the centre of the highest culture of the time. It is true, we know comparatively least of this period of the general labours of the Apostle, a period which according to all indications was of considerable duration; we must therefore make the more careful use of the few details which are at our disposal. The entire following history shows that the period was for Paul of the greatest importance.

According to Luke he now took his way in the first instance to his native city of Tarsus, and remained there a considerable time; and without doubt that statement is in this connection the most accurate that could be made, if only we do not understand Tarsus in the restricted sense, but as meaning that this great city was regarded as the more permanent centre for labours in Cilicia generally.³ Taking his native city and the

¹ Acts ix. 29, 30; comp. with xi. 25.

² Gal. i. 18.

³ That is, we might infer from the

mention of the 'regions of Syria and Cilicia,' Gal. i. 21, that he now went first into Syria and afterwards into Cilicia.

region round about as his basis of operation, he now sought to lay the foundation of the first established beginning of his new labours: in Tarsus he had at once a firm basis, and it could not be an easy thing to expel him thence, while it was easy for him to extend his labours from this centre through the extensive and populous district belonging to it. He thus obtained a deep and secure basis for his labours; but he was, as a labourer in this field, still quite alone, and if his work of sowing the good seed of Christianity in heathen soil, which was still wholly uncultivated, was of itself very difficult, it necessarily became still more difficult from the fact that he had to labour quite alone. Still, he continued to prosecute his labours indefatigably, contending with the greatest difficulties; this he did probably for some two years in that region of Cilicia, and the basis which he then laid for his own perfect education and training was proportionally deep. If in his subsequent conflict with the conceit and obduracy of the Judeans as well as heathenism, he exhibited the greatest skill, it was in this limited sphere that he acquired it by long and unremitting exercise. And as his first labours in this new field of apostolic activity were the most toilsome, so his inward agitation and transports were at this period undoubtedly the most violent. One and another of the most ravishing transports of this period were vividly remembered by him fourteen years later; he may then have just tasted, in a surprisingly rich harvest, the first delicious fruits of his difficult labours, and for the first time his soul, under the most blessed anticipation of future glory, was transported into the third heaven, and then even into Paradise, into the presence of Him whose sole service was his purest joy and consolation, and he heard words from Him which he could never forget again, and which he had nevertheless never been able, for the whole world, to communicate to any mortal ear.¹

But whilst amid such labours and enraptured experience in this more limited sphere of work, he was as it were buried from the world, his fame nevertheless soon extended beyond the bounds of this country. And with what delight must his older Christian friend from Jerusalem, Barnabas, who had then been

But Paul probably speaks of Syria in this case first, simply because its capital became to him of far greater importance; moreover, Cilicia was always little more than an appendage to Syria. And we learn from this passage the important fact that the names Tarsus and Antioch must not be taken in the Acts in their restricted

sense.

¹ We must thus understand the words, 2 Cor. xii. 2-4. The two visions which Paul mentions in this passage were undoubtedly connected, and the second was more wonderful than the first. Paradise in this passage as in Enoch, xxv. 1, and elsewhere.

staying some time in Antioch,¹ have heard such happy accounts of him! Barnabas was just then occupied in Antioch with forming a church, which was mainly composed of heathen Christians; he may have found this no easy task, and have heard with the more interest that Paul had succeeded in a similar work in Cilicia. Accordingly he travelled from Antioch to Tarsus to visit Paul, succeeded in finding him, and persuaded him to go with him to Antioch. For the first time the two men joined in a common work, and for a whole year they laboured together in Antioch with greatest success. In the great Syrian capital, the residence of the Roman governor, a church consisting mainly of heathen Christians was gathered together, of such importance in point of numbers and inward excellence that public attention was here first most powerfully attracted to it, and those who had at first everywhere borne by preference the name of *Disciples* (of Christ) simply, were for the first time called *Christians*;² a name which, like the similar one Herodians,³ is quite of Roman formation, and undoubtedly proceeded solely from the ruling classes of that time who had received a Roman education.⁴ Taking the capital as his basis, Paul then laboured vigorously throughout Syria; the new name of Christians also rapidly passed from the Syrian capital into all Roman countries.

After the lapse of a year there came to this great and flourishing young church the report that a great famine prevailed at Jerusalem and throughout Palestine. Now, during the reign of the previous Emperor, Caligula,⁵ in the very first days of a church in Antioch,⁶ a Judean, named Agabus,⁷ had prophesied that there would be a great famine throughout the inhabited earth. This Agabus, who first became famous in those times as a Christian prophet, was then probably in early life, since we meet with him some twenty years later as an

¹ See *ante*, p. 189.

² Acts xi. 25, 26. It appears quite plainly from the verb *μαθητεύσατε*, Matt. xxviii. 19, and from the Acts, that they themselves preferred to be called *μαθηταί*, and by this name all Christians were put on an equality with the Twelve; the name *Brother* denotes rather the other Christians besides the Twelve, the latter addressing the former by it. The Old Testament name of honour, *servant of Christ*, which on that account occurs more rarely and in elevated language, is a more eminent distinction. The names *Galilean* and *Nazarene* arose much later, as merely derisive appellations.

³ See vol. vi. p. 73.

⁴ As a fact the name occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only Acts xxvi. 28, in the mouth of Agrippa, who had received a Roman education, and 1 Pet. iv. 16, where the action of Roman magistracies is spoken of.

⁵ The words, Acts xi. 27–30, certainly indicate that the prophecy was uttered before the reign of Claudius, and that it was fulfilled during it; but the phrase ‘in these days,’ ver. 27, must not, in a simple transition, be interpreted quite strictly.

⁶ *Ante*, p. 189.

⁷ Either עֲגֻב or עֲגֻבָּ.

esteemed Christian prophet.¹ He fled from the parent church with other men of prophetic gifts, in consequence of the disturbances which followed upon Stephen's martyrdom, and had come to Antioch; and the prophecy which he uttered at that time had undoubtedly a much less abrupt and detached form originally, being connected with all the Messianic expectations by which the parent church was agitated. Since that time he had returned again to Jerusalem, where we find him dwelling subsequently;² but his special utterance regarding a great famine which was soon to visit the whole world, acquired new meaning in the church at Antioch, when during the first two years after the accession of Claudius such a great and distressing famine actually prevailed in Rome and Italy, and then similar ones broke out during almost the entire reign of this Emperor in the various countries of the Roman Empire.³ But when in the year 45-46 Judea also was visited by a famine of this kind, profound compassion was at once stirred in connection with that prophecy in the flourishing church at Antioch, notwithstanding the fact that it consisted chiefly of heathen Christians. The Christians of the parent church suffered so much in other ways,⁴ and the gifts which were collected in the synagogues in heathen countries for the famine-stricken Judeans in Palestine did not come to their relief. It was accordingly generally felt in the church of heathen Christians at Antioch, that it was their bounden duty to send temporal assistance to the 'brethren in Judea,' to whom they were under such obligations spiritually. The contributions of all the members of the church were voluntarily given, everyone gave according to his ability, and a considerable offering of charity was soon ready to be transmitted to Jerusalem. This is the first considerable instance of charitable offerings on the part of heathen Christians for the parent church, which was subsequently to find frequent imitation down to the times of the great Roman war,

¹ Acts xxi. 10; comp. with xiii. 1.

² This follows from his not being mentioned amongst the others, Acts xiii. 1, compared with xxi. 10.

³ As may be seen most briefly in Suet. *Claud.* cap. xviii. It appears from Dio Cassius, lx. 11, that a famine raged in Rome during the first two years of Claudius's reign; it was repeated in Rome and Italy in the year 52, acc. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 43; in Greece it raged in the year 49, acc. Euseb. *Chron.* apud Mai, *Nova Coll.* viii. p. 377. We may infer from the

language of Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 5. 2, comp. with 2. 6, that 'the great famine' in Judea prevailed in the years 45-46; for the time 'under the governor Fadus and his successor Alexander' is about the years 45, 46, 47; acc. *Ant.* iii. 15. 3, a high-priest with the name Ismael was then in office, which must, however, first be adjusted to the name Joseph (son of Canade) who was then in office, acc. *Ant.* xx. 1. 3; 5. 2.

⁴ See *ante*, pp. 267 sq.

and became an important bond of union between all the Christian churches in heathen countries and those in Palestine.

When the church at Antioch now chose Barnabas and Paul to convey their liberal offerings to Jerusalem, the latter found a second opportunity of presenting himself before the parent church, and of conferring with its chief men. The two deputies undoubtedly stayed on that occasion some time in Jerusalem, and studied closely the condition of the parent church; but we have now no particular information on the point. Paul necessarily saw the chief men in public gatherings, but did not come into any close transactions with them;¹ and Peter, with whom he would probably have liked best to have gone into further explanations, was at the time absent from Jerusalem.² Paul continued still to avoid carefully all provocation of the Judeans, kept himself as retired as possible in Jerusalem, and on that account refrained from visiting the Christian churches dispersed through the province of Judea, although his reputation as a Christian preacher had also reached them.³ But in Jerusalem the two deputies found a younger man than themselves who adhered to them with great affection, and placed at their disposal all his Christian zeal together with his knowledge and acquirements. This was that John, surnamed Mark, whose mother⁴ had long before approved herself as one of the most active and self-sacrificing Christian women, and who had grown up from his childhood in the love of Christ's work and of his Apostles. He was probably that young man who, as he subsequently considered worthy of mention in his Gospel,⁵ at

¹ As follows from Gal. i. 21—ii. 1, inasmuch as he could not at this point have omitted an express mention of this visit if he had during it gone into matters of importance in his teaching with Peter or the other Apostles.

² Acts xii. 19, comp. below. It is true Luke appears to regard the beginning of this journey to Jerusalem, Acts xii. 1, comp. xi. 29, 30, as taking place during the life-time of king Agrippa. However, this combination of the various materials of the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles cannot of itself prove anything with regard to the exact chronology, see *ante*, pp. 30 sq.

³ His observations, Gal. i. 22, 23, with regard to his reputation amongst the churches of Judea, is likewise undoubtedly made with reference to this time of his second journey, of which he had no need to speak further in this connection.

⁴ Acts xii. 12; comp. below.

⁵ Mark xiv. 51, 52. Mark is now the

only evangelist who mentions this circumstance, which was apparently so unimportant and was therefore omitted by the later evangelists; but on that very account it cannot have seemed to the original narrator a matter of indifference, as long as it was still more distinctly known and could be orally related who this young man was. We might also be inclined to suppose that the youth was Paul; however, he was at that time probably older, see *ante*, p. 278. And if we consider the habit of Hebrew historians, explained vol. i. pp. 56 sq., according to which none of them mentioned himself directly as the author, and further the very similar manner in which John speaks of himself in his Gospel, and that the most natural supposition is that in such a case the author means himself, and simply wishes not to add his name directly, we may quite well suppose that Mark desired in this passage to mention a fact which was in his own life so memorable.

Christ's arrest ran after him, just as he was in his night dress, and was then roughly seized by the officers, and escaped from them in still greater nakedness: a supposition which is quite natural if he belonged to the same house in which Christ dwelt during his last days in Jerusalem,¹ and in which subsequently the Apostles, and particularly Peter, stayed.² It is still more certain that, like Paul and Barnabas, he sprang from a Hellenistic family that had settled in Jerusalem, but which, according to all appearance, had formerly had its home in Rome. For he had from an early period practised himself in the use of the Greek and Roman languages, and thus combined with his earnest Christian zeal the best qualifications for acting as an assistant to the two Apostles: just as in his subsequent life, amid all the outward vicissitudes of his career, he constantly approved himself most nobly as a faithful assistant of several Apostles and as an Evangelist.³ He was at that time still comparatively young, and would probably, with his fresh zeal in every kind of Christian work, have now rather attached himself to Peter, whom, according to all indications, he had long known, if this Apostle had not at the time been living at some place not far from Jerusalem, as it were in concealment. He now accompanied the two Apostles on their return to Antioch, and was determined to continue with them longer.⁴ But eventually it appeared, that it was after all Barnabas more especially, who had long been known to him in Jerusalem, and was a near relative,⁵ who had persuaded him to accompany them.

After the two deputies had returned to Antioch, they probably pursued their labours in this church for the whole year 46-47. The full development of the Christian life continued to make the most satisfactory progress there; and a noble band of distinguished men, who were voluntarily acknowledged as leaders and chiefs, had collected together in this church. There

¹ The unusual particularity and care with which the house is described, Mark xiv. 12 sq., thus receives the simplest explanation.

² *Ante*, p. 90.

³ As one of the appellatives given to him there has been preserved quite disconnectedly in Hippolytus's *Philosophumena* vii. 30, that of *κολοβοδακτυλος*, with a mutilated finger, probably because as a valiant Christian he had once suffered an injury of this kind. Latin authors made this word the basis of legends to the effect that he had thus mutilated himself that he might be incapacitated for the priesthood (Jerome's *Prof. ad Marc.* in the *Codex Amiat.*), or that on entering Alex-

andria he healed the finger of Annianus, who had pierced it in mending Mark's shoes (*Martyr. Marci* in Dillmann's *Christ. Eth.* p. 18; Molini, *De vita S. Marci*, p. 173); and these legends are at all events better than those which recent savants amongst us seek to make, see *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* vii. p. 197. It is baseless to suppose that the Evangelist and the John of the Acts are different persons.

⁴ Acts xii. 25, xiii. 5; comp. xii. 12.

⁵ According to Col. iv. 10. As Barnabas was a Levite, see *ante*, p. 132, it is not improbable that Mark was likewise, as some authors stated (comp. the passages in Molini, *De vita et lipsantis Marci* (Rome, 1864), pp. 2 sq.), of Levitic family.

was not one of the Twelve amongst them, nor anyone who otherwise put himself specially forward as an Apostle: they were regarded simply as 'prophets and teachers,' according as each one felt called upon to labour in the Christian spirit more after the manner of the prophets in the Old Testament, like Agabus above mentioned,¹ or to follow more simply the vocation of a teacher, like Paul. Agabus, indeed, had previously returned to Judea, but five other men of this class still laboured in Antioch, of whom Barnabas had been converted to Christianity first and Paul last.² The others were, in the first place, two more Hellenists, Symeon, with the surname Niger, and, as his surname of itself indicates, probably a Hellenist like Lucius of Cyrene; but in the second place, to these four Hellenists there was added, as a genuine Judean, Manaen or Manahem, a man who was already advanced in life, of whose history we should like to know more, inasmuch as he had been a fellow-pupil of the tetrarch Antipas, and had therefore been educated with him at the court of Herod the Great. These three had probably found their way to Antioch in consequence of Stephen's stoning, and had there established themselves.³ It was now as if that first fire and glory of Christian church life, which once burned and shone for years in the parent church, were about to reappear in Antioch; and whilst the state and condition of the parent church continued to be in various ways unsatisfactory, in the great Syrian capital of the Seleucidæ, which had been a few centuries before the greatest enemy of Jerusalem, the Christian church-life flourished otherwise than it had formerly flourished in its first centre, and yet in the most admirable manner.

And just because this church was at that time probably the largest, most flourishing, and prosperous of all Christian churches, the most profound minds in it were the more deeply conscious that such spiritual wealth ought not to be consumed upon their one church, but must flow as a blessing from it to others as widely as possible. Judea, Syria, and Cilicia, as far as Paul had extended his labours, had already been planted with smaller or larger Christian churches; but what was this when compared with the whole world? And it had already been proved that the heathen might be converted! Probably the thought

¹ *Ante*, p. 334.

² This meaning is undoubtedly implied by the order in which the five are enumerated, Acts xiii. 1, inasmuch as this order is evidently quite intentional and precise.

³ For undoubtedly the Lucius mentioned, Acts xiii. 1, belonged to 'the men of Cyprus and Cyrene' of Acts xi. 20, and some of those mentioned, xiii. 1, to the prophets of Acts xi. 27, that is, probably Symeon and Lucius.

had long before passed through the minds of individuals that Barnabas and Paul, particularly as associated, would be the men best fitted to extend the work of Christ amongst the heathen, and that they must be in every way supported by the large flourishing church in Antioch for such a purpose; but the idea and desire remained for a long time confined to individuals. It was not until the whole church was praying and singing psalms on a certain festival, in the profoundest fervour of the service of the Lord, that there was suddenly heard a voice from the midst of those prophets which gave from the Holy Spirit the command to choose and dedicate Barnabas and Paul to that work to which God Himself had called them for the furthering of His kingdom; and at once the church perceived therein the will of the Holy Ghost, and authorised their leaders to consecrate the two men to this divine object. Accordingly on one of the next days, after prayer and fasting, they were consecrated by the imposition of hands to this new and higher work, just as the priests of the Old Testament were consecrated,¹ or as the Apostles themselves introduced those who had just been baptized to the higher Christian life.²

With this something quite new had arisen in a creative moment, and something which was destined gradually to produce the most important results. Henceforth, Paul was not to go forth as an Apostle of Christ simply in his own name, nor Barnabas merely in the name of the parent church, but both together as mutual assistants and with the commission and the blessing of a church of heathen Christians. Just as previously the parent church had sent forth perhaps two of the Twelve, it may have been Peter and John, for a special object, so now for the first time the church of a heathen town began to send forth Apostles from its midst with independent authority, to whom it gave its blessing and whom it supported as far as was necessary, and who, on the other hand, were always to remain in close connection with it and to be responsible to it, although only in that sense in which Christian Apostles might be responsible to a human community. Thereby a great advance had been attempted and a new course of extensive development had been opened; and if it had been done

¹ It follows from the nature of the case that the words, Acts xiii. 2, 3, must be understood indefinitely, like the German *man*, of the whole church as acting in this matter. The church was just engaged by fasting in its worship, ver. 2, and it caused the two Apostles to be dedicated by its presidents, ver. 3; the

prophets and teachers, ver. 1, are therefore mentioned simply in order to explain how the Holy Ghost came to be heard in their midst, comp. Acts xxi. 11, and it would be ridiculous to suppose that these five alone, ver. 1, had done all that is said ver. 2-3.

² *Ante*, pp. 131 sq.

from the inner necessity of the case, it was nevertheless free from all wilful desire and hasty inconsiderate enterprise on the part of any man; for truly it is not narrated to no purpose, that it was the Holy Ghost only that was in this case, as in other decisive junctures of the history of the Apostolic Church, heard speaking with irresistible authority, and that it by its own power urged the church to this action. Paul even, the enterprising Apostle of most independent impulses and superior energy, moved and sustained by this Holy Ghost, as it was now felt in the whole church, and in view of the vastness of the still new and unknown enterprise, willingly allied himself with Barnabas, and, indeed, as the younger man both in years and in Christian life, subordinated himself to Barnabas in a certain sense.

And if any heathen city was to become the starting point and the place of retreat for this campaign of divine peace, Antioch was especially adapted for the purpose, not merely on account of its flourishing church, but also on account of its position and history. From this royal city of the Seleucidæ extensive territories had once been ruled, and as the seat of the Roman governor of Syria and of an extensive commerce, it still remained the powerful centre of a large number of countries.¹ As regards its position, although for the most part a heathen city, it was still situated not too far from Jerusalem and the parent church, and could easily keep up intercourse with Palestine. It would be an advantage, too, that a considerable Judean community lived there,² inasmuch as Christianity had still to derive its spiritual forces mainly from converts from the Ancient Community.

The first great Missionary Journey.

48 TO 51 A.D.

THE two Apostles resolved that they would not be supplied with the barely necessary pecuniary assistance on the part of the church at Antioch,³ although they had been so solemnly appointed by the church generally, and it was undoubtedly known that, according to Christ's utterance, 'the workman was worthy of his hire' in such a case also. The direction in which they would turn their steps was left by the church the more for their own determination; but their own past life and their experience as men left them no doubt on the point. Barnabas

¹ It is well known that it was regarded as the third city of the empire, after Rome and Alexandria.

² With regard to this community, see below.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 6.

was, as we have seen, from Cyprus, and undoubtedly was well acquainted with that large island; Paul had previously gone as a preacher throughout Cilicia, and accordingly desired to make further advances in Asia Minor. Consequently their joint plan was soon fixed—to take their course from Antioch, in the first instance, through the neighbouring island of Cyprus, and to make converts wherever it was possible, then to take ship from its western coast in a northerly direction for Asia Minor, and, without touching Cilicia again directly, to labour there as far as the consent of men and other events would allow. It was undoubtedly likewise left to them to determine how long they would be away from and when they would return to Antioch; it was understood as a matter of course that they would return thither and give a detailed account of the results of their undertaking before the assembled church.

We are unable to determine accurately how long this first great missionary journey of the Apostle Paul lasted; according to all indications, however, it may have lasted some three or four years. And if we compare with this comparatively long duration the extent of the regions which were travelled through and prepared for Christianity, the latter appears to us as somewhat small; for scarcely a fourth of Asia Minor was gone through, and Antioch in Pisidia remained the most western place to which they penetrated, according to the accounts of the Book of Acts. But we must not overlook the fact that this missionary journey was, as a first attempt on a large scale, attended by the greatest possible difficulties. The Acts, which describes at length only passages and a few incidents, by way of illustration, of this journey, indicates this plainly enough; and many of the serious mortal perils and profound humiliations which Paul quite briefly brings forward incidentally from his recollections,¹ may have belonged to these years. It is true the countries through which they passed with their assistants resembled a good deal the Cilician and Syrian districts in which they had previously had experience; but they were both quite strangers in the countries to the west and north of Cilicia, and had to learn much on first coming into contact with so many various nationalities. Moreover, an enterprise of this kind when conducted by two persons often makes much slower progress than when conducted by one, in consequence of the numerous conferences which are involved.

Inasmuch as the two Apostles, having taken John Mark definitely as their assistant, determined first of all to preach

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 23-29.

the gospel throughout Cyprus, they went from Antioch by the direct road to Seleucia, on the Mediterranean, the port of Antioch, embarked there for Cyprus, and travelled through the island from the town of Salamis, on the eastern, to Paphos, on the western coast. This large island, which was then very populous, had been flooded during the last centuries by Judeans, as in quite early antiquity, the Phœnicians, its nearest continental neighbours, had abounded in it; and there had long been in it, as in Crete, very enterprising and rich Judeans,¹ as well as a large number of synagogues. Many Judeans had also removed from Alexandria to Crete, undoubtedly on account of the close connection which often subsisted between the island and the Ptolemies. The Apostles, in the first instance, always visited the synagogues; but we have no exact information as to the amount of their success amongst the Judeans and heathen; the harvest appears to have been in the end somewhat small, in spite of all their labours. Much more was subsequently told of one remarkable conversion, the subject of which was no less a man than Sergius Paulus himself, the proconsul² of the island. This man, who is not known to us from Roman accounts,³ had, like so many other Roman magnates of that time, previously sought with great zeal to learn more about the Judean religion, and had, in the course of his inquiries, fallen into the hands of a Judean named Bar-Jesus. This Judean had evidently great similarity with the Samaritan Simon,⁴ felt himself, like the latter, greatly inspired by the new enthusiasm of the last twenty years since the Baptist and Christ, but sought to use for his own advantage, by artificial means and all forms of deception, the excited expectations of the time, while, unlike the Samaritan, he shunned contact with the Christians. He had probably come from the distant East, the ancient birth-place of sorcery, inasmuch as he bore the foreign name of Elymas,⁵ and had probably brought from thence other special kinds of secret arts. As a Judean he could not deny the

¹ Even when the Alexander above mentioned (v. p. 455) went to Rome, he found in Crete the most zealous helpers amongst the Judeans dwelling there, *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1: *Ant.* xvii. 12. 1, 2.

² Although Cyprus had only the rank of a propretorian province, Luke's use of the designation proconsul for the governor is not inaccurate, according to the custom of his time. [See on this point the Bishop of Durham's article on *Illustrations of the Acts from Recent Discoveries in Contemporary Review*, vol. xxxii. pp. 288 sq.]

³ [This defect has now been supplied

by the inscription discovered by General Cesnola. See the Bishop of Durham's article just referred to.]

⁴ See *ante*, pp. 179 sq.

⁵ If the name 'Ελυμας, which Luke interprets as meaning the *Magician*, Acts

xiii. 8, is really *حليم*, a wise man, the man must have come probably from some Arabian province, e.g., from the country of the Nabateans, inasmuch as the word is neither Aramaic nor Hebrew; we can conceive this as very possible.

existence of a Messiah, and, like the Samaritan, used for his purposes the conception of the Logos. When, therefore, the two Apostles spoke before the proconsul of the actual Messiah, and the attention of the Roman grew more intense, Elymas objected that the Messiah preached by them was not the true one, and that the doctrine which they proclaimed as the Messianic was not genuine; and he sought in every way to thwart their endeavours. Thereupon the younger of the two Apostles grew indignant at so much audacity in conjunction with the greatest craftiness and wickedness, and openly charged him with his numerous sins, demanding of him whether he would not finally cease to 'pervert the right way of the Lord';¹ indeed, as the Apostle proceeded his language became more vehement, till, overpowered by his zeal for the sacred cause, which Elymas so grievously misrepresented, he threatened him openly with the righteous divine punishment. But his vehement word was directed against a creature who was only too weak; such terrible utterances, striking him with utter amazement, he had never heard before, and while the Apostle invoked God to smite him with blindness, as a man who was not worthy to see the light, he really felt himself suddenly as if blinded, and held his peace. The proconsul was then the more quickly led to believe, being astonished at the wonderful power which was inseparably connected with the Apostles' doctrine.² Neither was any permanent harm done to the deceiver of the people, as the narrative briefly indicates.³

The basis of this narrative rests incontestably upon genuine historical reminiscences, although we regret that nothing more is known from other sources of the two men which appear here for the first time. Hitherto Paul had not had such a twofold success at one time as he met with in this case in the midst of vehement agitation.⁴ He regarded this triumph as one which had been won in a purely divine cause, and as a good sign which God Himself had given him in pledge of further conquests for Christ, and he resolved from this time forth not to call himself Saul, but *Paul*, from the proconsul who had been converted in

¹ From this very peculiar phrase, Acts xiii. 10, 11, we must infer that Bar-Jesus did not deny a Messiah, but under the supposition of his reality made his charge against the Apostles and sought to confound them. His position was therefore similar to that of the Samaritan Simon, though he was at the same time very different from him.

² The fact that merely the 'teaching of the Lord,' Acts xiii. 12, is mentioned is as remarkable and must be explained in the

same way as when, in the passage Mark i. 27 (where we must read *διεαχθη*), the teaching of Christ is placed in the closest connection with his expulsion of demons.

³ It is true only by the clause, 'thou shalt be blind *for a season*'; but this certainly supposes that the event corresponded, which needed no further remark. But it is not intimated that the Magician became a Christian.

⁴ [But comp. note 3, p. 342.]

such surprising circumstances. This change of name was undoubtedly made with the concurrence of the proconsul himself, who, after the Roman custom, supposed that he could not better represent before all the world the new relation of close spiritual kinship into which he had entered with the Apostle than by causing him to share his own name; he could not, as a patron usually did, make the Apostle his client by giving him his name, since Saul was already a Roman citizen; but he was well able to express his close intimacy with the Apostle and his gratitude towards him, by the request that he would henceforth call himself Paul after him, and thereby bear a name which had so much lustre amongst the ancient Roman names. Luke presupposes all this as known to his readers, or, at all events, as easily to be gathered by them, and henceforth simply uses the name Paul instead of Saul, regarding it as unnecessary to explain the cause of the change of name. But inasmuch as Luke always uses the Hebrew name when he relates anything of the life of Paul before this event, and subsequently, with equally strict uniformity,¹ the Roman name, he indicates clearly enough that the Apostle had not the slightest ambition to bear a Roman name, and would undoubtedly always have continued to use his ancient family name had not, on this unexpected joyful event, the wish of the new convert been put before him, whom he regarded as a noble firstfruits of this journey.

The journey was now to be continued into Asia Minor, which was then likewise very thickly populated, and by nationalities of very various kinds. The company took ship from the western end of Cyprus, directly to the north-west, past the long coast-line of Pamphylia, with its numerous cities, and in the first instance stayed for a time in its chief city, Perga.² There such doubtful reports as to the further prosecution of the journey into the centre of Asia Minor may have come to the company, that the younger man, John Mark, was suddenly seized with fear at the thought of accompanying the two Apostles further, and returned to Jerusalem. Paul condemned his fear, but Barnabas let him go back.³ They were, however, then undoubtedly compelled, in the first instance, to look for another assistant, which may have caused them to lose much

¹ Just as the name Abraham occurs first Gen. xvii. 5, but is previously always Abram. Luke's purpose is plain.—A much more artificial way of explaining the change of name is found in Buxtorf's preface to his *Concordantiæ Heb. Chald.*

² Its ruins have been discovered on the Cestrus, not far from the Attaleia of

Acts xiv. 25, see Fellows's *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor* (London: 1852), pp. 142 sq.

³ The few words, Acts xiii. 13, must be complemented by the further intimations, xv. 38. 39, and from the remarks above, p. 336.

time. No one could be so displeased at this as Paul, whose greater capacity and energy shone forth more evidently in comparison with Barnabas, although he did not in any way trespass on the rights of his older fellow-labourer.

It is, however, in the highest degree probable that already the same man was taken as assistant in Mark's place who afterwards always approved himself as most excellent, and who a few years later accompanied the two Apostles to Jerusalem—namely, Titus.¹ When he was converted he was a heathen, and, as we may with reason suppose, from Crete;² accordingly, undoubtedly at that time a man in early life, who was probably converted on this very journey through Cyprus by the Apostles, and through all his subsequent life accomplished far more than the proconsul Sergius Paulus for the promotion of the Christian cause, although in those years much more was said about the conversion of the proconsul than of that of Titus. In his entire later life he connected himself in faithful devotion with Paul, rendered him the most various and often the most important services, and always retained, according to all that we know, his confidence.³ But the thing that immediately proved to be most remarkable was, that a heathen, without having at all passed through Judeanism, was now accepted as even the most immediate helper and friend of Apostles.

When the journey was continued, they advanced at once, always in a northerly direction, as far as Antioch in Pisidia, almost in the middle of Asia Minor, a populous city,⁴ where, as in all larger cities of Asia Minor, many Judeans had long before settled and a synagogue had been built. The city, however,

¹ According to Gal. ii. 1, comp. ver. 3. Luke does not mention him anywhere, so that the only certain knowledge we have of him is from Paul's epistles. But we can still see from the epistle bearing his name that he was always well remembered; see on the epistle below.

² There must have been good reason for the supposition, Tit. i. 5, that he had the superintendence of all the churches in Crete. If he was a Cretan, he would like to go thither whenever he could; and we may well suppose that as a fact he subsequently occupied himself mainly with the conversion of the populous island, and on that account Luke could the more easily pass him by without notice.—The supposition that Titus was identical with Silvanus (Silas), to be referred to below (which is maintained at length in Heidenheim's *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Englisch-Theologische Forschung und Kritik*, 1865, pp. 373–95) is baseless, and can least

of all be supported by 2 Cor. i. 19. It would be more natural to ask whether he is not the same person as the proselyte Justus of Corinth, mentioned Acts xviii. 7; for in not a few of the oldest authorities this man is called *Titius Justus*, in some *Titus Justus*. Still, the latter is obviously abbreviated from *Titius*; and in other respects there is nothing to be said of importance for the supposition.

³ According to the latest evidence 2 Tim. iv. 10.

⁴ The ruins of this town, which, after the time of Augustus, had flourished afresh as a Roman colony, and was then called *Antiochia Cesarea*, have been discovered and described in W. J. Hamilton's *Researches in Asia Minor* (1842), i. pp. 472–4. An Antioch still further to the west, between Lydia and Caria, on the stream Morsynos, is another place, see Pinder in the *Berl. Akad. Monatsberichten*, 1857, pp. 476 sq.

had the peculiarity that already very many of its heathen citizens had partially attached themselves to Judeanism, and constantly met in the Judean synagogue; in consequence of which the purely heathen population were led to take an unusually great interest in all religious questions. These complicated relations of the three sections of the population made the public appearance and work of the Christian missionaries very difficult, whilst the fact that the attention of the whole population had beforehand been more or less called to such questions, necessarily brought with it no small advantage.

The two Apostles quietly entered the city, made inquiries as to its condition, and on the next Sabbath visited the synagogue. As it was seen that they were strangers, and might perhaps bring a greeting from brethren at a distance, or had some other address to deliver to the assembled people, they were invited by the heads of the synagogue, after the customary reading of the Scriptures,¹ to speak, if they wished to do so. Paul at once availed himself of the permission, and delivered a speech of some length, in which he briefly related the grand early history of Israel down to the time of David, then showed that the great son of David, expected by the prophets as the true Messiah, would be first preached to the Judeans abroad, because the heads of the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem had put him to death, and closed with the fullest Messianic proofs of the truth of the Christian proclamation of salvation, and with the most urgent exhortations not to reject it.² This address made immediately the most powerful impression, and contributed most to the subsequent success of the cause in that city; it could not accordingly be forgotten afterwards, was undoubtedly repeated in its main outlines in innumerable forms subsequently, and has in this way been preserved in Luke's work, at all events as regards its general course and principal thoughts.³ For while Paul was closing his discourse and the two Apostles were rising to leave the assembly, the heads of the synagogue requested that they would on the next Sabbath repeat the discourse, which had not been heard by all the members of the community; and when the meet-

¹ See *ante*, p. 308.

² The three parts of the whole address, Acts xiii. 16-41, which are plainly distinguishable, are vv. 16-22; vv. 23-31; vv. 32-41; it is not until he comes to the third part, that Paul speaks of the commission committed to him and Barnabas. With regard to the number 450, comp. vol. ii. pp. 371 sq.

³ Of course, the address is not verbatim

from Paul's lips; but the thought, vv. 26-28, that salvation will be offered to those abroad because those at home rejected it, is of a genuine Pauline type; and likewise that of ver. 39, that Christianity first brings full and true justification, inasmuch as such an uncertain and partial justification as the Pharisees derived from the O.T. was practically unworthy of the name.

ing was then adjourned, many Judeans and Proselytes followed them to their dwelling, and gladly received their exhortation to continue 'in the grace of God,' or under the influence of the new Christian life of joyful faith and hope. The next Sabbath showed how profound the effect was that had been produced; almost the whole city assembled to hear the preaching of Christianity, and it met with most glad reception even on the part of the heathen who happened to be present. It was just this, however, which aroused the anger of many Judeans, and their opposition, and indeed their raillery against Christ and those who believed on him, became more and more violent.¹ But the two Apostles answered them with bold frankness, that they had been obliged to place before them, in the first instance, the message of salvation, but that, as it had been rejected by them, they would henceforth offer it to the heathen, no less boldly than appropriately applying the Messianic utterance,² 'I made thee a light of the Gentiles,' to their own apostolic situation. And as a fact, very many of the heathen inhabitants received Christianity with great promptness; the Apostles found enough to do in the city and the neighbourhood generally; and the longer they laboured there, the more the joyful enthusiasm for the truth increased amongst the growing number of heathen Christians. Therefore the Judeans, unable to contend with their own strength against them, at last stirred up some of the most genteel women of the proselytes and the heads of the city against the two Apostles, undoubtedly under the allegation that the latter were not true Judeans at all, and had therefore no right to disturb the tranquillity of the Judean community. The Apostles were accordingly expelled from the city and its boundaries by the magistracy; but they yielded to force with joyful confidence, and the young Christians of the city, who were consoled by them at parting, were full of invincible Christian joy even after their departure.

Antioch, in Pisidia, had almost become to the Apostles of equal importance with the great capital of Syria; and such a degree of determination on the part of heathens to uphold Christianity, even against the will of powerful Judeans and proselytes of like mind with them, they had never met with before. Much would therefore have been gained if thus only one Christian church had been permanently established in the

¹ This idea of increasing intensity is conveyed by the use of the Hebrew idiom, ἀντέλεγον . . . ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ βλασφημοῦντες, ver. 45, according to my *Heb. Gram.* § 280 *b*.

² 'Isaiah,' xlix. 6: the pronoun *thee* does not refer to an individual Apostle—Paul, for instance— but to Christ in the Apostles.

midst of Asia Minor. Still, the Apostles did not as yet venture to go further away from Antioch in Syria. So they determined slowly to work their way towards it again in a south-eastern direction, and turned in the first instance towards the ancient city of Iconium, which has remained to our own time almost under the same name. In this city also the relation of the Judeans and Hellenists, or proselytes, resembled that in Pisidian Antioch, but the issue of their preaching was at first different. The Apostles arrived exactly on a Sabbath in the town, went the same day into the synagogue, and spoke with such force that many Judeans as well as proselytes believed. It is true the civil and ecclesiastical chiefs of the Judean community¹ sought this time to rouse the heathen even against them; notwithstanding they were able to make here the longest stay of their whole journey compared with other places, and were not greatly disturbed in their work. During this period of tranquillity they not only taught so powerfully that God Himself seemed by the power of the Holy Spirit to give them an evident witness of His grace; but they found leisure also to exhibit the miraculous power of Christian healing in the case of sick persons.² But, under the instigations of the unbelieving part of the Judeans, the divisions and feuds of the inhabitants grew too dangerous; and when these Judeans, with the assistance of the heathen and the magistracy of the city, really openly threatened to treat the Apostles as Stephen had formerly been treated in Jerusalem, they considered it more advisable to leave the place.

They then took their flight to the city of Lystra, situated in Lycaonia, further to the south-east, found there a good reception, and made a circuit from thence of the rest of Lycaonia, including the city of Derbe, which lay again further to the south-east.³ There also a large number of Judeans were everywhere to be found, but the Apostles were able to accomplish their mission with less interruption and converted many. It was especially only one incident from the period of their labours in Lystra which was subsequently more vividly remem-

¹ According to the full reading Acts xiv. 2, comp. ver. 5, which has been preserved in some of the oldest authorities: ἀρχισυνάγωγοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων are evidently, as distinguished from the ἄρχοντες, or πρῶτοι τῆς συναγωγῆς, the rich honorary presidents; they are all called briefly, ver. 5, ἄρχοντες; and an exactly similar instance occurs xxv. 2.

² This is the meaning of Acts xiv. 3.

³ The situation of Lystra and Derbe, Acts xiv. 6-8, 20, 21; xvi. 1-3, was re-discovered not so many years ago in the ruins of these cities, Lystra being near Bin-bir-Kilissch, north of the Qaradagh, and Derbe near the present place, Divlé — both not far to the north of the Taurus; see W. J. Hamilton's *Researches*, ii. pp. 316-20.

bered, though more on account of its unusual character than its importance. Amongst the numerous diseased people who sought to be cured by the Apostles, there was especially one lame man, who had been a cripple from his birth, and sat quietly in his seat observing their teaching and labours. But when Paul read in his countenance that his faith in the saving power of the Gospel was profound, the Apostle commanded him with a loud voice to stand up, and healed him. This cure seemed to the assembled multitude so absolutely miraculous that they, in their Lyaconian dialect,¹ exclaimed, according to an ancient and common belief of the country,² that only gods could have appeared on the earth disguised in the two Apostles, that Barnabas (the older and more quiet of the two) was Zeus; Paul (the younger and principal speaker) was Hermes. Indeed there was an inclination to compel the priest of the temple of Zeus, situated outside the city, to sacrifice to them garlanded oxen: but the Apostles heard of it early enough, and sought with the greatest concern to turn the people from their intention, which, however, was not so easily done. On this account Paul felt the more inclined to speak on this occasion the profoundly wise words, which have been preserved at all events in their general scope,³ regarding the general nature of heathenism.

But when the report of the great results which the Apostles had obtained in Lystra reached the hostile Judeans in Iconium and Antioch, and the latter felt themselves therefore greatly endangered in their own cities, many of them hastened to Lystra, pretended at first to be simple auditors of Paul's, but afterwards instigated the people against him as speaking falsely, so that many heathens became uncertain as to whom they must believe. When they then began to even stone Paul, whom they especially hated, and the common people saw the man falling whom a little time ago they had desired to worship as divine, they likewise took up stones; and already he had

¹ At present we know but few remnants of this dialect; to judge by the name it ought to be, most likely, some dialect of the Lycian language, which we are now better acquainted with (see Lassen in the *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch.*, 1856, pp. 329 sq., and particularly the work of Moriz Schmidt, *The Lycian Inscriptions*, Jena, 1868, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 14 sq.).

² It cannot be accidental that in these same Phrygian districts the legend of a possible descent of Zeus and Hermes in a human form had come down from ancient

times, see Ovid's *Metamorph.* viii. 621-726; if the legend was repeated annually there on a temple feast of Zeus, as ancient custom was, it would be easy for the people to form this idea of the two strange missionaries.

³ The words which have been preserved in many authorities, Acts xiv. 19, are, according to all indications, genuine, and have been improperly omitted by recent editors. They might be omitted by many early readers on account of their harsh sound, but they describe accurately the situation of the time.

been, under this stoning, partly driven and partly dragged as half-dead outside the city, and was supposed to be dead,¹ when his faithful disciples taking courage, swept the field and surrounded their fallen teacher. Thereupon the man, who they supposed was dead, arose with unexpected strength, and entered the city again under their protection. Still, both Apostles departed the next day to Derbe, where they at once courageously resumed their work again, and likewise collected a large number of disciples.

They felt, however, that the time was approaching when they must return to Antioch in Syria, and they might have at once taken the direct way back in a south-easterly direction through Cilicia. But they preferred to adopt a more difficult course, thinking that they could not well return until they had once more visited, and by their presence strengthened, the churches which they had founded on their way through Asia Minor. They accordingly went back the same way by Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, put in more stable order the affairs of each church, arranged for the election of good elders in each, and comforted all with Christian hope in view of the persecutions which most had to suffer; on parting they observed in each church a day of fasting and prayer, that they might commend it to the protection of the Lord with fervent supplication. They went back to Pamphilia also and stayed a little while in Perga, though this time without much more success than before. They then embarked at Attalia,² its harbour town, and arrived safely in Antioch.

As by the Holy Ghost itself they had been sent forth from the Syrian parent church, and commended to the grace of God for the work which they were undertaking; they now returned as if led by the same Holy Spirit,³ and could report to this church divine results of their labours, which, notwithstanding all the severe sufferings which they had to endure in the prosecution of them far surpassed all human expectations. It had now been decided by the most undeniable facts that Christianity could make the greatest advance amongst the heathen in the Roman Empire, and, indeed, that the heathen were competent to form entire Christian churches. But these very

¹ We may thus best imagine the nature of this incident, which is undoubtedly briefly referred to, with others of a similar nature, by Paul himself, 2 Cor. xi. 25. For it would, of course, be impossible that the Jews should, in such a heathen city, as though it were Jerusalem, first thrust one whom they

held guilty out of the city, and then stone him.

² It is now called *Atalia*, with softened *t*; see Fellows's *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, pp. 133 sq., and Noroff, *Die Sieben Kirchen der Offenbarung*, 1851.

³ Acts xiii. 4, comp. xiv. 26.

advantages, which had been won mainly by Paul's zeal and activity, were destined to involve him in a conflict with the parent church itself, which would from this time forth more and more exclusively call into exercise his profoundest energies.

2.—*In the midst of his labours as Apostle to the Heathen.*

His Third Journey to Jerusalem and the Resolution of the Parent Church.

It may easily be imagined what an unusual sensation would be made in the parent church by the events in Cyprus and Asia Minor, since for the first time whole churches, with even Heathen-Christian elders, were seen to be rising there. But the great joy which was felt at such a vigorous extension of Christianity was mingled with astonishment at what had never before been seen, by which the pre-eminence which Israel had hitherto possessed in all questions and conflicts concerning religion appeared to be seriously threatened, and a condition of Christian affairs must necessarily be brought about, which, undoubtedly, Christ himself could not have anticipated and given directions about when he was in the flesh. Moreover, the situation had now become extremely difficult through a special circumstance which appeared very happy for the parent church, and which was nevertheless capable of completely interrupting and even destroying the whole development of Christianity at this period. That is, during the last years not a few Pharisees had attached themselves to the parent church.¹ Paul had in this respect also, quite unexpectedly to himself, opened up a course which others might take, inasmuch as, he having remained so far a Christian with impunity, all his former co-sectaries were able to follow him, and those who now joined the new Community were undoubtedly generally like him adherents of the strict Pharisaic sect. For those who sought an easy way of life did not attach themselves to Christianity at all during these years, least of all in Jerusalem, and particularly none of the men of repute; and if the strict Pharisees desired, amid the growing confusions of the age, above all things the speedy coming of the Messiah, many of them might be convinced that Jesus, the Messiah who had

¹ According to Acts xv. 5. comp. with xxi. 20, 21, where we are not necessitated (see *ante*, p. 295) to suppose that the many thousands zealous for the Law were all Pharisees; this great number also belongs

to a later period. It cannot be supposed that a very large number of Pharisees had become Christians very long before the period under review.

appeared must likewise be the Messiah who would soon appear again as the Judge from Heaven. But while they thus shared with Paul the profound earnestness and the fear of the Christianity of those days, and became Christians with whom so far the elders of the parent church might be satisfied, they wholly differed from Paul in the matter of Christian freedom, which was of no less and, indeed, for this juncture of still greater importance. They retained too much of their general Pharisaic education, had all along too great a preference for their merely external legal life, and though they regarded, therefore, faith in Christ, as the final Judge, as the highest necessity for their life, it was only in the sense that every word of his must be revered as an external law of life. Inasmuch, therefore, as they knew that Christ had always held by the laws of the Old Testament, and interpreted his utterance, that he was not come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, in their own narrow sense, they concluded that no believer in Christ might break a command of the Old Testament; or, they held, that, at all events, only he at his coming in glory, when he should set up his perfected kingdom as victor over the world, could further cancel the laws of the Old Testament,¹ and that no one was entitled before that great period of the future to inaugurate greater freedom. The old national pride, together with the contempt of the heathen, at that time so prevalent, and the arrogance of a Pharisaic fulfilling of the Law, were easily combined again with such a scrupulously timid conception of the Christian hope and of the new Christian law of life; and the more closely the parent church was compelled, as we have seen,² subsequent to the stoning of Stephen and the execution of the Apostle James, to adapt itself once more to the ancient Community, the less did those new believers in Jerusalem itself, with their greater strictness, think of requiring anything new.

These Christian Pharisees, however, were far more distinguished as regards the learning of the schools and oratorical skill than the generality of Christians in Jerusalem, just as we find Paul as a Pharisee excelling in this respect. They consequently carried likewise the greater pretensions and activity which are often connected with a superior learned education into the modest circle of the parent church, and gained there great influence; while, on the other hand, this church might feel itself not a little honoured, and even protected and de-

¹ Which could be easily derived from the words Matt. v. 17-20.

² *Ante*, pp. 104 sq.

fended, by the accession of such learned and highly-esteemed men. As genuine scholastic teachers of the Law, they then raised questions with regard to circumcision, and maintained the principle that circumcision was the necessary sign to be borne by every member of the Community of the true religion, and though much was in other respects overlooked in the case of converts from heathenism, it was surely impossible that this rite should be dispensed with; Christ himself had been circumcised, and so forth. And undoubtedly circumcision had obtained in the history of the development of the Community of the true religion the high significance that the necessity of the observance of the Old Testament Law by the individual seemed to stand or fall with it.¹ With great skill, therefore, they thrust this question into the foreground; and, as it was thought in the parent church necessary to cleave as closely as possible to the existing ancient religion, they were easily able in it to raise such nice questions, and to successfully insist upon them; at all events, they appear to have met in it with no serious opposition at all for a considerable time. The parent church, particularly in the situation in which it then was, was not naturally the best place for the unprejudiced examination and proper settlement of this question; and everything Judean was just then still in the process of attaining a higher value amongst the heathen. The converted Pharisees could therefore thus easily propose such questions in the parent church. They had, besides, sought to rule the other churches from this central position, and dispatched some of their way of thinking to Antioch, to teach that all the heathen Christians in the Syrian and Cilician churches, who, they had heard, were very numerous, must be circumcised if they wished to be regarded as Christians in the full sense. According to all indications, it was less an ancient school prejudice than ambition which in this matter played its part. Paul, as we have seen,² had been a Pharisee of the same type, and these men seemed rather to envy him his great successes as a missionary, and desired themselves to reap the fruits of them. And as at that time everything amongst Christians was still in the powerfully fermenting stage of initiatory life, and nothing but the name of the Christ who had already appeared, and the fear of the Christ who was soon to appear in a wholly different manner, kept Christians together, these baptized Pharisees in Jerusalem undoubtedly acted in many respects more according to their own personal discretion

¹ See *Antiquities*, pp. 90 s. 1.

² *Ant.*, p. 278.

than according to any carefully-considered commission of the whole parent church. When they sent their delegates to Antioch, too, it was only rumours that had just arrived in Jerusalem from the newly-founded churches in the midst of Asia Minor; the delegated 'brethren' contented themselves, at all events, with making inquiries amongst the Syrian and Cilian churches only, and propagating their teaching amongst them.¹

When, however, Paul and Barnabas fell in with them in Antioch, the Apostles were so indignant at both their teaching and their intrigues that immediately a violent contention arose between the two parties: Paul especially, as formerly a member of their school, quickly saw through their dangerous aims, and regarded them ever after as 'false brethren,' who had crept in in order to spy out the liberty of the true Christians, that they might cast suspicion on it, and bring hearts and hands again under the yoke of the Old Testament laws as the Pharisees interpreted them.² But at first he felt himself profoundly shocked by these intrigues; so much so that he scarcely knew what to do in such an entirely unexpected entanglement of the threads of his Christian experience. He had then laboured for the Christian cause with all his might for the space of fourteen years amidst innumerable mortal perils, and led thousands to Christ; and amid all his toils and cares and thoughts it had only become to him constantly more certain that the heathen must be converted in some such way as he had attempted, and that Christianity laid the foundations of the highest spiritual liberty, such as had never before been known in the world; and now it was maintained that he had been completely mistaken as regards the very foundation of his Christian convictions and labours; that they were the true saints who, by the destruction of the necessary freedom of the Christian life, hindered the cause of every form of Christianity in the world just as it had properly begun! And who was to decide between him and opponents of this kind? Men? But men, even though they were the Twelve, he could not acknowledge as qualified judges in this contention, inasmuch as it was truer to him than his life that he had not received his call and commission from men.³ We can easily conceive how much he suffered, and how intense his inward agitation was. However, it became

This follows from the form of the resolution of the church, Acts xv. 23, which may, in so far, supplement the account ver. 1.

² Gal. ii. 4, comp. 2 Cor. xi. 5, 12 sq. Phil. iii. 2 sq., and other passages.

³ See especially Gal. i. 6-ii. 21.

suddenly marvellously clear to him, as by a celestial vision, what he had to do, and he felt strong enough to go forthwith to Jerusalem into the midst of his enemies, and into the presence of the great Pillars of the parent church, to expound the correctness of his procedure, and to see whether he had really laboured wrongly, and therefore in vain, and whether he should labour on or not. This was the most divinely wise thought that could then direct him; he could not permit the parent church to assume the place of the controller of his Christian convictions and labours, though he might seek a fraternal understanding with it, and do everything that he could in this respect. But as often that which comes to the person most directly and most seriously concerned as a sudden and reviving ray of divine light, appears to a calmer person, who is less immediately concerned, as simply the wisest thing to be done, so was it then in the case of Paul. The church at Antioch, being involved in the contention of the teachers, had meanwhile itself perceived, without knowing at all what had taken place in Paul's mind, that it was the best thing that the two Apostles, to whom they were already so much endeared, should go with some deputies from their own midst to the parent church to discuss the question there. And Paul then willingly adopted this expedient.¹

The travellers proceeded southwards along the coast of Phœnicia, and then turned to the great road to Jerusalem through Samaria, staying for a time everywhere with the smaller or larger churches, and gladdening them with their exhortations and reports. In Jerusalem they then attended the first meeting of the church, to present the greetings of the brethren at Antioch, and particularly to report the great progress of Christianity amongst the heathen. This full report, with which Barnabas, as the senior and principal of the two Apostles, undoubtedly began,² of itself gave rise to the question whether he and Paul had proceeded correctly in their work of converting the heathen. The assembly was not prepared at once to enter fully upon this difficult question, though some of the believing Pharisees who happened to be present immediately declared that they were unable to justify the Apostles' procedure. The decision had to be postponed until a subsequent meeting of the church; all that the two Apostles

¹ There is thus no discrepancy at all between the simple narrative, Acts xv. 1, 2, and Paul's own statement, Gal. ii. 2, which he makes more from his own secret personal experiences; in the same way, as was above, p. 331, remarked, no dis-

crepancy is conceivable between the narrative Acts ix. 30, and that Acts xxii. 17-21.

² Who is, therefore, contrary to Luke's custom, for once placed first, Acts xv. 12.

to the heathen had to say before the church on behalf of their cause was said at that time; in the subsequent resolution, to be taken after due discussion, they could not take part. Paul himself then discussed the matter specially in a more private conference¹ with the three who had then long been regarded as the Pillars of the parent church—James, the brother of the Lord, Peter and John; their judgment and their approval was to him also a matter of special importance, inasmuch as he esteemed them as highly as others.

On the day of the decision the meeting was unusually well attended; those of the Pharisaic way of thinking made every effort to get their view adopted, and on all sides the contention was very violent. Therefore Peter, to whose voice the church was likely in all cases to attach the greatest importance, at last rose. He spoke, in accordance with his own earlier experiences,² as a good Christian and Apostle was bound to speak. It was then some fourteen years (a period which appeared very long during the early history of the Church) since Peter had permitted some heathen to be baptized without requiring of them circumcision or otherwise the observance of the entire Law;³ meanwhile times had arrived for the parent church when it supposed it necessary to adhere more closely to the laws of the Old Testament, and Peter was generally occupied elsewhere; but that reception of believing heathen by Peter had continued to be an incontrovertible and irreproachable precedent, as he now candidly confessed. Entering from that point somewhat more minutely into the matter, he maintained that it would be tempting God if it should be determined to impose the yoke of the observance of all the Old Testament laws on heathen in whom really none but God Himself had kindled living faith in Christ, laws which (as the Pharisees interpreted them) neither previously nor then even those born Judeans had ever been able wholly to keep;⁴ that surely, on the contrary, the grace of God, through Christ, was

¹ *κατ' ἰδίαν*, Gal. ii. 2: it need create no surprise that nothing is said in Luke's narrative of this special conference and final approval, since it is only the great public events which belong to such a short historical book; to which consideration we must add the other, that Luke never used the epistles of the Apostle. Paul, on the other hand, narrates, Gal. i. ii., only what was necessary for his special purpose.

² See *ante*, pp. 185 sq.

³ We must read Acts xv. 7, *ἐν ἡμῶν*

ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεός, and this clause can only mean, in accordance with the customary Hebrew idiom, *God chose us*, as Peter modestly says, instead of *we*, although he then immediately speaks more plainly of himself, *that by my mouth the heathen should hear the Gospel*.

⁴ This is undoubtedly a very important, and only too true a circumstance, the correctness of which is proved by the whole history of the nation (comp. *ante*, p. 306), and which is expressed most forcibly Matt. xxiii. 4.

the sole dominant principle in Christianity, so that whoever looked in faith for salvation from it must be considered a Christian, and that they themselves, the Judeans, had not become Christians in any other way. The silence which followed this decisive speech was then at once used by the two Apostles, not only to relate the great results of their journeys, but particularly to describe the signs of the operations of the higher Christian powers which had been so unmistakably manifested in connection with the conversion of the heathen; and, as we have seen,¹ these signs were necessarily regarded together with faith as the undeniable proofs of the existence of true Christianity.

James, as the president, considered then that he might bring the transactions to a close by summing up the chief points on which the question hinged, and proposing a resolution to be expressed in definite terms. He maintained likewise (in appropriate additional words) that the Old Testament prophecy, which foretold the conversion of all the heathen,² was in accordance with the historical proof which Peter had brought forward; that they might therefore confidently resolve to impose on the believing heathen only those of the Mosaic laws which were absolutely necessary and not to be disputed. As such necessary laws, about which there could be no dispute, he named (1) the command to abstain from all idolatry; (2) that prohibiting fornication, accordingly the observance of all Mosaic laws concerning it; and (3) abstention from eating blood and things strangled; in accordance, therefore, with similar requirements previously made by the Judeans in the case of proselytes.³ But as regards the fear alleged by many brethren in the assembly, that in that case the Mosaic Law generally would be neglected and despised, he maintained that it was the more groundless in that the Law had always been read every week from early times in every heathen city wherever there was a Judean community, even by men publicly appointed for that purpose, the only question being, therefore, simply concerning the true meaning and the application of the Law and not about its value;⁴ an argument which presupposes

¹ *Ante*, p. 113.

² Instead of other passages of the Old Testament which might have equally well been quoted, the speech appeals only to the words Amos ix. 11, 12, which, in the translation of the LXX. quoted by Luke, are more suitable than in the Hebrew; but according to this quotation the Hebrew text contained a further

clause, which ran, 'saith God who doeth this, whose work was long ago known.' γνωστων ἀπ' αἰῶνος τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, for this is the most correct reading of ver. 18 (נִרְצָה כִּי עָשָׂה לְעוֹלָם), and we have every reason to suppose that these words belonged originally even to the great closing sentence.

³ See *ante*, p. 311.

⁴ This must be the meaning of the

that the Christians in heathen countries either continued to belong to the Judean synagogues, or had, in any case, procured similar ones for themselves, in which the Sacred Scriptures were publicly read every week and explained for the edification of the hearers.¹

Thereupon the Church adopted the resolution in that form, only with the addition that two deputies of the parent church should go with Barnabas and Paul to Antioch to further explain there by word of mouth the meaning and object of the resolution, and also to look after its proper enforcement. The two Apostles had, moreover, the satisfaction of being acknowledged by the three 'pillars' of the parent church as fully-authorised fellow-labourers in the work of Christianity. They gave each other the right hand of fellowship, and agreed that Barnabas and Paul should labour amongst the heathen outside Palestine with the same right with which James and John, who remained in Jerusalem, laboured in the first instance for the Judeans in the Holy Land, and with which, in conjunction with them, Peter, who had long been occupied a good deal beyond its limits, should likewise labour in the first instance for the Judeans amongst the heathen,² each Apostle according to his qualifications; as, in fact, had already been the practice. At the same time the wish was expressed that the Apostles to the heathen should specially keep up the idea of the unity of all Christians, and of the proper gratitude of the heathen Christians to the parent church, by remembering 'the poor' in the Holy Land,³ which the two Apostles gladly promised to do, and subsequently faithfully performed, having, in fact, formerly spontaneously done so on a special occasion.⁴ When this became from that time a constant practice, there was undoubtedly involved in it an acknowledgment of the permanent precedence of the parent church as the centre of Christendom, in the same way as the great Ancient Community in the Holy

brief and apparently unintelligible words Acts xv. 21 (comp. xiii. 27); thus understood, they perfectly fit into the context, and could not well be dispensed with. The earlier utterance, Mal. i. 11, 12, was very similar.

¹ See *ante*, pp. 308 sq.

² We must thus understand Gal. ii. 7-9. Of course this distinction remained always very elastic, having arisen in accordance with purely historical necessities, so that we find Paul also always beginning with the Judeans (see *ante*, p. 320), and Peter was not forbidden to labour amongst heathen. The agreement simply declared

the validity of a practice which had already been established. We see simply that the three 'Pillars' did not at that time feel so confident of their ability to labour with such effect amongst the heathen as Barnabas and Paul, and accordingly committed, after a formal resolution, to the latter the more difficult and in the end more responsible task.

³ Gal. ii. 6-10; in connection with which it is again by no means surprising that Luke does not specially mention this.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 335.

Land received such gifts from all the communities scattered throughout heathen countries as a kind of homage; nevertheless it was historically the most just and harmless form of acknowledging the pre-eminence of the parent church and of the eternal unity of Christendom represented by it, which Paul could and did willingly adopt,¹ and an acknowledgment justified by the extremely necessitous condition of the parent church at the time.

We have in the above instance the model of a conference regarding the most difficult questions that could arise in a church: and we must confess that no transactions regarding public affairs could even in our own times be conducted with greater thoroughness, competency, and success. Every view of the matter in dispute was carefully listened to and discussed: and from the conflict and collision of the most dissimilar views and aims, a resolution was called forth which could not have received a wiser or juster form. Of the three general commandments of the Old Testament which were to be obligatory on the heathen Christians, the first two, as necessarily implied in the nature of true religion generally, needed no defence—the prohibition of fornication having no other object than to secure the indispensable domestic foundation of true religion, and the existence of any true religion being impossible without domestic virtue.² The case is somewhat different with the command to abstain in eating ‘from blood and animals strangled’ (in their blood). This command has, it is true, a very important place in the Old Testament even, and is there placed much above circumcision.³ It was also in accordance with the feeling of the higher nations of antiquity generally, and was undoubtedly accepted then as beyond contradiction; nevertheless it is based only upon an ancient view of blood, and accordingly a view regarding something purely physical and terrestrial with which a higher thought had been connected, which had however no necessary and inseparable connection with it. There was therefore something unexplained, obscure, and doubtful connected with this point, out of which a new controversy might arise, and as a fact did very soon arise. With regard to the range of the resolution respecting idolatry also, doubt might arise when it came to be applied. According to the form of it, which we may regard as the original one,⁴ the command was to abstain from

¹ See especially 2 Cor. viii. ix.

² *πορνεία*, Acts xv. 20 and ver. 29 (where its position at the end is less suitable), can only be taken in this sense, as follows from the entire N.T. (and par-

ticularly from 1 Thess. iv. 3-5, 1 Cor. v. 1 sq.) and from the general antithesis of all true religion to heathenism.

³ See *Antiquities*, pp. 37 sq.

⁴ Acts xv. 20. When, instead of this

'the pollutions of idols;' but how far was that meant to extend? We know that soon afterwards it was supposed to mean that a Christian might not even eat of the flesh of sacrifices that had been killed in a heathen temple;¹ and undoubtedly that had likewise been strictly prohibited to the Judeans: was the same rigour to be regarded in the case of Christians also? It might also in certain cases be doubtful how far the prohibited marriages in the case of heathen Christians were to be limited as avoidance of 'fornication.'

When, therefore, Christian liberty in its infancy began necessarily to be asserted in those times on the first more serious attempt to convert the heathen in large numbers, many doubts and uncertainties as to details might arise with regard to the application of the above directions, and we shall soon see such doubts actually arising. But for the moment all these directions were salutary, and were adopted by all concerned as correct. Blessing on all sides sprang out of the dangerous contention, because it had been settled in the right way. All the Apostles could go to their difficult work with fresh courage and higher confidence. The unity of visible Christendom generally had been preserved, and the dignity of the parent church had been afresh confirmed.² This church was also constantly regarded as the great centre for the churches founded in heathen countries; and if the latter churches were written to from it, they were still denominated, in accordance with ancient custom, as 'the Twelve Tribes,' or Israel in the Diaspora.³

form, 'sacrifices to idols' are mentioned ver. 29, xxi. 25, the latter is plainly a later form. For it appears from the addition to ver. 20, in Codex *D.* and other ancient authorities, according to which the utterance, Matt. vii. 12, was adopted as the fifth principle, because five laws had always been preferred in such summaries (see vol. ii. pp. 159 sq.), how often these resolutions were in the earliest times thrown into different forms. The five were in that case the avoidance of (1) sacrifices to idols; (2) blood; (3) things strangled; (4) fornication; and (5) to act according to Matt. vii. 12.

¹ Comp. my *Johanneische Schriften*, ii. p. 131, and Mishna *Aboda Sara*, ii. 4.

² It is scarcely needful to show further that the event related Acts xv. is the same as that referred to by Paul himself

in a very different manner, Gal. ii. 1-10, and that the two accounts are not contradictory as regards the real matter itself. Moreover, the resolution of the church, as it is communicated Acts xv. 23-29, as if verbally copied from the original document itself, may have been originally written down and further circulated substantially as it appears there. The mention of the Holy Ghost, ver. 28, is quite after the early Christian manner; the notes of times appear (as was above said) plainer in ver. 23 than in ver. 1, and Barnabas is, as the senior, vv. 25, 26, placed first, as might be expected in such a document, but contrary to Luke's habit. Comp. also *Jahrb. d. E. W.* x. pp. 267 sq.

³ Comp. below in connection with the epistles of James and Peter.

The Second Great Missionary Journey and the Fourth Return to Jerusalem. 52-55 A.D.

It cannot be proved that the agreement come to at that time with regard to the observance of the Mosaic laws was not inviolably kept by Paul on this journey. On the contrary, all indications show that on his part everything was done to the extent of his power to act in accordance with it. However, the prejudices and the obstinacy of the Pharisaic party in the parent church, who had taken part in the above decision and were at heart determined nevertheless not to give up their views, combined too seductively with the elasticity of the particular regulations adopted and the general condition of Christianity at the time, which still lacked definite development, to be consistent with a peace of long duration. Soon after his return to Antioch, Paul had to meet with a foretaste of this.

In the meantime the two Apostles returned to Antioch, rejoicing at the peace which had been obtained. The two deputies of the parent church travelling with them were also undoubtedly quite of one mind with them, and laboured harmoniously with them in Antioch. They were both excellent men. The one of them, Judas, surnamed Barsabbas, was undoubtedly the same constant hearer of Christ himself whom we met with above;¹ the other, Silas, whose unabbreviated name, Silvanus, is always used by Paul—a Hellenist residing in Jerusalem, as his name indicates, but like Paul a Roman citizen²—was probably much younger, though he was regarded, like Barsabbas, as a man of prophetic gifts, and became so intimate with Paul that he was destined soon to enter into closer relations with him. Both stayed now for a considerable time in Antioch, and then returned to Jerusalem. In the large and important church at Antioch, the most active labours for Christ's cause were at once begun again, under the activity of Barnabas and Paul, and the co-operation of many other excellent leaders. But after some time an event occurred which was calculated to disturb the peace again, and to interrupt the work which had just been so vigorously resumed, had not Paul exhibited in this emergency no less dauntless courage than wise self-restraint.

The case appears to have been as follows: The Pharisaic party in Jerusalem, as we may very well imagine, made careful inquiries of the deputies on their return from Antioch, with

¹ *Ante*, p. 113.

² Acts xvi. 37, 38.

regard to everything which they had seen there, and discussed this and that in which they thought they could show a violation of the resolution concerning the heathen Christians. It necessarily soon appeared that the heathen Christians in many countries could only with difficulty be brought to the required care in avoiding 'blood and things strangled,' and trustworthy reports on that point might arrive at Jerusalem. In what way could the eating of such things be always strictly controlled? In a word, it is only too certain that at the instigation of the Pharisaic party in the parent church the resolution was adopted, that at all events the Judean Christian, inasmuch as he could really never be sure whether 'blood or something strangled' was not amongst the food prepared by the heathen, must refrain from eating with heathen Christians. A resolution to this effect was adopted in Jerusalem just as Peter had entered upon a missionary journey in the north, he having probably been invited by Judeans in Pontus and others of these northern countries to preach the gospel to them.¹ He then stayed a considerable time in Antioch, and lived in unrestrained intercourse with the heathen Christians at their tables. But when some deputies from James, the head of the parent church, arrived to announce the recent resolution, he privately withdrew, without desiring to begin a contention with anyone. Whereupon the other Judean Christians likewise separated themselves, and even Barnabas wished to have no further fellowship with the heathen Christians at their tables. Must therefore a matter in itself in the highest degree unimportant, resting for the most part purely upon suspicion, break up Christian fellowship? And was it desired under this pretext to impose again upon the heathen Christians the joke of the ancient laws as interpreted by the Pharisees, although they might have no desire to be put under them while they nevertheless wished to remain Christians? Was the work of the Law and not faith to be made once more the chief thing? The man that showed himself somewhat scrupulous in the matter of food, was he to be a saint, and far holier than other equally good Christians? In this matter Paul could not repress his zeal. He brought the matter forward before the assembled church, showed his brother Apostle, Peter, that his present conduct contradicted his former conduct, and that it could be nothing else than Christian hypocrisy to suppose that by the observance

¹ We may infer this from the mention of Pontus quite at the beginning 1 Pet. i. 1, inasmuch as this cannot be accidental.

It is certain that Peter had no intention of going then to Antioch alone, as there was no occasion for him to do so.

of such works of the Law a man was better than other Christians. The most important Christian truths necessarily came under discussion in connection with the matter; and the result was undoubtedly a complete victory for Paul, although Peter at last hardly confessed that he had been more timid than was justifiable.¹ Paul did not thereby depart from the resolution of the primitive church which was binding on him, inasmuch as a prohibition of eating with heathen Christians was something quite different from inculcating on them care with regard to 'blood and things strangled.' However, a division amongst those who had hitherto been in complete agreement remained easy, since these laws regarding food could really all along be taken more strictly than was possible with Paul.

He most wisely repressed his zeal in the matter, however, in so far that he did not take any such step as to hasten at once back to Jerusalem, with the view of making representations with regard to resolutions of such a foolish nature—a step which would have been utterly useless. On the contrary, he now felt impelled to extend Christianity the more vigorously further and further, in accordance with the original resolution, that he might, if possible, return to Jerusalem once more only after fresh and greater Christian conquests. When, however, he invited Barnabas to visit with him again the churches which they had founded in Asia Minor, that Apostle desired to have John Mark again as their companion, a proposal which Paul, for the reason above referred to,² could not approve. There consequently broke out a sharp contention between the two Apostles, and Barnabas soon afterwards took sail for Cyprus, attended by Mark only. Really Paul's labours did not suffer at all in consequence of this, but, on the contrary, from that moment first displayed their full strength. The cause of the alienation of the two Apostles lay evidently deeper than the question as to Mark's going with them: the Pharisaic party had since the recent contention in Antioch produced a profounder difference between the two men. And as Paul was beyond question bolder, and bent on following his convictions to their logical conclusion, it was in the highest degree important for the Christian cause, that he should now be able to promote it independently, quite by himself and unrestrained by any colleague who was on an equality with him, and still less by one

¹ The fact that Paul does not mention the latter circumstance, Gal. ii. 11-21, is no less easy to explain than that Luke passes over the entire incident in silence. But we may infer from it that those who

were scrupulous about the sacrifices to idols, 1 Cor. viii.-x. were evidently a Petrine party.

² *Ante*, p. 344.

above him. As a fact we soon see him beginning afresh his difficult work with entirely new and higher confidence. In these circumstances he desired to take Silas with him, and the latter, gladly following his call, went from Jerusalem to meet him. This time also Paul went forth with the blessing of the church at Antioch; and their journey was destined to become the most important of all in most widely extending Christianity.

It is true the Apostle was evidently from the beginning uncertain as to the limits of his journey: he was simply impelled by the burning desire once more to see the churches already founded and to extend his journey as far as possible into the heart of the countries of Europe. Still greater hindrances, too, now threatened from abroad. For at the beginning of the year 52, the prohibition of Christian-Judean meetings which Claudius, as we have seen,¹ issued at the beginning of his reign, was republished in Rome under that Emperor, on occasion of a similar prohibition of the Chaldeans or astrologers.² If perhaps only a few Christian Judeans may have been thereby expelled from Rome, and the entire measure, like that against the Chaldeans, soon lost all its rigour in the great capital, the insolence of the Judeans towards the Christians was very naturally increased by it in all countries. The parent church had at this time once more to suffer very severely, and the heads of the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem sent expressly their exhortations to all synagogues not to allow Paul to speak and labour freely.³ However, it was farthest from Paul's intention to curb his zeal for such reasons. It had always been one of the strongest weapons with which the heads of the Hagiocracy and their adherents fought against the Christians, to pronounce them apostate Judeans and to declare that, therefore, they had forfeited all public privileges; but the reproach of having apostatized from the true Israel might with much more justice be retorted upon themselves.⁴

¹ *Ante*, p. 261.

² It is true that we cannot prove from other authorities that Claudius expelled all Judeans from Rome at that time, as is stated, Acts xviii. 2; but this statement is not, on that account, to be rejected as baseless, since it is only expressed in too general a form. In connection with the resolution of the Senate regarding the Chaldeans, Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 52, comp. Cassius Dio, p. 972, ed. Reim., according to Zonaras, the former resolution regarding the 'Judeans' could very well be republished. Other points, to be touched on below, lead to the same conclusion. And only on this supposition can the

words of Suetonius, *Claud.* cap. xxv., *Judeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultantes Roma expulit*, be explained; it was not unusual to say *Χρηστός* (benignant) instead of *Christus* (*Tert. Apol.* c. iii., *Lact. Instit. Div.* iv. 7), and the word may have been first used by the persecuted Christians themselves as a paronomasia. There is nothing that favours the idea of a Judean who actually bore the name *Chrestus*.

³ According to the very important statements, 1 Thess. ii. 14-16, comp. *ante*, p. 275.

⁴ See *infra*.

So Paul then visited again all the churches which had been founded in Syria, Cilicia, and elsewhere in Asia Minor, found their condition on the whole satisfactory, confirmed their hope, and communicated to them the resolution of the church in Jerusalem regarding the heathen Christians. In Lystra he met with an exceedingly zealous young Christian, *Timotheus*, who was spoken most highly of by the leading Christians of that town, as well as in the neighbouring town of Iconium. The young man seemed to him to be a very useful helper, and he was very glad to follow him. Luke scarcely gives any hint as to the circumstances under which *Timotheus* became a Christian, but according to other indications which have been preserved elsewhere, they were so unusual, and especially was his reception into the church, both on his own part and on that of the Apostle and the brethren of Lystra and Iconium, so touching and memorable, that even a long time after his death too much could not be told about them.¹ If in the case of any youth of those days it could at once, on his first reception into the Christian Church, be foreseen, from the most memorable signs, how nobly he would turn out as a man, such was the case with *Timotheus*; and, as a fact, he subsequently proved himself to be the most faithful helper and colleague, and one well versed in the Scriptures; and with no other of Paul's companions was there subsequently so closely associated the ideal of gentle immortal youth.² At that time Paul considered it proper, as his mother, Eunice, who had undoubtedly had him baptized,³ was a Jewess, but his father a heathen well-known to all Judeans, to at once have him circumcised, because according to ancient custom a Jewess ought never to marry a heathen, and the son of one who had was regarded as a bastard.⁴ If *Timotheus* had been, like *Titus*, of purely heathen origin, Paul would never have caused him to be circumcised; he was unwilling that the reproach of being a bastard should rest upon his assistant, and *Timotheus* was probably himself quite willing to submit to the rite.⁵ The company of his assistants, however, was soon greatly increased by other additions on their journey.

¹ This follows from a careful comparison of 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14, vi. 12; 2 Tim. i. 4-6, ii. 2, and then of the brief remark, Acts xvi. 2. It is wholly gratuitous to suppose that the above allusions in the pastoral epistles were taken from Luke's narrative, or reversely; on the contrary, the words of the epistles all contain the most lively reminiscence of the unusual history of the youth of the

man who had then passed away.

² 1 Tim. iv. 12.

³ She and the grandmother Lois are spoken most highly of 2 Tim. i. 5.

⁴ See *Antiquities*, pp. 193 sq.

⁵ It is baseless to find in this a contradiction of Paul's principles, inasmuch as the case is quite peculiar, and Paul was only determined that circumcision should not be enforced upon a Christian.

Leaving Lycaonia and Pisidia, where he had previously preached the gospel with such energy and success, his journey, when we review it from the end, is seen to fall into three sections. *In the first instance*, he directed his steps to the districts of Phrygia and Galatia, to the north of Lycaonia and Pisidia. We do not know what churches he then founded in Phrygia: in south-western Phrygia the three neighbouring towns of Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis are situated, in which Christian churches existed at an early date; but we know definitely that it was disciples of the Apostle who founded the first two of these churches.¹ Neither are the Galatian towns in which he then founded churches known to us in detail, though we know something about the circumstances under which he founded them. When he first appeared and began to work amongst the Galatians he suffered exceedingly from a severe physical infirmity, probably the same which tormented him so much in later years;² but, instead of being thereby repulsed from him and his message, they accepted with the greater sympathy and joy the gospel, so that, when in later years he recalled the circumstances, it seemed to the Apostle as if they had then received him as an angel, or rather as Christ himself; and soon they likewise felt the power and the blessedness of Christian truth.³ In these Galatians there was undoubtedly still much of that simpler and more upright life which they had brought with them into these districts of Asia Minor, centuries before, from their northern home in the distant west; but they had also long ago adopted so much of the Greek language and culture as to be able to have intercourse through it with other people; and, further, a sufficient number of Judeans lived dispersed amongst them, to enable them easily to understand Judean and Christian ideas. Moreover, although they had been for some decades immediately subject to the Romans, they still formed more than was usual a distinct nationality, so that Paul could afterwards write to them as a separate nation. No country had hitherto received the gospel so true-heartedly, unanimously, quickly, and decidedly as Galatia, and subsequent times were soon to show still more with what earnestness it was bent on understanding and obeying genuine Christianity. After a few years even Paul writes to the 'Galatian churches'⁴ about the most difficult questions of

¹ Col. i. 7, ii. 1, iv. 13, and Rev. iii.

14.

² See *ante*, p. 322.

³ Gal. iv. 9, 13-15; v. 7.

⁴ This ought to be properly the form of the heading of this Epistle, according to Gal. i. 2.

Christian knowledge and doctrine, with as much profundity, and under the supposition of as much Old Testament learning, as if he had had to address the oldest and best instructed Christians, while at the same time he uses such perfectly frank expressions of severe censure as can be employed only in the case of the most true-hearted readers.¹ It is as if we had here the prelude of the subsequent conversion of the German nations.

From Galatia he would then, following the same direction eastwards, have naturally come into Pontus; but Peter, as we have seen,² was probably at that time working there; accordingly he changed his course directly westwards, and was proposing to travel through *Asia Proconsularis*, when he believed that a divine intimation had been given to him which for the time prevented him from entering that country. He turned from the east boundary of that country northwards to where Mysia is divided on the east from Bithynia, and proposed to pass through Bithynia on the Black Sea, when there likewise he recognised a divine intimation to desist from his purpose.³ Consequently he turned again westwards, and went straight along the southern border of Mysia as far as Troas on the Ægean Sea, opposite Macedonia. It was as if the spirit of Christ himself sought the more urgently to guide him, through all these cross paths, to set his foot on European soil without further hesitation. Indeed, on the first night, when he slept on that distant coast near the sea, it seemed to him as if he plainly saw a man, clothed like a Macedonian, coming to meet him, and calling to him with a loud voice to go over to Macedonia to help those in need of salvation there. So he could not stay longer in Asia, and the whole company of his travelling companions were rejoiced to take part in the daring enterprise. Luke also, who had up to that time been residing in Troas as a physician, accompanied him, having been changed into one of his most active and faithful assistants.⁴

The missionary tour in Macedonia became, therefore, the *second* great section of this general journey; and it very soon appeared what extremely fruitful ground for his labours the Apostle had entered upon in the European country on which he had set his foot. He proceeded from Troas by ship in a north-westerly direction to Samothrace, from that island, still in

¹ For Paul writes to no other church as he does to them, Gal. iii. 1-3, iv. 11, 18-20, not even to the Corinthians, at a time when he had probably most cause to

be indignant with the latter.

² *Ante*, p. 362.

³ See *ante*, p. 315.

⁴ See *ante*, pp. 28 sq.

the same direction, to the most northern point of the Macedonian coast, and from thence soon reached Philippi. This city, which was furnished with the rights of a Roman colony and newly repeopled in the time of Augustus, was very flourishing at this period, and could, by virtue of its being such a flourishing Roman city, be called 'the first city of the province of Macedonia,'¹ although it did not, like Thessalonica, surpass all the other Macedonian towns as regards commercial prosperity and wealth, and resembled rather a Roman than a Greek city. Consequently, even after its restoration by the Romans, such a large number of Judean families had not settled in it, and there was no synagogue within its walls; only a simple house of prayer, or *proseuche*,² had been erected in it by the side of a little stream, where the few Judean inhabitants and proselytes assembled on the Sabbath. Nevertheless, Paul determined at once to commence his work in this first European town; but the desire to hear him and his companions was for some time so small that they had to be content with speaking merely to a number of women who collected at the *proseuche*, and were animated with a strong desire to hear. Amongst these assiduous listeners was a rich tradeswoman, who had come from the Lydian town of Thyatira, famous for its purple dyes, and who, under the name of Lydia, traded in purple wares. She was already a proselyte, but was now so much moved by Paul's discourses, and felt the truth of them so deeply in her heart, that she wished to be baptized, her numerous household following her example. Indeed, she was so exceedingly zealous that she desired Paul with his whole company to dwell with her, 'if the missionaries regarded her really as a Christian.' A case of this kind had probably never occurred before; hesitation might be felt as to whether to reside in the house of a heathen Christian, and particularly when the lady of the house only was the Christian, was a becoming thing. Paul, however, determined to accede to her urgent wishes; and it soon appeared that the example of this rich and influential family produced a very favourable effect on other Philippians. There was soon collected in that town a church, consisting for the most part of heathen Christians, which always remained very

¹ Nothing more than this is implied in the words, Acts xvi. 12, and *μείρις* may, in such a connection and in this Roman period, very well signify the *province*, as a distinct portion of the Roman empire. We do not know precisely whether the Roman governor resided at that time in this city and not in Thessalonica (which

Strabo, *Geogr.* vii. 7. 24, calls, in his time, the chief city of Macedonia); the epithet *πρώτη* was often a merely honorary epithet (Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* i. 4, pp. 282 sq.).

² Acts xvi. 13, comp. with xvii. 1, 2, where in connection with the neighbouring Thessalonica, the exact opposite is purposely observed.

much attached to the Apostle amid all the changes of the following years.

In these circumstances it befell the company of missionaries to be greatly molested by a strange woman. This woman, of low birth, knew the art of ventriloquism, and was on that account regarded, according to an early belief of those countries, as concealing within her a prophetic god;¹ but as she obtained her living by her rare art, she engaged herself for money to anyone who proposed to produce an effect by her aid upon the people, and had, as a fact, already brought to her 'masters' much gain. By the wholly new phenomenon presented by the Christian missionaries, however, she had been greatly excited, and appeared to be in no wise disinclined to offer her services to them likewise. She accordingly often took up her position on the Sabbath outside the city by the road to the place of prayer, followed Paul and his companions, and cried out to the people, 'These men are servants of the Most High God, who proclaim to you the way of salvation!' Were, therefore, the Christian missionaries to look for any kind of assistance from a woman in whom, as they perceived, merely a demon was operating? At last Paul was profoundly troubled and offended by her behaviour, and, in a moment of sudden energy, with a voice of thunder commanded not so much the woman as her demon to be quiet; and as a fact she was thereby so unexpectedly and so terribly confounded that she became perfectly silent, and felt that the noisy spirit had departed from her. She had been playing with higher things, and now they almost annihilated her with their power, and she found that she had forgotten her art. But when all this got abroad, the woman's previous 'masters' considered that they had been so greatly wronged with regard to the money which they had expected to gain, that they stirred up a popular tumult, dragged Paul and Silas in sudden fury before the Roman magistracy, and charged them with desiring, as Judeans, to corrupt Roman customs and injure lawful trade. And this magistracy was so far intimidated in what was, it is true, practically a Roman town, as not to listen to any representations on the part of the two missionaries, but, in order to check the popular tumult in some way, commanded them to be beaten by the beadles upon their naked bodies until the blood came,² and then to be thrown

¹ But in accordance with Christian ideas, it is not said that she had a *θεός* *πίθων*, but a *πνεῦμα* *πίθων*, Acts xvi. 16, comp. ver. 18; comp. vol. vi. p. 221.

[Comp. *Die Lehre der Bibel*, &c., i. pp. 212 sq.].

² According to 2 Cor. xi. 25 he had suffered as many as three times the

into prison, probably justifying their procedure by the severe regulation of the Senate passed just before, in the year 32, against the new religion.¹ The magistrates desired undoubtedly to consider the question whether expulsion beyond the precincts of the colonial town should be enforced; but before the heroes of faith left the place, the most magnificent reparation was to be made to them. The jailor, it is true, put them into the inmost prison, making their feet fast to the wooden block,² as as if they had been the most dangerous criminals; but they were not to be kept from striking-up, towards midnight, their customary hymn of praise, this time with even still greater heartiness, so that their fellow-prisoners listened to them with astonishment. Suddenly a great earthquake was felt, shaking all the foundations of the prison, bursting open the doors, and loosening all the fetters; as the prayer of the believers was regarded in those days, as we have seen,³ as able to shake the atmosphere and walls, we can imagine the effect of this incident upon the minds of our two prisoners. And undoubtedly they might then have fled, before it could have been noticed in the confusion, but they stayed quietly where they were; the jailor, suddenly wakened from his sleep, was in despair when he found all the doors open and supposed the prisoners had fled; Paul called to him the more loudly in the darkness not to do himself any harm. When the man entered, after he had obtained a light, the terror of the moment and the sight of the calmness of the two missionaries, who had long been known to him as unusually devout men, overpowered him, so that he fell at their feet and besought them to show him 'the way of salvation.' And the very same night he, with his whole house, was baptized, amid rejoicing, after brief instruction, whilst he could not show care enough in washing them from the blood of their stripes and refreshing them with food. And still they would not even then have fled, but the next morning the magistrates ordered them quietly to leave the town; this time, however, at Paul's suggestion, they refused to leave the prison and town as if they had been criminals, and asserted their rights as Roman citizens. Accordingly the authorities of the town were finally glad to induce them by profound apologies to voluntarily leave the place; and not until they had seen and comforted unhindered the Christians, who were met

punishment inflicted by the lictors; but it is only this one instance of which we have special information; comp. also Paul's own reference to this instance, 1 Thess. ii. 2.

¹ See *ante*, p. 364; a *colonia* was under Italian law.

² Comp. my *Commentary on Job* (London, 1882), p. 164.

³ *Ante*, p. 153.

at the house of Lydia, did they leave the city, amid an honourable attendance. They left Luke, however, in Philippi as a *teacher*.¹—With very special interest Paul always remembered afterwards the experiences which he met with in this first European city, particularly the wonderful vicissitudes of the last hours of his stay there. After his departure also the Church continued to flourish, and always adhered affectionately to him; he likewise displayed on every subsequent occasion his special affection for it, as is shown by the epistle addressed to it, which has been preserved; and in order to show special attention of this kind, he made an exception in the case of this church from his usual principles with regard to the acceptance of gifts for his support.²

Moreover, the elevated mood in which he left Philippi was kept up by him during the next days. As he was never in a more exalted mood and more full of rejoicing towards God and Christ than when he had been most severely suffering for Christ's cause, he proceeded along the sea-coast, by the cities of Amphipolis and Apollonia, farther to the south-west to Thessalonica, and began at once to labour in this great maritime and commercial city, where very many Judeans resided and where there was a famous synagogue, with such marvellous energy that his entrance into this city remained to him ever afterwards as memorable as his departure from Philippi.³ For three Sabbaths successively he came forward in the synagogue with the proof that Jesus was the true Messiah, and produced this proof with invincible force from the Scriptures and their most enigmatical passages, in opposition to the most learned speakers,⁴ refuting every objection. He was also incessantly employed in other ways in promoting his great object.⁵ The result was that a considerable church was gathered around him, consisting for the most part of heathen who had previously joined the synagogue, and including not a few of the most respected women as well as some Judeans. A certain Jason, probably one of these Judeans,⁶ who had given his name Jesus this Greek form, was the principal patron of the church, and it was in his house that the missionaries dwelt. The report of the wonderful zeal which had been enkindled in this church soon flew from this

¹ See *ante*, p. 28.

² See *ante*, p. 217.

³ 1 Thess. i. 9; ii. 1, 2.

⁴ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, Acts xvii. 2, 3, must be connected with διαλογῶν, ἀπό as 1 Cor. xi. 23.

⁵ 1 Thess. ii. 5-12.

⁶ Acts xvii. 5. This person is thus unexpectedly mentioned, and undoubtedly the narrative in Luke has been here left unfinished.

great maritime city by its ships and caravans through the entire Roman world.¹ However, as in very many of the larger cities, the majority of the Judeans were exasperated with the new church; and with the aid of idle mercenary loiterers in the market they stirred up the populace and sought to drag Paul and Silas from Jason's house before the magistrates. The two missionaries had been warned in time, but Jason himself and a few others of the new converts were then dragged before the municipal court, under the charge that the missionaries whom Jason protected, having already created great disturbance in the Roman Empire, had come to that city also and stirred up the people against Cæsar by the worship of their king (the Messiah); just as the high priests in Jerusalem had previously crucified Christ himself under this charge of treason against Cæsar. In conformity with that precedent, the municipal court² resolved to take from Jason and those accused with him money-security that they would not harbour the missionaries any longer nor favour any treasonable attempt against Cæsar. The missionaries had then no further protection in the city, and the two chiefs of the mission were the same night sent by their faithful friends safely from the city. Timotheus, however, remained behind by their wish, to conduct to a more satisfactory end their labours, which had been in this city too suddenly interrupted.³ And, as a fact, this church continued likewise, after the subsequent departure of Timotheus, to increase amid all the trials which it had all along to endure from the heathen magistracy, which had become hostile to it, and from the co-operation of the magistracy with the hostile Judeans.⁴ The constant increase consisted undoubtedly mainly of heathen. One of the most able and faithful assistants and attendants of the Apostle at a later time, Aristarchus,⁵ was probably converted then.

But Paul and Silas then continued their journey in a south-westerly direction to Berœa, at the southern extremity of Macedonia, where they knew there was likewise a synagogue, probably by way of Pella, not so very far from the sea-coast. Between the two commercial towns of Thessalonica and Berœa there had probably long existed a certain rivalry; and the more unjustly the missionaries had been expelled from Thes-

¹ 1 Thess. i. 8, 9.

² With regard to the *politarchs* of Thessalonica, compare the inscription given at last with greater accuracy in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* 1861, pp. 445 sq. [See also Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, i. pp. 357 sq.]

³ Acts xvii. 10, compare with ver. 14 and 2 Thess. i. 1.

⁴ As appears from the two epistles to this church. see *Sendschreiben*, pp. 19, 32.

⁵ Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2; Philommon, ver. 24; Col. iv. 10.

salonica the more magnanimously were they received in Berea by the Judeans, and the more willingly were they heard; indeed, instead of simply listening to their proofs of Christianity on the Sabbath, the Bereans occupied themselves with them daily. A considerable church was accordingly soon gathered there around the missionaries, consisting of many Judeans and not a few heathen men and women of position. Paul stayed there probably some months, and most likely founded several churches in the neighbourhood. After some time Timotheus also arrived there from Thessalonica, and reported concerning the Thessalonian church which was just becoming independent, as he may also have been well informed with regard to the church at Philippi. His favourable report, however, contained some unfavourable passages. Paul therefore dispatched the more promptly that *Epistle to the Thessalonians*, which was subsequently called the *second*, as being the smaller of the two addressed to them which have been preserved, whilst closer examination shows that in point of time it was the first.¹ As the earliest of all Paul's epistles that have come down to us it is still of special interest to us; and moreover we have no other epistle which enables us to take such a clear glance into a church which had only been a short time before founded.

It is quite intelligible that Paul should have to suffer in Berea also from 'unreasonable and evil men;'² but on the whole he laboured there quite peacefully. Nevertheless the success and tranquillity of the Apostle in this district annoyed those exasperated Judeans of Thessalonica so much, and the good example of such churches as those of Berea and Philippi seemed to them to be so dangerous for their city, that many of them proceeded to Berea to carry on there the same machinations against him which had proved so successful in their own city. They stirred up the populace there likewise, and prepared an accusation to be laid before the magistrates. In those circumstances it appeared to the Apostle's friends most advisable at once to place him in safety at a distance from the coming storm, whilst Silas and Timotheus, as less obnoxious, might still remain behind. They accompanied him accordingly beyond the city walls, advised him to depart quickly for the sea, and committed him to some trustworthy men, who brought him at his desire by ship to Athens. He thereby lost the opportunity

¹ In recent times this truth is more and more acknowledged, comp. *Jahrb. der Bibl. Wiss.* x. pp. 241 sq. and Laurent's *Neu-*

Testamentliche Studien (1866) pp. 49-61.

² 2 Thess. iii. 2.

of travelling through northern Hellas, which he had undoubtedly intended to do; but he came the more quickly to the important Greek cities which were destined to have far greater importance for him than any which he had previously visited.

With this tour through Greece or Achaia (as it was then called, as a Roman province) the *third* section of this missionary journey begins. And at Athens, its first stage, Paul must have stayed a considerable time. For no sooner had he arrived there than he felt himself, in this wonderful Greek city, so strange and so far from his beloved Macedonian churches that he commissioned the returning Bereans to request, in his name, Silas and Timotheus to join him as soon as they possibly could; Silas, however, had still too much to do in Macedonia. Timotheus alone consequently came to him, bringing to him, however, such reports regarding the condition of the Macedonian churches, particularly of the much persecuted church of Thessalonica, that he would have preferred to hasten to them again at once, and inasmuch as that was not feasible, sent to them once more Timotheus with commissions and probably epistles likewise.¹ He was, therefore, a considerable period in Athens alone, and had consequently the more leisure to observe the marked peculiarities of that city and of its settled or temporary inhabitants. There were Judeans also who resided in it, to whose synagogue semi-proselytes also belonged: still, everything Judean was eclipsed in Athens as unimportant by the radiant splendour of the great philosophic schools and the exceedingly numerous heathen temples of all kinds. Paul had hitherto never seen anywhere so many heathen altars, with the most beautiful statues, crowded together in such a narrow space; and the more deeply were his inmost feelings violated that a city which, according to outward appearance, so assiduously revered what was divine, should know so little of the true God, particularly of the Christian worship of Him, that in fact it exhibited rather the appearance of being the main seat of the darkness of heathenism generally. He commenced, accordingly, earnest dialogues concerning the true religion, sometimes in the synagogue, sometimes daily in the market-place, with all who were willing to take part in them. This procedure was in the end successful. It is true, the Academician and the Peripatetic teachers

¹ All this, which is passed over unnoticed in the Acts (Luke having, indeed, remained at Philippi), follows from 1 Thess. ii. 17-iii. 2, comp. on the other hand 2 Cor. i. 19, with regard to the time at Corinth.

held aloof; some of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, however, who generally stood in closer relations with the ordinary life of the people, held discussions with him; and if some supposed that he was a mere babbler who, with his unscholastic thoughts and language, would do better not to speak at all in the highly-cultured capital of philosophy, to others he seemed at least remarkable as a herald of 'strange divine powers,' inasmuch as they had hitherto never heard, even from the mouth of Judeans, anything of Jesus and of the Resurrection, as such divine powers to which men must look and which they must fear. In accordance with the characteristic habit of such towns, which boasted of their love of science and philosophy, and felt the attractions of any new phenomenon,¹ some of the latter class, whose curiosity had been greatly excited, called a great public meeting upon the Areopagus, that they might be able to hear the more quietly and completely the strange man's new doctrines, brought him thither almost against his will, and called upon him to fully expound his views. When, however, he saw himself thus pointedly challenged to speak in the presence of the most cultured audience of the heathen world, he did not shrink from the task, but came forward with that bold confidence which nothing but firm faith in the great truth of his entire Apostolic message could impart, and with the prompt readiness which such a rare moment and the dignity of such an assembly inspired. In his walks and inspection of the numerous magnificent altars of the city he had accidentally found one which, from its inscription, was dedicated to an 'Unknown God.'² Inasmuch, therefore, as his hearers desired to hear something more definite regarding 'the unknown strange God' whom he preached, the idea struck him that he should take that inscription, as a fact well known to all his

¹ Such as Athens continued to be, particularly in those days before it was plundered by Nero; in the subsequent civil wars it appears also to have suffered much, Tac. *Ann.* xv. 45, *Hist.* ii. 8; Cassius Dio. lxxiii. 11. This explains the fact at all events that Luke, Acts xvii. 21, could describe those times and habits of the Athenians as already past.

² It is not easy to suppose an altar existed having nothing more than this inscription; but if there stood (according to Oekumenios, *Cat. in Acta et Epist.* (Verona, 1532), p. 81, who is more accurate than Jerome, *Comm. ad Tit.* i. 12) in Athens, which was so hospitable and glad to attract foreigners from all parts of the world, an altar 'to the gods of Asia and of Europe

and to the unknown foreign god of Libya,' Paul might take these words from that inscription; in that case the special point is the singular number, whilst we know from other sources that altars were erected to 'unknown gods,' Paus. i. 1, 4. The account of the 'nameless altars' in Diog. Laert. *Life of Epimenides*, iii., is not pertinent. The above inscription, however, is the more purely historical, inasmuch as it is only appended in Oekumenios himself by way of addition to the uncertain accounts of the actual existence of such an altar and its origin, as we can now more plainly see if we compare Oekumenios with Isidorus Pelusiota in the *Catena in Acta Ap.* ed. Cramer (Oxford, 1838), p. 292.

hearers, as his starting point, in order that he might show to them who the God proclaimed by him really was. The fact that a people paid homage to even an 'unknown God' who might possibly exist, must be taken as a mark of its fine and strong religious feeling; and it was fortunate that Paul could thus commence with an appropriate commendation of this singular people. But having thus commenced, he conducted his hearers by a sudden turn in his discourse to the centre of the great subject which he intended to expound to them as his proclamation, showing that the strange God whom they did not know and whom they yet worshipped, must be none other than the true spiritual God whom he had to declare unto them, the same God and Creator of all men who had then established the new Christian era, and would go on to complete it through Christ as the Judge of the world. The speech was in all its chief points extremely appropriate, touching upon the general requirements of Christianity quite definitely enough in brief outline, and, as meant for heathen hearers, without any proofs from the Old Testament, calling in the aid rather of the utterances of Greek poet philosophers.¹ The first two parts of the discourse were willingly listened to; but when, in the third part, the Apostle touched upon distinctly Christian truths, and particularly the Resurrection, there arose in one quarter hissing; others, on the other hand, sought to bring about a peaceable conclusion, with the desire of hearing him again further upon the matter. Only a few adhered believingly to him; amongst the men especially Dionysius of the Areopagus itself, who is not now known to us further by any certain reminiscence;² amongst the women a certain Damaris, who was likewise much spoken of subsequently in her own circle. The Apostle, however, had now learnt by the best experience that all the highest heathen wisdom of itself availed little in enabling men to comprehend in faith the mysteries of Christian wisdom and to feel their effects; this experience also became, in his case, fruitful seed for his future work, and from this time we find him forming the truest and most decisive judgments in this respect also.³

¹ E.g. the saying of the Cilician poet Aratus, Acts xvii. 28; for it is obvious that this discourse, with its three parts, vv. 22-25, 26-29, 30, 31, has been preserved in a very abbreviated form representing its most general meaning and spirit only.

² It may very well be believed, as his namesake Dionysius of Corinth stated

(Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 4, iv. 23), inasmuch as Luke also intimates this in his manner, that he may have been, according to the later way of speaking, the first 'bishop' of Athens; but the writings which were subsequently ascribed to him can be no authority in this connection.

³ See *Sendeschreiben*, p. 33.

His stay in Athens could not therefore be very protracted: but he remained all the longer in Corinth, whither he then turned his steps; and it is marvellous to see how much he accomplished during the year and a half of his residence there.¹ But few towns were so well adapted as the Corinth of that time for extensive Christian labours. After its destruction by the Romans, the city had at the time of Paul's visit long recovered itself and become exceedingly flourishing and populous through its trade and shipping, so that it was regarded as the largest Greek city; the Roman governor of Achaia also resided in it. Moreover, the arts and sciences were highly appreciated in it, on account of its nearness to Athens. Paul found in it, besides, a numerous colony of Judeans, some of whom were very rich and highly educated, to whose synagogue a good many proselytes had attached themselves. And he met there also a Judean who had a short time before come from Rome as a Christian, who might on that account alone attract his special attention, and with whom he then formed a friendship which was not without its fruits. This man was Aquila, or according to the Greek form of the name Akylas,² of a family belonging originally to Pontus (as Paul's to Cilicia), and he had probably come early in life to Rome and been already converted to Christianity when the lot of exile fell upon him with so many others, in consequence of the command of Claudius.³ He had when Paul made his acquaintance settled temporarily in the great trading city of Corinth, for the purpose of carrying on an extensive business as a manufacturer of tents,⁴ but continued all along very zealous in the new Christian doctrine which he had undoubtedly adopted in Rome; although his wife, who had likewise a Roman name—Prisca or Priscilla—was, like so many women of that time, much more energetic and active with regard to it than her husband.⁵ Paul visited him in Corinth at once, and the more readily took up his abode with him as he could work with him at the same trade. The Apostle was there at first without his companions, but appeared nevertheless at once

¹ The year and a half, Acts xviii. 11, are undoubtedly intended to give the length of the entire stay of Paul at Corinth; for according to the expression, ver. 12, the end of the proconsulship of Gallio fell in this period, and after the expiration of it Paul remained there a considerable time, according to ver. 18.

² The Greek translator of the Old Testament of the same name and likewise from Pontus cannot, as living at least half a century later, be identical with

him, although he may perhaps have been his grandson; comp. with regard to the latter vol. viii.

³ See *ante*, p. 361.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 277.

⁵ For she is always mentioned with him, and is mentioned everywhere first, except Acts xviii. 2, 3, where the context does not naturally admit of it, Acts xviii. 18, 26; Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19; an exception from this rule occurs only 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

every Sabbath in the synagogue and began to speak zealously to Judeans and heathens. When Timotheus subsequently arrived from Thessalonica,¹ and Silas probably from other Macedonian cities, and Paul had obtained definite information as to the latest condition of those churches, he wrote the *Epistle to the Thessalonians*, which has come down to us as *the first*, partly full of rejoicing at the continued faithfulness of those churches, in spite of the numerous mortifications which its members had recently suffered from their fellow-citizens, and partly with the view of expressing himself with regard to certain errors and improprieties which still prevailed in it.

So far, however, scarcely a Judean had been converted, with the exception of Stephanus, who was probably a man of considerable wealth, whom Paul subsequently remembered as the 'firstfruits (or the first sacrifice to Christ) of Achaia,' particularly as he, with other members of his house, afterwards voluntarily took upon himself the burdensome duties of the deaconship.² But as soon as Paul's companions had arrived in Corinth and he could labour more energetically with their help, he desired to bring the Christian cause there to a more permanent decision. In the first instance, therefore, he then endeavoured, with all possible effort,³ to show in the most convincing way that in Jesus the true Messiah had appeared, as if he would lead them to salvation by the full power of the Spirit of Truth. But when they for the most part resisted so much the more violently, and indeed, broke out into railing against Christ, he declared to them plainly, shaking his raiment (as if at most their railing had clung to it only), that he was determined to have nothing further to do with their obduracy which approved the slaying of Christ, and, in fact, slew him afresh, that for the future their blood might be upon their own heads, and that from henceforth he would go to the heathen. It is from Luke only that we become acquainted with this decisive appearance before the Judeans; in the epistles which Paul wrote subsequently to the church of this city he never refers to this turn of affairs; but without doubt this rupture necessarily followed at some time in Corinth, as in so many other places where the Judeans dwelt in considerable numbers, and

¹ 1 Thess. iii. 6, comp. i. 1.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16; this explains the fact that Paul, 1 Cor. i. 15, 16, could only after a time recall him to memory, inasmuch as he had not been baptized with the generality of the Corinthians.

³ This is the force of the words

συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ, according to the best reading, Acts xviii. 5, 'to put oneself wholly into a matter' ['sich mit etwas zusammennehmen'], or to seek to accomplish something by the utmost exertion (*coegere*); but his exertion existed simply in *the word*.

in this city it produced at last the happiest consequences after the great exertions of the Apostle. Without again entering the synagogue, he turned at once to a large house closely abutting upon it, belonging to a heathen proselyte named Justus, who had already been converted, and gladly lent his house for Christian gatherings. At the same time Crispus, the important head of the synagogue, confessed with his whole house his faith; ¹ and in proportion as the Christian cause generally became thereby known in the whole city, the more quickly did many join it, amongst others Gaius, probably a rich heathen, in whose house Paul dwelt on his last visit to Corinth, and who at that time had the entire church collected in his premises.² It could then be plainly foreseen that the indignation of the Judeans would soon break out the more madly; but Paul was marvellously strengthened during the next days by a vision in a dream, in which it seemed to him as if Christ himself addressed to him, from his exaltation, the most encouraging and comforting words, 'for He had much people (as yet unconverted, but dimly longing for the truth) in that city;' and when at last the storm on the part of the Judeans really broke out, it took a considerably different course from that which they had desired. The occasion for this was given by the same man who had only just become the successor, as chief of the synagogue, of Crispus upon his conversion to Christianity—*Sosthenes*: as a thoughtful and meditative man, he may in his new office have disapproved of the conduct of the Judeans towards Paul, and thereby have come into a bitter conflict with the Judean community: they accused him accordingly of a partiality for Christ and unfaithfulness in his office, and dragged him with Paul, as the immediate originator of the mischief, before the tribunal. They may have heard how successful the charge against Paul had been in the cities of Macedonia, and hoped confidently to obtain a similar triumph; all the members of the numerous community, with the exception of the few who were disposed to adopt Christianity, likewise joined in this accusation as a question of honour, and unanimously stormed the court with their demand. But the proconsul Gallio, who was then in office at Corinth, a brother of the well-known philosopher Annaeus Seneca, was too wise and well-informed, as well as too kindly and just,³ to follow the example of a Pilate. Therefore, before

¹ According to the intimations Acts xviii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 14.

² 1 Cor. i. 14, comp. with Rom. xvi. 23.

³ What little we know of him from

Roman authors does not contradict this representation of the Acts, although according to Tac. *Ann.* xv. 73, he was of a somewhat timid nature.

Paul could defend himself even against the charge of being an innovator with regard to the Judean religion, Gallio gave his decision to the effect that he would reasonably accept their accusation, if there were any actual violation or wickedness concerned; but as the matter was really about words and names and the Judean law, they might themselves settle it, and he would not act as judge in it. After this decision they were obliged to set Paul at liberty at once, since he could have appealed to his Roman citizenship if they had sought to inflict on him a punishment from the synagogue; but they then wreaked the more their wrath upon Sosthenes, at once inflicting upon him the customary number of blows publicly before the court-house, as if they had been in the synagogue, while the proconsul, on his part, observed the same indifference as he had done towards their charge against Paul.¹ The Christians then justly held this Sosthenes in the greater honour; but he appears to have left Corinth; and Paul, with whom he subsequently met again in Ephesus, received him there as a fellow-correspondent in his epistle to the Corinthian church.

After the proconsul's departure also, Paul remained in Corinth unmolested. This church consequently grew the more flourishingly, although it numbered but a few Judeans amongst its members. The largest number of them consisted, as most of the new Christian converts, of people in humble circumstances,² but not a few very well-to-do persons and many men who were highly educated after the Greek manner likewise joined the church. It became the most important of all the Greek churches, and Paul always kept his apostolic eye vigilantly upon it. Christianity too very soon spread from it to other places in Greece—for instance, to the harbour of Corinth—Cenchreæ—on the east of the city.³

But meanwhile Paul had already been absent almost three years from the parent church, and had not yet delivered up the contributions for it which had in some way been collected amongst the various churches.⁴ While his missionary zeal urged him to penetrate ever further into the West, at times a still more powerful inward voice called to him to return once more

¹ The words, Acts xviii. 17, must be understood thus; and we have no reason whatever for supposing that the Sosthenes of 1 Cor. i. 1 was another man.

² 1 Cor. i. 26, xi. 33.

³ Rom. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1.

⁴ The fact that there is no mention of such contributions in the two epistles to

the Thessalonians cannot surprise us, inasmuch as this church had then only just been founded. Nor does the Book of Acts speak anywhere of these gifts; we have, however, every reason to suppose that Paul collected them at that time wherever he could.

to Jerusalem; and as Priscilla and Aquila were just about to commence a journey to Ephesus and intended to settle there for a time, he determined to accompany them. But no sooner had he reached the harbour of Cenchreæ, perhaps in order that he might not run the risk of being induced by these friends to stay in Ephesus, he took a solemn vow to be in Jerusalem if possible before Easter, and as a sign of this vow had his head shorn.¹ Consequently this *fourth* section of his long journey was the shortest. As soon as he had arrived at Ephesus by ship with his two friends, he took leave of them, but still visited by himself the synagogue of the Judeans, who were undoubtedly very numerous in this great commercial and trading city, and entered into discussions about Christianity with them. He found there eager listeners, and he was requested to stay longer; but he openly declared that he must that year keep the Easter feast in Jerusalem, and promised that he would soon visit their city again. He took ship at Ephesus accordingly for Cæsarea, on the coast of Palestine, and arrived thence at Jerusalem in due time.

His Third Great Missionary Journey, and his Fifth Return to Jerusalem, 55-59 A.D.

His Changed Position.

Luke relates nothing further of Paul's stay in Jerusalem on this occasion than that he 'saluted the church;' however, the result shows that his departure this time was quite different from that which preceded his entrance on his previous missionary journey. If any man living could have counted on the gratitude of the parent church, it was Paul, even thus early in his career; but those Pharisaic opponents who had sought immediately after the commencement of his previous great journey to put obstacles in his path, and whose views he had refuted in Antioch,² had not abandoned their doubts; and the reports which they were receiving from the heathen coun-

¹ It is quite obvious that *κεφάλαιον*, Acts xviii. 18. cannot be referred to Aquila, inasmuch as we should not know what it could signify when related of the latter, even if the circumstance had actually been known of him. It is only when referred to Paul that the clause has any meaning; and it naturally points to him as the proper subject of the narrative. In like manner, there is no ground for omitting the clause regarding the approaching feast, ver. 21, as some MSS do, inas-

much as the narrative is then rendered quite obscure. It cannot be doubted that *the Feast*, in this absolute sense, always meant, in those times, Easter; it is also apparent enough to what the vow pointed. Finally, this cutting off of the hair of the head has nothing whatever to do with the Naziritic practices which are described subsequently, Acts xxi. 23-26, but must be compared with the custom of fasting (*Antiquities*, pp. 83 sq.).

² See *ante*, pp. 361 sq.

tries through which Paul had journeyed, appeared to justify them. Paul had nowhere paid any attention to their scrupulous interpretation of the laws regarding food; he had made heathen Christians elders of the churches, and had not insisted on many points of the Mosaic law in the case of Judean Christians. The entire Law appeared to those Pharisaic Christians to be in danger, whilst they taught that only Christ himself, when appearing in his glory, could at once give permission for such an abolition of it. But this appearing of Christ in glory was being continually deferred, and already a generation would soon have passed away without it, while Christ himself had promised to appear in glory before the end of that generation. Could he not seem intentionally to defer his appearing because Christians abolished the Law too soon, contrary to his will? Did not the straits of the parent church grow constantly more distressing? And were not the Christians of freer tendencies, who were accused of apostasy from Judeanism, severely persecuted in many places by the governments? To questions and accusations of this kind these Pharisaic brethren undoubtedly sought this time to subject the Apostle; but he appears to have evaded them, correctly foreseeing how useless it would be to enter into them; and as he felt urgently the call to visit Antioch again, which he had not visited this time on his return to Jerusalem, he probably made his departure the more rapidly on that ground also, after he had done what was absolutely necessary in Jerusalem.

But neither in Antioch did he stay long. An overpowering desire urged him this time to advance, after he had again visited the countries previously travelled through, if possible to Rome itself, and, indeed, to the extreme west of the Roman empire and of the then known world.¹ The actual course and the end of this journey, however, took quite a different form. On the one hand he found, when he had come to examine the condition of only a few of the churches which had been thus far founded by him, that the hostility of the Pharisaic brethren of the parent church had suddenly broken out so openly and severely against him that he was thereby involved in an entirely new conflict. These brethren may have been the more deeply exasperated with him on account of his sudden departure from Jerusalem; and, as if they determined to meet defiance with defiance, they seem to have induced a majority of the parent church to resolve, that

¹ This may be seen most plainly from the words which he penned towards the end of this journey, Rom. i. 10-15, xv. 22-33, comp. Acts xix. 21.

inasmuch as the Mosaic law was being more and more abrogated in heathen countries by the persistent fault of Paul and others, circumcision, with its further consequences, which had a few years before been as it were tentatively remitted in the case of the heathen,¹ must really be required of them if they became, or had already become, converts. In consideration of the zeal and learning of these brethren, and of the distressed condition of the parent church and the growing insecurity of this time generally, a resolution of this nature was not so very surprising; the parent church appears, however, to have received about this time an unexpected addition favourable to this party, through the entrance of a number of members inclined to Essenism. We shall see from this time forth a form of Christianity obtaining influence and extending in various directions, which either repudiates marriage,² or goes even beyond the Law in avoiding flesh and wine,³ or likes to boast of special revelations from angels or Christ;⁴ these men were undoubtedly some who had been educated in Essenism, and who, having been impressed by the greatness and glory of the historical Christ, had attached themselves to the parent church, while at the same time they sought to convert what was merely accidental in Christ's life, as, for instance, his celibacy, into a law of life, and liked to take their name immediately from Christ himself.⁵ These people were undoubtedly for the most part very simple and straightforward, but in their punctiliousness suffered themselves to be too easily carried away by the legal zeal of the Pharisaic party, and became thus one of their supports; moreover, some who had once known Christ himself more intimately, and indeed boasted of having seen the risen Lord, so that they could claim to be counted as Apostles,⁶ attached themselves to these people, who liked to think themselves specially 'Christ's,' and who had such Pharisaic inclinations. Peter undoubtedly remained at a greater distance from this party, though on his part he adhered to the laws concerning food in the sense of the general

¹ See *ante*, pp. 356 sq.

² 1 Cor. vii.

³ Rom. xiv. 2 sq., Col. ii. 16, 21; but the errors intended in the epistle to the Colossians cannot be treated of yet.

⁴ As is intimated, 2 Cor. x.-xiii., comp. Col. ii. 18, 23; the false teachers, or rather, false Apostles, who are plainly enough indicated in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, may be best conceived as belonging to this party.

⁵ As must be inferred from 1 Cor.

i. 12, and 2 Cor. x. 7, xi. 23.

⁶ To which Paul alludes generally in such strong language in such passages as 2 Cor. v. 16, xi. 4, 5, 13, xii. 11, 12. The opponents against whom Paul contends in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, are therefore essentially the same as those against whom he wrote previously in the Epistle to the Galatians; and they belonged, according to the designation, 1 Cor. i. 12, not to the Cephas but the Christ party.

resolutions of Jerusalem in the year 52. James, however, the head of the parent church, himself long since somewhat more closely influenced by Essenism, was less opposed to it, and was in fact obliged, as head of the church, to submit to many of its resolutions when once the majority had passed them; although he always refused to renounce the Apostle Paul, and undoubtedly never did himself the slightest thing against him. Thereby, in any case, caution and a certain moderation were imposed upon the most bitter enemies of the Apostle. Still they prosecuted most actively, as far as they were able, their purpose, despatched messengers into the churches founded by Paul to proclaim the most recent resolutions of the parent church,¹ or appointed in important places even well-chosen counter-Apostles in opposition to him,² doing everything cautiously, and apparently not openly contending against him. But Paul on his part would have sooner been able to give up his life than follow a view which, as he too plainly perceived, must destroy the inmost nature of Christianity and its progress in the world. Painfully as this contention, which was breaking out in the inmost sanctuary of Christianity, affected him, he adhered only the more firmly to the pure truth, as he had hitherto perceived it, and was daily perceiving it afresh in the restless activity of his mind. The most important question of the entire Apostolic age had now at last become that of the validity of the Mosaic Law; and this very question was now most profoundly agitated; and the true answer to it appeared to grow daily clearer to the man who had long been completely prepared to give it; and he could, moreover, justly consider himself now dispensed from a minute consideration of the laws regarding food, to which he had submitted at his entrance on his previous journey,³ although he never willingly gave offence with his freer views regarding them. But the inconsiderate procedure of his opponents had now driven him, on his part, into the position that the ancient Law in all its details had validity for him only so far as it involved an eternal significance, and as it could be accepted and valued by the higher Christian spirit itself, or at all events changed into a Christian form.

On the other hand, he found most of the churches, which he now desired to visit again and examine afresh, in a condi-

¹ For instance, to the churches of Galatia, a short time before, he sent the epistle to them which has come down to us.

² For instance, in the Corinthian church, in the interval between the first and second epistles addressed to it.

³ See *ante*, p. 358.

tion much too restless and excited not to present everywhere the most unexpected necessities for delays and longer residence. The great interruption above described led of itself to the formation of three distinct parties, since, in addition to the scrupulous and the free party, which were diametrically opposed to each other, Peter with his followers adhered to his previous position, not going therefore quite so far as Paul then did.¹ These three parties were variously distributed amongst the churches, and at different times assumed various forms in the same church; we can, however, easily recognise everywhere plain traces of their existence, their endeavours, and their fortunes. To these parties there was soon added an ambitious school of a purely rhetorical and philosophical character, which, as taking its rise from Philo, sought to appropriate the new Christian ideas in another than that perverse way of a Simon Magus;² it adhered as closely as possible to the freer form under which Paul proclaimed them, but it was only too much disposed to permit the Christian truths and spirit to appear in brilliant discourses and systems only, or even to dissolve them into ingenious allegories.³ Whilst the churches were all thereby more or less disturbed and brought into various severe temptations, a multitude of errors and wrong aims of other kinds naturally arose locally in this time of youthful ferment; indeed things which were at the beginning the best might the more easily degenerate on account of their new and unusual character, or even on account of their peculiar difficulty and obscurity.

For such a delicately sensitive, and at the same time energetic, nature as Paul's rising schisms are generally hateful, and above all in such a new cause as that of Christianity, to which he had dedicated himself with heart and soul, and which had then, moreover, to contend with the most deadly perils. Wherever he set his foot in this journey he was soon compelled to hear the cries, 'I am of Paul!' 'I of Apollos!' 'I of Cephas!' 'I of Christ!'⁴ And, with slight variations, this shrill four-voiced cry was dinned in his ears even after this journey down to his death, as we still plainly enough perceive.

¹ The relation of the parties can be very clearly perceived from the contention regarding meat offered to idols, 1 Cor. vi. 13, viii. 1—x. 33; the Cephas party was, in this case, undoubtedly the stricter.

² See *ante*, pp. 179 sq.

³ The allegorizing of the Resurrection, 1 Cor. xv., e.g., was probably due to Apollos, and had found, through him, acceptance in the Corinthian church. This

is, undoubtedly, more probable than the supposition that merely heathen philosophers had made their influence felt in this matter; it could not have appeared so important to the Apostle to speak thus against them.

⁴ As is generally the case with Paul, his language, 1 Cor. i. 12, enables us to take the clearest glance into the real state of the whole matter.

For the four different parties which could arise during his apostolic labours, and the form in which we find them, itself in no small degree owing to these labours, had at this time come decidedly to the front. When they are examined in detail, the three against which he had from this time to contend are seen to be, it is true, not by any means equally irreconcilable and hostile to him from their inmost nature. For men like James and Peter might naturally for a moment be astonished at many things that the daring man did or said, and might hesitate to follow him at once in everything; still at the bottom of their hearts they could not help regarding him as a most excellent Christian, and Peter, the longer he lived in heathen countries, necessarily became the more easily convinced that Paul was really taking the most proper course. And Paul himself was of a sufficiently philosophic vein to conduct back to the true Christian way the wandering steps of the philosophic schools of Apollos and others. It was only the party claiming in their arrogance to be 'of Christ'—as if they alone were the true Christians, whilst they really fell back into Pharisaism—who stood irreconcilably opposed to him. Still, how easily might he have suffered himself amid such severe conflicts to be provoked and led astray into bitter hostility to those who, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, did not occupy a position so very far from his own deepest aims! It was at this point therefore that the most severe temptation, and also the true elevation of his whole labours, commenced, so long as the field for them was still quite free. And we may recognise the greatness of Paul in the fact that he was determined, the more difficult the field of his operations became, to advance slowly rather than to labour evanescently and cultivate anything dangerous amongst his own institutions; every church which he now founded afresh, or which he had before founded, appeared to him like a virgin whom he might present to Christ coming in his glory, only as perfectly pure and holy—as pure and as holy as Christianity when it left the hands of Christ. When he was therefore prevented by such causes from advancing rapidly, his labours on this journey were the more thorough and deep, in order that he might secure and defend what he had for the most part already founded, and preserve it from the new dangers which now threatened. In this way this journey became the most fruitful of all: for greatly as the labours of the Apostle were now called into requisition from all sides, he satisfied most wonderfully all the most difficult requirements even of this increas-

ingly complicated period. Even his epistles must now begin to be of the most various, and at the same time most extensive and weighty nature; and as his whole spiritual energy and activity reached its highest development in this department, the epistles belonging to this time, which have been preserved, bear the impress of an absolute elevation and eloquent finish, which far eclipses the ordinary effort of mind, even when the latter cannot, owing to the pressure of the time, conceal its traces.¹

The very beginning of and first preparation for the journey answered to this new position of the Apostle. He did not on this as on the previous occasion commence his journey with Silas; the latter remained this time temporarily in Jerusalem, his previous residence, and subsequently laboured amongst the heathen in closer relations with Peter;² and, as on the former occasion, of the members of the parent church Barnabas left him,³ so now did Silas. He began this journey accordingly only with younger helpers and companions whom he had himself educated; of these there were at this time undoubtedly a considerable number,⁴ not only Titus and Timotheus, but others also less known to us, for instance Erastus.⁵ A number of men possessed of great gifts, who had been fully initiated into his line of thought and action, already served him on this journey, either regularly throughout its entire course, or occasionally in each church as special necessity arose.⁶ For the custom arose that each important church should be represented by a delegate with Paul, though it might be only for a time. Coming to details, we can distinguish in this last and most important of Paul's journeys three sections and phases.

He turned from Antioch, in the first place, in a north-westerly direction, to all the numerous churches which he had founded in those parts, as far as Galatia and Phrygia.⁷ When he now visited again the Galatian churches, founded by him some three years before, he had already heard of the hostile

¹ As, for instance, is found especially in the second Epistle to the Corinthians. It is thus easy to explain the fact that the four epistles belonging to this journey which have been preserved, contain much in common that is peculiar in their language; but how extremely unjust would it be on that account to deny that others from his pen have been preserved!

² 1 Pet. v. 12.

³ *Ante*, p. 363.

⁴ According to the indication, Gal. i. 2, and other signs.

⁵ See *Sendschreiben des Apost. P.* p.

288; on the other hand, the Erastus at Corinth, denominated 'treasurer of the city,' Rom. xvi. 23, who filled there a civic office, was undoubtedly quite a different person.

⁶ E.g. in the case 2 Cor. viii. 18. ix. 5.

⁷ The latter are expressly mentioned in the account Acts xviii. 23, which is undoubtedly very brief; but the 'higher parts,' xix. 1, are probably intended to be the same higher districts, in contrast with the countries on the western coast, with Ephesus as their capital.

feeling which had broken out against him in Jerusalem, and exhorted these churches to remain the more faithful to that true Christianity which he had taught them; but from another quarter the same unfavourable report of him had reached them also. The fact is thereby explained, that this meeting with his churches was a less happy one than the former, when he founded them in the joy of a new work; neither was he willing to say to them all that he feared, nor were they able to speak to him quite freely; and he left them accordingly in a mood considerably depressed.¹ The delegates from Jerusalem, when they shortly afterwards arrived amongst these churches, with their demands of a stricter observance of the Law, found all the more willing ear with many well-meaning but inexperienced Christians. And already most of them resolved to observe the Pharisaic usages instead of the freer ones introduced by Paul; for instance, to keep the Jewish Sabbath² instead of the less rigorous observance of the Sunday which Paul had introduced only into churches which were mainly composed of heathen Christians; whilst, though other Galatian Christians remained faithful to Paul's views and habits, many of them the more violently opposed those who had been led astray. When Paul heard how the majority had thus gone seriously astray, and that these internal disturbances were growing, he had probably not yet come even as far as Ephesus in the prosecution of his journey, and just then he was but little prepared for writing; but he did not lose a moment in reminding the erring ones of all kinds of the genuine Christian truth in a letter, which, though severe, was plainly well intended and ended with Christian conciliation. This is the exceedingly important Epistle to the Galatians, which, although speaking more than others as from the spur of the moment, won for itself immortality by its intrinsic greatness, and became an imperishable memorial of the whole thought and life of the great Apostle. It attained too at once its immediate purpose; the Galatian churches returned to the truth, and from that moment showed themselves all the more devoted to their founder in affectionate compliance.³ His opponents also grew more cautious, and for a long time did not return at all events to the requirement of circumcision as the most extreme of their demands, having probably been admonished on this point by James, the president of the parent church.

With the entrance of Paul into Ephesus the *second* and the

¹ See *Sendschreiben*, pp. 53 sq.

Col. ii. 16.

² As may be justly inferred from
1 Cor. xvi. 2, comp. with Gal. iv. 10,

³ See further on this epistle, *Sendschreiben*, pp. 100 sq.

longest section of this journey begins. He had previously visited this great city, towards the end of his former journey, and had then promised an early and longer visit; ¹ but when he now entered the city, he certainly did not foresee that he would stay in it, with some interruptions, towards three years.² Nor was he the first Christian that entered the city; as might be expected, in the case of a city of such extensive commerce and wealthy trade, individual Christians had long before met in it.³ And in the very last year a man, very famous at that time, appeared in the city as a Christian teacher, who was destined soon to come into close connection with Paul. This was the Judean, Apollos, born and educated in Alexandria, a man of an ardent nature, trained undoubtedly in Philo's school, and, like this master, greatly distinguished both as a Biblical scholar and public speaker, but who had nevertheless come under the powerful influence of the spirit of Christian truth, and possessed sufficient self-sacrifice to labour for it alone. He was the first who taught Christian truth in the midst of great heathen cities as an orator upon the public platform and defended it against all the world,⁴ just as a trained orator amongst the heathen was in the habit of speaking on other subjects and of collecting auditors or disciples around him. But, as he had never visited the parent church, he suffered from the defect that he was acquainted with the earliest form of Christianity only, or, in other words, knew only the Baptism of John, as has been explained at length above.⁵ When he appeared thus as a teacher in Ephesus, and Priscilla and Aquila, who had a short time before settled there,⁶ heard of it, they took him aside and explained to him the difference of the two forms of teaching. He was teachable and ingenuous enough to approve the better view, and was also prepared to act in the future in accordance with it; in the case of a man who had been already spiritually so deeply awakened, nothing could be said about a second baptism. But as he determined not at once to come forward publicly in Ephesus again, and thought of going into Achaia, the few Christians who were already residing in

¹ See *ante*, p. 381.

² The three years of his stay which are incidentally mentioned Acts xx. 31, are certainly nearer the truth than the time we get by merely adding the three months, Acts xix. 8, to the two years, v. 10. It is moreover indicated, xix. 21, 22, that a delay followed upon these two and a quarter years. The means of determining more definitely the length of his stay are now wanting; but probably

the three years were, in any case, not quite completed.

³ As may be certainly enough inferred from the incidental observation Acts xviii. 27.

⁴ The word, *δημοσίᾳ*, Acts xviii. 28, compared with the more distinct expression, xix. 9, is intended evidently to signify more than the synagogue, xviii. 26, xix. 8.

⁵ See *ante*, pp. 135 sq.

⁶ See *ante*, p. 381.

Ephesus gladly gave him letters of recommendation; and soon he came forward with great success, specially in Corinth, where indeed Paul's labours had prepared the way for him, producing such an effect by the threefold charm of his finished and powerful eloquence, of his fresh enthusiasm—which was now, if possible, still more elevated—and of his secret Philonic doctrines as applied to Christianity, that many preferred him to Paul even, and a group of ardent admirers was formed around him. We are justified in supposing that he was the first to connect the Philonic doctrine of the Logos more definitely with the historical Christ, that he advanced new propositions regarding Christ's appearing, and that he thereby in various ways quickened speculation concerning the significance of Christianity. At the same time, furnished with the arts of Philonic biblical interpretation, he attacked the Judeans particularly with new proofs that Jesus must have been the Messiah.¹—When Paul came to Ephesus, after Apollos had left, he found there other partial Christians, such as Apollos had been; as they were less educated men and showed no signs of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Christian, and in fact knew nothing of it, differing entirely in that respect from Apollos, who, though an imperfect Christian, was full of spirit, he considered that in their case the higher Christian baptism was necessary.² It was afterwards related that some twelve men were thus baptized in Ephesus.³

Although, therefore, there had been previously some Christians in Ephesus, it was Paul who first began the work of conversion on a large scale. For he soon perceived clearly the great importance of this city for such an object, inasmuch as it would powerfully influence almost the whole of Asia Minor by its example,⁴ and stood moreover, on the west, in constant communication, through the sea, with Greece and the rest of the Roman empire. And if once his Christianity was firmly established there, it would then be ineradicably founded from the Euphrates almost to the confines of Italy. Just as he had done therefore in Corinth, so he commenced his great work in Ephesus also. The Judeans resident there, as already appears from the remarks above,⁵ were on the whole more favourably

¹ This is the idea of the general labours of Apollos which we gather from 1 Cor. i.-iv. 17, and Acts xviii. 24-28, compared with the remarks, *ante*, p. 296. No other sources regarding him are now available, as we have no reason for ascribing the Epistle to the Hebrews to

him. See further below.

² *Ante*, pp. 135 sq.

³ Acts xix. 1-7.

⁴ To which there is an allusion, Acts xix. 10, 26, 27.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 381.

disposed than those of Corinth; at first for more than three months he sought, therefore, in every possible way in their synagogue to convince them, and the heathen who came as auditors, of the truth of Christianity. But when at last some Judeans resisted the truth with such obduracy that they publicly reviled Christianity, he declared to those who wished to hear him, that he desired them for the future to meet him somewhere else, and commenced his instruction in a public place known by the name of 'the School of Tyrannus.' Apollos had begun with such daily public lectures; Paul now followed his example, and accustomed himself in Ephesus so much to this place that during the rest of his stay in the city he taught nowhere else.¹ But before he could commence these more quiet labours, he had to undergo the most severe and perilous conflicts with men who deserved rather the name of wild beasts.²

The conflux of men from a great distance desirous to hear and learn, and sometimes to dispute with him, became so great in this town that Paul might have been kept there from that fact alone longer than he had anticipated;³ but he was no less occupied soon by a multitude of works of healing. People with the most various diseases gathered about him, challenging, as it were, his apostolic gifts of healing, and making large demands on his time. We know also, by cases from other places, that, in spite of his abounding spiritual power, he was in this respect very cautious, and sought to assist rather by slow and patient than precipitous steps;⁴ just as it is also easy to see that he was unwilling to leave any difficult work he had once commenced unfinished. The healing power of the man who was always speaking such holy words, and himself living such a holy life, was so much in request that even the handkerchiefs and the short aprons which he wore on his breast at his work, were asked for and laid upon the sick while they were still warm from his skin; and in the case of certain evils, demoniacal possession for instance, relief was thereby found.⁵ And inasmuch as the name of Jesus had through him suddenly become in every way on the part of the populace the object of a feeling which varied between highest hope and mysterious horror, some of those Judeans who were then strolling

¹ The Tyrannus of Acts xix. 9 was probably a public orator who had a great hall for public instruction.

² A fact omitted by Luke but incidentally mentioned by Paul himself, 1 Cor. xv. 32.

³ 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

⁴ According to the correct meaning of the words, 2 Cor. xii. 12, compared with 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28.

⁵ Which is narrated, Acts xix. 12, not for imitation, or because Paul had himself promoted it, but simply because it had occurred.

about widely as exorcists,¹ endeavoured to exorcise the demons by invoking 'Jesus, whom Paul preached;' but subsequently a singular example was quoted of the way in which the two names that had been so shamefully abused avenged their own perversion, and the demons even, as if by an ancient reminiscence, proved themselves more sagacious and powerful than their exorcists. Seven sons of a Judean high-priest Sceva,² were just then practising this art in Ephesus, and sought to reap their own advantage from this condition of the mind of the populace; but the very first demon which they tried to exorcise became most frightfully hostile to themselves, knowing, as he declared, Paul and Jesus well, but not them; and scarcely had this demonic exclamation escaped the demoniac when he himself sprang upon the exorcists, and, hurling them down, overpowered them so horribly that they could reckon themselves fortunate to escape, with torn garments, almost naked, and covered with wounds, from the house.³ It was natural that this event should make an immense sensation everywhere amongst Judeans and heathen, and should simply increase respect for, and indeed fear of, the name of Jesus: but one of the most beneficial effects of it was, that many of these bad magicians and exorcists really became believers, and indeed voluntarily confessed, with profound repentance, the secret deeds and tricks of their former life. Not a few brought, of their own accord, even their magical books to a fire which was to be kindled to burn them, and the value of the books burnt was reckoned at 50,000 silver drachmas.⁴

Paul, therefore, remained a long time in Ephesus; and the great church which arose there was practically solely his creation. We can still see very clearly from the considerable fragment of an epistle, addressed to this church itself, preserved as an insertion early introduced into another epistle,⁵ how large this church became, and how many distinguished members, men

¹ See *ante*, p. 317.

² If this Sceva (or, according to another reading, *Seevja*, probably טַעַבְיָה) belonged to one of the families qualified for the high-priesthood, he might, according to the custom of the time, be also called ἀρχιερεύς; and the fact that we are not further acquainted with him can prove nothing against his historical character.

³ Acts xix. 14. We must read with Lachmann τινός, and cancel οἱ, although Tischendorf restored the false readings; *they were doing* is a well-known idiom for *they were just then doing*, so that the

subsequent case might be the first of its kind. ἀμφοτέρων, according to the proper reading, v. 16, can only mean *on both sides*. In this connection, therefore, where an attack with the fist and vanquishment are spoken of, *from above and below*, so that they were hurled down.

⁴ According to our present coinage, about 1,800*l.*; a remark of importance for the history of literature in these centuries.

⁵ Rom. xvi. 3-16, comp. *Sendschreiben*, pp. 428 sq. The various smaller churches are mentioned vv. 3-5, 14, 15.

and women whose memory the Apostle cherished ever afterwards, it included, and likewise into what smaller churches, grouped according to their various houses, it was divided. And inasmuch as this epistle belongs to one of the last years of the Apostle's life, we learn likewise from it how well this church was preserved after he had left it, and how faithful it continued to him on the whole.

It would, nevertheless, be quite inaccurate to suppose that Paul remained during these years always within the walls of that great city. We might very well imagine this from the short narrative in Luke, but other sources enable us to look beyond Ephesus. As a matter of course, he always remained in constant intercourse with all the churches which he had previously founded; ¹ but he must also have undertaken short journeys from the city. The Corinthian church, which was scarcely second to the Ephesian in size and importance, occasioned him special anxiety during his stay at Ephesus. After his departure from Corinth, some of the Christians there, to some extent, perhaps, influenced by obscure ideas of Christian liberty, had abandoned themselves to an unchaste life. At the very beginning of his stay in Ephesus, he wrote an epistle—now lost—on that subject to the Corinthian church, and promised it an early, though hasty, visit, as he had then, undoubtedly, the journey to Rome still in his mind. ² Meanwhile, he soon heard of further disorders which had broken out in the Corinthian church; above all, the divisions which threatened soon wholly to break up the church may then have commenced. He determined, therefore, to send Timothy on a mission to the churches in Europe, when he would have to call at Corinth, after passing through Macedonia, and help to restore order in the church of that city. However, whilst the arrival of Timothy was delayed, and Paul also postponed his promised journey, the divisions in Corinth made rapid progress, and already the adherents of Paul sought to separate themselves more and more completely from those of Apollos, both these parties from the followers of Peter, and all of them, again, from the party calling themselves 'of Christ'; although, of these four parties, the first two were most without foundation, since quite recently Apollos had come to Paul at Ephesus and gladly sought an understanding with him on every point.

¹ For instance, the Macedonians, Gaius and Aristarchus, were with him in Ephesus, Acts xix. 29, the latter from Thessalonica, xx. 4, who subsequently

remained always with him, xxvii. 2, Philem. ver. 24, Col. iv. 10.

² See *Schickschriften*, pp. 101 sq.

In these circumstances, there arrived at last from Corinth a letter to Paul, in answer to his, conveyed by three men of repute, as delegates from the church, who gave Paul the fullest report as to the latest state of affairs at Corinth. As soon as they had gone back, he sent to the church the exceedingly important epistle which has been preserved as the *first to the Corinthians*,¹ in which he announced repeatedly an early visit, and this time of greater length.² All this may have happened before the end of the first year of his residence in Ephesus; it was towards Easter of the year 56 when he despatched this epistle, and at that time he proposed to stay in Ephesus only till Whitsuntide.³

But in the circumstances in which Paul was generally living, purposes of this kind could not be by any means so speedily executed as he proposed; it was soon found that a longer stay in Ephesus would most promote the cause of the Gospel in Asia. When, therefore, Timotheus returned to him by way of Corinth, and reported that his last epistle to the church there had produced but small effect, and that, on the contrary, a rival Apostle had arrived there from Jerusalem, and that, further, his personal presence was most urgently needed there, he may have found himself in no little perplexity. Yet, with his habitual rapidity of decision, he resolved to make a brief run from Ephesus to Corinth by the shortest route, across the Ægean Sea, and at once to return again to Ephesus. This is the journey of which Luke says nothing; it was undoubtedly the same in which he sailed on the outward journey with Titus, Apollos, and a former teacher of the law, Zenas, to Crete, and left them behind him there.⁴ In Corinth, however, he found the churches in such a serious state of disorder, and the influence of the rival Apostle so dominant, that he this time hastened back to Ephesus full of the deepest grief. And as at this time many things had to be put in order in the Macedonian churches also, he sent Timotheus and Erastus to them. Both returned to him during his stay at Ephesus.⁵—When he himself had resumed his work in Ephesus, and saw many things of importance still to be done there, he learned, not only how little the abuses in Corinth had as yet been removed in accordance with his desires, but also that one member of position

¹ See *Sendschreiben*, pp. 104 sq.; it is, however, better to suppose, in the case of 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18, comp. with v. 12, that the epistle was intended to be sent with these three delegates, the brethren, ver. 12, being undoubtedly the same men.

² 1 Cor. iv. 13, 19, xvi. 5–7.

³ 1 Cor. v. 8, xvi. 8.

⁴ As must be inferred from Tit. i. 5, iii. 13: everything that has been stated here briefly will be found discussed more at length *Sendschreiben*, pp. 225 sq.

⁵ According to Acts xix. 22, comp. with what has to be said below.

especially had even accused him openly of unworthy conduct. Thereupon he wrote an epistle to the Corinthians, which is now lost, in which he once more urgently pressed the immediate removal of all abuses, completely justified himself against that insulting accusation, and declared that he would hardly see the church again if it did not, as a first step, induce the slanderer to withdraw his charge. This was undoubtedly one of the epistles which compelled even his opponents to confess that they were irresistibly powerful,¹ as the result subsequently proved. This time he made Titus, who was again with him in Ephesus, after the frustration of an earlier project,² the bearer of his epistle and the interpreter of his further thoughts. And he ordered him, if the Corinthians should still hesitate to show submission, to return to him through Macedonia, since, in that case, he was determined not to see Corinth again, by the nearest route, but hoped to meet Titus on the way as he travelled through Macedonia.

In fact, however, Titus did not return so soon, and the anxiety of the Apostle with regard to the Corinthians continued necessarily to increase. As his stay in Ephesus had, contrary to his expectation, been so protracted, he had, at this time, long proposed to himself to postpone his journey to Rome for a later opportunity, for the present to make journeys through Macedonia and Greece simply, and then to revisit the parent church before going to Rome. For bitter as was the hostility shown to him during these last years by some leading members of that church, he never thought of severing all spiritual connection with it; on the contrary, he gradually felt more strongly urged to see it once more before his journey to Rome, and, if possible, to come to some full understanding with it. The charitable contributions for it, which he could then likewise best of all himself convey, he now collected in all his churches with the greater zest under the influence of this desire. In these circumstances, there occurred in Ephesus the terrible uproar against him which compelled him to enter more speedily than he desired on the *third* and last portion of this journey. By his long, persistent, and uniform labours in Ephesus, he had struck a blow at heathenism there from which it never recovered. This was observed by no one sooner than

¹ 2 Cor. x. 10.

² 'When I send Artemas or Tychicus to thee, hasten to come to me to Nicopolis, for there I have determined to winter,' Tit. iii. 12. If the Nicopolis in the south of Epirus, close by the sea, is meant, he undoubtedly intended, at that

time, to go to Rome the next spring. Artemas is otherwise unknown; Tychicus was from Asia, Acts xx. 4, and was now undoubtedly with Paul in Ephesus, as he, from that time, always faithfully followed him.

by Demetrius, a rich goldsmith, who manufactured the miniature temples of Artemis, of various sizes, which were so much in vogue. These were little figures of Artemis, who had been from of old so much worshipped in Ephesus, and of her temple, which was so famous throughout Asia, and they were placed in the houses or worn on the body as amulettes.¹ As he employed a great number of artists of a higher class, and of ordinary workpeople, in the manufacture of these figures, he possessed, as the man on whom they depended for their livelihood, and in other respects as a wealthy man, great influence in the city. As he now saw the demand for his wares seriously threatened, he at last got together a large assembly of the people who were dependent on him, and himself placed before them so cleverly the injury which Paul would occasion, as dangerously impairing not only their profits and their honour, but also the honour of the Ephesian Artemis, and of the city of Ephesus as the famed *sacristan*² of her temple, that one morning, the whole city was in uproar with a wild cry against the Christian foreigners, and the excited praise of the 'great Ephesian Artemis.' The multitude, in its growing excitement, dragged Paul's two Macedonian companions,³ as they could not immediately find the Apostle himself, into the theatre, as a temporary place of arrest, whilst they could consider what had further to be done. Paul was then desirous to enter boldly into the midst of the multitude as it was engaged in its excited consultations, to defend Christianity before it, but his Christian friends kept him back; even some of the ten Asiarchs,⁴ who were more favourably disposed towards him, urgently dissuaded him. As the populace made little distinction in those times between Christians and Judeans, the latter suddenly found that they also were seriously threatened; and already the Judeans who were amongst the crowd in the theatre endeavoured to put forward a certain Alexander⁵ as their speaker, and he was just

¹ Similar customs may be observed still in India. As regards the *Εφεσια γράμματα*, so called by the ancients, which were found upon the earliest image of Artemis, and their meaning, compare my essay in the *Jahrb. der Bibl. W.* xi. pp. 175 sq. and *Journ. of Sacred Literature*, 1861, p. 190. [For further illustration and confirmation of Luke's account of the disturbances in Ephesus, see now Wood's *Discoveries at Ephesus* (London: 1877), and comp. Lightfoot's art. *Contemporary Review*, vol. xxxii. pp. 294 sq.]

² On the term *neocoros*, see Lightfoot's art. *l.c.*

³ See *ante*, p. 393.

⁴ Who belonged once to the magistracy of Ephesus, but whose power was at this time greatly restricted. Comp. with regard to them, *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* ii. pp. 801, 832, 836, 1085, and Babington, in the *Numism. Chronicle*, 1866, pp. 73-127.

⁵ This Alexander, who is thus mentioned without any description, Acts xix. 33, 34, must have been a very well-known man; and it is implied in the nature of the case that he was not about to speak for Paul. We may very well suppose, therefore—from the brief remarks, 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 14, 15—that he was the smith of this name known as the opponent of Paul. If he had not long been

on the point of addressing the people for himself and the Judeans, with insults against Paul, when the simple observation that he was a Judean incensed the people exceedingly against him. The multitude, accordingly, continued their uproar until, late in the day, the town clerk¹ succeeded in dispersing them by a speech which flattered their prejudices while it pointed out the certain evil consequences of their lawlessness. Nevertheless, Paul's life was so undoubtedly seriously threatened, that he resolved, after a short conference with his friends, hastily to leave the city.

Fleeing from this city, therefore, in momentary peril of his life, he commenced his journey to Macedonia. The Ephesians, Tychicus and Trophimus, however, accompanied him; Timothy remained at first behind in Ephesus, and was sent to Macedonia later on.² And as soon as he reached Troas again he found much to do; but after he had hoped many days in vain to meet Titus there with the longed-for reports from Corinth, full of anxiety that he had not come, he hastened on his journey to Macedonia, where Titus actually met him. For it was long before Titus succeeded in bringing over the Corinthians to Paul's mind; at last, however, that church had come to a better way of thinking, and, in an answer to the Apostle's epistle, given him a friendly invitation to come to them; although from the verbal report of Titus, Paul could perceive enough to show that there were many abuses still remaining, the removal of which he had made the condition of his amicable re-appearance amongst them, and that the hostility of the rival Apostle had not yielded to a better mind. While still in an unusual frame of mind from the recent events in Ephesus, he wrote accordingly, under the freshest impression of these very diverse reports, the epistle which has come down to us as *the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, after that to the Galatians, the most agitated and impassioned of all his letters, and, indeed, to some extent, more so than the last-named epistle, owing to the fact that the strongest impressions of the various kinds had just powerfully affected him.³ It was intended, in conjunction with the work of Titus, who was returning with it, to remove the last disorders which still stood in the way of the Apostle's amicable revisitation of Corinth. In the meantime

known in Ephesus as an able speaker, and as, likewise, an enemy of Paul, the Judeans would not now have put him forward. It is also implied, Acts xx. 19, that Judean enemies were always seeking Paul's life in Ephesus.

¹ ὁ γραμματεὺς, Acts xix. 35, comp. vol. v. p. 266.

² 2 Tim. iv. 13-15, 19-21, comp. with Acts xx. 4.

³ See *Sendschreiben*, pp. 228 sq.

he visited the churches of Macedonia; indeed, this time he penetrated in the north-west as far as Illyria, whither he had not previously gone, everywhere prosecuting the great mission most zealously.¹

When at last he arrived, in the autumn of the year 58, at Corinth, he found the church, in consequence of his last letter and the efforts of Titus and other friends, already so much composed and so faithfully loyal to him, that he had leisure there, seizing an occasion which readily presented itself, to write that *Epistle to the Church at Rome*, which has been preserved as the most finished of all the letters which came from his pen. With this epistle he departed from his principle of writing to those churches only which had been founded by himself. While there in the neighbourhood of Rome, the desire overpowered him to place himself at least by correspondence in some closer connection with that most important of the Christian churches, inasmuch as he could not then in person visit it; and in consequence of his true perception of the necessity of then forming a just and clear idea of the general relation of Christianity to Judeanism, he could not very well be in want of the most important materials for such a letter. And when we further remember the connection of the time with the general history of the world and the unexpected nearness of the greatest events of universal significance when he wrote this epistle, it seems as if the Holy Spirit itself had impelled him to teach the complete incompatibility of Judeanism with Christianity most definitely, exhaustively, and convincingly, just in the very nick of time, as we find him doing in this epistle of an unusual nature.²

He hoped soon to be able to follow to Rome this epistle as a forerunner of himself, and to go from there to Spain; but for the present he turned his mind once more to Jerusalem, sad as were the forebodings which already tormented him with regard to this projected visit thither.³ And after he had stayed but three months in Greece he already determined to take ship from Corinth by the most direct route to Syria, when he learnt, just in time, that his life was in danger by that route from his embittered Judean enemies. He resolved, accordingly, to take the more circuitous route by Macedonia, and once more saw those churches which had always been to him

¹ According to Rom. xv. 19, and not contrary to Acts xx. 1, 2, as we saw above, p. 395, he had previously proposed to go thither.

² See *Schuldschreiben*, pp. 314 sq. Comp.

further. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* ix. 208 sq.; and again, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1866, pp. 1754 sq.

³ Rom. xv. 30-32, comp. Acts xx. 22, 23.

almost the dearest of all. A company of seven of his most tried friends had also come together in Philippi, who all determined to accompany him as far as Ephesus; he let them go on before him to Troas to make the needful preparations for a speedy sea passage to Jerusalem, as he longed to arrive there before Whitsuntide; and followed them then with Luke, shortly after Easter, to Troas, where they were nevertheless compelled to tarry a whole week. A remarkable incident was, in after times, related of the last night at Troas. It was Sunday, and the church of Troas remained till midnight with Paul and his fellow-travellers; for Paul still continued indefatigably his exhortations, so that the Lord's Supper even had not yet been taken.¹ In these circumstances a young man, who was sitting at the window, was overpowered by sleep, and fell down from the third storey of the house; but whilst he was being taken up as dead, Paul hastened down, threw himself upon him with all the energy of his healing love and power, and so restored him that he could confidently promise his recovery. And not until this did he distribute the sacred supper, and continued to speak until break of day.² The youth was able to be taken with them to the ship; but Paul himself so much desired solitude on this day, that he purposely made the long journey to Assos, south of Troas and north of Mitylene, on foot, and joined his companions at Assos on the ship.

According to Luke's detailed description, the sea passage was continued for four days along the coast as far as Miletus; as time pressed, Ephesus had already been passed a considerable distance; nevertheless as rest was desired during the Saturday and Sunday, Paul sent for the elders of the church at Ephesus to come to him, that he might exchange with them a few words of paternal love. The words which he then uttered could never afterwards be forgotten, nor the effect which they produced. As he gradually approached nearer to the Holy Land and Jerusalem, and his mind was more immediately occupied with the affairs there, the evil foreboding, which he had felt from the beginning of the journey to Jerusalem, grew stronger within him; and whilst he felt himself 'bound in the spirit' to go to Jerusalem, 'the Holy Spirit testified to him in every city that bonds and afflictions awaited him there.' And

¹ See *ante*, p. 125.

² Acts xx. 7-12. We cannot assert that the youth had not a spark of life left in him; and the real miracle does not consist in that fact.—When, further, there is such express mention of the burning of numerous lights in connection with the

reference to the Lord's Supper, vv. 7, 8, Luke evidently adds this particular simply to meet the numerous evil reports about such solemnities which had been thus early spread abroad, comp., *ante lucem*, Plin. *Epist.* x. 97. 7.

now it seemed to him as if he was destined not to see again this Ephesian church either, to which he had last devoted the largest and most self-denying service, although he had a distant foreboding that the same 'ravens' against which he had contended—the Pharisaic Christian teachers, and at their back the Judeans themselves—would force their way into the flock when he would lie in chains or in death! He spoke to these elders, therefore, with the greater pathos, warning them the more earnestly never to forget their great responsibility, and to be upon their guard in remaining faithful to the truth which had always been declared by him with absolute candour. And inasmuch as all these various forebodings of the great Apostle were subsequently fulfilled, these words which had been heard by so many, as Luke seeks vividly to reproduce them, remained all the more indelibly fixed in memory.¹ The farewell was the most touching conceivable.

Three weeks had already passed since Easter: the next fourteen days were probably occupied with the voyage to Tyre; this route was the shortest, by way of Cos north of Rhodes to Patara on the Lycian coast, thence upon a fresh ship, which had to unload its freight in Tyre, past the south coast of Cyprus to the Phœnician coast. In Tyre, where Paul found some Christians, he remained an entire week; he inquired more particularly about the condition of affairs in Jerusalem, and the Christians of Tyre besought him 'by means of the Spirit,' that is in the Christian manner, under the pure influence of the Spirit and by invoking it, not to go up to Jerusalem: but he would not be turned from his purpose; so after a pathetic farewell, like that at Miletus, he took ship for the final passage to Cæsarea by way of Ptolemais.

At Cæsarea the Evangelist Philip,² with four adult but unmarried daughters of prophetic spirit, was now residing and labouring in a Christian church. It is not difficult to imagine the advice which Philip and his daughters gave the Apostle. But after he had stayed there a few days Agabus, above-mentioned,³ came into this house; and exactly like an ancient prophet,⁴ he put the girdle which Paul had just laid aside round his own body, as if he would look like Paul, then appeared before the Apostle with his hands and feet bound, and as an acknowledged Christian prophet foretold to him by this forcible symbol the certain bonds which awaited him if he went to

¹ The discourse, Acts xx. 18-35, falls into three sections: vv. 18-24; 25-31; 32-35; and it is folly itself to doubt its general historical character.

² See *ante*, p. 178.

³ See *ante*, p. 334.

⁴ See *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, i. p. 45.

Jerusalem. Whereupon not merely all his companions, but all the Christians of this church likewise, besought the Apostle not to go to Jerusalem. But painfully as this affected him, his courage simply grew with the nearness of the danger, and for the last time he declared that his mind was made up. They committed him to the will of God, and after the necessary preparations,¹ a two days' journey sufficed to bring him to Jerusalem. Several Christians of this church travelled with him, and took him to the house of Mnason of Cyprus, an old and faithful Christian, where he was well received, with his companions.

But before we describe the fortunes of the Apostle after his last entrance into Jerusalem, we must at this important point consider more particularly the progress made by Judeanism and its relation to Christianity during these twenty years, that we may then follow it further.

II. *Judeanism and its relation to the Christian Church.*

In fact the marvellous advance in Christianity which this period had to produce for it, has been already accomplished, though it may still be almost invisible to the sight and wish of the world. In this wonderfully brief period of twenty years we see it effecting in itself, even by the simple life and labours of one man, that great advance which had sufficient inward force to set it free from the first stage of its temporal development and weakness, and the noblest fruit of which, though still hidden by the mists of the time, favouring wind and sun could finally display and rapidly ripen in the immediate future. On the other hand, however, it still remained in its outward aspects without any power and independent position in the world in relation either to Judeanism or any of the heathen governments; indeed, in proportion as it continued to develop itself now more freely, it was by degrees more severely persecuted again by the Judeans and, at their instigation, by the heathen governments. It is all the more marvellous at first sight, though intelligible enough when the true nature of the case is considered, that in Judeanism the exactly opposite phenomenon in both respects is presented. We find in it still a multitude of splendid victories and advances as regards the outward world, while at

¹ If ἀποσκευάσμενοι, Acts xxi. 15. is the proper reading, it must refer to such things as had to be laid aside previously, that a man might appear as a pilgrim in Jerusalem and show due honour to the Holy City; the reading, ἐπισκ, on the

other hand, refers to such badges as a pilgrim had previously to put on when he went up to a feast – festive fillets, or the like; and this would certainly suit the connection of the narrative better.

its inmost centre all the forces of dissolution are more and more fatally and inevitably at work. Throughout these decades the ancient glory of Israel is still perpetuated, at all events in that object, which had become its one earthly possession, the splendour of which shone more and more widely through the earth, and attracted the eyes, and indeed, the hearts of many foreigners. But while the external Sanctuary remained intact, in what ought to have been the inmost and most inviolable Sanctuary of its whole life, the forces of dissolution, which had long been operative in it, awoke afresh and ravaged with utterly destructive violence. For when we consider more closely--

I.—*The relation of Judeanism to other Nations and Religions,*

as this is shown partly in the general estimation in which it was held amongst the nations of the earth, and partly in the actual conversion of heathen, it is impossible not to see that in this respect it continued to make considerable advances during the whole of this period. As we have already seen,¹ it was pursuing this triumphant course until the death of Agrippa; and the fact that it was afterwards connected immediately with Rome again produced no injurious effects, inasmuch as the ancient religion had long before learnt to maintain itself amongst heathen nations, and the change might, on the contrary, have proved rather to its advantage, if it succeeded in gaining permanent influence over that immense power, and by it over the other powers of the earth.

Of all the conversions of individual heathen, which were so frequent about this time, it was particularly that of one prince, with many members of his family, which attracted the attention of the world, and which had actually some influence upon the course of history immediately afterwards, although the subsequent issue will show how little it was to be compared in influence with the one conversion of the Apostle Paul to Christianity, with which it is almost contemporaneous. This conversion concerns the then reigning family of *Adiabene*,² a royal house of Persian descent and customs, which, like so many others in those eastern parts, had gradually risen with the decline of the Syrian Empire, and which acknowledged the Parthian king as its liege lord. As regards its narrower bounda-

¹ See *ante*, pp. 191-272.

² In the language of the country, the name has a harder consonant at the beginning, *Adybe*, as the country is often called in Syrian books.

ries the country lies south-east of the ancient Nineveh and south of the Zab; from early times descendants of the Ten Tribes dwelt in those parts, but the conversion of the Prince Izates and of his mother Helena, was not due to them, but to itinerant Judeans. This Izates was a child born late in life to his princely parents, but from his earliest years a favourite child, the fruit of a marriage which was in those days allowed at most among the Persians, his mother being his father's sister: on this account the good-nature of the Judeans sought subsequently the more to cast a veil of sanctity around his conception.¹ His father's name was Monobazos, with the surname Bazcos. As his parents intended that he should be the successor to the throne, but were concerned for his life on account of the jealousy of his brothers, particularly of Monobazos, who was older than he and his equal as to birth, they sent him away to the court of Abennerig, king of a similar small kingdom, to the south of Adiabene, by the mouths of the Euphrates-Tigris, that kingdom being at that time usually called, in the Greek fashion, Spasinû-Charax, after its principal city, and according to the language of the country Maishân (Maishôn), or, in a Greek form, Mesene.² This king, who, like all the Eastern

¹ According to the account, *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2. 1, that before the birth of the child his father had, in a dream, heard a celestial voice intimating the sanctity and high destination of the child in the womb of its mother. From this narrative, it might be supposed that Izates was the first-born of Helena, while Josephus immediately afterwards designates Monobazos such.—The Persian habits of the royal house are evident from this relation of the boy's mother and father. The name Izates, which the Syrians write with exactly the same letters إزاتس, is undoubtedly Persian, signifying pretty nearly *worshipper*; of Monobazos, the first portion may be Syrian, it is true, as the Syrians have an ancient royal name ܡܘܢܘܒܐܙܘܫ (comp. *Μαυος Θαυμου* upon a Haurân inscription in the American Orient. Journ. v. p. 183) amongst the Abgars of Edessa; but the second portion is Persian. And if it is really a double name, it is intelligible that he should be surnamed *Bazcos*, or, according to another reading, *Bázcos* 'Bazu's son.' Comp. also *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1861, p. 267. The orthography of the Talmud מזנז simply follows the Greek.

² The full name of the city, which occurs in *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2. 1, 4, so called,

undoubtedly, from its founder, is much spoken of, together with its kingdom, Charakene, in *Plin. Nat. Hist.* vi. 30-32; the name Mesene is found there also, cap. 31, and *Ammian. Mare.* xxiii. 6, xxiv. 3, but it no doubt arose from ميسان, *Assemani, Bibl. Orient.* iii. 1, p. 506, or ميسان *Lex. Geogr. Arab.*, and *Abulf.*

Tab. Arab., pp. 6 sq., ed. Wüstenfeld (written ميسان also in the Talmud), not from a Greek word, as Quatremère supposes, in an essay of some length on this little kingdom (*Journ. des Savans*, 1857, pp. 615-632). In quite recent times, the history of this kingdom is made clearer by the discovery of many of its coins; by which, however, the correctness of the reading, Abennerig, has been made doubtful, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1861, pp. 364 q.; W. Vaux, in the *Nomismat. Chronicle*, 1858, pp. 32-38, and *Prokosh-Osten, ibid.* 1866, pp. 131 sq.; F. Lenormant, *Description des Médailles de Bêr* (1857), p. 181; Reinand, in *Journal Asiat.* 1861, ii. pp. 161 sq., who, however, introduces much that is irrelevant; further, the coins in the *Beruz Archæol.* 1866, p. 218, and the *Revue Numismatique*, 1866, pp. 303-333.

princes of that time, had received a certain amount of Greek culture, heartily took the part of the young Izates, who was destined to become some day a neighbouring monarch, gave him his daughter Samacho¹ in marriage, and bestowed upon him the revenues of an extensive portion of the country for the time that he should stay in his territories; but his father recalled Izates into his own country before his death, and assigned to him a residence in the lofty Kurdistan² mountains in the north. After the death of the father the elder son Monobazos was raised to the throne, being invested with the princely diadem, the royal ring and sword,³ but this was only until Izates, with the approval of the chief dignitaries and other representatives of the nation, was fetched from his residence on the frontier and legally appointed the successor of his father. The king, who had now thus come to the throne, sympathised with his mother in a common respect for Judeanism. While at the court of Abennerig Izates had made the acquaintance of a Judean named Ananias, who professed to be a merchant, and whose teaching was readily received by the women there; and Izates afterwards took him with him into Adiabene, and continued to show to him great respect. Helena had been converted by another Judean, and it was not for lack of zeal on the part of either the king or his mother that the entire nation was

¹ Or, according to another reading, Symacho, which may remind us of the man's name, **Σαμάχο**—that is, *Red*, in Assemani's *Bibl. Orient.* i. p. 419.

² **Καππών**, *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2, 3, 'Where the best Amômon grows, and Noah's ark remained suspended after the deluge,' is not meant to be the well-known Charre, in Mesopotamia, which Josephus always properly writes **Χαππών**, but is a mistake for **Καπδών**, and corresponds to the town Qardâ, which is described in the *Lex. Geogr. Arab.* ed. Juynboll, ii. p. 398. as regards its position, and still after the same tradition of Noah. It is true Moses of Chorene confounds this town, as he found it in Josephus, with the better known Mesopotamian Charân, *Armen. Hist.* ii. 32; and then further, inasmuch as he, perhaps, found some Helena, as a wife of Abgar's, in the ancient history of Edessa, considered the latter lady as identical with the Helena of Adiabene, and transferred to her what Josephus relates of the latter. But it would be perverse to infer from this that the famous Abgar of Edessa, who is said to have had a correspondence with Christ (see vol. vi. p. 142. comp. Moses of Chorene, ii. 25 sq., and Lerubna,

in the *Collection des Historiens de l'Arménie*, Paris, 1867, i. pp. 217-25), was identical with Izates. It is true an Izates occurs, according to the genealogical tree in Assemani's *Bibl. Orient.* i. pp. 421 sq., as the father of the fourth and then of the seventh successor of this Abgar; and this Izates might, as far as his date is concerned, be identical with the Izates whom Josephus writes of, supposing that the one princely family in Edessa followed the other; but in that case, Abgar and Izates could the less be the same person. Moreover, according to all accounts, Adiabene was situated entirely on the other side of the Tigris; yet in Hippolytus' *Philosoph.* x. 30, Ararat is reckoned to belong to Adiabene; and the recollection of the closer relations of the royal family of Adiabene may have contributed to the formation of the tradition of Abgar's correspondence with Christ.

³ The word **σαυψήρα** is not explained *Jos. Ant.* xx. 2, 3, but is undoubtedly the Persian **شاهشیر**, which is celebrated by the *Shâhnâmeh*, and passed into Syrian as **ܫܫܝܪܐ** (*Knûs, Christ.* p. 112, ver. 75).

not then converted. The magnates of the realm, however, displayed great repugnance to a design of that kind. It is true Izates sent his brothers with their children away as hostages, either to the Roman or to the Parthian Court, and then, contrary to the will of his mother and his teacher Ananias even (who regarded circumcision as unnecessary), underwent the rite of circumcision, in obedience to the requirements of a Galilean, named Eleazar, who had in the meantime come to him as a stricter teacher. He further not only allowed his mother to take up her residence in Jerusalem, but also sent five of his sons with her, that they might thoroughly learn the language of the Sacred Scriptures and all the usages of the Judean religion;¹ and he sought in every way to remain in spiritual intercourse with Jerusalem.

The arrival of the royal lady from Adiabene with her five grandchildren, and their settlement there, had not a few consequences of some importance. She was in reality a devout woman, and manifested with sincerity her good feeling towards Jerusalem, as must be shown below in a great illustration of it. Her arrival in Jerusalem took place probably in the summer of the year 44 A.D., and the circumcision of her son a few years earlier. As she had the intention of remaining permanently in Jerusalem, and wished to establish there a permanent residence for her whole family, she had built for the princes of Adiabene a royal palace, nearer the centre of the city than the older sites of royal houses,² and another edifice for herself, in the north of the city, which was intended also to serve as a mausoleum for her whole family.³ On account of this subsidiary purpose the second edifice was placed three stadia from the northern wall of the city, and in construction it was distinguished by three small pyramids; for the same reason

¹ Josephus subsequently supplies, *Ant.* xx. 3. 4, what he might have said previously, 2. 5.—The Talmudic writings likewise have much to say of *הילני המלכה* and her sons, especially of their splendid gifts to the Temple, e.g. *M. יומא*, iii. 10; but there is little probability in what is narrated, *M. נזיר*, iii. 6, where it is said that she was, by virtue of a vow, three years a Naziritess, that she then came to Jerusalem, and was there sentenced by the Rabbis to be a Naziritess again from seven to fourteen years. Upon a coffin, which may be considered hers, in Jerusalem, the name *מלכה*, *Queen Sélou*, has been found as her name in Adiabene, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1866, pp. 1573 sq., *Journ. Asiat.*, 1869, ii. p.

551.

² At the time of the Roman siege, the building was called 'Monobazos' Court,' after the reigning king, *Jos. Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 1, comp. vi. 6. 3.


³ This other erection is called in the same passage, *Jos. Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 1, 'Helena's royal residence,' but elsewhere, *Bell. Jud.* v. 2. 2; 3. 3; 4. 2, 'Helena's sepulchre,' and is designated, after its architectural character, as the 'three pyramids,' *Ant.* xx. 4. 3, and described at a subsequent time, with reference to its remarkable architectural features, in Paus. *Perieg.* viii. 16. The ruins are probably those which are now called the Tombs of the Kings. Her relative, Grapte, built another royal edifice, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 11.

it was called both 'Helena's Sepulchre' and 'Helena's Royal Residence.' The two buildings belonged to the most modern and magnificent of the city in the last years of its existence. A still more remarkable thing, however, is that the example of this pious mother and the temperate and wise conduct of her reigning son exercised the most lasting effect upon the other sons, who had been previously sent into foreign countries. They were recalled, and (as it seems) were all likewise converted to Judeanism; so that king Izates could also send some of his brothers likewise to Jerusalem. And these 'sons and brothers of Izates' remained there until the middle of the siege of the city,¹ evidently distinguished in no small degree by their zeal for their new religion and their constancy.

But notwithstanding this rare example of the prince and his numerous family, the conversion of the people of Adiabene themselves made no visible progress. On the contrary, the magnates of the country were estranged from their ruler by his conversion, and, notwithstanding all the moderation and prudence by which his reign was marked, sought assistance against his innovations from abroad. They involved him in a serious war with Abia,² who ruled over an Arabian tribe which had at that time settled and grown powerful in the desert plains of northern Mesopotamia; but Izates conquered Abia, passing over the Tigris and carrying war into the enemy's country, taking his fortress Arsamopata with rich spoil, and finally pressing him so sorely that he committed suicide. They then involved Izates in war with the Parthian king Vologeses, who had reigned from the year 52; but this war was soon ended by the outbreak of internal commotions in Parthia. The further relations of Izates to the Parthian king Artabanos, who fell in the year 43, and to his successors, as well as to the Romans, with whom he sought, without on that account breaking with the Parthians, to keep the peace, for the sake of Jerusalem which was situated in Roman territory and was so dear to him, lie beyond the range of this history.³ Izates died about

¹ *Jos. Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 4; they are also called 'the relatives of Monobazos,' and two of them are named—Monobazos and Kenedeos, ii. 19. 2. Kenedeos is probably identical with *Nicanor*, according to *M. S. 221*, iii. 10. The latter, most likely, finished the golden Temple doors above mentioned (p. 196), so that they usually took their name from him, which is the best explanation of the fact referred to in *note 1*, vol. v. p. 322.

² To this name, *Jos. Ant.* xx. 4. 1,

corresponds the diminutive  used by the later Arabs.

³ Josephus relates so much about the conflicts of Izates, *Ant.* xx. 3. 1-4, 2, simply because the man appeared to him of such general importance as a ruler who had adopted Judeanism; but we must compare the hints of *Tac. Ann.* xii. 13, 14, short as they are, with Josephus's somewhat partial descriptions.

the year 60 A.D.,¹ after an extremely troubled reign of twenty-four years, only fifty-five years old, but to his last breath he remained faithful to Judeanism, and evinced in no small degree this faithfulness even in death by appointing Monobazos, his elder brother, his successor, since Monobazos had then likewise long gone over to Judeanism, and lacked neither valour in war nor wise moderation. His mother Helena, after his death, went from Jerusalem back to her native land (probably to bring his body to Jerusalem), and died there soon afterwards.² It was said that Izates left behind him twenty-four sons and an equal number of daughters.

We have no certain example of any other ruler that turned in like manner wholly to Judeanism.³ It was unlawful for the daughters of the royal families of Israel to marry heathen princes unless they had adopted the true religion, and in earlier times particularly not a few heathens had been on that account induced to give up heathenism, as we have seen now and again in the course of this history. Still, Judeanism did not reap any permanent advantage therefrom. Amongst the populations of the heathen countries Judeanism undoubtedly made considerable advances, though more in the form of partial conversion (Proselytism) than of complete conversion, as can be seen nowhere more plainly in detail than in the history of the great journeys of the Apostle Paul. It was rarely the case in the extensive Roman empire of this period that a town was found in which at least practically all the heathen women had either completely or partially been converted to Judeanism, as

¹ Neither in his report of his death, *Ant.* xx. 4, 3, does Josephus supply any chronological note; we know, however, from *Tac. Ann.* xv. 1, 14, Cassius Dio, lxii. 20, 23, lxiii. 1, so much, certainly, that Monobazos had succeeded him as ruler in the year 62; as we may further suppose from Josephus that Helena did not come to Jerusalem before about the year 44, we may adopt the year 60 as that of his death, until we get a more definite date.

² *Jos. Ant.* xx. 4, 3.

³ According to Moses of Chorene's *Hist. Armen.* ii. 23, an Armenian magnate at the court of Arsabama, named Ehan (Hanania?), was charged as early as the time of Herod the Great with great inclination to Judeanism; but the reminiscence is too fragmentary to enable us to learn much from it. The Christian Armenians traced with great zeal the connection between Armenia and Judea from the times of Tigranes, vol. v. p. 393,

and narrate a good many details about it, in a disconnected way, and sadly mixed up with Josephus's words; comp. Moses of Chorene, *Hist. Arm.* ii. 13-24. Noble Armenian families also (like the Afghans) boasted of their Judean descent, and possess definite traditions on the point (see *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, i. pp. 251 sq.); but for history in the proper sense all that has but little significance. On the other hand, we know that a grandson of Herod the Great, by virtue of his son Alexander's marriage into the Cappadocian royal family, and then again his nephew, were made kings of Armenia by the Romans; but both of them took the completely Armenian name of Tigranes, apostatized from Judeanism, and acquired small honour by their reigns. Moses of Chorene does not mention them at all, and Tacitus does not refer to their Judean descent; see *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 5, 4, *Tac. Ann.* ii. 3, vi. 40, xiv. 26, xv. 1.

is narrated of Damascus in the year 66,¹ a city in which, as we have seen,² so many partial or complete Judeans dwelt in the years 38–41. But in general there were not many towns in the whole Roman Empire, or in the East far beyond its limits, in which this religion had not already some adherents, and would not, in so far, be sufficiently well known.

Moreover, it is a fact that a general awe of the religion of this people was making itself more and more profoundly felt at that time throughout the Roman Empire. Under the rule of the emperors of this period every form of heathenism was being rapidly superannuated and losing, in the case of many, its last charms; there was a general longing for an unknown new and better religion, and men's eyes were generally directed towards the East. People who had never consented to enter a synagogue, the Empress Popæa, for instance, became religious³ and did many things to please the Judeans; it was also well known what great influence she had with Nero, and that Emperor had himself long entertained a special awe of everything Oriental, and even after his death was long honoured or feared in the East. And though men like Seneca might be greatly vexed with the *sceleratissima gens*, and particularly with their sacred observances and Sabbaths, they were nevertheless obliged to confess that the 'vanquished gave laws to their conquerors,' and that the common people ran after the teachers of this religion with incomprehensible infatuation.⁴ And not a few Judean scholars accordingly went amongst the heathen with the proudest confidence, hoping that they would all soon be converted.⁵ It is, however, impossible not to see that the growing expectation and suspense with which the heathen were at this time more and more looking to the East, grew likewise in intensity through the influence of Christianity, although only the very fewest could already plainly enough distinguish it from Judeanism.

¹ *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2.

² *Ante*, pp. 327.

³ θεοσεβής, as Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 8. 11, calls Popæa briefly, from his own personal knowledge. It is true Tacitus does not mention this about her; but the completely un-Roman manner of her burial, *Ann.* xvi. 6, points to her conversion.

⁴ Which mixed feelings may be seen in the sentences from a lost book of Seneca's, quoted in Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, vi.

11. The more certainly are the fourteen Latin epistles between Seneca and Paul, which have, at last, been printed from the best MSS. in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1867, pp. 609–20, the simple fabrication of a Christian about the middle of the third century, with a view of thereby recommending Paul.

⁵ As Paul so admirably describes this, *Rom.* ii. 17 sq.

The Governors and the Nation, the Priests and the Herods.

But what purpose could in the end be answered by all such conquests of single individuals, or even of princes and cities, if at the inmost heart of the nation the old diseases, instead of disappearing with the new period, only ravaged afresh the more incurably, and more and more permanently conditioned the entire remaining life of the whole nation! And that was actually the case; and while not one of the earlier evils which were eating away the marrow of the nation was removed, entirely new ones appeared, which in the end raised the inward fever to a rapidly devouring fire. If we desire to understand this we must never forget the issue of the irreconcilable contradiction involved, as we have seen,¹ in the collision of the Judean and Roman-heathen claims, was seeking its consummation, and we must further remember that there was no period which could like this gradually so greatly intensify to the utmost the inward contradiction that repressed those claims, or which could with such increasing force drive them to outward expression. For, on the one hand, the Judean claims and hopes, as they now burned at the centre of the Hagiocracy and elsewhere in the Holy Land, and also in the breast of every true Judean scattered amongst the heathen, had just been greatly intensified by the various good fortunes of the period, when, as we have seen,² all the most recent experiences of the nation, the bad ones no less than the good, had roused its courage to the highest pitch, and had wrung from the Roman government constantly greater concessions. On the other hand, however, the Romans had learnt, the more they yielded to this nation, the insatiable character of its claims; and in proportion as many of the Roman magnates had come into closer relation with it, they felt the more frequently how little, after all, the actual life of so many of the Judeans of high reputation answered to the proud demands of this nation, although they may not have felt this by any means in so true a way as the Apostle Paul.³ Only on the condition that all the Roman demands and provocations should be met in Jerusalem by the means of petition and prayer, which had been employed, as we have seen,⁴ at the period between the rising of the Gaulonite

¹ Vol. vi. pp. 2 sq.

² *Ante*, pp. 235-272.

³ See *ante*, p. 306, *infra*, p. 429 sq. On one occasion Josephus presents, in a long speech which he introduces, *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4, a most graphic picture of the great

sins of the Judeans, and, at the same time, of their ingratitude for the forbearance of the Romans; and it cannot be said that he is guilty of any exaggeration.

⁴ *Ante*, pp. 243 sq.

and the reign of Agrippa, was a collision avoidable. But the interim of Agrippa's reign had once more filled greatly the sails of the national hope: exalted claims and hopes had been afresh strongly roused, and this entire period of Judean history had been brought into a condition of agitated movement and suspense through the new opposition to Christianity, a condition which might easily become intensified indefinitely.

As soon therefore as the Roman governors assumed again the direct government, the old hatred of heathen rule returned in all its strength. At all events, it was not long that the feeling of satisfaction at having been delivered from the equally great arbitrariness of an Herodean rule, was here and there retained. On the contrary, it was when the Roman Emperor hesitated to sanction the succession of the younger Agrippa, who had come to years of maturity, in his father's stead, and the thought of such a thing was soon entirely abandoned at Rome, that the intolerable heathen rule appeared to many for the first time to be about to become for a period, the end of which none could foresee, an iron necessity for the people of God. While the mere thought of this would throw many minds in Israel off their balance, there was the further circumstance that the Emperors proceeded by no means always with great caution in the choice of the governors; but, on the contrary, sometimes, just as the humour of the court dictated, sent the most unsuitable and unworthy men.¹ The fire that was hidden under the ashes in this case was accordingly fanned into a flame from both sides, so as soon to break out into constantly hotter conflagration at the centre. And hardly had the hatred of the Judeans to everything heathen, and the tendency to open rebellion been a little checked, on the one hand, when, on the other, the injudicious, or even the malicious, measures of the rulers constantly provoked that hatred in a worse way. If in these circumstances all who cherished ideas and aims in the nation which were hostile to the heathen rule, had been at once in mutual agreement and united for rapid and common resistance, the upshot would at all events have been more rapidly brought to pass. But the inmost unity of the national mind had long been variously and profoundly divided and rent, and its power even in political affairs too much weakened and paralysed to permit at once a union, superior to minor differences,

¹ It is true that Josephus passes a too partial judgment, according to his Judean prejudices, upon the whole of the seven governors that now followed (there had been before just seven likewise); nor is he always consistent with himself in this

respect, since in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11. 6 he speaks much more leniently of the first two than he does later, *Ant.* xx. 1. 1, 2; 5. 2. At the same time the accounts of Roman authors regarding some of these governors are unfavourable enough.

of all who were, from justifiable or unjustifiable causes, more or less discontented with the Roman rule. This condition of things was such that the ancient evils which were during these last centuries eating away the life of the nation, without driving it to the last extremity, were still perpetuated. The generality of the nation, on the one hand, all along obscurely felt that heathenism must not triumph, and it was to some extent involuntarily affected by the influence of the new Christian movement, and thereby led to expect the near approach of a mighty change and a Divine final judgment; while, on the other hand, it was too deeply involved in the contentions and degeneracy of the learned schools; at last not a little divided by the new Christian schism, and in too many ways mixed up with the heathen and made dependent on their goodwill and prosperity. The populace of the capital was too dependent on the tranquil perpetuation of the Hagiocracy and its sacred institutions. The numerous rich Judeans within and beyond the Holy Land too anxiously desired peace with Rome, and trembled, on account of their worldly gains, at the thought of a war. The learned men and the priests were too immovably attached to ancient prejudices and half-truths of the most various kinds, and were too absolutely concerned to promote their own interests, even at the cost of the people's, while they had long been seriously divided amongst themselves. The Herods, who survived in considerable numbers, and with great claims, continued to intermeddle and, not without result, to show their good services, and indeed their indispensability, to the Romans, while they never, even when they desired to do so perhaps, rendered real and lasting assistance, but only increased afresh the internal disorders. The Emperors were without any fixed principles with regard to the treatment of the Judeans, and constantly vacillated, while the office of the high-priest was for sale. And while all these earlier evils were perpetuated, the deepest strata of the whole national life were being convulsed, and from their depths there constantly arose, beyond all power of permanent repression, either the most infatuated and insane, or the most ferocious and exasperated, and indeed the most reprobate, endeavours to violently break through the hard shell of the humiliations and darkneses of this period, and to obtain in some way the chance of another future. The country teemed either with enthusiasts and magicians, who sometimes, in false imitation of the work of Christ and his disciples misled the people, or with robbers and murderers, who sought in the most horrible ways to rouse the nation from its indifference. For the latter class

of evildoers were undoubtedly impelled least of all by a mere desire of plunder; and in earlier times also, the brooding but fierce discontent of the people had often expressed itself in outbursts of that kind.¹ So that at last when the soil had been sufficiently turned up, by degrees a new race of men grew up upon it, of which we shall have to speak further subsequently.

The judgment which Josephus passes in his earlier work on the first two governors, *Cuspius Fadus* and *Tiberius Alexander*, is, that 'they had not violated the national customs and had kept the people tranquil,' but neither of them held office long. And Fadus was really an energetic governor. As soon as he had arrived, he found a fierce civil war was being waged, which had broken out in the country beyond the Jordan, between the heathen inhabitants of the capital of the people who were formerly the Ammonites² and the Judeans dwelling in the neighbourhood. The capital was then called Philadelphia, and had from earliest times been most hostile to the people of Israel. The immediate occasion of the war was the boundaries of a village with a very belligerent population.³ To judge from the names, Judean priests were involved in the feud,⁴ and we may therefore infer that the point in contention was most likely the payment of tithes; and it is likely enough that the Judeans had in this case historical justice on their side; but inasmuch as they had taken up arms, following simply the instigations of their principal men, and had slain many of the inhabitants of Philadelphia, the Governor regarded their conduct as a breach of the peace, took prisoners the three principal leaders, and inflicted on the one layman of their number the punishment of death, and on the other two, who were priests, that of exile merely. After this disturbance had been put down, he employed great and wholesome care in ridding the country generally of the robbers who had in so many districts got the upper hand; he also arrested, particularly, a certain Tholomaus, who had spread much mischief far and wide in the south as far as the frontiers of the Idumæans and Arabs. But when he sought to restore the earlier prerogatives of the governors in relation to

¹ See vols. v. and vi. *passim*.

² See vol. v. p. 236.

³ With the name of *Mia*, *Jos. Ant.* xx. 1. 1.: this name has, however, not yet been re-discovered, and *Zia*, 15 Roman miles west of Philadelphia, which Reland offered as a conjecture instead of it, upon the art. *Zήβ* of the *Onomast.* of the Church Fathers (therefore *זב* *Wolf*, probably the place meant, vol. ii. p. 383), is probably only a mistake in writing for *Ziba*.

⁴ The names Amaram, *אמראם*, and Eleazar in *Jos. Ant.* xx. 1. 1, naturally point to priests; the name of the third, Hannibal, to a layman. We must also read in this passage *οἱ τῆς Περσίας χάρις ἐκ γλώσσης τῶν πρώτων*, instead of *χάρις γλώσσης*; for it is plainly implied by the entire narrative that they had not revolted without the opinion and will of the leading men, but, on the contrary, in pursuance of it.

the representatives of the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem, and demanded that the festal attire of the high-priests should be again deposited in the castle Antonia, which, as we have seen,¹ had for some time been omitted, he provoked a storm of opposition whose force he had never anticipated. He had made the demand, it is true, with the full concurrence of the Syrian Proconsul Longinus, and the latter had himself come to Jerusalem with a great army, inasmuch as disturbances were feared at the first feast at which the orders should be carried out. But the heads of the Hagiocracy, remembering what had been accomplished under Caligula,² though, with the greatest astuteness, they did not venture to resist, besought the two governors for permission to send a deputation to the Emperor on the point; and as such deputations were often dealt with very summarily in Rome, and, on the other hand, often made unjust charges against the governors, it was agreed on both sides that the deputation should remain in Rome until it received an actual decision, while their children should be left as hostages in Jerusalem. The heads of the Hagiocracy naturally regarded it as a point of honour to win the day; but when their deputation in Rome perceived how little chance they had of being successful without other help, the readiness with which the younger Agrippa, in addition to the two brothers of the late Agrippa,³ interested himself for their cause was to them very acceptable. This Agrippa, at that time still quite young, whose father it was known had so much influence with Claudius and who had been brought up at his court, introduced the deputation to the Emperor at a state audience; and Claudius, who had formerly on other occasions gladly protected ancient customs with a certain degree of superstition, granted the petition of the Judeans, and had likewise a letter drawn up on the point, which was of a very flattering nature for Agrippa and the two other Herods.⁴ This took place in the year 45 A.D. Soon afterwards one of the uncles of the younger Agrippa, the Herod who had been previously appointed king of Chalcis,⁵ requested the Emperor to grant him the office of a steward of the Temple and the Temple treasury, with the right of nominating the

¹ Vol. vi. p. 40.

² See *ante*, pp. 246 sq.

³ See *ante*, p. 237.

⁴ This letter in *Jos. Ant.* xx. 1. 2. is certainly quite genuine; it contains not only the most minute chronological notes, but likewise describes the circumstances of the event much more minutely than the previous narrative of Josephus himself. It is remarkable also, and, in this

respect, different from the statements of Josephus elsewhere, that the letter mentions the wreath, *στέφανος*, of the high-priest, in addition to the sacred garment; the only thing that can be meant thereby is the ornament of the head, which is, however, not very accurately described by such a name. *Comp. Antiquities*, p. 297; further *comp. Jos. Ant.* xv. 11. 4.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 259.

high-priest; and it was really only consistent, on the part of Claudius, that he then granted the request. It was undoubtedly represented to the Emperor, that by graciously consenting he would greatly contribute to checking the growing discontent of the Judeans; and undoubtedly that was the effect for the moment, but served in the end only to provoke new claims and demands on the part of the Hagiocracy, and to further increase the difficulties of the governors. Herod at once made use, on two occasions, of his right to change the high-priest. On the same occasion the representatives of the Hagiocracy appear to have also obtained the right to continue the interrupted¹ circumvallation of Jerusalem according to Agrippa's plans, although with some diminution of the strength of the walls; for this right they paid much money to the Romans, and this period was particularly favourable to their secret intentions.²

Towards the end of his government Fadus had a good deal of trouble from the sudden appearance of a certain Theudas, who led a great many people astray.³ This man was one of the false imitators of Christ, practised in magical arts, who in the end, like the magician described in the previous volume,⁴ by an ignorantly literal interpretation of the Bible, deceived himself first, probably, and then many others. It was in those times a widely spread notion that the nation must once more make a new beginning by following Moses; and Theudas had persuaded himself that the march of Israel into the Holy Land could only then take place properly in accordance with the divine commands of the Pentateuch; he prevailed on many people to follow him with all their possessions into the country beyond the Jordan, and prophesied that the passage over the river would be as easy to the believers as it had formerly been under Joshua,⁵ and, indeed, that that passage would be to them the true baptism into the kingdom of God. But Fadus sent a squadron of Roman cavalry against him, which suddenly fell upon and dispersed his followers at the Jordan; he himself was decapitated and brought to Jerusalem.⁶

Josephus does not tell us why Fadus so soon retired; but if

¹ See *ante*, p. 265.

² Josephus, it is true, passes over this fact without notice in the passage where it would naturally be mentioned, but we can infer it from *Bell. Jud.* v. 4, 2, and *Tac. Hist.* v. 12.

³ *Jos. Antiq.* xx. 5. 1. The name Theudas is an abbreviation of Theolotus, or Theoderus.

⁴ Vol. vi. pp. 69 sq.

⁵ See vol. ii. pp. 244 sq.

⁶ The Theudas mentioned Acts v. 36,

'who thought himself to be something,' and yet perished with 400 followers, is undoubtedly described in such a way that he might be easily confounded with the Theudas of Josephus. But, according to the Acts, he perished before Judas the Gaulonite, and in the same way as he; it is therefore altogether improbable that he was originally supposed to be identical with the Theudas before us. Leaving the name out of sight, the description in the Acts suits admirably the Simon who, as

he was really an energetic man with a feeling of honour, it is intelligible enough, after the Emperor had decided against him at Rome in the above important matter, that he should decline to remain any longer in that position. The choice of his successor also proves plainly enough that Rome went much further in the path of concession that had once been entered upon. For it was evidently from well-intentioned provision for the contentment and tranquillity of the Judeans that Claudius then, about the year 46, appointed *Tiberius Alexander*, the above-mentioned¹ son of the rich Judean Alabarch of Alexandria, who was undoubtedly recommended likewise by the Herods, as they had become connected by marriage with his family. As therefore a rich Judean even had been granted to the Judeans as governor, there was reason for thinking at Rome that all ground of anxiety had been removed for a long time: the thought, however, was a great mistake. It is not mentioned, it is true, that the governor was inactive in the great famine, above referred to,² that occurred during his term of office. But the fact that he ordered two of the sons of that great opponent of the Roman government, Judas the Gaulonite,³ who then dared to walk more boldly in their father's footsteps, to suffer the death of slaves even—that is, crucifixion—might seem to many to be the result of an excessive preference for the Roman supremacy. But it was observed, too, that he had already entirely surrendered himself to heathenism, and the Judeans made his life disagreeable to him. Probably therefore he preferred soon to return to Egypt, where we shall meet with him below, more than twenty years afterwards, as a powerful Roman official, and indeed taking active part in the war against Jerusalem.⁴

Without considering further the national wishes of the Judeans, therefore, *Ventilius Cumanus* was sent from Rome as

we have seen (vol. v. p. 153), made a rising soon after Herod's death; he might subsequently be the more easily confounded with the Theudas of Josephus, as, like the latter, he fell east of Jerusalem (at Jericho, namely), and his head, like that of the latter, was cut off for a triumphal token. In that case, Luke would be no farther to blame than that he confounded the names, having been misled in some way; and, as he was not a Judean (*Ant.*, p. 29), such slight confusions in Judean matters are the more excusable in him; or we might suppose that this Simon bore likewise the Greek name Theudas. The fact that, according to the Acts, he had only 400 followers, does not contradict the accounts of this

Simon in Josephus, as he does not state the number of his most devoted and faithful adherents. The only thing which could be objected would be that at the time of the rising of this Simon others had likewise rebelled (vol. v. pp. 453 sq.), so that it does not appear why he alone should be mentioned; but we can see from Tac. *Hist.* v. 9, as well as from other indications, that he seemed at that time to be distinguished from the rest as unique of his class, and would therefore be easily mentioned alone.

¹ *Ant.*, p. 136.

² *Ant.*, p. 335.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 62-3.

⁴ But we find there a certain Demetrius as Alabarch, who married Mariamne

Alexander's successor in the year 48, undoubtedly simply an ordinary Roman knight, of whom nothing more is known. But there was appointed with him, as the official immediately subordinate to him, a man who was very well known at the Imperial Court of that time, as if with the object of overlooking him and of always having at court reports from the first source of such a dangerous and restless nation. This man who was sent with Cumanus¹ was *Felix*, at first a slave of Antonia, the mother of Claudius, then freedman of that Emperor, whence he decorated himself with the prænomen of Antonius or Claudius; but it was especially through his brother Pallas, who had unbounded influence at the court of Claudius, that he owed the great consideration he enjoyed there. Tacitus can find nothing better to say of Felix than briefly that 'with a servile nature he exercised royal prerogatives in every form of barbarity and caprice.'² When he first came into Judæa, it is true, he did not make himself prominent, but preferred to attach himself to the Samaritans with their heathen proclivities, and lived amongst them; and, as Pallas's brother, undoubtedly soon obtained amongst them likewise the reputation of being the real representative of Rome in the country. At first Cumanus had serious trouble with the Judeans in Jerusalem only. There the mad hatred which had long secretly fired the subject Judeans and the ruling heathen, broke out suddenly at the provocation of an extremely petty cause. On the fourth day of the Easter feast one of the Roman soldiers who had, as was usual at the feast, been posted in the western forecourts of the Temple to keep order, stepped forth from the ranks to give expression to his insolent contempt for Judean habits by an insulting position of his body with a corresponding utterance. A Judean who had committed a public insult of that kind would most likely, according to ancient laws, have been quietly punished without further ado. But at once nothing less than universal and burning indignation broke out against the Roman soldier who had thus insulted, not the Judeans, but the Sanctuary, and, indeed, God Himself, many going so far as to rail at the governor even, as the real instigator of the enormity.

a daughter of King Agrippa I., *Jos. Ant.* xx. 7. 1. 3. In the meantime he was engaged, according to *Tac. Ann.* xv. 28, as an *illustris eques Romanus* in Parthian affairs in the year 64.

¹ We must consider, according to all the circumstances, that this was the case, if we try to combine the account in *Tac. Ann.* xii. 54 with the much more detailed account in *Jos. Ant.* xx. 5. 1-7. 1, and do not charge Tacitus with having com-

mitted an outrageous blunder. As we regard the case, we suppose that Josephus omitted only what he was not strictly required to relate: Tacitus simply confounds a few of the more minute details, as they might easily be confounded when the result only was looked at. Suetonius, *Claud.* xxviii. speaks at all events of military offices which Claudius conferred on his freedmen before the governorship.

² *Tac. Hist.* v. 9.

Cumanus, therefore, after vainly requiring order, commanded all the soldiers then present in Jerusalem at the castle of Antonia to take arms and advance; but the mere sight of this advance spread such a panic amongst the multitudes of people that were assembled at the Temple that a horrible crush arose, by which twenty thousand persons were said to have been killed, the sacrifices were interrupted, and all festal rejoicing suddenly converted into profound mourning. But soon afterwards a slave, a freedman of the Emperor's, named Stephanus, a man of position, was robbed of all his wealth on the high road a few miles from Jerusalem; ¹ this deed was ascribed to a company of conspirators against the Roman rule, and Cumanus, who had already returned to Cæsarea, commanded that the immediate villages should be destroyed, and the elders of them put in chains, that they might give an account of the crime. Thereupon one of the Roman soldiers who had been dispatched to execute these devastations, found a copy of the Pentateuch as a part of his spoil, and tore it up while uttering the loudest public curses upon a nation which allowed itself to be thrown into such insane commotion by a mere book. Immediately large crowds of people repeated the same means of expiating the desecration of their sanctuary which had formerly proved so efficient against Caligula; ² they hastened to Cæsarea to beseech the governor to punish this violation of 'God,' and pressed him so hard that, after the opinion of his advisers had been obtained, he ordered the Roman soldier to be beheaded, that tranquillity might be restored.

From another and apparently accidental cause, however, there soon arose a commotion which threatened more and more irresistibly to seize the entire country, and in the intensification of the darkest confusion of which we find Felix for the first time publicly engaged. The old antagonism between Samaritans and Judeans had only a few years before made itself more strongly felt: ³ and as the Samaritans could always act with greater freedom under a direct heathen rule, they might once more, after such a rule had been restored, gradually resent more boldly the Judean pride in proportion as Felix seemed to have long taken up his residence amongst them from a feeling of hostility to the Judeans. In these circumstances

¹ Near Beth-chôrôn, somewhat to the north-west of Jerusalem, past which the high road from Jerusalem to Cæsarea might run. This place is thus definitely mentioned by Josephus *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 2, but it is omitted *Ant.* xx. 5, 4, probably

only by an oversight or through haste, as he relates much in the latter passage hastily.

² See *ante*, pp. 244 sq.

³ See *ante*, p. 273.

there arose, as on one occasion the Galileans, according to their custom, were about to pass through the territory of Samaria on their way to the feast at Jerusalem, a contention in Ginæa, the first Samaritan village on the northern boundary¹ of the province. The contention increased until many Galileans had been injured and one of them had been slain,² and threatened then to end in a general rising of the Galileans. The elders of the Galileans therefore requested the governor to punish the Samaritans; he refused their request, bribed, it was said, by the Samaritans. Having met with this rebuff at Cæsarea, the Galileans went to Jerusalem with their complaint increased, and called upon the whole nation to fight against the enemies of Judean liberty, as nothing, they said, was so intolerable as servitude which had been rendered doubly bitter by even the insult of innocence. Some of the chief men in Jerusalem thereupon vainly sought to prevent matters coming to the worst by promising their earnest efforts with the governor on behalf of the punishment of the guilty. The passions of many in Jerusalem had already been too violently aroused; the determination to obtain satisfaction by arms in open war had been formed, and at the same time to accept the help of two notorious banditti captains of that time, who, with their hordes, made inroads from the south-east into Samaritan territory by way of the district of Acrabatene,³ and laid several villages waste. As Cumanus had previously accepted bribes from the Samaritans, Felix encouraged the Judeans the more in return for similar payments to himself, and was gratified even with the advantages which they had thus obtained. Cumanus, on the contrary, marched against the Judeans from Cæsarea, not merely with a squadron of Roman cavalry⁴ and four companies of infantry this time, but also with the militia, killed many, and took others prisoners as rebels. Once more many of the most prudent and honoured of the Judeans gave themselves the utmost pains to tranquillise their people by means of the most touching representations and even by strong entreaties: and

¹ It still exists under the slightly altered name of G'inîn.

² In his *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 2 sq., Josephus speaks always of one slain only, but *Ant.* xx. 6. 1, of several; and, undoubtedly, when the matter was subsequently complained of, the Judeans adduced many cases similar to this one.

³ With regard to this name, see vol. v. p. 313. The two captains were Eleazer, the son of a notorious banditti-captain Dineus, and Alexander. These details,

according to the more detailed accounts in *Bell. Jud.*, as well as the short enigmatical words of Tacitus, when properly understood. The memory of the first is preserved even in *M. סוטה* ix. 9; the account there appears to be taken from an ancient and good source; but it is unfortunately too brief, and the language is not very clear.

⁴ As to the Sebastians mentioned in this instance, see *ante*, p. 185.

they succeeded in the case of most; but a civil war had really been enkindled, armed bands went forth against armed bands, and Roman soldiers also fell in conflict with them, whilst Felix and Cumanus rivalled each other in defence of their respective clients and in return for repeated bribes.

When the Roman proconsul of Syria, Ummidius Quadratus, heard of all this, he not only advanced nearer the scene of such atrocities, and perceived the necessity of mediating, but he also sent to the Emperor for permission to deal judicially with Cumanus and Felix; for though he could only send them before the imperial tribunal, he could still prepare the way for sentence to be passed upon them. When the whole matter is reviewed, it is evident that the Judeans and the Samaritans, as well as Cumanus and Felix, as the case then stood, were all equally in fault, though, not without appearance of justice, the charge of having been the cause of the greater atrocities could be transferred to the Samaritans and Cumanus. With this view a Judean deputation, with the high-priest Jonathan, son of Ananias and the captain of the temple-guard,¹ Ananus, at its head, went to meet Quadratus at Tyre; but he only promised to go into Judea soon to inquire into the matter. Instead of doing so, however, he went first to Samaria, where Felix may have been all along staying, and came to the conviction there that in the first instance the fault rested with the Samaritans, but he could not find the first agents, and accordingly merely crucified the Judeans who had been taken prisoners by Cumanus as rebels. He then went into Judea also, but in order to have greater freedom of action, chose not Jerusalem, but Lydda, north-west of it, as the locality of his tribunal, and was compelled, as no Judean appeared as an accuser of Judeans, to learn there from Samaritans only that a Judean elder, named Dortus, had publicly, with four others, instigated to revolt; who were executed accordingly. These rigorous measures at once restored tranquillity everywhere in the country, although a grumbling discontent remained concealed beneath the outward quiet, and very soon openly broke out. But for the time the Syrian proconsul had to prepare for the Emperor the further report upon these rebellions; he accordingly sent those two Judean representatives of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem bound (in case they should have given false witness against Cumanus for instance) to Rome with Cumanus and his military tribune,

¹ *στρατηγός*, as above, p. 151; Jos. *Ant.* xx. 6. 2, we have for brevity's sake merely Ananias, instead of Jonathan, son of Ananias, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 5, *Ant.* xx. 8. 5;

but he had not been before, nor was he ever afterwards, high-priest in the official sense, as far as we can judge from Josephus (comp. *ante*, p. 392).

Celer, as well as the Samaritan elders; and not until after this had been done did he go to Jerusalem to the feast, where he found the people, however, quite quiet. But against Felix, the brother of the powerful Pallas, he had not made any accusation, but allowed him, on the contrary, to go to Rome as accuser and witness against Cumanus and the Samaritans; and, greatly as the latter endeavoured to get the victory at the court of the Emperor, they met, in addition to Felix, whose scale was just then rising, a powerful opponent from another quarter.

For soon after the appointment of Cumanus the Herod above mentioned¹ died; whereupon Claudius invested the younger Agrippa² with his little kingdom of Chalcis and the other offices which, as we have seen,³ he had shortly before received. This Agrippa was entirely educated at Rome, a cautious and, on the whole, well-meaning man, so that at the beginning he did not change the high-priest so frequently as his predecessor. As he was just then in Rome, he interested himself actively on behalf of the cause of the Judeans with the Empress Agrippina. Claudius accordingly decided that the three representatives of the Samaritans must suffer capital punishment as false witnesses, that Cumanus should be exiled, and his military tribune, Celer (probably because he had led the Samaritan militia against Jerusalem), taken back to Jerusalem, to be publicly dragged through the city and put to death.⁴ The Judeans were completely successful; and Felix, warmly recommended by the high-priest also to the Roman court, became governor in the year 52.⁵ Somewhat later in the year 53, Agrippa, undoubtedly in consequence of his persistent request, received, instead of the small kingdom of Chalcis, the somewhat larger one which the Tetrarch Philip had once possessed,⁶ together with the small neighbouring kingdom that had belonged to Lysanias, and which was then likewise without a ruler.⁷ His father also had at first received that north-

¹ *Ante*, p. 413.

² *Ante*, p. 273.

³ *Ante*, p. 413.

⁴ It is evident, judging from the character of his few words, *Ann.* xii. 54, that Tacitus had the proceedings of this important trial in a complete form before him, but that he abbreviated them so greatly that he does not even plainly state what the two crimes were for which Cumanus was finally condemned. We must, moreover, read *Ann.* xii. 54, comp. *Hist.* v. 9: *Sane præbuerant Judæi specimen motus orta seditione ob C. Cesaris effigiem in templo collocandam postquam cognita*

cæde ejus haud obtemperatum esset. Sed manebat metus ne quis Principum eadem imperitaret. We see from this passage how far back the accusers of the Judeans went at that time to establish a charge against them.

⁵ As Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 8, enumerates, contrary to our expectation, all the countries over which he was placed, we have probably in that circumstance a reminiscence of the fact that he practically ruled over one of them at an earlier date.

⁶ *Vol.* vi. p. 72.

⁷ See *ante*, p. 258. In the *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12. 8 it is described more fully than

east corner of the Holy Land alone from the Imperial favour,¹ and, like his father, he therefore made the city of *Cæsarea Philippi* his capital; although for a long time he liked to date his reign from the year 49, when he first became king.² His full name was *Marcus Agrippa*, as we learn from inscriptions.³ We perceive from many indications that the government of these territories had been conferred upon him and his two sisters conjointly; they also bore the title of queens,⁴ and, particularly Berenice, became subsequently very famous.

Felix, however, had now attained his object, and the heads of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem expected great things of him. Nor can it be denied that he remained far longer in his office than any other of these governors of the second series, in that respect to be compared with Pilate of the first series. But how greatly were they especially who had expected most of him destined to be deceived! His longer residence in the country, it is true, and his more intimate acquaintance with it might well have served to enable him to govern it better. Moreover, as the man who was usually called the husband of three queens,⁵ he had in his third marriage taken as his wife Drusilla, a daughter of King Agrippa I., and might thereby have had further special occasion to enter into closer relations with the nation. But though the daughters of the Judean royal family were usually by law given in marriage

in the *Ant.*, as 'the kingdom of Lysanias, and the past dominion of *Varus*;' we know nothing otherwise of the latter and his rule (as he is not the same *Varus* who is mentioned *ante*, p. 328), but he was probably a brother of Lysanias, who ruled over the northernmost Trachonitis bordering on Abila, for this country is referred to as distinct, *Ant.* xx. 7. 1, only we must then understand that it refers to the northernmost part of Trachonitis only.

¹ See *ante*, p. 240.

² The remarks of Eckhel, *Doctr.* iii. pp. 493 sq., on the coins of this king, particularly with regard to their dates, are very doubtful. On one of his coins the year 11 is made equivalent to the year 6: this is the year 60 A.D., the 11th of his reign, and 6th of Nero's (but not of his own second reign, as Cavedoni, *Bibl. Numism.* ii. 38, ed. Wehrhof supposes), just as Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4, fixes the beginning of the great war by the 12th year of Nero and the 17th of Agrippa. But after Agrippa had received additional dominions from Nero, he calculated the years of his reign afresh from the year 60 A.D. as the first. Generally his coins

can be easily distinguished from those of his father. Coins of the governors, which begin again with the year 44, see in de Sauley's *Numism. Jud.* pp. 149 sq. [Madden (2nd ed. p. 146) gives two coins on which the year 11 is made equivalent to year 6. Of coins of the governors of the years 44-52 Madden, *ibid.* p. 181, says none have been discovered. He gives one of the year 53 and one of 59.]

³ As the above coin in Eckhel, p. 494, and the inscription in the *Corp. Inscriptt. Græc.* iii. p. 244, show; still, the name is wanting on most of the coins.

⁴ Josephus nowhere gives any explanatory account of this relation, but often presupposes it; we cannot therefore very well make the conjecture that he was compelled to resign the government of Chalcis to his sisters. An inscription, with Berenice's name, see in Franz, *Elementa Epigr. Gr.* p. 254.

⁵ Suet. *Claud.* cap. xxviii. His first wife, likewise named Drusilla, was a grandchild of Anthony and Cleopatra, and previously wife of a king Juba, Tac. *Hist.* v. 9, Suet. *Calig.* xxvi. Who the second wife was is not known.

only to those princes and potentates who had adopted the Judean religion, Felix managed, as a powerful Roman, to remain a heathen. This beautiful Drusilla had, in the first instance, been betrothed by her father to a young prince Epiphanes, son of Antiochus, king of Comagene,¹ who had also promised to submit to circumcision, but from fear of the rite did not complete the marriage; she was then given by her brother to Aziz, the petty king of Emesa;² but when Felix had seen her, he sent to her a Cypriote Judean, named Simon, of notoriety in those days as a magician, who was so successful as a panderer that she deserted her husband and gave herself to the Roman freedman, and bore him a son Agrippa. We shall soon see an example of her influence over her husband;³ but Josephus seeks in vain to excuse this marriage.—When Nero soon afterwards, in the year 54, became emperor, he granted Armenia Minor to Aristobulus, the son of the deceased Herod, king of Chalcis, and gave to the younger Agrippa further the cities of Tiberias and Tarichæa, on the Lake of Galilee, as well as Julias in Peræa with its territory,⁴ undoubtedly because Agrippa claimed them as a kind of family possession on account of their having been built and assisted by the Herods with special pains.⁵

But in spite of all this everything grew worse in the country from year to year. We shall see below, in a flagrant example,⁶ how the governor had an open ear for nothing but bribes. He sought, it is true, vigorously to put down the continued disturbances of the discontented who had become robbers and of the robbers by profession; he at last also caught the above-named Eleazer,⁷ and sent him bound to Rome like a distinguished enemy taken prisoner in war. But when the same high-priest Jonathan, who had assisted so much in his elevation, and who, on that account, considered he was entitled to admonish him from time to time, had become troublesome to him, he did not hesitate in the least to alienate from him his most faithful friend Dora, and, indeed, by bribery, to make that friend the instrument of his own mortal hatred against Jonathan; in collusion with the governor, Dora admitted a great number of clandestinely armed robbers into the city, as if they had been

¹ *Ante*, p. 266.

² *Ante*, p. 266.

³ *Infra*, p. 439.

⁴ When *Jos., Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 2, adds further Abila, and thus enumerates expressly four cities, that arises probably from some confusion with the Abila which Agrippa previously possessed, for the

correct statement is found *Ant.* xx. 8. 4. Nero's donation was in the year 60 A.D. according to the coins referred to *ante*, p. 421.

⁵ See vol. vi. p. 72.

⁶ *Infra*, p. 439.

⁷ *Ante*, p. 418.

religious pilgrims to the feast, and they pretended to have business with Jonathan, and killed him; and as they were not to be punished, they fell without scruple upon other people—even in the Temple itself—and filled the city with blood. Felix seems at the same time to have sent also some of the principal Temple priests to Rome as rebels, because they somewhat boldly opposed him, and they still remained as prisoners there after his fall.¹—But amongst the magicians and false prophets who, to the disturbance of the people, began, in rivalry with the robbers, to play a more dangerous part, and whom Felix endeavoured rigorously to put down, there was an Egyptian Judean who especially distinguished himself. Like the Theudas above described,² he sought to prove, by a perverse interpretation of the Bible, that the walls of Jerusalem, as having become subject to the heathen, must fall down in some such way as those of Jericho, under Joshua, had once done, and that only when that had been accomplished would the victory over the world accrue to those who should in that way enter the city. He had already collected many people from the populace on the Mount of Olives, in his advance from the eastern desert, when Felix fell upon him with a large body of horse and cavalry, killing 400, and taking 200 prisoners; the Egyptian himself made his escape, and was, as we shall see,³ long afterwards much sought after. The robbers, however, also obtained large accessions to their ranks by such fugitives; and the necessity of the expulsion of the Romans was spoken of more and more openly, and the dwellings of those who opposed such an idea were plundered.

In these circumstances, a term was set to the rule of Felix at last, by an occasion with regard to which he himself was not to blame, though it proved the fittest punishment for his very earliest sins. In Cæsarea, which had then become so populous and luxurious as the residence of the governors, there always dwelt, from the time that Herod had converted Strato's Tower into a large city,⁴ a large number of Judeans mixed with the heathen, and during the last years they had grown in numbers and taken a prominent position, particularly by their great wealth. The contentions which were customary elsewhere were, accordingly, least of all absent in Cæsarea. The heathen claimed the precedence in civil matters, because, as Strato's Tower, the place had been purely heathen; and they pointed proudly to the fact that most of the Roman soldiers quartered

¹ Jos. *Vita*, cap. iii. see below.

² *Ante*, p. 414.

³ *Infra*, p. 434.

⁴ See vol. v. p. 430.

there had been enlisted in Cæsarea itself and in the Samaritan Sebaste,¹ whilst the Judeans refused to perform military service. The Judeans, on the other hand, boasted of their Herod as the second founder of the city, and of its greater wealth; and the youngest amongst them were the most hot-headed. And the first flames of this mutual mortal hostility had hardly been checked by the vigorous interference of the Roman advisers of the governor that were resident there, when provocations, outrages, bodily injuries, and murders, commenced in a more violent form than before; but this time the Judeans remained masters of the field. Thereupon, Felix went himself into the market-place, and sharply commanded the Judeans to lay down their arms; on their refusal to do so, he let loose the soldiers upon them, and, after the slaughter, allowed the soldiers to plunder some of the richest houses. It was with difficulty that the most peaceful members of the Judean community succeeded in obtaining from him a cessation of hostilities; and, as by a righteous turn of events, the man who had once come into office by favouring the Judeans against the Samaritans, was now compelled to lead Samaritan soldiers against them.

Inasmuch as these most dangerous disturbances at Cæsarea were necessarily quickly heard of at Rome, and created most attention there, it is intelligible that Nero should now, in the year 61, suddenly send a new governor in the person of *Porcius Festus*, and summon Felix to Rome. Some of the principal Judeans, it is true, went from Cæsarea to Rome at the same time to publicly accuse Felix there, and made every possible effort to secure success. But the influence of his brother Pallas was still in the ascendant at Nero's court; and, at the special instigation of two heathen elders from Cæsarea, Burrus, who, as we shall see,² had the special conduct of the affairs of the East, succeeded in inducing Nero to declare Cæsarea a Hellenic, or heathen, city; the civil equality, or *isopoliteia*, in the affairs of this important city being thereby expressly withdrawn from the Judeans. The course of this history will soon show what a bitter hostility this imperial decision stirred up amongst the Judeans.

It is not surprising, under such circumstances, that when the new governor, Festus, arrived in the country, the occupation of predatory gangs was just in its most flourishing condition; and though large numbers might take to the calling of robbers purely from dissolute motives, the ultimate cause of its extensive prevalence and its constant recurrence was really to

¹ Comp. the note *ante*, p. 185.

² *Infra*, p. 445.

be found in the profound discontent with the Roman rule.¹ This national epidemic raged a long time in very various forms, and it dates back, in its germs, as far as the earliest period of the Roman supremacy; but it was just before the years under review that it became very much aggravated. For a special kind of diabolical art had supervened, imported from Rome and Italy; and scarcely had the great national evil derived from the East—the epidemic of demons—been checked in its worst ravages by the miraculous cures of Christ and his followers, when this still worse mania, which was not likely to be extirpated under the most serious exertions of the Government, was introduced from the extreme West. In Rome and Italy, which had, from of old, been the native country of such desperate mortal struggles of the vanquished against the powerful victors, the art of the assassins, or *sicarii*, had long been brought to greatest perfection. With the intimate intercourse between both countries which was then established, this art was imported, with its Roman name, into Palestine, and became there, in the hands of those despairing patriots and criminals, the worst of all desperate weapons against the Roman rule and all its friends. The adepts from the school of this cold-blooded mania carried a short sword concealed under their garments, in open day even, and in the midst of crowds, attacked therewith their victims, but then suddenly pretended to be themselves in the highest degree horrified at such atrocities, and so often escaped all detection. It was subsequently always said that the high-priest Jonathan, above mentioned,² was the first man of distinction who thus fell; but the general terror of the *sicarii* soon became so great that, at a distance, people carefully put themselves on their guard against every imagined enemy, while at the same time they feared to trust their nearest friend; and in spite of all their precautions, the assassinations increased.³ These men exhibited their skill especially at the annual Temple-feasts; but they also attacked whole villages, in conjunction with other robbers, and laid the villages waste with fire and sword. The new governor, however, who was also,

¹ As in our own time (1858), such countries as Italy and Hungary, and more recently Ireland likewise, were seen to be suffering from the same pest.—The close connection between this prevalence of banditti and the tendencies of the Zealots may be recognised in the fact that according to Hippol. *Philosophumena*, ix. 26, one branch of the Essenes even were called *Sicarii*. And nothing is a greater proof of the long and deep influence of their predatory and revolutionary movement,

which was hallowed by religion, than that the Latin word even סִיכָרָא found a lasting place in the New-Hebrew vocabulary, and (as the Talmud shows) the schools of law were obliged seriously to occupy themselves with the difficulties which the epidemic created.

² *Ante*, p. 419.

³ *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 3, *Ant.* xx. 8. 5, 10; 9. 2, 3, comp. with *Bell. Jul.* iv. 7. 2; vii. 7. 9; viii. 10. 1; 11. 1.

soon after his arrival in the country, to have the fate of the Apostle Paul placed in his hands, took vigorous measures for the eradication of this already deeply-rooted evil. Festus had, moreover to contend against a new magician and prophet, who promised the people—imitating, like others, Moses and Christ, after a new fashion—a great immediate deliverance, and the cessation of all sufferings, if they would follow him into the desert.¹ The governor sent Roman soldiers—cavalry and infantry—against the crowds that had been misled by such delusive arts, and extirpated, by sanguinary means, this mania of quite a different kind. But he died after a short time, in the year 64, supplying the rare example of a Roman governor who died during the occupancy of his office.

The governor then appointed by Nero—*Albinus*—who, like Tiberius Alexander,² came from Alexandria to the country, found, like his predecessor, on his first entrance upon his office, the effects of a Christian-Judean contention awaiting his interference—a contention which was much more serious than that which Festus had to deal with. But the fortunes of Christianity are, during the last years of this period, involved so closely, in the world generally, with those of Judeanism, and through Judeanism with the Roman empire itself, that we must consider this relation more closely, and its great importance. For this purpose, we resume the history of Christianity at the point where we left it³ on the last visit of the Apostle Paul to Jerusalem. It is true the sources of our knowledge of this history become extremely scanty, disconnected, and obscure at this very point, particularly when the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles quite ceases, and its place is not supplied by any similar outline. Still, if we glean with proper understanding all the other scattered fragments of this history, and carefully put them together, we cannot remain in uncertainty, at all events, as to the chief points.

2. *The last events of Paul's life.*

The events previous to his arrival in Rome.

While all the labours of Paul as an Apostle, as above described, exhibit, notwithstanding the many vicissitudes of time and circumstances, the most wonderful consistency and the most

¹ Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8. 10: it is strange that Josephus does not give his name; still the whole account is hardly one that differs from the similar narratives above

given (pp. 414, 423) simply by legendary accretions.

² *Ante*, p. 415.

³ *Ante*, p. 401.

direct advance, as the outcome of one fundamental thought, the firmness and divine courage with which, in the face of all unfavourable signs, he carried out his last return to Jerusalem, and there once more appeared in the midst of the parent church to render an account of his work generally, are what we must, if possible, still more admire. His labours in the heathen countries had, at last, reached a height which might have made any other man giddy in that age of universal suspense and vast expectation. How many churches had he alone founded and then further established? and if 'the care of all the churches,'¹ greatly weighed upon him, their progress and the love which was shown to him by them and by so many of the noblest individuals cheered and encouraged him. He had then been acknowledged generally by those who knew him, or had merely heard of him, as the great Apostle of the heathen, and the wonderful utterances which he had committed to the fly-leaves of his epistles, could only increase and perpetuate his fame the more widely they were made known. By a visit to Rome and the countries of the West, he was on the direct route for attaining the utmost goal of apostolic labours which the age could comprehend, and which could present itself to the gaze of even the most enthusiastic athletes as the reward of the highest hope of any of them; and he was still, all along, devoutly longing to attain that goal. But, notwithstanding, he turned his steps once more towards Jerusalem, where mortal peril, as he clearly enough foresaw and all human considerations foretold, awaited him at every step. For just because he sought not himself and his temporal weal, but the progress of the work of Christ alone, regarding himself only as an individual member of the great Christian body, he always perceived likewise quite clearly the necessity of remaining in living connection with the parent church, as at that time the centre of the whole Church, and of not anticipating, by his self-willed action, the advance of the divine development. By the mere collection and transmission of charitable assistance, he could not remain in adequate connection with that church; he felt the necessity of presenting himself, with his whole soul and body, before it; of coming again to an understanding with it as regards matters which had, in the meantime, become doubtful; and he might not shun even his most declared opponents in it. And this he then felt the more in proportion as other matter for serious misunderstandings had accumulated during the last years.

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 28, and the subsequent account.

But if he presented himself before the parent church, he was obliged to acknowledge its characteristic nature as for that time not without its justification. As a fact, two forms of Christian life had then been originated by the labours of no one else so much as by his own. The parent church in all its usages had remained in close connection with the ancient Temple, and its scrupulous care in this respect had, indeed, from many causes increased during the last few years; the character of all the Christian churches in Palestine and wherever else Judeans predominated was undoubtedly similar. In heathen countries, on the other hand, Paul had founded churches composed for the most part of Heathen Christians, and in these only that portion of the Mosaic Law was retained which appeared necessary for Christians also; and Paul had rigorously rejected all further requirements. This duality could not well be permanently perpetuated, particularly inasmuch as the Jewish Christians living in heathen countries occupied an uncertain position between both, and individuals belonging to them often did not know whether they were to regard themselves as Heathen Christians or not. But for the moment the two classes of Christian churches existed, and it was only Christ, whom all alike acknowledged as the Lord, who kept them together. The uncertain position of the numerous Jewish Christians in heathen countries had long given rise to all kinds of serious doubts. The unconverted Judeans feared that they would become entirely Heathen Christians, and were on that account also increasingly hostile to Christianity. But the Jewish Christians in Palestine, of whom so many continued to regard the Heathen Christians as less fully authorised, likewise considered that their influence was threatened by them, or were unwilling, so far as they still adhered sincerely to the Mosaic Law, to tolerate the idea that native Judeans should be put on an equality with the heathen. Moreover, during the last ten or twenty years respect for the Mosaic Law had, from various causes, greatly increased in the case of both converted and unconverted Judeans. Most members of the parent church accordingly, increased by so many other Jewish Christians on feast days, and also those amongst them who were in other respects not opposed to Paul, brought at last the charge against him, that he taught the Jewish Christians that lived amongst the heathen to despise the Law. Previously the feeling against him in Jerusalem was, as we have seen,¹ still worse. On this occasion that charge at least was made against him. But in fact he had

¹ *Ante*, p. 382.

only made resistance when the attempt was made to impose the Law as a yoke upon Heathen Christians, and lived with them without this yoke, that they might not be repelled from fellowship with Christ. Whenever he was amongst Judeans or Jewish Christians he had observed the Law, and required only the true Christian spirit to keep it.¹ He taught everywhere that the Law could not have for Christians the validity of a precept to be slavishly followed; that the practice of it could not justify men without the Christian spirit, and that when that spirit existed the heathen could become complete Christians without the Law. But he despised no one who kept the Law with a Christian spirit, and he kept it himself as far as it did not damage his Christian activity. And when he then presented himself to the parent church, he must have made up his mind to observe the Law with the church as far as it observed it, supposing that no demands were made of him that should appear absolutely injurious for the Heathen Christians.

Moreover, for the sake of the unconverted Judeans he might not then scorn either the journey to Jerusalem or participation in its Temple-services. For it is obvious that the heads of the Hagiocracy had then formed a very definite idea of him, and of all who like him converted the heathen to Christianity, and had given accordingly a more rigid form to their peculiar conception of the relation of the true religion to heathenism. It was the time when the sacred Law grew in esteem, more or less intelligent, amongst heathens everywhere in the Roman empire, so that even the most ordinary man in the Holy Land acted constantly on the supposition that the whole world envied the Judeans their Law.² Christian missionaries like Paul contributed much to the more rapid and earnest spread of this esteem, inasmuch as they also always made the Old Testament the basis of their preaching; but the heads of the Hagiocracy had an entirely different object in view from that of these new missionaries. Their wish was no other than that all the heathen might have the deepest reverence for the Law, with its interpreters and guardians; that they might, as partial or full proselytes,³ send their marks of homage and presents to Jerusalem, and thus make themselves in a sense vassals of the kingdom of the true

¹ The principle of his apostolic labours which Paul lays down so admirably (1 Cor. ix. 19-23) is only the consequence of his view of the significance of Christ for all men, without exception, and especially for all the various divisions of men of his age, 1 Cor. vii. 17-20, Gal. iii. 28, v. 6, vi. 15, Col. iii. 11.

² *Jos. Bell. Jud.* vii. 1. 7, with the whole speech of a Judean given there, in which Josephus represents for once the inmost thoughts of this class of men. *Comp. ante*, 408. [In the reference *Bell. Jud.* vii. 1. 7 there is an error: v. 9. 3, 4; vi. 2. 1, there is relevant matter.]

³ See *ante*, pp. 310 seq.

religion; at the same time they proposed to retain in their own hands dominion over the heathen, were unwilling to entertain the idea of the heathen proselytes being placed on an equality with the Judeans, or of the immense alterations which might result therefrom, and the dream of the constantly increasing supremacy of the Judeans remained most attractive to them. Isolated texts and representations of the Old Testament, the general tendency of the past development of Judeanism, and their own personal selfishness and ambition, combined to place that object before their eyes as the highest to be attained; and in proportion as everything was now tending forcibly to a new reconstruction, in consequence of the growing power of the Christian movement, they grew more zealous to attain their object soon, an endeavour which seemed likewise to be favoured by the general political situation of the world at that time. We shall shortly see whither the aims of this party finally led the party itself and all its adherents. At the time under review it was in a flourishing condition, and it is easy to see therefore what would be the view which the leaders of the Hagiocracy took of the Apostle Paul. They were obliged to admit that the Christian missionaries in the end likewise sought nothing else than the fulfilling of the Old Testament prophecies of the consummation of the Kingdom of God, but they wholly disapproved of the special nature of their endeavour, supposed that they simply created schism and mischief, and expressed their bitter disapproval most pointedly in the declaration, that 'they did evil that good might come.'¹ Long before this they had spoken thus, unreservedly enough, in Paul's hearing; and as the populace of Jerusalem was still living, particularly in the absence of a royal court, almost entirely from the splendour of the Temple and the brisk intercourse of this centre of the true religion with the entire heathen world, they could not find it difficult to constantly inspire it afresh with zeal for their aims, which were so flattering to the ambition of Judeans.

But the less could Paul then on his part, therefore, fear possible contact with the heads of the Hagiocracy in their own peculiar and venerated capital. It is true, Christianity and Judeanism had already, in consequence especially of his own labours, become to him widely distinct, and the one sad result of all the efforts of many years was, in his case also, the growing foreboding that the conversion of all the Judeans could, according to the hidden purpose of God, take place only at a

¹ Rom. iii. 8, according to the proper meaning of this whole passage.

distant period.¹ Nevertheless, he was still always conscious of being a Judean, in that immortal sense which the word, and the recollection of the significance of Israel for the general development of the true religion until it became Christianity,² had necessarily borne for centuries. He was proud to be a member of this nation of unique character, though filled with the greater sorrow at the obduracy of his contemporary compatriots; and he perceived also, in the hereditary sacred usages of this nation, the deeper meaning which they might have for true religion generally. Neither might he despair of their conversion, which might perhaps soon take place even, in larger numbers, and was bound, for himself at least, to do everything to show them that the most faithful Judean could likewise be the best Christian. In the capital of Judeanism also, and indeed in the actual participation in its sacred institutions, it was least of all allowable for him to shun the contention with regard to the advantage of converted or unconverted Judeanism, if that contention should be necessary. The hostility of the unconverted Judeans had then accumulated against him in an increasingly bitter and deadly form. He had evaded their plots whenever it was possible, but he could not allow their charge that he was not a true Judean any more; and he felt, therefore, the overpowering call to go to that spot where alone such a contention could be most properly decided; and if he should be obliged 'to die for the name of the Lord Jesus,' he was prepared for that, as he had said on the morning of the last day of the journey.³

The firm resolution and lofty courage with which he carried out this journey and then acted in Jerusalem, may, therefore, be compared with the last journey of Christ himself to Jerusalem.⁴ The spirit of Him whom he had once bitterly hated, had gradually made him more and more like Himself, had raised him in all his determinations and deeds more and more irresistibly to His height and His love, had guided his steps, different as they were, more and more to His goal, and had transformed him into a servant of His work than whom none could be more suitable for that time. And the issue of this last journey

¹ Rom. ix.-xi.

² See vol. v. p. 95.

³ Acts xxi. 13, 14. It is only needful to consider clearly what would have happened if Paul had, by his own choice, cut the double tie with Jerusalem which still continued to bind him, and if he had thereby given to all his opponents a handle against him, and then all mis-

understanding of his conduct will in this matter also cease. It seems to be weakness and inconsistent that he now goes up to Jerusalem, and even into the Temple, but in reality it is one of his greatest actions; just as it was in the similar case of Christ, vol. vi. pp. 376 sq.

⁴ See vol. vi. pp. 381 sq.

to Jerusalem of the Apostle is likewise similar to that of Christ : but it is so much more protracted, partly because the relations of Christianity had now already become much more complicated than they were when He represented them alone in His own person, and partly as if for the purpose of removing from the former enemy of Christ the last defects of his imperfect earthly existence, and of purifying him so that he might have that perfect purity which made him the greatest Christian and Apostle of his time.

It could not be expected but that Paul should generally be well received by the parent church. A great fame had then gathered around his name ; an honourable escort, consisting mainly of delegates of the churches which he had founded, accompanied him, and he conveyed a large number of charitable gifts in the name of many churches. The next day he, together with his attendants, was present in the house of James, the first elder, at a sitting of the elders which had been summoned on his account, and he there gave a report of the results of his last missionary journey. The report was so well received that all broke out in loud thanks to God who had accomplished such great things by him ; but at the same time they remarked to him, that complaints had been laid against him to the parent church by thousands of converted Judeans, and that they could not be indifferent to those complaints. He was advised, therefore, to demonstrate by a public sign, that he by no means desired to have the Law abrogated for Jewish Christians ; though the Heathen Christians of course could not be bound by it in the same way.¹ Accidentally there were then at Jerusalem four poor Jewish Christians, who were from former times under a Nazirite vow,² and were waiting for a somewhat richer devout man who would give the cost of their necessary offerings. Such a friend was obliged at the same time to present offerings for himself likewise, after the needful preparations ; and the entire ceremony, until the priest declared the complete fulfilment of

¹ It is easy to perceive that Luke, Acts xxi. 18-25, reproduces in a very abbreviated form only, the important transactions of this sitting ; he uses most brevity, however, ver. 25, in the case of the question of the Heathen Christians, simply referring back to the previous transactions, ch. xv. As a fact, Paul observed the exceptions in the matter of flesh offered to idols, blood, and things strangled, when weaker consciences took offence at the greater freedom which he adhered to as a principle, as appears

from 1 Cor. viii. 1-xi. 1, Rom. xiv. 1 sq. If, therefore, the three or four propositions regarding the Heathen Christians were on this occasion placed before him, he was able afresh to approve of them, though he maintained, in conjunction with them, the principle of Christian liberty and at the same time insisted on the difference between Christians of weaker and stronger consciences. But Luke omits to mention this, as a matter that had already become of no importance for his age.

² See *Antiquities*, pp. 84-88.

the vows, lasted, according to an ancient custom, a week.¹ Paul was the more ready to accept this proposal, as he had in any case determined to present an offering in the Temple.² He entered the Temple accordingly, and announced to the priest that he desired, by participation in the needful offerings, the official discharge of the four men from their vows after the expiration of a week. By that act the complaint against him in the parent church had been defeated, the eldership of the church requiring from him no further pledge. The Pharisaic party who had previously persecuted him so much were, it is true, undoubtedly not all satisfied with the proof given; and the deeper points of dispute with the Christian Church of those days were not thereby settled. It was, however, the future only that could bring the final solution of those points; and in the end Paul's opponents amongst the Christians were really bound by the one name of Christ common to them all. Having then obtained the sanction and blessing of the parent church, Paul might have begun his apostolic work afresh in the heathen world in spite of all dissentients, and have continued it to the end he had himself proposed. He had neither time nor inclination to stay longer in Jerusalem; and during the next few days, he purposely observed the greater retirement in order that he might not provoke the Judeans.³

In those circumstances, before that week was passed, the event occurred which decided the course of the Apostle's outward history, and that event was brought about by those who had certainly more cause than short-sighted Christians to be indignant with him, namely, the unconverted Judeans. Judeans of that class from Ephesus and the neighbourhood, who had often seen him there, recognised him in the Temple, and could scarcely believe their eyes, that the man whom they regarded as one of the worst despisers of the Temple should seek to distinguish himself in it. They, therefore, stirred up the people against him; and they charged him also with having brought even his heathen friend Trophimus⁴ into the inner sanctuary, whilst they really had seen Trophimus in the city only. The people accordingly then dragged him from the inner sanctuary, the doors of which were at once closed behind him; and he would have been beaten to death in the Court of the

¹ It is true we know only from the incidental remark Acts xxi. 26, 27, that the entire ceremony in the Temple in such cases lasted a week; but the thing itself is thoroughly credible as Luke relates it.

² Acts xxiv. 17.

³ Acts xxiv. 12, 13, 18. All that follows may be told simply after Acts xxi-xxviii.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 397.

Gentiles,¹ unless the captain, Claudius Lysias, had come up, on hearing the noise, with the Roman Temple-guard. He supposed that the populace had captured a strolling magician, who was at that time notorious,² and ordered him to be put in chains and led away to the garrison for further examination. As this was being done Paul found an opportunity, on the raised steps of the Temple, where he was rather carried than led by the soldiers on account of the violence of the crowd, to make himself better known to the captain; and in consequence the latter allowed him to speak to the people from the Temple steps. The silence of the crowd deepened when he began to speak to them fluently in their own language; and he spoke at great length, beginning with the events of his own life, as if everyone that knew accurately the main facts of his history must acquit him. But scarcely had he come to the point in his narrative where his journeys amongst the heathen began, when this his confession that he was about to go amongst the heathen seemed to confirm the accusation against him. The rage of the crowd was thereby so terribly aroused again, and Paul was so evidently threatened with immediate stoning, that the captain ordered him to be taken quickly into the garrison at the Castle. He was then just on the point of being beaten with rods, inasmuch as the concealment of a serious crime was presupposed, when his declaration that he was a Roman citizen saved him from that painful humiliation. And as soon as the captain perceived that the real point at issue was contentions connected with the Judean religion, he sent Paul the next morning unbound to the Sanhedrin, which had been summoned by him for this case, that the Apostle might defend himself before it.

He stood now therefore before the Sanhedrin, almost as his Master himself, or as Stephen and other apostles, had once done. But, as a highly educated Pharisee from the learned schools, who could vie with any Pharisee in the matter of scholarship and strictness of life, he really stood before this tribunal more on an equality with his judges, so far as they proposed to examine and pass judgment upon him with regard to his teaching simply. As a fact he accordingly began—directing a steady glance at his judges—to speak as an equal to equals, with the same cordiality and sincerity which he was accustomed to show to Christians. But scarcely had he, in this tone and manner, said that he believed he had always conducted himself as a good citizen in the Kingdom of God,

¹ See vol. v. p. 173.

² *Ante*, p. 423.

when the high-priest Ananias¹ ordered him to be smitten on the mouth. To no purpose, therefore, had he begun thus calmly, in vain had he sought to lead his discourse up to the great matter itself, and he was not to be permitted even so much as to speak freely. In the first moment of righteous but too violent indignation at this treatment, he suffered to escape him a few pungent words against the man who had given the order, not considering that it might be the high-priest himself; for that dignitary did not always appear so that he could at once be recognised by his costume, nor did he always preside in judicial transactions. The words themselves were really only too true, the Apostle having been in that moment only too justly struck with the feeling of the hypocritical hollowness that everywhere prevailed in the priesthood—but they were too incautious. When he had been made aware of his mistake, he excused himself at once, remarking that he did not know that it was the high-priest, whom he undoubtedly ought not, according to the command of the Law,² to have spoken against. Inasmuch as he could not proceed as he had begun, and probably felt that a calm defence such as he had been prepared for was impossible, he turned his discourse at once to the great matter in such a way that, though it was for the moment deprived of its specially Christian character, it nevertheless immediately concerned at least one portion of that judicial meeting. In Christianity, as we have seen,³ everything finally depends on the living power of the hope of immortality and the certainty of the resurrection—that is, upon the same reality which Phariseeism sought to recognise and hold fast, but was actually able to recognise only with immeasurably less power and clearness than it had then been supplied in Christianity. Still, it was precisely this search for spiritual realities that was the tie which had once led the Apostle from Phariseeism to Christianity, and which then constituted his sympathy with the Pharisees in opposition to the Sadducees, and which could also enable him to believe that really every Pharisee must become a Christian, if he would only follow out his own faith with reference to the historical Christ. If, therefore, there remained for him then nothing else than to utter the lamentation, that it was really only ‘the hope of Israel and the resurrec-

¹ The son of Nabeleus, who was then in office according to *Jos. Ant.* xx. 5. 2; 8. 8.

² That is, the passage *Ex.* xx. 28: nothing shows so strongly the stage which the development of the Hagiocracy had

then reached as the term *the high-priest of God*, *Acts* xxiii. 4: an expression of a nature much more presumptuous than occurs in earlier times than those before us.

³ *Ante*, p. 107.

tion from the dead' for which he was about to be condemned, a man who was by his origin a Pharisee, he thereby involuntarily touched the most sensitive point amongst his judges themselves, so that subsequently it might easily appear as if he had intentionally sought to create a division amongst them. For the Sadducees, who had always been, as most influential in the Sanhedrin, far more hostile to Christianity than the Pharisees, became then more violently indignant with him, while the Pharisees, who formed perhaps half the judges, were the more inclined to be lenient towards him. Indeed, the Scribes amongst the latter declared plainly that they could not find any fault in him, inasmuch as an enquiry must first be made regarding that which a spirit, or an angel, may have said to him on such mysteries. As the judges, therefore, instead of being unanimous with regard to the fundamental question which Paul had admirably placed before them, raised more and more clamour amongst themselves, the representative of the Roman Government (for a captain waited to hear the issue) saw that the matter could not be decided at all events that day, and took Paul back into the Castle, to ensure his safety. Although still a prisoner, the Apostle had won a decided victory over the Sanhedrin in the great cause itself: and a celestial vision gave him comfort at night; for it was made clear to his mind that he would bear witness for Christ in Rome, at the chief seat of the government of the world, as certainly as he had in Jerusalem boldly witnessed for him before the venerable Hagiocracy.

While the Roman commander at Jerusalem had naturally already concluded that he could do nothing else than send the man, who made so much commotion amongst this excessively excitable people, to the Roman governor, as the authority superior to the Sanhedrin, there came to his notice a fresh and frightful project on the part of the most bitter enemies of the Apostle to expedite his determination. Paul's most bitter enemies, with a few exceptions—for instance, the Sadducean high-priest—were not members of the Sanhedrin; they were much more, those Judeans from Asia, who, having been vastly deceived in the hope of a speedy extermination of the Apostle, combined with others most decidedly of their way of thinking, and agreed upon a diabolical undertaking of a kind not very uncommon in those days, when the *Fehme*¹ flourished amongst the Judeans of the Holy Land. Upwards of forty men took an oath not to take any nourishment until Paul had been removed by their hands, and called on the Sanhedrin, perhaps

¹ See *infra*.

by a threatening letter or some other means, at once to request the Roman commander to bring Paul the next day before their court again, and they would then fall upon the man, who had been devoted by their *Fehme*, on his way from the Castle. It is improbable that the Sanhedrin would have consented to the use of such means; but the report of a conspiracy of that kind spread rapidly, and Paul's sister's son¹ told it to Paul at the Castle, as he was not kept in rigid confinement. The Apostle made it known to the captain through this young man and a centurion; and the captain resolved to send Paul late the same evening under a strong guard to the governor at Cæsarea. It was considered that not less than two hundred Roman foot soldiers with seventy horsemen and two hundred spearmen,² were required to bring him over the frontier of ancient Judea to Antipatris;³ from that point the seventy horsemen alone conducted him, on the evening of the next day, to Cæsarea; he himself was conveyed on relays of beasts of burden. The governor Felix, after he had read the letter of conduct, asked him simply the preliminary question—from what province he was—and ordered him then to be confined, until his accusers should come, in the palace built by Herod,⁴ called thence the *Prætorium Herodis*, where the governor resided.

After the Roman governor had been appealed to as the supreme judge, the Sanhedrin, in consequence of its constant jealousy of him, felt itself placed in an entirely different position with regard to Paul, and the two parties quickly united with the view of preventing his possible acquittal by the Roman; it could, moreover, appear to the high-priest, in consequence of the well-known levity of Felix, as no difficult matter to procure from him an unfavourable sentence. In fact, in the minds of all the members of the Sanhedrin who were not then prepared openly to become Christians, the thought must get the upper hand of having in Paul the man who was at that time the most active, boldest, and ablest of all the Christian leaders, and in striking whom they could with one blow perhaps inflict a mortal wound on Christianity itself. The high-priest, therefore, after five days, having been instructed to do so by the Roman commander at Jerusalem, went down to Cæsarea, with delegates of the Sanhedrin and

¹ *Ante*, p. 278.

² δεξιολάβοι, Acts xxiii. 23 (from λαβή, *handle*, because they carried their sword fastened on their right side, and not, as was usual, on the left, on account of the spear which they had to use with their right hand) are most likely the same class

of soldiers whom Suet. *Claud.* cap. xxxv. calls *spiculatores cum lanceis* (σπεκουλατώρ Mark vi. 27, by an etymological confusion), as the Coptic version has *re'phlouchē* [militēs lancearii].

³ See vol. v. p. 435.

⁴ See vol. v. p. 436, note 2.

an orator Tertullus, who was undoubtedly regarded in Jerusalem as the best Latin speaker and advocate before Roman courts. In a formal sitting of the judicial court this Tertullus began then, under servile flatteries of the governor, to accuse Paul of being a great disturber of the peace, and in other respects a bad man; and the Judeans who were present as the proper accusers proceeded in the same way. Paul replied with perfect self-possession, that his case could undoubtedly be the more easily decided by the governor, who had been so many years administering the affairs of the country, inasmuch as he himself had only arrived twelve days before in Jerusalem.¹ He went on to state that he had not caused the slightest disturbance, that he served no other God than the God of his country, and that he believed in the resurrection of the dead, as all his fellow-religionists must do; that only was the nature of his life and teaching. He then contended that, as he had come to Jerusalem for a wholly harmless purpose, either the Judeans from Asia, whom he did not see present, and who were his proper accusers, ought to say in what he had offended, or he would be condemned on that occasion simply for his belief in the resurrection of the dead, which he had maintained before the Sanhedrin.² This no less skilful than true defence embarrassed the governor: he was astute enough to perceive that a condemnation was impossible, particularly as no charge of a violation of Roman law had been made, while yet he wished not to decide at once in favour of the one man as against the Sanhedrin. He deferred, therefore, his decision, alleging that he would inform himself more fully with regard to Christianity, and himself hear what the commander at Jerusalem had to say.³ Paul was then not put in strict confinement, and could, at all events, be served by his friends quite freely in his prison.

The Sanhedrin had thereby, it must be admitted, obtained all that it could very well desire for the moment against Paul;

¹ These twelve days, Acts xxiv. 11, are undoubtedly based on a reliable reminiscence, but must now be calculated by us according to the references to the several days, xxi. 17, 18, 26, 27, xxii. 30, xxiii. 11, 12, 23, 31, 32, xxiv. 1, while this calculation remains in its details somewhat uncertain, inasmuch as the day of the interrupted Temple ceremony, xxi. 27, is not quite definitely fixed. If the other indications of the days are accurate, that ceremony in the Temple must have really been soon interrupted.

² This is undoubtedly the meaning intended by the words from τὰς. Acts xxiv.

18, to ver. 21, so that ἡ περί, ver. 21, means, put concisely, "or the one question is the resurrection, etc." But in that case the words ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου, ver. 20, are incorrectly placed, and ought to come after ἐστὼς, ver. 21. With regard to such passages see *ante*, p. 26.

³ The words ver. 22 are undoubtedly intended to indicate the twofold reason which he alleged; εἶπας is therefore placed too far forward in the words quoted, and would stand more appropriately after εἰδώς; at the same time it would not be very appropriate there.

but the wickedness of the governor, Felix, was really much greater than that of the Sanhedrin. His promise to seek fuller information with regard to Christianity he fulfilled in a characteristic way. That is, a few days afterwards he went with his Judean wife Drusilla, who was naturally especially curious to see and hear a man such as Paul was, into the prison, where other men were kept in easy confinement, and ordered Paul to be brought to him, that he might hear him speak of Christianity. The Apostle boldly expounded before him the Christian duties of righteousness, self-control, and the expectation of the approaching judgment. But as this free and serious language naturally aroused the governor's bad conscience, he soon caused the Apostle to cease, and departed with the promise to hear him again. For a high ransom he would most likely, with his venality, have set the Apostle at liberty; he pretended to be well-disposed towards him, and often had conversations with him; but, as Paul could not be induced to offer a bribe, he left him two years in prison, until a successor to himself was sent from Rome. These are the two years of Paul's life of which we know scarcely anything further. His faithful Luke and some other friends, or relatives, were always at his service during that period; but he was not allowed to see strangers nor to preach freely, his circumstances being thus different then from those of his later imprisonment at Rome.¹ The thing which was worst and troubled him most was, therefore, that he was not permitted to have free communication with his churches; and, of course, no epistles by him can exist from this period. Neither do we find any remembrance left of interpositions on his behalf on the part of the churches he had planted, and still less on the part of the parent church; the former were necessitated to confide their wishes to the latter, and the latter was always in too dependent a condition to permit the most sincere friends of the Apostle to attempt much. It is natural to suppose that some of his Pharasaic opponents made use of his misfortunes for their own purposes; and from Ephesus a plain intimation to that effect has been preserved.²

When Felix retired, he might suppose that he could still do the Judeans a favour by leaving his prisoner Paul to the judgment of his successor, Porcius Festus. And when the

¹ As appears from the words Acts xxiv. 23, compared with xxviii. 30, 31.

² Namely, in the forebodings of the Apostle, above referred to p. 400, which Luke would not have mentioned so dis-

tingently and at such unusual length, if they had not soon proved to be only too true; as well as in the words Rom. xvi. 17-20, and last of all 2 Tim. i. 15-18.

latter, three days after he had landed at Cæsarea, made his customary visit to Jerusalem, the representatives of the Sanhedrin¹ immediately called his attention to Paul, and demanded as a favour from him that he should send him to Jerusalem to be judged there by the Sanhedrin; some of the former conspirators may also have then meditated again their plan of assassinating him. Festus did not comply with their demand, but called upon them to repeat their accusation at Cæsarea immediately after his return thither; and after eight or ten days he left Jerusalem. As early as the next day after his return, therefore, Paul was again brought up for trial; his accusers had then had time enough to collect everything that they could possibly seek to bring against him; and they accordingly added to their two previous accusations, that he had violated the Law and the Temple, the new one—that he had also been guilty of treason against the Roman supremacy, or against Cæsar, supposing that the old charge against Christ would in this case prove once more effectual. Paul found it easy to defend himself against all three charges, and Festus perceived that he must be acquitted. But the Judeans spoke beforehand against any acquittal, threatening even an appeal to Cæsar.² Festus accordingly, that he might ingratiate himself as the new governor with the Sanhedrin, pretended that a new trial at Jerusalem itself might be probably desirable, and asked the Apostle whether he desired that his final sentence should be given at Jerusalem after another trial. If Paul had agreed to that, he could not have necessarily had justice on his side, as was hitherto the case; there remained, therefore, nothing for him, inasmuch as the governor had, wholly without ground, refused then to pass his sentence, but to appeal to the final decision of Cæsar himself at Rome. He argued that if he had done anything deserving death, he did not refuse to die according to the sentence of Cæsar. And the hope which he still cherished of being able, at all events, to preach Christ before the chief heathen government only strengthened him in this just decision. After a short conference with his imperial counsellors, Festus permitted him as a Roman citizen to make this appeal.

Whilst Festus was then considering which would be the most convenient day for sending Paul to Rome, the younger

¹ 'The principal men of the Judeans' mentioned in addition to the high-priests, Acts xxv. 2, are, of course, identical with those who are called, ver. 15 and xxiv. 1 and elsewhere, the elders; the two classes

constituted the main body of the Sanhedrin, and are together called also 'those which are of power' in the nation, ver. 5.

² Acts xxviii. 19, comp. with xxv. 9.

king Agrippa came, with his sister Berenice, to visit the governor at Cæsarea; and when Festus told him of Paul's case, and the perplexity he was in as to the report that he must make to the Emperor regarding his prisoner's guilt, Agrippa desired to see him. The governor accordingly arranged a magnificent sitting of the court, at which Paul should speak for himself before the Judean royal pair and a select company of the chief captains and principal inhabitants of Cæsarea. It might seem to the Apostle as if he already stood practically before the Emperor, as everyone knew what great influence this Agrippa had at Rome. He prepared himself, therefore, to make a powerful speech, and addressed himself mainly to the king, who was also in point of rank the principal person of the company assembled in the court. He began by saying that as he was to defend himself before the king with regard to all the points charged against him, he considered himself happy that the king was so well instructed in all Judean customs and disputes,¹ and begged him, therefore, to listen to him patiently. After this introduction, coming quickly to the matter in hand, he observed that, having been from his earliest youth, as was well known, attached to the most strict religious party amongst the Judeans, he was then accused simply concerning the hope of the resurrection and consummation, which was beyond dispute a genuine prophetic legacy and firmly held by Israel in its entire higher life and existence.² He then mentioned that he had been changed from a persecutor of Christianity into its advocate and promoter only in obedience to the force of the most powerful divine admonition; and he closed with the declaration that down to that day he had done nothing but, with God's help, teach all men that Christ must suffer and become the firstfruits of the resurrection, two things which were denied by most.³ He was still in the midst of the growing fervour of his speech and his proofs from the Bible, when Festus, to whom the question about a dead man and his resurrection had previously always appeared ridiculous, cried out to him, in the greatest impatience, that he was mad, and that probably it was his great book-learning which had driven him to such madness. Paul answered calmly, that he hoped that he

¹ The words *μάλιστα γνώστην ὄντα*, etc., Acts xxvi. 3, depend simply on the words *ἡγημαὶ ἐμαυτὸν μακάριον*, ver. 2, and otherwise have no meaning.

² The words *τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν ἑκτενεῖα νόκτα καὶ ἡμέραν λατρεῖον*, ver. 7, refer to the *קִיָּץ* of the Temple and its

undoubtedly great significance, see *Antiquities*, pp. 114 sq.

³ The denial of these two things by most is sufficiently indicated in the particle *εἰ*, *whether*, ver. 23, but for that very reason we must read *μαρτυροῦμε:ος*, *witnessing* (teaching), ver. 22.

was not mad, but speaking with truth and soberness; that, indeed King Agrippa could testify how true everything was that he had said of the agreement of the history of Christ with the Prophets; for at all events he must surely believe in the Prophets. And when the king replied, 'For a little he would persuade him to be a Christian,' Paul answered that 'he could pray to God, both for a little and for much, that not only he, but all hearing him, might that day become, as Christians, as happy as himself, and only free from his chains.'¹ But the king then dismissed the court; all supposed that Paul had done nothing worthy of death, and the king said to Festus that he might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed to Cæsar.

The journey to Rome, with its many strange vicissitudes, we can follow with considerable minuteness, as Luke himself was one of Paul's companions on it. His other companion was the above-named² Aristarchus, and he was then, like Paul, in chains, probably for similar reasons.³ The governor delivered Paul, with some other prisoners, to a centurion named Julius, belonging to the Augustan cohort,⁴ and undoubtedly commended him to the special attention of that officer; and the Apostle was soon, by virtue of his personal qualities, the leading spirit of the whole party on board. It was already late in the summer of the year 61; yet the centurion hoped to reach Italy that same year before the prevalence of the great storms, and made use at first of a trading ship from Adramyttium in Mysia. The very next day he allowed Paul to visit the Christians in Sidon;⁵ the wind became there so contrary that, instead of sailing south of Cyprus,⁶ they sailed north of it, by the coast of Cilicia and Pamphilia, to the seaport city Myra, in Lycia.⁷ There the centurion embarked with his people in a great trading vessel from Alexandria bound for Italy; but hardly had they come slowly as far as Cnidus in Caria, when a contrary wind drove them too much south, over against Salmone on the east coast of Crete, and at length they landed on its most southern point, Fair Havens (*Kaloi Limenes*), near the town of Alassa. As it was then quite autumn and the voyage was dangerous, Paul's advice was that they should winter

¹ ἐν ἄλιγῳ, vv. : 8, 29, can only denote the price like - ב, § 217 f. a.

² Ante, p. 393.

³ According to Acts xxvii. 2, comp. with Col. iv. 10. Philem. ver. 24.

⁴ Ante, p. 185.

⁵ Ante, p. 400.

⁶ Ante, p. 400.

⁷ The Coptic version has, Acts xxvii.

5, strange to say, the reading *Lystra in Cilicia*; but this reading was also found in other ancient authorities, and we have here a remarkable example of very early amendment of the text, a phenomenon which is intelligible enough, particularly in the case of the Acts, as we have seen p. 26.

there, as it was only with foolhardiness and at great risk, not only of the cargo and the ship but also of their own lives, that the voyage could be continued. But the centurion preferred to follow the advice of the captain and steersman of the vessel and of the majority. Accordingly they set sail again with the view of wintering, at all events, in Phœnix, which lay further south-west in Crete, and had, moreover, a better harbour, having shores on the south-west and the north-west. The gentle south wind, however, suddenly changed into the most violent storm from the east-north-east,¹ so that the ship became wholly unmanageable; and after they had run under the small island Cauda,² south of Crete, they were compelled to draw up the boat and, by mechanical aids, undergird the ship, and then, from fear of being driven upon the southern sandbank, to strike sail, and soon to have the tackling thrown out; and as the storm, with a black sky, lasted several days, they gave up all hope; neither did anyone think any more of taking any food. In these circumstances Paul, who had been marvellously strengthened by a vision in the night with regard to the great hope of his life, addressed words of higher comfort to the mixed company before him. He told them that they might have spared themselves the foolhardiness and injury from which they were suffering, nevertheless not a soul amongst them should be lost; and that it seemed to him as if God had given to him the preservation of all these souls, although he had a foreboding that shipwreck on an island awaited them.

They then drove to and fro upon the sea that lies to the south of what is now called the Adriatic, but which then had still that name, when the sailors, in the fourteenth night after they had left the harbour on the island of Crete, perceived that land was near, and, through fear of banks, cast four anchors from the stern; and they were already on the point of making their escape secretly from the foreship by means of the lowered boat, when the centurion with the soldiers, admonished in time by Paul, cut away the ropes of the boat and frustrated the evil intention of the sailors. But towards morning Paul exhorted the whole of the 276 souls on board at last to take some food in peace; and as if that very meal had been to him a Christian *Agape*, he preceded them all with his thanksgiving and his glad participation. After the meal was over, all the rest of the corn was thrown overboard to lighten the ship. When the

¹ According to the correct reading, *Εὐρακίλων*, Acts xxvii. 14; see *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* iii. p. 247.

² According to the correct reading, ver. 16, see *Jahrbb. ibid.*

day broke, a bay was sighted, upon the flat beach of which they thought the ship might be driven; so they cast off the anchors, loosened the bands of the rudders again, hoisted the mainsail against the wind, and made for the beach. But suddenly they struck and stranded on a reef, so that the foreship stuck fast, while the stern was broken up by the violent shock. The soldiers then feared that one or another of the prisoners might escape by swimming, and proposed to kill them all; but the centurion desired to save Paul, and ordered those who could swim to get first to land and the rest to save themselves on planks and wreck; so that all really escaped with their lives. And soon they perceived that they had landed on the island Melita (Malta), whose inhabitants received the wrecked most kindly, though it could hardly have been expected of them, they being still, for the most part, barbarians—that is, of Phœnician nationality. Luke afterwards still remembered a memorable incident from the very beginning of their three months' stay on this island. When the inhabitants kindled a fire to warm their dripping and cold guests, and Paul vigorously assisted in gathering sticks, a snake, suddenly revived by the heat, fastened on his hand; and forthwith the inhabitants had concluded that the man that had escaped from the sea must be a murderer, since a beast with fatal bite had nevertheless immediately laid hold upon him as if sent by the gods, when Paul quickly shook the snake into the fire; and as he remained wholly unharmed, he was then in danger of being worshipped by them as a god.¹ In the neighbourhood of the place where they were stranded, there was by chance the country residence of the governor of the island, named Publius; he entertained the Romans three days; and after Paul had succeeded in curing his sick father by the Christian method, the rest of the sick on the island sought to be cured by him. He did not succeed in founding a Christian church there, but when the sea was at last fit for sailing, he and his friends were dismissed with much honour and assistance.

The rest of the journey was rapidly accomplished; and it could not be afterwards forgotten that the ship from Alexandria, which had then to convey them on their way, bore most appropriately the image of the Dioscuri as its figurehead of good omen. In Syracuse, where there was no Christian church, they stayed three days, but in Rhegium only one, and came with a

¹ The snake, Acts xxviii. 3-6, as the inhabitants perceived, was a poisonous one, and this case therefore falls under the word of Christ, Mark xvi. 18; but Luke does not intimate that the snake,

which was still somewhat stiff from cold, bit Paul; and it is not becoming on our part to wish to know more than he has said.

favouring wind to Puteoli.¹ In order to make the last preparations for his entry into Rome, the centurion resolved to stay there a week; and as Paul found there a Christian church, his stay there was a great comfort to him.² From that place the report of his arrival in Italy rapidly spread to the larger Christian church in Rome; that church accordingly sent a deputation as far as the *Tres Tabernæ*, and indeed, also as far as to the *Forum Appii*, to welcome him, and, attended by them, he arrived in Rome.

Paul's Stay in Rome.

The Apostle had now arrived at that renowned place where he had long desired to preach the Gospel, though in such circumstances, it is true, as might well have wholly depressed any other man. The governor Festus had undoubtedly furnished the centurion with very good testimonials in Paul's favour; but the authorities in Rome troubled themselves but very little about the domestic contentions of the Judeans, and to prevent further contentions and disturbances of that kind, the simplest means seemed to be to retain the individual in their power a prisoner as long as possible. When he was committed to the custody of the *Prefectus Prætorio*,³ as the officer who had to present him and his case to the Emperor, that officer permitted him to reside in any house he chose near the Prætorium, and to receive visitors freely, though one of the prætorian guard had always to stay in the house with him. He hired for himself a dwelling,⁴ as no Christian with whom he might have been able to live had a house in that neighbourhood. But his case dragged itself along very slowly, and he remained two whole years in these circumstances.⁵

As compared with his situation in Cæsarea, this in Rome was at all events an improvement. He began at once, therefore, with as little hindrance as was permissible, the same labours which he had formerly pursued in that heathen city. He contemplated in Rome likewise the conversion of the Judeans in the first instance, but he had additional cause for thinking of them there. For it could least of all be a matter of indifference to him, in his situation at Rome, what the other Judean communities, and especially this at the foot of the

¹ *Ante* p. 239.

² Acts xxviii. 14, we must read according to some authorities ἐπιεικῶντες, whence the above interpretation of the narrative generally follows.

³ As Burrus was still living at this time, and, according to Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8, 9, looked especially after the affairs of the

East, we may regard him as the one of the two prefects here intended.

⁴ As a *ξένος*, whence his hired dwelling is called *ξενία*, *hospitium*, Acts xxviii. 23, compared with vv. 16, 30.

⁵ We may compare the account of Appollonius in a similar situation in Philostratus, vii. 22, 23, 40.

imperial throne, thought of him. After three days, therefore, he already besought those who were then¹ the chiefs of this community, to come to him for conference. He explained to them verbally why he had appealed to Cæsar; that he had not thereby meant in the remotest way to make an accusation against his fellow-countrymen, the Judeans; that he simply desired to have his innocence acknowledged by the Emperor; and that it was only for the hope of Israel that he was in chains. They cautiously replied that they had received no letters from the parent community with regard to him, nor had otherwise heard any evil report of him; but that they would be glad to hear his opinion of Christianity, which, as they understood, was everywhere spoken against. We see from this only the extreme caution with which these elders in the neighbourhood of the Imperial Court had learnt to express themselves, warned by the previous painful experiences of this community.² The conference broke up when a day had been appointed on which Paul should speak about Christianity to all the Judeans who would come. At the time fixed they appeared in considerable numbers, and Paul sought the whole day through, by every argument, to convince them of the truth of Christianity; but, as the majority remained unbelieving, he concluded with a complaint at the unbelief of the Judeans—to be read in the Old Testament—and with the prophesy that the Gospel must be sent to the heathen. The experiences in this respect which Paul had so often met in other cities he met again in Rome the more quickly, in that, as a prisoner, he was less able to inspire those of a worldly mind with much reverence.

As far as his isolated situation permitted, he naturally remained all along in close intercourse with the Christian church in Rome. And the longer he laboured in his characteristic manner the greater was the respect that he gained; many of the Prætorian guard, likewise, with whom he must have lived in constant contact, received through him the best notions of Christianity, and many of even the household servants of the Emperor became Christians.³ But gradually, his intercourse with the churches founded by him and with other churches personally strange to him was renewed; and nothing then so much rejoiced and occupied the Apostle as this. The churches which he had founded sent him spontaneous marks of

¹ This is intimated by τοὺς ἄρχοντας pp. 261, 364.
 πρῶτους, Acts xxviii. 17, comp. xiii. 1.

² See vol. vi. pp. 82 sq., and *ante*, i. 13, iv. 22.

³ According to the intimations, Phil.

their continued affection—the Philippians, for instance, sending again to him, after a considerable time, the gift which previously had been customary with them,¹ by a special representative, Epaphroditus, which became the occasion of his writing his *Epistle to the Philippians*. Numerous reports, likewise, reached him through travellers, or persecuted Christians, or even by persons who had been made prisoners like himself and sent to Rome; and he then accustomed himself also to write to the churches founded by his disciples, if anything specially urged him to do so; for instance, the *Epistle to the Colossians*, from whose church Epaphras was then like himself a prisoner in Rome.² He wrote, too, about individual Christians in whose history he wished to take special interest, as the autographic *Epistle to Philemon* shows. Owing to this intercourse, he rejoiced to see a considerable number of friends gradually collecting around him again. Timotheus must soon have come to him once more, since he made use of his assistance again in the composition of a number of epistles; and in addition to those two—Luke and Aristarchus—there were often several others with him, even Mark again.³ He was glad to make use of them for missions to the churches; but several of them did not stand well the test of the trying time, which was often the more painfully felt by him in his imprisonment.⁴ But in this respect also he exhibited again a marvellous activity; and of the numerous epistles of this period, those to the Philippians, to Philemon, and to the Colossians, have been preserved, in addition to the large fragment of one to the Ephesians,⁵ and of smaller fragments of one to Timotheus;⁶ although, in the case of the epistle to the Colossians, there are strong signs of Timotheus having had a large share in its composition.⁷ The latest of these productions of his pen are undoubtedly the fragments of an epistle to Timotheus, when he had been compelled to send the latter to distant churches on pressing business.

It is quite intelligible that his Pharisaic opponents grew more active as his imprisonment was protracted; they put forth their efforts also to some extent in his neighbourhood, and several expressions of his righteous indignation on that account escape him involuntarily in the epistles of this period.⁸ So much

¹ *Ante* p. 371.

² See *Sendschreiben*, pp. 463 sq.

³ Phil. iv. 21, Philem. xv. 23, 24, Col. iv. 7, 10–12, 14, 2 Tim. 1, 16–18, iv. 9–12.

⁴ Col. iv. 11, 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11.

⁵ Rom. xvi. 3–20, see *Sendschreiben*, pp. 428 sq.

⁶ Especially 2 Tim. i. 15–18, ii. 17, iv. 9–14.

⁷ See *Sendschreiben*, pp. 466 sq.

⁸ For instance, Rom. xvi. 17–20; many amplifications in the Epistle to the Philippians and similar ones in that to the Colossians: 2 Tim. i. 15, ii. 17 from the latest date likewise.

the more glorious is the lofty Christian gladness and the unabated enthusiasm which he was able to retain, in spite of the overflowing measure of his sufferings of all kinds, as the epistles from this period plainly show. If we find in them the fire of his earlier years somewhat moderated, the refined gladness and quiet blessedness which all of them express is the more complete, and not infrequently all the fire of the earlier period still flashes from them. And nothing is, in this respect, more elevating to behold than that though he is prepared for the worst issue of his case, and, after so much suffering, longs the more for everlasting rest in Christ, he is nevertheless constantly overtaken afresh by the still stronger power of love for his churches and of zeal for the great work of his life, and is always strong enough to comfort others and to animate them with the purest hope.

With regard to the successive stages and further progress of his case before the imperial tribunal no sufficient accounts have been preserved, as the Acts of the Apostles ends just at this point. But before we pass to the consideration of the final issue of his trial and of his whole life, we must go back to the course of the history of the other most prominent Christians of those days, since, different as their fortunes had been previous to that period, they then became almost contemporaneously surprisingly similar.

The Martyrdom of the three Heads of the Church at that time.

The Epistle of James and his Martyrdom.

The Apostle Paul, according to all that we have seen, had, with growing distinctness and justice, taught the inward incompatibility of Christianity and Judeanism in the form which the latter had then assumed, and to which it held incorrigibly fast. In fact, the Apostle had, in practice, already set Christianity almost completely free from Judeanism, and he shunned none of the bitterest persecutions, no imprisonment and threats of death, in labouring for its absolute independence. Yet, at the period at which we have arrived, Christianity had not effected its complete severance from Judeanism, and numbers of closer or looser ties of a delicate nature connected it with its venerable parent, some of which Paul himself still regarded as obligatory. Every tie of this kind that is not yet completely severed may, at any time, be easily drawn tighter, and Christianity was still not sufficiently safe from even a complete relapse

into Judeanism. The victories and the advantages of many kinds which the latter had succeeded in either wresting from the Roman empire or gained within it in other ways, its growing influence amongst the heathen, and the entirely new confidence which it began to feel in relation to them, were so many discouragements of the youthful Christian spirit, inspired with fresh courage the hearts of Judeans who opposed and despised it, and made many of the less vigorous Christians ready, or even inclined, to return into the arms of the venerable parent that was obtaining, once more, such power in the world. For undoubtedly the fear of the impending end of the world which was then universally felt, contributed to the great results which Christianity had then obtained; but that end was seen to be delayed, and Christ, in his celestial glory, appeared to be waited for in vain. This led weaker Christians—both Judean and heathen—into serious temptation. When, further, Paul had been imprisoned and threatened with immediate death; and when, at all events, his misfortunes had already been protracted, the most powerful Christian arm which had contended against Judeanism with the deepest personal conviction appeared to be rendered wholly useless, and likely soon to be paralysed in death; the Judeans accordingly rose up in many places much more boldly against the Christians, as against apostate brethren, as we shall soon see in the great instance of James at Jerusalem itself. But within Christianity itself the Apostle's long and enforced withdrawal from the scene of action produced a bad effect, inasmuch as the Pharisaic Christians, who had all along misrepresented and hindered his work, found now, suddenly, full freedom to persecute him and his adherents. And as regards the true prosperity and the brighter future of Christianity generally, this danger was really much worse than the former, since it threatened to destroy the great general progress which Christianity was called upon to make beyond the limits of its earliest form. We have seen¹ how soon these excessively punctilious Christians in the important city of Ephesus endeavoured to undermine the best work that Paul had commenced; and again,² how much the Apostle had to suffer, even in his Roman imprisonment, from the intrigues of people of that kind.

If, therefore, these enemies of Paul amongst the Christians had previously³ always gladly appealed to the concurrence of James, the Lord's brother, and through him to the concurrence

¹ *Ante*, p. 400.

² *Ante*, p. 417.

³ *Ante*, p. 384.

of the parent church, it is easy to imagine that they would now still more try to induce him openly to declare himself against Paul. And some things might appear to excuse their urgency and their entire plan. For after the commencement of Paul's labours, two classes of Christians were undoubtedly in process of creation. An internal schism and serious misunderstanding such as was now threatening to break out in the bosom of the Church, which though young, was composed of such various and widely scattered elements, was, however, extremely dangerous just at this time, when Judeanism more and more proudly opposed Christianity with such new and unexpected courage, and, besides, all the dangers which befel Judeanism from the heathen assailed Christianity likewise. And while a closer adherence of all Christians appeared now to be once more in the highest degree necessary, so James, the Lord's brother, occupied, as the head of the parent church in the capital of the true religion, the position of the one universally acknowledged leader and representative of Christians; and at no time was how he would decide, speak, and act of such great consequence, as just now after Paul had been imprisoned. But the excellent man nobly stood the test of this juncture, which presented to him also so much temptation; and as we previously¹ saw how, in times when wrong things were similarly expected of him, he resisted, without becoming unfaithful to the peculiar nature of his own immediate knowledge and obligations, we can, in this instance, observe that the steadfast confessor of Christ had simply advanced in prudence and moderation, in counsel and administration, most nobly with the elevation to which the development of the age had reached.

We should know nothing in detail of all this, it is true, if there had not been preserved in the *Epistle of James*, when properly interpreted, the most eloquent and trustworthy document regarding it. On closer examination, we cannot doubt that we really possess in this epistle evidence from his own hand, and at the same time the most precious and clearest evidence, regarding both the condition of that transition period and the spiritual characteristics of the head of the parent church. This epistle introduces us into the midst of the circumstances of the parent church, and of the other Christians, as those circumstances were at the time after Paul's imprisonment; and that time is presented with such clearness and simplicity by it, that it is impossible not to recognise its

¹ *Ante*, p. 357.

features.¹ Christianity still lay, as it were, in the lap of Judeanism, since, while the epistle gives distinct prominence to what is characteristically Christian, and proceeds, of course, from the assumption that the Christian religion is the reformed, and indeed, genuine Israelitic religion, it never speaks openly against Judeanism, as if not unnecessarily to provoke the latter with its bitter hostility and the great power it still preserved. Which is quite what we should have to expect from the head of the parent church at that time, who was as cautious as he was steadfast. As, therefore, the epistle is composed as we must expect it would be if it spoke from the capital of the Christianity of that time, and proceeded further from a man who was but little acquainted with heathen countries, it has distinctly in view far less the relations of Christianity to the heathen than to the Judeans. But its Christians are generally, as such, the poor, the oppressed, those in danger from all sides, as they are undoubtedly described in Paul's epistles also; while the Judeans are generally the rich—those luxuriating in hitherto undisturbed prosperity, aiming after nothing but trade and gain, and therefore spending their days in an enterprising spirit, such as leaves scarcely any room for the thought of God,² and who, moreover, arrogantly entered the assemblies of the Christians as if they had a right to do so, and who were also glad to drag Christians before the law-courts.³ Such were the circumstances of the Judeans still at this time, particularly when they lived amongst the heathen, or traded amongst them from the Holy Land; but how changed was the entire situation of both Judeans and Christians after the year 66 A.D.!

A great number of complaints of persecutions from without and of contentions within, undoubtedly reached James from the churches in heathen countries; likewise a multitude of inquiries as to conduct, and also as to the opinion to be formed of the peculiar views and doctrines of the Apostle Paul. James felt at length called upon, not so much to make a public reply

¹ In the *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 258 sq., iv. p. 111, vi. pp. 136 sq., vii. pp. 206 sq., viii. p. 216, I have exposed the great errors which have been advanced from entirely opposite parties with regard to the date and the author of this epistle. [Since this note was written, the author has published his Commentary on the Epistle of James, *Das Sendschreiben an die Hebräer und Jacobus' Rundschreiben* (1878), pp. 177–230. The Commentary gives only an elaboration of the views expressed above.—Tr.]

² If we compare and understand accu-

rately the passages Jas. i. 10, 11, ii. 5–13, iv. 13–v. 11, and observe that *the brethren*, i.e. Christians, although a few of them might be rich (i. 10, ii. 6a), are generally put in contrast with the rich (v. 7, ii. 6b), but that these rich men are by no means described as heathen, we cannot be in doubt as to the real meaning. Titus (*Jos. Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2) accuses the Judeans, even at the siege of Jerusalem, of being ungrateful to the Romans, under whose rule they had been able to get very rich.

³ James ii. 2, 6b.

in response to the inquiries, as to send forth a circular letter to all Christians scattered abroad in heathen countries. As head of the universally acknowledged parent church, it was quite within his province to assume such a superior position, and, if possible, to declare to all Christians at once what was most necessary for them at that time. And if he seriously resolved to do this, though he might himself be unable to write good Greek, there could not be wanting Christians in Jerusalem who could put his thoughts and words into a good Grecian dress. After Paul had been withdrawn from his labours, James had sufficient public influence in the Christian Church everywhere to enable him to speak, in the growing confusion of the times, with a voice which was likely to be generally listened to. It must be historically regarded as a noble service rendered by him that he was not silent at such a time, but that he determined to speak to all without exception from the chief seat of Christianity. But in doing this he in no way relied upon his prominent office as the head of the parent church, or his dignity as the eldest and most respected of the Lord's brothers, but spoke simply as any ordinary Christian to all the brethren, preferring, in genuine modesty, rather to conceal his outward eminence,¹ and permitting the lofty truths which he had to utter to commend themselves by their own weight simply. Simply on that account the epistle scarcely mentions Christ at all, whilst it everywhere presupposes, as the universally acknowledged basis, the Christian life, with its great exaltation, freedom, and sincerity.

When we examine the special subject-matter of the epistle, we observe that it undoubtedly attaches an importance to some things such as Paul is not in the habit of attaching to them, and appears to define some things differently from Paul. When the Christians amongst the heathen are denominated, as is the case in the heading of our epistle, as 'the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion,' this accords completely with the standpoint of the parent church as late as 60 A.D.; but it is alien to the manner of expression used by Paul and his friends. The strict avoidance of every form of oath, and the Christian treatment of sick members of the church with prayer and oil,² to which two things the epistle attaches great importance, are especially customs such as had then most probably been established in the

¹ See *Jahrbh. d. B. W.* v. pp. 279 sq. In this respect James exactly resembles John in his relation to Christ; in his relation to Paul, Luke is likewise very similarly influenced by this truly Christian

trait (see *ante*, p. 28), this trait appearing as an exceedingly admirable ornament of these men of the earliest Christian period.

² Jas. v. 12, 14.

parent church, and in the observance of which the claim was made of a more sedulous perpetuation of commands and institutions of Christ himself; but the customs nowhere appear in Paul's writings as having the same importance. This epistle, therefore, serves at the same time to show us more accurately what the customs were which grew up in the parent church during these thirty years. In this restricted circle, with its ancient associations, there prevailed a stricter adherence to certain utterances and actions which were derived from Christ himself. It was supposed that the true meaning and the proper practice of them were still preserved by the best tradition from himself; but in this undoubtedly the danger was involved of laying too great stress upon such single utterances and actions.¹ However, all this is but a small matter compared with the great Christian truths themselves. With regard to the latter, James does not differ in the least from Paul; and though Paul's enemies may have urged James openly to declare himself against the abrogation of the laws regarding food, circumcision, and similar restrictions, they found nowhere in this epistle any utterance favouring their desire. There is only one matter, which was undoubtedly laid before him, with Paul's epistles themselves, for his decision, with regard to which he declared himself openly (as always) and with simple honesty, not against Paul, or an entire view and doctrine of his, but only against a misunderstanding which many had drawn from some of his epistles, and which just then might very easily produce a very injurious effect. The strong emphasis which, we have seen,² Paul laid upon faith in contrast with the works of the Law admitted thus early of a no less false than malicious misinterpretation, as readily as in our own day on the part of very various classes of Christians that are hardly worthy of the name. Those Christians who were inclined to Pharisaism might justly object that faith might consist of mere words, and that in that case nothing was easier than to believe; and that misunderstanding could be injurious most of all just at a time when Christianity was threatened on all hands by the most serious dangers, and genuine faith had above all things to be attested by the most steadfast action. If this serious misunderstanding had not already existed at that time, and had not been very injurious, James could never have spoken as he did with regard

¹ The words, Jas. i. 1. v. 12-20, supply us therefore with the most important evidence, after the Acts of the Apostles, regarding the internal condition of the

parent church, particularly at this later period.

² *Ante*, pp. 293 sq.

to the relation of faith to works; but as matters stood, he felt called upon to deliver a few brief earnest sentences against it—sentences, which in view of the misunderstanding, have really their full justification, and are inadequate only in as far as they do not enter more particularly into the sense in which Paul had demanded faith.¹ In this way a man of high position, held in universal esteem, who had long been valued as the wise and moderate head of a church, briefly corrects a misunderstanding when it appears to him to be already producing very injurious effects; and if thereby no one is forbidden to conceive fundamentally that general relation of faith to works exactly as Paul conceived it, this wise and prudent counsel, as given by James in his manner and from his point of view, serves admirably to correct a misunderstanding which may easily attach itself to that higher truth taught by Paul.

In the form of his discourse and the plan of his epistle, James exhibits the same great independence which appears in its subject-matter. Almost as much as the discourses of Christ in the Collected Sayings,² and in the Gospel of John,³ or as the sentences of the first Epistle of John, the exhortations of this epistle have the ring of genuine prophetic utterances, conducting at once to the heart of the weighty subjects dealt with, and deciding everything from an elevation with the utmost calmness. It is as if in these late times, when genuine ancient prophecy had long disappeared, the inward certainty and concise decisiveness of the prophetic word had once more come back to Israel, and it is as if we heard here an echo, although a far feebler one, of that absolutely peculiar kind of speech and precept which Christ himself had used some decades before. It is only rarely that this discourse condescends to prove its affirmations and to answer possible objections, and when it does this it remains far simpler than is the case with the Apostle Paul. But it is just in this respect that the defect peculiar to it is exhibited most plainly, as we have just seen in the case of its treatment of faith in its relation to works.

¹ It is obvious that the passage Jas. ii. 14–20, 23 has Paul's epistles as its basis; the instance of Abraham, ver. 21, moreover, alludes verbatim to Rom. iv. 1 sq., whilst the instance of Rahab, ver. 25, need not have been borrowed from Heb. xi. 31, inasmuch as another epistle of Paul's might be in James's hands. However, the passage contains nothing which Paul would not approve of; and there would have been a direct contradiction to Paul's

doctrine only if James had spoken of *ἔργα τοῦ νόμου Μώσεως*. So far is that from being the case, that he has plainly enough indicated, as early as i. 21, 22, what he means by *the work*, and i. 25, ii. 12, what he means by *the law*; and he comes back to this again iii. 13.

² See *Jahrbh. der B. W.* ii. pp. 196 sq. [*Die drei Evang.* i. p. 63 sq.]

³ *Ibid.* iii. pp. 163, 165.

After the illustrious example of the Apostle Paul, the prophetic utterances which James delivers to all Christians dwelling amongst heathen, are it is true, thrown into the form of an epistle; but it is only in a purely formal way that this destination of the book is expressed at its commencement, giving it the appearance of being an epistle of this universally known man, which is meant, like a fly-leaf, to be scattered throughout the world. Apart from this formal opening, the book has not the slightest similarity to one of Paul's epistles. On the contrary, James treats the various matters with which he has to deal in his epistle by simply passing from one to the other, beginning with what was most pressing precisely for that time, and so advancing seriatim to all the other matters on which he has to speak. Inasmuch, therefore, as the complaints of the manifold persecutions had come loudly enough from the churches in heathen countries to the parent church, he shows, in the first place, how a Christian has to endure all the trials of the world and how he has to regard all temptation; ¹ and he then forthwith teaches how injurious the effect of wrath is as the exact opposite of true patience.² After he has thus said enough with regard to their outward relations, he turns more especially to the internal circumstances of the Christian societies, and censures, in the first instance, an amount of consideration for the rich wholly unworthy of Christians, and a foolish human fear of them; ³ and then immediately passes with emphasis to the dangerous abuse which was being made of the term faith: ⁴ two points requiring serious censure, and, dissimilar as they seemed to be, both ultimately arising principally from a lukewarmness and indolence which were creeping into the Christian Church. But inasmuch as the Christian world was already seriously endangered by internal contentions, in consequence especially of the greater freedom which it possessed in heathen countries, the epistle teaches, in its further course, first, that the desire to shine by the use of the tongue, as teachers and men of superior wisdom, must be checked by every true Christian; ⁵ and secondly, that all such internal dissensions really flowed from the prevalence of evil desires and passions.⁶ After he has thus, at the call of three occasions, uttered in two deliverances to each, accordingly in six sections, all the needful special admonitions in order, he collects them all

¹ Jas. i. 2, as far as *ἴστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί*, ver. 19. It is a great mistake to connect these words with ver. 19. [In his Commentary on the Epistle of James (1870), Ewald reads *ἴστω* twice, and con-

nects, of course, both with ver. 19.]

² i. 19, from *ἴστω δὲ* to ver. 27.

³ ii. 1-13.

⁴ ii. 14-26.

⁵ iii.

⁶ iv. 1-12.

together in a seventh section, as a suitable conclusion, in the one fundamental Christian exhortation, to wait patiently for the great approaching day of judgment, and then his discourse takes a loftier prophetic flight.¹ The prophetic and didactic epistle might have been therewith closed, but James further, as in a postscript, reminds his readers of those customs of the parent church above referred to, and briefly recommends them as salutary.²

This thoroughly independent epistle, serving as an equipoise to the epistles of Paul, as it does, is accordingly, like well-meant drops of wormwood and oil honestly poured into the troubled sea of Christian life and thought, and notwithstanding its apparent insignificance, it undoubtedly did not remain without good effect in a temporary calming of the commotions of the time. The profounder questions of Christian inquiry were not solved by it, and the agitated commotions of the age soon returned all the more threateningly. At the same time, this small epistle deserved the full attention of the age and the permanent appreciation which it has subsequently found, and which it will retain in the future. It could at that time be at once felt, that not merely the Lord's brother and the honoured head of the parent church was speaking in it, but also (which is much more) an earnest and good Christian. And when this epistle from his pen became known, inasmuch as he published it fearlessly under his own name, amongst the Judeans also, or even amongst the heads of the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem themselves, we need not be surprised that this James fell a victim, by his martyrdom, to the hatred of the members of the Hagiocracy not long afterwards; namely, about Easter of the year 63.

For the Apostle Paul was still alive, and the conversions of Judeans of position even, were constantly increasing, as had been observed in Jerusalem at the last Passover particularly, when the prayers of so many who seemed to be Judeans went up from the Temple itself for the speedy coming of the glorified Christ. Moreover, a little time previously the office of high-priest had fallen to the younger Annas, whose father, with

¹ iv. 13-v. 11. It is obvious that these are the seven true sections of the epistle. We have, indeed, a formal indication of it in the fact that in each of these seven sections the direct address of the *brethren* occurs once or twice as the fundamental Christian note of the epistle, either at the beginning or at the end, a phenomenon which cannot be accidental. The question

whether the division into seven sections is itself purely accidental or not, is answered by the self-evident form of other great Christian discourses of this kind, a point on which I have often dwelt. [Comp. Ewald's introduction to *Jacobus' Sendschreiben*, pp. 176 sq.]

² v. 12-20.

the same name, had also at one time been high-priest.¹ Like his father, this younger Annas was of a violent and almost foolhardy disposition, and was a Sadducee, too, and therefore, as such, very unfriendly to Christianity. Moreover, he was consumed with the desire to show at once, by a striking illustration, the reputation of that strict enforcement of the Law for which the Sadducees were noted. In those Easter days of the year 63, he accordingly raised an accusation against James, as the first elder of the Christian church in Jerusalem,² and vehemently urged him to declare himself against Christ. No amount of caution, therefore, or of humility, could in the end be of any service to James. It was subsequently related that when he had been taken by force to the projecting gable of the east Temple-court,³ in order that he might testify against Christ before the assembled people, he only evinced his faithfulness to Christ the more firmly and openly without any dread of death, so that all the large number of Christians who were standing around broke out in the triumphal Hosannah of the first Christian church;⁴ that he was then precipitated from the gable, and, inasmuch as he was not at once killed by the fall, stoning was accordingly resorted to, whilst he prayed aloud for his persecutors; that as he was being slain a Rechabite priest⁵ loudly called on the murderers to have pity on the man who was thus praying for them; but at that moment a fuller, stepping forth from the crowd, with his fuller's club smote down his head and so killed him. In these late stories there have probably been preserved several historical reminiscences of the death of this 'just man,' as it is natural that the end of this most distinguished brother of Jesus, and the first elder of the parent church, should long remain too memorable to be forgotten. We know, moreover, from the earlier source⁶ very

¹ See vol. vi. p. 64.

² See also *Jahrbh. d. B. W.* x. p. 268.

³ τὸ πρεβύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ, or rather τοῦ ἱεροῦ, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23, 11 sq., must undoubtedly be thus understood in this passage, as well as the very similar one Matt. iv. 5. The east court is the first to present itself, and in the east lies the deep valley before the Temple.

⁴ 'Hosannah to the son of David!' see vol. vi. p. 395.

⁵ This name, formed as in the case vol. iv. p. 79, is evidently meant in this instance to signify an Essene; comp. *ante*, p. 169.

⁶ *Jos. Ant.* xx. 9. 1, comp. vol. vi. p. 140. The Christian account given above, as far as it seemed correct, is that

of Hegesippus in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23. 3-19, with which that of Clement of Alexandria, Euseb. ii. 1. 5; 23. 3, is in substantial agreement. The narrative of Hegesippus, it is true, ends by saying that 'Vespasian immediately besieged the city,' as if that event at once followed the murder as its first punishment; we are not, however, compelled to take the connection quite so strictly as it was subsequently conceived. We must not, therefore, infer from this error that everything else that is related in this account with regard to James and his end is without foundation; the two accounts, on the contrary, supplement each other in other respects, and we can only regret that Josephus related everything with such brevity.

definitely, that the high-priest just mentioned, caused James, and at the same time some other Christians, to be stoned, on the charge of apostasy from the ancient Law, during the interval when there was no Roman governor in Palestine. He, it is true, kept so far within the limits of the Law as to call for this case a special court; but both those who were more leniently disposed towards the Christians and the strict lawyers thought that he had acted too rashly. Some accordingly appealed secretly to King Agrippa for assistance against him; others went to meet the governor on his way, representing to him that Annas ought not to have summoned a court on a question of life and death without his consent. As a fact, Albinus at once exhibited great indignation at the high-priest's presumption, and Agrippa hastened to anticipate worse consequences of his indignation by deposing Annas. He held the office only three months.

Amongst the Christians the memory of James remained subsequently only the more vividly fresh. He was the second great martyr for Christ;¹ and from that time the surname of *the Just* was always given him. By this great sign of the age we can note most distinctly the vast progress which had taken place in the development of Christian as well as Judean affairs generally during the preceding twenty years or so. The most modest and pious clinging and submission to the ancient Judean church, the greatest caution and reserve compatible with fundamental Christian convictions, both in speech and action as well as in writing, were no longer of any avail against the jealousy of the Judeans at the fresh life and progress of Christianity. The profoundly cautious and most strictly pious Brother of the Lord had to fall a sacrifice to unbelieving Sadducean arrogance, just as Christ first, and then Stephen, had fallen, in the midst of the Ancient Community, and though protected by its apparent rights and laws. It is as if the Hagiocracy, when it could not extend its arms so as to seize Paul, had now vented its revenge on the man who was regarded by many as his most important opponent, as if to punish the parent church for not having helped it to destroy the more dangerous man.

¹ See *ante*, p. 163.

The Martyrdom of Peter and Paul : 64-65 A.D.

Whilst the parent church was thus most painfully afflicted by the execution of its long-trying chief elder and some others of its principal men, from other causes a storm was gathering up in Rome itself, which broke not less severely over the Christian churches in heathen countries likewise, and became the first great persecution that Rome inflicted upon the Church. But this is so closely connected with the end of the great Apostles Peter and Paul, that we must at this point resume the general and more obscure history where we left it above.¹

The liberation of Peter from the prison in which Agrippa had cast him in the year 42,² is described by Luke³ in just the same vivid colours in which it had been represented in the original sources on Peter's history. This liberation occasioned a new era in his Apostolic labours, and caused him to go forth without reserve finally into foreign countries, in which he was destined to labour for Christianity far more than within the narrow confines of the Holy Land; and as the liberation had taken place in a marvellous manner, it was the more naturally represented in that original account in the full light of its higher significance. According to the custom of those times in the case of strictest imprisonment, Peter had been given in charge to a night-guard of sixteen men, four of whom, changing with the four night watches, were to keep such close guard over him that he was secured to two of them by his chains, the other two keeping watch at the door.⁴ From this apparently hopeless situation—whilst the Church, which was troubled almost to death by his mortal peril, was continuing personally and collectively in agonising prayer for him—he was so marvellously delivered (by what special event we do not now know) that his first word, when he reached his friends, was no other than that he believed he had been rescued by an angel of God.⁵ And, with the faith of the primitive Church in the power of earnest prayer, it was only a further representation of this thought when it was related, that suddenly his prison was illuminated in the night by a divine light, and that an angel appeared to

¹ P. 270.

² As the Acts does not, according to p. 269, assign the year definitely, we may best suppose the above year, inasmuch as it then accords perfectly with the early tradition, that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius; see below.

³ Acts xii. 5-19.

⁴ Philo, ii. p. 533, also uses the expression *ὁ ἐν τοῖς τετραδίοις φύλακες*, Acts xii. 4-10.

⁵ According to Acts xii. 11; comp. on the whole incident the case *ante*, pp. 152 sq.

lead him forth from his bonds, whilst he himself did not know whether he was dreaming or not, and even the portress, Mary, the mother of Mark,¹ to whose house he turned as a well-known man, and then the other inhabitants of Mary's house, themselves supposed that they beheld already his angel rather than himself as still alive. He well knew, however, that he could not remain anywhere in Jerusalem at that time unless he was prepared at once to rush into the jaws of death again; he requested those who were in that house to report only to James, as the head of the Church, and through him to the Church itself, the fact of his deliverance, and then at once left Palestine;² and as Paul, as we have seen,³ first went into a foreign country under the compulsion of a higher appointment, so now it was a blessing for the Christianity of those days that Peter was driven, as by force, into distant heathen countries.

But we saw above⁴ that, some time before, Simon the Magician had pretended subservience to him, though only in order to get himself out of momentary difficulties. It is, therefore, to be supposed, from all these indications in Luke's narrative, that the early tradition of Peter's being at some time in Rome during the reign of Claudius, and of his meeting there with the Magician, is not baseless, to say nothing of the romance which was subsequently drawn up concerning that meeting of the two Simons in Rome.⁵ It is undeniable that the Christian church in Rome was founded at an early period, and, at the time when Paul wrote to it, it was considered as having been

¹ See *ante*, p. 336.

² In the brief clause, 'he departed to another place,' Acts xii. 17, there is not implied, it is true, the express statement that it was a foreign land; but this expression is so brief simply for the reasons above (p. 26) indicated; and it is obvious that he could not then remain within the reach of Agrippa's power, that is, anywhere in Palestine.

³ *Ante*, p. 332.

⁴ P. 181.

⁵ Namely, in the work of fiction called the *Recognitions* or *Homilies* of Clement, which must once have been much read and variously reproduced, and from which pieces of narrative found their way into the *Constitt. Apost.* vi. 8, 9, as well as into Abdias' *Apostolic Hist.*, i. 8-20, the *Acta Petri et Pauli* in Tischendorf's *Actu Apost. Apocr.* pp. 1-39. The original work, however, was not guilty of mixing up the time of Nero, as is done in these latest ones; and it does not appear how a meeting of the two Simons in Rome could have been supposed, if it had been

wholly without foundation. This meeting, moreover, is supposed, quite independently of the fiction, in the narrative of Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 14, 15, which was certainly not invented by him; and the remarks about the Magician's presence in Rome under Claudius, in Just. *Apolog.* i. 25, 56, and Iren. *Adv. Hær.* i. 23. 1, 2, are not opposed to a meeting of Peter with the Magician. The tradition received into Euseb. *Chron.* (in Mai's *Scriptt. vet. nova coll.* viii. pp. 376, 378), and Jerome's *Catal. Scriptt. Eccles.* cap. i., that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius, and remained bishop there twenty-five years, cannot be approved in this coarse and pretentious reference to a Roman bishopric; but it is difficult to deny that he visited Rome once in the reign of Claudius. The second year of Claudius may be quite correct, as was remarked above, and from that year to his death nearly twenty-five years elapsed. The *Ancient Syriac Documents*, p. 35, have the third year of Claudius.

converted about as long as himself;¹ nor do we need even to suppose that Peter first founded it. If the Magician, after having been humbled in Asia, took his departure to Rome to begin again there his former course of action, to the injury of true Christianity, and if complaints to that effect had reached Jerusalem, it was natural that Peter, just when he was about to leave Jerusalem for a time, should for that very reason go to Rome, to oppose the hypocrite and boaster there, just as he had already done in Samaria. At all events this might be one reason for his going just then to Rome rather than any other place; and we know definitely enough that, like 'the other Apostles and brethren of the Lord,'² he made distant journeys, attended usually by his wife. However, the death of Agrippa, which soon followed, facilitated his early return to Jerusalem.

At present we know scarcely anything of these various journeys. But when we find him, as we have seen,³ at Antioch in the year 52, it is quite probable that he then visited the north-eastern districts of Asia Minor, and laid there the first foundation for those churches to which he addressed the epistle from Rome which we must shortly consider. He had undoubtedly thus early Mark with him as his coadjutor, since Mark, as we saw,⁴ returned to Jerusalem in the year 49, where he had long known Peter as a friend in the house of his mother; and we observed above⁵ that Paul, as if intentionally, did not visit those districts. Neither could an epistle of Peter have been subsequently addressed to these churches in particular, if he had not been regarded as their founder.⁶ If he was on one occasion in Corinth, as a somewhat later report says,⁷ that would have been about the time when Paul had been put in prison, when the churches were suddenly made, as it were, orphans.

If he had, therefore, been already on a former occasion in Rome, we have the less cause for surprise that he visited it again later; the oldest writers preserved state—and it follows with certainty from other indications—that that visit took place during the reign of Nero, and that the Apostle soon fell as a martyr in Rome. It is only the particular circumstances that

¹ See on this point *Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, p. 315.

² 1 Cor. ix. 5.

³ *Ante*, p. 362.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 344.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 267.

⁶ It does not follow from 1 Pet. i. 12, that Peter had not himself founded, at all events, the churches of Pontus, and did not wish to be regarded as having founded

them.
⁷ Dionysius, the bishop of Corinth, about the middle of the second century, in an epistle to the church at Rome, in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 25. Nothing can be objected to the historical truth of this, since the fact that Clemens says nothing about it in his Epistle to the Corinthians is no proof to the contrary.

are now but little known to us. When Paul came to Rome, Peter was hardly already there; Luke would not have passed over that fact with complete silence. Neither is it easy to suppose that when Paul sent from Rome his epistles that have been preserved Peter was there; since, although he sends greetings from Mark, who was probably then in Rome at first with commissions from Peter himself,¹ he in no way mentions Peter. But when, after the two years of undisturbed residence of Paul in Rome, with which the Acts of the Apostles closes, about the first months of the year 64, a sudden interruption in the quiet state of things occurred in Rome, which most painfully threatened the tranquillity of all Christians, Peter appears at once to have hastened thither, that he might do his part to prevent the dangerous consequences. We do not now know the particulars with regard to this interruption, but may very well imagine that the specific report regarding Paul himself and all the Christians which the Emperor may have required, and for which the decision in Paul's case was all along waiting, had then arrived, with a Judean deputation, in Rome. That report must have been very unfavourable, since from that time Christians were regarded in the Roman Empire as 'evil doers';² and probably Poppæa, whose sympathies were with the Judeans,³ helped to render the Christians obnoxious to Nero. Inasmuch, however, as no capital offence could be proved against Paul, it seems that he was on that occasion set at liberty, and only prohibited to stay in Rome, or to revisit Palestine, or perhaps also to send out epistles—a decision with which he might be tolerably well satisfied, since he had long desired to visit Spain. It was in this period subsequent to Paul's departure that Peter undoubtedly issued the epistle which has been preserved as the *first Epistle of Peter*, and which may serve us as a very important witness as to the position of affairs at that time as well as to Peter's stay in Rome.

This epistle is very especially intended to admonish all Christians without exception, and primarily those of the Roman Empire, to show that caution and prudence in public life which they so particularly needed at that time, as being exposed to such grievous accusations. As issued by an Apostle and intended substantially, moreover, for all Christians, it is true it assumes a much higher standpoint, from which the

¹ Philem. ver. 24; Col. iv. 10; we may infer from 2 Tim. iv. 11, that Mark had really commenced the journey there mentioned.

² Κακοποιῶν, *Malefici* (flagitiosi), 1 Pet. ii. 12 (14), iii. 16, iv. 15; comp. John xviii. 30, Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44, Suet. *Nero*, xvi.

³ See *ante*, p. 408.

entire life of a Christian can be reviewed and its principal duties described; but it is quite obvious that its special object is to speak of public duties.¹ And it is precisely in this that its chief merit lies, as a discussion of the proper behaviour of a Christian towards every magistracy, and accordingly towards a heathen magistracy, had become a growing necessity; whilst Paul, even in his Epistle to the Romans, which was then much read, had expressed himself only incidentally on that head. The relations of Christians to the heathen governments had so far only grown more and more unsatisfactory, particularly in consequence of the provocations against them on the part of the Judeans, and more remotely, it must be allowed, on account of the incompatibility of the Christian and the heathen views and modes of treating things. This epistle is the first that was written simply for the purpose of teaching the proper attitude of Christians towards heathens generally and all heathen magistracies, of pronouncing Christian love towards all men without exception a highest command in this special application particularly, of checking wrong feelings which might perhaps arise amongst Christians with regard to public matters, and of commending as blessed that endurance alone which might become necessary in the service of goodness. These and the other exhortations and reflections of the epistle are of such a general character that they could just as well be addressed to all the churches then in existence as to individual churches, and undoubtedly the epistle had this universal reference;² but as all Christian epistles were originally always addressed to special churches, and thus far it was only the Epistle of James³ which had for good reasons used, as it were, the privilege of addressing all Christians beyond the Holy Land, so this epistle of Peter is primarily by its form addressed only to the churches of northern and eastern Asia Minor, which had for the most part been founded by Peter, though it is at the same time so expressed that it could also be at once easily read by all Christians, and nothing hindered its rapid circulation amongst them likewise. Nothing is said at all, therefore, of the merely personal relations of Peter to the churches just named; at the end only there is a greeting from

¹ As soon as the epistle comes, with the words 1 Pet. ii. 11, to insist upon duties, it is this duty towards the magistracy and all the heathen that is the first of which it speaks at length, and it is that duty to which it always recurs, from iii. 8 to iv. 19; all else is but as the framework of these primary exhortations, or like

offshoots from this central point.

² The entire subject-matter of the epistle showing that it proceeded from the most immediate and pressing experience of that period, and it being indicated clearly enough, v. 9, that the experience of *all other churches* was then no better.

³ *Aute*, p. 451.

‘the fellow church in Babylon’ and from Mark. It had undoubtedly then been long customary in Judean and Christian circles to denominate Rome Babylon.¹ As the epistle had to be written in Greek, and Peter, as we know from other sources,² could not speak and write Greek with ease, he made use of the literary services of Silvanus.³ Silvanus had some time previously attached himself, as we have seen,⁴ more closely to Peter, was employed by him in literary work of this kind, and had accompanied him to Rome. But it is at this point that we can most clearly see that this epistle was, as it were, wrung from the Apostle only at the call of an unavoidable necessity. For though the Christian instruction which the epistle supplies is as perfectly appropriate as could be expected from a Peter, it is no less obvious that the epistle lacks, as a literary work, pure originality and independence, so that we may say that its writer would probably never have felt, from his own personal inclination, called upon, like the Apostle Paul, to labour as an author, and that it was only a powerfully-impelling outward cause which induced him to produce this epistle. We know what it was which urged him, we perceive that both Peter and Silvanus had their forte elsewhere than in literature, and we can easily understand that, when the necessity arose for the composition of such an epistle, they made approved epistles of earlier date their models. With a little examination we perceive the models which the authors resolved to follow: on the one hand, the Epistle of James, on the other, the epistles of Paul, and of the latter especially the Epistle to the Romans, and from these epistles they quoted several passages almost verbatim. Certainly it was not literary ambition, or an unhappy rivalry, which guided their pen; and we have rather an

¹ We have no ground for supposing that John, the author of the Apocalypse, was the first to introduce this custom. The name Babylon for Rome, on the contrary, occurs in the Apocalypse, as well understood, and the enigma of the book concerns quite a different matter which was really original in it. There must have existed at some time a much-read book, in which, for the first time, Rome and the Romans were respectively indicated by Babel and Edom (as if אֲרָוֶם could be easily read instead of אֲדָוֶם); that book probably appeared subsequent to the *Ascension of Moses* (see vol. vi. pp. 55 sq.), and traces of it are seen with increasing plainness in the New Testament writings, in 4 Ezra, ch. iii. and ch. xv., xvi. in the Sibylline books, and in all the Tal-

muldic writings. The idea of representing the Romans as Edomites undoubtedly took its rise from the Idumean Herod. Further, comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* ii. p. 123.

² Namely, from the history of the Gospel literature, see *Jahrb. d. B. W.* ii. 184, 245 sq. [*Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 51 sq. 75], to which we may now add the testimony in Eusebius's *Theophan.* v. 40.

³ The words 1 Pet. v. 12 admit of no other meaning, and *ὡς λογιζομαι* yields its proper sense only on the supposition that Peter alludes to Silvanus as the Greek editor who, as he considers, faithfully expresses his meaning. As to the similar instance of the composition of the Epistle to the Colossians, see *ante*, p. 447.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 387.

indication in this epistle that Peter did not hesitate to appropriate whatever was best in Paul even, and to commend it to others by his influence.

Peter's distinct individuality, in contradistinction to Paul's, it is true, is never concealed in this epistle. There is not throughout it a single word against Judeans and Judean tendencies, a feature which plainly enough distinguishes it from an epistle of Paul's. And if Paul had little to say about the past earthly life of Christ, Peter, on the contrary, everywhere loves to allude to it,¹ as was to be expected from him, and as he was specially qualified to make such allusions. And in certain distinctive expressions too, Peter follows rather the Epistle of James, as when he calls Christians in heathen countries *elect sojourners of the dispersion*.² But in the elevation of its thoughts it is really the epistles of Paul only that this epistle follows, although not without a characteristic and happy copying in which there is still observable the full elevation of these primitive apostolic times. And in the arrangement and plan of the epistle as a whole the epistles of Paul serve so exclusively as models, that it is as if, in this respect again particularly, we perceived most distinctly the hand of the same Silvanus who once drew up so many epistles in conjunction with Paul himself, and who had long accustomed himself perfectly to precisely these models.³ But when all this is understood as certain, there is not the slightest ground for doubting that the epistle actually comes from Peter as it was written and dispatched, and that it accurately represents his mind at this final period of his apostolic labours; so that we possess in it a characteristic monument of the mind of this great Apostle, quite unique of its kind.⁴ Just as from the earliest period of his Christian life,

¹ i. 8 (according to the correct reading *εἰδότες*), ii. 21-23, comp. iii. 18-22.

² In the dedication, i. 1; but he plays more freely with this idea in the subsequent part of the epistle, i. 17, ii. 11.

³ After the author has abundantly alluded (1) in connection with the *thanksgiving*, i. 2-ii. 10, to the highest Christian truths, he comes (2) in the *business part* of the epistle, ii. 11-iv. 6, to the admonitions which it is his special purpose to give, with regard to the duties of Christians, particularly in their relations to the heathen and to every government, ii. 11-25, with regard to their domestic duties, iii. 1-7, and finally with regard again to their general duties, iii. 8-iv. 6; after this most weighty section, the epistle refers (3) to the near end of all things, as if it were about to speak further, like

the Epistle of James, of the end of the world; but instead of that, it falls once more into admonition, iv. 7-19; and (4), as is the case in the epistles of Paul, concludes with some brief observations of various kinds, ch. v. It is only the third of these sections which indicates that the author had the Epistle of James also before him. The second and third sections are distinguished by the address 'Beloved,' placed at the beginning, or shortly after the beginning, and this is found in the whole epistle in the two passages, ii. 11, and iv. 12 only; comp. *ante*, p. 456.

⁴ With regard to the various errors of the most recent interpreters with regard to this epistle, see *Jahrbh. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 265 sq., iv. p. 115, viii. pp. 212 sq., 247 sq., ix. pp. 226 sq.

Peter displayed a mind open to every truth as soon as it was revealed to him, and, in spite of all doubts and temptations, remained always at the decisive juncture faithful to it, with absolute decision and immovable faith; so in this instance we find him at last, without renouncing his own characteristic nature, agreeing so perfectly with Paul in all the most important questions, that we hardly know whether to admire more the greatness of the mind of Paul, which is in this instance also so triumphant, or the noble freedom from all jealousy on the part of Peter, who practically acknowledges that greatness. The question whether the timid resolutions of the parent church of the year 52, in matters of food, were to be followed, as Peter had previously done, is not touched on in the epistle; and that question gradually disappears in the midst of the new and serious complications which were coming upon the Christian Church.

When we look, finally, at the admonitions to quiet and prudent behaviour towards heathen magistracies, which it is the special object of this epistle to teach and spread abroad as widely as possible; and when we observe that every word in it is of a character to allay ill-feeling, to calm passion, and to inculcate submission to heathen governments, we see that every heathen government had the best reasons for being perfectly satisfied with such principles, particularly as the life undoubtedly of the majority of Christians actually harmonised with them completely. What a spectacle of the profoundest infatuation and cruelty, therefore, is presented on the part of the Roman Government when we soon afterwards see the massacre of Nero, in which, according to all indications, Peter perished! In spite of all the evil calumnies under which Christians suffered, they would probably have long been left in peace by heathen magistracies, when infinite thoughtlessness and an evil conscience combined in Nero to create the infamous determination to put to death in the most cruel ways these good subjects of his, whom he, as Emperor, ought to have protected against baseless imputations. This took place in the latter part of the year 64. He had then sought in every way to throw upon others the crime of the burning of the city of Rome. When every other effort failed, he hit upon the thought of accusing the Christians of the crime, as for some years they had become more and more disliked, in consequence of the provocations of the Judeans and ridiculous notions of the populace. He proposed to himself to surrender them when condemned to die, like hundreds of other phenomena, if possible always novel, to

the insatiable love of theatrical and sanguinary spectacles of the common populace of Rome, as the real stay of his rule. And in resolving to do this, he anticipated likewise being able himself to indulge his imperial tastes in a new way. He commanded, accordingly, a few Christians to be arrested, that they might be compelled to confess that they were really Christians, and where their co-religionists were to be found in Rome. He then ordered as many as possible to be seized, compelled them all then to confess—if not to the burning of Rome, to faith in Christ. In a confession to the latter, the crime of separation from the rest of mankind, and of hatred of them, was found; and they were, therefore, all condemned indiscriminately. And for the celebration of the spectacle of their death, the Emperor lent his own gardens, and arranged circus-games for those days. The victims were clothed in skins of animals, as if they were really wild beasts, and dogs were let loose upon them to worry them; some were crucified, with an evident allusion to Christ; some, having been covered with pitch and planted like stakes in the ground, were set fire to and burnt like huge torches when night came, as if there had been the desire to punish them for having called Christ the light of the world. Meanwhile, the Emperor, attired as a charioteer, mingled with the crowds of spectators, or, standing on his chariot, drove about his gardens! Tacitus,¹ who, however, had not taken the slightest pains to understand the real nature of Christianity, tells us that thereby a certain kind of commiseration was at last excited even amongst the most indifferent Romans. He is, moreover, the only authority who gives us all this particular information, although he did not make any further inquiries as to the cause of the fierce hatred from which the Christians then suffered for the first time. If we consider, however, that only a few years before, James, with other members of the parent church, had been cruelly put to death in Jerusalem, that Paul was most persistently persecuted, and that the young Christian Church was the more profoundly suspected and hated by Judaism in proportion as the latter was then putting forth new vigour, we cannot doubt but that provocations on the part of the Judeans against these their own brethren and half-brethren, were the most powerful cause of the first great Roman persecution. The ridicule and contempt, or even the hatred, with which the Judeans had then long been regarded by the Romans and other heathen, was thus for a time suddenly diverted with double

¹ *Ann.* xv. 44.

fierceness to the Christians as semi-Judeans and as people who were despised by their own singular brethren.

Neither can it be doubted that persecution thereupon broke out in the other countries of the Roman empire, and that very soon many hundreds, or even thousands, in some places if not everywhere, fell a prey to the same barbarities. Hatred of the Christians, fed and sustained especially by Judeans and Proselytes, could then ravage freely everywhere where a heathen magistracy thought well to follow the imperial example. A time of fiercest trial and purification had suddenly overtaken the Christian Church, which was already spread so far and wide. How large a number of martyrs may then have fallen in the numerous countries of the Roman empire! And how often must precisely the most faithful and longest tried, as well as the most illustrious, members of the Church have succumbed to the ravages of this terrible storm! We are not now in a position to prove this in detail;¹ but the Apocalypse,² written only a few years afterwards, supplies general evidence of the most distinct character, alluding as it does in the strongest terms to all such 'slaying of the prophets, saints, and other Christians;' being, in fact, mainly occasioned by these persecutions as we shall soon see. On one occasion the Apocalypse expressly mentions Antipas in Pergamos, as a famous martyr of those days, who had undoubtedly fallen likewise on account of the very peculiar position of Christianity in that city.³ Indeed, it is as if the entire first generation of Christians had been drowned in these rivers of blood at Rome and Jerusalem, and then in so many other places, not much more than thirty years after the crucifixion of Christ: so that we shall see that from that time there gradually arises from these furious devastations an

¹ For which reason our scholars of an earlier generation doubt the fact altogether. In my early work, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* [Gött. 1828]. I put the matter in the proper light. As a fact, Suetonius, *Nero*, cap. xvii., does not place the persecution of the Christians under Nero, briefly as he refers to it, in any connection with the conflagration in Rome, and does not limit it to Rome; and although it must be granted that a Roman law, in the strict sense, regarding the persecution of the Christians, does not appear to have been made at that time, inasmuch as neither Suetonius nor Tacitus says anything about it; the concise words of Tertullian, 'sub Nerone damnatio invaluit' (*Ad Nationes*, i. 7), nevertheless correctly represent the true state of the case. How-

ever, neither Tertullian, nor any other of the early Fathers, is able to give any particulars regarding the persecution under Nero.

² In addition to the numerous other passages of the Apocalypse, the passage xx. 4 points, by the use of the word *πελεκίζω*, expressly to the Roman manner of execution by the axe (comp. vol. v. p. 416); and it is quite probable that the execution of Paul by the axe was especially in the author's mind in using this term.

³ Apoc. ii. 13. comp. the remark in *Jahrb. d. B. W.* viii. p. 115, with regard to the special situation of Christianity in Pergamos. The Epistle to the Hebrews also alludes to sanguinary persecutions, particularly x. 32-34, comp. *infra*, p. 478.

entirely new, and in many respects, very different generation of Christians.

But the most precious blood that could be shed in consequence of this furious outbreak of persecution, was beyond doubt that of the two Apostles Peter and Paul; and they certainly belonged in a special way to the host of martyrs of whom the Apocalypse speaks. Yet we must not imagine that both fell at the same time; this close connection of both in the memory of their death had, it is true, gradually become more and more usual after the middle of the second century,¹ but it is opposed to all the vestiges of definite reminiscences and traditions as far as we can yet recover them. Strictly speaking, we learn from the New Testament itself² that Peter was crucified; and he may really have been of the number of those who were then crucified in Nero's gardens; it became an established tradition that he was crucified in Rome under Nero, as we see from the Fathers; and, as we above found him actually in Rome about that time, and Tacitus speaks expressly of those who met their death by crucifixion, we may with confidence suppose that he was crucified then. When he saw his wife being also led to death, he is reported to have rejoiced that she likewise was called to make the ascent to the celestial home, and to have encouraged her by calling out to her to remember the Lord.³ But it is a later invention that he expressly desired to be crucified head downwards, so as not to die like his Lord;⁴ the earliest allusion to his crucifixion which we possess presupposes⁵, on the contrary, a simple cruci-

¹ Bishop Dionysius of Corinth was the first, as far as we know (and not Irenæus, *Adv. Hæc.* iii. 3. 2, with his much more general language), who recorded, in his Epistle to the Romans (in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 25) that the two Apostles had in Italy taught contemporaneously, and both together sealed their testimony with martyrdom. Clement of Rome, in his epistle, 1 Cor. ch. v., is so far from intimating this that, on the contrary, he speaks first of Peter alone, and then of Paul, and keeps both separate in his narrative; and his account is of far greater importance. The probable source of all such arbitrary suppositions regarding Paul and Peter, e.g., their numerous contentions and final amicable meeting and companionship in death at Rome, is the *Κήρυγμα Παύλου*, a production similar to the above-named Clementine fiction, of which an idea can be formed from the fragments in Lactantius' *De vera Sapientia*, iv. 21, and the anonymous writer

De bapt. non iter., attached to Cyprian's *Opera*, ed. Rigaltius, p. 139.

² See *ante*, p. 71.

³ Clemen. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 11, 63, and 1 in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 30.

⁴ As is narrated in a source already used by Origen, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 1, but unknown to us; and still more plainly by Jer. *Catal. Scriptt. Eccles.* ch. i. This feature of the tradition was probably likewise first invented in the above *Predicatio Pauli*.

⁵ The utterance of the Lord recorded John xxi. 18, 19, comp. xiii. 36, comp. *ante*, p. 71, and *Jahrb. d. B. W.* iii. p. 171. There is in that passage simply an allusion to the girdle which the otherwise completely naked crucified man wore, and which he could not himself put on, but which the executioner fastened round him, and carried him thus to his painful death. The above facts as regards Peter's relation to Rome may all be granted, and, nevertheless, the Papist

fixion in the ordinary manner; although such intensifications of the horrors of death by crucifixion probably occurred.¹

Paul, on the other hand, really attained the long-cherished wish of his life, of being able to visit Spain as the best known of the western countries of the Roman Empire. If we have no express evidence on this point from his own hand,² the oldest account of his martyrdom, which has been preserved in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians,³ really leaves no doubt about it. It was not the design of Clement to give in this passage a complete account of Paul's or Peter's martyrdom; but the incidental language he uses does not allow us to doubt but that Paul met his death later than Peter, and that it was not until after he had gone into the extreme west that it occurred. When he heard in Spain of the persecutions of the Christians in Rome, he perhaps hastened back thither, that he might the more plainly bear witness for the truth of Christianity; but he was then again arrested, brought up for trial, and condemned to die. As a Roman citizen, however, he was not crucified, but met the more honourable death of decapitation, as tradition always related of him.⁴ The sepulchres of these two great Apostles were subsequently shown in two quite different places.⁵ Though we do not know precisely the date of Paul's execution,⁶ we may

view of him is wholly without foundation, although it was still defended in 1867 by Pius B. Gams (*Das Jahr des Martyrtodes der Apostel Petrus und Paulus*, Regensburg).

¹ As the great instance in *Jos. Bell. Jud. v. 11. 1* shows.

² It is an entirely baseless conjecture of some modern scholars that Paul made another journey to Asia after his liberation, the motive of that conjecture being the explanation thereby of some passages in the Pastoral Epistles. Eusebius even, who records, *Ecc. Hist. ii. 22*, Paul's second captivity in Rome according to early tradition, knows nothing of fresh journeys to Asia, which Paul, it is true, had in prospect, according to his epistles from Rome, but which he certainly never carried out.

³ Ch. v. These words are in their connection so perfectly clear that it is incomprehensible that they could be so completely misunderstood, or rather perverted, as they have been in our time. Moreover, this epistle, as despatched from Rome (comp. the next vol.), could not possibly speak of Rome as the limit of the whole earth. We possess, too, in the Muratorian Fragment evidence quite independent of Clemens, comp. *Jahrb. d. L. W.*

viii. pp. 126 sq.

⁴ In Euseb. *Ecc. Hist. ii. 25* this is related, like the journey of Peter to Rome under Claudius (see *ante*, p. 460), without any further mention of authorities, comp. Laetantius *De Mort. Persee*, ch. ii., who, after his fashion, mixes rhetoric with his narrative. The same fact is also implied in the brief rhetorical sentences of Tertullian, *Romæ Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatior* (after all, therefore, not with such exaggeration as some other narratives above, p. 469, referred to) *Paulus Joannis* (Baptistæ) *exitu coronatur*, *De Præscrip. Hæret.* xxxvi.

⁵ That of Peter on the Vatican hill, that of Paul on the Ostian road, as the Roman bishop Caius asserts in the second century, Euseb. *Ecc. Hist. ii. 25*. Even in the book on the *Dormitio Mariæ*, Peter is fetched from Rome, but Paul from a town on the Tiber (which is undoubtedly meant to be Ostia), Tischendorf's *Apocal. Apocr.* pp. 99, 101.

⁶ The attempt has been made to infer the date from the words *μαρτυρήσας ἐν τῶν ἡγουμέων* in the Epistle of Clement, ch. v. But those words are not at all intended to indicate the time, and would not in any way indicate it; they denote

very well suppose that it took place as early as the year 65.—Timothy also was imprisoned about that time, while he was on a visit to the parent church, but afterwards set at liberty again;¹ the last certain fact that is known of his life.

With Paul the strongest human stay of the Christianity of that period, and at the same time the chief opponent, as the heads of the Hagiocracy and their dupes believed, of the Judeanism of the age, had fallen. These enemies of his, to whom he bore no hostility, could then greatly rejoice, and his death occurred only about a year before the wild outbreak of the ultimate intentions, which we shall soon have to describe, of the heads of the Hagiocracy in Jerusalem, who were destined soon to learn how little ground they had for such rejoicing. He fell as the noblest and most vigorous, but at the same time the most willing and devoted, sacrifice for Christ's cause which this generation of Christians, now verging to its end, had in its ranks; but he fell also as one of the last in whom the whole elevation and energy of the immortal aims of the ancient people of the true religion were once more concentrated, as if in this late Benjamite the ancient ravening wolf Benjamin had arisen in a bodily form, though only that he might snatch innumerable souls from the heathen and Judeans as prey for Christ.² And yet in reality his meritorious claims as a man are simply these, that by seeking and finding the simple truth alone, instead of all the error of his time, he correctly perceived in the cause of Christ and his kingdom what was the right thing to be done at that particular time; and his renown was simply that he firmly, with unshaken faithfulness through all the vicissitudes, triumphs, and sufferings of his life, maintained what he had perceived to be the right thing, even to his martyrdom. It is idle to compare him with Christ; it would be most offensive to his own feeling. With Christ the highest religious mirror and model, incentive and motive, that could be presented in history had been given. But in every

simply that Paul was condemned by customary judicial procedure (not like Peter in the persecution under Nero) before the magistracy (comp. 1 Peter ii. 13, 14). It has been shown above (pp. 24 sq.) that the Acts of the Apostles by its plan points to the death of Paul and Peter in Rome; and it follows plainly, from the anticipatory hints of the book as to their end, ix. 15, xxiii. 11, which, when carefully considered, cannot be otherwise understood, that it intends in this reference a magisterial accusation and condemnation

of Paul in Rome, in which he finally proclaimed his bold utterance regarding Christ before kings. Moreover, the book at the very beginning, i. 8, points to Paul's journey to Spain. Comp. *Jahrb. d. B. W.* xi. pp. 244 sq.

¹ Heb. xiii. 23.

² According to the expressive figure taken from Gen. xlix. 27, with which a Christian describes his fame a few decades after his death, *Testam. XII. Patr., Benj.* cap. xi.

new age fresh hindrances and obscurations meet the highest truth of religion, even when it has been clearly supplied, whether men seek or not to be guided through them by that religion. So in the Apostolic age the heaviest clouds of misconception, uncertainty, and hostility at once gathered around the divine word, which had at last appeared in fullest truth. In that early age it must have been in so many respects still more difficult to break through such clouds, if the historical light of Christ's own appearance had not still immediately and most forcibly shone upon the believer, and if the fire of the first Christian hope had not continued still to inspire him most vividly. But Paul overcame those dark clouds more perfectly than any other man of his time in the spheres of perception, labour, and of practice equally; and on that account he will always rank as a model of the truest Christian. In estimating his worth, the decisive thing is not his particular doctrines, still less an artificial system; his mind thinks acutely and correctly, but it is always everything with him to correctly perceive all earthly things in the light that has once been given from heaven, and every moment to do with divine joy and assurance the most difficult tasks that follow from that perception; and for all true Christians this must always be everything. That man had appeared in the Christian Church who, as the most prominent teacher and worker, missionary and martyr amongst the heathen, lived and moved perfectly as Christ himself would have done if he had then been amongst them on the earth. The Christian Church of that time waited for such a man; and after he had fulfilled his divine mission so perfectly and so luminously before all the world, all the great difficulties which, as we have seen,¹ were about to impede the course of Christianity throughout the world in the period of its infancy were already practically removed.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

The consequences of these great calamities in Rome, which so soon followed those in Jerusalem, must have been far-reaching. Christianity, in the form it had to assume when bereft of the visible Christ, had come into the world as an almost too tender and purely celestial thing, and in order to be able at all to remain and work in the world had, therefore, to cling in child-like ingenuousness and love of existence, in the first instance, to its own terrestrial mother on the sacred hill of Zion. Having been soon rudely repulsed by her, it

¹ *Ante.* pp. 173 sq.

had, at first with hesitation and uncertain step, but soon with greater confidence and increasing success, cast itself into the midst of the great heathen world, with the view of transforming this according to its own religion and love, and of protecting it against the threatening general ruin. And after the true feeling had at last triumphed, that, before that catastrophe, heathendom must be generally converted, the aim of Christianity appeared likely rapidly to be attained by means of Paul's extraordinary labours amongst the heathen. At this point it was a second time most cruelly treated by its own mother, and soon afterwards it received a most painful blow from the overwhelming power of heathenism; indeed branded, as it were, for all future time, it was threatened with the final death-blow and as good as annihilated in the eyes of the world. Under these two terrible blows, from two entirely opposite quarters, it seems as if, inasmuch as it is still in its infancy so weak and alien, it must very soon wholly perish. Heathens as well as Judeans could now freely show their hostility to it, and the contempt as well as the hatred which Judeanism had long excited against itself were vented, for the time, solely upon this its offshoot. Moreover, with the three Apostles, James, Peter, and Paul, the boldest and most honoured heads of the young Church had fallen.

If, therefore, there was in infant Christianity, whose existence was still so fluctuating, something that could not be vanquished by the most severe persecutions, which was capable of confronting the terrible power of heathenism no less than that of Judeanism as it still existed and was lifting its head more proudly than ever before, it must be shown now or never. And when we look at everything closely we must say that it then stood the test in such a wonderful way that at that early date its world-subduing indestructible energy could be most fully perceived; just as all the subsequent victories, which it always in the end obtained under similar persecutions, would have been impossible without that victory which it won in this most trying and decisive period. The details of this victory, so far as they belong to the time under review, may be briefly given.

From the very commencement the fury of the persecution was checked by the unexpected heroism with which most of its victims met death. This genuinely Christian alacrity to be like Christ himself, and in view of his glory to die with him in order to be glorified with him, had been previously exhibited in the parent church in certain illustrious instances. But it was now for the first time exhibited in the midst of the heathen

and, indeed, before the eyes of the most distinguished Roman world, in the case of a great multitude of faithful Christians; and the sting of hostile persecution generally was thereby blunted. It was not as yet that excessive eagerness with which subsequently Christians urged each other to hasten to death; but the first powerful impulse in that direction was then given. Heaven rightly appeared to be suddenly filled with martyrs, who, assembled around the glorified Christ, prayed for righteous divine vengeance, and besought from God the final consummation of things, as the Apocalypse soon afterwards works this out in its poetic and prophetic manner. And instead of Christian zeal generally and the new Christian view of the whole future being thereby checked, both came forth from this great extended baptism of blood with an accession of fervour. The honour Christians paid to the graves of the martyrs, which commenced earlier, as we have seen,¹ was likewise unmistakably at this time greatly increased.²

We can well understand that not a few weaker Christians were brought by such deadly persecution into strong temptation to apostasy, and, indeed, that to some extent they really fell back either into heathenism or Judeanism. Whilst heathenism terrified all by its secular power, and seduced many heathen Christians by the natural participation in its sacrifices and other practices, the Judeans often used the privileges which they still enjoyed in the Roman empire against Jewish Christians as apostates from their faith, bringing them, for instance, into prison when the heathen magistracy was anywhere favourable to them, or themselves inflicting punishments on them in their own synagogues.³ If the various churches, as thus alarmed and restricted, fell into the greatest dangers, this brought to them, it is true, the particular advantage that the contentions that had before been stirred in their own midst were repressed; but, on the other hand, the timid anxiety to hold fast what then appeared essential necessarily increased rapidly. The esteem in which Paul was held was undoubtedly in the highest degree further increased by his martyrdom; but that age was least of all adapted for bringing to a final

¹ P. 138.

² For instance, in the case of Peter and Paul (*ante*, p. 470), and in the middle of the second century the sepulchre of James, the Lord's brother, was shown, according to Hegesippus (in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23, 18). On the other hand there

is no mention of a sepulchre of James, the son of Zebedee, who fell much earlier (*ante*, p. 269.)

³ The experience clearly intimated. Rev. ii. 9, 10, iii. 9, from the life of the churches of Asia Minor, was undoubtedly not uncommon then in other churches.

decision, as some new teachers, whom we shall soon meet, then desired, the difficult questions which his labours had given rise to. And, therefore, we find precisely the best and most faithful Christians then adhering to the limitations which the meeting at Jerusalem in the year 52¹ had laid down against a complete break with ancient usages. The strict warning against flesh offered to idols and fornication, which was now uttered again,² was only like a late echo of the cry against falling back into any form of heathenism, whether the usual one or that of Gnosticism.

In the years 65 and 66, however, the arrogance and the hopes of the Judeans greatly increased; and while Christianity appeared to be sinking into the dust, the fresh exuberant spirits, and very soon the outward successes also, of Judeanism once more attracted the eyes of all the world to it. We can well understand both that many Christians would be thereby led astray, particularly in the more remote heathen countries, where the greater distance itself exercised its charm, and that Judean emissaries, who undoubtedly at that time travelled most zealously through all heathen countries, would seek to utilise to the utmost this feeling, which was so dangerous to Christianity, in order to reconvert Christians to the ancient religion. Between the year 33, the date of Christ's resurrection, and the year 66, a human generation had elapsed; but the Christian hope of the immediate outward consummation by the *parousia* of the glorified Christ, on which faith in him still appeared to depend, as on some celestial meteor, seemed as if it were fated not to be fulfilled, although, as we have seen,³ the declaration of Christ was known, that it would be fulfilled 'in that generation;' the most powerful and enterprising Apostles had almost all of them fallen, and after their fall a second Christian generation, suddenly bereft, as it were, of all divine guidance, saw itself exposed to the most threatening storms of the age. It is true, many Christian churches had already existed long enough in heathen countries not easily to fall back wholly into heathenism, even if they consisted for the most part of heathen Christians; but why should they not, as the Judean emissaries sought to persuade them, go over to Judeanism, since it was really regarded by Christians themselves as the venerated ancient religion? Intrigues and thoughts of this kind must have been announced to the parent

¹ *Ante*, p. 357.

² Rev. ii. 14, 15, 24. comp. *Jahrbh. d. B. W.* viii. pp. 115 sq.

³ *Ante*, p. 382.

church by a deputation from an important Italian town at the commencement of the year 66, so that a younger member of the parent church, who was, however, intensely animated by the Christian spirit, felt called upon to deal particularly with the subject in a letter in reply. This letter, which is of such great importance as regards both that age and the whole matter of the relation of the New Testament to the Old, and which, according to all indications, was written about the beginning of this year 66,¹ was that which has come down to us under the name, subsequently given to it, of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*.²

The name of the author will probably always remain unknown, no other work of his than this epistle, in which he does not think well to give his name, having come down to us. It is, however, evident that he was at that time still of a younger generation of Christians,³ who wrote from the parent church,⁴ though not in its name, to the Italian city above referred to, and had previously paid a visit of some length to it, becoming thus sufficiently acquainted with it.⁵ As was habitual in the parent church, he speaks everywhere like a genuine Israelite, as from the bosom of the ancient nation,⁶ and does not allude by a single expression to Judeans in an unfavourable sense. If in this respect he does not resemble Paul, but James and Peter as authors of their epistles, in his presentation of the fundamental Christian doctrines of faith, and of the significance of the sacrificial death of Christ, he appears as one following quite in Paul's steps; so that he is a powerful witness for the early effects of Paul's epistles. In elevation of language,

¹ It is obvious that it cannot be of an earlier date: but neither can it well be of a later one, since the words Heb. vi. 10 can only be understood to refer to a gift to the parent church that had just been renewed, implying that that church, therefore, was still at Jerusalem. The church of the Italian city which sent this gift had had to suffer many things in the persecution under Nero, Heb. x. 32-34, xii. 4, but had not endured a persecution unto death; for that reason, amongst others, we cannot suppose the city was Rome, but, according to xiii. 24, another large city of Italy—Ravenna, for instance, which was then in frequent intercourse with the East, or some other city. Who its first elders, who had then passed away (xiii. 7) were, we do not know.

² This heading may date back as far as the beginning of the second century, and may have been placed at the head of

the anonymous epistle, because its subject-matter could at that time be appropriately used in refutation of the Jewish Christians, *i.e.*, Ebionites; but it is certain that it was not there originally. Comp. *Johrb. d. B. W.* iii. pp. 254. sq.; vi. pp. 135 sq.; x. pp. 244 sq.; xi. p. 243.

³ According to the general strain of the language, Heb. ii. 1-4.

⁴ On this supposition we get the best explanation of his very brief allusion to the place of the crucifixion of Christ, xiii. 12. For all the reasons involved in the above considerations, we cannot suppose, with some of the Fathers, that either Barnabas or Luke, or, with Luther, that Apollos was the author.

⁵ xiii. 18, 19, 22, 23; the language of x. 32-34 is also like that of a man who had experienced what is described.

⁶ The language of the epistle shows this everywhere.

too, he rises here and there to the height of Paul; yet his style is generally more that of an essay, one of the plainest indications of the rise of a second generation of Christians. Another sign of this is that he already transfers the views and phrases of Philo regarding the Logos to the glorified Christ, thereby attaining the possibility of describing that Christ as the eternal celestial High Priest and Mediator, who on that very account renders the terrestrial Temple, with its fallible high-priest, redundant. If we compare the language of Philo above referred to¹ regarding the Logos, its adoption by our Christian author is obvious. The object of this epistle was to show to all Christians generally, according to the necessity of that age, by lengthened exposition and admonition, that to go over from Christianity to Judeanism was a relapse from a higher to a lower stage of true religion, against which nothing was so sure a protection as a firm and joyous faith, joyful alike in action and in suffering. And as the Christian epistles, particularly those sent from the parent church, were then gradually assuming a more general character, he accordingly drew up his epistle, both at the beginning and throughout, as if all Christians could read it, adding, in the course of the epistle and at the end, only a very few observations referring more to his own experience. He does not, after Paul's manner, begin his epistle with an elevated thanksgiving, but, like a teacher of the Church (such as everywhere succeeded to the apostles),² commences in the form of an essay. Passing from heaven to earth, and from the earliest to immediately present and future matters, he teaches that Christ is (1) higher than any angel, (2) the true High Priest, and (3) the one true consummator of all hope of perfection;³ when it has been shown each time hortatively in connection with these three artistically interlaced essays, what the further inference is which follows from each of these three truths, the author can turn the more freely to the description

¹ Pp. 215 sq.

² See *ante*, p. 319.

³ These are the three sections of increasing length, i. 1-ii. 4; ii. 5 v. 10; v. 11-x. 31. Each of these three sections closes with its appropriate exhortation; and the progress of the argument is so arranged that the same fundamental truth with which the previous one closes, is taken up again at the beginning of the next section, to be insensibly carried over in the course of the argument to the new truth. Thus the writer begins again, ii. 5, with the angels, but only to come by apt turns of thought as soon as possible to

Christ as High Priest, and to linger on this thought in different developments; at the beginning of the third section, after preparing at some length for the following most important discussion, v. 11-vi. 12, he resumes, vi. 13-vii. 28, what he had said, iv. 1, of the promise, and, v. 6-10, of Melchisedec, but only the more plainly to set forth by this apt transition the relation of the Old Testament generally to the New. We must carefully note this concatenation of the three fundamental thoughts in this epistle if we wish to properly appreciate its matter and art.

of faith as the proper means by which the elevation of Christianity can be kept.¹ And thereupon the epistle closes with a few less continuous observations, after the manner of Paul.²

In reality no book could supply a better transition than this to the wholly new period, at the threshold of which Christianity had fully arrived in the year 66. The first impulses and customs with which it entered creatively into the world, baptism particularly, in its new spiritual form,³ and that imposition of hands connected therewith, by which, under the Old Covenant, only a few, but now all without exception, were to receive the highest consecration to the spiritual life,⁴ were exceedingly marvellous. Yet even the practices and habits which had at first originated in the most intense and burning spiritual zeal often gradually become mere usages and customs, which are never in themselves adequate, without constant fresh zeal in every new time of difficulty, just as they were then inadequate in view of the new trials of the age.⁵ At that time it needed such fresh zeal both in thought and in action to finally set Christianity quite free from Judeanism, and that it might no longer be in peril of falling back into it. When our author shows that Christ is the true eternal High Priest and the New Covenant as such the consummation of the Old, he makes the latter redundant, and lets it go more decidedly than Paul. And he does that within sight and in the immediate neighbourhood of the ancient Temple that was still standing, and although not rising to the height of strict prophecy, yet as with an involuntary anticipation that it could not last much longer.

Neither did the admonitions of this general epistle fall upon unprepared soil. The perfect divine life can be embraced only by men who are prepared to die for it, should the attempt be made to wrest it from them by rude force; and as Christ, who first brought it to the earth, also died for it, it was necessary that a time should come when his followers would learn more and more universally not to shrink from that extreme trial, when the highest thing which they had to guard against the attacks of the world was not otherwise to be maintained. And already there had fallen for this cause not only a few most prominent individuals, such as Stephen and the two Jameses, but in the persecutions under Nero the purest and most precious blood

¹ This fourth section extends from x. 32 to xii. 29.

² Ch. xiii.

³ See *ante*, pp. 134 sq.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 135.

⁵ Which is admirably insisted upon at the opening of the third section, v. 11-vi. 2.

had been sacrificed in rivers; and even a Mark, who was at first unable to overcome all human fear,¹ became in the end, as maimed in his fingers,² almost a martyr. Moreover, they were the times when it could be said that the sons of those who crucified Christ became themselves evangelists and apostles.³

Yet the Judeans, especially in the Holy Land itself and the proud city of Jerusalem, who had once and for all turned away from Christianity, did not at all observe the profound movements that were taking place in Christianity. We shall see this plainly enough in that part of the history to which we now turn.

3. *The Last Two Roman Governors.*

Albinus, who acted energetically, as we have seen,⁴ in a case in which the Christians were concerned, prosecuted zealously on his part likewise the work, which had been vigorously commenced by his predecessor, of exterminating the assassins and banditti; and as he was not wanting in caution, he would probably have finished it. But he was unhappily not inaccessible to bribery; and fresh complications which practically frustrated entirely his exertions very soon arose. For in addition to all the serious wounds that had long been festering in the aged system of Israel, there had been inflicted a new injury which already very nearly reached its heart. From the time of Herod the Great the office of high-priest had constantly followed the caprices of the potentates, and the younger Agrippa fell again in the last years into the same capricious ways. Still the high-priest had always to be chosen exclusively from the old high-priests' families.⁵ On that account the arrogant claims of these few families in relation to the other priestly houses and the nation, had increased in the same proportion as their humiliation and weakness in relation to foreign rulers. After the commencement of the direct Roman rule, as it really left to the nation some semblance of liberty, the high-priesthood had boasted of being the one popular national power left to Israel; and inasmuch as the office of high-priest could be held only by the members of the few high-priestly families, the domestic constitution of the nation might be called an aristocracy;⁶ all the older members of these houses were also thus described in ordinary discourse, inasmuch as every one of them might become high-priest. But in reality the office in all but domestic

¹ *Ante*, p. 337.

² *Ante*, *ibid.*

³ *Ancient Syrian Documents*, p. 10.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 158.

⁵ See vol. v. pp. 423 sq.; vi. p. 62.

⁶ We can thus most correctly conceive the matter according to *Jos. Ant.* xx. 10 *ad fin.*

matters was entirely dependent on the caprice of the secular rulers, and it was reckoned that there were as many as twenty-eight high-priests between the years 37 B.C., the beginning of Herod's reign, and the year 70 A.D., when the office ceased with the Temple itself.¹ On that account there had now long ago arisen a great degree of jealousy amongst these families and the various members of each family, in place of the quiet paternal relation in which the members of the high-priesthood stood previously. Under the new state of things every member of these families might hope to rapidly reach the highest dignity, and on that account probably likewise sought to obtain as much money as possible, in order thereby to become acceptable to the potentates who granted the office. These are the same bad practices which have arisen amongst the Greek patriarchs under the Turkish Government. In Israel they

¹ This number is given *Jos. Ant.* xx. 10 *ad fin.*, and must be accepted; but as Josephus does not in the closing passage of his work once more give their names in order, there is a good deal that is uncertain when we take into consideration the other obscure points of his narrative. The most probable succession of the twenty-eight is the following: (1) Chanael (Ananelus), vol. v. p. 423; (2) Josus, son of Phabi, and (3) Herod's father-in-law, Simon, son of Boethus, according to *Ant.* xv. 9. 3, xvii. 4. 2, whose three sons likewise became high-priests, but on account of the frequency of the name Simon were more briefly called after their grandfather, Boethus, *Ant.* xix. 6. 2, and the parallel passages; (4) Matthias, son of Theophilus, and (5) Joseph, son of Ellem, *Ant.* xvii. 4. 2; 6. 4; (6) Joazar, son of Boethus, *Ant.* xvii. 6. 4; xviii. 1. 1; (7) his brother Eleazar and (8) Jesus, son of Si'e, *Ant.* xvii. 13. 1; (9) Chanan (in N. T. Annas), son of Seth, of whom not fewer than five sons became high-priests (*Ant.* xx. 9. 1), *Ant.* xviii. 2. 1; (10) Ismael, son of Phabi (פאבי), probably not a brother of the second of the series, mentioned also in *M. סוכה* ix. 15; (11) Eleazar, son of Chanan; (12) Simon, son of Kamith; (13) Joseph Caiaphas, *Ant.* xviii. 2. 2, comp. vol. vi. pp. 64, 79; (14) Jonathan, son of Chanan (Annas), *Ant.* xviii. 4. 3; xix. 6. 4; (15) Theophilus son of Chanan, *Ant.* xviii. 5. 3; (16) Simon, son of Boethus, called also *Cantheras*, *Ant.* xix. 6. 2; (17) Matthias, son of Chanan, *Ant.* xix. 6. 4; (18) Eljōnāi, son of Cantheras, *Ant.* xix. 8. 1, comp. *ante*, p. 263; (19) his brother Ismael, with the surname Cantheras, whom Josephus omits, xix. 8. 1, probably by an oversight, and calls simply

Cantheras, xx. 1. 3, but who is incidentally mentioned by his name Ismael simply, *Ant.* iii. 15. 3 (see *ante*, p. 335); (20) Joseph, son of Kami, xx. 1. 3, or, more properly, Kamyd (according to another reading Kamed, קמדיה, abbreviated קמדיה), xx. 5. 2; (21) Chanajī (Ananias), son of Nebedāi, xx. 5. 2, comp. *ante*, p. 435; (22) Ismael, son of Phabi, xx. 8. 8; (23) Joseph, surnamed Kabi, son of Simon, the son of Boethus; (24) Chanan, the fifth son of Chanan (Annas), and (25) Jesus, son of Damnāi, xx. 8. 11; 9. 1; (26) Jesus, son of Gamaliel, or, more briefly, Gamala, xx. 9. 4 (who, according to Talmudic tradition, obtained the office simply through the ambition of his wife Martha, the daughter of Boethus, which led her to bribe the king), and (27) Matthias, son of Theophilus, xx. 9. 7, whom Josephus could also speak of as the son of Boethus, if he descended from him. *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 1, comp. iv. 9, 11; vi. 2. 2. The following high-priests who may have been appointed by the revolutionary party after the year 66, Josephus does not count amongst those twenty-eight; and as that number is not completed by the above names, he probably included the last Asmonean amongst them, who, as we saw above (vol. v. pp. 423 sq.), interrupted for a short time the high-priesthood of Chanael; further comp. *ante*, p. 419. We must further bear in mind, to get a clear idea of the uncertain tenure of this office, that not a few of the above twenty-eight were several times appointed and deposed.—It may be remarked that Josephus, as himself a priest, traces this part of the history evidently with special sympathy and comparatively great accuracy.

appear in their most glaring form under the rule of Felix, half a century after Herod their originator's death, when the fire of domestic discord had in other respects been fiercely burning. In accordance with a one-sided interpretation of a passage in the Pentateuch, which was probably first attempted only in the learned schools, the high-priest at that time laid down the principle, that the tithe belonged not to the priestly families generally but only to those of the high-priests;¹ and he at once proceeded to act according to this principle, caring but little whether the other remaining priestly families fell into distressing poverty or not. If Josephus, whose family suffered in consequence of this innovation, complains of it with excessive bitterness, it is certain that the circumstance contributed in no small degree to the profound internal schism and dissolution of the nation; and, in fact, that it would not have been possible if one single elevated and pure thought had kept the community together, and the process of disruption had not already permeated everything. For neither was the supreme heathen power, supposing that a better man than Felix had been governor, inclined to meddle with a domestic affair of this kind, so closely connected with the national religion; and the consequences were accordingly already of the most lamentable nature. The so-called high-priests, as in fact all who had already been high-priests, or who had a claim to the office, despatched their domestic servants to the threshing-floors to carry off the tithes beforehand, but many of the elders and principal men of the people took the side of the other priests; thus public parties were formed, each of which sought to win the day by the aid of the multitude, and did not hesitate to employ the most dangerous characters; and from reproaches and stone-throwing it came almost to sanguinary conflicts. After these commotions had been somewhat allayed by Roman interference as it seems,² another of the 'high-priests' named Chananja (Annas) made the same claim under the governorship of Albinus, and by his determined and decided bearing towards all who were considered enemies of the nation he had won the high esteem of very many and succeeded in increasing it every day; he was, moreover, rich, and bribed both Albinus and the high-priest then in office. He could accordingly venture to send his domestic servants, with numbers of strong-handed

¹ That is, the words Num. xviii. 28. were explained as if Aaron only, *i.e.*, the high priest, was intended, which was certainly not the original meaning; see

Antiquities, pp. 299 sq.

² At all events, we may supply this as understood *Jos. Ant.* xx. 8. 8 and 9. 2, 3.

subordinates prepared to beat those who resisted, to carry off the above-mentioned tithes. And this violence was successful. But at the next feast when, as was customary, the multitudes that flocked to Jerusalem could be only imperfectly watched, Sicarii, who had crept into the city at night for that purpose, took prisoner the secretary of one Eleazar, one of the sons of Chananja, who had been made captain of the Temple guard,¹ and had certainly been most actively engaged in those tithe-raids; they led him off as a hostage, afterwards demanding of his father that he should request from Albinus ten prisoners of their number as his ransom; and as it had proved successful, they frequently repeated this artifice, in the case of the domestic servants of this powerful and wealthy man. Thus all the restraints of order were removed under the eyes of Albinus.

Meanwhile, the younger Agrippa had long before arrived at full age; and though he was far more discreet than his thoughtless father had been, he still did not know in the least how to use the power which he possessed in correcting the evils which were eating ever more deeply into the life of the nation. If only a limited power had been accorded to him he might still, particularly with his authority over the high-priests and the Temple, have exerted the happiest influence if he had had any feeling for truly spiritual matters; but all such things were alien to his nature, as the example above given² sufficiently shows. He placed, on the contrary, so much confidence in the fortunes of Nero, that he named Cæsarea Philippi, which he possessed and renovated,³ *Neronias*.⁴ But the scattered territory which he owned in the north and the east was too quiet and rural to please him: following the example of his father⁵ he preferred to reside in the great maritime city Beyrout, receiving adulation there from heathen as the great patron of art and science. As if he meant this city to be his Rome and himself its emperor, he endowed the theatre built there by his father, in aid of the expenses of the annual performances, fed with gifts of corn and oil the populace who visited it and applauded him, and adorned the entire city with the most valuable statues. But his subjects complained the more loudly that he applied their

¹ The *στρατηγῶν*, *Jos. Ant.* xx. 9. 3, identical with *στρατηγός*, *ante.* p. 419. The name *Ἀνανίας*, which occurs frequently in this narrative, *ch.* 9. 2, 3, in our present editions of Josephus, in this case interchanges in the editions with *Ἀνανος*, 9. 1, this promiscuous use of the names

being frequent elsewhere. Further comp. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2.

² Pp. 440 sq.

³ See *ante.* p. 421.

⁴ The name occurs on coins of this period, see Eckhel, p. 493.

⁵ See *ante.* p. 263.

money without any conscience to a foreign city,¹ and we shall subsequently see how far they were from being faithful to him in the hour of trial. At Jerusalem he built in the Castle-palace, west of the Temple, which was still the property of his family,² a tower, from which he had the most unhindered and finest view of the city and the buildings of the Temple. But as the heads of the Hagiocracy regarded it in the highest degree improper that common eyes should watch, for their own pleasure, everything that was going on in the sacred Temple, they quickly erected, with the sanction of the inhabitants of the capital, a high wall opposite the tower, by which not only was the view from the royal dining hall cut off, but that of the most western Temple-court was intercepted, in which the Roman soldiers kept guard on the festivals. Neither would they be deterred by the threats of either Agrippa or the Governor Festus, but on the contrary sent, with the latter's permission, a deputation to Nero, consisting of ten of the chief elders of the city, the high-priest Ismael, son of Phabi, and the Temple-treasurer Helcias, to defend before him their rights. And that this deputation attained its object before Nero was ascribed to the Empress Poppæa, who was inclined to the Jewish faith. Still the two priests were obliged to remain in Rome as hostages for the tranquillity of Jerusalem in the future.³ This caused Agrippa to appoint a new high-priest, a liberty of which he subsequently made increasingly frequent use. But when he, on one occasion, under Albinus, changed the high-priest again, the respective adherents of the deposed and the new high-priest, in consequence of the spirit which then animated the populace, confronted each other openly in the wildest uproar; on which occasion not only the above-mentioned Chananja with his money, but also two members of the Herodean family, Costoba and Saul, who everywhere gladly lent their physical force and their names for such brawls and extortions of money, played the most disgraceful part.

As the Judeans were not therefore more tranquil under Albinus, Nero was the more disposed to recall him, as he might hope to find in Gessius Florus, a Greek of Clazomenæ, whose wife Cleopatra was a friend of the Empress Poppæa, a better successor, who had been recommended by the former to his wife, who was so favourably inclined towards the Judeans.

¹ *Jos. Ant.* xx. 9. 4.

² Abutting on the *Antonîa*, and according to Josephus, built by the Asmoneans, therefore distinct from the palace of

Herod, a fact to be noted in connection with the account given vol. vi. p. 435 [see Translator's Pref. to vol. vi].

³ *Jos. Ant.*, xx. 8. 11.

And as soon as Albinus heard of it from Rome, he quickly ordered the most guilty of the numerous persons remaining in the prisons to be executed, that he might then liberate the rest in return for liberal ransoms, thereby getting as much money as possible from his office before his retirement, while at the same time he appeared to be the true liberator of the country. But Florus, who had obtained his office in some such way as Felix (whose memory was not yet forgotten), and who was destined to be the last governor, was soon, together with his wife, detested in the country beyond measure. In his haste to enrich himself, and relying on his exalted patronage in Rome, he accepted bribes, not secretly like Albinus, but quite openly from everyone, promised protection to all who made him presents, and in the end left everybody quite without it; so that robbery prevailed more than ever, whole villages and districts were devastated, and many from despair turned their backs upon their native land. Moreover, he soon displayed a mind not less sullen and crafty than cruel and impervious to all noble feeling; and how was he likely to prove a better governor, since he sought to imitate his master Nero, who had at that time already fallen so low? ¹ It is easy to understand why Josephus manifests special indignation against him, and is unable therefore to speak badly enough of him. Moreover, we have no reason to expect much that is good of such an admirer of Nero.

Nevertheless, the capital itself appeared specially fitted to accustom itself by degrees to a government of this kind, since the sacred services of the Temple, at all events, remained all along very much unmolested, and no stop was put to the influx of rich strangers into it. Everything connected with the Hagiocracy and its splendour continued to develop itself under the protection of the Roman peace. With the mania for external honour, splendour, and distinction, which had at this restless and vain period permeated almost all sections of the people, the Levitic singers desired to be put pretty much on an equality with the ordinary priests, who had been as we have seen humiliated,² by being allowed to wear like them the long white linen priestly robe;³ and Agrippa in order that, at all events, some memorial of his rule might remain (as was said to him in flattery), gave them permission; some of the other Levites received thereupon permission to do the same, all this being done with the sanction of the Sanhedrin. And as the

¹ Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 2; *Ant.* xx.
11. 1.

² *Ante*, p. 480.

³ *Comp. Antiquities*, pp. 278, 288.

building of the Temple according to the original plan of Herod the Great had just then been completed,¹ and thereby eighteen thousand labourers were likely to starve, the town council besought the king that he would order the eastern outer courts of the Temple, the plan of which was still ascribed to Solomon,² and which had then fallen into decay, to be restored by these labourers. He had no inclination to do that, but he permitted the workmen to be employed in paving the streets of the city with costly white stones, and made also fresh preparations on a grand scale for further additions to certain portions of the Temple.³

If therefore the peace, which was with difficulty maintained, was thus protracted, at all events so far as the whole nation was concerned, upwards of twenty years, and if some Judeans at all events continued honestly to do their best still to preserve it, it is nevertheless as if all the most spiritual aims and energies of the rest of the nation which still adhered to the ancient faith were no longer able to find any rest. We should see this most plainly if the whole literature of this period had been preserved; but the one work which has come down to us from it, the *Fourth Book of the Maccabees*, considered above,⁴ notwithstanding all the art of exalted philosophic language, flashes with a fiery passion, that could not be more burning, for the glory of the *Law* and against every form of heathenism, and enables us clearly to perceive that minds which drank in such thoughts and descriptions could not possibly long remain tranquil.

¹ Comp. vol. v. p. 434, vi. pp. 67, 153.

² *Jos. Ant.* xx. 9. 7, comp. *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 1.

³ The latter according to the incidental remark, *Bell. Jud.* v. 1. 5.

⁴ Vol. v. pp. 484 sq.

THE END OF THIS NEW AGE.

The Seven Years from 66 to 73 A.D.

IN this apparently tranquil state of things the nation had in reality been for a long time in a condition of intense inward ferment; nor on the surface even was it, properly speaking, peaceful, notwithstanding all the most various and repeated efforts. And into the midst of it there came an event, seemingly insignificant, which in a very short time produced a complete revolution. That event served to bring to the plain surface all the elements of the most passionate fire for the honour of the Law that had been accumulating through decades and centuries; it served also to bring out the elements of the profoundest exasperation and the wildest havoc. Indeed, it arrayed everything of an impure and injurious nature that had been collecting around the nobler heart of the nation since the foundation of the second Jerusalem six centuries before against that nobler heart with irresistible force, and it brought about in the first instance the end of this Herodean and Roman period, and with it the entire period of the second Jerusalem. For, it is true, it is only the apparently logical and yet wholly false aims and requirements of the Hagiocracy, as they had been more and more firmly developed around the sacred sanctuary of the second Jerusalem during six centuries, which now, at last, brought to light, as in an unexpectedly mild spring, and yet, with the violence of a storm, came suddenly to their full flower. But inasmuch as those aims and requirements proceeded from the most direct and sincere tendency that could inhabit the soul of that Hagiocracy, it had necessarily the more quickly to be shown whether they would bring to new life or to death the Community of the true religion when they obtained complete prevalence within it in its sick and aged condition.

Matters had long been prepared for the most extreme and open conflict. The momentous question which Judas the Gaulonite had by daring deed proposed in the Community, as the logical consequence of the Hagiocracy of such a nation as Israel, had remained unanswered after the death of Herod the Great and the banishment of Archelaus. Although persecuted

and checked, and however much disfigured in their forms, adherents of the Gaulonite all along remained under the cover of the day, and appeared in the most marvellous transformations—for instance, as robbers and sicarii; and in their deepest aims and their strangely varied undertakings they remained essentially the same as regards their final determination and their veiled and questionable intentions. During the last few decades that moderation and timid discretion which had arisen under the most trying experiences, and had in reference to this great question adorned the fair middle period of the Roman rule,¹ had practically disappeared. Under the victories over the heathen and Roman omnipotence which had been fought without any bloodshed, and on that account were the more encouraging, and, on the one hand, under the concessions which had been subsequently repeatedly wrung from it, and, on the other, under the arbitrary and unjust acts of such governors as Cumanus, Felix, Albinus, and Florus, a younger generation had grown up, which, forgetting both the sufferings and the painful conflicts of the previous period and the advantages which had been already won, longed only for ever fresh concessions and privileges, hoping thus to attain the ultimate object, which seemed to lie upon the direct road of such victories, as the longed-for reward of all exertion and endeavour. The absolute supremacy of the sacred Law, as the Schools had then interpreted it, and therefore, above all things, complete freedom from the Roman and all heathen rule; the Hagiocracy as it was then taught in the Schools of highest repute, but developing itself according to its own laws and privileges; Jerusalem, the great and, indeed, sole sanctuary of true religion in the wide world, acknowledged as inviolable and as the living centre of this one true religion, and therefore gradually finding all nations at its feet, converted and seeking to sacrifice and learn there; and this freedom and supremacy, the one worthy object of desire, to be won and protected by force of arms if necessary—this was the sacred ideal future which moved before the souls of the younger generation as their hope and aim. But just as certainly as this aim lay from the very first at the very bottom of the heart of the second Jerusalem, and remained indelibly there, in spite of all changes, through the subsequent six centuries, and, indeed, touched certain fundamental truths which had from the time of Moses created the Community of the true religion, so certainly must

¹ See *ante*, pp. 213 sq.

all the living members of the nation, as soon as ever it appeared attainable, make the aim their own, that is, as many of them as had not perceived, through the influence of the Christian spirit, the defects of the Hagiocracy generally, and were not prepared and determined to attain the consummation of the hope of the true religion in an entirely different way. The conversion of almost all Judeans into *Zealots*, after the fashion of the Gaulonite, had made most rapid progress during the last years,¹ and suddenly it had now been made complete. The bands of robbers, or other fugitives and unsettled people who had been driven to such extreme courses by dissatisfaction with the most recent form of public affairs, were necessarily the first and the last to be faithful to this new turn of things when it arose. The men of highest reputation in office and dignities, too, if they were not prepared to renounce their own doctrines and profoundest hopes, were obliged to follow the same impulse, as soon as it in any way made itself generally powerful. The Herods themselves appeared unable always to oscillate between Rome and Jerusalem.² And whoever amongst the people generally was deeply attached to the principles that had been taught for so many centuries in the most famous Schools, must be ready in proportion to his virtue to follow such a turn of things, if it appeared to present any hope of succeeding. And at that time this hope was not wanting.

For, it is true, those who could properly appreciate from personal knowledge Rome's character and power, might seriously hesitate to join any attempt in the way of open revolt. Indeed, to the calm reflection of many, the beginning of such a revolt might appear ungrateful and unjustifiable, inasmuch as the nation really possessed under the Roman rule all the freedom and the benefits which it could expect, as the people of the true God, from secular empires. If the nation remained tranquil, it enjoyed everywhere in all countries of the Roman empire freedom to live, to act, and to teach in conformity with its religion, the partial limitations of that freedom having never proved anywhere permanent. The special privileges which had been granted by the Greek kings,³ especially dispensation from military service, the Romans continued, although they might occasionally be interrupted. After the failure of the mad attempt of the Emperor Caligula, an almost delicate

¹ 'Ye all' as early as Acts xxii. 3, comp. xxi. 20, on which see *ante*, p. 295.

² For instance, it was sometimes reported of Agrippa himself that he would be against the Romans, *Jos. Life*, xi.

xxxvi. lxxiv; moreover, some of the Herodian family actually joined the popular movement, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 4.

³ See vol. v. *passim*.

attention even was paid in Rome to the wishes of the nation.¹ There was no other subjugated nation under the Roman rule substantially better off than this one, at the mysterious sanctity of which a certain awe even was gradually spreading throughout the empire; a feeling which was not a little increased after the star of Christianity, though at first in obscurity, began to shine as part of it. There was no nation that was really more prosperous in its subjugation under Rome than this; and if during the last decades it had had some bad governors, there was room to hope for better ones. What an entirely different position in the world had the members of the nation now than some two and a-half centuries previously, when, under the yoke of the Seleucid supremacy, they were driven to rebellion, and how clearly can we perceive in this the progress which respect for the religion of Israel had made since then amongst the heathen! Still, what in the long run do such considerations avail when once, as in those days, the fire of most zealous but most confused aims and of profound hate has long burned in the heart of a nation, and, when caused to break out by some insignificant occasion, seizes everything! The memory of the great struggles for freedom under the Seleucidæ, or similar heroic efforts, really simply led to kindred attempts. The oftener Rome had yielded, the more were the expectations and demands of people in Jerusalem intensified and increased; and the more the power of the Augustan dynasty, and, indeed, of Rome itself, which had once been dreaded above all things, seemed, in consequence of Nero's frivolity, to be likely to fall to pieces, the higher might the hope rise in Jerusalem of complete deliverance, not merely from a Florus, but from all heathen supremacy. All the rich acquisitions and possessions, the highly-raised claims and hopes, and likewise all the most painful calamities and apparently most insufferable humiliations, as well as the most serious errors and confusions of six centuries, had at that time accumulated in their closest combination. At last the moment seemed to have arrived for obtaining the freedom which had so long been vainly desired, for permitting everything that had been repressed freely to take breath, and for revenging all ancient wrongs; indeed, the time seemed to have come for a return to the primary form of a community of the true religion such as Moses had once designed, but which appeared to have vanished from the earth ever since that first age, and to be then about to be fully realised in life for the first time.

¹ Comp. the speech of Titus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2.

For it is further impossible not to see that by freedom, as soon as the attempt was made earnestly to obtain and secure it, nothing else could at this time be meant than the return to the original form of the Community of the true religion, or to the pure Theocracy, as far as this could be then restored. All intermediate stages which lay historically between that primary form of it and the existing generation had become impossible. The Pentateuch, then regarded as the one basis of doctrine and life generally, at most tolerates, but never recommends, a human monarchy, that is, when the book is looked at simply as teaching the law. The very thing which it was then sought completely to avoid, was the arbitrary acts of all monarchical as well as heathen governments. The David of old no longer existed, and the celestial radiant crown of the higher David was not acceptable to those who had nailed him to the cross and were persecuting his followers. Of the rule of the Herods, too, the nation was at last quite tired. The Biblical scholars and students of the law, on the contrary, had long been enthusiastic for the lofty ideal of the Theocracy, as they found it presented in the Scriptures. And as the letter of the Scriptures had been more and more exclusively appealed to since the first days of the second Jerusalem, and as there had been no desire even in the midst of the victories of the Seleucid period, which most resembled the period before us, to set up a national king, the object most exclusively and absolutely desired was necessarily the restoration of the original Theocracy. This was, of course, the aim of those only who were determined to hear nothing of that king, the sad memory of whom and the joyful hope of whose re-appearing formed the central life of infant Christianity.

The Hagiocracy, therefore, seeks to return to the Theocracy, of which, however, it has no intelligent conception. At most the end of this history of two thousand years is to be nothing more than the repetition of its commencement, and Moses must rise again with his heroes, whilst all this claim is based on the interpretation of certain books bearing his name, although all the time no pains are taken even to understand them historically and thoroughly in their undying significance.¹ But it is just here that we have the real basis of all the wrong and impossible aims that seek to prevail and become permanent, only the more quickly to be destroyed and in their overthrow to drag down with them the entire ancient system, as far as it

¹ As the instance of Josephus, who and we have seen substantially the same was educated in this period, amply shows; fact in Philo's case.

was perishable, and, as having long been inwardly rotten, only waited for the hour of its final destruction. The serious defects and ingrained sins besides from which the nation now lay sick, might perhaps have yet been got rid of in the midst of a new exalted movement, rooted out or ground down by its bitter distress, chased away by the force of its noble inspiration. But as the very end and aim which were placed before the movement that now actually took place, were from the beginning quite wrong and confused, the issue was necessarily such as we find followed. The worst was that those sins which had now become ingrained in the nation's whole mode of thought and action, for the most part proceeded from looking at that false aim and end. Consequently, in the midst of the most favourable revival, they always, in the end, choked the noblest efforts and the purest endeavours that were still possible in this nation, and which, if once more at all, had now necessarily to be called forth.

For it is no less undeniable that, in this great final national war, many of the noblest endeavours and the most glorious deeds appear that were at all possible in the still existing Community of the ancient true religion, and the light of which had so often shone in it in earlier times. Everywhere the profoundest of its noble powers must come into action when any nation, especially one of high and ancient culture, will once more rise from its past errors and calamities, with freedom from the yoke of a foreign ruler, and gain the commencement of a new and better life. The breath of freedom and of pure courage once more in this case mightily inspires the ancient nation in the midst of its still flourishing native country; and if the ideal of that freedom which lived before it was purely deceptive, it was nevertheless the inspiring breath of new freedom which animated everything. Moreover, of all the nations of high and ancient culture, this was the only one which at this late period took up and waged a life and death struggle with the Roman power, while all other nations of that kind, having been long before exhausted, had only learnt to serve its purposes. But, in the last instance, this whole conflict and war, however much alien purposes were mixed up with it, was in reality the struggle of true religion with heathenism, and, in fact, with the most terrible power that could arise under its influence; and we witness that wonderful phenomenon that an ancient and almost superannuated nation, that has already been in other respects dispersed and divided in a thousand ways, rises once more, as if rejuvenated and contending for the

true weal of all nations, to fight against the most powerful heathen kingdom, and, in fact, makes that kingdom tremble and enter into a life and death struggle with itself. Nothing but the power of the true religion, even though it was in an impure form, could accomplish that; and it is in this that the great significance of this war, as well as its terrible seriousness, consisted; neither can the sympathy that it met with outside the ancient nation be otherwise explained.

Even in this caricature and in this wholly wrong direction, therefore, the true religion now made the utmost exertion to overcome its ancient limitations, to subjugate the heathen and to bring about an entirely new condition of things; for the latter would certainly have resulted if the Judeans had been victorious. And we may with truth say that this final mortal effort of the ancient Community of the true religion for victory in the world, deserves in so far a certain excuse, as the superiority of Christianity, which was then being developed out of it, had at all events not yet been shown by a great proof which must be apparent to the world even against its will. For in the eyes of the world at large a mysterious obscurity still surrounded Christianity; it had not as yet decidedly enough separated itself from the parent that gave it birth, and it still required an unusual, purely spiritual, effort to convince itself perfectly of its exclusive truth, and to remain faithful to it even to readiness to die. But, inasmuch as the ancient true religion, in the form in which it was obdurately determined to remain without Christianity, and, in fact, to return to its own primary principles, now undertook this mortal struggle with heathenism, the struggle might serve forcibly to eradicate even all the serious defects that had clung to it from the earliest time, as was shown in the second volume of this work and must be further shown below.

On account of the great importance of this war, we may therefore be very thankful that we are in a position to follow it in all its aspects with comparative minuteness. The work of Josephus *concerning the Jewish War*, written a few years only after its close, supplies us in fact with the best and, when properly employed, most valuable means of doing so. In elegance of diction and vivid description, to some extent also in honesty and straightforwardness, this work far surpasses his subsequent larger one, though it has, it must be allowed, serious defects. To properly estimate it we must remember that it was drawn up exactly after the fashion of the Greek and Latin histories of that time, and that it was designed solely for

readers with the tendencies and habits which then prevailed in the world. It contains therefore also elaborate descriptions of important places of all kinds, lengthy accounts of remarkable customs and other curiosities, and particularly a number of invented speeches by the chief actors in the history, one or two from every principal actor. All these features of the work we must judge of simply in accordance with the art and the taste of heathen historical writers of the time. The matter particularly which Josephus introduces into the long speeches of the actors was not arbitrarily invented by him; the speeches contain, on the contrary, often the most important information with regard to the circumstances of those times, often too the most instructive intimations with regard to matters which Josephus was unwilling to introduce into his own public story. The composition of these speeches is the author's artistic invention, and they would not be otherwise regarded by their first readers: they were, therefore, in accordance with the custom of the time, introduced simply to give due prominence to the spiritual summits of the whole history, and to present them with suitable vividness. As Josephus wrote for Romans, he preferred to pass over the darkest things which he ought, as an impartial historian, to have narrated of his countrymen, particularly when they would have been offensive to the pride of the Romans; or he only half-hints at them, and often in a veiled manner, for instance, in the speeches which he puts into the mouths of actors. But as he had a bad conscience, as a deserter to the Romans, and formed in the highest degree partial judgments regarding some of his former opponents, he speaks by no means sufficiently highly of many of the bravest Judean heroes, and fails to recognise the real greatness of the deeds and aims of his own nation.¹ This war was much more honourable to the Judeans than their own historian's description implies; and it is significant enough that he failed to properly appreciate it. To this we must add, that the execution of the work, as a whole, is not uniform, the plan of the story being generally very elaborate, while in other places it is briefly summarised; and Josephus not only describes his own doings at greatest length, but does this not without a mixture of egotism. In fact, we can still almost perceive the main strata of the component pieces of narrative, out of which the work gradually grew. But notwithstanding all these defects, the truest and most vivid features of the period glean forth from the work,

¹ With regard to the attacks under which Josephus himself suffered on account of this work, see the next volume.

and we find ourselves once more translated by it into the full light of those great events and vicissitudes with which the history of Israel is so full. Tacitus, who subsequently described the war in his manner,¹ evidently used the work of Josephus, but it is equally plain that he used other authorities also; unfortunately his description has not come down to us in its completeness. That portion of the large historical work of Dio Cassius that treats of this war which has been preserved,² is taken from quite different sources and offers some valuable additional information. We do not know any early Christians who left any literary account of the war; a Christian of a somewhat later date, of about the fourth or fifth century, reproduced the work of Josephus in a Christian dress, everywhere giving a preference to the New Testament form of narrative, and adding accordingly only a preface and long appendix;³ but this work, usually ascribed to Hegeppus, as the earliest ecclesiastical historian, has no special value to us, which is likewise the case with the still later and more arbitrary Jewish reproduction of *Josippon*.

If we now review the great seven years' tragedy with which this portion of the history of Israel closes, and note carefully how it commenced and grew in intensity until it reached its climax in the most extensive woe, we must take care to distinguish exactly five phases of it.⁴

1. *The Commencement of the Delusive Freedom.*

As was above said, an intrinsically very unimportant event was the first occasion of all that followed.⁵ Before the Passover

¹ *Hist.* v. 1-13, the description of the siege is discontinued at the end, evidently in order to complete it later at an appropriate place; and this subsequent piece, belonging to the year 70 A.D., has perished.

² *Hist.* lxxvi. 4-7: the only Roman description of the siege preserved in a less incomplete form.

³ Called in Latin also *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*, from which we may infer that the book was originally in Greek. The work exists, at all events, in a very old manuscript, was much read in the middle ages, and at first frequently printed. A new edition of it, nearly three centuries after the last old one, began to be published by C. F. Weber, Marienburg, 1858, and was completed after his death, 1864.

⁴ The division by Josephus of his history into seven, or not counting the

introduction, into six books, is more arbitrary, and undoubtedly originates, as we have it, with him.

⁵ In *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 3 Josephus makes no separate section of it at all, but in his *Antiquities* he properly closes before it the narrative which he proposed in that work to carry as far as the beginning of the war. But it is almost ridiculous to see how, in his *Antiquities*, before the close he looks for the most various causes of the war without anywhere recognising and honestly naming the one true one; so wholly prejudiced was he, and so much partiality did he still display while he was writing and publishing the *Antiquities*. Indeed, this was even more the case than when he was writing his earlier work!—With regard to de Sauley's *Les derniers jours de Jerusalem* (Paris, 1866), comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868

of 66 A.D., not only the Governor Florus, as was customary, but also the Syrian Legatus, Cestius Gallus, which was quite unusual, came to Jerusalem; the latter not for any such reason as that the Judeans had previously complained to him of Florus, but simply on account of rumours of a threatening discontent of the people. The astonishment at his presence became greater as the multitudes crowded into the city to the feast. He was surrounded by people bringing charges against Florus, whilst Florus, being present, seemed to despise them all. The legate sought to appease the multitude, but when he returned home he permitted Florus to accompany him as far as Cæsarea, did not make any serious effort to then relieve the people, and thereby excited the suspicion that he had been misled by Florus, to the disadvantage of those who had made complaint. Thus undecided and powerless to remedy abuses did the Syrian governor also appear, whilst people thought they observed signs of Florus continuing his past conduct only in a more reckless way. It is easy to imagine that angry language was then used in Jerusalem against the Roman rule generally; but shortly afterwards a much more serious incident occurred.

About the same time the official decision of the Emperor, above mentioned,¹ in favour of the heathen, arrived at Cæsarea, and it immediately changed terribly for the worse the state of things in the most important city after Jerusalem. A second, likewise intrinsically exceedingly unimportant event, which occurred in that city in consequence of the decision, fanned into a flame in Jerusalem also the fire which had only just been checked a little. The Judean Synagogue stood upon a piece of heathen ground, a fact plainly showing how little justice there was in the claim to have Cæsarea pronounced an originally and, by law, Judean city. The heathen had accordingly hitherto resisted all the efforts of the Judeans to obtain the plot of ground by purchase. No sooner, however, had the heathen obtained from Rome the decision in their favour, than they took steps to almost completely build up the narrow approach to the Synagogue. The most hot-tempered of the younger Judeans sought to prevent their so doing by force; but the elders, amongst whom was a rich farmer of taxes, John, thought the safer course would be to bribe the governor with eight talents, and so get him to stop the obnoxious building. So little, therefore, did even the noblest of the Judeans

¹ *Ante*, p. 424.

of that time perceive that all bribery, even when it may serve most easily to attain a good object, is wrong in principle and wholly incompatible with the true religion which they sought to confess and defend. What a striking contrast does the Christian spirit in Paul's case present at the same time!¹ It is not, therefore, much to be wondered at that this act of bribery, which even a Josephus finds quite proper, should have produced nothing but mischief. Florus accepted the talents, but, as if to consider what was the best thing to do, left Cæsarea for Sebaste, where a part of the Roman army was generally stationed.² Thereupon a malicious heathen insulted most coarsely, on the following Sabbath, the Judeans who were just assembled in the Synagogue, by placing a chamber-vessel close by the entrance to it and sacrificing thereon pigeons, imitating thus the Judean sacrifices for lepers, and making an allusion to opinions about the origin of the Hebrews, which were then common amongst the heathen.³ Instead of passing over such puerile folly with contempt, the more moderate of the Judeans were no longer able to restrain their fanatical brethren from open warfare; and as the Roman captain Jucundus vainly endeavoured to restore order, the Judeans, as if their Synagogue had been desecrated, withdrew to a place called Nabata,⁴ about sixty furlongs off, with their sacred books, and despatched thence their twelve elders to Florus at Sebaste, seeking from him protection. Florus had, it is true, the semblance of a justification for censuring them on account of their flight from Cæsarea, but he sent at the same time to Jerusalem demanding seventeen talents from the Temple treasury, which he alleged he needed for imperial purposes. If they had been quietly and humbly given to him, he would probably have then tried to do something against the heathen in Cæsarea. But the ill-feeling in Jerusalem, partly on account of the situation of the Judeans at Cæsarea and partly on account of this act of seeming sacrilege, was so great that many in the Temple loudly besought the distant Cæsar for protection against the new robber of the Temple, while some openly insulted Florus by handing round a beggar's bag for 'the poor

¹ See *ante*, p. 439.

² See vol. vi. p. 39.

³ Comp on all this vol. ii. pp. 80 sq., and *Antiquities*, pp. 179 sq.

⁴ We know this chief place of a 'toparchy' of that time from *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 5 and 18. 10 only; but as the 'toparchy,' according to *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 5.

did not belong to those of Judea, and it is not easy to suppose such a root as נַרְבָּ, the name has probably been abbreviated from נִהַר בְּתָה, and signifies the place Batha, south-east of Cæsarea, situated by a stream; and, at all events, Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii. p. 125, found a *Tell N'arabeh* there.

and unfortunate man.' By this conduct there was simply given to him the desired pretext for employing the military force against Jerusalem, which he was probably on the point of using against the heathen. When the approach of the Roman force, both infantry and cavalry, was heard of in Jerusalem, not a little terror was created, and there was a desire to pacify the angry governor by a festive and loyal reception; but he dispersed those thus sent to meet him with fifty horsemen, they having been sent on before him under Capito, so that the submissive reception completely failed, and he entered the city as if it had been subjugated, proclaiming that the next day he would set up his tribunal.

The next day Florus demanded of the chief men, of the priestly and lay orders, that appeared before him nothing more than the surrender of those who had been guilty of insulting his official dignity. Excuses were made on the alleged ground that the offenders could not be discovered. But no sooner had the judicial proceeding proved fruitless than he let his Romans loose upon that part of the city which adjoined the royal palace where he dwelt, and which was called the Upper Market. At once massacre and plundering spread much further; many even of the most innocent fell, particularly in their flight through the narrow streets. It was afterwards calculated that three thousand six hundred men, women, and children were killed; and it was considered that Florus was guilty of a crime against the Roman law, such as had never occurred before, in that he ordered all who had been taken prisoners, without distinction, even those Judeans who had been raised to the rank of Roman knights, to be crucified, though every one that enjoyed the rights of Roman citizenship ought to have been protected against punishments which were reserved for slaves. Even King Agrippa's sister Berenice,¹ who was then residing at Jerusalem on account of a vow, sought that day in vain—in the first instance by her masters of horse and guards, afterwards by appearing herself barefoot as a suppliant—to induce Florus to show mercy.

When, on the next day, a horrible hubbub of voices of lamentation or of revenge arose in the city, the principal men adjured the people, with the signs of profound mourning, not to provoke the governor further, and sought to persuade them to go to meet amicably the two cohorts that were advancing from Cæsarea, the governor having required this as a sign of amendment. They used their utmost endeavours to persuade

¹ See *ante*, p. 421.

the people to do this, when the most violent were already seeking to provoke an open rebellion. The priests of all ranks especially resorted to the last measures that were of old considered allowable and efficacious in such cases of a danger that threatened the Temple, bringing out the whole of the sacred ornaments and placing them before the eyes of the people, to see whether they really desired the destruction of those treasures or not.¹ But there was then a determined band of men in Jerusalem who considered it their duty to use the occasion, whatever might be the consequences, to bring about a rebellion. They went quietly, as it seemed, with the masses of the people, who supplicated for peace, to meet the Roman soldiers; but as soon as the latter failed at once to respond to the salutation of the people, they exclaimed aloud against Florus as a traitor, and thereby obtained their object. The Romans at first struck the people merely with their clubs, and put the cavalry in motion to pursue the fleeing; but at the gate especially there arose then a terrible crush, through which more lost miserably their lives than by the simple attack of the Romans. With this war had been fully commenced; the Romans, pushing their way at the same time as the people into the city, sought to occupy the Temple and the Castle Antonia with the soldiers waiting for them under Florus at the king's palace and at the market above-mentioned, thereby driving the multitude towards Bezetha, the northern part of the city. But they were received with darts from the roofs, were unable to make a way through the narrow streets occupied by crowds of people, and therefore withdrew to the king's palace. The idea of the Romans was evidently, therefore, to occupy permanently the Temple, with the adjoining castle, as it had formerly been that of the Syrians, that they might thence always hold the people of the capital in check; whilst hitherto Jerusalem had been regarded as a sacred city, and accordingly a considerable Roman garrison had been stationed in the castle at most only on feast days. The rebels, therefore, did not know what else to do than as quickly as possible level to the ground the portico connecting the Temple with the Castle, that in case of extremities, at all events, the Temple with its treasures might be the more easily defended. And as Florus saw that thus for the time his plans were frustrated, he offered to the Sanhedrin to leave the city if they would admit a cohort of Roman

¹ In this respect the description *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 15. 4 is very instructive, especially as no one could make it so well as the priest Josephus. Comp. a similar case. vol. iv. p. 182.

soldiers into the Castle. In these circumstances they begged simply not to have that particular cohort with which the people had just been fighting, and with this concession he withdrew to Cæsarea. The Roman soldiers that had been there previously were, however, still in the Upper City.

With this the rebellion was practically ended; but, as if they had risen from the ground, there now appears suddenly in broad daylight the host of Zealots, as the Judean heroes of the edge of the coming storm, the same men who were destined to become the true representatives and agents of this entire movement until its end. Who they were and how they originated, Josephus never tells us plainly. Though he was personally connected with them at first, he became subsequently their most bitter opponent, although he really could not object to their zeal as such. Their prime importance, however, as regards the next seven years is undoubted. Neither need we suppose that they sprang, as old conspirators, from the ranks of the *Fehme* and robbers;¹ on the contrary, the best educated and most highly respected Judeans were of their number. They simply sought, like Judas the Gaulonite,² their true spiritual father, in fact, to be truly zealous for the holy Law; which they might consider that really every Judean ought to be.³ But since the ordinary Judeans appeared to them to be too inert, they entered into confederation, for life and death, to zealously maintain the honour of the Law; and they understood by that, as did the Gaulonite, before all things the expulsion of the Romans and the refusal to acknowledge any heathen governor or human king. For the most part young men and the noblest flower of the time, they embraced with all the fire of their hearts the impulse which had then long lain unconsciously in the bosom of the entire Judean or post-exile period. They sought, by all the force of their personal effort, to bring about and to maintain the freedom of Judea in this sense; and they conspired together, under solemn oaths, not to relax in their zeal until death, and never to surrender themselves alive to the Romans;⁴ and they probably wore some badge by which they could recognise each other. The dead Gaulonite suddenly reappeared in them multiplied a thousand times; many of the noblest priests likewise now took the lead, and considered that they were, of all men, most pledged to do so by virtue of their profession. It did not require a long prepara-

¹ See *ante*, p. 425.

² See vol. vi. pp. 48 sq.

³ See, for instance, how one of them, Jesus of Tiberias, swears against Josephus

by the Pentateuch, *Life*, xxvii.

⁴ As is on one occasion incidentally remarked, *Jos. Bell. Jud.* vi. 7. 2.

tion; the seething unrest and the vague impulses of the time suddenly created them, and the time found in them the fullest expression of its desires. But as regards the future, the important point was how they could permanently communicate their zeal to the whole nation; and for the moment they were successful in this respect. For although Josephus keeps this back in his public narrative, probably out of consideration for the Romans, it is unmistakable that the people in Jerusalem gladly hailed them as with one soul; and now already all the most decisive differences of ranks, of vocation, and of school, were about to be sunk suddenly in the one thing that appeared to be necessary. Even Essenes were mixed up in the movement, and became its boldest promoters. It is unmistakable that already the payment of any Roman taxes was refused, and that the Roman tax-gatherers were expelled,¹ the occasion of the rejected demand of the governor being used for this purpose. The object of the Gaulonite in refusing taxes and customs to the Romans had, therefore, thus been attained in Jerusalem, and undoubtedly soon in the whole country, as with one blow. But while, on the one hand, the boldest undertakings and the most wonderful feats of the next years proceeded from these Zealots, and thousands of them went joyfully to meet death, so, on the other, all the excess and confusion, as well as all the inexpressible misery, of these years must be traced in the first instance to them.

If we look, on the other hand, to the masses of the people, we find that there was in all, not excepting the most simple and meanest, really only one thought which they had in common with the Zealots, namely, that the Temple and the sacred city must be defended as the highest treasure of life, at the risk of life itself. The Temple and the city, invested with holy and supreme sanctity, were to them the visible symbols of the existence of true religion; and hundreds of thousands were prepared, with the most touching self-sacrifice, to defend them with their bodies and with all else that they possessed. If any injury should be proposed to this apple of the nation's eye by the Romans or anyone else, all hearts within and beyond Jerusalem would feel profound indignation, and would shrink from neither war nor any other calamity to defend their holiest possession with their utmost strength. The Zealots knew and utilised this readiness of the masses of the people to sacrifice themselves, and supposed that they could easily prove in their way that there was no longer any other means of securing

¹ A fact only incidentally mentioned in Agrippa's speeches, *Loll. Jud.* ii. 16. 5.

this sanctuary against further violation and desecration than the complete expulsion of the Romans, and the public victory of the true religion in the world. It had now to be seen how far the nation generally could be fired with enthusiasm for their ambitious plans.

The rupture at all events had been made, and the men in Jerusalem who still kept their heads cool, forming thus far the magistracy there, perceived its great significance. They applied officially on both sides, therefore, in the first instance to the Syrian governor—Florus begging for help against the rebels, the Sanhedrin and the civil magistracy of Jerusalem, together with Berenice, laying complaint against the governor. The advisers of Cestius were for an immediate employment of the greatest severity, but he himself considered it possible to proceed at first once more with greater leniency. He sent accordingly the Tribune Neopolitanus as his representative, to make careful inquiries into the situation of things and to give the people a preliminary warning. Neopolitanus, travelling from Cæsarea along the coast, met King Agrippa at the imperial town of Jamnia,¹ the king having been on a visit to Alexandria, to congratulate Tiberius Alexander on his appointment to the governorship of Egypt.² As chief steward of the Temple, Agrippa had undoubtedly an important voice in such a situation; and it could hardly be doubtful from the beginning to which side he would incline. But the delegates of the Sanhedrin, who likewise went to Jamnia, listened deprecatingly to his exhortation to peace; and when the two potentates approached Jerusalem they were received eight miles from the city with the loudest complaints and petitions of a vast multitude, headed by the wives of those who had been slain. In the city itself Neopolitanus was easily persuaded of the perfectly peaceful feeling towards the Romans prevailing in it, he being requested to walk through it with only one servant as far as Siloa, that is, the most southern part;³ and, apparently satisfied, and, indeed, having shown his reverence for the Temple by sacrificing in it, he left the city with an earnest exhortation to keep the peace in the future.

However, under the prevailing feeling, it became easy for the few who were for completing the rupture with the Romans, whatever it might cost, to carry the masses with them to greater lengths. The king and the Sanhedrin were accordingly besieged with the demand for a deputation to the Emperor, with the object of laying before him an accusation against Florus; and

¹ See *ante*, p. 244.

² See *ante*, p. 415.

³ See vol. iii. p. 254.

in case of their refusal further disturbances were threatened. Agrippa on his part already felt that he was not equal to his post, yet he desired to attempt what his honour seemed to require. He summoned accordingly a great public meeting in the front of the ancient royal palace of the Asmoneans, over against the Upper City and not far from the Temple,¹ and his sister Berenice listened to him from the elevation of the covered portico adjoining the palace, whilst he spoke as urgently as possible to the people. He exhorted them to banish all thought of war with the Romans,² and when it was observed to him that it was only with Florus that they were dissatisfied, he concluded with the emphatic demand, that if they did not desire war with the combined power of Rome, they must immediately pay the outstanding taxes to the Emperor, amounting to forty talents, and rebuild the destroyed portico near the palace. The prime movers in the rebellion were unable for the moment to take any further steps. It was therefore pretended that both things should be done. The taxes were soon collected, but every exhortation on the part of the king to obedience to Florus until the appointment of his successor was rudely resented. Indeed, the king was loudly reproached, and he was called on to leave the city and pelted with stones. He fled accordingly into his own realm, after he had first dispatched the representatives of the people with the taxes to Florus at Cæsarea, requesting him in future to choose tax-collectors from their own midst, and not therefore send to them again Roman officials for that purpose.

It was then that the friends of rebellion for the first time got their hands free, and at once they struck two decisive blows. First, they clandestinely sent men against the important fortress of Massada³ in the extreme south, which was then held by a weak Roman garrison, and their men executed their orders, after slaughtering the garrison, only too efficiently. Secondly, they prohibited all sacrifices for the heathen in the Temple, that under cover of this pretext the daily sacrifice for the Emperor⁴ might also be abolished, and thereby the open sign of shaking off the Roman rule be given. In connection

¹ *Ante*, p. 483.

² The exceedingly long oration, ii. 16. 4, has not, of course, been preserved verbally as Agrippa delivered it, but has been reproduced in this form by Josephus, to meet at the same time the tastes of his Roman readers, although as regards its ideas it contains nothing foreign or inappropriate.

³ Comp. vol. v. p. 332. The ruins of it have been recently discovered plainly enough on the western shore of the Dead Sea, under the name of *Sabbek*, and have been several times described, in the last instance by Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, pp. 303-315. [3d ed. pp. 298-310.]

⁴ *Ante*, p. 309.

with this second step, there came forward for the first time as the true leader of the revolt, that Eleazar whom we have already met,¹ and who was by virtue of his office alone very influential. He got his way in spite of the scruples and hesitation of other priests of eminence and distinguished men. He may have read in the Scriptures the commendation of the fiery zeal of his great ancestor of the same name and of his son,² and have been thereby fired to imitation, but he did not nevertheless consider fully what he was doing, and thus became the principal instrument of the destruction of all the freedom and greatness of his nation. It was to no purpose that the magistracy still in existence arranged, outside the Brazen Gate, which, looking to the east, led to the court of the priests, a thorough consultation with the high-priests, the principal Pharisees, and the experts in the laws of the country, concerning this extremely dangerous innovation. In the consultation it was shown that since the founding of the second Temple, heathen had always presented sacrifices in it, and indeed that they had contributed most to its adornment.³ Those who had introduced the innovation did not so much as appear at the consultation.

Nevertheless, the moderate men did not abate their efforts, with a view of preventing the necessary consequences, which they only too surely anticipated would follow this revolt. They dispatched to Florus a son of the high-priest Ananias, named Simon, to Agrippa the three members of the Herod family, Saul, Antipas, and Costobar, with the request to both that they would at once put down the rising by a sufficient military force; and Agrippa hastened to send to them from his own dominions three thousand horsemen, under the captain, Darius, and the general, Philip, the son of Jacin.⁴ They took possession of the Upper City in the south, but at once a continuous skirmish arose between them and the rebels, whose main position was the Temple. After this state of things had lasted a week, on August 14th, the annual festival of Xylophory,⁵ the rebels excluded those whom they now called the Royalists from taking part in the services of the Temple, and at the same time attacked them with such superiority, many of the Sicarii⁶ having in the

¹ *Ante*, p. 482.

² Vol. ii. p. 315.

³ Vol. v. pp. 163 sq., 173 sq., 284.

⁴ This no less brave than faithful man was a grandson of the cavalry officer Zamoris, whom Herod the Great had obtained from Bablylonia, and his immediate attendants were therefore still called Bably-

lonians; comp. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 4, with *Ant.* xvii. 2. 3, and *Life*, cap. xi.

⁵ See, with regard to this festival, vol. v. p. 166; *Antiquities*, p. 365 note. We retain in our account generally the order of the days of the months then used.

⁶ *Ante*, pp. 424 sq.

meantime joined them, that they were compelled to retire. The victorious party burnt down in the city the palaces of the high-priest Ananias and of King Agrippa, and likewise the city archives, whose keepers had fled, burning the latter with the hope of destroying at the same time the records of debts, and of thereby attracting to their side all the poorer people. The heads of the moderate party hid themselves in subterranean passages, or retreated with the retiring soldiers of the king into the castle of the Upper City, amongst them especially the high-priest Ananias and his brother Hezekia, as well as the members of Herod's family who had fetched the royal soldiers. The next day the Zealots attacked the Castle Antonia, after two days took it, put to death the garrison, and burnt down the buildings. The siege of the castle of the Upper City, which they next undertook was found more difficult; they attacked its walls from four sides, but suffered heavy losses from the breastworks and towers.

In these circumstances Manahem, the still surviving son of the Gaulonite,¹ who had formerly fallen for the same cause which now promised to be victorious, went with his closest friends to Massada, which had already been taken,² took better arms from the armoury, which Herod the Great had built there, armed many robbers as well as his own people, and, proclaimed king by his own men, returned to Jerusalem to carry on the siege with greater energy than ever. As such difficult work had to be done, he was suffered at first to have his way, in remembrance of his father. The Judeans were as yet very unskilful in the art of conducting a siege; yet, by undermining and using subterranean fire, they made one of the towers totter; and although the besieged had already run up another wall behind it, they regarded their position as nevertheless untenable, and simply negotiated the conditions of a surrender. The royal and Judean soldiers were suffered to freely retire; but the Romans fled into the three strong towers built by Herod, not far from the royal palace, and, on September 6, the conquerors entered the towers, slaying, plundering, and burning everything that they met. The next day, the robbers drew out the high-priest Ananias, who had concealed himself in an aqueduct with his brother, and slew them both. But Eleazar, who was of priestly rank, soon observed in Manahem, who had been raised from the rank of a scholar to that of a king, an intolerable desire to rule; and undoubtedly the whole tendency of this period was³ opposed to royalty. Neither was there

¹ Vol. vi. pp. 48 sq.

² *Ante*, p. 502.

³ See *ante*, pp. 489 sq.

really any inclination to become too dependent on the Zealots of the School and the Sicarii, who were the special supporters of this king. Eleazar consequently provoked the people against him, just when he was about to offer sacrifices in the Temple, clothed in royal robes, and surrounded by armed Zealots; and he really fled with his people at the onslaught of the masses, but was then seized on the Ophel (or, as it was pronounced at that time, Ophla),¹ and executed cruelly, together with his general Absalom, who was particularly hated for his barbarity. An Eleazar, son of Ja'ir (Jairus), however, together with a few others, made his escape to Massada, which subsequently remained all along in the hands of this extreme party. Neither could the fact be doubted that in this Manahem that party had really triumphed for which his unfortunate father had, sixty years previously, first raised the standard, and which was at last destined to get the upper hand amongst all the rebels. Thus painful divisions arose at the very beginning in the bosom of the triumphant party.

Eleazar continued to besiege the few Romans with all the greater energy, and they were soon compelled by hunger to beg for a free retreat. This was granted them by three men of reputation as negotiators, and even with the security of their oath; but afterwards Eleazar's men fell upon them and slew them all, with the exception of their leader, Metilius, who, in his terror, promised to submit to circumcision. This wholly useless barbarity was committed on a Sabbath evening; on which account the moderate party in Jerusalem were filled with the greater horror; and subsequently it was always remembered that on the same day the entire Judean community at Cæsarea, after it had returned thither appeased,² was fallen upon and cut to pieces by the treachery of the heathen; so that from that time not a single Judean dwelt in this Roman capital of Palestine. It is true, it was said that Florus had not in this instance either acted quite honestly, that he had ordered the fugitives to be taken captive and brought to the dockyards, and the like; but undoubtedly neither side was able thenceforth to reproach the other on account of the barbarities which had been committed by both without the previous knowledge of the other on the same day.

¹ Vol. iii. p. 219.

² *Ibid.* p. 496.

The Struggle beyond the limits of Jerusalem.

But the struggle which thus raged in Jerusalem during the summer of 66 A.D. spread from that centre in ever-widening circles, both within Palestine and throughout the Roman Empire. Wherever Judeans lived in considerable numbers amongst heathen, they felt that the entire future of Judeanism was then at stake, and their courage rose higher whenever the heathen were worsted, as they had been in Jerusalem itself. And wherever the heathen had long felt bitterly the arrogance of the Judeans, they also became more restless, and supposed that, at all events, they must secure themselves from attacks, or even seized the opportunity to avenge themselves on the Judeans in the name of the insulted honour of the Roman Empire. On both sides the worst passions were easily called into play—covetousness, rapaciousness, and many other vices of the same kind. But we must not, however, overlook the fact that the heathen had to some extent just cause to dread the new claim to complete independence on the part of the Judeans. For, inasmuch as the latter were about once more to enforce the sacred Law as it was interpreted in the schools at Jerusalem, the severe laws against the heathen would again become valid, wherever the Judeans were powerful enough to carry them out. The heathen had to dread being again treated as no more than partial citizens;¹ and even the new rigour in the observance of the laws regarding clean and unclean food necessarily greatly hindered trade and intercourse.² Under the Roman rule, no Judean was suffered to insult the heathen as such; the latter dreaded the possibility of a return of the Judean laws, and were therefore the more likely to assume the attitude of self-defence.

The whole of Syria, which, ever since the period of the Seleucidæ, had stood in very close connection with Judea, and where so very many Judeans resided,³ more or less thickly dispersed, and which, moreover, had then become more closely mixed up, through Christianity, with the fortunes of the Judeans, was during this summer in a state of growing ferment. In those circumstances the outbreak in Cæsarea and the expulsion of the Roman soldiers from Jerusalem occurred on one day; and

¹ A memorable instance of this at Macherus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6, 4, is explained below; further, comp. vol. v. p. 364.

² As in the instance *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 2, see below.

³ The teachers of the Law therefore desired to have it regarded as almost a *semi-sacred* land, and distinguished it very distinctly from the common heathen countries; see *M.* חלה, iv. 7; ערלה, iii. 9; ראש השנה, i. 4.

as if lashed by the storm—some with rage at that outbreak, others with exultation at this expulsion—at once the Judeans of all the towns and villages of Syria and Palestine, wherever they were in considerable numbers, rose, as if by arrangement, against their heathen fellow-citizens. Suddenly Judean armies sprang up from the quivering soil, and, devastating everything with fire and sword, embraced the principal cities and villages in all directions: Philadelphia and Hesbon¹ in the south-east; Gerasa and Pella,² farther north, on the other side Jordan; then Scythopolis on the western side; still farther north Gadara, Hippos, and the district Gaulon,³ on the eastern side of Jordan again; the farthest to the north the well-fortified and flourishing town of Kedasa on the frontier of Tyre, which had long become heathen, and had formerly indeed been actually made a part of Tyrian territory;⁴ thence to the south-west the maritime city, Ptolemais;⁵ next Gabath, south-west of Ptolemais and west of Tabor;⁶ and, finally, Cæsarea itself. But neither did Sebaste, the ancient Samaria, scarcely withstand the first fury; and in the south-west, Askalon, Anthedon,⁷ and even Gaza were demolished. In all this there seemed to be a pre-arranged plan, and yet it was simply the outcome of an inner necessity, inasmuch as the liberation of Jerusalem could only be effected by the clearing of this extended zone around it from the Roman and every heathen government. And whilst previously the Judeans, and with them their friends likewise (amongst whom, as matters then stood, all the Christian heathen might very well be reckoned)⁸ had much to suffer, their fortunes seemed now to have been suddenly reversed.

Though the victorious Judeans, however, easily devastated the open country, the larger cities presented a more energetic resistance; and one of them, Scythopolis, situated on the im-

¹ On Philadelphia see vol. v. p. 336; Hesbon, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1, as well as elsewhere, is called simply *Schönitis*, comp. as to the city, vol. ii. pp. 205 sq.

² On Pella, comp. vol. v. p. 236. Pella is still called *Fihil*, *فَيْهِيل*, or *فَيْهَل* (see *Jahrb. d. B. W.* xi. p. 236; Kremer's *Mittelsyrien und Damaskus*, pp. 17 sq., 24 sq.). We do not know whether the name was old, and Pella simply another form of it.

³ Comp. on Gaulon, vol. v. p. 236. vol. vi. p. 48.

⁴ It is the ancient Kedesh, vol. ii. p. 193, and is best described *Bell. Jud.* iv. 2.

3; when it was ceded to the Tyrians we do not know, but it happened early undoubtedly; comp. *Ant.* xiii. 5, 6.

⁵ Comp. vol. v. p. 236.

⁶ *Γάβα*, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1; iii. 3. 1, is an abbreviation of *Γαβάθ*, still *Gebatha*, a little south-west of Nazareth; the town had become large after Herod (vol. v. p. 430) had made it a fortress and a colony for his pensioned horse soldiers; but as those soldiers were generally heathen, it had become principally a heathen city.

⁷ Comp. vol. v. p. 431.

⁸ There were undoubtedly many heathen Christians amongst the *Ἰουδαίους*, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 2.

portant frontier between Galilee and central Palestine, and often in earlier times of decisive importance,¹ was this time also destined, as by a higher fate, to bring about a turn of affairs which was very unexpected to the Judeans. In this free imperial city, belonging to the Decapolis,² the number of the Judeans had likewise greatly increased during the immediately preceding period, although they had not acquired equal civic privileges with the heathen; but probably because they had been always treated very leniently by the city magistracy, they were unwilling to disturb their good relations with their heathen fellow-citizens, notwithstanding the fact that a Judean army now surrounded the precincts of the city; they promised to obey the laws of the city, and even took the field with the heathen against their own co-religionists. It may, however, be supposed that this would not be quite unanimously the case; the magistracy soon came to fear treachery in some form or other, and required that all Judeans should for a time (it was autumn, when it was not pleasant to leave the city) depart into the adjoining city-grove. After they had been there in perfect security two days, they were the next night treacherously fallen upon and massacred, probably because the heathen zealots in that city had suddenly overpowered the magistracy. It was said that thirteen thousand were slain.³ Simon, son of Saul, who had previously fought bravely on the side of the city against his co-religionists, but who in that night of terror put to death first his parents, wife, and children, and then himself, from bitter remorse, was subsequently much talked of. However, as if suddenly emboldened by this fate that had befallen the Judeans, the heathen round about as swiftly rose up against the Judeans that had been pressing upon them. Those of Askelon slew two thousand five hundred, those of Ptolemais two thousand, and took many captive; the Tyrians, the heathen of Hippos and of Gadara sought to help themselves rather by taking the Judeans captive than by slaying them; and in this way every city acted as it deemed best. It was the Antiochians, the Sidonians, and the Apamians only who left their Judean fellow-citizens in peace, probably not so much because they were conscious of being in the large majority, as compared with the Judeans, but because the latter

¹ Comp. vol. iv. p. 231; v. p. 353.

² Vol. v. p. 455.

³ We may, probably, in the above way, best reconcile the apparently contradictory accounts regarding Scythopolis in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 1, 3, 5, and *Vita*, cap. vi. And when in the latter passage Jos. remarks that

according to the law of the Judeans (as it was then interpreted) no Judean might bear arms in a heathen army against his own countrymen, this explains the fact that they would nowhere take military service under a heathen government.

behaved towards them with greater moderation, to which the Christian churches in Antioch and Sidon undoubtedly most contributed. The heathen of Gerasa permitted them to leave the city with honour, and did no harm to those who decided to remain.

King Agrippa's possessions still remained tranquil, not so much through his efforts, inasmuch as he went to Antioch late in the summer to Cestius Gallus, as if at a loss to know what to do, but rather through the services of his faithful servant Philip, whom we mentioned above.¹ The latter had now, by the aid of a few of his soldiers, likewise of Babylonian origin, and disguised by false hair, escaped from the Upper City. As soon as he reached the territory of his master near Gamala, on the east of the Lake of Galilee, he wrote that he would immediately go to Agrippa's capital, Cæsarea Philippi.² Happily for himself he was taken ill there; for he did not know of the departure of his king, and if he had fallen into the hands of Varus, Agrippa's representative, he would have been executed by him out of envy. For this Varus, of whom we have previously spoken,³ who was a man who unscrupulously pursued his own objects even by murder, feared that Philip would have greater influence than himself with the king, and hoped also by the strict punishment of all Judeans to put himself in greater favour with the Romans than even the king himself enjoyed, and, thus getting confirmed in his position by the Romans, to soon become Agrippa's successor. He accordingly ordered twelve of the Judeans of greatest repute in Cæsarea to go to the Judeans who were settled farther eastward in Batanea, to get them to clear themselves from the suspicion of revolt, and to send seventy of their principal men for that purpose; but when they arrived at Cæsarea he fell upon them and slew them all, and prepared an expedition against the Judeans of the east. But the latter found time to escape to Gamala, when Philip admonished the district in a pacificatory tone to remain faithful to Agrippa and the Romans, and Agrippa himself deposed Varus from his office.⁴—The

¹ *Ante*, p. 503.

² *Ante*, p. 482.

³ *Ante*, p. 328.

⁴ Josephus adds to and amends (*Vita*, cap. xi.), from later inquiries, a good deal of the earlier narrative of *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 6, as Henke properly saw in his edition of the *Vita* of 1786: there remains much in the Greek text requiring emendation, e.g., *Vita*, cap. xi. (p. 294. 22, 23, ed. Bekk.), we must read *ὡς αὐτὸν ἀφικεσθαι τὴν*

Φιλίππου. Ταῦτα δὲ . . . where ἡ *Φιλίππου* is our Cæsarea; a little further on (line 26 in Bekk.) *τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν*, (instead of *παισίν*) *Ἀγρίππα καὶ Βερενίῃ*; from which we see (comp. line 29, and *Vita* 24, 26, 36) that Berenice was regarded as sharing with her brother the possession of those countries. Instead of *Ἐβαλανα* we must read *Βαθγυρα*, and *Οὔραρος* instead of *Νότροπος* in the *Bell. Jud.*

rebels, on the other hand, took at the time the fortress Cyprus, north of Jericho,¹ slew the garrison and destroyed the fortress; they took also the important fortress Machærus, in the extreme south,² and permitted the Roman garrison to leave it.

But the conflict immediately spread with all its horrors to Alexandria in Egypt especially, a place which was always so excessively excitable. We saw above³ that after the last contentions all their privileges had been restored to the Judeans there; and, moreover, the governor of Egypt at the time,⁴ although he had become practically a heathen, was of Judean blood, and, at all events, certainly not hostile towards his fellow-countrymen. But it was in Alexandria as if the contention was about to break out just at the point where it had been closed. As soon as the heathen heard of the rebellion in Jerusalem, they assembled in the Amphitheatre for the purpose of sending an address to Nero expressive of their devotion; but as soon as they observed that a few Judeans had crept into the assembly, they at once raised a great cry, chased them out, and seized three of them, to vent on them their rage. Thereupon the entire Judean population rose up, many threw stones at the heathen, and threatened to set fire to the Amphitheatre if the three Judeans were burnt, as was intended. Tiberius Alexander put forth all his efforts to calm them, but was ridiculed, and, indeed, insulted. He accordingly let loose upon the Delta, the Judean quarter of the city, the two legions garrisoned in Alexandria and five thousand other soldiers that had just arrived from Libya; and the bloodshed and plundering became the more terrible in proportion as the Judeans defended themselves with all the arms and skill at their command. It was said that fifty thousand dead bodies were counted. The governor, however, withdrew the Roman soldiers as soon as he could.

This happened in September (to use our name of the month), that is, in the autumn of the year, which was the season so productive of popular rebellions. In the next years also such heathen and Judean risings were frequent in the heathen countries, whenever the sparks of fire which were everywhere flying through the air of these years kindled a flame. Antioch particularly, which had hitherto been so tranquil,⁵ became the scene of the wildest outbreaks of heathen rage when, in the year 67, Vespasian transferred the war from Syria to Palestine. At that time a Judean, named Antiochus,

¹ Vol. v, p. 435.

² Vol. vi, p. 199.

³ *Ant*, p. 260.

⁴ *Ante* p. 501.

⁵ See *ante*, p. 508.

who had gone over to heathenism, accused his own father and the rest of his co-religionists of intending to destroy the city by a conflagration, and he actually delivered up as guilty some Judeans not belonging to the community of the city. He brought this accusation forward in the theatre, caused the enraged heathens to burn the accused persons forthwith in the theatre itself, and provoked them further to such an extent that the Sabbath could not for weeks be kept in the Syrian towns, and the Judeans were to be compelled by force to go over to heathenism, as had formerly been the case under the Syrian king of the same name. Later also he accused them of causing a fresh conflagration, so that the Roman governor had great difficulty in preserving the lives of the innocent.¹

The Defeat of Cestius: the Completion of the Delusion of the Judeans.

Whilst the above sanguinary risings and humiliations of the autumn of 66 succeeded each other in rapid succession, the entire country far and wide around Jerusalem was up in arms, including even loyal Galilee. After the expulsion of the Roman garrison, Cestius could not delay any longer, and advanced from Antioch with the twelfth legion, which was usually quartered in Cappadocia, two thousand men belonging to other legions, six cohorts of infantry, and four squadrons of cavalry. King Antiochus² contributed further two thousand mounted archers and three thousand on foot, Agrippa nearly as many, and Sohemus³ four thousand men—a third of whom were cavalry; the free imperial cities, such as Tyre and Berytus, contributed a large number of soldiers fired with hatred of the Judeans. Ptolemais was fixed on as the place of rendezvous, and Agrippa, in his capacity of guide, urged a rapid advance towards Jerusalem. But it was thought that ‘Zebulon of men,’⁴ which was situated inland not far from Ptolemais, must be first castigated. The town, which had been forsaken by its inhabitants, was accordingly sacked, and its beautiful houses burnt. When the march back commenced, however, those who were still engaged in plundering the city, some two thousand in number, were fallen upon and slain by the Judeans, who were watching their opportunity. Cestius considered it was above all things, on

¹ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3, 3, 4.

² See *ante*, p. 266.

³ *Ante*, p. 328.

⁴ We do not know the origin of the

surname; the place is probably identical with that now called Abilin, which Robinson describes *Bibl. Res.* iii. 103 sq.

account of Jerusalem, necessary to secure the maritime city of Joppa, and taking Cæsarea as his basis of operation, he caused it to be attacked so unexpectedly, both by sea and land, that it fell into his hands and was sacked without resistance; the number of the inhabitants that fell was counted at eight thousand four hundred. He also ordered the toparchy of Nabata¹ to be occupied and laid waste; and, with a view of completely covering his rear against Galilee, he sent the commander of the twelfth legion, Cæsonius Gallus, against it. The chief city in the centre of the province, Sepphoris, at that time principally a heathen colony,² opened its gates to him very gladly; and a great number of Zealots, who were intrenched on the hill Asamon, near Sepphoris, could not long hold out after they had done the Romans some injury. Thereupon Cestius advanced with the main army from Cæsarea to Antipatris,³ dispersed a camp that had been pitched not far off near Aphek, moved further to Lydda, whose inhabitants he found almost all gone to Jerusalem to the autumn feast, and burnt the city. Thence he turned eastward, by the usual road through Beth-choron, to Gabao (or, according to another pronunciation, Gibeon), six miles north of Jerusalem, and there pitched his tent.

As at the commencement of the Maccabean struggles,⁴ the feast and the Sabbath were not regarded in Jerusalem as a sufficient reason for not resisting the enemy. On the great last day of the feast,⁵ the 23rd October, he was fiercely attacked and made really to retire. Four hundred Romans and one hundred and fifteen of their horsemen were counted dead upon the battle-field. The foreigners Monobazos and Kenedæos, two kinsmen of the king of Adiabene,⁶ Niger of Perea, and Silas, one of Agrippa's Babylonian Judeans,⁷ distinguished themselves on the side of the Judeans on this occasion; and the brave young hero Simon, son of Giora, of Gerasa,⁸ who was destined to become the second chief hero of the entire war, took at last much booty by falling upon the retreating enemy. It is true the retreat of the Romans ended at Beth-choron, but Cestius observed with horror that all the summits of the hills were occupied by Zealots. Thereupon Agrippa endeavoured after three days to effect something by negotiation; but, of his two ambassadors, Phœbus was forthwith slain by the Zealots

¹ See *ante*, p. 496.

² Vol. vi. pp. 74 sq.

³ See vol. v. p. 435. Schick thinks he can prove that it was the present *Râs el 'ain* on the *Asfah* stream between Jerusalem and Cæsarea. (*Austland*, 1866, pp. 910 sq.)

⁴ Vol. v. p. 307.

⁵ Τὸ μάλιστα θρησκευόμενον σάββατον, according to *Antiquities*, p. 364.

⁶ See *ante*, pp. 403 sq.

⁷ See *ante*, p. 503.

⁸ *Comp. Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 3.

and Boreæus wounded. As it was observed, however, that a dangerous schism was likely to arise amongst the Judeans themselves through this barbarity, Cestius resolved to advance again, and encamped north of Jerusalem upon the hill Scopus,¹ laying waste the country from that position. At last on the fourth day, the 30th October, he ordered the city to be taken by storm; but the Zealots had retired into the interior of the city and the Temple. The Romans accordingly pushed from the north into the New City and the timber market, devastating as they went, and also obtained a position in the Upper City opposite the royal castle. But the commander of the sixth legion, Tyrannius Priscus, and most of the officers of the cavalry were opposed to any serious attack; and the moderate party, who gathered about Ananus, son of Jonathan, and wished to give up further resistance, were violently attacked by the Zealots who occupied all the walls. Still, the Zealots appeared to be very much alarmed when Cestius, on the sixth day, directed a more serious attack against the north side of the Temple. They had already relinquished the defence of the portico on that side, and the legion formed with their shields the customary *testudo* against the wall, when Cestius hastily commanded the signal for retreat to be given, retired for the night into his camp on the Scopus, and the next morning continued his retreat.

This abandonment of the city is strongly censured by Josephus as uncalled for; but undoubtedly the last attack which Cestius commanded was executed in appearance only, in order to cover the retreat which had for other reasons become necessary. For the Zealots, however, nothing could be more acceptable; and the unexpected event suddenly animated the Judeans everywhere like a reviving spring breeze. On the very same day a hot pursuit of the Romans was commenced, which was still more hotly continued the next day, and the entire heavily-armed Roman army found itself soon shut in from behind and on all sides between the mountains by the lightly-armed Judean soldiers. Many Romans fell, particularly Priscus, the tribune Longinus, and the commander of the squadrons, Æmilius Jucundus; and it was only with the loss of most of the baggage that the former camp at Gabao was that day reached. Cestius remained there two days. As the number of the enemies surrounding him continued to increase, the third day he marched to Beth-choron,² after he had killed all the beasts of burden that were not necessary for conveying the

¹ Σκοπός, probably only a translation of the Hebrew הַצִּפְרִי, vol. v. p. 310.

² *Antc.*, p. 417.

valuable instruments of war. The Judeans, however, swarmed round the army in the narrow passes on all sides with such extreme daring, bravery, and skill, that the loss of the Romans increased with almost every step, until they could hardly reach Beth-choron under cover of night. Thereupon Cestius resolved to rapidly continue the flight while it was still dark, leaving behind only about four hundred of the bravest men in the entrenchments of the camp, with the ensigns of the camp sentinels, that he might thereby deceive the pursuers. But early in the morning the latter fell upon the four hundred, quickly cut them down, and pursued the fleeing army, which had not got much above an hour's march in advance, with so much obstinacy that it this time abandoned all its heavy siege engines and other instruments of war. The conquerors pursued the Romans as far as Antipatris,¹ only a little more than some two hours' distance from Cæsarea, and then returned home laden with rich booty of all kinds. The bodies of five thousand three hundred Romans and their allies, together with three hundred and eighty horsemen, covered the course of their flight. Thus the 8th of November once more beheld a great victory of the Judean nation.

This great victory, it is true, was destined to leave a bitter taste behind it. For the Damascenes had scarcely heard of it when, in order to take precautions against their city being attacked by the Judeans, they slew at one blow the ten thousand of them who dwelt amongst them. The stratagem which they employed in order to effect this was that they invited all the men into the theatre, as if to give them a triumphal feast, and then fell upon them. They were more in fear of their own wives, because they were almost all of them inclined to the Judean, or (as we may safely add) to the Christian faith.²

Still, the victory over the Roman governor of Syria remained very great and had momentous consequences. By a chain of marvellous events Jerusalem had for half a year been the scene of one victory after another in the cause of freedom, and the marvel of the last victory ranked with the greatest victories of the glorious past. Heaven itself seemed evidently to favour the cause of the Zealots; and whilst Jerusalem after such a long interval became at length once more free from heathen and also every form of monarchical government, the lofty thought of firmly establishing and defending that freedom seemed about to unite the most various members of the nation. All the previous divisions in the nation had as by magic disap-

¹ *Ant.*, p. 512.

² See *ante*, pp. 312, 408.

peared in the presence of the exalted enthusiasm which seized almost all without distinction. Some who were too Roman or too monarchical in their tendencies, and who thereby grievously sinned against their past history, forthwith left Jerusalem; particularly two of the three members of the Herod family, who had, after the deputation to Agrippa above referred to,¹ returned to their palace in Jerusalem—Costobar and Saul—the last of whom Cestius sent as bearer of the evil tidings to Nero.² But the priests, including those who had hitherto been more cautious and retiring, and especially all the Pharisees, now went over to what appeared to be the only good national cause. The entire country, including such towns as Joppa, which were still held by the Romans, appeared to be waking up as from a long dream, and joined, where the heathen were not too powerful, the cause of the freedom that had been won in Jerusalem. The glorious times of Moses and Joshua appeared to be returning, and in addition the Temple to be inviolably established for all time with all the requirements of the true religion as the Pharisees interpreted them. It was perhaps only the Sadducees and a few others that remained in isolated instances more sober.

But with the victory the delusion that was involved in all these endeavours and hopes reached its highest summit; and it was just when the nation was preparing to cut off all possibility of retracing the course which it was then taking, that it took the decisive step towards its own final ruin. A somewhat more extended glance at the entire situation of matters is, therefore, unavoidable at this point.

The General Situation of the Nation with regard to the Roman and the Parthian Empires. The Parthian Judæans. The Prophecies.

If the object aimed at in Jerusalem during these days, and the thing that had long been the hope of so many hearts, including those of the noblest members of the nation, were really to succeed, the first condition was that the merely local struggle around the Temple at Jerusalem should at once become a universal conflict that would have shaken the entire Roman empire to its deepest foundations and made it assume a completely different form. It was necessary that all the

¹ *Ante*, p. 503.

² On the other hand Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 20. 1, simply in error reports that

Philip, above referred to (p. 508), now first fled from Jerusalem.

members of the nation of Israel, wherever they were scattered in the Roman empire, should rise against its supremacy; even those who dwelt beyond it, especially those of the Parthian empire, must co-operate with all their power and self-sacrifice to produce this result.¹ The time for convulsing, dividing, and destroying the Roman empire seemed from many indications to have just then arrived. Nero was already generally hated and despised; he was, moreover, the last of the Augustan family, and it seemed as if the Roman empire could subsist only with the marvellous fortunes of that house. The more remote north-western nations still continued unsubdued, and the nearer Parthians remained the same old irreconcilable enemies. The Christian expectations of the approaching end of the world had also highly excited and called into new life the ancient Messianic hopes, even amongst the Judeans.

Anticipations and prophecies of all kinds naturally arise in every nation in connection with such immense movements; and after the centuries of foreign rule, and while it suffered its own religion to fall into deeper and deeper confusion, the nation of Israel had long acquired such a timid and superstitious spirit that it readily lent, in the course of these years, credence to evil omens even of a heathen nature.² And as is always the case, the predictions were contradictory. If ever before, most now believed confidently in the impossibility of the destruction of the Temple, and in proportion as that calamity drew near, prophets declared more absolutely it could never come.³ But others inferred from a prophecy of the Old Testament that it must fall as soon as it was polluted with the blood of citizens, a desecration which soon occurred.⁴ And as early as the rejoicings of the autumn feast of 62, and from that time forth, an uneducated husbandman, Jesus, the son of Ananus, came forward in a wild weird way, loudly and perpetually, especially on all the festivals, uttering his loud mad lamentations and woes regarding the certain destruction of

¹ Josephus mentions this only once in the preface to his *Bell. Jud.* § 2: 'The Judeans expected that their co-religionists beyond the Euphrates would join them; and the Romans were disturbed by the movements in Gaul; the Celts likewise were restless'; and once more in the speech of Titus, vi. 6. 2.

² A star resembling a sword, a comet, a light at night around the altar and Temple, a cow giving birth to a lamb at the altar, a temple-gate opening of its own accord, troops of soldiers in the clouds, celestial voices heard by priests in the

Temple, are mentioned *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3, comp. ii. 22. 1; with regard to the meaning of the four-square Temple (vi. 5. 4), see below.

³ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 1; 5. 2, comp. vol. iv. p. 266. The indestructibility of the Temple was now found foretold, Enoch, xciii. 7, also.

⁴ The passage which Josephus has in mind, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 6. 3. vi. 2. 1, and which he quotes with great freedom, and very differently on each occasion, is undoubtedly Mic. iii. 10-12.

Jerusalem. No one, not even the governor Albinus, could silence him, until seven years and five months later he fell at the beginning of the siege,¹ as if the deepest and truest foreboding of all the earnest spirits could really make itself felt only in this rude and violent manner. But it was especially the hopes of the immediate coming of the Messiah and the consummation of human affairs which, revived through the influence of Christians in the ancient Community with fresh vigour, kept the expectations of all constantly strained in the most various ways, and greatly increased the ferment of the time. And inasmuch as the Roman empire was then generally supposed to be meant by Daniel's last universal power, the hopes of its speedy overthrow were thereby intensified.²

Such hopes were undoubtedly entertained by many of the best Judeans of this period; and then perhaps, although in quite another sense and form, the same final destiny of the Roman empire might have been fulfilled which was subsequently brought about by the German nations on the one hand and Christianity on the other. But the number of the members of the Judean nation, even if they had all as one man risen to contend with the Roman empire, was very small as compared with its omnipotence; so that foreign assistance was necessarily very much to be desired by them, and the point of special importance was at this juncture what the attitude of the Parthian Judeans and of the Parthians themselves would be.

It might naturally be hoped that the Parthians would take part in the war. A hundred years before they had protected Jerusalem and Palestine against the Roman supremacy, and had then concluded a treaty with the Asmonean house;³ and since then they had waged so many wars against Rome that they were generally regarded as always ready on any occasion to make inroads upon the Roman empire.⁴ However, at that time the Parthian empire had for some time been greatly weakened by internal discord; the reigning king Vologeses had at length got tired of war with Rome, and his brother and rival Tiridates had even gone to Rome to seek assistance from Nero. Without new and strong motives, therefore, a Parthian king was just then not likely to take up this war. The power-

¹ See the details, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3.

² *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 4, comp. iii. 8. 9; the base flattery of Josephus, that Vespasian was meant by the Messiah, found credence afterwards in the Roman historians, Tac.

Hist. v. 13, Suet. *Vesp.* iv., Cassius Dio, lxxvi. 1.

³ See vol. v. pp. 411 sq.

⁴ As we may infer from Rev. ix. 14-21; xvi. 12-16.

ful Parthian vassal in Adiabene, Monobazos,¹ was, it is true, with his family very favourably disposed towards the Judeans, and the conduct of his relatives in Jerusalem at the time deserves great admiration.² In the first risings they fought zealously against the Romans, and afterwards, in spite of all hardships, remained in Jerusalem almost till the end of the siege (as we shall see below) ; it is as if, steadfast in their faith, they had hoped that the Judeans would conquer in the end, and that then they might be able to induce their king to take up the war and strike a heavy blow against the Romans. But Monobazos could not be induced to break the peace before the time had come, and there was, therefore, nothing of importance done by him on behalf of the Judeans.

In reality, therefore, the only thing of decisive importance was the attitude of the Judeans who dwelt in the Parthian empire, or elsewhere throughout the east and south beyond the limits of the Roman empire, amongst whom the possible remnants of the Ten Tribes had by this time been practically absorbed. Of these Judeans there was comparatively a very large number, and they had from ancient times also dwelt throughout those countries, collected in considerable communities. If any living desire for the victory of their ancient religion in the world at large, and for the continuance of their great Temple at Jerusalem was left amongst them, it was necessary that they should then show it. But neither from them did there come in the end any assistance worth speaking of—a fact which at first sight appears so surprising, and which undoubtedly so greatly surprised the heads of the Hagiocracy at Jerusalem at the time, that we shall do best to seize this opportunity of describing the general character of these Eastern Judeans, and tracing their history as far as it is known to us down to the great moments before us.

We possess, it is true, only meagre accounts and historical vestiges of the condition of this distant branch of the Judean nation at this time ; but we are, at all events, able clearly to perceive that that condition was very dissimilar from that of the Judeans of the Roman Empire. As human life and aims in the Greek and Roman countries were in general higher and of a nobler type than in the Parthian and other foreign countries, so the aims of the Judeans in the former were generally much loftier and purer than in the latter—a plain proof that Judeanism as apart from Christianity had no longer the power to reform the world, but on the contrary submitted to the in-

¹ *Ante*, p. 406.

² *Ante*, p. 512.

fluence of the world, whatever that might be.¹ In Biblical learning and interpretation there had all along been much zealous activity in the far East, particularly in the schools by the Euphrates and Tigris, a fact which can create no surprise when the circumstances described in earlier volumes of this work are remembered ;² but all national movements suffered in those regions particularly under that want of all lofty enthusiasm of mind and that pursuit simply of temporal advantages which everywhere become so powerful when arbitrary government on the part of rulers is found in combination with weakness and debasement on the part of the governed. We have on this point at least one striking proof from an account which Josephus could not pass unnoticed, inasmuch as it ultimately concerned intimately the general history, although he narrates it without any perception of its higher meaning, and only as under compulsion.³

This story, as far as it concerns the Parthian court, has much similarity with that of Mordecai at the Persian court.⁴ But it is connected almost entirely with the fortunes of two orphan brothers, Asinai and Anilai, whom their mother brought up to the trade of weavers, as this trade was still considered as exceedingly honourable in Babylonia,⁵ the land which had once become rich and famous by its skill in weaving. But they soon grew tired of this art and its strict discipline, stole the arms which were kept in their workshop, fled into a lonely district, rich in pastures and caverns, in southern Babylonia, which abounds in rivers and bogs,⁶ attracted kindred idlers into their society, converted their remote fen country into a fortified district with a kind of citadel, and made themselves so much feared, by predatory inroads in their neighbourhood, that the herdsmen willingly paid blackmail to them in order to be sure of their protection. Babylonia was just then in such a condition of transition from a better past into a state of dissolution and rapid disorganisation, that things of that kind could easily occur. The Babylonian satrap, it is true, made preparations for destroying, with Parthian horsemen and Babylonian foot soldiers, this nest of robbers, prudently chose

¹ A fact which has since been more and more apparent through all the centuries.

² Vol. v. pp. 131 sq.; vi. p. 20.

³ *Ant.* xviii. 9.

⁴ Vol. v. pp. 330 sq.

⁵ With regard to the Judean silk merchants in Edessa, see *Ancient Syr. Decum.* p. 14, and as agreeing therewith, *Lerubna's* History in the *Collection des Historiens*

de l'Arménie (Paris, 1867), pp. 323 sq. Though these are later writings, the reminiscences are historical.

⁶ The nature of these districts is best described in K. W. Loftus' *Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana*, Lond. 1857, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1858, pp. 174 sq.

a Sabbath for his attack, and advanced, full of assurance. But the quick ear of Asinai heard the noise of the horses and their riders in time, in all haste collected his followers, and inspired them, in spite of the Sabbath, with courage for such a brave attack that the satrap was completely defeated and compelled to make a shameful flight. The Parthian Empire suffered at that time, under the comparatively long reign of King Artabanus (who died 44 A.D.), from such disunion of the satraps and numerous magnates amongst each other and their insubordination towards the king, that he declined to commence a great war against the daring and victorious brothers in their marshes; on the contrary, he amicably invited them to his court, with the view of entering into negotiations with them. Asinai, as the conqueror of the satrap, however, dreaded some artifice, and, in the first instance, despatched only his brother with presents to the court; but the king convinced the latter of his good intentions so fully, and gave him such kindly promises, after the custom of the Persian kings, that he returned and persuaded his brother to undertake the journey to the court. Asinai was small of stature, and on that account little esteemed by the people at court; and Abdagasus, one of the court marshals, showed no disinclination to fall upon him; but the king perceived his mental superiority, trusted him completely, and made him a kind of governor over a portion of ancient Babylonia. He then strengthened himself in his former position, and became soon so powerful that his voice was very influential throughout Mesopotamia, and even Parthian magnates sought his friendship. His fortunes accordingly rose constantly higher for fifteen years, and his gracious protector King Artabanus was still living.¹

We might think that in this case the germ of a powerful Judean kingdom in the East had been supplied, so many good materials for it having long lain there in a scattered form. But this fifteen years' success of the two brothers became, through their own fault and that of the majority of their co-religionists, the occasion of the most painful and enduring calamities to the Eastern Judeans. For, in consequence of the hollow nature of the Judean religion at that time, success in the case of these Eastern Judeans, as somewhat later in Jerusalem itself,² brought to light and to maturity the profound

¹ This is, however, not so absolutely certain, inasmuch as Josephus does not speak afterwards of any actual doings of

this king, and generally omits all dates in this case as in others.

² *Ante*, pp. 409 sq.

moral defects which adhered to them. But as the cause of the rise and prosperity of these two children of fortune was accidental, so the cause of their overthrow was to be equally so; and this overthrow was to follow in consequence of a fresh insistence upon those national laws by the violation of which, leaving out of sight the temporary weakness of the king, they had really risen. Accidentally Anilai saw the very beautiful wife of a Parthian commander-in-chief in that district, began a feud with him on her account, and married her after her husband had fallen in a battle, while she had been taken captive. But, according to the heathen custom of those parts,¹ the woman continued to carry about with her her idols, even, as the wife of the powerful Judean, refused to put them away, and met constantly with toleration from him even when, trusting to the favour in which she stood, she quite openly worshipped her idols. The exhortations of the experts of the Law not to give such a public offence produced no effect upon Anilai, and his brother also let him have his way. Only when the proud upstart had slain one of these monitors who had seemed to him intolerable, and the woman grew more and more insolent with her idolatry, did many venture more urgently to appeal to Asinai for remedy. But when the latter at last advised his brother to send away the woman, she revenged herself by poisoning him, and Anilai became then, with his unpunished wife, the sole governor.

In those circumstances the desire to undertake fresh raids against heathen villages pricked the wilful man. But, as it happened, those villages belonged to the territory of a satrap, Mithridates, who was son-in-law to the king, and, being moreover just then in the district, witnessed with his own eyes the great misery that Judean arrogance was causing. Mithridates proposed to attack him with Parthian horsemen on a Sabbath, but once more his former good fortune attended the Judean. By the treachery of a Syrian, or fellow-countryman, he learnt in good time that the satrap was advancing, very early in the Sabbath morning fell upon his horsemen, defeated them and took the satrap himself prisoner, insulted him most cruelly, according to the custom of the country, by placing him naked upon an ass with his face to the animal's tail, and supposed that he showed wonderful magnanimity and prudence in permitting Mithridates at last to go away alive, with the hope that he would ever after show himself grateful for such kindness. As a fact, this Parthian nobleman would probably have

¹ From primitive times, as the instance of Rachel shows, vol. i. p. 356.

borne this disgrace if his royal wife had not urgently and persistently stimulated him to take revenge. He prepared himself accordingly for a great campaign; and Anilai was also obliged to muster all his forces. For many years, it is true, an immense number of Judeans had been collecting around this Judean kingdom; but most of them were at best idle adventurers, and all of them were really held together by the prospect of large booty and worldly power in other shapes. When, therefore, Anilai, with his great army of idlers, had advanced a few miles beyond the boundaries of his marshes to meet the Parthian army, he was totally defeated and lost many thousands of his men—a defeat which it was sought to excuse by the terrible scarcity of water from which the army suffered. He then once more ventured, with the remains of his idlers, to leave the marshes, but was the more disastrously driven back. And then it was that the unmeasured hatred which the Judeans had long provoked against themselves in those countries was fully displayed. Suddenly the whole of Babylonia rose like one man to demand revenge. And then for the first time was it seen plainly how insanely the better class of Judeans had acted in not renouncing earlier the two brothers, and in continuing all along to take advantage of their influence and power. As Anilai could not easily be got at in his morasses, the appeal was made to the Judean community at Nahardea, as the most respected and peaceable of all the communities scattered through Babylonia, to deliver him up. For as the supreme ecclesiastical government of the Babylonian Judeans (like a small Sanhedrin at Jerusalem), had its seat in that town (as we must suppose), it could at all events have cited him before its tribunal, and then have pronounced him an outlaw. By such action these learned heads of Eastern Judeanism might have averted in time the danger which threatened the latter; but they adopted half-measures only, declared simply that they were prepared to negotiate conditions of peace, and appointed a mixed deputation of Judeans and heathen to negotiate with Anilai in his locality. It is intelligible enough that the latter was indisposed to come to any terms; but the Babylonians had meanwhile observed the best approaches to the robbers' dens, at night fell upon those who had fallen asleep, probably intoxicated after a feast, and slew Anilai amongst a thousand others.

His overthrow was the signal throughout Babylonia for a general and rapid rising against the Judeans. Alarmed from all sides, most of them then resolved to seek refuge in the great

capital Seleucia, on the Tigris. That town still retained a half-Grecian character, and was in the possession of many privileges; and as the old inhabitants of the country especially, called Babylonians, and also Syrians, had risen with animosity against the Judeans, a semi-Grecian city appeared to them most likely to give them security. They actually found there a friendly reception; but whilst they ought to have connected themselves the more closely with the Greeks, in all disputes between the Greek and the Syrian citizens of the city they took the side of the Syrians. After they had thereby sacrificed the favour of the Greek citizens, the two sections of the old inhabitants once more coalesced against the new citizens, and suddenly, after the Judeans had dwelt in the city for five years, fell upon them. This blow was most serious: fifty thousand Judeans were slain at once. Those who escaped sought refuge in the neighbouring city of Ctesiphon, an entirely Grecian city, where they hoped besides to be more secure in consequence of the court of the Parthian king being there in the winter. However, the hostility of the neighbouring Seleucians was so inveterate, and the power of the king with regard to such internal animosities so small, that neither there did they find any peace. There remained accordingly only two cities in the whole extent of Mesopotamia where they could dwell with any degree of security: in the north the ancient Nisibis, in the south the above-mentioned Nahardea, which subsequently became still more a Judean city, and in consequence of its situation on the Euphrates¹ could easily be converted into a strong fortification. Both cities were, as the residences of the Judeans, early of great importance, and became in the time before us the great centres of Judean aims and Judean wealth. The Temple-tax was also collected and kept there; and when it was annually carried in solemn procession to Jerusalem,² many thousands were glad to attach themselves to the train, that they might be protected on the journey from the depredations of the Babylonians, who remained irreconcilable.³

¹ The site of the place has not yet been discovered by modern travellers; and the place appears to have been destroyed at an early period. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 9, 1, where we have the best description of the site, writes the name *Νααρδᾶ*, *Ptolem.* *Georg.* v. 17 and Stephanus of Byzantium, *Νααρδᾶ*. The Rabbis write it נהררעא, as if they had intended thereby to allude to it as *the place of Rabbinical science*, so famous in subsequent centuries. But although Benjamin Tudelensis, *Itinera-*

rium, i. pp. 53, 69, ed. Asher, at all events is acquainted still with Nahardea as the district in which Pumbeditha and Shafjatib were situated, I have not yet met with the town in any Arabic writer. Neither was the town seen by Petermann (*Reisen*, ii. p. 68). It is to be doubted whether the Christian place Nuhadra is identical with it, as Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. 2, supposes.

² See vol. v. p. 241.

³ Josephus reverts more plainly quite

We see from this that the Judeans of the East were overtaken nearly twenty years earlier by the same fatal blow that was at the time of which we are writing being prepared for those of the West. For that reason alone only a few helpers came from the East to the great Judean struggle in the Holy Land itself, to say nothing of the fact that love of repose and pleasure bound many, as with iron fetters, to the soil on which they dwelt. In fact, even from the countries of the Roman Empire it was at last only a few who hastened to the scene of the great decision, to shed their blood there for their religion. It was manifest that the dispersion of the nation amongst the heathen had been too deep-rooted to allow the survival of an Israel of the genuine and noble type. However widely the Judeans were dispersed, they constantly followed, it is true, with the greatest interest the movement that had been kindled around their ancient and exalted Sanctuary; every victory gained there swelled their veins with pride, and they would certainly at the end have almost all hastened to share in the great lasting fruits of victory; but it was only a few who were equal to the sacrifice of their lives in gaining the victory at the scene of the hottest conflict.

It was, therefore, after all, only in the Holy Land itself that there was kindled a steady and lasting fire of rebellion that did not shrink from death. How fiercely and how generally it raged there we can see most plainly from the fact, that even the Samaritans were brought to share it, as we shall see below. In the ancient fatherland of Israel there still dwelt a considerable nucleus of a nation capable of fighting to the death for their country and their Temple; and it must at last be seen fully what the nation was still capable of in this respect.

The Resolution of the Christian Church at this Final Period.

But Christianity did not fail to exert an influence on the development of the great impending decision. What growing numbers of the noblest minds and men with higher aims had during the previous thirty years been estranged from the great Ancient Community by the rise and increasing separation of Christianity! But for the most recent and most profound schism which Christianity had caused, the past history of that Community had probably in various ways taken another

at the close, § 9, to what he had said regarding these two cities, *Ant.* xix. 9. 1; and elsewhere he makes Agrippa speak quite correctly about the position, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 4.

form; and if, notwithstanding its frequent striking movements, we have observed in this history an increasing diminution as of its most regular and healthy blood, how much more might this become a serious loss when now the wildest fire was burning in the whole system of the Ancient Community! And the attitude which the Christian Church would determine to assume in these decisive moments was necessarily no less important with regard to its own entire future; for it likewise came now, as never before, into extreme peril; and, indeed, it had already by its fortunes during the years immediately preceding fallen into a series of most perilous trials, such as were adapted to convulse the most flourishing society to its very foundations.

Now, there were some reasons which might induce the Christians to make common cause on this occasion with the Judeans against the Romans. How severely had they just suffered under the persecution of Nero! And inasmuch as the Judean struggle was directed against heathen supremacy in the world, and since in the fiery enthusiasm of the time all the previous divisions and internal enmities of the Ancient Community of the true religion—including even the Samaritan schism—were welded together in this one overpowering movement against Rome, why should this not also be the case with the most recent and as yet least fully developed party? And if only the parent church should, on that spot where the fiery enthusiasm was hottest, participate in it, it possessed still too much influence over all the scattered communities, especially at a time when Paul no longer lived, not to carry them along with it.

Notwithstanding, it at once appeared all the more plainly that the gap which divided Christianity from Judeanism had already become wholly incapable of being filled up. When such an undoubtedly eminent member of the parent church as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews¹ could present to the churches of heathen countries the view of the relation of Christianity to heathenism which we find there, we understand that the parent church could easily be its own best adviser in the necessity of an absolute decision which was about to be placed before it. When the cry to arms towards the end of the autumn of 66, above described, was heard loudest in Jerusalem, and no one was permitted to remain in peace there who refused to join the movement against the Romans, what was the parent Christian church to do? Should it advise its members to lend themselves to the dominant party in the city

¹ See *ante*, pp. 472 sq.

as instruments of Judean pride and Judean ambition? Though the Christian Church had then far greater cause than the Judeans to feel indignation against the Roman supremacy, it had long and deeply learned to wait for Christ alone as its deliverer from all the injustice of the world; and moreover, it had during the last years too often and too seriously heard the words of the Apostle Paul and other great teachers urging the duty of prudent behaviour with regard to heathen governments, to suffer itself to be drawn into this war. We know that not a single Christian of importance was carried away by the fiery ardour of this war. But a fresh decision had to be come to in this perplexing question; and the bond which had hitherto bound the parent church to Jerusalem had already been sufficiently loosened by the martyrdom of James, the brother of the Lord, and those who had fallen with him. This unexpected necessity therefore was only a new inducement the more quickly to sever completely a tie which had long been on the point of breaking. In the midst of the church were heard at this period of general excitement prophetic voices declaring that Christ commanded his faithful followers to leave Jerusalem; and the resolution was quickly carried out, probably at the juncture above described.¹ Yet the nucleus of the parent church was determined not to disperse, but to remain somewhere as near as possible to Jerusalem, as if recollecting its old expectation of the coming of the glorified Christ near the ancient sacred city. It removed over the Jordan, therefore, to the town of Pella,² probably because it found there a faithful protector; and, though pursued on the way by fierce Judeans, it nevertheless made a successful escape over the Jordan.³ So far as a simple narration goes, the only knowledge we have of this flight to Pella is given by Eusebius;⁴ but although he speaks of it only incidentally, the event is in itself perfectly credible. For the moment the relations of Judeans and Christians were still more embittered by this flight of the parent church from Jerusalem; the Zealots in Jerusalem, incensed that the Christians would not assist them, wherever their power extended, spurred on the Judeans against the Christians in

¹ *Ante*, p. 515.

² It is remarkable that Josephus nowhere mentions the fortunes of Pella subsequent to the time above referred to, *ante*, p. 506.

³ A point which we may safely infer from Rev. xii. 13-17, comp. *Tüb. Theol. Jahrb.*, 1842, pp. 553 sq.

⁴ *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 5. 3, where Eusebius,

as in the two no less important instances above referred to (*ante*, p. 470), does not indicate his authority. Undoubtedly the fragment of history which Eusebius has preserved in this case is too short to permit us to fix exactly from it the time of the flight; and it might not be impossible that it did not occur before nearly the end of 67.

their widely dispersed communities; we know this definitely in the case of the churches of Asia Minor,¹ and the same thing may be inferred of the rest. But such troubles might go by with the war.

On this point, however, as well as on the general character of this period of the Christian Church, we have in the book of Revelation evidence which, when properly understood, could not be truer or more vivid. The book, it is true, was written somewhat later in the course of the war, towards the end of 68 or beginning of 69, neither was it written by the Apostle John, but by another John, who was at the time very active in the churches of Ephesus and the neighbourhood, and therefore at a distance from Palestine. Nevertheless, it describes the feelings of Christians which might prevail at the beginning and then during the course of the great Judean and Roman war, with the greatest vividness and clearness, as well as with no small degree of art in the use of prophetic style.² If any of these later periods could once more call forth the ancient prophetic power of Israel, as by a higher necessity, in the two existing divisions of the ancient Community, it was the period before us; but while not a single prophetic piece of that period has been preserved from the Judean division, which was then intoxicated with its victories, there was produced in the Christian section, though it was then exposed to almost intolerable persecution from all sides, a prophetic book which for the first time revived all that was best in the ancient prophets, saturated with the Christian spirit, and artistically perfect. It was not, as had latterly been the custom, written in the name of an ancient hero, but in that of the author himself; and as the Christian book of prophecy, it won for itself an imperishable existence. Though designed for the entire Christian Church, it is still addressed, according to the true Christian custom of that time, primarily only, as in a prophetic epistle, to the churches of Roman Asia;³ and, though written far from the parent church, it still pays due attention to its fortunes. It lay in the nature of the time itself that the prophecy of the book should be mainly directed against Rome only; and for the first time the just expectation of early Christianity finds expression that it is really only in heathenism, as concentrated in its full power in Rome, that its truly terrible enemy is to be

¹ Rev. xii. 17, comp with ii. 9, iii. 9, xi. 8.

² See on this point the essay in *Jahrbh. d. B. W.* viii. pp. 78. and my new commentary on the Apocalypse in the second

vol. of my *Johannische Schriften*, Gött. 1862.

³ As was the case with the Epistle of Peter considered above, p. 462.

found. With regard to the Holy Land and Jerusalem, the ancient Messianic hopes, that were unshaken even in Paul's case, still remain in force; but on that account the Jerusalem which then existed is no less regarded by the Christian prophet as rejected by God and awaiting severest punishment, and the Judeans as they then were he no less than Paul considers wholly unworthy of the name. But we must especially admire the absolute truth and zeal with which the prophet castigates the sins and errors which at the time threatened to ruin the Christian churches, and the strictness with which he separates the true Christians from the false, particularly in view of the trying future.

But the Christian Church itself had in this way practically separated itself completely from Judeanism, and left the latter to the vicissitudes of its own fortunes. It had not thereby become the ally of heathenism against its own sacred parent; we do not know of a single Christian that he had fought in the ranks of the Romans against the Judeans; and it was far from the Christian spirit, as it then was, to take revenge for 'the blood of Christ and the Saints.'¹ But undoubtedly this dissolution of the parent church at Jerusalem, and this reserve of the Christians in all the other scattered churches, did not contribute to the strengthening of the Judeans, and many a brave soldier and wise counsellor was thereby lost to them.

2. *The New Constitution and Administration of the State.*

In Jerusalem the young Christian church was in the meantime wholly lost sight of, much more important matters, as it was supposed, having for the moment to be attended to there. The great new cause of freedom, which had been so long desired, had, indeed, prevailed there, and had filled all sections of the people with one enthusiasm and one hope. The future appeared to lie in roseate hues before the feet of all, and everything seemed simply to depend upon the proper use of the opportunities given, and a good arrangement of the new State which had become possible. In fact, at this juncture a multitude of great thoughts and resolutions were once more felt by almost the entire nation; and the most evident indication of this is that attention was now paid to the moderate party also, who were for the most part the most learned and skilful. Indeed, inasmuch as the latter took part almost unanimously

¹ Comp. Rev. xi. 8.

in the new movement, they appeared in the first instance to obtain the control of the uproarious surging of its waves, as if, in spite of the fears of so many calmer minds, everything might yet turn out well, and really a new and brilliant epoch for Israel arise out of this deluge.

The new State was, therefore, constituted in Jerusalem in the best way practicable, and zeal was not wanting in any direction. The supreme power was vested in the Sanhedrin; in conjunction with it was the assembly of the people¹ meeting in the court of the Temple, where the military commanders,² for instance, were elected, who, when they had been chosen, had almost unlimited power, in accordance with the circumstances of the time, although they were still legally subordinate to the Sanhedrin. In reality, as is necessarily the case in all such risings, the masses ruled in Jerusalem and every other city more than the official authorities. As a sign of independence the people struck coins of their own, which did not show the least mark of a ruler; they bore simply symbols of the Temple or of the country, were inscribed with the words 'The Holy Jerusalem,' and were dated by the years of 'Liberty,' the first of which the current one was reckoned.³ Joseph, the son of Gorion, and the universally respected former high-priest Chanan, were chosen military commanders of Jerusalem. They possessed pretty much the authority of consuls, and were particularly charged with the repair of the city walls. The priest Eleazar, son of Simon, who, as we have seen,⁴ had just before obtained a magical influence over the people, was exceedingly busy, and managed to get under his control all the resources of the state, was at this juncture, although already the acknowledged head of the Zealots, not chosen, on account of his tyrannical temper, though he gradually got the business of the state more into his hands; and we shall see below that he remained, nevertheless, really the soul of the whole movement.

¹ Ὁ δῆμος, or τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν. The Talmud often mentions the *Hall of Stones*, הַבַּיִת הַגָּדוֹל e.g. *M. פאה*, ii. 6, as the place where the Sanhedrin assembled in the period before the destruction of Jerusalem.

² Greek, *Strategoi*; in Lat. the name *legati* might have been used for them, comp. *πρέσβεις*, *Jos. Vita*, § 12.

³ It was not until our own time that the fact of the existence of such coins was known and proved from actual specimens preserved (Josephus making no mention of it). See on this point my essay in the

Gött. Gel. Nachrichten, 1855, pp. 199 sq.; I have there described them, and subsequently noted accurately, in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1862, pp. 845 sq., those that do not belong to the above period. We shall have to speak of the latter further in connection with Barcocheba in the next volume. The coins referred to our period in Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 161 sq. (comp. Fr. Lenormant's *Description des Médailles de Béth*, Paris, 1857, p. 218), need closer examination. [In his second edition (1881) this has been done.]

⁴ *Ante*, pp. 504 sq.

The choice of the other military commanders likewise shows that at first the Zealots were not specially favoured. For Idumea, that is, the south, the high-priest Jesus, son of Sapphia, and Eleazar, whom we have just mentioned, were appointed, in the place of the brave soldier Niger of Perea;¹ for Jericho, that is, the east of Judea, Joseph the son of Simon; for Perea, Manasse; for the west, John the Essene; and for the north (Gophna and Acrabatene), John, son of Hananja; for Galilee, Josephus, son of Matthias, who was destined, before the end of another decade, to describe this war in the work which has come down to us.²

But the new state had soon to pay a heavy price for its experience. In the first intoxication of victory an expedition was arranged against Ascalon-on-the-Sea, the city which had from ancient times been so much disliked by the Judeans, and which had in recent times³ proceeded so cruelly against the Judeans that dwelt in it. If the expedition had proved successful, perhaps the communication of the Romans between Syria and Egypt would thereby have been seriously interrupted for a long time. John, the Essene, in whose district this maritime fortress lay, was joined for that object by a very large number of volunteers under the command of the Babylonian Silas and Niger of Perea; and it seemed the more easy to take the city, as it was occupied only by one Roman cohort and a squadron of horse, under a certain Antonius. But just in proportion as the Judeans marched up in haste and foolhardily, without any cavalry, their ranks were slaughtered the more miserably by the cavalry and military science of the Romans in the wide and open plain, particularly as the Judeans fought obstinately throughout an entire day. By evening ten thousand of them covered the battle-field, and of the commanders, Niger only escaped with the fleeing to a little Idumean town called Sallis. When fresh bands, under Niger, renewed after a time the attack, the result was still more disastrous, as the Romans had become better prepared. Again some eight thousand were slain, and in the flight Niger escaped only as by a miracle from the burning tower of a village called Bezedel.⁴ After that a similar attack was never under-

¹ See *ante*, p. 512.

² See *ante*, pp. 492 sq. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 3, 4; iii. 7. 9 sq.; iv. 1. v.; i. 2. We have supposed above that the Eleazar, son of Chananja, ii. 20. 4, is the same man as Eleazar, son of Simon, § 3. The reasons for this supposition have been stated in

the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1868, pp. 908 sq. His more famous grandfather was the תנניה (or חניניה) חניניה, *M. שקלים*, iv. 4, אבות, iii. 2.

³ *Ante*, p. 508.

⁴ *Jos. Bell. Jud.* iii. 2. 1-3.

taken from Jerusalem; yet subsequently an attempt was made to recover Joppa,¹ as we shall see.

But any rebuff received from abroad always induces the most zealous rebels, in such situations, to seek to make good what has been lost by greater efforts at home, and it supplies them with a certain justification for proceeding with less consideration towards those who seem to them to be too quiet and deficient in energy at home. So now Simon, the son of Giora, distinguished in the victory over Cestius,² when he had been left without any military commander, marched with a number of like-minded men into Aerabatene, on his own responsibility, plundering, and indeed doing violence to the wealthier people, so that he was already pronounced a robber. A special army was sent from Jerusalem to reduce him to submission. Thereupon he fled with his faithful adherents to Massada, which was held by men of like mind,³ and from that place frequently made incursions into Idumea, with such requirements and violence that the rulers there had enough to do to protect with arms the more peaceful inhabitants against his agitation.

At this juncture, affairs were comparatively most quiet in Jerusalem. The city walls were energetically repaired, arms of all kinds were got in readiness, and military exercises were carried on. Chanan still sought, in the midst of all the commotion, most carefully and unweariedly to remedy the deeper injuries of the State by new and better institutions. A multitude of evil forebodings and omens were meanwhile uttered, though they were despised by the less timid.⁴

Galilee under Josephus.

At first, most depended on the bearing of Galilee,⁵ which was no less warlike and possessed with a strong sense of honour than fruitful and populous; for Galilee lay nearest the seat of the Roman government at Antioch, and could be regarded as a remote and strong rampart to Jerusalem. The government of this important province had been entrusted to Josephus as a young man of whom then great hopes were entertained, and of whose life and acts generally we are better informed than of any other Judean of those times, inasmuch as he speaks in his numerous writings so much and so willingly of himself. He was then in his thirtieth year, having been born 37 A.D. He sprang from

¹ *Ante*, p. 512.

² See *ante*, p. 512.

³ *Ante*, pp. 502-5.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 22. 1, comp. *ante*,

p. 516.

⁵ As we find it well described by Josephus himself, from his personal knowledge, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 1, 2.

a family resident in Jerusalem, and one closely related to a house of high-priestly dignity, that house belonging likewise to the first of the twenty-four courses of high-priests.¹ On his mother's side he could boast of his descent from the Asmoneans. From his example we can follow fully the usual course at that time of the education of men of his rank. He was first instructed in the Scriptures, and especially in the Law, in which he made such progress that in his fourteenth year he could vie in his knowledge with the most experienced men that visited his father's house, a thing which need not cause any great surprise, inasmuch as at that time almost everything was a question of memory. Being ambitious and desirous of knowledge, he resolved in his sixteenth year to pass through the whole of the three schools then publicly acknowledged in Jerusalem, namely, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes;² and in his nineteenth year he entered further the strictly anchorite school of a certain Banus,³ who was, with his clothing of the bark of trees,⁴ his subsistence upon vegetables which grew of their own accord, and his frequent bathing both by day and night, a sort of perpetuator and exaggerator of the school of the Baptist. But the ambitious man of the world was nevertheless developed in the anchorite's school, since immediately afterwards the young man joined the Pharisees and in essential matters subsequently remained with them.⁵ In the year 63 A.D. he went to Rome as a kind of deputy of the priests in Jerusalem, in order, if possible, to obtain the liberty of their brethren who, as we have seen,⁶ were kept prisoners there, and lived on figs and nuts rather than eat heathen food; and as he succeeded in making the acquaintance of the Empress Poppæa, through the actor Haliturus, and in getting high into her favour, he really effected their liberation, and when he returned met, as might be expected, with a splendid reception from his fellow-priests in Jerusalem. He had thus early learnt the Greek and Roman languages and modes of life. To his past life and his great capacity and tact

¹ According to *Vita*, § 1, his father would have been born in the seventy-sixth year of his grandfather's age.

² Whence we may incidentally learn that the Essenes also had a kind of university, where their views and principles could be mastered in a tolerably short time.

³ Probably a Greek form of *Abdnu*, and so, according with the case mentioned vol. vi. p. 232. It is improbable that at that time the name was the mutilated form **אבנני**, later in use, derived from *bal-*

neum, and that it thus signified the *Baptist*.

⁴ As amongst the Hindoos, comp. Manu's *Dharmacastra*, vi. 6, and elsewhere.

⁵ The dispute on the point whether he remained *substantially* a Pharisee (discussed by E. Gerlach, *Die Weissagungen des A. Ts. in den Schriften des Josephus*, Berlin, 1865, pp. 6-19; and in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1865, pp. 1-59) is idle; comp. *Jahrb. der bibl. Wiss.* viii. p. 281.

⁶ *Ante*, p. 423.

he evidently owed his appointment at the time under review to the high and most difficult office of a military commander in Galilee, after he had cautiously kept himself through the whole of the previous summer more in the background. He had been raised to the position by a momentary majority of moderate men on account of his great distinction as a man with special connections, talents, and adroitness, a fact never to be lost sight of if we desire to understand his subsequent conduct and history. In his entire life, which was so full of vicissitudes, he represents the average degree of culture to which a gifted, ambitious, and above all self-seeking and therefore moderate priest and Pharisee of those times could attain.—Two priests, Joazar and Judas, were joined with him, but since they found it very difficult to get in Galilee the tithes which fell to them in Judea, they soon desired to go home again; and the commands regarding his action which he received from the Sanhedrin were as cautious as possible.¹ The plainest sign of the spiritual current of this period is that a man like Josephus could be selected for this office, and that he could enter on its duties full of courage and determination.

This courage he certainly needed as soon as he arrived in Galilee and observed the particular circumstances of the country. It had always been from of old an uncommonly divided country in all civil and all religious matters, and in consequence of the Roman supremacy this feature was exhibited afresh. At that time it was just on the point of wholly casting off the last fragments of both Roman and Herodean domination. Various parties, however, intersected each other there far more than elsewhere:—the ten free imperial cities of the south east,² the Phœnician cities on the west and north, in both cases mainly heathen, though inhabited also by many rich and still more poor and restless Judeans; the possessions of Agrippa on the north-east, with a very mixed population; the new proud city of Tiberias, indignant that it had then been assigned to Agrippa,³ and had thereby ceased to be the capital of Galilee, and, as under Agrippa I., the seat of the royal treasury⁴ and the archives; Sepphoris, in the midst of the country, situated very favourably for war and peace, but constituted, in spite of its mainly Judean population, like Tiberias, more like a heathen city,⁵ and precisely as the capital of Roman Galilee very flourishing, and

¹ All this may be seen in the more exact accounts in the *Vita*. §§ 4-7.

² See vol. v. pp. 455.

³ See *ante*, p. 422.

⁴ Or, according to the Hellenistic expression of the time, of 'the royal *table*, *Vita*, § 9. *Ant.* xii. 2. 3.

⁵ Vol. vi. pp. 74 sq.

in fact, scrupulously Roman in its feeling, on account of the hostages whom it had had to send to Antioch; ¹ and then amongst the Judeans themselves the same irreconcilable divisions that in Jerusalem itself had only just tended somewhat to coalesce. Josephus was called on to bring the unity of new life into this most motley mixture of contrary tendencies. And he really did all that adroitness, patience, good nature, and to a certain extent self-sacrifice, could very well accomplish. Whatever seemed to him necessary on religious grounds he did with a firm hand. Thus he found the important city of Tiberias divided between three parties, none of which completely satisfied him. The richest people wished the city to remain under Agrippa; the great middle class, under the leadership of a certain Justus, the son of a rich man named Pistus, who had no independence of character, advocated joining the movement in favour of Galilee and Judea; and a certain Jesus, son of Saphat, had already excited the mariners and poor people to rebellion. But as if with the view of creating a diversion by a new project, Josephus himself required first of all that the palace built by Herod the Tetrarch should be destroyed, on account of the figures of animals which were everywhere found in it, since they were, according to the interpretation then prevailing, a violation of the second commandment; although the above-named Jesus, with his band of robbers, executed this requirement with the greatest barbarities after the departure of Josephus, and greatly against his designs.² It was the wish of Josephus that all the movable property besides the figures should be preserved to the Herodean family.³ He succeeded everywhere in arming the people, and took great pains to exercise them in the use of arms after the Roman manner; he procured also 250 horsemen and maintained 4,500 paid soldiers⁴; and he sought to make the volunteers (if we may thus name the bands that were generally known as robbers), who were so easily got together in large numbers from the Syrian fugitives, as harmless as possible.⁵ All the places the fortification of which could be of

¹ *Vita*, § 8.

² According to the more accurate accounts *Vita*, §§ 9, 12, 57, 65, 70; but the text must be very imperfect in § 9, only two of the three parties being described. What is wanting can, however, be fairly well supplied from § 12; only *Saphia*, in § 12, might seem to be a wrong reading for *Saphata*, according to *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9, 7, although *Vita*, §§ 27, 53 sq., *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21, 3, support it. In any case,

this Jesus, son of Saphia, would then be a different man from the one mentioned *ante*, p. 530. The 'arch-robber' Jesus, *Vita*, §§ 22, 40, is evidently another man again, since he roamed about everywhere.

³ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21, 3; *Vita*, § 13.

⁴ The hundred thousand armed men, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20, 6, were a militia; the best of them, called hoplites elsewhere, were sixty thousand, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20, 8.

⁵ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20, 7, 8; *Vita*, § 14.

use, he energetically put in condition for defence;¹ there were seventeen of them, only, unfortunately, Josephus presupposed an entirely different plan of operation on the part of the Romans than that which was subsequently actually adopted. But he maintained fully the right of the country to its national independence, ordering the choice of seventy elders, after the example of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, without whose voice he decided no point on which there was a difference of opinion, and for every commune again the choice of seven judges.² Moreover, he appropriated for himself nothing besides the title of the booty taken in war from the heathen,³ the allowance of the Law; and he endeavoured to calm men's minds everywhere, an endeavour in which he was not wholly unsuccessful. But there was one man in particular, who became of increasing importance to the very end of this history, who gave him much trouble.

This man was *John*, the son of *Levi*, of *Giskhala*, undoubtedly, as far as mental ability and dauntless courage went, the most distinguished of all the heroes of this war, although Josephus, who soon became his most bitter enemy, cannot speak too disrespectfully of him.⁴ He sprang from the small town of *Giskhala*, in Upper Galilee,⁵ and was by birth quite without means, but had as a Pharisee early adopted with fame a learned career, and so obtained powerful friends in Jerusalem, although he gave but little heed, for instance, to the Pharisaic laws about food.⁶ Neither did he from the beginning meditate treason and revolution, but exhorted his fellow-citizens to be quiet. But when the surrounding heathen populations had destroyed his native city amongst others, he was transformed, as it were, into another man, put himself at the head of his fellow-citizens, exercised them in the use of arms, overcame the enemy, and made *Giskhala* much stronger and better fortified than it had ever been before.⁷ From that moment he became the most implacable and most persistent enemy of the heathen, and was, by his

¹ See the list of them, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 6; *Vita*, § 37.

² *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 5; *Vita*, § 14.

³ See further details *Vita*, §§ 15, 16. *Comp. Antiquities*, p. 303.

⁴ Josephus speaks of him, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 2. 1, as if he had not previously mentioned him, ii. 21. 1 sq., probably because he wrote the former passage before the latter; but he describes his earliest history most fully in his *Vita*, from §§ 10 and 13 onwards.

⁵ The ruins of Gish are now found

north-west of Safed; later Jews call it גיט הלב (*Milked* as a new nickname?) see Carmoly, *Itinéraires*, p. 262; Benjamin Tud. p. 45, ed. Asher, calls it still עינת גיט, probably a clerical error for עינת, for the name was probably originally עינתבלה = איטבלת, grape-cluster, or even גיט קלטה, Castle of Gish.

⁶ *Vita*, § 38; *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 13; vii. 8. 1.

⁷ *Vita*, § 10.

inexhaustible resources of strategy, as well as by his bravery and popularity, exceedingly dangerous. He devoted himself with his whole soul to the cause of the people, and was discontented with all measures that did not seem to him at once to sufficiently further it, and indeed gladly thwarted them. He procured for himself also a select band of four hundred well-armed mercenaries, whom he could easily dispatch in any direction. It could therefore hardly be otherwise than that he should break with Josephus; and if the latter charges him with using strategy and ambition, and seizes every possible opportunity of reviling him, he forgets how frequently he himself made use of the first, and how inglorious his own end was. At the beginning, however, Josephus favoured his proposals; a fact, amongst other things, illustrated in connection with a question, in other respects remarkable, which made a great noise in the schools at that time.

The schools of law had, during the preceding decades, occupied themselves a great deal with the question how far the laws regarding clean and unclean things extended geographically. As this matter had previously been reduced to defined limits and figures with regard to Jerusalem itself and its centre, the Holy of Holies,¹ now they sought to embrace the whole world, wherever Judeans had been scattered, within fixed laws regarding food and drink. The Holy Land was considered to be the soil on which everything relating to food and drink had the greatest purity; next to it, it was supposed, came Syria (as the more extended fatherland since the times of the Seleucidæ), and Egypt was undoubtedly regarded similarly for the Hellenists; the remaining countries occupied only a third rank in the series.² Bread and oil, much more animal food, could be well prepared in the Holy Land only, and might not be received from heathen.³ Naturally, these rigid principles, by which the Hagiocracy now sought to set itself against the heathen, and to consummate itself in no small degree, and which were peculiarly the product of the most recent fervour of these times, did not meet with general acceptance. The example, however, of the prisoners of Rome⁴ shows that they appeared very sacred to many of those who claimed to be the most faithful children of this period; and the intoxication of the very latest moments could only have the effect of strengthening this tendency.⁵

¹ Comp. *Antiquities*, p. 331, note.

² Comp. the way in which Syria is distinguished by the teachers of the Law, *ante*, p. 506.

³ *M. Aboda Sara*, ii. 5.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 532.

⁵ The fact that after the destruction of Jerusalem this tendency arose with new

But Josephus was in this matter also very compliant, and as he just then desired to be gracious to the man of Giskhala, he not only allowed him to confiscate and carry away the Imperial corn—that is, corn that was still lying in the villages of Galilee forming the Roman land-tax, but also to sell to the Judeans of Cesarea Philippi at a great profit the oil of Galilee, as not having passed through heathen hands,¹ in order that he might complete the fortification of Giskhala with the money thus obtained. Josephus also expressly recommended him to the rulers of Tiberias when he wished to use the famous warm baths there.² But his entire labours in Galilee were destined soon to centre chiefly in his struggle with John of Giskhala.

For Josephus's governor at Tiberias, Silas,³ thought that he had found John speaking unfavourably of Josephus, and reported to him the fact at Cana, where he was just then staying. In his jealousy he hastened at once with two hundred armed men to Tiberias, marching all night, and early next morning delivered an address to the people, whilst John retired into his own house. As he was speaking it was told Josephus that John was plotting against his life, and he quickly descended from his platform and escaped with only two companions over the lake to the neighbouring place Tarichæa,⁴ on the southern shore. Whereupon, John went back to Giskhala, making apologies to Josephus, whilst the latter also declined to entertain the thought of proceeding with rigour against Tiberias. Thereupon, he advanced to Sepphoris, which in its embarrassment, had even invited the 'arch-robber' Jesus from the confines of Ptolemais; and Josephus chased away Jesus and his following by means of strategy and threatening. And as king Agrippa, in order to protect the important place Gamala, on the eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee, had sent Æquiculus Modius as the successor of Varus above mentioned,⁵ and the Roman commanders of the horse, Ebutins and Neapolitanus, sought to protect with small cohorts, from Ptolemais on the west and Scythopolis on the east as their base, the great plain of Galilee, with its corn supplies belonging to

zeal in the schools of law (comp. the next volume), is one proof that it belonged especially to these later times.

¹ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 1, 2; *Vita*, § 14.

² *Vita*, § 16; a fact which Josephus mentions later in the *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 6, 7. Undoubtedly the narrative in Josephus's *Life* is not only more copious from this point, but it is also more accurate as regards the chronological order of the events than *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. We there-

fore take it as the basis of our narrative.

³ As he is called in the ordinary reading *Vita*, §§ 17, 53; but probably, in §§ 71-73, at all events, the Arabic name Silas, or Sillaëus, is more correct. Comp. vol. v. pp. 412 sq.

⁴ It is either to be sought in the ruins of the present Kerak, or is a Greek translation of *Samakh*, not far from it.

⁵ *Ante.* p. 509.

Berenice, and, in fact, already occupied Samaria again and made inroads as far as Tiberias, Josephus, not unsuccessfully, though it must be allowed, with much more numerous forces, expelled them, at all events from the hilly part of Galilee.¹ But he could not prevent Sepphoris remaining attached to the Roman rule, and Gabara, or Gabaroth, situated somewhere in the centre of Galilee,² and the third town of the country in importance, preferred to join John, whom the party of the Poor in Tiberias courted.

At that time the wife of a high official of the king's, named Ptolemy, who was purposing to travel with a guard from the country under Agrippa, which was growing more and more insecure, into Roman territory near the sea, was robbed near the place Debarija,³ by the inhabitants of the village, of all her precious things, and they were brought to Josephus at Tarichæa. Some time before he had protected two heathen noblemen, who had come over from the royal Trachonitis, against the determination of the people to compel them to be circumcised; and he was now still less inclined to allow these spoils, taken from a Judean, to be kept. But thereby he came under the suspicion of being a friend of the Romans.⁴ The general displeasure of the people, therefore, was roused against him, and one morning he unexpectedly found himself as good as forsaken by the whole of even his own body-guard. But quickly recovering himself, he ran, in the guise of a person accusing himself, clothed in a black garment, with his sword hung at his neck, into the assembly of the people of Tarichæa, succeeded by skilful language in dividing the vast number of his accusers and saving his own life, and, indeed, at last boldly attacked the bands of volunteers who alone continued to seek his life. These and other apparently dangerous incidents, however, had such a bad effect on the feeling with regard to him in Tiberias, that suddenly the determination was arrived at to submit once more to king Agrippa, and he succeeded only by an unusually daring piece of military strategy in bringing this important city back again into his possession. He set sail from Tarichæa in a fleet of almost empty ships, which the people of Tiberias supposed to be properly manned, frightened the discontented

¹ *Bessara*, twenty furlongs from Gabá, above mentioned (p. 507), *Vita*, § 24, has not been rediscovered, Tireh, near Ptolemais, being probably too far off. Comp. further §§ 52, 54 sq.

² It has been rediscovered in *Kubara*, between Ptolemais and the north side of the Lake of Galilee. See Robinson's *Re-*

searches, vol. iii. pp. 85 sq.

³ Comp. vol. ii. p. 376.

⁴ *Vita*, §§ 23, 26-31; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 3-5. There is no indication whatever of Josephus intending at that time to betray his countrymen and go over to the Romans.

with strong language, and took back with him many hostages, whom he, however, soon set at liberty again; the principal instigator, Clitus, only was compelled to cut off his own left hand,¹ (as Josephus was always glad to punish Judeans with something less than death). A short time before he had succeeded in getting possession, for the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, of the important place Gamala, on the east shore of the lake, from which Philip, above-mentioned,² had been called away by excessive anxiety on the part of the king, and where many internal commotions had afterwards broken out, after a sanguinary rising against the nobles, which a certain Joseph had instigated. The whole of Gaulonitis, as far as the village Solyme, with the important town Seleucia, on the lake of Merom, and Sogane followed its example, likewise longing for freedom.³ The king's possessions, therefore, wavered greatly, whilst he himself preferred to stay far from them in Beyrout and other places on the sea-coast, that he might in no case lose the good opinion of the Romans for a moment.

However, Galilee was now really divided in its inclinations between Josephus and John; and it was obvious that the latter had done greater service against the Romans, who were once more making incursions and plundering round about, than Josephus, who manifested no great activity in that direction. Neither could material for an accusation before the rulers of Jerusalem against his arbitrary procedure be hard to find; and John himself accordingly sent, under the conduct of his brother, an imposing deputation for that special purpose to his old friend Simon, the son of the famous Pharisee Gamaliel,⁴ who as regards wisdom and business tact could rival his father, then long dead, and who enjoyed during all these years a great reputation in Jerusalem.⁵ Through his exertions a resolution was adopted, to send a committee of four men of repute, under cover of a strong armed guard, to Galilee, to inquire into the charges against Josephus; that committee consisted of two Pharisees of position, of the laity, Jonathan and Ananias

¹ *Vita*, §§ 31-35; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 8-10.

² *Ante*, p. 509.

³ *Vita*, §§ 36, 37; *comp.* §§ 24 and 11, and *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 6. The name *Solyme* must be added to the many similar names mentioned vol. i. p. 307, vol. iii. p. 187. The position of the three towns, Gamala, Seleucia, Sogane, is most accurately described, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 1. Perhaps Dukah, on the north-east of the Lake of Galilee, is a remnant of Sogane; Gamala lay farther to the south of it.—That this

took place in the course of January, 67, follows from the seven months incidentally mentioned *Bell. Jud.* iv. i. 2.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 193.

⁵ The sayings of his mentioned in *Pirqæ Aboth.* i. 17, 18, reveal a calm, moderate, benevolent, and painstaking mind. I have shown sufficiently in *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1862, pp. 815 sq., that there is no foundation for ascribing to him the coins with the inscription שמועין נשיא ישראל.

(Hanauja), and of two priests Joezar (Jozar) and Simon.¹ The good intention was to get Galilee put under the powerful management of John only; but Josephus obtained through his aged father in Jerusalem sufficiently early information of the proposed step, and all his dreams and ideas rebelled at what seemed to him such a dishonourable expulsion from the high office that had been entrusted to him. His resolution was quickly taken, and he advanced for a time with an army to the little town Chabolo,² as near as possible to the confines in the direction of Ptolemais, in order to show his zeal, if not in fighting with, yet in keeping off, the Roman commander Placidus with his two cohorts; and at the same time he did not neglect anything likely to win for him the favourable feeling of the Galilean peasantry. In reality most of the people of property dreaded the prospect of the ascendancy of John, as if his rule would necessarily bring with it that of the freebooters, especially in the open country; and when the committee arrived, it appeared that only four towns of importance were in favour of John, namely, Gamala, Tiberias, Gabara with Giskhala, where the men of the people happened to be at the head of affairs, and Sepphoris; the latter, however, without doubt only with the view of remaining secretly the more faithful to the Romans. The four committee men travelled at first from the south northwards by way of Japha, Sepphoris, and Asochis as far as Gabara, but found the people nowhere favourable in sufficiently large numbers to their purpose.³ They then turned to Tiberias, where Jesus, who was in power there⁴ just then, was very favourable to them, and whither John also was advancing with his armed men, whilst Josephus sought, from his retreat in Tarichæa, to thwart their schemes; but neither there were they able in the end to accomplish anything against Josephus with his inventive capacity, who this time took the town of Tiberias by force of arms even, and with difficulty kept his men from sacking it.⁵ Meanwhile, he had sent on his part a deputation sufficiently well guarded to Jerusalem, the

¹ *Vita*, §§ 39, 56, 61, 63. Since of these four names that of Jonathan especially appears in Josephus's *Life* everywhere as that of the head of the deputation, the four different names, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 7, must be amended accordingly. In the *Life* we find only the unimportant variation of Ἰωαῆσδρος, יוֹאָזָר, and Ἰωαζάρ, יוֹזָר.

² The ancient *Kahûl*, vol. iii. p. 292, rediscovered recently (see Robinson's *Researches*, iii. p. 88), but not given on

Kiepert's map. [It is marked in Kiepert's map to Robinson's 2nd English edition.]

³ *Vita*, §§ 40-52. Japha has been rediscovered a little to the south-west of Nazareth; Asochis was situated, according to §§ 45, 78, to the north of Sepphoris on the comparatively large plain on the south margin of which lies Sepphoris, and which took its name from Asochis, but the place has not been rediscovered.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 534.

⁵ *Vita*, §§ 53-64.

duty of which was to lay complaint with regard to the machinations against him, not before the Sanhedrin but before the people; and as soon as that deputation returned with a resolution favourable to himself, he acted with such vigour that John himself found it advisable to retreat to his town Giskhala with fifteen hundred soldiers who had remained faithful to him, where we shall meet with him again.¹

Josephus had at all events then got rid of his most dangerous Judean opponent in Galilee; but the precious opportunity when he might have succeeded in converting this bulwark of Judea into a terrible basis for attacks upon the Romans had been lost in those persistent domestic contentions of the popular leaders amongst each other. It is true Josephus took Sepphoris by force of arms as soon as he learnt that its population, although preponderatingly Judean, had sent again to the Romans praying for help, and he succeeded in preventing its complete sack only by a stratagem. But, in consequence of the increasing uncertainty with regard to Judean affairs generally, it was found advisable in Tiberias to return to the idea of surrender to the king; even Justus, who had previously done most to join the Judean movement,² now seized the first opportunity to flee from Josephus, from whom he thought he was in mortal danger, and surrender himself to the king. And Josephus had scarcely finished the fresh conquest of that changeable city,³ when Sepphoris was really occupied by a sufficiently strong number of Roman foot and horse soldiers; whereupon he tried in vain to take it by a siege and scaling the walls at night; his men, on the contrary, were seriously worsted by the Roman cavalry upon the great plain near Sepphoris. On the east, the royal forces, under a commander named Syllas, likewise advanced on horse and foot into the country, and they pitched such a strong camp outside Julias, above the north-east corner of the Lake of Galilee, that they were in a position both to advance easily to the west, over the Jordan, so as to threaten Galilee, and to the east, so as to command the great road which went northwards to Seleucia and

¹ *Vita*, §§ 52, 60-64, 66. While, in *Bell. Jul.* ii. 21, 7, Josephus has given this story of the inquiry into his official acts only in very brief hints, he communicates it in his *Life* in great detail; but, unhappily, we learn from it only the more directly and undeniably what an amount of moral obliquity and weakness was in his mind, as in that of almost all the other men in power. The details,

however, are of too insignificant a character to be retold here at length.

² *Ant.* p. 534.

³ According to *Vita*, § 15, he took Tiberias four times, Sepphoris twice, and Gadara (which ought to be Gabara) once, according to the laws of war, and he boasts that he had never proceeded cruelly against John even.

southwards to Gamala; by which means those two important cities, which had previously surrendered to the Judeans,¹ were practically cut off. With this new enemy Josephus was never engaged in anything more serious than skirmishes, in one of which he himself met with a fall from his horse in a quagmire, and had to be taken back to Capernaum.²

Vespasian in Galilee.

When Josephus had governed Galilee in this way not quite six months³ Vespasian arrived in Tyre, having travelled by land to Antioch, and then in Ptolemais. He was a man quite unknown in Asia, but he had become famous in German and British wars as a successful soldier and friend of soldiers; and representing in these degenerate times once more ancient Roman rigour and discipline, both towards himself and particularly towards the army, was destined soon to become not only the magnanimous conqueror of Asia, but also its benefactor, and at last its emperor. The evil tidings from Judea had come to Nero in the autumn of 66, when he was not very far away from the scene, as he was at that time staying in Achaia. He at last made the best arrangement which was possible there, in appointing the ablest of his generals, who was just then in Achaia, his representative (*legatus*) in Judea, and committing to him three legions; soon afterwards he appointed, as the successor of Cestius Gallus, who had died, Licinius Mucianus with four legions, if the above three should not be sufficient.⁴ Gessius Florus, too, of whose subsequent fortunes we know no particulars, appears to have soon met with his end, since Josephus was able as early as the year 75 to write without any reserve about him. Titus, Vespasian's son, who was already experienced in war, and far superior to his father in tact and humane virtues, was sent from Achaia to Egypt to fetch thence the fifth and the tenth legions, to complete, with the fifteenth, the number of the three legions.

¹ *Antc.* p. 539.

² The above, according to *Vita*, §§ 67-73. Instead of Cana, § 71, which is not at all appropriate here, we must read with the better MSS. Seleucia; and it is obvious from the context that Kepharnome, § 72, is the Capernaum of the Gospels (see vol. vi. p. 252); on the other hand, the name Capernaum for a spring further south, in the passage *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10. 8. remains very surprising.

³ Neither in his *Bell. Jud.* nor in his

Vita does Josephus supply the slightest chronological note as to this entire period, a fact which is very characteristic of him as a historian, and for us very troublesome. The above calculation is, however, on the whole safe, as Vespasian was in full activity in May, 67, according to *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 3.

⁴ According to Tac. *Hist.* i. 10, ii. 4, and the words *fato aut tadio occidit* of Cestius v. 10, Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 1. 1 3; 2. 4, *Vita*, § 74.

In Antioch already Agrippa met the new governor, but was then, on the accusation of the Tyrians, compelled by Vespasian to send the above-mentioned Philip¹ to Nero, to defend him; and in Ptolemais the Decapolis accused Justus² of having devastated their villages at the beginning of the movement.³ The actual war Vespasian began by sending six thousand infantry and one thousand cavalry under Placidus to Sepphoris, who, with this city as their basis, devastated Galilee far and wide.⁴ Meanwhile Titus joined his father at Ptolemais; and to the three legions and twenty-four cohorts of various kinds, cavalry and infantry, were added six thousand archers and three thousand horsemen from the three kings Antiochus, Agrippa, and Sohem, who, as we have seen,⁵ had in the previous campaign sent many men into the field, and five thousand foot with one thousand horse from the Arabian king Malchus.⁶ This collected army—some sixty thousand men without camp-followers—was not only, as regards military efficiency, but also in numbers, so formidable that Josephus, after he had been rapidly driven back to Tiberias, in spite of his somewhat fortified camp near the little town Taris,⁷ in the plain, an hour's march from Sepphoris, supposed that all he could do was to seek a preliminary defence for himself and his friends in the places that had been more carefully fortified. It may be, as he subsequently narrated,⁸ that he was already at that time, after these repeated defeats, in doubt as to a successful result of the conflict with the Romans; but he undoubtedly did not then think of going over to them. On the contrary, after he had urgently besought the people in power at Jerusalem for reinforcements, he removed from Tiberias again into the centre of Galilee, though he retired into the fortified town which he regarded as the strongest and the citizens of which were favourable to him.

That fortified place was Jotapata, a town north of the plain near Sepphoris, almost exactly midway between Ptole-

¹ See *ante*, p. 503.

² See *ante*, p. 534.

³ Jos. *Vita*, § 74.

⁴ The statement of Josephus regarding his attempt to reconquer Sepphoris, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 4. 1, will refer to the earlier time mentioned *ante*, p. 541, if we compare his more definite utterances in his *Life*, § 74 with § 71.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 511.

⁶ Malchus was probably the son of the Aretas referred to vol. vi. pp. 76 sq.

⁷ This name occurs as *Garis* also, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 6. 3; and it ought then to be

read thus, *Vita*, §§ 71 and 74 likewise, instead of Tarichæa. As, however, a *Turan* has been found in this region (*Robinson's Researches*, ii. p. 369), which in point of situation suits this connection, it is probably best to read *Taris*. But there was also, according to *Bell. Jud.* v. 11. 5, a town *Garsis* in Galilee, with which *Garis* interchanges at this place in the MSS.; and a גַּרְסִים is met with in the Talmud. Either this *Garsis* or *Taris* was therefore the original reading.

⁸ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 2.

mais and Tiberias,¹ to be approached on three sides only up steep precipices, and on the north alone somewhat more easily accessible; upon the artificial fortification of which Josephus had further expended great pains, and which any enemy must first take if he desired to subjugate the whole of Galilee, and especially if he desired to obtain a road to Tiberias. When Placidus some time before attacked the town, its inhabitants had bravely repulsed his attempt; but as soon as Vespasian with a great army, after the taking and devastation of Gabara² and its territory, had with difficulty made a broad road to it, Josephus threw himself into the place on May 21,³ resolved to try his fortune there; many other brave soldiers had also taken refuge in it. In the defence of fortified places the Judeans were at that time always far more successful than in battles in level country; and if, as Josephus had desired, a large and well-led relieving force had advanced from Jerusalem, the defence of this excellently situated place would not have been hopeless. Indeed, if the people of Jerusalem had been wise they would have devoted all their resources to the defence of the fortified places of Galilee. But no one there carried such a proposal. The ultimate fall of Jotapata, in spite of the bravest and most tenacious defence on the part of the numerous soldiers that were crowded together within its limits, was therefore inevitable. Arms and provisions did not fall short in the fortress, as Josephus had extended its walls on the north, but water was scarce during the oppressive heat of summer. After the close siege had gone on for a considerable time, and the enemy outside was compelled more and more loudly to admire the brave defence of the besieged, there broke out in the town of Japha, which lay a little south of Nazareth,⁴ and had already been subjugated, a threatening rising against the Romans, as if the inhabitants intended to go to the assistance of those in Jotapata. But Vespasian quickly despatched, under the command of Trajanus, the general of the tenth legion (father of the subsequent emperor), and then again under Titus, a considerable army against the town, which was

¹ The Prussian Consul Schultz discovered this town in the ruins of the present Tell *G'efat*, see *Zeitschrift des Deut. Morgenl. Gesells.* 1849, pp. 51 sq.; the present name can only be abbreviated from the old one, the situation agreeing exactly with the description, *Jos. Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 7. [See Robinson's *Researches*, iii. pp. 105 sq.]

² In the passage, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 1, we must likewise read Γαβαρά instead of

Γαδαρά, this better known town being probably often written instead of the former less known one; comp. *ante*, p. 541.

³ According to the remark *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 3; from this point Josephus becomes generally more minute again as to dates, as soon as the history of Judea comes once more into closer relation with that of Rome.

⁴ According to the maps of Kiepert and Vandevelde; comp. *ante*, p. 540.

retaken on the 25th of June. Fifteen thousand men were said to have fallen, and only two thousand to have been taken prisoners.¹ Jotapata was therefore once more left to its own resources, and even the most daring deeds of the entire garrison, and particularly of some of the soldiers, whom Josephus highly praises, could not, in spite of the serious injuries repeatedly inflicted on the Romans, including the wounding of Vespasian himself, avert its doom. After the Romans had besieged it forty-seven days, it was taken in July² with the assistance of the first deserter, whilst the completely exhausted garrison was snatching its morning sleep. The detailed description of all the incidents of this protracted siege, of the various stratagems which Josephus employed in it, and of the numerous proofs of the exceedingly brave courage of the Judeans, is, as given by Josephus, very instructive, particularly with regard to the conduct of military operations in those times. The history of this siege shows likewise especially what a large number of resolute defenders of the newly-gained liberty there was in populous Galilee, and what might have been made of this people under better leaders. On the day of the taking of the place many voluntarily met death as true Zealots;³ forty thousand men were said to have been slain, and only twelve hundred taken prisoners.⁴

But Josephus himself at this point came badly out of the severe trial into which the entire Judean movement, since the previous autumn, and particularly this long siege, had led him. We cannot say that he was a traitor, still less that he was a man of a cruel disposition. But the want of thoroughness and clearness and the weakness of all the principles of the Pharisees, to which he remained faithful on the whole, notwithstanding the many bad things he ascribed to the Pharisees in history, and the really worldly tendency at bottom, which had cleaved more and more during upwards of two centuries to the Pharisaic school, became in his case more and more predominant and undisguised as all his astuteness and strategy failed him as a national leader and a general. Which may be taken as the plainest sign that in actual life a Pharisee must in trying positions either determine to rise to something much higher, or fall very low before all the world, and apparently

¹ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 31.

² The dates *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 3, 29, 33, 36; 8. 9; 9. 1, are a little contradictory, unless we suppose that the forty-seven days of the siege were not reckoned from the day of the close blockade, but from the earlier commencement of the siege.

³ *Ante*, p. 499.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 36. We have no reason for supposing that these numbers and the other circumstances of the siege have been seriously exaggerated by Josephus, although many details may surprise us at first sight.

without any shame. With his customary astuteness Josephus had on certain occasions anticipated before he was shut up in Jotapata that the Romans would be in the end victorious;¹ and, trembling for his life, he had during the siege endeavoured, under the pretext of being in a better position outside for fighting the Romans, to get away from the place, though he remained at the wish of the multitude.² But on the morning when the place was taken, instead of fighting at the head of his people, he secretly crept with forty men of eminence into a cave that could be easily defended; but was betrayed on the third day, and conducted negotiations for his surrender with messengers of Vespasian, through the almost inaccessible opening of the cave. It is easy to understand that Vespasian preferred to take him, and probably the whole of his forty companions in the cave, prisoners to killing them; but when he communicated to the latter noble Galileans, amongst whom there was not a Pharisee, his resolve to surrender himself alive, they were so indignant that they almost killed him. He vainly sought to convince them that suicide was in that case also not permissible.³ He persuaded them at last to kill each other in the order determined by lot, and, as by special good fortune in his lot,⁴ found that he was left last with only one more companion, and him he persuaded easily to surrender himself alive with his commander. Vespasian proposed to have him strictly guarded, that he might on an early opportunity send him to Rome, to be at Nero's disposal. But just then our son of a priest felt the sudden prophetic impulse to request the great general, who had him then in his power, to let him stay with him, as Vespasian himself would soon be Emperor instead of Nero. It is difficult to say what various powers and motives may have mingled in Josephus's breast at this moment and led him to make this utterance, which was, however, fulfilled subsequently otherwise than he then expected. They may have been the dread of losing his life, a wide view of the affairs of the world of which he was capable as a general, the hope of triumphantly entering Jerusalem as the high-priest appointed by the Romans after the overthrow of the existing Hagiocracy,

¹ Indeed, he once plainly gave the elders of Tiberias to understand this. (*Jud.*, § 35): from which we must not, however, conclude that he was then thinking of treason.

² *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 15-17.

³ In this respect the long speech, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 5, is very instructive. It could only be arbitrarily inferred from certain

passages of the Pentateuch that it forbade suicide, as we see from this instance that the Pharisees then taught.

⁴ At all events he must have been a very great liar if he quite misrepresented the case, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 1 *ad fin.*, which we must hesitate to suppose; the description of the similar case, vii. 9. 1, is undoubtedly plainer.

and the claim to higher religious and prophetic endowments which were still made by Judean priests, particularly amongst the Galileans, and were still gladly acknowledged.¹ Vespasian, flattered by this prophecy, and especially influenced by the intercession of Titus, permitted Josephus thereupon to remain with him in honourable relations, and, indeed, gave him, as still a young man whose wife had remained in Jerusalem, one of the captive Jewesses.² We can, in fact, scarcely find a more striking illustration of the degraded spirit and action, and the depraved treatment of the Scriptures then prevailing in the case of even the most distinguished Pharisees;³ and the worst of it is that Josephus does not blush to tell all this of himself, and, indeed, to boast of it.

Whilst the siege of Jotapata was in full course, Vespasian sent the commander of the fifth legion, Cerealis, with three thousand foot and six hundred horse to Samaria, where the Samaritans had just taken up a threatening position on their holy mountain Gerizim itself. It may surprise us that these old enemies of the Judeans had now revolted against the Romans, and Josephus does not take the trouble to mention the immediate motive of their rebellion. We see from it, however, that the cry for liberation from the Roman yoke was passing through the length and breadth of the Holy Land; and the Samaritan also could undoubtedly complain at that time of the severity of Rome.⁴ The whole of Samaria was already surrounded by Roman forces, not only from the north,⁵ but from other sides; a pressure on its frontiers which appears to have caused it to fly to arms. Cerealis lay round the mountain through a long hot summer day, when want of water on the top of the mountain compelled many to take to flight, and on the next day, 27th June, he demanded the surrender, and as that was refused, he attacked and defeated the enemy. Eleven thousand six hundred Samaritans covered the battle-field.⁶

Vespasian already turned his attention generally closely to

¹ Comp. *Vita*, § 39 *ad fin.*, and vol. vi. p. 374.

² *Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 9; *Vita*, § 75 sq.

³ We need not, it is true, suppose that he is lying whenever he appeals to his own dreams and kindred prophetic phenomena, as he so often does; on the contrary, a belief from old times may just then have been prevalent in the case of sons of priests particularly. But the prayer which he utters before his expressed determination to surrender, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 8. 3, is pitiable; and the interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies as pointing

to this Roman victory that he boasts of, § 9. 3, is purely arbitrary in the way in which he is led to it simply by his feelings. It is often asked now-a-days in what passage of the Old Testament Josephus found his prophecy regarding Vespasian; but the question is one of comparative indifference to us when we observe in what an arbitrary way people like him interpreted the Old Testament.

⁴ Comp. *ante*, pp. 419 sq.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 538.

⁶ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 32, where Bekker correctly reads *εἶ* instead of *ὄεἰ*.

the south, as if he had conceived the conquest of Jerusalem still possible that year. While at Jotapata he ordered two legions to Cæsarea and one to Scythopolis, to recruit themselves for a time, as if the reduction of Galilee had been practically finished. But as many Judeans had meanwhile settled afresh amongst the ruins of Joppa,¹ and from that place carried on a serious system of piracy in a large number of boats along the Syrian and Egyptian coast, and thus interrupted all sea traffic, he sent an army thither, which immediately drove all the pirates from the land to their ships: and a terrible storm which overtook them the next day on their coast, almost destitute of harbours, completed their destruction.² But he had now to learn that even in the north everything was far from secure, the Galileans after his departure from Jotapata having almost everywhere risen again, while even the royal territories suffered still from the most serious commotions. He acceded accordingly to an invitation of the king to his capital, Cæsarea Philippi, in the far north, where he rested, with the remainder of his army, twenty days. But as the popular party under Jesus, whom we met with before,³ had just then got the upper hand in Tiberias, and Tarichæa, together with Gamala, still remained quite opposed to the king, Vespasian determined, in the first instance, to make a clear course in this important district, and ordered the entire army to be concentrated in the large and beautiful city of Scythopolis, as the most suitable base for carrying out these military operations. He sent only fifty horsemen towards Tiberias, to reconnoitre the position; they were repulsed by a sally of the Zealots, but the party opposed to the Zealots begged Vespasian to pardon the act; and after the Zealots had fled to Tarichæa, he marched into Tiberias, not, however, until he had as a conqueror demolished a part of the city walls that had been raised in height by Josephus.⁴ In the neighbouring town farther south, Tarichæa, which had all along taken a quieter but more decided part than Tiberias in the movement, troops of volunteers had long been collecting in great numbers from all quarters, particularly from the district of the Decapolis; Vespasian, however, committed to his son Titus the fiercer fighting which

¹ *Ante*, p. 511.

² See the detailed description, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 2-4. In connection with the frequently occurring uncertainty whether Joppa was to belong to Phœnicia or to Judea, it had previously been accused of piracy, comp. Strabo, *Geog.* xvi. 2. Titus

thereupon caused triumphal coins to be issued with *Judea navalis* (capta) on the reverse side, such coins having now been found (comp. further below).

³ *Ante*, p. 540.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 7, 8.

their subjugation required. The town, built like Tiberias at the foot of a hill, had been but little fortified by Josephus, but presented, nevertheless, for the determined fighters that had been collected in it, the possibility of a protracted resistance, or at all events of a secure escape, in its numerous boats and the proximity of the Lake. In consequence of the want of discipline and leadership on the part of the Judean troops, however, the victory over them was comparatively easy. After the Romans had constructed their camp not far from the town, and had suffered a little from a sally of the volunteers of Jesus, they dispersed with their superior cavalry the troops that were still outside the town, and drove them for the most part within the walls. In consequence of the wild confusion which arose in the place at this, the Romans forced their way the more easily into it, and took possession of it with great bloodshed. They then compelled the vanquished to build quickly a number of large and secure rafts, that they might be able to pursue on them the large number that escaped in their boats. The sea-fight which then arose was made horrible by the desperation of the struggling Judeans; and the same lake which, some thirty years before, had been the chief scene of the operations of celestial peace amongst mankind, as we saw in the previous volume, became now the theatre of a horrible fight, such as its banks and waves had certainly never before witnessed.¹ The number of those who perished in those land and sea fights was six thousand five hundred; but the number of the prisoners was so immense that Vespasian himself did not know what to do with them. He granted them accordingly permission to go to Tiberias, as they thought to be at liberty, but then shut them in the racecourse of that city, cut down twelve hundred old and weak men, sent six thousand of the strongest as slaves to Nero, who might just then employ many such slaves in the mad undertaking of piercing the Isthmus of Corinth,² and sold or gave to the king, as far as they consented to be his subjects, the remaining thirty thousand and four hundred. But Agrippa found it necessary to sell his subjects for slaves, as he was just then in great want of money. All this had been accomplished by the 8th September.

The numerous larger and smaller towns of Galilee surrendered then; but there were two places that held out most obstinately, and the three Gaulonite towns above mentioned,³ moreover, declared themselves afresh against all

¹ See the fuller description, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10, 9 sq.

Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10, 10, is further explained in *Suet. Nero.* §§ 19, 37.

² The reference which is too brief in

³ *Ante.* p. 539.

monarchical and Roman rule.¹ Agrippa, however, succeeded without difficulty in bringing back Sogane and Seleucia. Gamala, which from its extremely secure situation² might, even more than Jotapata, cause an enemy the greatest difficulties, and had already been besieged seven months in vain by Agrippa's soldiers, held out with all the greater obstinacy. The town suffered from want of water, but was of one mind under the two brave leaders Chares and Joseph.³ Of volunteers it had not received many, but had nevertheless, probably on account of the seven months' siege just mentioned, not been able to lay in a sufficient supply of provisions. Vespasian, with the whole of his three legions, commenced his march against it from Emmaus, that is, 'the warm baths,' a short distance south of Tiberias, and began, without being able to completely surround the city, to besiege it according to the principles of military science. The citizens shot at the king, when, after the beginning of the siege, he sought, opposite one of the walls, to exhort them to surrender; and when subsequently the Romans, having made a breach in the walls, rushed in and endeavoured to storm the higher parts of the city, they were repulsed with such severe loss that Vespasian was obliged to put forth all his efforts to get them to retreat in order; a number of the bravest leaders also had fallen. The rest which had thereby been made necessary was used by Vespasian in sending a division of cavalry under Placidus against the fortress which Josephus had built upon the Tabor on the southern frontier. Its warlike garrison was enticed by a stratagem of the Roman general's into the plain and annihilated, so that the fortress which was suffering, moreover, from want of water, surrendered, whilst the bravest of the garrison withdrew to Jerusalem.⁴ Meantime in Gamala famine had been the best ally of the Romans, and many of the ablest defenders had already made their escape from it: still, neither in the town nor in the citadel did any one think of surrender. At last a tower, secretly undermined by some Romans, fell, and in the confusion thereby created the Romans forced their way into the city. It was, however, not until the next day, October 23rd, that they ventured to storm the citadel, in doing which they were assisted by a

¹ We must, at all events, conclude this from the few words *Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 1. and 10 *ad fin.* although it is not plainly said in the narrative of Josephus as we have it.

² See the detailed description. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 3. 9 sq.

³ 'Joseph, the son of the midwife,' *Vita*, § 37, is evidently the same man, but the Chares of *Vita*, §§ 35. 37, would necessarily be an entirely different person from the Chares of *Bell. Jud.*, iv. 1. 4. 9.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 8.

violent storm of wind, which carried away the projectiles of the besieged. Though four thousand, chiefly weaker people and children, were slain, more than five thousand precipitated themselves into the deep valley below the citadel. The only persons saved were two daughters of the sister of the above-mentioned Philip,¹ who were probably retained there as hostages. The two popular leaders had fallen the day before. Titus did not take part in the struggle before the last day,² because his father, who had then perceived the difficulty of a successful conclusion of the war, had sent him to the Syrian governor, Mucianus, at Antioch, to put himself in good relations with the latter. This, however, was not then very completely effected.

There remained then only Giskhala in Upper Galilee, which Josephus had fortified, with other northern towns, under the false supposition that the Romans would commence the war from the north; and that little place would also have long before surrendered, if John of Giskhala had not defended it with his veteran volunteers. It was not until after the disgraceful fall of Josephus that John's ability and valour were properly appreciated. When Titus at last appeared before Giskhala with a great troop of horsemen, John had perceived that he would be unable to hold out against any serious siege; he therefore persuaded Titus to leave him in peace for the day, because it was the Sabbath; whereupon Titus rode into the heathen place, Kedas or Kydysa,³ lying considerably to the north of Giskhala. But in the night John left the fortress with most of the natives and others who desired to escape, with the view of going to Jerusalem, which had really most unjustly neglected to help the Galileans. When Titus arrived the next day he found the town prepared to open its gates to him. He ordered his cavalry accordingly to pursue the fugitives, and (according to Josephus) they slew some six thousand people and took some three thousand women and children prisoners, without being able to overtake John; but he spared the town and its inhabitants, pulling down only a small piece of the wall to satisfy military honour.

¹ *Ante*, p. 509.

² What is said of these deeds of Titus in Suet. *Tit.* § 4, can be correctly understood only from *Jos. Bell. Jud.* iv. 1. 10.

³ When this town is called *μεσόγειος*,

Bell. Jud. iv. 2. 3, what is meant by this adjective is, that, although Tyrian, it was at the same time situated on the high mainland, and not by the sea. Further comp. on it *ante*, p. 507.

Vespasian in the South of Palestine. A Fresh Great Delusion of the Judeans.

The winter camps received the Roman armies wearied with the difficulties of the campaign in Galilee; and as early as this winter many strange rumours regarding the tottering reign of Nero might have found their way thither from the distant west. Nevertheless, Vespasian adhered firmly to his purpose of prosecuting the war entrusted to him, and employed the repose of the winter in reimposing the Roman rule on the subjugated districts and destroying, as far as possible, the traces of the devastation.¹ He also pushed troops into the south-west, as far as the towns Jamnia (Jabne) and Ashdod on the coast, put garrisons in them, and removed Judeans loyal to him into them, which, however, was not as yet successfully accomplished in the case of Jamnia.²

He resolved, therefore, in the first instance to clear the country on the other side the Jordan; and the citizens of Gadara, the most important city of the Decapolis next to Scythopolis, volunteered to lend him assistance in this. In that rich city the Judeans had not been completely extirpated in the revolution of the autumn of 66;³ their party had accordingly gradually recovered, and their opponents, with the rich mayor of the place, Dolesus, at their head, resolved secretly to invoke Vespasian's assistance. The seditious party did not discover this fact until the Romans were already approaching the city; they despaired of being able to hold it, and after they had slain Dolesus and violated his dead body, they abandoned the place in wild flight. As early as March 4th of the year 68 the Romans marched into the city, amid the joyful acclamations of the inhabitants, the walls of which its own citizens had pulled down in their servility. Vespasian then returned to Cæsarea, but sent Placidus, whose name was so terrible to all Judeans, with three thousand foot and five hundred horse, to pursue those who had escaped. They most likely proposed to take the road to Jerusalem, whither all such worsted bands of volunteers collected at that time, by way of Jericho; and they had already got near Bethannabris,⁴ a little north of the passage of the Jordan, when they were overtaken

¹ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 1.

² *Ibid.* iv. 3, 2; comp. iv. 8. 1.

³ *Ante.* p. 508 sq.

⁴ The name of this place seems to be

בֵּית עֵין נִמְרִי, the same, therefore, met with in the O. T. as נִמְרִי, which has now been rediscovered as Nimrin; the situation of the latter place suits exactly.

by the Romans. As they found in that small fortified place young men who were ready to join with them, they assumed the defensive, being, as usual, wholly without cavalry. The fight outside the walls was desperate, and the defeat in consequence more terrible, until they were forced back again into the town. Placidus did not take the place until after a fresh and still fiercer struggle, and he then drove the fugitives, with his overwhelming cavalry, into the Jordan, which was just then more than usually swollen by the rains, so that masses of corpses floated down into the Dead Sea, and he also pursued those that had escaped in boats into that sea. He was unwilling to pass the Jordan with his small forces, but he took the important towns situated there, Abila, Julias, and Beth-jesimoth,¹ and protected them with garrisons. The whole of Perea was thereby subjugated, at all events, for some time; the fortress of Machærus only, quite in the south, he did not venture to attack.²

Vespasian himself then advanced with the largest part of his army from Cæsarea, to conquer all the country round about Jerusalem; and he pursued that object obviously this year also with the greatest determination, only it is described with less detail by Josephus,³ probably because he was not himself attending the general. He advanced first to Antipatris,⁴ and stayed there two days, for the purpose of settling the affairs of the city after the Roman manner. From there he overran and plundered the district of Thamna, and subjugated the towns Lydda, further to the west, and Jamnia (properly Jabne), not far from the sea, arranged their government on Roman principles, and transferred to them citizens from those towns that had already submitted to him. Thence he marched to Emmaus, in the direction of Jerusalem, on the slope of the range of hills,⁵ constructed there a camp for the fifth legion, and thereby cut off the entrances towards Jerusalem from the great plain. Thereupon, he advanced with the rest of his

¹ With regard to Julias, see vol. vi. p. 72, and on Beth-Jeshimoth, see vol. ii. p. 210; the latter place has been rediscovered as *Saïme*, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, p. 1576. We cannot, therefore, compare the Abila mentioned here with the Abil discovered on the east of Gadara, but must suppose some town in the neighbourhood.

² *Bell. Jv.* iv. 7. 3-6.

³ *Ibid.* iv. 8. 1 sq.; 9. 1. Josephus undoubtedly used in this case the *Commentaries of Titus* (comp. the next vol.)

⁴ See *ante*, p. 514.

⁵ We might be inclined to suppose the Emmaus here intended was that situated, according to the correct reading of Luke xxiv. 13-28, and of Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6, only thirty [see *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 450] stadia from Jerusalem, as Vespasian, according to the latter passage, subsequently transferred a colony thither, whence it is probably still called *Kolonieh*; but it is evident that, in the passage before us and elsewhere, Josephus must mean the more distant and much larger town.

army further southward into the two districts of Lepteph¹ and Idumea, defeated in a great battle the Judeans of Idumea, who were determined to make resistance, when he slew upwards of ten thousand and took more than one thousand prisoners. In the heart of Idumea he took the two places Bethgabra² and Caphartoba, planted military posts throughout the whole of Idumea at suitable places, in order to cut off all escape to Jerusalem, drove away many of the best of the inhabitants, and left behind a large number of soldiers to constantly overrun the district. With the remaining portion of his army he turned again rapidly, by Emmaus, north-eastwards to the ancient Sichem or Neapolis,³ as it was subsequently called, that he might similarly subdue the eastern side of Jerusalem by coming down from the north. On 2nd January he pitched a camp at Corea, on the northern frontier of Judea, and the next day entered the territory of Jericho, where Trajan, who had marched through Perea with another division of the army, joined him. The large population of Jericho had for the most part fled to the mountains over against Jerusalem; those who still held the city were at once cut down.⁴ It seemed to him unnecessary to advance farther south on that side. He returned therefore temporarily to Cæsarea, after he had constructed a permanent camp for Jericho on the east, and another just opposite at Adida,⁵ west of Jerusalem; and as Adida might at any time be disturbed by the inhabitants of Gezara,⁶ who continued all along to be very seditious, he sent Lucius Annius with a considerable army against the place, who inflicted a cruel chastisement upon it; he slew one thousand of the younger men who could not escape in time, took the unarmed prisoners, gave the town up to his soldiers to be sacked, and laid it and the surrounding country waste.

But while Vespasian was thus making the last arrangements in Cæsarea for attacking Jerusalem, which had already been surrounded at a distance and rendered all but helpless, and would probably have taken it before the close of that

¹ The place is certainly not the present *Lifta*, a little north of Jerusalem which is in no way appropriate here—amongst other reasons, because it lies too near Jerusalem. The present *Netlif* would be more appropriate as regards locality and orthography, having probably arisen from an ancient place, נֶתִיף. Jos. xv. 43.

² Which must be read instead of *Bήταρις*, the later Eleutheropolis; Caphar-

toba was probably situated not far from it.

³ Or, according to the language of the country at that time, *Mabortha*, comp. vol. v. p. 97.

⁴ The *Onomast.* of Eusebius, p. 234, ed. Larsov, narrates how Jericho was then destroyed.

⁵ Comp. on this place, vol. v. p. 332.

⁶ Which is the correct reading according to vol. v. p. 335.

year 68, he received reliable reports of the suicide of Nero on June 9th, and of the nomination of Galba as emperor by the Senate. When previously an emperor died, the authority of every one of his governors lapsed temporarily, and they were especially obliged to make inquiries as to what was to be done with the armies under their command. Vespasian was necessarily particularly uncertain whether he was to prosecute the war, and begin the new undertaking of a siege of Jerusalem. The occupation of the imperial throne of Rome had not been for a century so doubtful as it then was; and although all the legions in Asia and Africa, unlike those throughout Europe, had not hitherto shown the slightest inclination to interfere in the internal affairs of the empire, Vespasian might at this juncture seriously reflect whether he might not soon employ his army in a better way, for the restoration of domestic peace. He therefore put the war in abeyance, and in the first instance endeavoured through Titus to get a complete understanding with Mucianus, in which he succeeded at this juncture of general danger better than on the former occasion.¹ As soon as it was certainly known that Galba had ascended the imperial throne, Vespasian sent Titus to Rome to congratulate him; Agrippa likewise went to Rome on the same errand. But as it was winter the journey took so long that they both heard of Galba's assassination before they arrived; whereupon Agrippa continued his obsequious journey, being willing to throw himself at the feet of any actual *imperator* in Rome, but Titus returned to his father.² Through these circumstances a fresh delay in the military projects against Jerusalem was occasioned, which lasted till the middle of the year 69, at which time all this was once more repeated (as we shall see), when Vespasian had actually come to the gates of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem was thereby for the second time most unexpectedly saved as from inevitable destruction, and whilst the entire Roman empire appeared to be falling to pieces, it might once more rise as from the midst of ruin, and begin a new life of calm reflection and moderation and of true reform; indeed, the victory over its enemies which had been so painfully snatched from it, might seem once more to recall it to its standard. It was as if once more a final chance should be given to it, either of attaining in some good way a fresh rising from under the Roman supremacy or at all events of gaining once more the same condition of patient endurance in which it had

¹ See *ante*, p. 551. and Tac. *Hist.* ii.

² Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 2; Tac. *Hist.* ii. 1-4; Suet. *Tit.* § 5; comp. *Galba*, § 23.

maintained its existence before the war. The most exuberant hopes and most glowing expectations on the part of most Judeans were also undoubtedly connected with this unexpected turn of Roman history; and if the Temple with the Holy City appeared before to be inviolable as against heathen power, many might now suppose that all these disasters of Rome would serve perpetually to protect those sanctuaries, and that they would issue from the trial and severe afflictions of that time more gloriously than ever.¹ When even the Christian Apocalypse could anticipate about this time, that though Jerusalem would be conquered by the heathen, on account of its many sins, it would not be destroyed,² how much higher would the thoughts and language of the Judean seers have then flown! Moreover, the deceased Nero increased the ferment and commotion of the time. For suddenly the report spread that he was still living somewhere in the East, and that he would soon return thence to Rome as the omnipotent conqueror; to him were thus attached expectations, on the one hand, and terrors on the other, at this most trying juncture. As Nero himself had despatched Vespasian against Jerusalem, it might have been expected that the Judeans would not soon have changed their feelings with regard to the dead man; but it could then be remembered that he had formerly been always well disposed towards the Judeans,³ and that he had so hotly persecuted the Christians at their instigation.⁴ Expectations are quickly changed at such times: and many sought to persuade first themselves and then others that he would soon appear in the East even, to take vengeance on Vespasian, who was advancing to destroy Jerusalem, and on all his enemies; whilst the endeavour was made to alarm the Christians with the same spectre.⁵

¹ A reminiscence, still sufficiently clear, of this situation and feeling has been preserved in the tradition that is found in *R. Nathan's Aboth*, ch. iv. According to it, when Vespasian had put to the people of Jerusalem the question, why they refused, in their infatuation, to send to him the announcement of their submission, he received the answer that, as they had repulsed two Roman generals before him, they would repulse him likewise. This tradition is referred to the time of the last siege, as the desertion of *Johanan ben Zakkai* (see on this the next volume) is connected with it. When we remember that later writers generally speak of Vespasian when Titus is meant,

we see plainly that Cestius Gallus and Vespasian himself are here meant by the two generals that had been previously beaten.

² Rev. xi. 1, 2. 13.

³ *Ante*, pp. 408, 483.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 466.

⁵ From the latter fact, which is certain, we may infer the former; comp. *Die Johanneischen Schriften*, ii. pp. 10 sq. As the effects of the death of Mani, with regard to his disciples and the spread of his doctrine, may be compared with those of the death of Christ, so those of the death of the Fatimite caliph Hâkim with those of the death of Nero.

But whilst the same causes which threw the seed of death into the midst of the bloom of this warlike enthusiasm of the ancient nation continued in full operation during the whole of this last opportunity, and were, indeed, intensified, this favourable armistice, once more sent from heaven, became still more than the prosperity of the year 66 the occasion of yet greater delusion and disappointment, which the next section will show.

3. *The Parties in Jerusalem.*

We must now look at the party divisions in Jerusalem more closely. Since the summer of 67 they had put themselves more and more openly forward, and had developed themselves with logical thoroughness, as if by an unavoidable necessity, till they reached such a degree of consuming violence, on the one hand, and on the other such an obstinate persistence, that they alone would have been sufficient to bring the newly-established commonwealth to destruction. It is instructive to note, in spite of the wild confusion of the various parties which now arose, the logical thoroughness and consistency of the general development. The drama which is now opened in this history is only the same which is everywhere created when a resistless national movement is based on a totally perverse thought and aim; and the drama that was unfolded in Jerusalem in the years 67-70 is only too similar to the convulsion of the Parisian state in 1789-93. The difference between the two is mainly this only: that in Jerusalem a small, in many respects very feeble nation, entered into a life and death struggle with a giant nation of the time, by which the utmost energies that lay hidden within it were called into the most terrible tension, and every party that was possible within it was compelled, amid the most rapid changes of necessity and of endeavour, to see what could be effected by its last resources; whilst in Paris a purely domestic struggle had arisen at the centre of one great, powerful, and established kingdom. But the fundamental idea in both cases was wrong, inasmuch as both nations sought to obtain an ideal liberty that had only been confusedly thought out, and to obtain it by means equally deficient in clearness; and on that account especially we have in both cases a very similar development and the same unfortunate issue.

We saw above ¹ that a unanimity superior to all party divisions prevailed at the beginning in Jerusalem, the centre of the

¹ *Ante*, p. 529.

commonwealth, and that it was continued there much longer comparatively than in the provinces; but in reality it was simply the marvellous fortune and the enthusiasm of a moment which had called forth this superior unanimity with regard to the one fundamental idea, whilst the old motives and occasions of the most destructive divisions were unchanged in the background; and the condition of the provinces soon reacted on the capital, so as to arouse these motives and occasions into double force and vigour. The provinces, which were further removed from the light and the force of the new life that was strongest in the central city, had nevertheless to endure soonest the dangers and sufferings of the new state of things; the divisions, accordingly, appeared in them soonest in all their destructive force, as the example of Galilee above shows. It soon appeared in the most decisive way, in a thousand different forms, in the provinces, whether anyone was animated by the purest, or, at all events, the most tenacious zeal, against the Romans, and how he meant accordingly to bear himself towards his own fellow-countrymen and fellow-religionists; but after the Romans had re-occupied many of the towns there, or had transferred to them to some extent Judeans favourable to Rome, the internal hostilities and disturbances became still worse. From all quarters the persecuted naturally flocked to Jerusalem, as well as those also who were led by a deeper zeal, in the hope of being able most freely to use their powers there; but undoubtedly likewise other people animated by the basest desires and ambitions; and, as the one holy city, it had been regarded from time immemorial as the asylum in which all had the right of entrance and refuge.¹ By this incessant influx of fresh people from the provinces, and even from all the countries of the earth, the fire of division and party spirit, as soon as it had once been kindled, was vigorously fed; but the causes of it lay deeper, and in the course of these three years there were really developed in Jerusalem only the three great party divisions which necessarily unfolded themselves at this point of the history; whilst, notwithstanding all the misery and baseness of the case, there was at least this element of grandeur in it, that these divisions were developed with complete clearness and decisiveness, and thus in the end all the latent motive forces at work were entirely exhausted.

¹ To which Josephus alludes justly, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 3.

The Learned Zealots.—John of Giskhala.

The Zealots, as we saw above,¹ formed, as it were, the fundamental party, inasmuch as the soul that from the first animated the entire movement was embodied in them.² Their principle that a true Judean must do with the greatest zeal everything that was required to secure liberty from the yoke of heathen supremacy, was at first reduced, by the power and influence of the *moderate* party,³ to the observance of the existing laws. But as the Romans soon became victorious again, and the new commonwealth appeared to be more and more seriously threatened, their zeal easily became increasingly suspicious and uncompromising. They therefore soon fell more and more deeply into the twofold temptation, in relation to men and measures, of placing zeal above eternal justice, and the apparent advantage of the moment above the permanent and true weal of the nation. They were ready to ally themselves with violent, or even with bad men, bent on creating disturbance, or were, at all events, incapable of firmly resisting the latter; and they sanctioned, or, in any case, did not prevent, the employment of measures which necessarily involved, sooner or later, the further promotion of the ruinous condition of things. Being zealous and inventive also in their reflections on public affairs generally, they naturally came across many customs and laws which rested apparently or actually on abuses, and the perpetuation of which seemed opposed to the freest movement and most self-denying work of the citizens of that period; they demanded the abolition of such customs and laws, and probably successfully carried through their demand, inasmuch as the storm of a period which calls forth the highest exertions of a nation easily removes the most difficult things that seem wrong or a hindrance, there being an inclination to effect a complete renovation of all the bases of the State. Still thereby the wild passions, which were involved from the first in this confused and unintelligent zeal, were only the more irresistibly let loose, the activity of the more moderate and calm-thinking men was more and more paralysed, and, on the other hand, the influence of a few especially energetic men, or such as were less scrupulous in their choice of means, grew constantly more perilous at the cost of the large and more peaceable majority.

¹ *Ante*, p. 499 sq.

² The name had therefore at first no element of reproach in it, as Josephus repeatedly allows, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9;

vii. 8. 1.

³ The *μέτριοι*, as Josephus calls them at times.

The first thing was that the popular feeling in Jerusalem veered round soon and plainly in favour of the Zealots; and the effect of that, as may be easily understood, was most painfully felt by the members of the Herod family still left in the city. Three men with that pedigree, though only distantly related to the reigning king—an Antipas, a Levi, and a Sophia, son of Raguel—had, unlike others,¹ remained all along faithful to the national cause, evidently without any evil designs in the background; and the first of them, undoubtedly a rich man, had, moreover, been entrusted with the public treasury in the new commonwealth. All of a sudden the cry was raised that they were friends of the Romans in disguise, and they were thrown into prison, without first bringing them before any judge; and soon a certain John, son of Tabitha,² with ten armed men, rushed into their prison and slew them. This John himself, however, was regarded only as an assassin employed by men in a high position, and there were many who sanctioned the murder; at all events, it went by unpunished.

Meanwhile the rest of the public officials who had been chosen in the autumn of 66, or were otherwise in office, continued to keep their posts; and as they were generally of the 'moderate' party, they were gradually felt to be in the way of the plans and aims of the Zealots. The attempt was therefore made to irritate them against each other, and a special measure was invented for keeping the office of the high-priest subservient. In consequence of the arbitrary action of Herod the Great in relation to this office, it had become doubtful how the office was to be filled up; and in the schools various views on the point may have been held. Nevertheless, from Herod's time, at all events, the members of the first-born families of the twenty-four priestly houses had been kept to solely, that the high-priest might be chosen from them for life, or till the appointment of his successor; but now, when everything was to become more national, it was proposed to choose the high-priest by lot from all the numerous members of all the families of a priestly house, *seriatim* through the whole twenty-four, but only for a week, for which procedure precedents could be appealed to.³ With regard to the lot, also, ancient practice could be produced.⁴ The proposal, moreover, originated with the priests

¹ See *ante*, p. 514.

² We may thus restore the Aramaic original of *ἡνὶ Δορκάδος*, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 4. 5, after Acts ix. 36.

³ Comp. *Antiquities*, pp. 275, 298.

⁴ In which matter, however, they probably took their stand on the original meaning of the word *קלפון*, *κλήρον*, see *Antiquities*, pp. 294 sq.

themselves, especially with Eleazar,¹ the son of Simon, and Zacharias, the son of Phalek;² and the Zealots of the priestly profession, after the proposal had been adopted by the people, took possession of the Temple, as if it belonged by law to them; and, as if they alone could protect it, they sought to convert it into a fortress against their enemies; they entered the inner sanctuary, also, without the marks of reverence³ to which the people were accustomed. They actually chose by lot from the first priestly house Phannia, the son of Samuel, from the country village Aphtha,⁴ a plain man, who had first to be instructed in the functions of the high-priest.⁵ Similar revolutions in the judicial department were made by the Zealots.⁶

All actions and daring innovations of this kind could only end in a complete overthrow of the constitution that had been made in the stormy autumn of 66, and in a subversion of the rule of the moderate party in the State. The latter saw this clearly enough, and at their head arose at last, in the winter of 67-68, two of the most influential and irreproachable leaders, with the purpose of openly opposing the dangerous party of the Zealots, and of leading back the entire national movement to the position in which it had obtained its noblest victories during the first year. One of these two men was Chanan (Ananus), above mentioned,⁷ whom his office entitled to take this most serious step; he was also very popular with the masses of the people, and although advanced in years was still a powerful orator and an indefatigable worker.⁸ The other was Jesus, the son of Gamala, distinguished by similar excellent qualities,⁹ and, next to Chanan, the oldest in the hereditary dignity of high-priest. The two were often spoken of as simply 'the high-priests.' Two of the noblest and most popular of the lay citizens—Gorion, the son of Joseph, probably the son of the

¹ See *ante*, p. 529.

² *Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 1; comp. ii. 20. 3; v. 1. 2. Instead of Phalek, other authorities read Amphicalus. This might be a contemporaneous Greek form of the name, so that an early reader explained the one name by the other.

³ 'With polluted feet,' as is said *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 6, comp. §§ 7, 9 sq.

⁴ An ancient priestly town of this name is not known: the name is written חבתא and הפתא (אפתא), and Phannias appears to be a Greek form of Pinchás. A reminiscence of this incident has been preserved in the Talmudic writings, comp. Derenbourg's *Essai*, p. 269.

⁵ The above is the most probable meaning of the passage *Bell. Jud.* iv.

3. 6-8. Many indications favour the view that what is narrated in § 6 is not essentially different from what is more definitely told again, §§ 7, 8, and that Josephus, therefore, had not in this case revised his work so as to give greater unity to what he had very nearly twice related.

⁶ According to the indication *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 14 *ad fin.* compared with iv. 5. 4.

⁷ *Ante*, p. 529.

⁸ On the latter point see the incidental observation of *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 13, 4. 6; further the general panegyric of him in connection with his death, iv. 5. 2.

⁹ Regarding Jesus, see particularly *Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 3; 5. 2.

lay fellow-official of Chanan, above mentioned,¹ and the famous Simeon,² the son of Gamaliel, of whom we have spoken above,³ had been working longer than those two high-priests for the same end. No objection could be made against these men as friends of the people and sincere supporters of the liberty that had been won. When therefore those dangerous resolutions with regard to the complete revolutionising of the offices of the high-priest and the judges had been passed, and the first injurious effect of them had been felt, Chanan called upon the assembled people, in one of his most effective speeches, to retrace their steps on the downward path of destruction, into which they were about in their folly to hurl themselves;⁴ and he succeeded in rousing them so thoroughly against the small party of the uncompromising that they revoked all their previous resolutions in favour of that party, and declared themselves prepared to follow their aged leader in everything. This assembly of the people was held in the market-place near the Temple; and preparations were forthwith made for attacking the Zealots, who were still securely encamped in the Temple, when they received early news of the great danger which threatened them, and immediately leaped forth with their weapons in self-defence, and, indeed, for attack—a few individuals against many thousands, but fighting with the most marvellous energy. Blood was soon shed on both sides: the Zealots carried their bleeding comrades back into the inner Temple, thereby also showing how little they regarded any of the common opinions of the people, since the Temple was considered to be desecrated by the smallest drop of blood, and the more conscientious avoided above anything desecrating it in that way, or entering it when it had been so desecrated.⁵ By the aid of the innumerable numbers of the infuriated populace, the moderate party gained the day and drove the Zealots back into the Temple; but it was against Chanan's principle to enter that sacred edifice desecrated as it then was with blood. On that account he rested satisfied for a time with having blockaded the inner Temple, which had been at once closed by the Zealots, with six thousand guards from the citizens; everyone of the citizens had to serve in order

¹ *Ante*, p. 529.

² *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9.

³ *Ante*, p. 539.

⁴ The long speech of Chanan, iv. 3. 10, and the equally long one of the son of Gamala, iv. 4. 3. owe the artistic beauty of their arrangement and style to Josephus, but in their historical aspects present a very faithful general view of the

situation at the time, and have so far considerable value.

⁵ 'It was their blood alone (and not that of the heathen) that polluted the Sanctuary, and produced therefore its final destruction by the wrath of God, Josephus says accordingly, iv. 3. 12, seeking in this, as in other cases, the reasons of that destruction in his superstition.

in this guard, though rich men might have a substitute. For the first time after regaining its liberty, Jerusalem became the theatre of internal feuds; and Chanan was destined very soon to repent his partial victory.

For just at this climax of the raging internal strife, we see John of Giskhala, whose importance in the Galilean movement we have already described, for the first time taking a decided part in those relations with which he, as one of the principal leaders, was destined ever afterwards to be identified. When, in the late summer of 67, he entered Jerusalem with a considerable army of disciplined Galilean soldiers,¹ he was as highly honoured as his opponent in Galilee, Josephus, was deeply despised, on account of his treachery;² and soon the leaders in Jerusalem contended for his favour. Moreover, he had now become quite at home in the liberated Jerusalem, and was conscious of possessing the power to give a more definite direction to affairs there. His previous connection as a Pharisee with Simon, the son of Gamaliel, and his friends,³ attached him to the moderate party, and it was afterwards said that he earnestly sought to obtain the favour of the aged and esteemed Chanan; but the fire of his nature, and his experiences in Galilee, led him more and more decidedly to the Zealots. Whilst therefore Chanan kept the Zealots besieged in the inner Temple, and perceived that such a state of things could not continue for weeks, he hit upon the idea of employing John as a mediator acceptable to both parties, and sent him with amicable proposals to them. Those proposals appear to have been to the effect that the Zealots should be pardoned if they would open the Temple for a great penitential sacrifice, to be solemnised by Chanan and the whole people. John himself (it was said by many later) promised to use his influence in favour of these proposals.⁴ But the Zealots, who were so few in numbers, feared that they would be easily overpowered by Chanan's hosts, looked about for stronger guarantees, and resolved, on John's suggestion, to invoke the aid of the Idumeans, who dwelt further to the south of Jerusalem. These plain and hardy Idumeans, who were for the most part very barbarous though brave, had at that time long been the most orthodox Judeans, having been converted to Judeanism by force more than a century and a half previously,⁵ and next to the Galileans, who had

¹ John's soldiers were subsequently always called Galileans from this nucleus. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 10.

² *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9. 5, 6; iv. 3. 1.

³ *Ante*, p. 535.

⁴ We can hardly understand in any other way what Josephus says in his customary prejudice against John, iv. 3. 13, 14.

⁵ See vol. v. pp. 350 sq.

now been subdued, they were the ablest soldiers.¹ The Zealots, then guardians of the Temple, moreover, were undoubtedly regarded everywhere in the provinces as the best support of the Hagiocracy and the most reliable enemies of Rome. And often the Idumeans may have sent to them in the Temple the message, that they were always ready to venture everything in the defence of the Sanctuary.

These Idumeans, therefore—some twenty thousand strong, and well armed—advanced, under four commanders,² from the south; but found the gates of the capital closed, Chanan having heard just in time of their approach. The surprise, however, of the moderate party, and the fear of the interference of these peasants, who were looked upon as semi-robbers, were so great that one of the two high-priests, Jesus, used his utmost endeavours to get them to return amicably. But, spurred on by one of their commanders, Simon, the son of Cathla, they were determined not to make the expedition for nothing, and resolved to remain before the gates for the next night. Early that night commenced such a horrible tempest and deluge of rain that the moderate party, in accordance with the old superstition with which such rare celestial disturbances were regarded in Israel,³ saw therein the wrath of God poured out on the Idumeans, and went to rest for the night after the exertions of the previous days and hours. But in the midst of this commotion from above, which checked with its overwhelming force the heat and passion of men, a few of the Zealots, having sawed in two the bars of the gates, crept out of the inner Temple, went to the city-gate where the Idumeans waited for them and opened it in the same way, conducted them then to the sleeping guards, and having joined their comrades, began with them a merciless massacre. By morning eight thousand five hundred had been slain, amid incessant plundering; and seeing that they were the conquerors, the Zealots, with their barbarous allies, began in earnest a furious chase of the leaders of the moderate party, to slake their thirst for vengeance in their massacre, and to gain at last the undisputed supremacy. They murdered accordingly the two high-priests, Chanan and Jesus, and did not even grant them the honour of burial; they murdered one of the

¹ We must not here overlook the fact that the campaign of Vespasian did not reach the Idumeans before the summer of 68, see *ante*, p. 554; but even then they rendered comparatively the strongest resistance.

² Whose names are specified by Josephus, *Bel. Jud.* iv. 4. 2.

³ Comp. *ante*, p. 283. But Josephus, iv. 4. 6, who in his prejudiced blindness seeks for every conceivable explanation of the final overthrow of his nation, and yet never finds the right one, sees in this case, as in so many others, only a malicious trick of *Jatun*, or *εἰμαρμένη*.

richest men, Zacharias, the son of Baruch, after they had brought him before a mock jury of seventy men, threw all the influential men of the moderate party whom they in any way suspected into prison, amid the greatest cruelties, and abandoned themselves to all the horrors of a mad reign of vengeance.¹ It is true many of these horrible deeds were committed only by some barbarous individuals who had joined the party which had so suddenly become victorious, and who indulged their cruel passions under its banners.² It is also very remarkable that, in describing the horrors, Josephus cannot give the name of one notable leader, not even that of his mortal enemy John, as directly engaged in or promoting them. But the worst thing was the very fact that the leaders did not condemn and could not punish such abominable deeds. After a time the Idumeans withdrew again to their mountains, partly because the fierceness of the Zealots soon really roused their disgust, and partly because an eloquent, and not less well-meaning than respected man,³ endeavoured to persuade them to that course by his arguments. Indeed, before they left they opened the newly filled prisons and permitted some two thousand to escape from the city. But the Zealots then made the more undisturbed use of their victory; and they converted their power more and more into a reign of terror and intimidation. They afterwards executed Gorion, who, it is true, had endeavoured to rouse the people to oppose them,⁴ but against whom nothing else could be brought. Indeed, they condemned Niger even, who had rendered the most distinguished services at the commencement of the revolt.⁵ He was dragged through the streets to death, loudly complaining and pointing to the wounds he had received in fighting against the Romans, in his death asserting his innocence, and uttering the worst prophecies, and indeed, imprecations against his non-Roman enemies.⁶

The Zealots reigned unopposed in Jerusalem for a long time after the winter of 67–68; and if there were before perhaps some in Jerusalem who, in the anticipation of a bad issue of the entire national movement, desired the return of the

¹ See the details *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. 1–3.

² Zacharias, for instance, was stabbed unawares by two infuriated assassins only, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. 4.

³ It is odd that Josephus (iv. 5. 5), speaks of this man, who had so much influence, and whose name would above all others have been deserving of preservation, only as $\tau\iota\varsigma$, although he gives his speech. Indeed, we should naturally suppose from the words $\tau\iota\varsigma$ ἀπὸ τῶν ζήλωτων

that he was himself a leader of the Zealots; only this would not accord with the character of his speech, although the translators understood the above words in that sense. It is undoubtedly best to take them as meaning *one coming clandestinely* (without anyone observing it) *from the Zealots.*

⁴ See *ante*, p. 561.

⁵ See *ante*, pp. 512, 530.

⁶ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 6. 1.

Roman supremacy,¹ their influence was now absolutely destroyed, and the last possibility of coming to terms by some mediation with the Romans was so completely set aside, that no one who was not prepared to do as Josephus had done could in future think of it. But the consequences of the apparent supremacy of the Zealots that had been obtained by such means unfolded themselves now with inevitable and surprising rapidity.

To the Romans nothing could be more welcome than this domestic mutual immolation. Deserters announced to them the events that had occurred in Jerusalem. The frontiers were, it is true, closely guarded; at most only rich people were allowed to pass, on payment of a high subsidy, and any who were at all suspected were more barbarously handled than ever.² But, instead of becoming stronger against the Romans, they had become far weaker. When leading Roman generals that winter advised Vespasian at once to attack Jerusalem, he preferred to let the inhabitants continue their work of mutual destruction; ³ and if in the summer of 67, during the campaign in Galilee, people in Jerusalem had been too inactive with regard to affairs elsewhere, they were now equally slow to move when the war was advancing, in the summer of 68, continually closer to the capital.⁴ It was already as if their intention was simply to protect the Temple, and as if the belief that all their prosperity depended on it alone had assumed gigantic dimensions.

Within the towns and districts outside Jerusalem that had not then been occupied by the Romans the same seed of domestic dissension and barbarous devastation that had been sown in the capital produced the more rampant desolation in proportion as it mingled there with kindred weeds that had sprung up earlier. Amongst other dangerous characters the Sicarii became more active again, though they had withdrawn to Massada, as we have seen,⁵ and its immediate neighbourhood after the commencement of the movement. At Easter of 68 they even broke one night unobserved into the little town of Eengadi, which was situated above four hours to the north of

¹ From the way in which Josephus likes to describe Chanan, iv. 5. 2, we might be led to conjecture that he had desired the return of the Roman supremacy. But there is nothing to show that any plot had been instigated in favour of it; and if there had been one, Josephus would not have passed it unnoticed. We know how baseless the mutual conjectures and suspicions of parties are in such situations.

² *Bell. Jud.* iv. 6. 3.

³ *Ibid.* iv. 6. 2.

⁴ It is true the account of this is very briefly given in Josephus, in accordance with the remarks *ante*, pp. 493, 553, as if he had used only the Roman camp-report, or the account of Vespasian himself; but we have in other cases no reason for any other supposition.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 504.

Massada, on the Dead Sea, drove the men capable of making armed resistance out of the gates, slew then above seven hundred women and children, took as booty everything they could lay their hands on, including the fruit of the fields that had just been brought home, and returned without molestation to their robber fortress. Their bands also were now increased in size.¹

Those who were now masters in Jerusalem also soon fell again into dissension amongst themselves; just as every band of men that grows powerful by wrong means always falls to pieces by victory, and is never able for long to maintain unanimity. It was soon observed that John of Giskhala was holding himself more aloof from the other Zealots, that he preferred to associate with singular characters; indeed, it was maintained that he was forming for himself a body-guard of spearmen, and was aiming at monarchy. He was not a priest, it is true, whilst among the Zealots there were many priests,² and the whole war aimed really at the defence of the Sanctuary, which again only priests seemed able to defend. Nevertheless Zealotism had sixty years before expected national deliverance not from priests alone, although Judas the Gaulonite, in whose steps all Zealots sought now to tread, was by birth a priest.³ Indeed, Zealotism was ultimately only thoroughgoing and logical Pharisaism, and rather a product of the ruling school and learning than of the priesthood. And if the descendants of the Gaulonite were not now suited to take the lead, why should not the Galilean John do it? His habits, moreover, were always those of a genuinely cultivated and scholarly man, and a lover of art, notwithstanding his skill in arms; he was not one of those people who sought to show their zeal by fasting and other gloomy habits. But he permitted his Galileans gradually to indulge in too great licence; and as conquerors after victory only too easily become luxuriant, so John appeared glad to see that his men lived for pleasure, in direct contrast with the gloomy Zealots and the growingly sombre age.⁴—To these phenomena it was owing that gradually two parties were formed against the man of the day and the most illustrious of all the Zealots, who was also able the longest to maintain his position. These two parties, however, could really only produce the disruption of Zealotism, as it was shown that after all it was only zeal for the Sanctuary and hostility against the Romans that could be exhibited in very different directions. But as in these intensely agitated times everything

¹ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 7, 2.

² See *ante.* p. 515.

³ *Vo.* vi. p. 60.

⁴ *Comp. Bell. Jud.* iv. 9.

came into the strongest mutual collision, so in this case also one party soon came into the most violent conflict with the other.

Simon, son of Giora,¹ the popular Zealot.

If John was especially a learned Zealot, the popular Zealotism now found in Simon its representative. He was that daring young man who exhibited the most splendid bravery at the beginning of the entire movement,² and who then, on account of his excessive zeal, fled to Massada, having been expelled by Chanan (Ananus) from the district of Acrabatene.³ He was not learned or wily, like John, but he surpassed him far in physical power and reckless bravery; and was therefore, with his burning zeal for the national cause, and his indefatigable care for those who committed themselves to his guidance, as it were expressly made to be the most popular national leader at this period. And he everywhere forced his own way to the front. The Sicarii in Massada at first mistrusted him, and permitted him, with the rich women whom he had taken prisoners as hostages, to dwell in the lower part of the fortress only. But he succeeded in making himself indispensable to them, became their faithful comrade in their raids, and only failed in inspiring them with sympathy for his lofty schemes. Just then the whole country was thrown into commotion by the report of the fall⁴ of Simon's old enemy Chanan, and the victory of the Zealots. Simon himself had formerly fought for Zealotism, and it seemed then as if the Holy Land could not produce sufficient able Zealots; still he thoroughly mistrusted those learned and wily Zealots who then ruled in Jerusalem. Instead of allying himself with them, he publicly called to his standard all slaves and freemen who were ready to fight honourably for the national freedom, separated himself from the Sicarii, and thus created for himself, from low but as respectable materials as he could get, a considerable army of defenders of the country or enemies of the Romans.⁵ The southern parts of Judæa are geographically well adapted to favour the designs of leaders of desperate bands of all kinds.⁶ The success which once attended David in these districts as the rising national leader was destined to be repeated in the case of this his late imitator. As in David's case it was the

¹ Or *Bargioras*, as he was called by the Romans, after the language of the country, comp. Tac. *Hist.* v. 12, where he is, however, confounded with John.

² See *ante*, p. 512.

³ *Ante*, p. 531.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 564.

⁵ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 3.

⁶ See vol. iii. p. 85.

fear of the tendencies of Saul, so in this later case it was mainly the terror by means of which the sleek and wary Zealots ruled in Jerusalem that soon drove a great number of deserters or other opponents of theirs to Simon, and filled his army with not a few 'citizens,'¹ that is, men of the common people but of good character; just as we have seen² that all the deserters from Jerusalem on the departure of the Idumeans fled to him. He had his quarters then in southern Acrabatene, which extended along the Dead Sea as far as its southern point; he had constructed for himself³ a small fortification in a place called Nain,⁴ whilst farther south, in the narrow valley Pharan,⁵ likewise familiar from David's history, he held a number of caves for secreting his stores and treasures.

As thereby an army of popular Zealots, with its raids on the surrounding country and its other claims, publicly contested the supremacy of the learned Zealots in Jerusalem, the latter desired to annihilate such a dangerous enemy in time, and advanced in arms against him. But Simon overcame them in the battle that arose, and drove them back to Jerusalem. This was the commencement of the open struggle for the supremacy in Jerusalem; but before Simon could lay claim to the latter, it was necessary for him to subdue the mountainous district lying between his quarter and Jerusalem, then in possession of the brave Idumeans.⁶ He attacked therefore their eastern frontier with twenty thousand well-armed men; the leaders of the Idumeans got together some twenty-five thousand men in haste to oppose them; but as they were compelled at the same time to bring together another powerful force against the dreaded incursions of the Sicarii, they obtained no complete victory over the army of Simon, both armies being compelled after the long day of battle simply to withdraw weakened into their own territory respectively. After a short time he besieged the little place Thekoa, six miles south-east of Beth-

¹ *δημοτικοί*, the term elsewhere customary to represent this kind of people.

² *Ante*, p. 565.

³ With regard to the northern Acrabatene, see vol. v. p. 81.

⁴ If the reading *Ναῖν*, occurring twice *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 4, 5, is correct, we might suppose the place still called Bani-Na'im, to the east of Hebron, is meant; Rufinus read *Ἀιαμ*, or *Ἀῖμ*, which might suggest *Ἰῖμ*, *Jos.* xv. 32, or the present *el Ghurain* (Robinson's *Researches*, ii. p. 204), but the latter place lies probably too far south-west. Perhaps we must

read *Μαῖν*, according to vol. iii. p. 97, as the more recent name for the ancient *Ἰῖμ*, *Ezra* ii. 50; comp. for the vocalisation vol. i. p. 239.

⁵ As in the early history, vol. iii. p. 97, neither in this case is the Pharan of Israel in the desert, as too far south, suitable; but we may suppose that it was near *Ma'ôn*, which the *LXX. Vul.* have instead in the passage *1. Sam.* xxv. 1., and in that case we can retain the Hebrew, reading *1. Sam.* xxv. 1.

⁶ *Ante*, pp. 563 sq.

lehem, and dispatched one of his trusted servants, Eleazar, to the fortress of Herodium,¹ situated a little farther to the north, which was faithful to those in power at the time in Jerusalem, to persuade the garrison to surrender. Eleazar was precipitated from the walls; but the Idumeans, who had probably already been humbled by Vespasian in the summer of 68² and were expecting nothing further from the Zealots in Jerusalem, felt little prepared for striking an immediate blow, and dispatched one of their four generals, named Jacob, from their camp at Alurus,³ into Simon's camp to ascertain first the strength of the enemy. The general was persuaded by Simon to accept a guarantee simply for his own native city, and promised, on the other hand, to desert to him when the two armies came into battle; and as he with his subordinate commanders, who had been taken into his confidence actually did this at the moment when the battle was to begin, a panic seized the entire Idumean army, and it fled in all directions without any fighting. Thereupon, Simon took Hebron, the ancient capital of Judah, and devastated with his constantly increasing army the whole country, openly defying the government in Jerusalem.

Simon had then in the field the only army capable of giving battle; and though his army was nominally raised against the Romans, in feeling it was still more opposed in the first instance to the affected and luxurious Zealots in the proud capital. The latter could not have demonstrated their hollowness and weakness more plainly than they did, by seizing Simon's wife by strategy and carrying her off to Jerusalem, when they were unable to vanquish him in the open field. They thereby only gave him for the first time a just pretext for attacking the capital itself. Though he did not then feel himself strong enough to storm the city, he occupied all its gates so vigilantly, did such various injury to its inhabitants, and sent so many from the proud city back into it with their hands cut off, that its arrogant masters at last felt compelled to induce him to depart by the surrender of his wife. This probably happened late in the year 68.⁴

But he then returned willingly into Idumea, only with the view of increasing his forces in the province and of then attacking Jerusalem; and the mistakes of his opponents contributed

¹ See vol. v. p. 435.

² See *ante*, p. 554.

³ This name, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 6, is probably only dialectically different from the name Hadōram, or, as it is now called, *Dura*, comp. vol. iv. p. 45.

⁴ Which we may infer from the fact

that Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 9, relates the assassination of the Emperor Galba afterwards; which, however, misleads him to relate, § 9, something that was done on the part of the Romans in June, 69, before the Judean event of April, § 12.

most to his rapid successes in that design. It is true, he effected the increase of his forces in Idumea by such means as drove many to flee from him to Jerusalem, where from that time a powerful band of Idumeans, similar to the Galileans, but soon opposed to them, was collected. But although Simon then really began the siege of the capital, it was observed in the city that John allowed people devoted to him only greater licence, and that on the one hand they became robbers of the rich, and on the other degenerated into effeminate men, and, in fact, men that actually aped women's habits, which may be tolerably well explained from the remarks above.¹ The majority of the quiet inhabitants of Jerusalem, it is true, greatly dreaded the barbarity and cruelty of Simon's bands which already surrounded the city; but they had become equally tired of the doings of the smooth and learned Zealots, who warmed themselves in their sun. Just then broke out a division amongst the armed bands themselves within the city; the Idumeans suddenly declared themselves against the Galileans, that is the largest number of the Zealots attached to John; they surprised and killed a large number of them, drove them into the palace of the Princess Grapte of Adiabene,² and from thence back into the Temple, and then turned to plundering that palace, where John dwelt and kept his treasures concealed. Meanwhile John got his men fully collected in the fortified Temple, and it was feared that the next night there would be again one of those mad outbreaks, by which the Zealots in their greatest despair often restored the life of their waning cause, and one of which the city had experienced in that night of terror a year previously.³ The people, having come together in crowds, advised with the high-priests as to what was to be done in the circumstances. There was, undoubtedly, immediate help close at hand against the madness of the refined Zealots, inasmuch as all that was needful was to call in the bands of the brave popular Zealots that surrounded the city. They were in any case the enemies most dreaded by the luxurious Zealots of John, and constituted, moreover, the one powerful army that could be employed against the Romans, if they should advance the next summer, as it was to be feared they would, against the city. Accordingly the high-priest Matthias, probably the same man that had been appointed by king Agrippa,⁴ was authorised to invite the proud young leader Simon to occupy the city as its protector. He entered with

¹ *Ante*, pp. 567 sq.

² See *ante*, p. 405.

³ See *ante*, p. 564.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 480.

his soldiers in April 69, and at once confiscated all the possessions which could be found in the city belonging to John.

It is impossible not to see that in these popular Zealots an exceedingly efficient army, and one that was animated with simple devotion in the defence of the Sanctuary, entered the city. In the end, too, it was an army which in the last mortal struggle with the Romans accomplished most for the city, and held out longest with the most marvellous bravery. But if the struggle in which they were immediately engaged was to turn out successful, it was necessary that Simon should not rest until he had completely expelled the Zealots under John from the city. He attacked them, it is true, with the assistance of the inhabitants; but they defended themselves, although very much smaller in number, with such persistence from their superior elevation, and with great expedition constructed with such skill four new towers at the four most suitable corners of the Temple, that Simon's soldiers gradually lost their first zeal.¹ Moreover, it was to his disadvantage that Judeans still preserved their strong scruples against doing any great injury to their Temple, or in any case destroying it, the more conscientious amongst them scarcely daring to pollute it in any way.² Thus the city remained in the hands of two hostile armies, which were constantly engaged in hostilities against each other, and neither of which was able to overcome the other, while both lived at the expense of the people and showed few scruples as regards the means used to procure the necessaries of life.

*Vespasian at the gates of Jerusalem. The Zealot Priests.
Eleazar the son of Simon.*

At the approach of the summer of 69, after he had acknowledged Otho as Emperor,³ and whilst Otho and Vitellius were still contending in the West for the possession of Rome, Vespasian seemed, it is true, inclined to resume the struggle, which might be less difficult to him in consequence of these internal conflicts in Judea. But it was as if all he wished to do was to show the mad Judeans that he was still in the country and could easily capture them if he desired. It was not until the 5th of June that he put an army in movement, which was this time to approach Jerusalem from the north, himself commanding. He occupied the two toparchies of Gophna and northern Aera-

¹ See on all this. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9.
10-12.

² *Ante*, p. 562.

³ *Tac. Hist.* i. 76.

batene and the two small towns of Bethel and Ephraim,¹ and from thence he ordered cavalry to make scouring expeditions as far as Jerusalem. His general, Cerealis, he sent with infantry and cavalry into Upper, or Southern, Idumea, where he took by surprise a little town Caphar-Teramim,² and burnt it; another strongly fortified town, Capharabin, Cerealis was on the point of besieging, when it opened its gates to him. The famous ancient city Hebron caused Cerealis more difficulty, inasmuch as it was defended, probably on account of its sacredness, by many Judeans with greater obstinacy. He was compelled to force an entrance, cut down all the soldiers left in it, and burnt the city itself. With that the entire country round about Jerusalem was subjugated; there were only the three strong fortresses Herodium, Massada, and Machærus that still offered resistance. But just when the time had come for commencing the siege of Jerusalem, the reports of Otho's death and of the elevation of Vitellius arrived, which threw all Vespasian's soldiers into such commotion and so exclusively directed their thoughts to the elevation of their own commander to the position of Emperor, that the war against Jerusalem was for the time forgotten, with Vespasian's own consent. He departed for the north to discuss with the Syrian governor, Mucianus,³ the affairs of Rome; and as he lent a willing ear to the prophecies of Josephus, so he also listened on Carmel to the favourable prognostications of a prophet who at that time sought, on this ancient scene of Elijah's labours,⁴ to effect a combination of true religion and heathenism.⁵

As soon as Vespasian had resolved to become Emperor, he endeavoured to make sure of the co-operation of that governor of Egypt, Tiberius Alexander, whom we met with above;⁶ and he was promised it. But before he left Palestine he set Josephus, who was all the time a prisoner,⁷ at liberty, as a man whose prediction had then come true; and, at the request of Titus, he gave him the reparation of having his chain, as if it ought

¹ Ephraim is the town mentioned vol. vi. p. 375. east of Bethel, probably belonging, therefore, to Acrabatene.

² After the best MSS., *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 9. only that in them the first part of the word is contracted into Καφθερ-, generally still further into Καφθρα. All the names of places beginning with כפר- probably arose in Judea after the Idumean conquest and settlement, and are therefore not to be sought in *Jos.* xv. The above name probably arose from כפר דרום, and must be then compared with כפר דרום,

Kemâle-în, p. 122. 136.

³ See an Antiochian coin of his of the year 68, with an acknowledgment of Galba, in *Leake's Supplement*, p. 17.

⁴ Vol. iv. p. 68.

⁵ We may say as much as this from the description in *Tac. Hist.* ii. 78, *Sæc. Vesp.* § 5: the man was probably a Samaritan, like Simon above referred to (p. 179), and called his God *Carmel*.

⁶ *Ante*, p. 501.

⁷ *Ante*, p. 516.

never to have been put on him, cut through with an axe, after the Roman custom. He then set sail with Titus and Josephus for Alexandria, where it was agreed that Titus should, with the aid of the best troops from the two Egyptian legions, and attended by Josephus as his adviser and assistant, accomplish with all expedition the conquest of Jerusalem. Vespasian thereupon departed thence for Rome, and Titus, with his large new army, by land along the sea coast, for Cæsarea, where he made all arrangements for the siege of the proud city which had offered resistance for nearly four years.¹ At the same time, M. Antonius Julianus was appointed governor of Palestine,² who was able to place at the command of Titus all the resources of the province.

The feeling that the decision must now at last come soon took possession of the leaders in Jerusalem also. The defeat in Galilee in 67 was followed by that of the moderate party in Jerusalem and the complete victory of the Zealots in 68; then the great successes of Vespasian in the south were succeeded by the almost accomplished fall of the cultivated Zealots and the rise of the popular Zealots about the Easter of 69; and now the fresh victory of Vespasian in the summer of 69, and the menacing proximity of Titus, produced a revolution in Jerusalem, and called forth a power which had hitherto been as it were in chains, and which appeared to be able to effect something by its own strength in delivering the sacred city and the revered Sanctuary within it. We see thus how completely the interaction of the internal and the external history was exemplified.

The power referred to was that of the priests. The prophetic power had long before so completely disappeared amongst the people that it scarcely revived even for a moment in early Christianity. The priestly power, as we saw in the last volume but one, had played an important part in founding the second Jerusalem six centuries before. In conjunction with Biblical learning, it had ever since endeavoured most carefully to preserve all sacred things; in the recent great national rising it gladly co-operated; indeed, not a few of its members belonged, as by a profound recollection of all the glory of its past history, and as urged by the stimulating consciousness of an hereditary duty, from the very first to the Zealots. Must they not, therefore, at the last moment, make the utmost effort to preserve

¹ *Bell. Jud.* iv. 10. 6. 7; 11. 1-3, v. 1.
1, 6, *Vita*, § 75, comp. *Con. Apion.* i. 9,
Tac. Hist. ii. 74-82. iii. 48, iv. 81, 82.

² A fact mentioned by Josephus only
incidentally, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. 3.

those holy things which had really been entrusted to them by the Law? Indeed, in proportion as the hereditary priesthood had historically almost coalesced with the ancient religion, if not with its inmost nature,¹ and in proportion as that religion again had for a thousand years been connected with the one Sanctuary in Jerusalem, that priesthood was necessarily the more profoundly called upon to attempt whatever was still possible for deliverance, and it had the more clearly to be shown, finally, whether it could really save the Sanctuary, the nation, and the religion. In point of numbers, too, the priesthood was not to be despised; each of the four divisions into which it had from ancient times been divided² numbered at this time upwards of five thousand men,³ and in times of necessity they could all be assembled, well-armed and well-disciplined, in defence of the Sanctuary.

Eleazar, the son of Simon, had been, as we have seen,⁴ from the first, and afterwards on all decisive occasions, a faithful Zealot. He had at first taken possession of the inner Temple for the Zealots exclusively, and had always willingly submitted to John in everything reasonable. But the victory of the Zealots over the moderate men had soon caused a division amongst their own number, inasmuch as some (amongst whom, undoubtedly, our Eleazar was prominent) refused to submit to the imperious commands of the man of Giskhala, while others adhered to him the more closely. At that time (the year 68), however, the two parties, as if conscious of their perilous position, had promised, in spite of their disunity, not to take up arms against each other, and at that time blood had rarely been shed between them. The rise of the popular Zealots, and their entrance into the city about Easter, 69, might likewise serve to unite them again somewhat in the presence of the common enemy; but the domestic repugnance continued; and it was easy to charge the Galilean with all kinds of arbitrary and cruel acts. Moreover, the Inner Sanctuary, at all events, ought, according to the Law, to be protected by the priests alone. Did it not seem to suffer, and its divine deliverance to be impossible, as long as it was not again committed solely to the hands of priests? Such thoughts may have influenced the mind of Eleazar when, with the help of his sworn friends, he suddenly, at the beginning of 70, separated from John, took exclusive possession of the inner circle of the Temple, with the court of the priests, and set up his arms, as for a sign, over the doors

¹ See vol. ii. pp. 137 sq.

² Vol. i. p. 361.

³ *Jos. Con. Apion.* ii. 8.

⁴ *Antic.* p. 529.

of that court opposite the Temple-house itself. There thus arose a separate party of *priestly Zealots*; indeed, these priests now made exclusive claim to the honourable name, and inasmuch as they probably adopted and always wore at the same time an external badge of Zealotism, they actually retained exclusively the name from that time.¹ But really all desired to be Zealots; only these various kinds of Zealots had now completely separated from each other in point of their localities likewise, and they made war upon each other instead of thinking alone in common rivalry of the protection of the commonwealth. The greatness in point of extent, and also in point of infatuation, of the zeal which inspired the whole people, or at all events those who still remained together in the sacred city, had now, at last, reached its climax.²

In detail the position of the parties was as follows:—The priestly Zealots occupied the Temple area from above down to the limits of the priests' court: in point of numbers they were the weakest, but they had, nevertheless, no scarcity of provisions. For, notwithstanding all the internal jealousy and hostility, the parties had tacitly agreed not to interrupt the attendance at the Temple and the sacrificial system, being well aware that otherwise their entire struggle in the world at large, and against the Romans in particular, would be quite baseless. On the contrary, they wished that the holy laws should be administered after the great rising more freely and completely, if possible, than ever before. And amongst the offerings which were to be brought to the Temple itself the first-fruits were especially reckoned;³ and the priestly Zealots appropriated them as the reasonable reward of their self-denying struggles for the Sanctuary.—The lower precincts of the Temple, that grew gradually more extensive, with a great part of the city immediately adjoining, were in the hands of the original Zealots, whom we may now distinguish as the learned Zealots, under John. They were far more numerous than the priestly fraction, and considered themselves the true, original, and genuine representatives of the party, being, moreover, well trained in military arts and exceedingly formidable soldiers. They had also got possession of all the best and most powerful instruments of war, and under their no less warlike than astute and inventive leader John, they sought to make their position every day stronger by every means, and particularly by new

¹ As we must infer from such language as *Bell. Jud.* v. 3. 1; 9. 2; vi. 1. 8; 2. 7. ³ *Bell. Jud.* v. 1. 4, comp. § 2. and *Antiquities*, pp. 301 sq.

² *Bell. Jud.* v. 1. 2-5.

fortifications. They considered themselves, moreover, as still the true defenders of the great Sanctuary, which they had closely surrounded on all sides, being hardly willing to let those pass who had necessary business in the Temple.—The great army of the popular Zealots, under Simon, held the whole of the upper city in the south and a part of the lower city, and they sought, like John's army, to live at the expense of the citizens,¹ in return for their defence of the city.

The original Zealots, who still maintained that they were the truest representatives of the party, were therefore now attacked from two sides, both as regards their general aims and their fortified position. From above they were constantly assailed by the priestly Zealots with their missiles of all kinds, and as those above them could always select the most favourable position for attack, their smaller number was less disadvantageous to them. From below, the great popular army, under Simon, assailed them. It might be supposed that by these attacks from both sides, which never ceased for long, the Zealots in the middle must soon have been put down and exterminated; but an understanding between the two assailing parties could not be arrived at on account of their different aims and principles, and the Zealots had, moreover, in John the most skilful and indefatigable fighter. In the midst of their straits the early Zealots thus acquired under him fresh heroism and energy. John brought his immense machines for casting projectiles into play against those who fought from above, and proposed to construct fresh and higher towers against them. Against those who assailed him from below he defended himself by burning down a number of buildings from which he could be more easily attacked, so that at last an extensive waste space was created quite round the Temple. By such means a number of provision stores were reduced to ashes, and the city deprived of many of the most indispensable necessities for meeting a siege. Those who were going to the Temple to sacrifice were suffered to pass, especially unsuspected strangers, and efforts were made on all sides not to interrupt strictly sacred duties; still, in the midst of the act of sacrifice not a few religious persons were sometimes mortally wounded in the Temple courts by the weapons of the contending Zealots. And the more bitterly the above three factions carried on their hostilities the more cruelly did the citizens generally suffer, on account of the tremendous requirements,

¹ ὁ δῆμος, as Josephus often calls them.

becoming constantly more oppressive, which were made by each of the two larger parties. The terrors and the intimidation of all the weaker people that previously prevailed had now been doubled and become a standing calamity. Such was the condition of the city when the armies of Titus advanced against it.

4. *The Siege and Capture of Jerusalem.*

The Fortification of the City and the Temple.

By the infatuation of the Judeans themselves the last part of their work seemed to have been made tolerably easy to the Romans; and several of their generals, particularly Titus himself, hoped for a voluntary proposal of terms on the part of the citizens who had been so grievously oppressed by their own defenders, as soon as the Roman camp should appear in the neighbourhood of the city. Titus had under his command the same three legions which had become so completely accustomed to the war in Palestine under his father; and the gaps in their ranks, which had been caused by Vespasian's march to Rome, had been completely filled up by other choice soldiers, namely, two thousand which Titus brought with him from the twenty-second and twenty-third legions stationed in Egypt, and three thousand from the outposts on the Euphrates; and the twelfth legion, that had been defeated in the year 66 under Cestius, might be trusted to fight again when well reinforced, and was consumed with the desire to wash off in the blood of the enemy the shame it then incurred. Of these four legions the fifth was to go to meet him from the west of Jerusalem, by way of Emmaus, and the tenth from Jericho. He himself started against the city from Cæsarea, by the usual route from the north, with the two other legions, the twelfth and the fifteenth,¹ and a large number of auxiliaries of the allies. The kings Sohem and Antiochus² joined him with their troops, the former immediately, the latter a little later; Arab archers came in large numbers to vent their old hatred on the Judeans, and subsequently did much injury. But more than all the rest Titus was animated by the strongest desire to bring the war to a triumphant close, having thereby to show himself to all the world as Cæsar and future Augustus, and the whole future of the imperial house being involved in the issue of the struggle.

¹ The fifteenth is mentioned, *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 4; 11. 4, vi. 4. 3; on other points see especially Tac. *Hist.* v. 1.

² See *ante*, p. 543.

Accordingly a great number of Roman magnates voluntarily collected about him. It must, on the other hand, have been exceedingly humiliating to the Judeans to learn that besides Josephus and king Agrippa, their own former governor, Tiberius Alexander, whose Judean extraction they could not forget, was present in the camp of Titus as his well-informed and faithful friend, and, indeed, as commander-in-chief, and although advanced in years took part in the whole campaign after he had resigned his governorship in Egypt.¹ Josephus, however, had still his father, mother, wife, and other relatives in the city.²

But if such recent or earlier renegades supposed that the internal hostilities and divisions in Jerusalem would, now that matters became in the highest degree serious, be necessarily very favourable to the Romans, or that they themselves might be able by persuasion to produce a good effect on such an apparently distracted multitude crowded together in the city, they made a great mistake, and led the Roman generals astray likewise. As soon as the really serious moment arrived, the internal contentions in Jerusalem were silenced, and every party did perfectly its duty as the direct obligation of the struggle appealed to it. Indeed, times arrived when hard necessity from without appeared to convert all the internal factions into one great close brotherhood, and all worked together most bravely, although undoubtedly the real grounds of the internal difference did not thereby disappear, and the dissensions easily broke out again. For a long time the Romans did not get many deserters; and the old deserter, Josephus, remained all along the sole interpreter, whose services the Romans could use when they were required.³ It was only during the dreadful siege of the great city that now followed that the tremendous bitterness of this war generally was fully brought out; the leaders of the various parties had long given up all thought of coming to terms, and even the general mass of the Judean soldiers were inspired with the most unyielding bravery. Indeed, the entire war from the commencement had been kindled in defence of the holy city against the heathen; and long ago the most determined soldiers who were most hostile to the heathen had come from all quarters into it. Now, therefore, when the fierceness of the war was concentrated around that sacred possession alone, the most obstinate, the most savage, and the most destructive conflict reached its climax. And

¹ *Bell. Jud.* v. 1. 6; 12. 2, vi. 4. 3,

² *Ibid.* v. 9. 4; 13. 1, 3.

³ As he himself states, *Contra Apionem*, i. 9.

with the wild rage of the din of arms in defence of the most sacred things, and, indeed, with the desperation of the last mortal struggle for them, there was mingled, as we have seen,¹ many an old and new prophetic utterance, promising the indestructibility of the holy city, or at all events of the Temple, and rekindling ever afresh the dying courage of its defenders. So that in this respect also the second great siege and destruction of Jerusalem was very similar to the first, previously described.²

Neither did the rulers in Jerusalem at the time omit to do what they could in seeking help from abroad. They early sent to the Parthians and the Parthian Judeans repeated and most urgent requests for assistance;³ and we may imagine how earnestly they sent in other directions for help, though almost always with equally poor success.⁴

It was more of the nature of an accident that a circumstance arose which added to the difficulties of the defence of the city. The siege began a short time before Easter; already a large number of visitors to the feast had arrived, and they were then prevented from returning to their homes. We do not, it is true, know accurately the number of the regular inhabitants of Jerusalem at that time, for the reason particularly that the early dislike of an exact census in Israel still continued;⁵ but it was calculated roughly that in those years some three million people, including the large number of visitors, were generally present in Jerusalem at Easter.⁶ If the number was much smaller at the beginning of the siege, on account of the calamitous time and because the feast was still somewhat distant, on the other hand very many deserters and men fond of war had long before come into the city; so that really a similar immense number of people was then collected in that narrow space.⁷ Thereby the number of men able to bear arms, it is true, was increased within the walls, but far more that of the defenceless people; and as the leaders

¹ *Ante*, p. 516.

² Vol. iv. pp. 270 sq.

³ Josephus incidentally mentions this on a later occasion, in Titus's speech, vi. 6. 2.

⁴ According to Cassius Dio, lxxvi. 4.

⁵ See vol. iii. pp. 160 sq.; *Antiquities*, p. 304.

⁶ That is, the number of those present at the Passover was determined by the number of lambs killed, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 3, vi. 9. 3.

⁷ When Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 13, estimates

the number of the besieged as only 600,000, he is probably confounding the number of the regular inhabitants of Jerusalem at that time; and that number itself is probably taken from the book of Aristeas, p. 114. The numbers of 120,000 inhabitants of Jerusalem, and 1,500 priests in the extracts in Josephus, *Con. Ap.* i. 22, go back to the earlier Greek period; and the number of only 70,000 inhabitants in Rev. xi. 13, would only be prophetic, and cannot be deduced as a literal fact from that passage.

had collected within the walls far too small a quantity of corn for such a mass of people, famine might soon arise. Numerous diseases, too, threatened on account of the crowding together of too large numbers.

Want of water in the neighbourhood of the city had in previous times often proved a great hindrance to the besiegers, especially when the besieged had sufficiently early taken advantage of that circumstance in their favour.¹ Those then in power in Jerusalem had been less provident in this respect, many soon supposing that water had in some marvellous way become more abundant with the arrival of the Romans before Jerusalem.² Yet we know that the Romans had to suffer much in the course of the summer from this calamity.³

The same was the case with the fortification and the general geographical position of the city. Not even a city by the sea could be more secure than it, as regards both natural situation and artificial strength. Whenever it had been taken before and its walls partly or wholly destroyed, they were always, as soon as circumstances allowed, reconstructed upon the same almost indestructible foundations, and, indeed, strengthened and added to. In the immediately preceding hundred years, in spite of all the Roman jealousy of both Herod and all his successors, as far as they held the Judean faith, the fortification of the city had been zealously prosecuted; Herod, acting from fear of the rebellious spirit of his people, and his successors from fear of Rome, as if apprehensive of a final and unavoidable collision with that power. And only a short time before the heads of this Hagiocracy had themselves been active in this respect.⁴ Within the city itself, moreover, fortress followed fortress, and not fewer than five or six could be distinguished closely connected with and protecting each other within its precincts; so that whoever had taken one or another fortress belonging to this frowning range, could always be as obstinately resisted again from another. Hence the great confidence which the Judean soldiers placed in this spot of earth, increased undoubtedly immensely in the case of most by their faith in its sacredness. Nevertheless, the fortifications were now as such not without their defects. The last great wall, as we have seen,⁵ was not quite so high and strongly finished as had been proposed. And the injuries which some

¹ See vol. iv. p. 175.

² Which Josephus mentions again only incidentally, in his speech *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4.

³ Cassius Dio, lxxvi. 4, 5.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 414.

⁵ *Ante*. p. 265.

important works had suffered when the Romans were expelled in the year 66,¹ had not been completely repaired by the new labours rapidly undertaken during the last winter.² But in order that we may more fully understand the history of the siege, we must describe more in detail the position of the city and the Temple as it then was; just as Josephus, though at a somewhat later place, supplies such a description.³

The ancient part of the city, sometimes called still simply *the City*,⁴ or usually the Upper City, situated in the south, had been enclosed from Nehemiah's days⁵ in one circumvallation with the south spurs of the Temple hill Ophel, or Ophla as it was pronounced in the times before us. The wall, therefore, ran southwards round the western edge of the high plateau, enclosing on that side the part of the city then called Bethso; then northwards along the eastern edge of the high plateau, as far as the gate called the Gate of the Essenes, on the north of the Tyropœon ravine;⁶ then again turning south on the west edge of the Temple hill, it enclosed on the south the Siloah spring, and on the east what was then the Pool of Solomon, running past Ophla and so forming the eastern wall of the Temple. In its northern course it ran above the Tyropœon ravine up to the west side of the Temple. It consisted, therefore, essentially of two lines of wall, in such a form that although the Temple hill with its southern slope might have been taken, the Upper City was still quite surrounded with a wall. This entire wall is called by Josephus the first, inasmuch as it was the oldest as far as its foundations were concerned; but, in his

¹ *Ante*, p. 498.

² A fact which Josephus again only incidentally alludes to, vi. 6. 2.

³ *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 5, with which *Ant.* xv. 11. 5, and many other remarks in Josephus, must always be properly compared. It has, however, been long perceived that Josephus's statements must be supplemented by more careful examination of the present localities and by thorough excavation; during the last few years especially, Tobler, de Sauley, Pierrotti, the English Palestine Exploration Society, and others, have done much in this respect, and much more important discoveries may be expected in the future. The great work of the Count de Vogué, *Le Temple de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1864), is of importance principally for the Byzantine-Arab periods; G. Rosen's *Das Haram von Jerusalem und der Tempelplatz des Moria* (Gotha, 1866), seeks mainly to do the unnecessary work of refuting

Fergusson's suppositions; and with regard to T. Lewin's work, *The Siege of Jerusalem by Titus* (London, 1864), comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1864, pp. 721 sq.

⁴ As *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 1.

⁵ See vol. iv. pp. 254 sq.; v. pp. 151 sq.

⁶ If we do not conceive these positions thus definitely, but suppose the wall lengthened to the south, right up to the extreme eastern point, making it turn there to the north, the Tyropœon ravine would have been completely without protection, so that the Romans, e.g., after they had taken the Temple and the hill Ophla (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 3), might at once have passed over that valley into the Upper City. *Βηθσω* is probably rather *בית שניא* *High-house* than *בית צווא* *House of filth*; and the Gate of the Essenes took, probably, its name from the fact that Essenes approached the Temple from it without presenting sacrifices there.

account of the siege, he calls it the third, from the point of view of the camp of Titus on the north of the city; and it will also be called the third in our subsequent description. The height of this wall was considered to be thirty cubits all round.¹

The second wall was much shorter. It did not probably receive its final form before the period of the Asmoneans, and was primarily constructed only for further enclosing the castle *Baris*, erected on the north-west of the Temple to protect it; the castle from the time of Herod being called *Antonia*.² In that Lower City very great changes in the surface had taken place during the century immediately preceding, all of them made principally on account of the Temple, which was situated on the lower hill on the north-east. The hill which lay north of the Upper City, extended from the west to the north-east in the form of a half-moon, and left between it and the Temple hill a broad valley; but it was itself higher than the Temple hill, though lower than the Upper City, so that it, together with its valley, was included under the name of the Lower City. As an early New City, or suburb, it had at first no walls, but Solomon even cast up a high earthwork as an artificial *castle*, called *Akra* in Greek, on the south-east of it opposite the Temple, and this south-eastern part of it primarily, and then the whole Lower City, was called thence *Akra*.³ But when the second Temple was built, a castle of that description was restored, under the new name of *Baris*, which the Asmonean kings immediately converted into a more strongly fortified place, by filling up the entire valley and lowering the western hill. In that way the Temple was, by means of this castle, more directly connected with the city, while the castle towered aloft without any obstruction on the west, and under Herod was once more reconstructed, as *Antonia*.⁴ To enclose this *Baris*, together with the Lower City of that time, as within a new fortification, the second wall was erected, beginning on the

¹ According to the incidental remark *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 4 sq.

² See vol. v. p. 435.

³ See vol. iii. p. 258, comp. p. 123: the word *ἄκρα*, as a castle generally, passed in the Greek age even into the dialect of the country, as the non-Aramaic word *אֲקְרָא* shows. At an appropriate place Josephus uses this name for the whole Lower City, v. 4. 1; but in another passage he uses the name of only a part of it, e.g., in the very clear passage vi. 6. 3; and that that part was the south-eastern follows from the remark, vi. 8. 4, that many deserters had fled from the wall of

the Upper City into the *Akra*, which would certainly not have been possible on the north-western side of that wall, where its three strongest towers stood. But Josephus everywhere distinguishes *Akra* plainly from the *Antonia*, and it did not constitute in his day a separate part of the fortifications of the city. We must, therefore, gather from the connection of each passage what is meant by *ἄκρα*; for Josephus gives the name, even to the summit of the Temple hill itself, *Ant.* xv. 11. 4 [5?].

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* v. 1. 1; 5. 8. 8; *Ant.* xv. 11. 4.

south-west at the point in the old wall where the *Gennath* or *Garden Gate* was, and embracing the Antonia on the north-east.¹—Inasmuch therefore as the city was doubly protected through the main extent of its weakest part, the northern, but on the north-western end there was still nothing but the old wall, Herod the Great determined to thoroughly remedy that defect, by building there a series of three extremely strong towers, very close to each other. In the angle itself farthest to the north-west, he erected the Hippicus, so called from one of his friends, from which tower, therefore, Josephus traces the course of the first wall; the other two were the Phasaël and the Mariamme, so-called from Herod's brother and his murdered wife. They were the three towers, the marvellous strength, height, and beauty of which Josephus so much admires,² and they were undoubtedly of greatest importance in the general defence of the city. In the middle one, which was fitted up like a small royal palace, Simon, the son of Giora, had taken up his chief quarters on entering the city.³ South of these three towers Herod had built his own royal palace, which was likewise surrounded by a wall thirty cubits high, and could be reckoned, on account of its great extent, as a separate fortress within the Upper City; and in this entire war it played accordingly an exceedingly important part.⁴ On the east of the palace ran as far as the Temple hill, the covered portico (the Xystus), which was no small ornament to the city; but on the south, close by the first wall in the Lower City, stood the archive office,⁵ farther on the palace of Helena,⁶ also the council house,⁷ so that this line from

¹ *Bell. Jud.* v. 4, 2.

² *Ibid.* v. 4, 3, 4.

³ See *ante*, p. 571.

⁴ See especially *Bell. Jud.* v. 4, 4, vi. 7, 1.

⁵ Τὸ ἀρχεῖον.

⁶ *Ante*, p. 406.

⁷ As we may clearly gather from the indications *Bell. Jud.* v. 4, 2, vi. 6, 3, comp. vi. 3, 2; 6, 2, ii. 17, 6.—If Josephus had particularly mentioned the situation and the extent of each of these three towers, and if we further knew accurately the position of the Gennath Gate, we might be able to settle the question whether the present church of the Holy Sepulchre can be on the site of Golgatha (comp. vol. vi. p. 440); but Josephus does not, unfortunately, speak definitely, and reliable traces of the Gennath Gate, or of the course of the second wall, have not as yet been discovered (see Robinson's *Researches*, vol. iii. pp. 212 sq.). On the other hand, the view which

Robinson maintained to the last, that the second wall commenced near Hippicus, is baseless and contrary to the manifest meaning of the language of Josephus. The most probable view is that the three towers stood close together in the north-western angle of the old city, and that the Gennath Gate therefore was far enough to the west to embrace within the wall the site of the later Christian church. But the third wall was also preceded by an inferior one, as we have seen, p. 265. According to the most recent reports, some traces of the course of the second wall have been found east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (comp. especially Vogué *Le Temple de Jérusalem*, pp. 114 sq.); but I have shown in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1864, pp. 725 sq., that that would establish nothing as regards the position of Golgatha. [The results of the Palestine Exploration Fund furnish no information as to the position of the Gennath Gate, or of the course of the second wall. They are

the west to the east, between the Old City and the suburb and the Temple, could be considered as the finest part of the whole city next to the Temple.

The third, that is, the most recent wall the origin of which was described above,¹ enclosed, at last, two portions of the city which had till then been regarded as mere suburbs, and which afterwards occupied, as equally privileged new cities, the largest area. In the north of the city there was situated a high hill upon an elevated plateau, of such an eminence that it hid the view of the Temple from anyone approaching from the north-west; but the city had long been extending around it on that plateau as it was only towards the north that it could freely expand. This fourth hill, which was thus at last included within the precincts of the city, was called Bezetha.² This large double town was generally called simply Bezetha; but in more precise usage Bezetha and the New City were distinguished and also called the upper and the lower New City.³ As this double town, which had in quite recent times grown so large, was to be wholly enclosed, this third wall was the longest. It was carried on the south-west from the first wall and the tower Hippicus northwards, and then passed over a broad ridge on the north as far as the north-east corner, where it turned to the south and joined the first again along the east side of the Temple. In construction this wall was unusually strong; it was made of stones twenty cubits in length and ten cubits in breadth, as if it was meant to rival, even in those late times, the structures of Solomon.⁴ It was not less than ten cubits thick; but because the Romans prevented its completion, it was only carried to a height of twenty, or, including battlements and parapets, twenty-five cubits. But on its north-west corner the high tower, Psephinus, octagonal in form and seventy cubits high, was completely and beautifully finished, and from its summit a view was commanded as far as the Dead Sea and the high mountains beyond the Jordan.⁵

now presented in the large volume *The Survey of Western Palestine—Jerusalem*. By Lieut.-Col. Warren and Captain Conder (London: 1884.)

¹ *Ante*, p. 265.

² When Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 2, explains this name as meaning *New City*, as if it were only a shorter form of בית הרותה, that explanation is in itself very incorrect (comp. vol. v. p. 320, and the various readings in the Greek and Latin MSS. of John v. 2), and is refuted by Josephus himself when he distinguishes

(*Bell. Jud.*, ii. 19. 4) the New City from Bezetha. For the attempt to understand the Greek words of the latter passage as if they expressed the identity of the two names must fail. The Talmud calls the Mount of Olives הר הפושטה after the later meaning of פושטה.

³ ἡ κατωτέρα καινὸπολις, *Bell. Jud.* v. 12. 2.

⁴ Comp. vol. iii. pp. 233 sq.

⁵ *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 3: the name points to its Mosaic ornamentation.

The entire circumference of the city round the outer wall was thirty-three stadia.¹ The old wall had sixty towers, the second fourteen, the third ninety at a distance of two hundred cubits apart. The city was, therefore, towards both the north² and the south, far larger than the modern Jerusalem, which really occupies only the large central portion or the trunk of the site of the ancient city. The walls were for the most part built in a zigzag line, after the manner of the ancients, so that assailants could be met from both sides of the angles; and where the level of the ground was lower, the towers were raised proportionately,³ so that the whole city presented from the outside also a pleasing appearance.

Within these three walls, and admirably protected by all of them, stood the Temple, with its numerous adjacent structures, courts and cloisters, itself again like a fortress above the deep ravine in the north-east,⁴ and defended on the north-west by the Antonia, being connected on the south with the old town by a bridge built over the Tyropæon ravine.⁵ That sacred edifice with its extensive premises, which constituted it a small town in itself variously fortified, had remained so far substantially as it was when restored by Herod,⁶ although subsequently very much had been added in the way of surrounding buildings and ornamentation.⁷ When the visitor ascended to it from below he found himself at first on the immense quadrangle which contained the sanctuary in the widest sense, and in the north-western corner of which was situated the castle Antonia. It had walls three hundred, and in some places more than three hundred, feet high, which, however, rose only partially above the ground; and on

¹ *Bell. Jud.* v. 4, 3.

² G. Rosen, de Vogué, and others now seek to show that the third wall did not run farther to the north than the present one; but on his fifth journey Tobler found traces of the contrary, *Ausland*, 1866. p. 275.

³ For both points, see Tac. *Hist.*, v. 11; but Josephus leaves both unmentioned, and only incidentally mentions, in connection with the deep ditch by which the Antonia was separated from Bezetha, that the towers at that point were considerably raised by the depth of the fosse, *Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 2; those towers, however, must have belonged to the second wall.

⁴ Here at the extreme north-east of the Sanctuary was undoubtedly the *πρεβύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, Matt. iv. 5; and Josephus describes, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 3. 2, 4, how frightful the look-down from that corner

was; comp. *ante*, p. 457.

⁵ Which is often mentioned by Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2.

⁶ See vol. v. pp. 432 sq.

⁷ The description of the Temple, *Bell. Jud.* v. 5 (compared with the shorter but independent one, *Cont. Ap.* ii. 8-10), is on the whole clear, and presents an adequate, though in some respects incomplete, picture of it. The description in the *M. Muddôth* of the Talmud is specially important for its information regarding the numerous separate subsidiary buildings, with their names and purposes; but it really contains only very vague and scattered recollections of various Rabbis with regard to the Temple as a whole, and deserves little credit when it differs from Josephus. We must also make use of other disconnected details, e.g. *M. שקלים* vi. 3.

its sides, including even the Antonia, it was surrounded by the most magnificent cloisters of thirty cubits broad, and internally it was laid with stones of all sorts and was open to the heavens. The immense quadrangle was regarded as only *the first sanctuary*, or the *outer court*, and heathen also could enter it quite freely.¹ When that court had been passed, a very small ornamental boundary wall, only three cubits high, was reached, on the numerous columns of which could be read, in Greek and Latin characters, that the strictly sacred part of the building commenced there, and that no heathen might pass that line, on pain of death.² For beyond that wall the *second sanctuary* began, called also *the sanctuary* simply, or the *Court of Israel*, which Judeans alone might enter. It formed likewise a large square enclosed by a strong wall of its own, forty cubits high; but it was situated so much higher up the hill that it had to be ascended by fourteen steps, and as they were placed in the front of the wall the latter was thereby to some extent hidden. The wall also did not begin to be visible for ten paces behind these steps and a fresh additional platform; and again five steps higher the gates were erected that led into the great court itself. Of these exceedingly magnificent gates there were really seven: on the east, as the direct approach to the inner sanctuary, the largest and most beautiful one, and on the north and the south three respectively. But, as on the east, in front of the inner sanctuary, a special large court, the *Court of the Women*, was built, which extended the whole length of the second sanctuary from north to south, and had also its own wall, there were added two doors to the latter, one on the north and one on the south, and a third one on the east opposite the inner sanctuary, so that altogether there were ten gates. The nine gates that were visible from the outside had then been adorned magnificently with gold plates by the rich Alexandrinic relative of Philo,³ but they were surpassed by that erected, on account of the Court of the Women, farther to the east, as directly opposite the inner sanctuary, inasmuch as it was constructed entirely of Corinthian brass.⁴ The Court of the Women itself was evidently regarded as a comparatively

¹ See vol. v. p. 173.

² But Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 4, describes how Titus reproached the Judeans with having themselves polluted the Temple that had been thus guarded, in fact, in the case of every heathen temple murder and blood were regarded as pollution.

³ See *ante*, p. 196.

⁴ This gate, often called by Josephus the 'brazen gate,' does not occur under this name amongst those enumerated *Middóth*, i. 4. v. 3, 6, unless the gate called Nicanor's there (*ante*, p. 106) is intended to be the same; but there can be little doubt that the 'Gate Beautiful' in the Acts is identical with it.

less important sanctuary, was situated fifteen or twenty steps lower, might be entered by women and they might not pass beyond it, and was open even to heathen women.¹ Between all these gates ran cloisters, interrupted by the treasuries of the Temple.² Each gate was seven cubits high and twenty wide. Farther on twelve steps conducted to the *third sanctuary*, or the *sanctuary of the priests*, and railing, only one cubit high, made of beautiful stones, marked the confines of the altar and of the Temple (*Naos*) in the strictest sense. If therefore the inner court was once taken, nothing prevented the conqueror from entering the inner sanctuary at once; but that court was protected by its own strong wall on all sides.³

Relying on the material strength of their inner or outer sacred place, on its divine inviolability, and on their own courage, the besieged, in the midst of the perpetually protracted course of the severe struggle, obtained twice the most brilliant advantages in the teeth of the whole besieging army of the Romans, so that in the midst of the approaching ruin the brightest hope of a successful issue of the heroic struggle for the Sanctuary shone upon them, and the prophecies of the indestructibility of the Temple that they heard seemed as if they must soon be fulfilled. Once more it was manifested in the life and death struggle of the nation, how it clung to its ancient Sanctuary, and sought thereby to defend its own existence as well as its religion—a rare exhibition of daring heroism and enduring tenacity in the midst of the most extreme sufferings. The nation was also at all events in a better position than before for a terrible struggle with the Romans as having added to its knowledge of the arts of war and being inured to bear its vicissitudes. But inasmuch as the self-deception of the besieged only increased with the two great victories which they at first won at this stage of the conflict,

¹ Which accords with the general estimation of women, *Antiquities*, pp. 194 sq. Including the Court of the Women, to which all unpurified men and children had access, four courts were often counted, to which the Holy of Holies was then added as the fifth part.

² Comp. Mark xii. 41, John viii. 20.

³ The departure from the above in the description of the *Middoth* it is scarcely necessary to refer to here in detail. Thus the seven gates of the Court of Israel (i. 4), are quite conceivable; but with regard to the relation of the Court of the Women and its gates correct statements are nowhere given, and on the contrary, thirteen gates

are not less vaguely mentioned, ii. 6 *ad fin.*, from an entirely different reminiscence. According to i. 3 the whole Temple hill had at its lowest edge five gates: two gates of Hulda (vol. iv. p. 234) on the south; the gate Qipponus (from *Coponius*, vol. vi. p. 62) on the west; Tadi on the north, but quite disused (therefore טדי in error for טני, the gate of the Antonia?, in which case its being closed could be explained); and the South Gate, 'on which the castle of Susa was represented' (accordingly from the time of Zerubbabel?). Josephus leaves quite unnoticed these outermost gates, which must have existed.

their final ruin was necessarily only the more complete. We have thus indicated the three stages of the tragedy which was now about to descend from its highest climax to its necessary issue, and we must now carefully distinguish them.

To the First more serious Defeat of the Romans.

The very beginning of the siege appeared to be in various ways favourable to the Romans. Titus advanced with two legions through Samaria to the Judean frontier town of Gophna, to which Vespasian had sent a Roman garrison,¹ encamped there for the night, marched the next day as far as Gabath-Saul, a place situated about thirty stadia from Jerusalem, where Saul had once held his royal court,² and encamped there in the Thorn Meadow.³ As he found the road to Jerusalem quite open, and deemed the Judeans far more intimidated than they actually were, he resolved at once to begin an inspection of the city with the aid of six hundred chosen horsemen; but scarcely had he turned aside from the road towards the wall on the west near the tower of Psephinus with the greater part of his horsemen than a large number of Judean soldiers rushed out of the gate, flung themselves amongst the Roman horsemen, and, whilst the larger number of them fled, interecepted Titus with a few others. His position between the walls and trenches of the many gardens outside the city wall was really desperate, and he fought his way through with his few attendants only by using the utmost daring and exertion, and, after the loss of a few horsemen, effected his escape with the rest by rapid flight. But while the Judeans regarded this as an important victory, Titus joined the same night the legion that was advancing from Emmaus, and on the next day he ordered two camps to be pitched for all three legions only about seven stadia to the north of Jerusalem. That elevation, from which a splendid view of Jerusalem and the Temple was obtained, was the point called in Greek Scopos, where the last Roman army that stood before Jerusalem had encamped.⁴ The legion that was advancing at the same time from Jericho was commanded to encamp six stadia to the east of the city at the Mount of Olives.

But before this legion had completed the fortification of its camp at the Mount of Olives, just opposite the Temple, a great

¹ See *ante*, p. 572.

² See vol. iii. p. 22.

³ Compare Sauley's *Voyage en terre sainte*, i. p. 90.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 513.

army of Judeans, drawn from all the parties, which had suddenly become unanimous, rushed early in the morning in the wildest fury upon it, and being constantly increased by fresh comrades, they drove the Romans, who had been taken by surprise in fortifying their camp, from the entire camp even, amid great loss. Titus hastened over the hills with the ablest soldiers of the two other legions to the relief of his sorely-pressed legion, and by his valour pressed the Judeans back into the valley of the Kidron again; but while the fierce struggle was thus protracted until past noon, his command to the soldiers who had at first been repulsed to return quickly to the work of fortifying their camp, produced on the outlookers from the walls of Jerusalem the impression that the Romans were fleeing again up the Mount of Olives,¹ so that a fresh multitude of Judeans rushed out of the gate with the overwhelming force of the intoxication of victory and flung themselves upon the Romans of the other legions that were still fighting and drove them in wild flight up the northern hill. At this point Titus, who refused to yield at the persuasion of his friends alarmed for his safety, once more came into obvious peril of his life; but he continued the combat in the most critical moments, though attended only by a few who were entirely devoted to him, until many of those who had been ordered to the camp fortifications on the Mount of Olives hastened back to the battle-field, and all the Romans, filled with shame and using their favourable higher position on the hills, gradually forced the Judeans back into the valley. So that the long and fierce struggle of that day after all was of no avail to the Judeans, and the Romans went on fortifying without obstruction their three camps from the fourteenth of April, or the day of the Passover (on which, thirty-seven years previously, Christ had been crucified.)

Titus had then plainly enough perceived what a hard struggle he had before him, and the besieged too began to look more seriously into the future. The leaders necessarily felt most keenly that the domestic division in the three parties and in the command was most detrimental to the successful defence of the city; and once more a change, which really facilitated the struggle with the Romans, though it appeared again to be capable of being put into effect only by strategy, was proposed by John of Giskhala, as the most zealous and most astute of all the Zealots. He thought that the last party division that

¹ The sign agreed upon was the shaking of the clothes of the sentinel, as if the friends should similarly put themselves in motion.

arose at the beginning of the year 70,¹ to his own and the city's injury, must be put an end to; and on Easter Day, when the doors of the Temple were thrown open to the crowds of worshippers, he ordered a multitude of his adherents, dispersed amongst the worshippers, to creep into the Temple with concealed weapons. They then commenced at once a merciless massacre of the surprised priestly Zealots, who maintained that they were the only faithful representatives of the party, and they were compelled to hide themselves in the subterranean passages of the Temple. Many of the people who took no part in the conflict suffered terribly for their presence in that completely consecrated place, and many a quiet citizen who was regarded as a friend of the priestly Zealots, or who had on some occasion offended the victorious leaders then in the Temple, was at that opportunity put out of the way. But the leaders of the priestly Zealots, Eleazar and Simon, the son of Jair,² soon felt that to yield was most advisable, and they with their followers acknowledged once more the supreme command of John. The city was once more commanded by two supreme leaders only, each of whom had to command an army more voluntarily attached to him in addition to his own. To John, with his six thousand heavy-armed men, Eleazar attached himself with two thousand four hundred men; to Simon, the son of Giora, with his ten thousand soldiers under fifty captains, the Idumeans attached themselves, with five hundred men under ten captains. The first had under him the entire Temple and its precincts, with the Ophla hill in the south, the valley of the Kidron, and a large district round the Temple.³

In order to render the sorties from the city less injurious, and to bring the works of the siege as near to it as possible, Titus kept one portion of his army always under arms against any sortie; the other portion he employed in levelling the ground round the city, and in removing all trees, hedges, and other garden fences, from the Scopus as far as Herod's tomb, in the neighbourhood of the Serpents' Pool.⁴ Josephus, too, was then compelled for the first time to try close at hand what he could do before the walls as a Roman ambassador of peace. As in bitter scorn of his efforts, the besieged arranged a wicked

¹ *Ante*, p. 575.

² He had a brother, Judas, almost equally renowned; but the MSS. differ between *Jair* and *Avi* as the name of the father. *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 1; vi. 1. 8, 2. 6; vii. 6. 5.

³ *Ibid.* v. 3. 1; 6. 1.

⁴ According to all indications in the north-west of the city, where the first Herod had had tombs built, not for himself but for the members of his family, which are elsewhere also called the 'royal tombs,' *Bell. Jud.* v. 3. 2; 4. 2; 12. 2.

feint for the next day. From the northern wall apparently respectable citizens were seen begging for a peaceable surrender and beseeching the Romans to come to their assistance, while others pretended to be fleeing from their fellow-citizens; but when the Roman soldiers approached the gates, to assist those who were thus seeking aid, and at the same time to take the city, the petitioners suddenly changed into enemies, inflicted much injury on the Romans in the confusion, and were soon in a position to loudly exult over the complete success of their feint. However, this little rebuff to the Romans had been brought about in the teeth of the warnings of Titus; he used it, therefore, in making his soldiers, by his severe censure, more guarded for the future. And, after the threatening position which he proposed to take up had been completely secured, he pitched his own commander's camp only about two stadia from the wall opposite the tower Psephinus on the north-west, and that of his army somewhat more to the west, near the Hippicus, whilst the one legion remained at the Mount of Olives. But when, shortly afterwards, he rode round the city to find the best point of attack, he ordered, nevertheless, in addition to Josephus, one of his citizen friends, Nicanor, who had formerly been so anxious and skilful in persuading Josephus at Jotapata to desert,¹ once more to address pacific words to the besieged; and soon afterwards he saw Nicanor seriously wounded by a missile from the city wall. He therefore urged on the actual commencement of an attack upon the walls, ordered his soldiers to lay completely waste the surroundings of the city, and, by felling all the trees still remaining in the suburbs, collected materials for the attacking banks.²

After a long examination, he selected as the most suitable point of attack a place near the sepulchre of the high-priest John,³ because the outer or first wall had been left lower there, and no second wall behind it prevented the approach to the third. From April 23rd he had entrenchments dug, ramparts and towers built, the slingers and archers placed between the ramparts, and the heavy hurling machines put in motion. The part of the city opposite to this section of the wall was in the possession of Simon the son of Giora; he was soon very active in defending it, while John kept quiet in the east of the city.

¹ We may suppose that the Nicanor of v. 6. 3 is identical with the man of the same name iii. 8. 2.

² *Bell. Jud.* v. 3. 3-5; 6. 2.

³ Near the middle of the western side of the city; comp. *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 2;

7. 3; 9. 2. This John may have been the early high-priest mentioned vol. v. p. 124, just as a 'Tomb of King Alexander' is mentioned *Bell. Jud.* v. 7. 3 (vol. v. pp. 386 sq.).

The defenders fought bravely from the wall, and made frequent sorties against the Romans; but the hurling machines taken from the Romans in the year 66, which were now used against them, were no longer in good condition, and were not skilfully enough handled, whilst the Romans inflicted great injury by the skilful management of theirs.¹ It was not until a later period in the siege that the Judeans learnt how to use those instruments better. But as soon as the works were sufficiently advanced, Titus ordered the battering-rams under shelter to begin their work, from towers brought as near to the wall as possible; and it required these prodigious blows on the walls to sound through the city, to unite on that side of it all the Judean soldiers against the Romans. But when John then yielded to the request of Simon for help, the resistance to the Romans was revived so much by incessant successful sorties, that all their efforts were for several days unavailing; and when a brief respite from fighting then arose on both sides, the Judeans ventured to make such a fierce sally from the Hippicus, that they succeeded in putting the Romans to flight, and setting their siege instruments on fire. Only the chosen soldiers just come from Alexandria held their ground with the greatest bravery, until Titus, hastening up with his select cavalry, and himself slaying twelve Judeans at their head,² recovered the battle by his courageous example, and drove all the enemies back into the city. One of them, whom he took prisoner, he ordered to be crucified, as a warning, from which we plainly perceive how unsatisfactory the situation of the Romans was. But during the retreat, one of the most respected Judeans—John, the leader of the Idumeans—fell upon the wall by the dart of an Arabian; and in the course of the following night the accidental fall of one of the three siege-towers caused a great panic amongst the Romans.

But as the Romans then resumed all their labours with increased energy, and put in incessant motion their battering-rams especially, the zeal of the Judeans in defending themselves considerably diminished; and the thought which arose probably

¹ It is not clear how it was that the large white stones hurled by the Romans, *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 3, could be seen coming by the Judean sentinels, but not the black ones afterwards selected. But when the sentinels cried out 'the son comes!' when they saw a piece of rock of that kind coming, it was probably a jocular phrase intentionally chosen for the bitter thing, alluding to the difficult arrival of the

stone from the womb of the instrument.

² It is plain that Suetonius' words, *Tit.* § 5, *novissima Hierosolymorum occupatione septem propugnatores totidem sagittarum ictibus confecit*, do not refer to this incident; comp. however, below. But Titus probably then received the severe injury to his shoulder and hand of which Cassius Dio speaks, lxxvi. 5.

in many a breast, that that was not after all the Temple wall, which was deemed impregnable, and that the Romans might, perhaps, be expelled again from the city with far greater success, may perhaps have had a paralysing effect. So, on May 7, the first Romans entered the city through the breaches made by the rams; and whilst the Judean guards retreated to the second wall, the Romans quickly occupied the most northern portion of the city completely, as far as the Kidron on the east, and destroyed a great part of the wall taken and of that part of the city; for Titus supposed that he would then soon finish his task, and removed his principal camp to the place then still called 'the Assyrian camp,'¹ opposite the second wall. But the Judeans of both parties now resumed, with increased energy, the most obstinate struggle in the best order, behind the second wall and in the south-west, near the tomb of John and the gate leading to the Hippicus. The next five days the conflict was continued day and night on both sides with the utmost exertion and marvellous coolness of blood. Subsequently, stories were told of the many wonderful exhibitions of bravery shown then, especially of the daring of a Roman Longinus,² of the courage, allied with the utmost cunning, and, indeed, with a contempt of all Romans, of a Judean named Castor, with ten comrades, who finally made their escape by setting fire to a falling tower. For the first time it was seen by the Romans that the Judeans fought with the greatest contempt of death, and only from the purest sense of duty as taught by their commanders themselves, whilst Titus sought to check the foolhardy valour of his men, and to spare their blood with greatest prudence.

On the fifth day after the storming of the first wall, the Romans actually took the second also, in consequence of the falling of the tower just mentioned; and already Titus proclaimed to the quiet citizens who would submit to him that their lives and possessions should be spared. But scarcely had he, with one thousand heavy-armed men and his other chosen soldiers, entered the New City, with its markets and narrow lanes, than the Judean soldiers, as if only waiting for that, rose for a deadly struggle on all sides—from the houses as well as in the narrow streets, and, indeed, at and outside the gates, and compelled the Romans everywhere to retreat. In fact, the

¹ See vol. iv. p. 182.

² The Longinus mentioned in this passage, *Bell. Jud.* v. 7. 3, was, therefore, another man than the Longinus met with

before (*ante*, p. 513); in the last edition of vol. vi. p. 444, I have suggested a more natural origin of the name of the man there intended.

son of Giora obtained, in this case, one of his greatest victories, and all the Romans that had entered the city might very well have been slain if Titus, supported by the tribune, Domitius Sabinus,¹ a friend and relation of his, had not planted himself at the gate, to keep back, with his own utmost personal effort, the rush of the Judeans, and to protect the flying Romans.² But these few hours frustrated almost all the previous labours of the Romans, and occasioned them a loss which, if it had been quickly and decisively used, might have brought about the end of the whole siege.

To the Burning down of the Roman Works.

But the exultation in the Judean camp at this victory was greater than the determination to follow it up at once with energy. It was already proudly believed that the Romans would not venture a fresh attack, while, at the very moment, they resumed their former attack without delay, and in defiance of the brave resistance which the Judeans then, on their part, renewed, continued it with so much courage and caution, that as early as the fourth day they took the second wall again. Thereupon Titus commanded the complete demolition of the more northern portion of it, and placed a garrison in the towers of the southern portion, directing his attention also at once to the storming of the third wall.

As he, however, clearly perceived then that the capture of the two strongest parts of the town still to be effected might be protracted, and that the siege would necessarily become more difficult during the approaching summer season, he determined at the same time to leave no stone unturned in inducing the Judeans at once to come to a surrender that would be honourable to the Romans. Four consecutive days, on the distribution of the full military pay, and probably of a special present of honour, he commanded his whole army to appear drawn up in order and in full uniform before the eyes of the besieged, with the view of terrifying them the more by letting them see that the Romans had abundance of everything, while they themselves were already threatened with famine. Thereupon he ordered the commencement of the new siege-works on the east, near the tower of Antonia, with the view of taking the

¹ With whom he had formerly first sealed the walls of Jotapata, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 34.

² The shooting of darts by Titus is

here expressly mentioned, *Bell. Jud.* v. 8. 1, and he may have there slain the seven mentioned *ante*, p. 592.

Temple from it, and on the south, near the tomb of John, as the place from which to take the Upper City. At this spring season accidentally all the streams, both within and without the city, flowed more abundantly. It was remembered in the city that a similar rare occurrence took place formerly during the siege of the Chaldeans, and an evil omen was discovered in the fact.¹ And as Titus thought he saw in all this reasons which might probably make the more peaceable of the citizens disposed to surrender, he permitted Josephus once more to try his powers in persuading his fellow-countrymen.² But it was Josephus himself alone that could imagine that his admonitions would produce any effect upon the masses of the besieged. In the case of some individuals who had kept in the background in the city, it is true, despair got the upper hand, so that many a one deserted to the Romans. Famine was increased amongst the great numbers shut up in the city through the growing barbarity of the defending army, many of the soldiers being unable to seize sufficient provisions for their own wants; and while the poorer people remained uncared for, many of the richer were either severely set upon, or even slain, on the slightest semblance of an inclination to the Romans, or to peace, if they were not, in the most favourable case, sent from the domain of the one general into that of the other.³ But the armed men themselves still retained full confidence, and nowhere amongst the people generally was there heard a loud or strong demand for submission to the Roman supremacy.⁴ But the armed men, it is true, felt strongly already that they would have little true enthusiastic support to expect from the masses; so that thus early invectives were heard amongst them against the miserable character of the 'Hebrews' of the time.⁵

In these circumstances Titus was unhappily carried away by his vexation and anger at the obstinate resistance of the besieged, and, in an attack of ill humour, commanded that all who were taken alive should be openly crucified as a warning. A multitude of poor people especially crept daily outside the walls, through the declivities and valleys on the south and the west of the untaken part of the city, to seek in their poverty

¹ As Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4, mentions quite incidentally in his speech.

² The long speech, v. 9. 3, 4, shows how he might have spoken on that occasion rather than what he actually said in detail, but it represents to us very clearly the feelings with which he recalled that period.

³ As is described at length, *Bell. Jud.* v. 10. 4.

⁴ On the contrary, even a few Romans at the time went over to the Judeans, according to Cassius Dio, lxxvi. 5, of which Josephus strangely says nothing.

⁵ We must probably thus understand the language of v. 10. 5.

green herbs and other means of sustenance. Five hundred or more of such wretched individuals were thereupon daily caught and nailed to crosses opposite the walls, after they had undergone the customary preliminary scourging; and the pains of crucifixion were outdone by the further barbarity of the Roman soldiers. In this way the Romans, in those late days, revived the same exhibition of horrible barbarity in war which had been presented by the Assyrians in their campaigns in Asia when a fortress refused at once to yield to them.¹ But instead of this cruelty destroying the courage of the besieged, as Titus had expected, it provoked even the most indifferent to exasperation. He proposed then to proceed with somewhat less severity, and sent many captives back into the city with their hands only cut off, but thereby likewise increased the contempt of death in the breasts of the numerous enemies of the Romans, particularly as they still held the Temple to be inviolable. At no period in the struggle were the fierce rage of battle and the unyielding bravery of the Judeans greater than at this, and Titus was soon to taste the bitter fruits thereof.

In the Roman camp, amongst the numerous other bands of liege and warlike allies, there arrived a select company from Comagene, splendidly armed after the ancient Macedonian fashion, under the king, Antiochus, and his son Epiphanes.² Thus even the frontiers of the empire next to the Parthians, on the Euphrates, were exposed, and thus desirous were all these Asiatics to take part in spoiling the Judeans.³ The new arrivals expressed surprise at the caution and delay of the Romans, and the young prince was really by far the most knightly and daring of all the allies. They accordingly made an assault on the wall, but soon retreated with serious loss, content not to have lost their king. Meanwhile the Romans completed their new siege-works, within fifteen days from the twelfth of May above referred to, with the most severe exertion, and at each of the two places selected for breaking through the walls, rose two strong banks with their appliances.⁴

But John, who was never at a loss or out of heart, had already undermined the ground where the two erections opposite him stood, and got everything ready for setting fire to them from below the earth. His stratagem was perfectly successful,

¹ As we may plainly see in the numerous frescoes of the Assyrian palaces discovered of late years; comp. Layard's two works.

² *Ante*, p. 578.

³ *Bell. Jud.* v. 11. 3; *Tac. Hist.* v. 1.

With regard to the names Antiochus and Epiphanes, see the next volume.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* v. 11. 4, 5; the fate of the two eastern works is described § 4, that of the two southern ones afterwards, § 5, as we must conceive the whole account.

and the Romans retreated in terror from their strong works, which were so suddenly seized by subterranean fire and were sinking into the burning ditch. As if thereby roused to the greatest emulation, two days afterwards it was resolved in Simon's camp also to make an open assault upon the other two works that were already occupied with their rams in full activity; and although such an assault was incomparably more difficult, it was successful through the marvellous and reckless daring of the Judeans, who willingly threw their lives into the breach. Three men, whose names did not perish—Teptheus, from the little Galilean town, Garsis;¹ Megassar, at one time a servant of Mariamme's,² the sister of Agrippa, and a soldier of Agrippa's; and a man who had come with the Adiabeneans³ to Jerusalem, son of a Nabateus,⁴ usually called, from some bodily defect, Chagira, that is, the lame one—rushed with fire-brands upon the battering rams, set fire to them in spite of the shower of arrows, carried the fire through them into the towers, and, supported by constantly fresh arrivals of Judeans, attacked the defenders of the works with such ferocity that the Romans everywhere retreated. Titus then hastened up from the eastern camp, where he was just ordering new works to be begun, with the choicest of his men, but, notwithstanding all his exertions, he could not prevent the destruction of the works, which were on fire in all directions. He at last compelled the Judeans to retire into the city, but saw all his works in preparation for the siege destroyed at one blow. The Judeans had a second time gained a serious advantage over him; once more the fortunes of the entire struggle might turn to the disadvantage of the Romans.

To the Complete Triumph of the Romans.

But once more the Judeans were too weak, or rather not sufficiently united and determined enough, to prosecute their advantage at the favourable moment, as in the year 66, under Cestius. So Titus found time in a serious council of war composed of his immediate experts, to think out a new plan, which, though it would greatly protract the siege and immeasurably increase the sufferings of the besieged, promised a

¹ See *ante*, p. 543.

² See *ante*, p. 420.

³ See *ant.*, p. 402.

⁴ He belonged therefore by birth to the Nabateans, and we do not know how he came amongst the Adiabeneans; but

his name, according to the above meaning, is pure Aramaic, and not Arabic, and we have therefore in this case Nabateans who actually spoke Arabic; comp. with regard to them *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1857, pp. 160 sq.

proportionally greater certainty of final success. It seemed quite undesirable to throw up new banks like those which had been burnt down, inasmuch as all the trees for a wide radius round the town had already been felled and used as building materials; to seek to take the city at once by a general assault seemed too uncertain; and to attempt to reduce it to submission by famine, by blockading all the roads to it, appeared too slow. Titus resolved accordingly to isolate it completely by building a wall quickly round the entire city, and then to storm it by portions as soon as possible. It was thus necessary in this case to resort to means which had not been used since ancient times; but there was not wanting the requisite number of hands, or the courage for executing the unusual task. With a zeal which was not second in any respect to that exhibited by the besieged, the entire besieging army threw itself into the new work; and it was subsequently said that the immense wall round the city was finished within three days. It ran from the camp of the Assyrians above-mentioned,¹ as the spot where Titus had his own headquarters between the first and the second wall, through the lower New City and the Kidron valley as far as the Mount of Olives; then on the east southwards to the spur of the hill called the Rock of the Doves, and over the hill in the south-east of the city; turned then westwards into the Siloah valley, and past the tomb of the high-priest Chanan² (Ananus) as far as the south-western hill which was still called 'the camp of Pompey,' because Pompey had formerly camped there first;³ thence to the north, past the village Peashouse,⁴ as far as the tomb of Herod at the farthest north-west point, whence, turning eastwards, it joined the point of starting. Along this wall, some thirty-nine stadia in length, thirteen small fortresses were built at appropriate places, to completely command every movement of the besieged, and to prevent any approach from without (which, however, was not much to be feared). Each of these fortresses was about one hundred and fifty yards in circumference, so that they stood near enough to each other, and it was impossible that at any point a breach should be made in the wall, strict watch being kept in the case of all the Romans from Titus to the commonest soldier.

¹ *Ante*, p. 594.

² Undoubtedly the earlier high-priest mentioned vol. vi. p. 61.

³ Which, though not mentioned plainly by Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 2. *Ant.* xiv. 4. 1. 2, must be added to the earlier narra-

tive from v. 12. 2.

⁴ We may probably thus translate 'Ἐπιβίθων οἶκος, inasmuch as the Greek name is really only a translation of some such name as *Bech-Adas*.

The calamities of famine soon extended still more unchecked over the unhappy city, whilst the Romans outside possessed an enviable store of provisions. For many weeks scarcely any one perished in the city by the Roman sword, but hunger slew immense numbers of those not engaged in the armed defence, as the stores were reserved for the armed men exclusively. Gold was so plentiful in the city that it lost above half its value, and yet the price of provisions rose to a hopeless height.¹ To leave the dying a last consolation, those in power had promised that all dying without any means should be buried at the public cost; this promise was kept as long as the number of such deaths did not grow too large, and it was calculated afterwards that the number of this class who died between the commencement of the siege and the July following was one hundred and fifteen thousand, eight hundred and eighty.² We can well understand that those who were better acquainted with the facts, and reflected calmly on the condition of things, though they had at first approved of the struggle with the Romans, completely despaired now of a Judean victory, and more or less earnestly thought of all kinds of proposals with a view of escaping from the intolerable position. The chief military commanders were, it is true, still resolved to fight to the bitter end, supported by so many thousands who not less than themselves preferred death to the Roman yoke; nevertheless they were already obliged most carefully to keep their eye on any outbreak of an inclination to surrender, and thus early betrayed their anxiety by excessively severe measures. The high-priest Matthias, who had so much assisted in admitting Simon into the city,³ was ordered by the latter to be executed at a place prominently in view of the Romans, as a man suspected of being on the Roman side, and even refused him his last request, to be executed before his three sons who were condemned with him; a fourth escaped to Titus. After him a priest of repute, Chananja (Ananias), son of Masambal, Aristeus, the secretary of the Sanhedrin, from Emmaus, and fifteen citizens of position, were executed. The commander of a tower, Judas, son of Judas, an officer under Simon, was detected in the act of being about openly to appeal to the Romans for help, and was at once, with his ten fellow-con-

¹ *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 4, 7. vi. 1. 1; compared with which examples the description, *Rev.* vi. 5, 6, is exceedingly low, a sign that the Apocalypse was written long previously.

² According to *Bell. Jud.* v. 13. 7, this calculation was from documentary sources

of Manneus, son of Iazarus, entrusted with the payment of the public money, who deserted to the Romans. Other deserters estimated to Titus the number of those who died thus as high as six hundred thousand men.

³ See *ante*, p. 571.

spirators, executed as a traitor. Josephus, whose parents were kept in prison, gave himself all along great pains to entice from the city many deserters to the Romans, and on one of his walks round the walls he was himself so severely wounded on his head by a stone from the Judeans, that for a considerable time he was compelled to remain quiet. But the desire to desert was soon most painfully checked through the fault of the Roman soldiers themselves, as the rumour, which was in itself sufficiently well founded, spread among them that the deserters had swallowed pieces of gold. Two thousand of the deserters were said to have been ripped up to extract the gold pieces from their bellies; and although Titus prohibited the practice under threats of the severest punishment, instances of it continued still to occur; nor were those who took part in these horrible cruelties by any means confined to the soldiers belonging to the Asiatic allies.

Meanwhile the Romans, soon after they had finished the great wall round the city, commenced four new banks near the Antonia, still longer and more firmly constructed than those which had been burnt down, although to procure the wood for the purpose they were obliged to fell all the trees round the city to a distance of ninety stadia. When at the end of a month, at the beginning of July, these banks were at last finished, John undertook a sally with a view of destroying them by fire. But this time the Judeans failed in the exact and skilful execution of the complicated series of assaults, and the Romans were now too much on their guard and too undaunted to permit the attempt to succeed as the former one had done. After the battering-rams, therefore, had been some days incessantly at work, one night the portion of the wall fell in under which John had previously carried the subterranean passage for the destruction of the first Roman banks;¹ but the morning showed the surprised Romans that another wall had already been carried up behind it. Impatient at the new delay, Titus provoked the martial spirit of individual soldiers, by exhortation and promises, to try to scale that hastily-erected wall and to drive the Judeans from the Antonia. But on July 3rd an extremely brave Syrian, Sabinus, sacrificed his life in vain in that way. Not until two days later did twenty men of the front watch, concurrently with the standard-bearer of the fifth legion, two horsemen, and a trumpeter, scale the wall at the beginning of the last night watch, slay the sleeping

¹ *Ant.*, pp. 597 sq.

sentinels, surprise the besieged by sounding the trumpet, so that they fled to the Temple, imagining that the whole Roman army had come up, and give to Titus, who was waiting, the signal to advance with his chosen men.¹ And already the Romans in large numbers entered through that subterranean passage and planted their feet in the outer court of the Temple, when the Judeans, collecting themselves at last, fought with the greatest valour in the closest hand-to-hand struggle, and finally compelled the resisting Romans to flee. On the side of the Romans a noble Bithynian centurion, Julianus, delayed most the final success of the Judeans by his marvellous heroism in single combat, until in the end he also fell, and the Romans contented themselves with the occupation of the Antonia. In this engagement, in which the drawn sword had to decide, the Judeans of all parties had shared with equal unanimity and bravery; the priestly Zealots also fought by the side of John, although he had begun to use for military purposes the most precious sacred gifts of the Temple, and, indeed, its stores of oil and wine required for the sacrifices.² Titus, however, commanded that the foundation walls of the Antonia should be demolished, so far as to permit the whole army to get up into that place, which was in immediate proximity to the Temple. A week was spent in effecting that.

The weeks between the taking of the Antonia and the 8th August were occupied only with the further preparation of the Romans for storming the Temple, and the most desperate efforts of the Judeans to save it, which led to a number of the most murderous *mêlées* and single combats, much against the will of the Romans. With the daily increasing peril of having the Temple fall into the hands of the heathen, the heroic resolve on the part of so many thousands to make a wall round it with their bodies only increased; and it was never seen so clearly as in these days of extreme trial, what a marvellous alacrity animated men's minds to live or die for it alone. On the 17th July the daily sacrifice was given up, because the hundreds of hands, which were required for its presentation, would be better employed in fighting for the Temple. When Titus heard of this, he once more caused representations to be made to John by Josephus with regard to the unreasonable resistance, earnestly deprecating his responsibility for the crime of the interruption of the sacrifices, and the threatening destruc-

¹ The same daring and stratagem by which Gideon had once conquered Israel's enemies (vol. ii. pp. 385 sq.) now turned

against Israel!

² *Bell. Jud.* vi. 1. 8, comp. v. 13. 6.

tion of the entire Temple. But this was interpreted by the Judeans as a sign of the incipient embarrassment of the Roman general, and the resistance was continued the more energetically. According to ancient ideas, it is true, the holiest things of religion were practically annihilated by the interruption of the daily sacrifice;¹ and the inmost apartments of the Sanctuary, which the foot of a soldier, or even of a common man, ought never to tread at all, began now to be worn by the steps of blood-stained soldiers of all kinds. As if indignant at that, eight men of high-priestly extraction² fled to Titus, were ordered by him to the most northerly frontier town, Gophna, for their own safety, and then, when the rumour spread amongst the besieged that they had been murdered by the Romans, were brought back and openly shown before the walls; but all that did not subdue the courage of the genuine Judeans, which they showed in the most brilliant manner on the occasion of a nocturnal assault which Titus to no purpose ordered to be executed by all the choicest soldiers of his army under the lead of Cerealis, the general of the legion.³ On another day the sortie of a few Judeans, impelled by famine merely, against the Mount of Olives, had almost broken through the ranks of the Romans and upset the whole siege; and from the Upper City also a Judean dwarf even waged a successful hand-to-hand combat with a Roman hero, but was in the end treacherously shot down by a brutal Roman centurion.⁴ In the Upper City itself, however, famine ravaged amongst the civilians to such an extent that it was soon said of a rich widow, who had escaped from Jerusalem to Perea, that she had killed her own child and eaten half of it.⁵

Meanwhile the four new banks grew up, which two Roman legions erected, upon the base of the captured castle, over against the west and the north sides of the Temple-hill; and as the Temple cloisters were in too close proximity to the Castle at that point, the besieged themselves were the first to set fire to them, on July 22nd; soon afterwards the Romans laid the remaining portion of them in ashes. On the 27th of that month many of the bravest Romans met with a most painful death,

¹ See *Antiquities*, pp. 129 sq. They were not interrupted in previous sieges, as Josephus expressly mentions. *Ant.* xiv. 4, 3; 16. 2.

² Who are separately enumerated *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2; as to Ismael, who was killed in Cyrene, see below.

³ The details *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 5, 6.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 8. 10. Formerly

Israel was invariably victorious even in such a case. See vol. ii. p. 402; iii. p. 72.

⁵ For details see *Bell. Jud.* vi. 3. 3-5. When Josephus in this instance says with such emphasis that such deeds had never been done in previous history, he shows that he has not read the Old Testament even carefully enough; comp. vol. iv. p. 91.

by fire and a surprise, in a pit which had been laid by stratagem between the columns of the west cloister, Titus considering it impossible to go to their relief.¹ On August 8th, after all the banks had been finished, the battering-rams, however, still continued to play in vain against the immense stones of the walls and gates of the Temple, which seemed to stand impregnable; and when Titus on that day commanded an attack with ladders, in consequence of the unyielding defence by the Judeans, so many Romans, and even their standard-bearers, were precipitated, that a repetition of such open attacks appeared impossible, although on the same day two of the Judean combatants who had been till then most faithful, though most barbarous, voluntarily surrendered to the Romans.² But the common Roman soldiers had then long become so excessively exasperated at the desperate resistance of the besieged, and so eager, moreover, for the spoil of the Temple treasures, which they deemed inexhaustible, that, without any higher command, they took in hand the speediest destruction of the Temple itself, and on that same 8th of August set fire to the northern gate,³ which the Judeans despaired of being able to quench. Titus, it is true, on the 9th commanded the fire to be put out, and in a council of war carried a resolution that the Temple as a sacred building should be spared as much as possible; but after the Judeans had almost entirely rested on that day, as from exhaustion and despair, early on the 10th they renewed their attacks with such fierceness and such effect that Titus himself, with his choicest horsemen, was compelled to advance to drive them back. When at midday, while Titus had retired into his tent, they renewed the attack with equal ferocity, they were again repulsed, but a Roman soldier, lifted sufficiently high by his comrade, flung a firebrand through the gilded door which conducted from the north into the houses adjoining the Temple. Having been thus kindled, the fire flamed up rapidly; the Judeans used the utmost efforts to quench it, but the Roman soldiers, eager for spoil and slaughter, refused to help in putting it out, even at the command of Titus, who hastened to the spot, but, on the contrary, in the most terrible *mêlée* cut down even the crowds of defenceless people who had collected densely around the altar, and who sought only by their prayers to avert the destruction of the Sanctuary. Titus still found just time to inspect with his generals the whole

¹ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 9; 3. 1, 2.

² *Ibid.* vi. 4. 1, 2.

³ Josephus contradicts himself, and, moreover, not to the honour of his patron

Titus, when (vi. 4. 1) he makes Titus himself order the gates to be set on fire, and then (§ 3) relates that he ordered the fire to be put out.

interior of the Temple; but his command to restrain the soldiers, even by blows, from storming the sacred edifice produced so little effect that one of them, having forced his way into the interior, laid fire on the door-hinges, and Titus with his attendants scarcely found time to escape.¹

The whole Temple hill was soon like one mass of flame; those who fought under the Roman banner could, as far as this was permitted by the conflagration they had kindled, indulge all their rapacious and murderous desires; and nothing but the lamentations of even the half-famished from that hill and the southern portion of the city, re-echoed from the valleys and hills on the east² in view of the Temple, were heard above the exultation of the brutal conquerors. The extensive cloisters and other buildings connected with the Temple that were still standing were also burnt down or otherwise destroyed; and in the treasuries of the Temple hill, whither the rich had carried off their own precious things also, the conquerors found in gold, garments, and other valuables, so much booty that gold suddenly sank in value throughout Syria one half.³ In the cloister of the outer part of the Temple the Romans found a multitude of six thousand defenceless people crowded together; they set fire to that cloister likewise, and not one of the people escaped. According to ancient belief it was the duty of the priests to die at the altar in its defence; and, as a fact, those who had remained all along faithful fled to the highest Temple walls, about eight cubits in breadth, which were still standing; some of them tore up the iron spikes forming part of the ornament, and threw them as missiles at the Romans; two, Mêir, the son of Belga, and Joseph, the son of Daleus, cast themselves down from that wall into the flames of the Temple ruins; the rest at last, tormented by hunger and thirst, descended, with the view of surrendering themselves to Titus, who, however, ordered them all to be executed.⁴ But

¹ Sulpicius Severus, in his *Chron.* ii. 30. 6-8, relates that Titus, according to the advice of many, destroyed the Temple especially for the reason that that would be the best way to exterminate the Jewish and the Christian religion at the same time. But it appears from the fact, amongst other things, that he immediately narrates, ii. 31. 3, that Hadrian, *existimans se Christianam fidem loci injuria percuturum*, set up idols on the Temple and on the *Holy Sepulchre*, that this was only a late wholly unfounded opinion regarding Titus. All that is told as one connected story, but is so preposterous

that we must hesitate to refer that passage to Tacitus. Comp. the essay thereon in *Göttingischen Nachrichten*, 1861, pp. 252 sq.

² The *περσία*, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 1, must be the country just beyond the Kidron; in the first instance, the entire valley farthest east.

³ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 2; 6. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.* vi. 5. 1; 6. 1; the name *Mêir*, מֵיִר, which is so frequent in the later centuries, occurs here for the first time. The Fourth Book of Ezra x. 22, comp. with xii. 11, is the first to speak of burnt priests.

Josephus, who then found his wholly different thirst for revenge slaked, consoled himself at all events subsequently, as was his habit, with all kinds of superstitious ideas, for instance, that as the first Temple had fallen on the 10th of August, so the second necessarily fell on the same day, by divine decree.¹

But before the 10th was over the Judeans had cut their way through the outer court into the Upper City, which could be easily disconnected from the Temple hill.² The Romans also suffered them to escape the more easily, as they themselves were occupied solely with their triumphal revels, proclaimed Titus Imperator, and planted their ensigns, with the eagles on them, within the precincts of the Temple, opposite the eastern gate, in order to present their heathen sacrifices to them, as if they were determined to take full revenge for the indignity which the Judeans had so long shown to their eagles.³ In his subserviency to the conquerors, Josephus ventures scarcely to hint at the heathen abominations with which the Sanctuary was then polluted,⁴ but they were undoubtedly only too fully practised.

5. *The final Frays. The Roman use of the Victory.*

John and Simon were now shut up in the Upper City, and the utmost straits compelled them more than ever to agree upon some common plan. Three possible courses only lay before them: surrender to the Romans, a continuation of the mortal struggle to the bitter end, or withdrawal into the deserts of Arabia and other countries on the south and east beyond the limits of the Roman Empire, with the view of resuming the conflict from that basis at a more favourable opportunity. It is evident that their feeling inclined to the latter course,

¹ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. 5. 8; comp. vol. iv. p. 274. In reality August 8th might equally well have been reckoned as the day when the destruction of the Temple commenced; but subsequently it was preferred to commemorate the calamity of the destruction of both Temples on the same day. Another of the superstitious notions of Josephus was that, according to a prophecy of the Sacred Scriptures, the holy city would necessarily be destroyed whenever the Sanctuary should be four-square, and that after the demolition of the Antonia it was made four-square (vi. 5. 4); but he forgets to mention the particular prophecy referred to, and how the Sanctuary was made four-square.

It is elsewhere especially said by him that the *ἱερόν* of Herod was quadrangular (vol. v. p. 434); but it appears from *Middôth*, ii. 1 5, 6, v. 1. that the quadrangle of the Court of Israel, for instance, was not deemed perfectly equiangular, as if the Holy of Holies only might be that, vol. iii. pp. 235 sq. When, therefore, John endeavoured by a new wall to fill up the breach which was made in the wall at the north-western corner by the taking of the Antonia, an evil omen might be discovered in the attempt.

² See *ante*, p. 586.

³ See vol. vi. pp. 65 sq.

⁴ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 1.

and we see accordingly that Arabia was from that time full of Judean fugitives as it had never been before.¹ The first possible course could not be seriously contemplated by them; but they would easily perceive that after the loss of the Temple the conflict had at that time no further object. Still, both commanders were undoubtedly entreated by many who had hitherto been the more resolute combatants to make terms with the Romans. So far as they themselves were concerned, the two men had often shown their determination in favour of fighting to the last, and they knew that all the Zealots were bound to do so by their oaths;² but, in order to satisfy the demands presented to them, they sought an interview with Titus. He granted it, and proclaimed to them, over the bridge leading from the Temple hill to the Upper City, that he was prepared, if they surrendered at once, to pardon the majority and punish only a few.³ But they desired for all simply liberty to retire through the wall which Titus had made, that they might then go into the desert with their arms. When Titus indignantly refused such terms, the relatives of king Monobazos⁴ surrendered themselves to him, and were subsequently sent by him to Rome as hostages for the king's fidelity. But the war began again at once with increased fury. Titus ordered the Archives, the Akra,⁵ the Council-house, and the Ophra-hill⁶ to be set on fire, which caused the destruction of many houses. The Judean soldiers at once fell upon the royal palace adjoining the bridge, into which the Romans had already in the confusion got.⁷ The Judeans drove them out, taking only two prisoners; they also put to death eight thousand four hundred defenceless fellow-Judeans, who had carried off their treasures into the palace and put themselves under the protection of the Romans; they plundered them of their treasures, and appeared determined to permanently establish themselves in the city. The Romans, on the other hand, on the following day set fire to all that they held of the city from the north to the farthest point south, but found only a little spoil: whilst the Judeans, although already looking for the numerous

¹ The Sibylline poet, xii. 107, names Assyrian, that is, Parthian, countries.

² *Ante*, p. 499.

³ The long speech of Titus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2, is certainly instructive reading, as Josephus explains in it many important details which he elsewhere does not allude to.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 512.

⁵ *Ante*, p. 583.

⁶ If it is asked how the Romans could

devastate the Ophel on the south of the Temple, as the Temple was still protected on the west by the walls, we must remember that after the first wall had been taken they could get to that hill round the Temple on the east.

⁷ It is to be lamented that here again Josephus has nowhere previously mentioned, still less described in detail, this important fact, which he alludes to vi. 7. 1.

subterranean passages of the Upper City as their final refuge, nevertheless still refused to hear any of the admonitions which Josephus persisted in addressing to them from a distance, but, on the contrary, put to death and plundered everyone who sought in any way to escape.

When, therefore, Titus, on August 20th, ordered new works to be thrown up against the Upper City, the commanders of the Idumeans consulted amongst themselves whether it would not be better to surrender to the Romans, and really sent a deputation to Titus on that account. The inexorable son of Giora succeeded in quickly preventing the execution of the design, punished the commanders with death, and set a stricter watch than ever over the Idumeans; but desertion continued nevertheless to increase, so that Titus commanded that no single deserter should be received, and that those who brought their wives and children with them should be sold. But as soon as the Roman works were finished, which was in eighteen days, on September 7th, and the battering-rams began to play, some of the weaker towers also falling, the most courageous still dared to drive the Romans back, and sought then in several places to break through their wall. They found, however, nowhere the requisite support any more on the part of their own people, and withdrew into the subterranean passages, whilst the Romans scaled the walls on all hands, plundered the almost empty city, murdered all who came across their path, and set fire to the houses: the conflagration lasted till the next day.

As no agreement of any kind had been come to between the conqueror and the conquered, the entire soil, as well as the whole nation, according to the ancient laws of war, was given over entirely to the arbitrary will of the victor, and his indignation was too much provoked to make it probable that he could show any mercy to those whose hostility, to judge from the Zealots, as the heart of the whole movement, seemed likely to cease only with their death. Titus accordingly commanded that the destruction should be fully executed in deadly earnest. Since the destruction of Carthage and Corinth there had not been, at all events in the civilised world of those times, a similar case in Roman history. All the great chief cities of the conquered nations had been left standing and continued to flourish, and amongst them Jerusalem. But, on the other hand, there had not hitherto been such a struggle as this, which in the end really turned upon two fundamentally different religions; and when the essence of the matter was examined, it was not the Roman

State which conquered in this case but heathenism, not Jerusalem and the Temple that were devoted to destruction, but Judeanism in the form which it had been assuming during so many centuries. Titus commanded that the city and the Temple should be laid completely even with the ground, although it was difficult to execute such a command to the letter, and several houses were spared for the Roman garrison. For, in order that the dispersed Judeans might not gather together again on their sacred soil, Titus resolved to construct there a Roman camp, under the command of Terentius Rufus,¹ and, with a view to that object, left the three strongest and finest towers—Hippicus, Phasaël, and Mariamme—with the western city-wall, standing. He found it more difficult to decide what to do with the almost countless number of prisoners, or of people who were otherwise liable to be put to death. He ordered the aged and weak to be at once put to death, and the rest to be temporarily brought together in what was formerly the Women's Court of the Temple. Of the latter, all who could bear arms were forthwith executed, which was made easy for the Romans, inasmuch as the victims became informers against each other, whilst the nobler of them committed suicide, and only the tallest and fairest were spared for the triumphal entry into Rome. Of the rest, those who were upwards of seventeen years of age were put in chains, either for the public forced labours in Egypt,² or for the public theatrical games in all the Roman chief cities. Those under seventeen were sold. But before they were thus separated, many thousands of them died either of hunger or by their own hands. Such a mode of dealing with the conquered was so exceptionally severe, that only a Josephus could as historian pass over it without any display of feeling. The entire nation, as it then was, was really thereby affixed to the cross, as if it had been the most criminal slave, only that there was not wood enough at hand for such wholesale crucifixion; and, above all, the conqueror sought to obtain something—glory, or money, or pleasure perhaps—from the business. Those who were allotted to the public games, were obliged to slay one another as gladiators, or to be torn to pieces by wild beasts. Those who were condemned to the unhealthy forced labours of Egypt were necessarily soon thereby carried off, and suffered, moreover, that disgrace in view of a nation

¹ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 2. 2; *Vita*, § 76.

² The brief phrase τὰ κατ' Ἀιγυπτίον ἔργα, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 2, reminds us of *ergastulum* and *ergastularius*, which, in fact, get thence their Latin name; and it

reminds us also of the similar labours in Sardinia, vol. vi. p. 83. In the Colosseum at Rome, also, many of them may have done similar forced labour.

which had been in early and more recent times separated from Israel by the deepest national repugnance. And all Israelites without distinction were then with one blow made the scorn of the whole world, whilst only a short time before they had supposed that they had a right to rule or to despise that world! The number of prisoners taken during the war was reckoned at ninety-seven thousand; that of those who perished during the siege at eleven hundred thousand, probably with some exaggeration; and a large number of individuals had long before escaped.

The most zealous of all, who could not effect their escape, had fled into the subterranean passages; all that were found there were massacred, but more than two thousand perished in those passages of hunger or by suicide. John, with his brothers, surrendered under the pressure of hunger, and was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. Simon defended himself longer, digging further into his subterranean refuge; but at last he also appeared above ground in disguise, was recognised, and preserved as the principal sacrifice for the triumphal procession into Rome.¹ The end of the other principal leaders is little known.² The cruelties enacted in Jerusalem on a large scale were repeated in the country, in some instances with still greater severity. Josephus, who, when the Romans met with disaster during the siege, was often threatened by them with death as an evil adviser, boasts that he obtained by his entreaties the liberty of many Judeans in Jerusalem, and that in the country he rescued from the cross three men known to him whom he saw crucified amongst many others.³ And although Josephus does not describe worthily the end of his nation as it was then accomplished, even heathens were compelled to applaud the marvellous courage with which the Zealots, when they saw everything lost on the holiest spot of earth, offered themselves voluntarily to be transfixed by the Romans, or joyfully ascended the funeral pyres, or even slew themselves and each other.⁴

Titus himself could then quite safely set out for the magnificent display at his triumph in Rome. To make it as splendid as possible, he had, in accordance with Roman custom, been long preparing, and for that purpose had also spared the lives of two Judean priests, who assisted him in finding the Temple

¹ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 4, vii. 2. 2.

² But it is certain, from the sense of the passage about Judas, the son of Jair, vii. 6. 5, that an important piece of the

narrative of Josephus has been lost.

³ *Vita*, § 75.

⁴ Cassius Dio, lxxvi. 6.

treasures that were still hidden. A certain Jesus, the son of Thebuti, and, a little later, the treasurer at the time of the Temple, Phineas (unworthy of that honoured name), lent themselves for that lamentable service, and drew from their hiding-place two candelabra like those placed in the Temple, as well as tables, mixing bowls, and phials, all well-preserved and of solid gold, the precious Temple veils, and further material for them, the garments of the high-priest, priests' garments, likewise materials for incense, and many other precious things.¹ Spoil of this kind was intended to gratify the eyes of the Romans in the triumphal procession, and partly to be represented on the triumphal arch to be erected.

Titus returned, therefore, to Cæsarea, whence he had moved in the spring; he complied then with an invitation of Agrippa to Cæsarea Philippi,² where he was obliged, while on the sacred soil of Israel, for the first time to sacrifice the vanquished Israelites in gladiatorial shows; and an Agrippa and even a Josephus could be spectators of such scenes! The same horrible sight was repeated immediately afterwards at Berytus, that heathen city upon which the Herods had lavished so much money from the Judean revenues; likewise in other Syrian towns through which he travelled, and in all of which the Judeans had long been so much disliked. It is not difficult to understand that thereby the old national hatred of the Judeans was more stimulated than pity for them; and when Titus was in Antioch he was urgently besought to banish them from that city, or, at all events, to cancel the ancient privileges which they enjoyed there;³ for the strong hatred of them which had been shown them three years before⁴ had not yet abated; and at the beginning of that very year they had been acquitted only by the firmness of the Roman governor of the charge which that Antiochus, who was a renegade from them, had hurled at them, that they had caused a great conflagration which destroyed the finest buildings of the city. But, after long consideration, Titus did not yield to that demand, inasmuch as the Judeans must, after all, reside somewhere; and he also left them their privileges.⁵

On the occasion of the triumph in Rome, which Titus arranged, in company with Vespasian and Domitian, immediately after his return, and which Josephus considers it so important to describe in detail, John and Simon were produced,

¹ *Bell. Jud.* vi. 8. 3.

² See *ante*, p. 548.

³ See vol. v pp. 243 sq.

⁴ See *ante*, p. 510.

⁵ *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 2-4; 5. 2.

with seven hundred handsome young men, and, according to all accounts, Simon only was executed after the ancient Roman custom. It is specially remarkable that the long series of articles taken as spoil was closed with the Law, obviously as a sign that that Law itself had been vanquished and rendered profane; since the entire war, in fact, had become essentially a religious war, and the Romans had taken great pains to destroy the sacred books also.¹ But we do not know whether that Law was the standard copy found, perhaps, in the Temple, as Josephus is silent on the point; he states expressly that the golden candelabra did not correspond to that standing in the Temple.² These spoils from Jerusalem Vespasian caused to be deposited in his new Temple to Pax;³ the Law and the Temple veils only he kept in his own house. Upon the magnificent triumphal arch which was immediately afterwards erected in memory of the victory, and which still stands, some of these articles were represented; and memorial coins of *Julæa Capta* in Greek and Roman characters were struck in large numbers,⁴ but neither Vespasian nor Titus adopted such an epithet of victory as *Judaicus*, manifestly in contempt of the hated nation, which, after it had lost its country, was no longer regarded as properly a nation at all.

How determined Vespasian was to exterminate the Judean commonwealth appears most plainly from the two legal arrangements which he instituted as soon as possible, and put into execution by a new governor, *Liberius Maximus*. The Holy Land, as far as it had been in the possession of the Judeans, and had now come into his hands by right of conquest, he caused to be sold to the highest bidder, proposed thereby, according to his habit, to fill his treasury, and thereby cancelled, as if intentionally, the ancient Mosaic law, that the whole of Canaan should be Jahveh's land.⁵ To eight hundred pensioned soldiers only he allotted, as a new Roman colony,

¹ As Josephus remotely intimates when he says (*Vita*, § 75) that he requested of Titus nothing else than the liberation of certain people and the Sacred Books; the latter, therefore, he rescued whenever he could from Roman hands.

² See further *Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 5 *ad fin.*

³ As we know that that Temple was burnt down under Commodus, it is doubtful whether the so-called gold table of Solomon was brought by the Vandals from Rome to Spain (see vol. iii. p. 319), or, as others maintained, to Carthage

(comp. N. Davis's *Carthage and her Remains*, p. 488).

⁴ These plentiful coins have been often discussed; comp. Eckhel, *Doctr. Numis.* vi. pp. 326, 330; de Sauley's *Numis. Judaïque*, pp. 155 sq.; Fr. Lenormant, *Description des Médailles de Béth.* (1857, p. 199); *Numis. Chronicle*, 1862, p. 114; and Madden's *Jewish Coinage*, pp. 183-96 [2nd ed. pp. 208-229]. Those mentioned above, p. 548, with the inscription *Jud. Navatis*, are not earlier than this period.

⁵ According to *Antiquities*, pp. 177 sq. and *Jos. Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6.

the little town of Emmaus, not far to the west of Jerusalem,¹ to serve also as a protection for the Roman camp at Jerusalem itself. Secondly, he commanded that every Judean should 'bring to the Capitol,' as Josephus puts it, probably from shame, the annual poll-tax which he had formerly paid to the Temple, and which in reality had henceforth to be paid to Jupiter Capitolinus;² by which arrangement the supreme claims of heathenism upon every individual Judean then living were established. The two laws were thus the complement of each other, and made every Judean henceforth dependent on the mercy of heathenism and the Emperor.

But after Jerusalem had fallen there still stood in the south-east the three fortresses above mentioned,³ in which many of the most belligerent Judeans and greatest enemies of the Romans continued their earlier mode of life. It was the task of the legate, Lucilius Bassus, to take them, but their fate varied greatly with their situation and their garrison;⁴ in fact, we can discover in them the three parties into which the whole nation had been divided during the war. The nearest fortress, that undoubtedly occupied by the royal party, that is, the moderate men, Herodium,⁵ soon surrendered. The struggle for Machærus, by the east side of the Dead Sea,⁶ was much more severe, partly on account of the extremely favourable situation of the place for defence, and partly because many of the best soldiers of the party in power had fled thither. The place consisted of the castle in the strict sense and a tolerably large lower city, likewise fortified, in which the remnants of the old inhabitants of the land, of Moabite descent, although having evidently long adopted the Judean faith, had settled, though only as 'strangers,' according to the re-inforced Mosaic law; a remarkable proof of the manner in which it was sought to put the ancient law in force again,⁷ and of what would have become of the world if the Zealots had been victorious.⁸ As a fact the Judeans of pure descent withdrew by themselves into the citadel at the approach of danger, made frequent sallies, and had skirmishes with the Romans, not altogether without success, and would probably have defended themselves

¹ See *ante*, p. 553. With regard to the situation of the place, see further *Jahrbh. d. B. W.*, xi. pp. 181 sq.; *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1866, pp. 438.

² *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6; Cassius Dio, lxxvi. 7; comp. Suet. *Domit.* § 12.

³ *Ante*, p. 572.

⁴ Which Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 1-3, and vii. 8 sq.) relates at length.

When poets like Statius (*Silvæ*, iii. 3. 140) speak of Vespasian's *Idumæus triumphus*, that can be explained from the observations in vol. v. pp. 396 sq.

⁵ See vol. v. p. 135.

⁶ Vol. vi. pp. 199 sq.

⁷ According to the law explained *Antiquities*, pp. 238 sq.

⁸ Comp. *ante*, p. 506.

successfully for a long time if a young man named Eleazar, highly distinguished by his birth and valour, had not been taken prisoner and threatened, by the strategy of the Roman general, with crucifixion before the eyes of the besieged. To prevent that, they all surrendered, on certain conditions, and received permission to retreat. But in those terms the 'strangers' of the lower city were not included; indeed, when these unfortunate people sought to make their escape during the night before the execution of the treaty, they were betrayed to the Romans by the Judeans of pure descent themselves; whereupon the bravest of them fought their way out, but seventeen hundred soldiers were slain and all the women and children were sent into captivity. Thus did these representatives of the Hagiocracy now understand the interpretation and application of the sacred Law! A great number of those who had escaped from Machærus and Jerusalem had retired into an extensive and remote forest; they also were betrayed, and though they defended themselves desperately against the Roman soldiers, and inflicted on them some loss, they were soon all cut down. Amongst the three thousand who thus fell was their noble leader, the priestly Zealot, Judas, the son of Jair,¹ who had escaped from the caves of Jerusalem to end thus.²

There was then left in the whole circuit of the Holy Land but one spot where Judeans collected unsubdued, and which defied the Romans—the fortress of Massada,³ on the south-west side of the same Dead Sea; and, as at the very beginning of the whole movement,⁴ Eleazar, as a relative of the ephemeral king Menahem, the son of Judas the Gaulonite,⁵ and thus doubly the genuine representative of the original Zealots, had retired into this fortress with his Sicarii, so notwithstanding all the vast changes of the interim he had thus far maintained without any alteration his position in it together with his followers. Thus the real end of the long sad tragedy was to be at this place; and the same fire of marvellous zeal which had kindled this entire life-and-death movement of Israel from the very first appearance of that ancestor of Eleazar, the Gaulonite, was destined once more to break out in its last purest flame, that it might even by its very mode of extinction surprise the world. This pinnacle of rock, Massada, had been afresh converted by Herod the

¹ See *ante*, p. 590.

² *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 5. The ἰάρονης ἄρουρος, the position of which Josephus does not mention, is probably meant to be simply יַעֲרָה, i.e. *forest*; comp. Seetzen's *Reisen*, iv. p. 382.

³ On its position see especially Rey's *Voyage dans le Hauran*, pp. 287 sq.; Tristram's *Land of Israel*, pp. 303–315.

⁴ *Ante*, p. 503.

⁵ According to *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 8, but not according to vii. 6. 4.

Great, with great labour and skill, into the strongest citadel, supplied with the most powerful weapons and other stores, and had been made, by utilising its extremely favourable position, into a fortification almost impregnable to ordinary besiegers, with the view of defending himself in it to the last, should the necessity arise. After a century it was still as secure, but only to witness the inevitable end, not of the Herods, who had long sunk so low, but of Judeanism itself. It was Flavius Silva, who, after the death of Bassus, advanced to take it. He perceived perfectly the difficulty of the task; cautiously carried a wall round the entire mass of rock, and on the basis of the nearest opposite rock, *Leuké*, erected, with immense difficulty, his banks for attacking the fortress with his rams. When all this proved of no avail, he caused a great fire to be kindled as near as possible to the wall, which threatened at first to be dangerous to the Romans themselves, but then being driven by the wind against the wall seized upon it in such a way that the assault necessarily succeeded the next day. The garrison of the lofty rock was small, and certain death with all the horrors of the conquest was to be expected at the hands of the Romans; and the genuine Zealots were already bound by oath to prefer death to submitting to the rule of any heathen or other human king. Eleazar accordingly persuaded all his people during that night to kill their wives and children and then themselves, but to burn all their treasures first. The next day the Romans found only nine hundred and sixty dead bodies, whilst but two women with five children hid themselves in caverns and were discovered.¹ The Easter of the year 73,² just seven years from the beginning of the great movement and forty years after Christ's crucifixion, saw this end of the whole tragedy.

Yet Zealotism itself did not therewith cease to ferment in the hearts and brains of many partial or full adherents of the party; and whilst that fire had been quenched in the blood of most of the older generation, it was soon seen to revive in many young men with the most marvellous force. Quenched and smothered outwardly to such an extent that it appeared to be for ever put out, this zeal continued in the inmost heart of the remaining fragment of the ancient nation its devouring fire for

¹ The two speeches of Eleazar, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 6, 7, were, of course, put into their present shape by Josephus; but they serve admirably as illustrations of some of the principal ideas of the Zealots.

² At all events we must adopt this

year if we follow Josephus, as he had spoken of the fourth year of Vespasian (vii. 7. 1) just before the last mention of the month (vii. 9. 1); and, in itself, it is hardly credible that the Romans longer delayed.

some time longer with the more consuming effect. The schism between Zealots and Anti-Zealots was perpetuated wherever Judeans dwelt in considerable numbers, and the indignation which had been forcibly kept under often broke out in remembrance of the last years the more unmanageably against quieter co-religionists or even against individual heathen. It was especially the Judean population in Egypt, which continued to be large, amongst which this deep exasperation raged most violently. Many Judeans were seen in that country to bear the most extreme punishments and sufferings rather than submit to call the Emperor their king. But it was just there also that the turbulent spirit was soon broken by its own immoderation. Some of the more quiet Judeans had been murdered; in these circumstances the Anti-Zealots themselves appealed to the Romans for assistance, and six hundred of the Zealots were seized, to be punished with death; others were fetched from southern Egypt, whither they had fled; but the governor, Lupus, then prohibited also, at the command of the Emperor, the use of the Temple of Onias,¹ lest that sanctuary should perhaps take the place of the Temple of Jerusalem; he deprived it of all its ornaments of every kind, and blocked up the approaches to it. In addition the most despicable displays of passion and mutual denunciation soon played a part. A certain Jonathan, of low rank, revered by many as a thaumaturgist, was first denounced in Cyrene by the richer Judeans to the Roman governor as misleading the people; but, in turn, when his adherents had been sanguinarily dispersed, he accused many of the most respected Judeans of Cyrene, Alexandria, and Rome (amongst whom was Flavius Josephus) of many crimes, procured the ruin of some of them, and was first unmasked in Rome itself by Vespasian, and punished by being burnt to death.² Thus by this means also the zeal which had long degenerated was painfully put down; and the rest of profound exhaustion after all such struggles appeared at last to extend to the still living members of the community of the former people of Israel, as they were now dispersed everywhere far more than they had ever been before.

¹ See vol. v. p. 356.

² The above according to *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10 sq.; *Vita*, § 76. It was probably

then that the high-priest Ismael was beheaded in Cyrene, as is incidentally told us *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 2.

INDEX.

ABD

- Abdias, Ten Books of Apostolic History under his name, 36, 460
- Abennerig, king of a small kingdom south of Adiabene, 403 sq.
- Abgar, king of Edessa, said to have had a correspondence with Christ, 404
- Abia, chief of Arab tribe in Mesopotamia, 406
- Abila, capital of principality of Lysanias, 258, 422
- Abilene, principality of, 359
- Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, tradition regarding siege of Jerusalem, 555
- Acco (Ptolemais) rising of Judeans at, in 66 A.D., 507 sq.
- Aera in Jerusalem, meaning of name, 582
- Acrabatene, district of, 418; military commander of, 529; southern A. haunt of Simon son of Giora, 568
- Adiabene, a Parthian principality, 402 sq. relation to Judeanism, 403 sq.
- Adida, town west of Jerusalem, 554
- Agabus, Christian prophet, 334, 338, 400
- Agapæ of Early Christians, 122
- Agrippa I., his life before he became king, 236 sq.; as Tetrarch, 240 sq.; the part he played in the affair between Caligula and the Judeans, 247; ascends the throne of Herod the Great, 257 sq.; his love of building, 263 sq.; his arbitrary appointment of high-priests, 263; his persecution of the Christians, 267 sq., 270 sq.
- Agrippa II., or the Younger, at the court of Claudius, 273; made Steward of the Temple, &c., and king, 420; his territory increased by Nero, 422; his actions and character, 482
- Alabarch, the nature of his office in Alexandria, 196; held by Alexander, 196; by a Demetrius, 415
- Albinus, Roman Governor of Judea, 426, 458, 479; recalled, 483
- Alexander, the Alabarch, 196; his age, 199; his son Tiberius Alexander, 415
- Alexander, Tiberius, Governor of Judea, 415; Governor of Egypt, 501; fruitless efforts to calm Judeans in Alex-

ANT

- andria, 510; Vespasian seeks his co-operation, 573; in the camp of Titus, 578
- Alexandria, Judeans in, 250 sq.; conflicts with the heathens there, 251 sq., 260 sq., 510; philosophy of, 197 sq.
- Alexas, the elder (Alexander, or Helqia), one of the later Herods, 247; succeeds Silas as prefect of Agrippa's army, 273
- Allegory, its full development by Philo, 219 sq.
- Alurus, site of a Zealots' camp, 570
- Anan (Chanan, Ananus, Annas), his sepulchre, 599
- Anan, the younger, son of former, his order of succession to high-priesthood, 480; a military commander of Jerusalem, 529; seeks to remedy the evils of the time, 531; seeks to check the Zealots, 560 sq.; his murder, 564
- Ananja (Chananja, Ananias), high-priest, 480; his influence, 481; played disgraceful part, 483; his party overthrown, 503 sq.
- Andronicus, one of the 'Seventy,' 131
- Angels, germs of worship of, 383
- Anilai. See *Asinai*.
- Anthedon, Agrippa arrested there, 238
- Antioch in Syria, Christianity there, 189; Barnabas and Paul there, 334 sq., 348 sq., 361; influence of Christians there, 508; outbreak of heathen hatred of Judeans at, 510 sq.
- Antioch in Pisidia, Paul's labours there, 345 sq.
- Antiochus, king of Comagena, influence on Caligula, 243; Josephus's mention of, 259 *note*; contributes to army of Cestius, 511; to the army of Titus, 513, 578, 597
- Antipas, Herod the Great's youngest son, Tetrarch of Galilee, goes to Rome, 241; is deposed by Caligula, 242; his death, 242 *note*
- Antipatris, Schick considers it *Ras-el-'Ain*, 512

ANT

- Antonia (Baris), Castle in Jerusalem, 382 sq.; siege-works of Titus near, 595, 601; taken by Titus, 601; Temple attacked from it, 603
- Aphek, Cestius encamped there, 512
- Aphtha, village, 560
- Apocalypse, its date and aim, 527, 555
- Apollos, the Christian teacher, educated in Alexandria, 389; the first to refer the Logos-doctrine to Christ, 390
- Apostle, double meaning of term, 129 sq.; the chief leaders of the community, 141; Paul as an Apostle, 287 sq., 313 sq.
- Apostles, Book of the Acts of the, its scope and form, 23 sq.; its historical value and sources, 27 sq.; for whom written, 33 sq.; chronology of, 37
- Apostolic Council, 356 sq.
- Aquila, Christian convert and friend of Paul, 377 sq.; Paul accompanies him from Corinth to Ephesus, 381
- Arabia, Judeans in, 300; Paul's retreat into, 327 sq.
- Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, guardian of the sons of Alexander, son of Herod the Great, 236
- Aretas II., Arabian king in possession of Damascus, 328
- Aristobulus, grandson of Herod the Great, 237; on bad terms with his brother Agrippa, 238; endeavoured to assist the Judeans, 247
- Ascalon, Judean rising against heathen at, 507; Judeans plan expedition against, 531
- Ascension of Christ, the narratives of, 78 sq.
- Asinai and Anilai, two Judean brothers in Babylonian, 519; their power and downfall, 520 sq.
- Asochis, town north of Sepphoris, 540
- Athens, Paul at, 373 sq.
- Aziz, king of Emessa, 266, 422
- Babylon = Rome in First Epistle of Peter and Early Christian usage, 464
- Babylonian Judeans in the first century of our era, 519 sq.
- Banns, anchorite, exaggeration of the Baptist's tendencies, 532
- Baptism in the Early Church, 134; over graves, 138
- Bargiras. See *Simon son of Giora*
- Baris. See *Antonia*
- Barnabas, the Levite, as Christian, 133; sent to Antioch by the parent Church, 189; introduces Paul to Peter, 331; visits Paul at Tarsus, 324; deputy to Jerusalem, 336; sent to the heathen with Paul, 338 sq.; in Jerusalem again, 355; separation from Paul, 363
- Barsabas, surnamed Judas, 143; chosen

CHIO

- Apostle with Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, 361
- Bethanabris, place north of the passage of the Jordan, 552
- Bethchoron, north-west of Jerusalem, 417; Cestius at, 512
- Bethel, small town, 572
- Bethgabra, in Idumea, 554
- Bethjeshimoth, 553
- Bethso, in Jerusalem, 581
- Berenice, Agrippa's mother, 237
- Berenice, sister of Agrippa II., 421; at Cæsarea, 441; at Jerusalem, 497
- Bereæ, in Macedonia, Paul at, 372 sq.
- Bessara, near Gaba, 538
- Beyrout, Agrippa I.'s buildings, &c. at, 263; residence of Agrippa II., 482; Titus gave gladiatorial games at, 611
- Bishop, James the Brother of the Lord, the first, 171
- Brotherhood, Christian, 117
- Cabbala. See *Qabbala*
- Cæsarea on the Sea, contention between Judeans and heathens at, 423 sq., 495 sq., 506
- Cæsarea Philippi, distinguished by Agrippa as Tetrarch, 241; capital of Agrippa II., 420; his minister Philip there, 509
- Caiaphas, high-priest, persecutes the apostles, 151 sq.
- Caius Caligula, his relations with Herod Agrippa I., 239 sq.; his follies towards Jerusalem, 243 sq.; towards Judeans of Alexandria, 250 sq.
- Candace, queen of Ethiopia, frequency of name, 183
- Capernaum, Josephus at, 542
- Capharabin, fortified town, 573
- Caphartheramim, small town in southern Idumea, 572
- Caphartoba in Idumea, 554
- Capito. See *Hercennius*
- Cephas-party. See *Peter*
- Cestius Gallus, Syrian governor at Jerusalem, 495; appealed to at beginning of revolt of Judeans, 501; his attack upon Jerusalem and defeat, 511 sq.; his successor, 542
- Chalcis, principality of, near northern Lebanon, 259; conferred on Agrippa II., 420
- Chaldean philosophy, astrology, and divination, 200; Philo's relation to, 210; expulsion of its professors from Rome, 364
- Chananja. See *Ananias*
- Chaos, idea of in Philo's system, 213 sq.
- Charismata of the Early church, 113 sq.
- Charran = Kardôn, in the Kurdistan mountains, 404
- Chobolo (Kabul), situation of, 540

CHR

Christ, the name displaces that of Je-us, 9; his glorification, 7 sq.; his resurrection, its significance, 45 sq.; its necessity, 49 sq.; the creation of the Church, 53; the various accounts of, 56 sq.; his mother and brothers, 127; 'Christ-party' in the Apostolic Age, 383 sq.; false imitators of (pseudo-Christ), rise of, 87 sq.:—Simon Magus, 180; Theudas, 414; a Judean of Egypt, 423; one who gave trouble to Festus, 426

Christianity, characteristics after Christ's death, 1 sq.; certainty of its victory, 12 sq.; difficulties in its way, 18 sq.; its adherence to the Ancient Community at the end of the Apostolic age, 524 sq.; and its severance therefrom, 472 sq.

Christians, the name of, 334; other names of, 334

Christophanies and Theophanies, 73

Chronology of Apostolic Age, 37 sq., 242

Church, its existence and power generally after Christ's death, 105 sq., 147 sq.; its labours and practices, 112 sq.; its members and constitution, 126 sq.; its spread, 132 sq., 149 sq.; dissolution of the primitive Church and formation of a new parent Church, 164-173; admittance of the heathen to, 174 sq.

Church fellowship, 115 sq.

Circumcision, whether necessary in the Christian Church, 353 sq.; Peter dispensed with it, 356; insisted on again by Pharisaic party, 383; though afterwards abandoned, 388

Claudius Cesar, his relation to Herod Agrippa, 257 sq.; his favour towards the Jews, 259 sq., 413; his dislike of Christians, 261, 364

Clementine Homilies, 35, 460

Clópas (Cleopas, Cleopater), one of the 'Seventy,' 431

Coins of Cesarea Philippi, 241; of Mescæ, 403; of Damascene Arctas, 327; of Agrippa I., 264 sq., 421 sq.; of the liberated Jerusalem, 529 sq.; of *Judea Capta*, 612; of Mucianus, 573

Community of goods in Christian Church, 115 sq.

Constitutiones Apostolicae, 36, 460

Corea, in north of Judea, 554

Corinth, Paul's first stay at 377-380; his second visit, 394; Paul's First Epistle to, 394; his Second Epistle, 397; lost Epistle to, 393

Costobar, late member of Herodean family, 483, 503, 515

Crucifixion, commanded by Titus, 596

Ctesiphon, Jews seek refuge there, 523

Cumanus, Roman Governor, 415 sq.

Cypriote Jews, 342 sq.

FAM

Cyprus, fortress of, 510

Cyprus, wife of Agrippa, 237

Cyrene, Jews there, 616

Damascus, as an Arabian city, 327 sq.; prevalence of Judaism in, 407 sq.; the Jews massacred there, 514

Deacons, the first seven, 144

Debarija, village of, 538

Decapolis, parties in, under Josephus, 533; volunteers from, against Vespasian, 548

'Decree' of the parent Church at Jerusalem, 355 sq.

Demoniacs, cured by Paul, 391

Derbe, Paul at, 348; return to, 350

Diaspora, the Judean and Christian, 305; 'Twelve Tribes' in, 360

Dio Cassius on Jewish War, 491

Discipline in the Church, 139 sq.

Dora, maritime town in Southern Galilee, 262

Dreams of Josephus, 547

Drusilla, daughter of Agrippa I., wife of Felix, 421 sq.

Elders (presbyters), the, in the early church, 146; as sharing the duties of the Twelve, 166 sq.

Eleazar, captain of Temple-guard and rebel, 482, 503, 505, 529

Eleazar, son of Simon, priest and leader, 529, 574

Elymas, Bar-Jesu, Judean magician, 342 sq.

Emmaus, 'the warm baths,' south of Tiberias, 550

Emmaus, west of Jerusalem, 553

Ephesus, Paul's stay in, 388 sq.; his last words to elders of church at, 399 sq.

Ephraim, small town, 572

Epistles, Paul the originator of this form of Christian literature, 321 sq.

Essenes, gate of, in Jerusalem, 581

Essenes in Christian Church, 382 sq.; Essenes, allies of Zealots, 500; John the Essene, 530

Ethnarch, Judean, at Damascus, 328

Eusebius, his Ecclesiastical History, value and defects of, 36

Evangelists, the, in the Early Church, 113, 146

Excommunication in the Christian Church, 139

Fadus, Roman Governor, 412 sq.

Faith, Christian, 82 sq.; in Paul's case, 290 sq.; in Epistle of James, 453 sq.

Famines in the time of Claudius, 335

FEA

Feasts, see *Xylophory*
Felice, against Paul's life, 436; against Roman Government, 425 sq.; its members at Massada, 502, 504, 567 sq.
 Felix, Roman Governor, 416 sq., 437 sq.
 Festus, Porcius, Roman Governor, 424 sq.
 Flaccus, Avilius, Egyptian Governor, 251
 Flaccus, Syrian Governor, 238
 Florus, Gessius, 483
 Food, laws concerning, in Christian Church, 187 sq., 357 sq., 383 sq., 432, 466, 475; amongst Judeans, 506, 536
 Gabara (Gaboroth), in centre of Galilee, 538, 541, *note*
 Gabath (Gabatha), fortress of, 507
 Gadara, in north-eastern Palestine, 507
 Galatians as Christians, 306 sq., 387 sq.
 Galileans, earliest Christians, 129 sq., 132
 Gallio, Proconsul, Paul before, 379 sq.
 Gamala, important place on east of Lake of Galilee, 509, 537, 541; siege of, 550 sq.
 Gamaliel I., account of, in Talmud, 193 sq.; sayings of, in *Pirqa Aboth*, 539
 Garsis (perhaps Paris), 543, 597
 Gath, see *Gittôn*
 Gerizim, Samaritans assume threatening position to Romans on, 547
 Gaulon (Gôlân), town and district, 507
 Gaza, demolished, 507
 Gazer, Gezara, 554
 Genath, or Garden Gate, in Jerusalem, 583
 Genethliology, see *Chaldean Philosophy*
 Gentiles, see *Heathen*
 Gerasa, 507
 Gibeá (Gabath) of Saul, 589
 Gibeon (Gabao), place six miles from Jerusalem, 512
 Ginea, Samaritan village, 418
 Giskhala, Fortress of, 535 sq.
 Gittôn, native place of Simon Magus, 179
 Gnosis, first signs of, 182; Philo the originator of, 211 sq., 218
 Goetes. See *Christ*
 Golgotha and the sepulchre of Christ, sepulchres described in Tobler's work on, 62; Church of the Holy Sepulchre not on site of Christ's sepulchre, 62, 584
 Governors, Roman, of Judea, Council of, 246; the successor of Pilate, 240; after Agrippa I.'s death, 273, 409 sq., 483 sq.
 Grapte, Princess of Adiabene, built a royal palace in Jerusalem, 405, 571
 Greek Philosophy. See *Philo*
 Hagiocracy, its attitude towards the Apostles and Christians generally, 149

ISM

sq., 155, sq.; under Agrippa I., 268 sq.; towards Paul, 364, 433
 Hands, imposition of, in Christian Church, 135, sq.
 Healing, works of, performed by the apostles, 113 sq.; by Paul at Ephesus, 391
 Heathen, Christianity taken to them, 175 sq.; the difficulties in the way of that, 189 sq.; the earlier facilities preparing for their admission, 299; controversy connected therewith, 351-360; its new and increased violence, 382 sq.
 Heathen-Christians, Cornelius, 187 sq.; churches of, in Cyprus and Asia Minor, 351 sq.; admonitions to, in Epistle to Hebrews, 474 sq.
 Heathen princes, sacrifices for, in the Temple, 309; abolished by Zealots, 502; relation of Christians to heathen governments, 462 sq., 467 sq.; heathen princes converted to Judaism, 407
 Hebrews, Epistle to the, its origin, subject-matter, plan, and value, 476 sq.
 Hegsippus, first after Luke to write history of Early Church, 35; account of James, the Lord's Brother, by, 170
 Helena, queen of Adiabene, converted to Judaism, 403 sq.; her palace, &c. in Jerusalem, 405
 Hellenists as Christians, 133 sq., 157; Hellenistic culture, 197 sq.
 Herennius Capito, Roman Governor of Jamnia, 239, 245
 Herod, king of Chalcis, 259, 273; Steward of the Temple, 413 sq.; his death, 420
 Herodians, party of, 261.
 Herodias, wife of Antipas, her ambition and defeat, 241 sq.
 Herodium, fortress of, 572, 613
 Herods, the younger, 236 sq.; the last, see *Costobar* and *Saul*. Three who side with the national cause, 560
 Hesbon, Sebonitis, 507
 High-priests, twenty-eight between 37 B.C. and 70 A.D., 43, 480; arbitrarily appointed by Agrippa I., 263; jealousy in families of, 480; custody of festal attire, 413
 Hippios, in north-eastern Palestine, 507
 Idolatry, image-worship, Caligula's statue, 245 sq.; Josephus destroys Tetrarch's palace at Tiberias on account of animal figures, 534
 Idumeans take part in war against Rome, 563 sq.; relations to Simon, son of Giora, 569; in the defence of Jerusalem, 592; seek to surrender to Titus, 607
 Ismael, high priest, 602, 616

ISR

Israel. See *Judeans*
 Iturea, country of Sohemus, 328
 Izates, king of Adiabene, converted to
 Judeanism, 403 sq.
 Jabne. See *Jamnia*
 James, son of Zebedee, martyrdom, 269
 James, the Lord's Brother, the chief elder
 of the parent Church, 167; his ascetic
 habits, 169; as the first bishop, 171;
 Epistle of, 450 sq.
 Jamnia. Agrippa arrested at, by Governor
 of, 228 sq.; Caligula's statue there, 244
 sq.; Vespasian's troops there, 552
 Japha, south-west of Nazareth, 549, 544
 Japho (Joppa), Peter there, 185; Cestius
 seeks to secure it, 512; Judeans re-
 settle there, 548
 Jerusalem, attacked by Cestius, 497 sq.;
 as occupied by the parties of Zealots
 just before the siege of Titus, 575 sq.;
 the city as described by Josephus, 580
 sq.; its defence and capture, 588 sq.
 Jesus, son of Gamala, leader of the
 moderate party, 561 sq.; slain, 564
 Jewish Christians, 361 sq., 383 sq.; in
 Epistle of James, 450
 John, the Apostle, near the Cross, 47;
 his account of the Resurrection, 47, 50,
 68 sq.
 John, the presbyter, author of the Apoca-
 lypse, 527
 John of Giskhala, 535 sq., 554 sq.; the
 head of the Learned Zealots, 562 sq.;
 puts down the Priestly Zealots, 590;
 his most important military feat, 597;
 his end, 609 sq.
 Joseph, son of Gorion, commander of
 Jerusalem, 529
 Josephus, Flavius, his History of the
 Jewish War, 492 sq.; his early life,
 531 sq.; governor of Galilee, 533;
 adviser and assistant of Vespasian,
 573; in the camp of Titus, 578; seeks
 to persuade his countrymen to sur-
 render, 595; his superstition, 605;
 intercedes for some of his people, 610
 Joseph, one of the 'Seventy,' 131; not
 identical with Barnabas, *ibid.*, note
 Josippon, Jewish reproduction of Jose-
 phus' history, 494
 Jotapata, fortress of, 543
 Judas, the Gaulonite, his sons, 415, 504,
 614
 Judeans in Arabia, 300. See *Parthia*,
Christians, *Samarita*
 Julia (Livia), 239 (see *Corrigenda*)
 Julius, north of Dead Sea, 553
 Julius, town of, in north-east corner of
 Lake of Galilee, 541
 Junias, one of the 'Seventy,' 131
 Justus, son of Pistus, opponent of Jose-
 phus, 534, 541

MAR

Kabul. See *Chobolo*
 Kalesh (Kodasa), on frontier of Tyre, 507,
 551
 Karduehian mountains, residence of
 Izates there, 404
 Kenedeus, relative of Monobazos, 406
 Law, the ancient, in the view of Paul
 and of the Pharisaic Christians, 381 sq.,
 428 sq.; copy of, amongst spoils of the
 Temple at Rome, 611
 Leftef, perhaps at present Nettif, 554
 Leprosy, imitation of sacrifice for, 496
 Levi, son of Alphaeus, one of the 'Seventy,'
 131
 Levites, their rivalry of the Priests, 481,
 484; as Christians, 132
 Libertini, synagogue of, 157
 Literature, epistolary, in the Early
 Church, 320 sq.; historical, 34 sq.
 Logos and Logoi, in Philo's writings,
 209 sq., in Epistle to the Hebrews,
 477; term applied to Christ by Apollos,
 390; whether used by Paul, 298
 Longinus, Roman tribune, 513, 594
 Lord's Day. See *Sunday*
 Lord's Supper, origin and significance,
 118 sq.; evil reports arising from its
 celebration at night, 399
 Luke, author of Acts of the Apostles, 23
 sq.; as companion of Paul, 28 sq., 442
 sq.
 Lupus, Egyptian Governor, prohibits use
 of Temple of Onias, 616
 Lyeaonia, dialect of, 349
 Lydda, town of, in plain of Sharon, 184
 sq.; Quadratus there, 419; Cestius
 there, 512; subjugated by Vespasian,
 553
 Lysanias, Prince of Abilene, 258, 420
note 7
 Lystra, town of, Paul at, 348
 Maccabees, Fourth Book of, 485
 Machærus, fortress of, 572, 613
 Magicians, 317 sq.; 391 sq.
 Malatha, castle of Agrippa I. in Idumea,
 237
 Malehus, Arab king, 543
 Manaen (Manahem), distinguished Chris-
 tian, 338
 Manahem, ephemeral Zealot king, son of
 Judas the Gaulonite, 504 sq.
 Mark, John, the Evangelist, previous
 history, 336; companion of Paul and
 Barnabas, 337; deserts Paul, 344;
 Paul declines to take him second
 time, 363; partial martyr, 479
 Marsus, Syrian Governor, watches Agrippa
 I., 265
 Martyrologium, the earliest, 163

MAR

- Martyrs, the first Christian, 163 sq. See *Persecutions*
- Marullus, Roman Governor, 240
- Mary, the Mother of Christ. See *Christ*
- Massada, fortress of 572, 813
- Matthias, last high-priest, 571; executed by Simon, 600
- Matthias, the Apostle, his election, 143
- Mesene (Maishon). See *Spasinû-Charax*
- Messiahs, Pseudo. See *Christ*
- Messianic hope of the Jews at the end of the Apostolic Age, 546 sq., 579; of the Christians, see *Parousia*
- Middoth, Talmudic tract, descriptions of Temple in, 585, 587
- Miracles in Acts of Apostles, 32, 150 sq. See *Healing, Demoniacs*
- Monobazos, king of Adiabene, convert to Judeanism, 404 sq.
- Muratorian Fragment on Canon of N. T., reference to Theophilus there, 33
- Mysteries, Judean, references to in Philo, 224
- Nabateans, a certain Nabateus belonging to, 598
- Nahardea, centre of Jews in Babylonia, 522 sq.
- Nain or Main, in the extreme south of Palestine, 569
- Nablata, sixty furlongs from Caesarea, 496
- Nazirite, James, the Lord's Brother, a, 169
- Nero, his awe of everything Oriental, 408; his persecution of the Christians, 466 sq.
- Neronias. See *Caesarea Philippi*
- Nisibis, Judean centre in Mesopotamia, 523
- Numbers, mystic meanings of, in Philo, 207, 210 sq.
- Oaths, avoidance of, in Epistle of James, 452
- Oblias, surname of James, the Lord's Brother, 170 sq.
- Oil, restorative means in Early Church, 452
- Omens, evil, 516, 564
- Onias, Temple of, 616
- Ophel, or Ophla, hill in Jerusalem, 581
- Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, 86
- Parousia, the presence of the glorified Christ, 84; expected near the Holy City, 190 sq.; disappointment at delay of, 85, 382, 475
- Parthian Empire in first century of Christian era, 517 sq.; Jews there, 518 sq.; latter decline to help fellow-religionists against Rome, 579
- Paul, his extraction and youth, 276 sq.; whether he ever saw Christ in the

PIL

- flesh, 58, 278 sq.; his conversion, 281 sq.; his view of Christianity, 289 sq.; his personal vocation, 298 sq.; as an Apostle, 313 sq.; whether other Apostles to the heathen preceded him, 323 sq.; his greatness as a writer of Epistles, 320 sq.; his labours previous to the Council at Jerusalem, 325 sq.; his action at it and immediately afterwards, 351 sq.; his second great missionary journey, 361 sq.; his altered position in his third journey, 381 sq.; the crisis of his history in determining to visit Jerusalem again, 427 sq.; his fortunes until his arrival at Rome, 432 sq.; his stay there, 445 sq.; his end and lasting greatness, 470 sq.
- Pella, rising of Jews at, 507; flight of Christians to, 526
- Pentecost. See *Whitsunday*
- Persecutions of the Early Church, 164 sq.; in Jerusalem under Agrippa I., 269; under Claudius in year 52, 364; of Nero, 466 sq.
- Peter, Simon, his relation to Simon Magus, 181 sq.; baptises Cornelius, 185 sq.; his relations to Paul at the Council of Apostles, 356 sq.; at Antioch, 362 sq.; to the 'Christ' party, 383 sq.; the general course of his later years, 459 sq.; his Epistle, 462 sq.; his martyrdom, 468 sq.
- Pharan, valley of, 569
- Pharisaic party in Christian Church, 351 sq., 381 sq., 449 sq.
- Philadelphia, 412, 507
- Philip, son of Jaicin, military commander, 503, 509
- Philip, the Evangelist, one of the Seven Deacons, 178 sq.; baptises the Ethiopian eunuch, 183 sq.; at Caesarea with his four daughters, 400
- Philippi, Paul at, 368 sq.
- Philo, the Alexandrine, his family and early history, 194 sq.; his love of philosophy and religion, 107 sq.; his language and style, 201; his studies and doctrinal system, 202 sq.; his position with regard to the Scriptures, 203; the sources of his philosophy, 209 sq.; the doctrines of his system, 211 sq.; his disastrous use of allegory, 219 sq.; the order of his works, 221 sq.; the Messianic element in his writings, 231 sq.
- Philosophy of Judeanism, 191 sq.
- Phineas, Treasurer of the Temple, 611
- Phocylides' poem, 307 sq., 311
- Pilate, Pontius, Roman Governor, in Rome, 240; legend regarding, 274
- Pilgrimages to Jerusalem, number of persons making, 579

PLA

Platonic philosophy in Philo, 201 sq., 213 sq.
 Politarchs of Thessalonica, 372
 Pompey's Camp, 599
 Poppea, wife of Nero, when raised to that position, 240; 'religious' and inclined to Judaism, 408; Josephus introduced to her at Rome, 532
 Prayer, three times a day, 126
 Priests, seek to persuade the people to make peace with Florus, 497; as Zealots, 574 sq. See *Levites* and *High-priest*
 Prophets in Christian Church, 140 sq. See *Agabus* and *Philip*
 Proselytes, classes of and conditions of admission to privileges of Israel, 310 sq.
 Rosenche, 'house of prayer,' 308; at Philippi, 368
 Ptolemæis. See *Ac'o*
 Purifications, 536 sq.

Qabbala, continuation of Philo's system, 218
 Quadratus, Ummidius, Syrian Governor, 419 sq.

Religion, the Christian, its nature and establishment, 84 sq., 138 sq.
 Roman citizenship, possessed by Paul, 277; by Silas, 361; exempting from crucifixion, 497
 Romans, Paul's Epistle to the, 398
 Rome. See *Paul* and *Peter*
 Rufus, Terentius, his camp at Jerusalem, 608

Sabbath, requirement to work on, 198 sq.; Judeans fight on, 505, 512, 519 sq.
 Sacrifices for the Cæsars in the Temple, 307 sq., 502; of the Christians, 118 sq.; the daily, 411; during the siege of Jerusalem, 602
 Sadducees in relation to first Apostles, 152 sq.; to Paul, 435 sq.
 Samaria (Sebaste), Christianity carried thither, 179; rising of inhabitants, 507; Vespasian sends forces against, 517
 Σαμάρῖται of the Persian Shâhnâmeh, 404
 Samsigeramus, king of Emessa, 266
 Sanhedrin in the Zealots' State, 529
 Saul, late member of Herodean family, 483, 503, 515
 Seeva, high-priest, 392
 Scopus, hill north of Jerusalem, Cestius encamps there, 513; Titus, 589, 591
 Scriptures, Sacred, how regarded and in-

SUN

terpreted by Philo, 202 sq.; penalty for their desecration, 417; interpretation of, amongst Christians, 159 sq.
 Scythopolis (Bethsean), 507 sq.
 Sebaste. See *Samara*
 Seleucia in Parthia, Jews seek refuge there, 523
 Seleucia on the Lake of Merom, 539, 550
 Sepphoris opens gates to Romans, 512; strong Roman feeling, 533 sq.; Josephus there, 537
 Seventy, Disciples of Christ, who they were, 131
 Sicarii, the Scourge of, 424 sq. See *Ethna*
 Sichem (Neapolis), 551
 Silas, prefect of Agrippa I.'s army, 267; succeeded by Alexas, 273
 Silas (Silvanus), companion of Paul, 361, 364; leaves the Apostle, 387; assists Peter in composition of his Epistle, 464
 Siloah, south of Jerusalem, 501
 Simai, the son of Gamaliel, 194; John of Giskhala sent to, 539; a leader of the moderate party, 561 sq.
 Simon. See *Peter*
 Simon Magus, character and motives of, 179 sq.; relations to Simon Peter, 181 sq.
 Simon, a model Zealot, 194
 Simon, the son of Giora, 512, 531; head of the popular Zealots, 568 sq.; received into Jerusalem, 571 sq.; as leader of the defence of the city, 590 sq.; his end, 610 sq.
 Simon, son of the high-priest Ananias, 503
 Sidon, influence of Christians there, 508 sq.
 Sergius Paulus, Proconsul of Crete, 312
 Sogane, in Gaulonitis, 539, 550
 Sohem (Sohemus), contributes forces to Cestius, 511
 Solyme in Gaulonitis, 539
 Sources of history of Apostolic Age, 23 sq.
 Spasinus Charax, chief city and kingdom south of Adiabene, 403
 Spirit, The Holy, coming of, 91 sq., 107 sq.; communication of, 135 sq.
 Stephen, Protomartyr, one of Seven Deacons, 145; his contention with the people, 157; Luke's account of his defence, 159 sq.; his martyrdom and its effects, 162 sq.
 Strato's Tower, subsequently Caesarea, 423
 Sunday, the Christian, 90; origin of, 125 sq.; difference between Paul and Pharisaic Party concerning, 388

SYN

- Synagogues, rise and multiplicity of, 307 sq. See *Libertini*
- Taricheæ (Kerak), given to Agrippa by Nero, 422; Josephus flees to, 537; populace suspects Josephus, 538, volunteers collect at against, Vespasian, 548; horrors at its capture, 549
- Tarsus, Paul's birth-place, 276 sq., 327
- Taxes, in Jerusalem, under Agrippa I., 262; refused by Zealots, 500, 502; due to the Capitol, 612
- Teachers, their office in the Church, 319
- Temple, finished according to Herod's plan, 485; general plan of, 585 sq.; its destruction, 601 sq.
- Temple-tax, 523
- Temple-guard, 151; Ananus a captain of, 419; another captain, 482
- Thaumaturgists. See *Magicians*
- Thekoa, besieged by Simon, 569
- Theophilus. Luke's friend, 33
- Thessalonians. Second Epistle to the, 373; First Epistle to, 378
- Thessalonica, Paul at, 371 sq.
- Theudas, Pseudo-Messiah, 414
- Tiberias, growth of, 265 sq.; given to Agrippa II., 422; indignant at that, 533; Josephus's escape from, 537; Vespasian enters, 548
- Tiberius, legend about in Tertullian, 274
- Tigranes, Armenian kings descended from Herod, 237, 407
- Timotheus, his youth and conversion, 365 sq.; with Paul on his third journey, 387 sq.; imprisoned, 471
- Titus, Paul's friend and disciple, 345
- Titus, Vespasian's son, fetches two legions from Egypt to Palestine, 542 sq.; intercedes with his father for Josephus, 547; takes Gamala and Taricheæ, 548 sq.; sails for Alexandria, 574; besieges Jerusalem, 577 sq.; reverses sustained by him, 588 sq.; energetic prosecution of the siege, 589 sq.; his fierce exasperation at the obstinacy of the besieged, 596 sq.; his wall round Jerusalem, 598 sq.; at the taking of the Temple, 603 sq.; his action after the victory, 607 sq.
- Thomas the Apostle, at the Resurrection, 69 sq.

ZEA

- Tongues, gift of, 94 sq.
- Tradition of the Elders in Philo's works, 210
- Trophimus, Ephesian friend of Paul's, 397, 433
- Tyropeæon Ravine in Jerusalem, 581 sq.
- Varus, Agrippa's II.'s representative, 328, 509
- Varus, probably brother of Lysanias, 420 sq.
- Vespasian, arrives at Tyre, 542; in Galilee, 543 sq.; in the South of Palestine, 552 sq.; at the Gates of Jerusalem, 572 sq.; leaves Palestine, 573 sq.; his measures for exterminating the Judean State, 612
- Virtues, the Four Grecian, in Philo's system, 218, 227
- Vitellius, Syrian Governor, 327
- Vologeses, Parthian king, in war with Izates, 406
- Vow, Nazirite, Paul's action with regard to, 432
- War, Jewish. See *Josephus, Jerusalem*
- War, service in, dispensation of Judeans from, 508
- Water, flowing, near the Synagogues, 303; water and wine at the Lord's Supper, according to Justin Martyr, origin of idea, 124
- Whitsunday, the first, 88 sq.
- Wisdom, relation to the Logos in Philo's system, 216 sq.
- Word of God. See *Logos*
- Works. See *Christian Faith*
- Xylophory, Judean festival, 503
- 'Zabulon, the Men of,' 511
- Zealots, and Zealots of the Law, Simon son of Gamaliel model of, 194; Paul one of them, 280; rapid ascendancy of, towards end of Apostolic Age, 488 sq.; as conspirators, 499 sq.; the party of learned Zealots, 559 sq.; their degeneracy, 567; the rise of the popular Zealots, 568 sq.; of the priestly Zealots, 574 sq.; their massacre, 590; the end of Zealotism, 614 sq.

END OF THE SEVENTH VOLUME.

A CATALOGUE OF WORKS IN GENERAL LITERATURE & SCIENCE

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Classified Index.

AGRICULTURE, HORSES, DOGS, and CATTLE.

<i>Burton's My Home Farm</i>	7
<i>Dog (The)</i> , by Stonehenge	21
<i>Fitzzygram's Horses and Stables</i>	10
<i>Greyhound (The)</i> , by Stonehenge	21
<i>Horses and Roads</i> , by Free-Lance	12
<i>London's Encyclopædia of Agriculture</i>	14
<i>Lloyd's The Science of Agriculture</i>	14
<i>Miles' (H. H.) Works on Horses and Stables</i> ..	16
<i>Neville's Farms and Farming</i>	13
— <i>Horses and Riding</i>	18
<i>Scott's Rents and Purchases</i>	20
<i>Steel's Diseases of the Ox</i>	21
<i>Ville's Artificial Manures</i>	23
<i>Youatt on the Dog</i>	24
— <i>Horse</i>	24

ANATOMY and PHYSIOLOGY.

<i>Ashby's Notes on Physiology</i>	5
<i>Buckton's Health in the House</i>	7
<i>Cooke's Tablets of Anatomy and Physiology</i> ..	8
<i>Gray's Anatomy, Descriptive and Surgical</i> ..	11
<i>Macalister's Vertebrate Animals</i>	15
<i>Owen's Comparative Anatomy and Physiology</i> ..	18
— <i>Experimental Physiology</i>	18
<i>Quain's Elements of Anatomy</i>	19
<i>Smith's Operative Surgery on the Dead Body</i> ..	21

ASTRONOMY.

<i>Ball's Elements of Astronomy</i>	22
<i>Herschel's Outlines of Astronomy</i>	12
'Knowledge' Library (The)	19
<i>Proctor's (R. A.) Works</i>	19
<i>Neison's The Moon</i>	18
<i>Webb's Celestial Objects for Common Telescopes</i>	23

BIOGRAPHY, REMINISCENCES, LETTERS, &c.

<i>Bacon's Letters and Life</i>	5
<i>Bagshot's Biographical Studies</i>	5
<i>Caryle's (T.) Life</i> , by James A. Froude	7
— <i>Reminiscences</i>	7
— <i>(Mrs.) Letters and Memorials</i>	7
<i>Cates' Dictionary of General Biography</i>	7
<i>Fox (C. J.), Early History of</i> , by G. O. Trevelyan	10
<i>Hamilton's (Sir W. R.) Life</i> , by R. P. Graves ..	11
<i>Havelock's Memoirs</i> , by J. C. Marshman	11
<i>Macaulay's Life and Letters</i> , by G. O. Trevelyan	15
<i>Malmesbury's Memoirs</i>	16
<i>Maunder's Biographical Treasury</i>	16
<i>Mendelssohn's Letters</i>	16
<i>Mill (James), a Biography</i> , by A. Bain	6
<i>Mill (John Stuart), a Criticism</i> , by A. Bain ..	6
<i>Mill's (J. S.) Autobiography</i>	17
<i>Mosley's Reminiscences</i>	17
<i>Müller's (Max) Biographical Essays</i>	18
<i>Newman's Apologia pro Vita Sua</i>	18
<i>Pastour's Life and Labours</i>	13
<i>Shakespeare's Life</i> , by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps	21
<i>Skobelev and the Slavonic Cause</i>	21
<i>Southey's Correspondence with Caroline Bowles</i>	21
<i>Stephen's Ecclesiastical Biography</i>	21
<i>Wellington's Life</i> , by G. R. Gleig	23

BOTANY and GARDENING.

<i>Allen's Flowers and their Pedigrees</i>	4
<i>De Caisne & Le Maout's Botany</i>	8
<i>Lindley's Treasury of Botany</i>	14
<i>London's Encyclopædia of Gardening</i>	14
— <i>Encyclopædia of Plants</i>	14

BOTANY and GARDENING—continued.

<i>Milner's Country Pleasures</i>	17
<i>Rivers' Orchard-House</i>	20
— <i>Rose Amateur's Guide</i>	20
<i>Thomé's Botany</i>	22

CHEMISTRY.

<i>Armstrong's Organic Chemistry</i>	22
<i>Kolbe's Inorganic Chemistry</i>	13
<i>Miller's Elements of Chemistry</i>	17
— <i>Inorganic Chemistry</i>	17
<i>Payen's Industrial Chemistry</i>	18
<i>Thorpe & Muir's Qualitative Analysis</i>	22
— <i>Quantitative Analysis</i>	22
<i>Tilden's Chemical Philosophy</i>	22
<i>Watts' Dictionary of Chemistry</i>	23

CLASSICAL LANGUAGES,

LITERATURE, and ANTIQUITIES.

<i>Aristophanes' The Acharnians</i> , translated	5
<i>Aristotle's Works</i>	5
<i>Becker's Charicles</i>	6
— <i>Gallus</i>	6
<i>Cicero's Correspondence</i> , by Tyrrell	7
<i>Lioner's Iliad</i> , translated by Cayley	12
— <i>Green</i>	12
<i>Horace's Works</i> , edited by Yonge	12
<i>Hort's The New Pantheon</i>	12
<i>Mahaffy's Classical Greek Literature</i>	16
<i>Perry's Greek and Roman Sculpture</i>	19
<i>Plato's Parmenides</i> , by Maguire	19
<i>Rich's Dictionary of Antiquities</i>	20
<i>Simcox's History of Latin Literature</i>	21
<i>Sophocles' Works</i>	21
<i>Virgil's Ænid</i> , translated by Conington	8
— <i>Poems</i>	8
— <i>Works</i> , with Notes by Kennedy	23
<i>Witt's Myths of Hellas</i>	23
— <i>The Trojan War</i>	23

COOKERY, DOMESTIC ECONOMY, &c.

<i>Acton's Modern Cookery</i>	4
<i>Buckton's Food and Home Cookery</i>	7
<i>Miller's Readings in Social Economy</i>	17
<i>Keece's Cookery and Housekeeping</i>	20

ENCYCLOPÆDIAS, DICTIONARIES, and BOOKS of REFERENCE.

<i>Ayre's Bible Treasury</i>	5
<i>Blackley's German Dictionary</i>	6
<i>Brande's Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art</i> ..	7
<i>Cabinet Lawyer (The)</i>	7
<i>Cates' Dictionary of Biography</i>	7
<i>Contanseau's French Dictionaries</i>	8
<i>Cresy's Encyclopædia of Civil Engineering</i>	8
<i>Groill's Encyclopædia of Architecture</i>	11
<i>Johnston's General Dictionary of Geography</i> ..	13
<i>Latham's English Dictionaries</i>	14
<i>Lindley & Moore's Treasury of Botany</i>	14
<i>Longman's German Dictionary</i>	14
<i>London's Encyclopædia of Agriculture</i>	14
— <i>Gardening</i>	14
— <i>Plants</i>	14
<i>McCulloch's Dictionary of Commerce</i>	10
<i>Mannder's Treasuries</i>	16
<i>Quain's Dictionary of Medicine</i>	20
<i>Rich's Dictionary of Antiquities</i>	20
<i>Rogel's English Thesaurus</i>	20
<i>Ure's Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, &c.</i> ..	23
<i>White's Latin Dictionaries</i>	23
<i>Willich's Popular Tables</i>	23
<i>Yonge's Greek Dictionary</i>	24

**ENGINEERING, MECHANICS,
MANUFACTURES, &c.**

<i>Anderson's</i> Strength of Materials.....	22
<i>Barry & Bramwell's</i> Railways, &c.	6
— <i>Railway Appliances</i>	6
<i>Black's</i> Treatise on Brewing	6
<i>Bourne's</i> Works on the Steam Engine.....	6
<i>Crosby's</i> Encyclopædia of Civil Engineering	8
<i>Cutley's</i> Handbook of Practical Telegraphy	8
<i>Dorning's</i> Elements of Construction	8
<i>Edwards's</i> Our Seamarks	9
<i>Fairbairn's</i> Mills and Millwork.....	10
— Useful Information for Engineers ..	10
<i>Goodeve's</i> Elements of Mechanism.....	11
— Principles of Mechanics.....	11
<i>Gore's</i> Electro-Metallurgy	22
<i>Groff's</i> Encyclopædia of Architecture	11
<i>Mitchell's</i> Practical Assaying.....	17
<i>Northcott's</i> Lathes and Turning	18
<i>Piessé's</i> Art of Perfumery	19
<i>Prece & Sivcotright's</i> Telegraphy	22
<i>Sennett's</i> Marine Steam Engine	20
<i>Shelley's</i> Workshop Appliances.....	22
<i>Stanton's</i> Electric Lighting	21
<i>Unwin's</i> Machine Design	22
<i>Ure's</i> Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, & Mines	23

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE and
LITERATURE.**

<i>Arnold's</i> English Poetry and Prose	5
— Manual of English Literature	5
<i>Latham's</i> English Dictionaries	14
— Handbook of English Language.....	14
<i>Roget's</i> English Thesaurus	20
<i>Whately's</i> English Synonyms.....	23

**HISTORY, POLITICS, HISTORICAL
MEMOIRS, and CRITICISM.**

<i>Abbey & Overton's</i> Eng. Church in 18th Century ..	4
<i>Amos's</i> Fifty Years of the English Constitution ..	4
— Primer of the English Constitution ..	4
<i>Arnold's</i> Lectures on Modern History	5
<i>Beaconsfield's</i> Selected Speeches	6
<i>Boulbee's</i> History of the Church of England ..	6
<i>Bramston & Leroy's</i> Historic Winchester.....	6
<i>Buckle's</i> History of Civilisation.....	7
<i>Chesney's</i> Waterloo Lectures	7
<i>Cox's</i> General History of Greece	8
<i>Creighton's</i> History of the Papacy	8
<i>De Tocqueville's</i> Democracy in America	8
<i>Doyle's</i> The English in America	9
Epochs of Ancient History	9
— Modern History	9
<i>Freeman's</i> Historical Geography of Europe ..	10
<i>Froude's</i> History of England	10
— Short Studies.....	10
— The English in Ireland	10
<i>Gardiner's</i> History of England, 1603-42.....	10
— Outline of English History	10
<i>Grant's</i> University of Edinburgh	11
<i>Greville's</i> Journal	11
<i>Hickson's</i> Ireland in the 17th Century.....	12
<i>Lecky's</i> History of England	14
— European Morals	14
— Rationalism in Europe	14
— Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland ..	14
<i>Lewes's</i> History of Philosophy.....	14
<i>Longman's</i> Lectures on History of England ..	14
— Life and Times of Edward III.	14
— Frederick the Great	14
<i>Macaulay's</i> Complete Works	15
— Critical and Historical Essays	15
— History of England	15
— Speeches	15
<i>Maunder's</i> Historical Treasury.....	16
<i>Maxwell's</i> Don John of Austria	16
<i>May's</i> Constitutional Hist. of Eng. 1760-1870 ..	16
— Democracy in Europe	16
<i>Mercivalde's</i> Fall of the Roman Republic ..	16
— General History of Rome	16
— Romans under the Empire.....	16
— The Roman Triumvirates	16
<i>Ravolinson's</i> Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy..	20

**HISTORY, POLITICS, HISTORICAL
MEMOIRS and CRITICISM.—cont.**

<i>Secoborn's</i> The Oxford Reformers.....	20
— The Protestant Revolution	20
<i>Short's</i> History of the Church of England.....	20
<i>Smith's</i> Carthage and the Carthaginians	21
<i>Taylor's</i> History of India	22
<i>Walpole's</i> History of England, 1815-41	23
<i>Wylie's</i> England under Henry IV.	24

**ILLUSTRATED BOOKS and
BOOKS on ART.**

<i>Dresser's</i> Japan; its Architecture, &c.	9
<i>Eastlake's</i> Five Great Painters	9
— Hints on Household Taste.....	9
— Notes on Foreign Picture Galleries..	9
<i>Hulme's</i> Art-Instruction in England	12
<i>Jamesson's</i> (Mrs.) Works	13
<i>Lang's</i> (A.) Princess Nobody, illus. by R. Doyle	13
<i>Macaulay's</i> (Lord) Lays, illustrated by Scharf ..	15
— illustrated by Weguelin	15
<i>Moore's</i> Irish Melodies, illustrated by Macleise ..	17
— Lalla Rookh, illustrated by Tenniel ..	17
— New Testament (The), illustrated	18
<i>Perry's</i> Greek and Roman Sculpture	19

MEDICINE and SURGERY.

<i>Bull's</i> Hints to Mothers	7
— Maternal Management of Children	7
<i>Coats's</i> Manual of Pathology	7
<i>Dickinson's</i> Diseases of the Kidney.....	9
<i>Erichson's</i> Concussion of the Spine	9
— Science and Art of Surgery.....	9
<i>Garrod's</i> Materia Medica	10
— Treatise on Gout	10
<i>Haward's</i> Orthopaedic Surgery	11
<i>Hewitt's</i> Diseases of Women	12
— Mechanic. System of Uterine Pathology ..	12
<i>Holmes's</i> System of Surgery.....	12
<i>Husband's</i> Questions in Anatomy.....	12
<i>Jones's</i> The Health of the Senses	13
<i>Little's</i> In-Knee Distortion	14
<i>Living's</i> Works on Skin Diseases	14
<i>Longmore's</i> Gunshot Injuries.....	14
<i>Mackenzie's</i> Use of the Laryngoscope.....	15
<i>Macnamara's</i> Diseases of Himalayan Districts..	15
<i>Morehead's</i> Disease in India	17
<i>Murchison's</i> Continued Fevers of Great Britain ..	18
— Diseases of the Liver	18
<i>Paget's</i> Clinical Lectures and Essays	18
— Lectures on Surgical Pathology.....	18
<i>Percival's</i> Materia Medica	18
<i>Quain's</i> Dictionary of Medicine.....	20
<i>Salter's</i> Dental Pathology and Surgery	20
<i>Smith's</i> Handbook for Midwives	21
<i>Thomson's</i> Conspectus, by Birkett	22
<i>Watson's</i> Principles and Practice of Physic ..	23
<i>West's</i> Diseases of Infancy and Childhood.....	23

**MENTAL and POLITICAL PHILO-
SOPHY, FINANCE, &c.**

<i>Abbott's</i> Elements of Logic	4
<i>Amos's</i> Science of Jurisprudence.....	4
<i>Aristotle's</i> Works	5
<i>Bacon's</i> Essays, with Notes, by Abbott	5
— by Hunter	5
— by Whately	5
— Letters, Life, and Occasional Works... 5	5
— Promus of Formularies	5
— Works.....	5
<i>Bagshot's</i> Economic Studies	5
<i>Bain's</i> (Prof.) Philosophical Works	6
<i>De Tocqueville's</i> Democracy in America.....	8
<i>Devas's</i> Groundwork of Economics	8
<i>Hume's</i> Philosophical Works	12
<i>Jeffries's</i> The Story of My Heart	13
<i>Justinian's</i> Institutes, by T. Sandars	13
<i>Kant's</i> Critique of Practical Reason	13
<i>Lang's</i> Custom and Myth	13
<i>Leslie's</i> Political and Moral Philosophy	14
<i>Lewis's</i> Authority in Matters of Opinion	14
<i>Lubbock's</i> Origin of Civilisation.....	14

MENTAL and POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY, FINANCE, &c.—continued.

Macleod's (H. D.) Works 15
Mills's (James) Phenomena of the Human Mind 16
Mills's (J. S.) Logic—Killick's Handbook to 13
 ———— *Works* 17
Monck's Introduction to Logic 17
Morell's Handbook of Logic 17
Seeborn's English Village Community 20
Sully's Outlines of Psychology 21
Swinburne's Picture Logic 21
Thomson's Laws of Thought 22
Troiss on the Rights and Duties of Nations 22
Whately's Elements of Logic 23
 ———— *Elements of Rhetoric* 23
Zeller's Works on Greek Philosophy 24

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

Arnold's (Dr.) Miscellaneous Works 5
A. K. H. B., Essays and Contributions of 4
Bagehot's Literary Studies 5
Beaconsfield Birthday Book (The) 6
Beaconsfield's Wit and Wisdom 6
Evans' Bronze Implements of Great Britain 10
Farrar's Language and Languages 10
French's Drink in England 10
Hassell's Adulteration of Food 11
Johnson's Patentee's Manual 13
Longman's Magazine 14
Macaulay's (Lord) Works, Selections from 15
Müller's (Max) Works 18
Smith's (Sydney) Wit and Wisdom 21
Sullivan's Stray Shots 5

NATURAL HISTORY (POPULAR).

Dixon's Rural Bird Life 9
Hartwig's (Dr. G.) Works 11
Maudslayi's Treasury of Natural History 16
Stanley's Familiar History of Birds 21
Wood's (Rev. F. G.) Works 24

POETICAL WORKS.

Bailey's Festus 5
Goethe's Faust, translated by Birds 11
 ———— *translated by Webb* 11
 ———— *with Notes by Sells* 11
Homer's Iliad, translated by Cayley 13
 ———— *translated by Green* 13
Ingelow's Poetical Works 12
Macaulay's (Lord) Lays of Ancient Rome 15
Pennell's 'From Grave to Gay' 18
Reader's Voices from Flower-Land 20
Shakespeare, Bowdler's Family Edition 21
Southey's Poetical Works 21
Virgil's Æneid, translated by Conington 23
 ———— *Poems, translated by Conington* 23

SPORTS and PASTIMES.

Dead Shot (The), by Marksman 8
Francis's Book on Angling 10
Jefferies' Red Deer 13
Longman's Chess Openings 14
Pole's The Modern Game of Whist 19
Reynolds' Fly-Fisher's Entomology 20
Walker's The Correct Card 23
Wilcocks' The Sea-Fisherman 23

SCIENTIFIC WORKS (General).

Arnott's Elements of Physics 5
Bauerman's Descriptive Mineralogy 22
 ———— *Systematic Mineralogy* 22
Brande's Dictionary of Science &c. 7
Ganot's Natural Philosophy 10
 ———— *Physics* 10
Grave's Correlation of Physical Forces 11
Haughton's Lectures on Physical Geography 11
Hehnholz's Scientific Lectures 12
Hullah's History of Modern Music 12
 ———— *Transition Period of Musical History* 12
Keller's Lake Dwellings of Switzerland 13
Ker's Treatise on Metallurgy 13
'Knowledge' Library (The) 19
Lloyd's Treatise on Magnetism 14
Macfarren's Lectures on Harmony 15
Maudslayi's Scientific Treasury 16
Proctor's (R. A.) Works 19

SCIENTIFIC WORKS (General)—cont.

Kutley's The Study of Rocks 22
Smith's Air and Rain 21
Text Books of Science 22
Tyndall's (Prof.) Works 22

THEOLOGY and RELIGION.

Arnold's (Dr.) Sermons 5
Ayre's Treasury of Bible Knowledge 5
Boulbee's Commentary on the 39 Articles 6
Brown's Exposition of the 39 Articles 7
Calvert's Wife's Manual 7
Christ our Ideal 7
Colenso's Pentateuch and Book of Joshua 7
Conder's Handbook to the Bible 3
Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul 8
Davieson's Introduction to the New Testament 8
Deves' Life and Letters of St. Paul 8
Eidersheim's Jesus the Messiah 9
Ellicott's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles 9
 ———— *Lectures on the Life of Our Lord* 9
Ewald's Antiquities of Israel 10
 ———— *History of Israel* 10
Gospel (The) for the Nineteenth Century 11
Hobart's Medical Language of St. Luke 12
Hopkins' Christ the Consoler 12
Jukes' (Rev. A.) Works 13
Kalisch's Bible Studies 13
 ———— *Commentary on the Old Testament* 13
Keary's Outlines of Primitive Belief 13
Lyra Germanica 14
Manning's Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost 16
Martineau's Endeavours after the Christian Life 16
 ———— *Hours of Thought* 16
Monsell's Spiritual Songs 17
Müller's (Max) Origin and Growth of Religion 18
 ———— *Science of Religion* 18
Paley's Christian Evidences, &c., by Potts 18
Psalms (The) of David, translated by Seymour 20
Rogers' Defence of the Eclipse of Faith 20
 ———— *The Eclipse of Faith* 20
Scovell's Night Lessons from Scripture 20
 ———— *Passing Thoughts on Religion* 20
 ———— *Preparation for Holy Communion* 20
Smith's Shipwreck of St. Paul 21
Supernatural Religion 21
Taylor's (Jeremy) Entire Works 22

TRAVELS, ADVENTURES, GUIDE BOOKS, &c.

Aldridge's Ranch Notes 4
Alpine Club (The) Map of Switzerland 4
Baker's Eight Years in Ceylon 5
 ———— *Kille and Hound in Ceylon* 5
Ball's Alpine Guide 4
Brassey's (Lady) Works 7
Crawford's Across the Pampas and the Andes 4
Freeman's United States 10
Hassell's San Remo 11
Horvitz's Visits to Remarkable Places 12
Johnson's Dictionary of Geography 13
Maudslayi's Treasury of Geography 10
Miller's Wintering in the Riviera 17
Three in Norway 22

WORKS OF FICTION.

Anstey's (F., 'The Black Poodle, &c. 5
Antonius, by George Taylor 22
Atelier du Lys (The) 17
Atherstone Priory 17
Beaconsfield's (Lord) Novels and Tales 6, 17
Burgomaster's Family (The) 17
Elsa and her Vulture 17
Harte's (Bret) In the Carquinez Woods 17
 ———— *On the Frontier* 13
Mademoiselle Mori 17
Modern Novelist's Library (The) 17
Oliphant's (Mrs.) In Trust 17
Payn's Thicker than Water 13
Scovell's (Miss) Stories and Tales 20
Six Sisters of the Valleys (The) 17
Sturges' My Friends and I 21
Troilope's (Anthony) Barchester Towers 17
 ———— *The Warden* 17
Unawares 17
Whyte-Mcville's (Major) Novels 17

A CATALOGUE

OF

WORKS IN GENERAL LITERATURE & SCIENCE

PUBLISHED BY
MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN & Co.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

ABBEY and OVERTON.—*THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.* By the Rev. C. J. ABBEY and the Rev. J. II. OVERTON. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

ABBOTT.—*THE ELEMENTS OF LOGIC.* By T. K. ABBOTT, B.D. 12mo. 2s. 6d. sewed, or 3s. cloth.

ACTON.—*MODERN COOKERY FOR PRIVATE FAMILIES,* reduced to a System of Easy Practice in a Series of carefully tested Receipts. By ELIZA ACTON. With upwards of 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

A. K. H. B.—*THE ESSAYS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF A. K. H. B.*—Uniform Cabinet Editions in crown 8vo.

Autumn Holidays, 3s. 6d.

Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths, 3s. 6d.

Commonplace Philosopher, 3s. 6d.

Counsel and Comfort, 3s. 6d.

Critical Essays, 3s. 6d.

Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson. Three Series, 3s. 6d. each.

Landscapes, Churches, and Moralities, 3s. 6d.

Leisure Hours in Town, 3s. 6d.

Lessons of Middle Age, 3s. 6d.

Our Little Life. Two Series, 3s. 6d. each.

Present Day Thoughts, 3s. 6d.
Recreations of a Country Parson. Three Series, 3s. 6d. each.

Seaside Musings, 3s. 6d.

Sunday Afternoons, 3s. 6d.

ALDRIDGE.—*RANCH NOTES IN KANSAS, COLORADO, THE INDIAN TERRITORY AND NORTHERN TEXAS.* By REGINALD ALDRIDGE. Crown 8vo. with 4 Illustrations engraved on Wood by G. Pearson, 5s.

ALLEN.—*FLOWERS AND THEIR PEDIGREES.* By GRANT ALLEN. With 50 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ALPINE CLUB (The).—*GUIDES AND MAPS.*

THE ALPINE GUIDE. By JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. Post 8vo. with Maps and other Illustrations:—

THE EASTERN ALPS, 10s. 6d.

CENTRAL ALPS, including all the Oberland District, 7s. 6d.

WESTERN ALPS, including Mont Blanc, Monte Rosa, Zermatt, &c. 6s. 6d.

THE ALPINE CLUB MAP OF SWITZERLAND, on the Scale of Four Miles to an Inch. Edited by R. C. NICHOLS, F.R.G.S. 4 Sheets in Portfolio, 42s. coloured, or 34s. uncoloured.

ENLARGED ALPINE CLUB MAP OF THE SWISS AND ITALIAN ALPS, on the Scale of Three English Statute Miles to One Inch, in 8 Sheets, price 1s. 6d. each.

ON ALPINE TRAVELLING AND THE GEOLOGY OF THE ALPS. Price 1s. Either of the Three Volumes or Parts of the 'Alpine Guide' may be had with this Introduction prefixed, 1s. extra.

AMOS.—*WORKS BY SHELDON AMOS, M.A.*

A PRIMER OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT. Crown 8vo. 6s.

A SYSTEMATIC VIEW OF THE SCIENCE OF JURISPRUDENCE. 8vo. 18s.

FIFTY YEARS OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION, 1830-1880. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ANSTEY.—*THE BLACK POODLE*, and other Stories. By F. ANSTEY, Author of 'Vice-Versa.' With Frontispiece by G. Du Maurier and Initial Letters by the Author. Crown 8vo. 6s.

ANTINOUS.—An Historical Romance of the Roman Empire. By GEORGE TAYLOR (Professor HAUSRATH). Translated from the German by J. D. M. Crown 8vo. 6s.

ARISTOPHANES.—*THE ACHARNIANS OF ARISTOPHANES*. Translated into English Verse by ROBERT VELVERTON TYRKELL, M.A. Dublin. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

ARISTOTLE.—*THE WORKS OF THE POLITICS*, G. Bekker's Greek Text of Books I. III. IV. (VII.) with an English Translation by W. E. BOLLAND, M.A.; and short Introductory Essays by A. LANG, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ETHICS; Greek Text, illustrated with Essays and Notes. By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart. M.A. LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS, Newly Translated into English. By ROBERT WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ARNOLD.—*WORKS BY THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. Late Head-master of Rugby School.*

INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY, delivered in 1841 and 1842. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED MOSTLY IN THE CHAPEL OF RUGBY SCHOOL. 6 vols. crown 8vo. 30s. or separately, 5s. each.

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ARNOLD.—*WORKS BY THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A.*

A MANUAL OF ENGLISH LITERATURE, Historical and Critical. By THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ENGLISH POETRY AND PROSE: a Collection of Illustrative Passages from the Writings of English Authors, from the Anglo-Saxon Period to the Present Time. Crown 8vo. 6s.

ARNOTT.—*THE ELEMENTS OF PHYSICS OR NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.* By NEIL ARNOTT, M.D. Edited by A. BAIN, LL.D. and A. S. TAYLOR, M.D. F.R.S. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

ASHBY.—*NOTES ON PHYSIOLOGY FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS PREPARING FOR EXAMINATION.* With 120 Woodcuts. By HENRY ASHBY, M.D. Lond., Physician to the General Hospital for Sick Children, Manchester. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

AYRE.—*THE TREASURY OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE*; being a Dictionary of the Books, Persons, Places, Events, and other matters of which mention is made in Holy Scripture. By the Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. With 5 Maps, 15 Plates, and 300 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

BACON.—*THE WORKS AND LIFE OF COMPLETE WORKS.* Collected and Edited by R. L. ELLIS, M.A. J. SPEDDING, M.A. and D. D. HEATH. 7 vols. 8vo. £3. 13s. 6d.

LETTERS AND LIFE, INCLUDING ALL HIS OCCASIONAL WORKS. Collected and Edited, with a Commentary, by J. SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo. £4. 4s.

THE ESSAYS; with Annotations. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., sometime Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ESSAYS; with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. price 6s. The Text and Index only, without Introduction and Notes, in 1 vol. fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

THE ESSAYS; with Critical and Illustrative Notes, and other Aids for Students. By the Rev. JOHN HUNTER, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE PROMUS OF FORMULARIES AND ELEGANCIES, illustrated by Passages from SHAKESPEARE. By Mrs. H. POTT. Preface by E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. 8vo. 16s.

BAGEHOT.—*WORKS BY WALTER BAGEHOT, M.A.*

BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES. 8vo. 12s.

ECONOMIC STUDIES. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LITERARY STUDIES. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait. 28s.

BAILEY.—*FESTUS, A POEM.* By PHILIP JAMES BAILEY. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

BAKER.—*WORKS BY SIR SAMUEL W. BAKER, M.A.*

EIGHT YEARS IN CEYLON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts. 5s.

THE RIFLE AND THE HOUND IN CEYLON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts. 5s.

BAIN.—*WORKS BY ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D.*

MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE; a Compendium of Psychology and Ethics. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE SENSES AND THE INTELLECT. 8vo. 15s.

THE EMOTIONS AND THE WILL. 8vo. 15s.

PRACTICAL ESSAYS. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

LOGIC, DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE. PART I. *Deduction*, 4s. PART II. *Induction*, 6s. 6d.

JAMES MILL; a Biography. Crown 8vo. 5s.

JOHN STUART MILL; a Criticism, with Personal Recollections. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BARRY & BRAMWELL.—*RAILWAYS AND LOCOMOTIVES*: a Series of Lectures delivered at the School of Military Engineering, Chatham. *Railways*, by J. W. BARRY, M. Inst. C.E. *Locomotives*, by Sir F. J. BRAMWELL, F.R.S., M. Inst. C.E. With 228 Wood Engravings. 8vo. 21s.

BEACONSFIELD.—*WORKS BY THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD, K.G.*

NOVELS AND TALES. The Cabinet Edition. 11 vols. Crown 8vo. 6s. each. Endymion.

Lothair.	Henrietta Temple.
Coningsby.	Contarini Fleming, &c.
Sybil.	Alroy, Ixion, &c.
Tancred.	The Young Duke, &c.
Venetia.	Vivian Grey, &c.

NOVELS AND TALES. The Hughenden Edition. With 2 Portraits and 11 Vignettes. 11 vols. Crown 8vo. 42s.

NOVELS AND TALES. Modern Novelist's Library Edition, complete in 11 vols. Crown 8vo. 22s. boards, or 27s. 6d. cloth.

SELECTED SPEECHES. With Introduction and Notes, by T. E. KEBBEL, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait, 32s.

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE BEACONSFIELD BIRTHDAY-BOOK: Selected from the Writings and Speeches of the Right Hon. the Earl of Beaconsfield, K.G. With 2 Portraits and 11 Views of Hughenden Manor and its Surroundings. 18mo. 2s. 6d. cloth, gilt; 4s. 6d. bound.

BECKER.—*WORKS BY PROFESSOR BECKER, translated from the German by the Rev. F. METCALF.*

GALLUS: or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CHARICLES: or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BLACK.—*PRACTICAL TREATISE ON BREWING*; with Formulæ for Public Brewers and Instructions for Private Families. By W. Black. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

BLACKLEY & FRIEDLÄNDER.—*A PRACTICAL DICTIONARY OF THE GERMAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES*: containing New Words in General Use not found in other Dictionaries. By the Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A. and C. M. FRIEDLÄNDER, Ph.D. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BOULTBEE.—*WORKS BY THE REV. T. P. BOULTBEE, LL.D.*

A COMMENTARY ON THE 39 ARTICLES, forming an introduction to the Theology of the Church of England. Crown 8vo. 6s.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; Pre-Reformation Period. 8vo. 15s.

BOURNE.—*WORKS BY JOHN BOURNE, C.E.*

A TREATISE ON THE STEAM ENGINE, in its application to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. With 37 Plates and 546 Woodcuts. 4to. 42s.

CATECHISM OF THE STEAM ENGINE, in its various Applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. With 89 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

HANDBOOK OF THE STEAM ENGINE; a Key to the Author's Catechism of the Steam Engine. With 67 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 9s.

RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE STEAM ENGINE. With 124 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

EXAMPLES OF STEAM AND GAS ENGINES of the most recent Approved Types. With 54 Plates and 356 Woodcuts. 4to. 70s.

BRAMSTON & LEROY.—*HISTORIC WINCHESTER*; England's First Capital. By A. R. BRAMSTON and A. C. LEROY. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

BRANDE'S *DICTIONARY OF SCIENCE, LITERATURE, AND ART.* Re-edited by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart., M.A. 3 vols. medium Svo. 63s.

BRASSEY. — *WORKS BY LADY BRASSEY.*

A VOYAGE IN THE 'SUNBEAM,' OUR HOME ON THE OCEAN FOR ELEVEN MONTHS. By Lady BRASSEY. With Map and 65 Wood Engravings. Library Edition, Svo. 21s. Cabinet Edition, crown Svo. 7s. 6d. School Edition, fcp. 2s. Popular Edition, 4to. 6d.

SUNSHINE AND STORM IN THE EAST; or, Cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople. With 2 Maps and 114 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Library Edition, Svo. 21s. Cabinet Edition, cr. Svo. 7s. 6d.

IN THE TRADES, THE TROPICS, AND THE 'ROARING FORTIES'; or, Fourteen Thousand Miles in the *Sunbeam* in 1883. By Lady BRASSEY. With nearly Two Hundred and Fifty Illustrations engraved on Wood from drawings by R. T. Pritchett, and Eight Maps and Charts. Library Edition, Svo. 21s.

BROWNE. — *AN EXPOSITION OF THE 39 ARTICLES,* Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester. Svo. 16s.

BUCKLE. — *HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE, SPAIN AND SCOTLAND.* By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. 3 vols. crown Svo. 24s.

BUCKTON. — *WORKS BY MRS. C. M. BUCKTON.*

FOOD AND HOME COOKERY; a Course of Instruction in Practical Cookery and Cleaning. With 11 Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 2s. 6d.

HEALTH IN THE HOUSE; Twenty-five Lectures on Elementary Physiology. With 41 Woodcuts and Diagrams. Crown Svo. 2s.

BULL. — *WORKS BY THOMAS BULL, M.D.*

HINTS TO MOTHERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF THEIR HEALTH during the Period of Pregnancy and in the Lying-in Room. Fcp. Svo. 1s. 6d.

THE MATERNAL MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. Fcp. Svo. 1s. 6d.

BURTON. — *MY HOME FARM.* By Mrs. JOHN HILL BURTON. Crown Svo. 3s. 6d.

CABINET LAWYER, The; a Popular Digest of the Laws of England, Civil, Criminal, and Constitutional. Fcp. Svo. 9s.

CALVERT. — *THE WIFE'S MANUAL;* or Prayers, Thoughts, and Songs on Several Occasions of a Matron's Life. By the late W. CALVERT, Minor Canon of St. Paul's. Printed and ornamented in the style of *Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book.* Crown Svo. 6s.

CARLYLE. — *THOMAS AND JANE WELSH CARLYLE.*

THOMAS CARLYLE, a History of the first Forty Years of his Life, 1795–1835. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. With 2 Portraits and 4 Illustrations, 2 vols. Svo. 32s.

CARLYLE'S LIFE IN LONDON; from 1834 to his death in 1881. By JAMES A. FROUDE, M.A. with Portrait engraved on steel. 2 vols. Svo. 32s.

REMINISCENCES. By THOMAS CARLYLE. Edited by J. A. FROUDE, M.A. 2 vols. crown Svo. 18s.

LETTERS AND MEMORIALS OF JANE WELSH CARLYLE. Prepared for publication by THOMAS CARLYLE, and edited by J. A. FROUDE, M.A. 3 vols. Svo. 36s.

CATES. — *A DICTIONARY OF GENERAL BIOGRAPHY.* By W. L. R. CATES. Svo. 28s.

CHESNEY. — *WATERLOO LECTURES;* a Study of the Campaign of 1815. By Col. C. C. CHESNEY, R.E. Svo. 10s. 6d.

CHRIST OUR IDEAL, an Argument from Analogy. By the Author of 'The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century' Svo. 8s. 6d.

CICERO. — *THE CORRESPONDENCE OF CICERO:* a revised Text, with Notes and Prolegomena.—Vol. I., The Letters to the end of Cicero's Exile. By ROBERT V. TYKRELL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, 12s.

COATS. — *A MANUAL OF PATHOLOGY.* By JOSEPH COATS, M.D. Pathologist to the Western Infirmary and the Sick Children's Hospital, Glasgow; formerly Pathologist to the Royal Infirmary, and President of the Pathological and Clinical Society of Glasgow. With 330 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Svo. 31s. 6d.

COLENSO. — *THE PENTATEUCH AND BOOK OF JOSHUA CRITICALLY EXAMINED.* By J. W. COLENSO, D.D., late Bishop of Natal. Crown Svo. 6s.

- CONDER.**—*A HANDBOOK TO THE BIBLE*, or Guide to the Study of the Holy Scriptures derived from Ancient Monuments and Modern Exploration. By F. R. CONDER, and Lieut. C. R. CONDER, R.E. Post Svo. 7s. 6d.
- CONINGTON.**—*WORKS BY JOHN CONINGTON, M.A.*
THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Verse. Crown Svo. 9s.
THE POEMS OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Prose. Crown Svo. 9s.
- CONTANSEAU.**—*WORKS BY PROFESSOR LÉON CONTANSEAU.*
A PRACTICAL DICTIONARY OF THE FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. Post Svo. 3s. 6d.
A POCKET DICTIONARY OF THE FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES; being a careful Abridgment of the Author's 'Practical French and English Dictionary.' Square 18mo. 1s. 6d.
- CONYBEARE & HOWSON.**—*THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.* By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. Dean of Chester.
 Library Edition, with all the Original Illustrations, Maps, Landscapes on Steel, Woodcuts, &c. 2 vols. 4to. 42s.
 Intermediate Edition, with a Selection of Maps, Plates, and Wood-cuts. 2 vols. square crown Svo. 21s.
 Student's Edition, revised and condensed, with 46 Illustrations and Maps. 1 vol. crown Svo. 7s. 6d.
- COOKE.**—*TABLETS OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.* By THOMAS COOKE, F.R.C.S. Being a Synopsis of Demonstrations given in the Westminster Hospital Medical School, A.D. 1871-1875. Anatomy, complete, Second Edition, 4to. 15s. Physiology, complete, Second Edition, 4to. 10s.
 ** These TABLETS may still be had in separate Fasciculi as originally published.
- COX.**—*A GENERAL HISTORY OF GREECE:* from the Earliest Period to the Death of Alexander the Great; with a Sketch of the Subsequent History to the Present Time. By the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. M.A. With 11 Maps and Plans. Crown Svo. 7s. 6d.
- CRAWFORD.**—*ACROSS THE PAMPAS AND THE ANDES.* By ROBERT CRAWFORD, M.A. With Map and 7 Illustrations. Crown Svo. 7s. 6d.
- CREIGHTON.**—*HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION.* By the Rev. M. CREIGHTON, M.A. Vol. I. the Great Schism—the Council of Constance, 1378-1418. Vol. II. the Council of Basel—The Papal Restoration, 1418-1464. 2 vols. Svo. 32s.
- CRESY.**—*ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CIVIL ENGINEERING,* Historical, Theoretical, and Practical. By EDWARD CRESY. With above 3,000 Woodcuts, Svo. 25s.
- CULLEY.**—*HANDBOOK OF PRACTICAL TELEGRAPHY.* By R. S. CULLEY, M. Inst. C.E. Plates and Woodcuts, Svo. 16s.
- DAVIDSON.**—*AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,* Critical, Exegetical, and Theological. By the Rev. S. DAVIDSON, D.D. LL.D. Revised Edition. 2 vols. Svo. 30s.
- DEAD SHOT, The,** OR *SPORTSMAN'S COMPLETE GUIDE;* a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, with Lessons in the Art of Shooting Game of all kinds, and Wild-Fowl, also Pigeon-Shooting, and Dog-Breaking. By MARKSMAN. With 13 Illustrations. Crown Svo. 10s. 6d.
- DECAISNE & LE MAOUT.**—*A GENERAL SYSTEM OF BOTANY.* Translated from the French of E. LE MAOUT, M.D., and J. DECAISNE, by Mrs. HOOKER; with Additions by J. D. HOOKER, C.B. F.R.S. Imp. Svo. with 5,500 Woodcuts, 31s. 6d.
- DE TOCQUEVILLE.**—*DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA.* By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by H. REEVE. 2 vols. crown Svo. 16s.
- DEVAS.**—*GROUNDWORK OF ECONOMICS.* By C. S. DEVAS. Svo. 16s.
- DEWES.**—*THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF ST. PAUL.* By ALFRED DEWES, M.A. LL.D. D.D. Vicar of St. Augustine's, Penderbury. With 4 Maps. Svo. 7s. 6d.
- DIXON.**—*RURAL BIRD LIFE;* Essays on Ornithology, with Instructions for Preserving Objects relating to that Science. By CHARLES DIXON. With 45 Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 5s.
- DOWNING.**—*ELEMENTS OF PRACTICAL CONSTRUCTION,* for the Use of Students in Engineering and Architecture. By SAMUEL DOWNING, LL.D. PART I. Structures in Direct Tension and Compression. With numerous Woodcuts and a Folio Atlas of 14 Plates. Svo. 14s.

DICKINSON. — *DISEASES OF THE KIDNEY AND URINARY DERANGEMENTS.* By W. HOWSHIP DICKINSON, M.D. Cantab. F.R.C.P. &c. Physician to, and Lecturer on Medicine at, St. George's Hospital. In Three Parts. PART I.—*Diabetes*, with 3 Plates of Figures and 17 Woodcuts. 8vo. price 10s. 6d. PART II.—*Albuminuria*, with 11 Plates and 31 Woodcuts, price 20s.

* * The Two Parts may be had separately, each an independent work: PART I.—*Diabetes*, price 12s. cloth. PART II.—Being the Second Edition Revised of Dr. DICKINSON'S 'Pathology and Treatment of Albuminuria,' price 21s. cloth. PART III., completing the work, is in the Press.

DOYLE. — *THE ENGLISH IN AMERICA;* Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas. By J. A. DOYLE, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. 8vo. Map, 18s.

DRESSER. — *JAPAN; ITS ARCHITECTURE, ART, AND ART MANUFACTURES.* By CHRISTOPHER DRESSER, Ph.D. F.L.S. &c. With 202 Graphic Illustrations engraved on Wood for the most part by Native Artists in Japan, the rest by G. Pearson, after Photographs and Drawings made on the spot. Square crown 8vo. 31s. 6d.

EASTLAKE. — *FIVE GREAT PAINTERS;* Essays on Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, Titian, Raphael, Albert Dürer. By LADY EASTLAKE. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 16s.

EASTLAKE. — *WORKS BY C. L. EASTLAKE, F.R.S. B.A.*

HINTS ON HOUSEHOLD TASTE IN FURNITURE, UPHOLSTERY, &c. With 100 Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 14s.

NOTES ON FOREIGN PICTURE GALLERIES. Crown 8vo.

The Louvre Gallery, *Paris*, with 114 Illustrations, 7s. 6d.

The Brera Gallery, *Milan*, with 55 Illustrations, 5s.

The Old Pinaluthell, *Munich*, with 107 Illustrations, 7s. 6d.

EDERSHEIM. — *THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH.* By the Rev. ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A. Oxon, D.D. Ph.D. Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn. 2 vols. 8vo. 42s.

EDWARDS. — *OUR SEAMARKS.* By E. PRICE EDWARDS. With numerous Illustrations of Lighthouses, Lightships, Lighting Appliances, &c. engraved on Wood by G. H. Ford. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

ELLCOTT. — *WORKS BY C. F. ELLCOTT, D.D.,* Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. 8vo. Galatians, 8s. 6d. Ephesians, 8s. 6d. Pastoral Epistles, 10s. 6d. Philipians, Colossians, and Philemon, 10s. 6d. Thessalonians, 7s. 6d.

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. 8vo. 12s.

EPOCHS OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

Edited by the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. M.A. and C. SANKEY, M.A.

Besley's Gracchi, Marius and Sulla, 2s. 6d.

Capes's Age of the Antonines, 2s. 6d.

— Early Roman Empire, 2s. 6d.

Cox's Athenian Empire, 2s. 6d.

— Greeks and Persians, 2s. 6d.

Curteis's Macedonian Empire, 2s. 6d.

Inne's Rome to its Capture by the Gauls, 2s. 6d.

Merivale's Roman Triumvirates, 2s. 6d.

Sankey's Spartan and Theban Supremacies, 2s. 6d.

Smith's Rome and Carthage, 2s. 6d.

EPOCHS OF MODERN HISTORY.

Edited by C. COLBECK, M.A.

Church's Beginning of the Middle Ages, 2s. 6d.

Cox's Crusades, 2s. 6d.

Creighton's Age of Elizabeth, 2s. 6d.

Gairdner's Lancaster and York, 2s. 6d.

Gardiner's Puritan Revolution, 2s. 6d.

— Thirty Years' War, 2s. 6d.

— (Mrs.) French Revolution, 2s. 6d.

Hale's Fall of the Stuarts, 2s. 6d.

Johnson's Normans in Europe, 2s. 6d.

Longman's Frederick the Great, 2s. 6d.

Ludlow's War of American Independence, 2s. 6d.

M'Carthy's Epoch of Reform, 1830-1850, 2s. 6d.

Morris's Age of Anne, 2s. 6d.

Scebohm's Protestant Revolution, 2s. 6d.

Stubbs's Early Plantagenets, 2s. 6d.

Warburton's Edward III. 2s. 6d.

ERICHSEN.

— *WORKS BY JOHN ERIC ERICHSEN, F.R.S.*

THE SCIENCE AND ART OF SURGERY: Being a Treatise on Surgical Injuries, Diseases, and Operations. Illustrated by Engravings on Wood. 2 vols. 8vo. 42s.; or bound in half-russia, 60s.

ON CONCUSSION OF THE SPINE, NERVOUS SHOCKS, and other Obscure Injuries of the Nervous System in their Clinical and Medico-Legal Aspects. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

EVANS.—*THE BRONZE IMPLEMENTS, ARMS, AND ORNAMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.* By JOHN EVANS, D.C.L. LL.D. F.R.S. With 540 Illustrations. Svo. 25s.

EWALD.—*WORKS BY PROFESSOR HEINRICH EWALD, of Göttingen.*

THE ANTIQUITIES OF ISRAEL. Translated from the German by H. S. SOLLY, M.A. Svo. 12s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL. Translated from the German. Vols. I.-V. Svo. 63s. Vol. VI. *Christ and his Times*, Svo. 16s. Vols. VII. and VIII. *The Apostolic Age*, Svo. 21s.

FAIRBAIRN.—*WORKS BY SIR W. FAIRBAIRN, BART, C.E.*

A TREATISE ON MILLS AND MILL-WORK, with 18 Plates and 333 Woodcuts. 1 vol. Svo. 25s.

USEFUL INFORMATION FOR ENGINEERS. With many Plates and Woodcuts. 3 vols. crown Svo. 31s. 6d.

FARRAR.—*LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES.* A Revised Edition of *Chapters on Language and Families of Speech.* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D. Crown Svo. 6s.

FITZWYGRAM. — *HORSES AND STABLES.* By Major-General Sir F. FITZWYGRAM, Bart. With 39 pages of Illustrations. Svo. 10s. 6d.

FOX.—*THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX.* By the Right Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P. Library Edition, Svo. 18s. Cabinet Edition, cr. Svo. 6s.

FRANCIS.—*A BOOK ON ANGLING;* or, Treatise on the Art of Fishing in every branch; including full Illustrated Lists of Salmon Flies. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. Post Svo. Portrait and Plates, 15s.

FREEMAN.—*WORKS BY E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L.*

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE. With 65 Maps. 2 vols. Svo. 31s. 6d.

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES. Crown Svo. 6s.

FRENCH. — *NINETEEN CENTURIES OF DRINK IN ENGLAND*, a History. By RICHARD VALPY FRENCH, D.C.L. LL.D. F.S.A.; Author of 'The History of Toasting' &c. Crown Svo. 10s. 6d.

FROUDE.—*WORKS BY JAMES A FROUDE, M.A.*

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.

Cabinet Edition, 12 vols. cr. Svo. £3. 12s.

Popular Edition, 12 vols. cr. Svo. £2. 2s.

SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS. 4 vols. crown Svo. 24s.

THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. 3 vols. crown Svo. 18s.

THOMAS CARLYLE, a History of the first Forty Years of his Life, 1795 to 1835. 2 vols. Svo. 32s.

CARLYLE'S LIFE IN LONDON: from 1834 to his death in 1881. By JAMES A. FROUDE, M.A. with Portrait engraved on steel. 2 vols. Svo. 32s.

GANOT.—*WORKS BY PROFESSOR GANOT.* Translated by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S.

ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON PHYSICS, for the use of Colleges and Schools. With 5 Coloured Plates and 898 Woodcuts. Large crown Svo. 15s.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY FOR GENERAL READERS AND YOUNG PERSONS. With 2 Plates and 471 Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 7s. 6d.

GARDINER.—*WORKS BY SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, LL.D.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. Cabinet Edition, thoroughly revised. 10 vols. crown Svo. price 6s. each.

OUTLINE OF ENGLISH HISTORY, B.C. 55-A.D. 1880. With 96 Woodcuts, fep. Svo. 2s. 6d.

* * * For Professor Gardiner's other Works, see 'Epochs of Modern History,' p. 9.

GARROD. — *WORKS BY ALFRED BARING GARROD, M.D. F.R.S.*

A TREATISE ON GOUT AND RHEUMATIC GOUT (RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS). With 6 Plates, comprising 21 Figures (14 Coloured), and 27 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Svo. 21s.

THE ESSENTIALS OF MATERIA MEDICA AND THERAPEUTICS. Revised and edited, under the supervision of the Author, by E. B. BAXTER, M.D. F.R.C.P. Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in King's College, London. Crown Svo. 12s. 6d.

- GOETHE.**—*FAUST*. Translated by T. E. WEBB, LL.D. Reg. Prof. of Laws and Public Orator in the Univ. of Dublin. Svo. 12s. 6d.
- FAUST*. A New Translation, chiefly in Blank Verse; with a complete Introduction and Copious Notes. By JAMES ADEY BIRDS, B.A. F.G.S. Large crown Svo. 12s. 6d.
- FAUST*. The German Text, with an English Introduction and Notes for Students. By ALBERT M. SELSS, M.A. Ph.D. Crown Svo. 5s.
- GOODEVE.**—*WORKS BY T. M. GOODEVE, M.A.*
- PRINCIPLES OF MECHANICS*. With 253 Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 6s.
- THE ELEMENTS OF MECHANISM*. With 342 Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 6s.
- GOSPEL FOR THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (The)**. Svo. 10s. 6d.
- GRANT.**—*WORKS BY SIR ALEXANDER GRANT, BART. LL.D. D.C.L. &c.*
- THE STORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH* during its First Three Hundred Years. With numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. Svo. 36s.
- THE ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE*. The Greek Text illustrated by Essays and Notes. 2 vols. Svo. 32s.
- GRAY.**—*ANATOMY; DESCRIPTIVE AND SURGICAL*. By HENRY GRAY, F.R.S. late Lecturer on Anatomy at St. George's Hospital. With 557 large Woodcut Illustrations; those in the First Edition after Original Drawings by Dr. Carter, from Dissections made by the Author and Dr. Carter; the additional Drawings in the Second and subsequent Editions by Dr. Westmacott, and other Demonstrators of Anatomy. Re-edited by T. PICKERING PICK, Surgeon to St. George's Hospital. Royal Svo. 30s.
- GREVILLE.**—*JOURNAL OF THE REIGNS OF KING GEORGE IV. AND KING WILLIAM IV.* By the late C. C. F. GREVILLE. Edited by H. REEVE, C.B. 3 vols. Svo. 36s.
- GWILT.**—*AN ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ARCHITECTURE*, Historical, Theoretical, and Practical. By JOSEPH GWILT, F.S.A. Illustrated with more than 1,100 Engravings on Wood by R. Branston from Drawings by J. S. Gwilt. Revised, with Alterations and Considerable Additions, by WYATT PAPWORTH. Additionally illustrated with nearly 400 Wood Engravings by O. JEWITT, and nearly 200 other Woodcuts. Svo. 52s. 6d.
- GROVE.**—*THE CORRELATION OF PHYSICAL FORCES*. By the Hon. Sir W. R. GROVE, F.R.S. &c. Svo. 15s.
- HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS.**—*OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE*. By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS, F.R.S. Svo. 7s. 6d.
- HAMILTON.**—*LIFE OF SIR WILLIAM R. HAMILTON, Kt. LL.D. D.C.L. M.R.I.A. &c.* Including Selections from his Poems, Correspondence, and Miscellaneous Writings. By the Rev. R. P. GRAVES, M.A. Vol. I. Svo. 15s.
- HARTE.**—*ON THE FRONTIER*. Three Stories. By BRET HARTE. 16mo. 1s.
- HARTWIG.**—*WORKS BY DR. G. HARTWIG.*
- THE SEA AND ITS LIVING WONDERS*. Svo. with many Illustrations, 10s. 6d.
- THE TROPICAL WORLD*. With about 200 Illustrations. Svo. 10s. 6d.
- THE POLAR WORLD*: a Description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions of the Globe. Maps, Plates, and Woodcuts. Svo. 10s. 6d.
- THE ARCTIC REGIONS* (extracted from the 'Polar World'). 4to. 6d. sewed.
- THE SUBTERRANEAN WORLD*. With Maps and Woodcuts. Svo. 10s. 6d.
- THE AERIAL WORLD*: a Popular Account of the Phenomena and Life of the Atmosphere. Map, Plates, Woodcuts. Svo. 10s. 6d.
- HASSALL.**—*WORKS BY ARTHUR HILL HASSALL, M.D.*
- FOOD*; its Adulterations and the Methods for their Detection. Illustrated. Crown Svo. 24s.
- SILV REMO*, climatically and medically considered. With 30 Illustrations. Crown Svo. 5s.
- HAUGHTON.**—*SIX LECTURES ON PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY*, delivered in 1876, with some Additions. By the Rev. SAMUEL HAUGHTON, F.R.S. M.D. D.C.L. With 23 Diagrams. Svo. 15s.
- HAVELOCK.**—*MEMOIRS OF SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, K.C.B.* By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. Crown Svo. 3s. 6d.
- HAWARD.**—*A TREATISE ON ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY*. By J. WARRINGTON HAWARD, F.R.C.S. Surgeon to St. George's Hospital. With 30 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Svo. 12s. 6d.

- HELMHOLTZ.**—*POPULAR LECTURES ON SCIENTIFIC SUBJECTS.* By Professor HELMHOLTZ. Translated and edited by EDMUND ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. With a Preface by Professor TYNDALL, F.R.S. and 68 Woodcuts. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15s. or separately, 7s. 6d. each.
- HERSCHEL.**—*OUTLINES OF ASTRONOMY.* By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart. M.A. With Plates and Diagrams. Square crown 8vo. 12s.
- HEWITT.**—*WORKS BY GRAILY HEWITT, M.D.*
THE DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF DISEASES OF WOMEN, INCLUDING THE DIAGNOSIS OF PREGNANCY. New Edition, in great part re-written and much enlarged, with 211 Engravings on Wood, of which 79 are new in this Edition. 8vo. 24s.
THE MECHANICAL SYSTEM OF UTERINE PATHOLOGY. With 31 Life-size Illustrations prepared expressly for this Work. Crown 4to. 7s. 6d.
- HICKSON.**—*IRELAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY;* or, The Irish Massacres of 1641-2, their Causes and Results. Illustrated by Extracts from the unpublished State Papers, the unpublished MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Lambeth Library, &c.; a Selection from the unpublished Depositions relating to the Massacres, and the Reports of the Trials in the High Court of Justice, 1652-4, from the unpublished MSS. By MARY HICKSON. With a Preface by J. A. Froude, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.
- HOBART.**—*THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE:* a Proof from Internal Evidence that St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts were written by the same person, and that the writer was a Medical Man. By the Rev. W. K. HOBART, LL.D. 8vo. 16s.
- HOLMES.**—*A SYSTEM OF SURGERY,* Theoretical and Practical, in Treatises by various Authors. Edited by TIMOTHY HOLMES, M.A. Surgeon to St. George's Hospital; and J. W. HULKE, F.R.S. Surgeon to the Middlesex Hospital. In 3 Volumes, with Coloured Plates and Illustrations on Wood. 3 vols. royal 8vo. price Four Guineas.
- HORACE.**—*HORATHI OPERA,* Library Edition; the Text carefully corrected, with Notes, Marginal References, and Various Readings. Edited by the Rev. J. E. YONGE, M.A. Assistant Master, Eton. 8vo. 21s.
- HOMER.**—*THE ILLAD OF HOMER,* Homometrically translated by C. B. CAYLEY. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
THE ILLAD OF HOMER. The Greek Text, with a Verse Translation, by W. C. GREEN, M.A. Vol. I. Books I.-XII. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- HOPKINS.**—*CHRIST THE CONSOLER;* a Book of Comfort for the Sick. By ELLICE HOPKINS. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- HORSES AND ROADS;** or How to Keep a Horse Sound on His Legs. By FREE-LANCE. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- HORT.**—*THE NEW PANTHEON,* or an Introduction to the Mythology of the Ancients. By W. J. HORT. 18mo. 2s. 6d.
- HOWITT.**—*VISITS TO REMARKABLE PLACES,* Old Halls, Battle-Fields, Scenes illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By WILLIAM HOWITT. With 80 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- HULLAH.**—*WORKS BY JOHN HULLAH, LL.D.*
COURSE OF LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF MODERN MUSIC. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
COURSE OF LECTURES ON THE TRANSITION PERIOD OF MUSICAL HISTORY. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- HULME.**—*ART-INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND.* By F. E. HULME, F.L.S. F.S.A. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- HUME.**—*THE PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS OF DAVID HUME.* Edited by T. H. GREEN, M.A. and the Rev. T. H. GROSE, M.A. 4 vols. 8vo. 56s. Or separately, Essays, 2 vols. 28s. Treatise on Human Nature. 2 vols. 28s.
- HUSBAND.**—*EXAMINATION QUESTIONS IN ANATOMY, PHYSIOLOGY, BOTANY, MATERIA MEDICA, SURGERY, MEDICINE, MIDWIFERY, AND STATE-MEDICINE.* Arranged by H. A. HUSBAND, M.B. M.C. M.R.C.S. L.S.A. &c. 32mo. 4s. 6d.
- INGELOW.**—*POETICAL WORKS OF JEAN INGELOW.* New Edition, reprinted, with Additional Matter, from the 23rd and 6th Editions of the two volumes respectively. With 2 Vignettes. 2 vols. Fcp. 8vo. 12s.

IN THE OLDEN TIME.—A Novel.

By the Author of 'Mademoiselle Mori.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

JAMESON.—*WORKS BY MRS. JAMESON.*

LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS AND MARTYRS. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 31s. 6d.

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, the Virgin Mary as represented in Sacred and Legendary Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 21s.

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 21s.

HISTORY OF THE SAVIOUR, His Types and Precursors. Completed by Lady EASTLAKE. With 13 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 42s.

JEFFERIES.—*WORKS BY RICHARD JEFFERIES.*

THE STORY OF MY HEART: My Autobiography. Crown 8vo. 5s.

RED DEER. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

JOHNSON.—*THE PATENTEE'S MANUAL;*

a Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent, for the use of Patentees and Inventors. By J. JOHNSON and J. H. JOHNSON. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

JOHNSTON.—*A GENERAL DICTIONARY OF GEOGRAPHY;*

Descriptive, Physical, Statistical, and Historical; a complete Gazetteer of the World. By KEITH JOHNSTON. Medium 8vo. 42s.

JONES.—*THE HEALTH OF THE SENSES:*

SIGHT, HEARING, VOICE, SMELL AND TASTE, SKIN; with Hints on Health, Diet, Education, Health Resorts of Europe, &c. By H. MACNAUGHTON JONES, M.D. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

JUKES.—*WORKS BY THE REV. ANDREW JUKES.*

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

JUSTINIAN.—*THE INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN;*

Latin Text, chiefly that of Huschke, with English Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Summary. By THOMAS C. SANDARS, M.A. Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. 18s.

KALISCH.—*WORKS BY M. M. KALISCH, M.A.*

BIBLE STUDIES. Part I. The Prophecies of Balaam. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Part II. The Book of Jonah. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT; with a New Translation. Vol. I. Genesis, 8vo. 18s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. Vol. II. Exodus, 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. Vol. III. Leviticus, Part I. 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s. Vol. IV. Leviticus, Part II. 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s.

KANT.—*CRITIQUE OF PRACTICAL REASON;*

and other Works on the Theory of Ethics. By EMMANUEL KANT. Translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, B.D. With Memoir and Portrait. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

KEARY.—*OUTLINES OF PRIMITIVE BELIEF AMONG THE INDO-EUROPEAN RACES.*

By CHARLES F. KEARY, M.A. 8vo. 18s.

KELLER.—*THE LAKE DWELLINGS OF SWITZERLAND,*

and other Parts of Europe. By Dr. F. KELLER, President of the Antiquarian Association of Zürich. Translated and arranged by JOHN E. LEE, F.S.A. F.G.S. 2 vols. royal 8vo. with 206 Illustrations, 42s.

KERL.—*A PRACTICAL TREATISE ON METALLURGY.*

By Professor KERL. Adapted from the last German Edition by W. Crookes, F.R.S. &c. and E. Röhrig, Ph.D. 3 vols. 8vo. with 625 Woodcuts, £4. 19s.

KILLICK.—*HANDBOOK TO MILL'S SYSTEM OF LOGIC.*

By the Rev. A. H. KILLICK, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

KOLBE.—*A SHORT TEXT-BOOK OF INORGANIC CHEMISTRY.*

By Dr. HERMANN KOLBE. Translated from the German by T. S. HUMPHIDGE, Ph.D. With a Coloured Table of Spectra and 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LANG.—*WORKS BY ANDREW LANG,*

late Fellow of Merton College.

CUSTOM AND MYTH; Studies of Early Usage and Belief. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE PRINCESS NORODY; a Tale of Fairyland. After the Drawings by Richard Doyle, printed in colours by Edmund Evans. Post 4to. 5s. boards.

LATHAM.—*WORKS BY ROBERT G. LATHAM, M.A. M.D.*

A DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Founded on the Dictionary of Dr. JOHNSON. Four vols. 4to. £7.

A DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Abridged from Dr. Latham's Edition of Johnson's Dictionary. One Volume. Medium 8vo. 14s.

HANDBOOK OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Crown 8vo. 6s.

LECKY.—*WORKS BY W. E. H. LECKY.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE 18TH CENTURY. 4 vols. 8vo. 1700–1784, £3. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS FROM AUGUSTUS TO CHARLEMAGNE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

HISTORY OF THE RISE AND INFLUENCE OF THE SPIRIT OF RATIONALISM IN EUROPE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

LEADERS OF PUBLIC OPINION IN IRELAND.—Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LESLIE.—*ESSAYS IN POLITICAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY.* By T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE, Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LEWES.—*THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY,* from Thales to Comte. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

LEWIS.—*ON THE INFLUENCE OF AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF OPINION.* By Sir G. C. LEWIS, Bart. 8vo. 14s.

LINDLEY and MOORE.—*THE TREASURY OF BOTANY,* or Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom. Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S. and T. MOORE, F.L.S. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. Two Parts, fcp. 8vo. 12s.

LITTLE.—*ON IN-KNEE DISTORTION (Genu Valgum):* Its Varieties and Treatment with and without Surgical Operation. By W. J. LITTLE, M.D. Assisted by MUIRHEAD LITTLE, M.R.C.S. With 40 Illustrations. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LIVEING.—*WORKS BY ROBERT LIVEING, M.A. and M.D. Cantab.*

HANDBOOK ON DISEASES OF THE SKIN. With especial reference to Diagnosis and Treatment. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

NOTES ON THE TREATMENT OF SKIN DISEASES. 18mo. 3s.

ELEPHANTIASIS GRÆCORUM, OR TRUE LEPROSY. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

LLOYD.—*A TREATISE ON MAGNETISM,* General and Terrestrial. By H. LLOYD, D.D. D.C.L. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LLOYD.—*THE SCIENCE OF AGRICULTURE.* By F. J. LLOYD. 8vo. 12s.

LONGMAN.—*WORKS BY WILLIAM LONGMAN, F.S.A.*

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND from the Earliest Times to the Death of King Edward II. Maps and Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.

HISTORY OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF EDWARD III. With 9 Maps, 8 Plates, and 16 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

LONGMAN.—*WORKS BY FREDERICK W. LONGMAN, Balliol College, Oxon.*

CHESS OPENINGS. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
FREDERICK THE GREAT AND THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR. With 2 Coloured Maps. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A NEW POCKET DICTIONARY OF THE GERMAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. Square 18mo. 5s.

LONGMAN'S MAGAZINE. Published Monthly. Price Sixpence. Vols. 1–4, 8vo. price 5s. each.

LONGMORE.—*GUNSHOT INJURIES;* Their History, Characteristic Features, Complications, and General Treatment. By Surgeon-General T. LONGMORE, C.B. F.R.C.S. With 58 Illustrations. 8vo. price 31s. 6d.

LOUDON.—*WORKS BY J. C. LOUDON, F.L.S.*

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF GARDENING; the Theory and Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture, and Landscape Gardening. With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF AGRICULTURE; the Laying-out, Improvement, and Management of Landed Property; the Cultivation and Economy of the Productions of Agriculture. With 1,100 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PLANTS; the Specific Character, Description, Culture, History, &c. of all Plants found in Great Britain. With 12,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

LUBBOCK.—*THE ORIGIN OF CIVILIZATION AND THE PRIMITIVE CONDITION OF MAN.* By Sir J. LUBBOCK, Bart. M.P. F.R.S. 8vo. Woodcuts, 18s.

LYRA GERMANICA; Hymns Translated from the German by Miss C. WINKWORTH. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

MACALISTER.—*AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY AND MORPHOLOGY OF VERTEBRATE ANIMALS.* By A. MACALISTER, M.D. With 28 Diagrams. Svo. 10s. 6d.

MACAULAY.—*WORKS AND LIFE OF LORD MACAULAY.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM

THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND:

Student's Edition, 2 vols. crown Svo. 12s.

People's Edition, 4 vols. crown Svo. 16s.

Cabinet Edition, 8 vols. post Svo. 48s.

Library Edition, 5 vols. Svo. £4.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS:

Cheap Edition, 1 vol. crown Svo. 2s. 6d.

Student's Edition, 1 vol. crown Svo. 6s.

People's Edition, 2 vols. crown Svo. 8s.

Cabinet Edition, 4 vols. post Svo. 24s.

Library Edition, 3 vols. Svo. 36s.

LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, &c.

Illustrated by G. Scharf, fcp. 4to. 10s. 6d.

Popular Edition,

fcp. 4to. 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

Illustrated by J. R. Weguelin, crown Svo. 3s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

Cabinet Edition, post Svo. 3s. 6d.

Annotated Edition, fcp. Svo. 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth, or 2s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

ESSAYS which may be had separately price 6d. each sewed, 1s. each cloth: Addison and Walpole.

Frederick the Great.

Croker's Boswell's Johnson.

Hallam's Constitutional History.

Warren Hastings.

The Earl of Chatham (Two Essays).

Ranke and Gladstone.

Milton and Machiavelli.

Lord Bacon.

Lord Clive.

Lord Byron, and The Comic Dramatists of the Restoration.

The Essay on Warren Hastings annotated by S. HALES, 1s. 6d.

The Essay on Lord Clive annotated by H. COURTHOPE-BOWEN, M.A. 2s. 6d.

SPEECHES:

People's Edition, crown Svo. 3s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS

Library Edition, 2 vols. Svo. Portrait, 21s.

People's Edition, 1 vol. crown Svo. 4s. 6d.

SELECTIONS FROM THE

WRITINGS OF LORD MACAULAY. Edited,

with Occasional Notes, by the Right

Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P. Crown

Svo. 6s.

[Continued above.]

MACAULAY—*WORKS AND LIFE OF LORD MACAULAY*
—continued.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS AND SPEECHES:

Student's Edition, in ONE VOLUME, crown Svo. 6s.

Cabinet Edition, including Indian Penal Code, Lays of Ancient Rome, and Miscellaneous Poems, 4 vols. post Svo. 24s.

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF LORD MACAULAY. Edited by his Sister, Lady TREVELYAN.

Library Edition, with Portrait, 8 vols. demy Svo. £5. 5s.

Cabinet Edition, 16 vols. post Svo. £4. 16s.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY. By the Right Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P.

Popular Edition, 1 vol. crown Svo. 6s.

Cabinet Edition, 2 vols. post Svo. 12s.

Library Edition, 2 vols. Svo. with Portrait, 36s.

MACFARREN.—*LECTURES ON HARMONY*, delivered at the Royal Institution. By G. A. MACFARREN. Svo. 12s.

MACKENZIE.—*ON THE USE OF THE LARYNGOSCOPE IN DISEASES OF THE THROAT*; with an Appendix on Rhinoscopy. By MORELL MACKENZIE, M.D. Lond. With 47 Woodcut Illustrations. Svo. 6s.

MACLEOD.—*WORKS BY HENRY D. MACLEOD, M.A.*

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICAL PHILOSOPHY. In 2 vols. Vol. I. Svo. 15s. Vol. II. PART I. 12s.

THE ELEMENTS OF ECONOMICS. In 2 vols. Vol. I. crown Svo. 7s. 6d.

THE ELEMENTS OF BANKING. Crown Svo. 5s.

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF BANKING. Vol. I. Svo. 12s. Vol. II. nearly ready.

ELEMENTS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. Svo. 16s.

ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS. Svo. 2s. 6d.

LECTURES ON CREDIT AND BANKING. Svo. 5s.

MACNAMARA.—*HIMALAYAN AND SUB-HIMALAYAN DISTRICTS OF BRITISH INDIA*, their Climate, Medical Topography, and Disease Distribution. By F. N. MACNAMARA, M.D. With Map and Fever Chart. Svo. 21s.

McCULLOCH.—*THE DICTIONARY OF COMMERCE AND COMMERCIAL NAVIGATION* of the late J. R. McCULLOCH, of H.M. Stationery Office. Latest Edition, containing the most recent Statistical Information by A. J. WILSON. 1 vol. medium 8vo. with 11 Maps and 30 Charts, price 65s. cloth, or 70s. strongly half-bound in russia.

MAHAFFY.—*A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE.* By the Rev. J. P. MAHAFFY, M.A. Crown 8vo. Vol. I. Poets, 7s. 6d. Vol. II. Prose Writers, 7s. 6d.

MALMESBURY.—*MEMOIRS OF AN EX-MINISTER:* an Autobiography. By the Earl of MALMESBURY, G.C.B. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

MANNING.—*THE TEMPORAL MISSION OF THE HOLY GHOST;* or, Reason and Revelation. By H. E. MANNING, D.D. Cardinal-Archbishop. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

MARTINEAU.—*WORKS BY JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D.*

HOURS OF THOUGHT ON SACRED THINGS. Two Volumes of Sermons. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. each.

ENDEAVOURS AFTER THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Discourses. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MAUNDER'S TREASURIES.

BIOGRAPHICAL TREASURY. Reconstructed, revised, and brought down to the year 1882, by W. L. R. CATES. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

TREASURY OF NATURAL HISTORY; or, Popular Dictionary of Zoology. Fcp. 8vo. with 900 Woodcuts, 6s.

TREASURY OF GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

HISTORICAL TREASURY, Outlines of Universal History, Separate Histories of all Nations. Revised by the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. M.A. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

TREASURY OF KNOWLEDGE AND LIBRARY OF REFERENCE. Comprising an English Dictionary and Grammar, Universal Gazetteer, Classical Dictionary, Chronology, Law Dictionary, &c. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

SCIENTIFIC AND LITERARY TREASURY: a Popular Encyclopædia of Science, Literature, and Art. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

MAXWELL.—*DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA;* or, Passages from the History of the Sixteenth Century, 1547-1578. By the late Sir WILLIAM STIRLING MAXWELL, Bart. K.T. With numerous Illustrations engraved on Wood taken from Authentic Contemporary Sources. Library Edition. 2 vols. royal 8vo. 42s.

MAY.—*WORKS BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B.*

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND SINCE THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE III. 1760-1870. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE; a History. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

MENDELSSOHN.—*THE LETTERS OF FELIX MENDELSSOHN.* Translated by Lady WALLACE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 10s.

MERIVALE.—*WORKS BY THE VERY REV. CHARLES MERIVALE, D.D. Dean of Ely.*

HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE EMPIRE. 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

GENERAL HISTORY OF ROME FROM B.C. 753 TO A.D. 476. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ROMAN TRIUMVIRATES. With Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

MILES.—*WORKS BY WILLIAM MILES.*

THE HORSE'S FOOT, AND HOW TO KEEP IT SOUND. Imp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

STABLES AND STABLE FITTINGS. Imp. 8vo. with 13 Plates, 15s.

REMARKS ON HORSES' TEETH, addressed to Purchasers. Post 8vo. 1s. 6d.

PLAIN TREATISE ON HORSE-SHOEING. Post 8vo. Woodcuts, 2s. 6d.

MILL.—*ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENA OF THE HUMAN MIND.* By JAMES MILL. With Notes, Illustrative and Critical. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

MILL.—*WORKS BY JOHN STUART MILL.*

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. Library Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

People's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 5s.

[Continued on next page.]

MILL.—*WORKS BY JOHN STUART MILL*—continued.

A SYSTEM OF LOGIC, Ratiocinative and Inductive.

Library Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

People's Edition, crown 8vo. 5s.

ON LIBERTY. Crown 8vo. 1s. 4d.

ON REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT. Crown 8vo. 2s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON SOME UNSETTLED QUESTIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

UTILITARIANISM. 8vo. 5s.

THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN. Crown 8vo. 6s.

EXAMINATION OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY. 8vo. 16s.

DISSERTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS. 4 vols. 8vo. £2. 6s. 6d.

NATURE, THE UTILITY OF RELIGION, AND THEISM. Three Essays. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MILLER.—*WORKS BY W. ALLEN MILLER, M.D. LL.D.*

THE ELEMENTS OF CHEMISTRY, Theoretical and Practical Re-edited, with Additions, by H. MACLEOD, F.C.S. 3 vols. 8vo.

Part I. CHEMICAL PHYSICS, 16s.

Part II. INORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 24s.

Part III. ORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 31s. 6d.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF INORGANIC CHEMISTRY. With 71 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MILLER.—*READINGS IN SOCIAL ECONOMY*. By Mrs. F. FENWICK MILLER, Member of the London School Board. Library Edition, crown 8vo. 5s. Cheap Edition for Schools and Beginners, crown 8vo. 2s.

MILLER.—*WINTERING IN THE RIVIERA*; with Notes of Travel in Italy and France, and Practical Hints to Travellers. By W. MILLER. With 12 Illustrations. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MILNER.—*COUNTRY PLEASURES*; the Chronicle of a Year, chiefly in a Garden. By GEORGE MILNER. With Vignette. Crown 8vo. 6s.

MITCHELL.—*A MANUAL OF PRACTICAL ASSAYING*. By JOHN MITCHELL, F.C.S. Revised, with the Recent Discoveries incorporated. By W. CROOKES, F.R.S. 8vo. Woodcuts, 31s. 6d.

MODERN NOVELIST'S LIBRARY

(THE). Price 2s. each boards, or 2s. 6d. each cloth:—

By the Earl of BEACONSFIELD, K.G.
Endymion.

Lothair.	Henrietta Temple.
Coningsby.	Contarini Fleming, &c.
Sybil.	Alroy, Ixion, &c.
Tancred.	The Young Duke, &c.
Venetia.	Vivian Grey, &c.

By Mrs. OLIPHANT.
In Trust.

By BRET HARTE.
In the Carquinez Woods.

By ANTHONY TROLLOPE.
Barchester Towers.
The Warden.

By Major WHYTE-MELVILLE.
Digby Grand. | Good for Nothing.
General Bounce. | Holmby House.
Kate Coventry. | The Interpreter.
The Gladiators. | Queen's Maries.

By Various Writers.
The Atelier du Lys.
Atherstone Priory.
The Burgomaster's Family.
Elsa and her Vulture.
Mademoiselle Mori.
The Six Sisters of the Valleys.
Unawares.

MONCK.—*AN INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC*. By WILLIAM H. STANLEY MONCK, M.A. Prof. of Moral Philos. Univ. of Dublin. Crown 8vo. 5s.

MONSELL.—*SPIRITUAL SONGS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLIDAYS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR*. By J. S. B. MONSELL, LL.D. Fcp. 8vo. 5s. 18mo. 2s.

MOORE.—*THE WORKS OF THOMAS MOORE*.

LALLA ROOKH, TENNIEL'S Edition, with 68 Woodcut Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

IRISH MELODIES, MACLISE'S Edition, with 161 Steel Plates. Super-royal 8vo. 21s.

MOREHEAD.—*CLINICAL RESEARCHES ON DISEASE IN INDIA*. By CHARLES MOREHEAD, M.D. Surgeon to the Jamssetjee Jeejeebhoy Hospital. 8vo. 21s.

MORELL.—*HANDBOOK OF LOGIC*, adapted especially for the Use of Schools and Teachers. By J. D. MORELL, LL.D. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.

MOZLEY.—*REMINISCENCES CHIEFLY OF ORIEL COLLEGE AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT*. By the Rev. THOMAS MOZLEY, M.A. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

MÜLLER.—*WORKS BY F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A.*

BIOGRAPHICAL ESSAYS. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SELECTED ESSAYS ON LANGUAGE, MYTHOLOGY AND RELIGION. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

INDIA, WHAT CAN IT TEACH US? A Course of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HIBBERT LECTURES ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION, as illustrated by the Religions of India. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION: Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution; with Notes and Illustrations on Vedic Literature, Polynesian Mythology, the Sacred Books of the East, &c. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A SANSKRIT GRAMMAR FOR BEGINNERS, in Devanagari and Roman Letters throughout. Royal 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MURCHISON.—*WORKS BY CHARLES MURCHISON, M.D. LL.D. F.R.C.S. &c.*

A TREATISE ON THE CONTINUED FEVERS OF GREAT BRITAIN. New Edition, revised by W. CAYLEY, M.D. Physician to the Middlesex Hospital. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations, 25s.

CLINICAL LECTURES ON DISEASES OF THE LIVER, JAUNDICE, AND ABDOMINAL DROPSY. New Edition, revised by T. LAUDER BRUNTON, M.D. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations.

[*In preparation.*]

NEISON.—*THE MOON,* and the Condition and Configurations of its Surface. By E. NEISON, F.R.A.S. With 26 Maps and 5 Plates. Medium 8vo. 31s. 6d.

NEVILLE.—*WORKS BY GEORGE NEVILLE, M.A.*

HORSES AND RIDING. With 31 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.

FARMS AND FARMING. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.

NEWMAN.—*APOLOGIA PRO VITA SUA;* being a History of his Religious Opinions by Cardinal NEWMAN. Crown 8vo. 6s.

NEW TESTAMENT (THE) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Illustrated with Engravings on Wood after Paintings by the Early Masters chiefly of the Italian School. New and Cheaper Edition. 4to. 21s. cloth extra, or 42s. morocco.

NORTHCOTT.—*LATHES AND TURNING,* Simple, Mechanical, and Ornamental. By W. H. NORTHCOTT. With 338 Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.

OWEN.—*WORKS BY SIR RICHARD OWEN, K.C.B. &c.*

THE COMPARATIVE ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF THE VERTEBRATE ANIMALS. With 1,472 Woodcuts. 3 vols. 8vo. £3. 13s. 6d.

EXPERIMENTAL PHYSIOLOGY; ITS BENEFITS TO MANKIND; with an Address on Unveiling the Statue of William Harvey at Folkestone, August 1881. Crown 8vo. 5s.

PAGET.—*WORKS BY SIR JAMES PAGET, BART. F.R.S. D.C.L. &c.*

CLINICAL LECTURES AND ESSAYS. Edited by F. HOWARD MARSH, Assistant-Surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. 8vo. 15s.

LECTURES ON SURGICAL PATHOLOGY. Delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons of England. Re-edited by the AUTHOR and W. TURNER, M.B. 8vo. with 131 Woodcuts, 21s.

PALEY.—*VIEW OF THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY AND HORÆ PAULINÆ.* By Archdeacon PALEY. With Notes and an Analysis, and a Selection of Questions. By ROBERT POTTS, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

PASTEUR.—*LOUIS PASTEUR,* his Life and Labours. By his SON-IN-LAW. Translated from the French by Lady CLAUD HAMILTON. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PAYEN.—*INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY;* a Manual for Manufacturers and for Colleges or Technical Schools; a Translation of PAYEN'S 'Précis de Chimie Industrielle.' Edited by B. H. PAUL. With 698 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 42s.

PAYN.—*THICKER THAN WATER.* A Novel. By JAMES PAYN, Author of 'Lost Sir Massingberd' &c. Crown 8vo. 6s.

PENNEL.—'*FROM GRAVE TO GAY*': a Volume of Selections from the complete Poems of H. CHOLMONDELEY-PENNEL, Author of 'Puck on Pegasus' &c. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

PEREIRA.—*MATERIA MEDICA AND THERAPEUTICS.* By Dr. PEREIRA. Abridged, and adapted for the use of Medical and Pharmaceutical Practitioners and Students. Edited by Professor R. BENTLEY, M.R.C.S. F.L.S. and by Professor T. REDWOOD, Ph.D. F.C.S. With 126 Woodcuts, 8vo. 25s.

PERRY.—*A POPULAR INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE*, designed to Promote the Knowledge and Appreciation of the Remains of Ancient Art. By WALTER C. PERRY. With 268 Illustrations. Square crown Svo. 31s. 6d.

PIESSE.—*THE ART OF PERFUMERY*, and the Methods of Obtaining the Odours of Plants; with Instructions for the Manufacture of Perfumes, &c. By G. W. S. PIESSE, Ph.D. F.C.S. With 96 Woodcuts, square crown Svo. 21s.

PLATO.—*THE PARMENIDES OF PLATO*; with Introduction, Analysis, and Notes. By THOMAS MAGUIRE, LL.D. D.Lit. Fellow and Tutor, Trinity College, Dublin. Svo. 7s. 6d.

POLE.—*THE THEORY OF THE MODERN SCIENTIFIC GAME OF WHIST*. By W. POLE, F.R.S. Fcp. Svo. 2s. 6d.

PROCTOR.—*WORKS BY R. A. PROCTOR.*

THE SUN; Ruler, Light, Fire, and Life of the Planetary System. With Plates and Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 14s.

THE ORBS AROUND US; a Series of Essays on the Moon and Planets, Meteors and Comets, the Sun and Coloured Pairs of Suns. With Chart and Diagrams, crown Svo. 7s. 6d.

OTHER WORLDS THAN OURS; The Plurality of Worlds Studied under the Light of Recent Scientific Researches. With 14 Illustrations, crown Svo. 10s. 6d.

THE MOON; her Motions, Aspects, Scenery, and Physical Condition. With Plates, Charts, Woodcuts, and Lunar Photographs, crown Svo. 10s. 6d.

UNIVERSE OF STARS; Presenting Researches into and New Views respecting the Constitution of the Heavens. With 22 Charts and 22 Diagrams, Svo. 10s. 6d.

NEW STAR ATLAS for the Library, the School, and the Observatory, in 12 Circular Maps (with 2 Index Plates). Crown Svo. 5s.

LARGER STAR ATLAS for the Library, in 12 Circular Maps, with Introduction and 2 Index Pages. Folio, 15s. or Maps only, 12s. 6d.

LIGHT SCIENCE FOR LEISURE HOURS; Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects, Natural Phenomena, &c. 3 vols. crown Svo. 7s. 6d. each.

[Continued above.]

PROCTOR—*WORKS BY R. A. PROCTOR* continued.

STUDIES OF VENUS-TRANSITS; an Investigation of the Circumstances of the Transits of Venus in 1874 and 1882. With 7 Diagrams and 10 Plates. Svo. 5s.

TRANSITS OF VENUS. A Popular Account of Past and Coming Transits from the First Observed by Horrocks in 1639 to the Transit of 2012. With 20 Lithographic Plates (12 Coloured) and 38 Illustrations engraved on Wood, Svo. 8s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON ASTRONOMY. A Series of Papers on Planets and Meteors, the Sun and Sun-surrounding Space, Stars and Star Clondlets. With 10 Plates and 24 Woodcuts, Svo. 12s.

A TREATISE ON THE CYCLOID AND ON ALL FORMS OF CYCLOIDAL CURVES, and on the use of Cycloidal Curves in dealing with the Motions of Planets, Comets, &c. and of Matter projected from the Sun. With 161 Diagrams. Crown Svo. 10s. 6d.

PLEASANT WAYS IN SCIENCE, with numerous Illustrations. Crown Svo. 6s.

MYTHS AND MARVELS OF ASTRONOMY, with numerous Illustrations. Crown Svo. 6s.

THE 'KNOWLEDGE' LIBRARY.

Edited by RICHARD A. PROCTOR.

SCIENCE BYWAYS. A Series of Familiar Dissertations on Life in Other Worlds. By RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Crown Svo. 6s.

THE POETRY OF ASTRONOMY. A Series of Familiar Essays on the Heavenly Bodies. By RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Crown Svo. 6s.

NATURE STUDIES. Reprinted from *Knowledge*. By GRANT ALLEN, ANDREW WILSON, THOMAS FOSTER, EDWARD CLODD, and RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Crown Svo. 6s.

LEISURE READINGS. Reprinted from *Knowledge*. By EDWARD CLODD, ANDREW WILSON, THOMAS FOSTER, A. C. RUNYARD, and RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Crown Svo. 6s.

THE STARS IN THEIR SEASONS. An Easy Guide to a Knowledge of the Star Groups, in Twelve Large Maps. By RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Imperial Svo. 5s.

QUAIN'S ELEMENTS OF ANATOMY.

The Ninth Edition. Re-edited by ALLEN THOMSON, M.D. LL.D. F.R.S.S. L. & F. EDWARD ALBERT SCHÄFER, F.R.S. and GEORGE DANCFER THANE. With upwards of 1,000 Illustrations engraved on Wood, of which many are Coloured, 2 vols. Svo. 18s. each.

QUAIN.—*A DICTIONARY OF MEDICINE.* Including General Pathology, General Therapeutics, Hygiene, and the Diseases peculiar to Women and Children. By Various Writers. Edited by R. QUAIN, M.D. F.R.S. &c. With 138 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 31s. 6d. cloth, or 40s. half-russia; to be had also in 2 vols. 34s. cloth.

RAWLINSON. — *THE SEVENTH GREAT ORIENTAL MONARCHY;* or, a History of the Sassanians. By G. RAWLINSON, M.A. With Map and 95 Illustrations. 8vo. 28s.

READER.—*VOICES FROM FLOWERLAND,* in Original Couplets. By EMILY E. READER. A Birthday-Book and Language of Flowers. 16mo. 2s. 6d. limp cloth; 3s. 6d. roan, gilt edges.

REEVE. — *COOKERY AND HOUSE-KEEPING;* a Manual of Domestic Economy for Large and Small Families. By Mrs. HENRY REEVE. With 8 Coloured Plates and 37 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

RICH.—*A DICTIONARY OF ROMAN AND GREEK ANTIQUITIES.* With 2,000 Woodcuts. By A. RICH, B.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

RIVERS. — *WORKS BY THOMAS RIVERS.*

THE ORCHARD-HOUSE; or, the Cultivation of Fruit Trees under Glass. Crown 8vo. with 25 Woodcuts, 5s.

THE ROSE AMATEUR'S GUIDE. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

ROGERS. — *WORKS BY HENRY ROGERS.*

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, a Visit to a Religious Sceptic. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

DEFENCE OF THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ROGET.—*THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES,* classified and arranged so as to facilitate the expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By PETER M. ROGET, M.D. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

RONALDS. — *THE FLY-FISHER'S ENTOMOLOGY.* By ALFRED RONALDS. With 20 Coloured Plates. 8vo. 14s.

SALTER.—*DENTAL PATHOLOGY AND SURGERY.* By S. J. A. SALTER, M.B. F.R.S. With 133 Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.

SCOTT.—*WORKS BY JOHN SCOTT.*

RENTS AND PURCHASES; or, the Valuation of Landed Property, Woods, Minerals, Buildings, &c. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE FARM-VALUER. Crown 8vo. 5s.

SEEBOHM.—*WORKS BY FREDERICK SEEBOHM.*

THE OXFORD REFORMERS — JOHN COLET, ERASMUS, AND THOMAS MORE; a History of their Fellow-Work. 8vo. 14s.

THE ENGLISH VILLAGE COMMUNITY Examined in its Relations to the Manorial and Tribal Systems, and to the Common or Openfield System of Husbandry. 13 Maps and Plates. 8vo. 16s.

THE ERA OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION. With Map. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SENNETT.—*THE MARINE STEAM ENGINE;* a Treatise for the use of Engineering Students and Officers of the Royal Navy. By RICHARD SENNETT, Chief Engineer, Royal Navy. With 244 Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

SEWELL.—*WORKS BY ELIZABETH M. SEWELL.*

STORIES AND TALES. Cabinet Edition, in Eleven Volumes, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each, in cloth extra, with gilt edges:—

Amy Herbert. Gertrude.

The Earl's Daughter.

The Experience of Life.

A Glimpse of the World.

Cleve Hall. Ivors.

Katharine Ashton.

Margaret Percival.

Laneton Parsonage. Ursula.

PASSING THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

PREPARATION FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION; the Devotions chiefly from the works of JEREMY TAYLOR. 32mo. 3s.

NIGHT LESSONS FROM SCRIPTURE. 32mo. 3s. 6d.

SEYMOUR.—*THE PSALMS OF DAVID;* a new Metrical English Translation of the Hebrew Psalter or Book of Praises. By WILLIAM DIGBY SEYMOUR, Q.C. LL.D. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SHORT.—*SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO THE REVOLUTION OF 1688.* By T. V. SHORT, D.D. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

- SHAKESPEARE.**—*BOWDLER'S FAMILY SHAKESPEARE.* Genuine Edition, in 1 vol. medium 8vo. large type, with 36 Woodcuts, 14s. or in 6 vols. fep. 8vo. 21s.
- OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE.* By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS, F.R.S. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- SIMCOX.**—*A HISTORY OF LATIN LITERATURE.* By G. A. SIMCOX, M.A. Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.
- SKOBELEFF AND THE SLAVONIC CAUSE.** By O. K. Honorary Member of the Benevolent Slavonic Society. 8vo. with Portrait, 14s.
- SMITH, Rev. SYDNEY.**—*THE WIT AND WISDOM OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH.* Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- SMITH, R. BOSWORTH.**—*CARTHAGE AND THE CARTHAGINIANS.* By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A. Maps, Plans, &c. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- SMITH, R. A.**—*AIR AND RAIN;* the Beginnings of a Chemical Climatology. By R. A. SMITH, F.R.S. 8vo. 24s.
- SMITH, JAMES.**—*THE VOYAGE AND SHIPWRECK OF ST. PAUL.* By JAMES SMITH, of Jordanhill. With Dissertations on the Life and Writings of St. Luke, and the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- SMITH, T.**—*A MANUAL OF OPERATIVE SURGERY ON THE DEAD BODY.* By THOMAS SMITH, Surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. A New Edition, re-edited by W. J. WALSHAM. With 46 Illustrations. 8vo. 12s.
- SMITH, H. F.**—*THE HANDBOOK FOR MIDWIVES.* By HENRY FLY SMITH, M.B. Oxon. M.R.C.S. late Assistant-Surgeon at the Hospital for Sick Women, Soho Square. With 41 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- SOPHOCLES.**—*SOPHOCLES TRAGÆDIE* superstites; recensuit et brevi Annotatione instruxit GULIELMUS LINWOOD, M.A. *Ædis Christi apud Oxonienses nuper Alumnus.* Editio Quarta, auctior et emendatior. 8vo. 16s.
- THE THEBAN TRILOGY OF SOPHOCLES;* Oedipus Rex, Oedipus Coloneus, Antigone: Greek Text, with copious Explanatory English Notes. By the Rev. W. LINWOOD, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- SOUTHEY.**—*THE POETICAL WORKS OF ROBERT SOUTHEY,* with the Author's last Collections and Additions. Medium 8vo. with Portrait, 14s.
- THE CORRESPONDENCE OF ROBERT SOUTHEY WITH CAROLINE BOWLES.* Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN, LL.D. 8vo. Portrait, 14s.
- STANLEY.**—*A FAMILIAR HISTORY OF BIRDS.* By E. STANLEY, D.D. Revised and enlarged, with 160 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- STEEL.**—*A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE OX;* being a Manual of Bovine Pathology specially adapted for the use of Veterinary Practitioners and Students. By J. H. STEEL, M.R.C.V.S. F.Z.S. With 2 Plates and 116 Woodcuts. 8vo. 15s.
- STEPHEN.**—*ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY.* By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- 'STONEHENGE.'**—*THE DOG IN HEALTH AND DISEASE.* By 'STONEHENGE.' With 78 Wood Engravings. Square crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- THE GREYHOUND.* By 'STONEHENGE.' With 25 Portraits of Greyhounds, &c. Square crown 8vo. 15s.
- STURGIS.**—*MY FRIENDS AND I.* By JULIAN STURGIS. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- SULLIVAN.**—*'STRAY SHOTS;'* Political, Military, Economical, and Social. By Sir EDWARD SULLIVAN, Bart. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- SULLY.**—*OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY,* with Special Reference to the Theory of Education. By JAMES SULLY, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- SUPERNATURAL RELIGION;** an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. Complete Edition, thoroughly revised. 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.
- SWINBURNE.**—*PICTURE LOGIC;* an Attempt to Popularise the Science of Reasoning. By A. J. SWINBURNE, B.A. Post 8vo. 5s.
- SWINTON.**—*THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF ELECTRIC LIGHTING.* By ALAN A. CAMPBELL SWINTON. With 54 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Crown 8vo. 5s.

TAYLOR.—*STUDENT'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF INDIA*, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR, C.S.I. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

TAYLOR.—*THE COMPLETE WORKS OF BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR*. With Life by Bishop Heber. Revised and corrected by the Rev. C. P. EDEN. 10 vols. £5. 5s.

TEXT-BOOKS OF SCIENCE: a Series of Elementary Works on Science, Mechanical and Physical, forming a Series of Text-books of Science, adapted for the use of Students in Public and Science Schools. Fcp. 8vo. fully illustrated with Woodcuts.

Abney's Photography, 3s. 6d.

Anderson's Strength of Materials, 3s. 6d.

Armstrong's Organic Chemistry, 3s. 6d.

Ball's Elements of Astronomy, 6s.

Barry's Railway Appliances, 3s. 6d.

Bauerman's Systematic Mineralogy, 6s.

————— Descriptive Mineralogy, 6s.

Bloxam and Huntington's Metals, 5s.

Glazebrook's Physical Optics, 6s.

Gore's Electro-Metallurgy, 6s.

Griffin's Algebra and Trigonometry, 3s. 6d.

Jenkin's Electricity and Magnetism, 3s. 6d.

Maxwell's Theory of Heat, 3s. 6d.

Merrifield's Technical Arithmetic, 3s. 6d.

Miller's Inorganic Chemistry, 3s. 6d.

Preece and Sivewright's Telegraphy, 5s.

Rutley's Petrology, or Study of Rocks, 4s. 6d.

Shelley's Workshop Appliances, 4s. 6d.

Thomé's Structural and Physiological Botany, 6s.

Thorpe's Quantitative Analysis, 4s. 6d.

Thorpe and Muir's Qualitative Analysis, 3s. 6d.

Tilden's Chemical Philosophy, 3s. 6d. With Answers to Problems, 4s. 6d.

Unwin's Machine Design, 6s.

Watson's Plane and Solid Geometry, 3s. 6d.

THOMSON.—*AN OUTLINE OF THE NECESSARY LAWS OF THOUGHT*; a Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By W. THOMSON, D.D. Archbishop of York. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THOMSON'S CONSPECTUS ADAPTED TO THE BRITISH PHARMACOPEIA. By EDMUND LLOYD BIRKETT, M.D. &c. Latest Edition. 18mo. 6s.

THREE IN NORWAY. By Two of THEM. With a Map and 59 Illustrations on Wood from Sketches by the Authors. Crown 8vo. 6s.

TREVELYAN.—*WORKS BY THE RIGHT HON. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P.*

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY. By the Right Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P.

LIBRARY EDITION, 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

CABINET EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

POPULAR EDITION, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX. Library Edition, 8vo. 18s. Cabinet Edition, crown 8vo. 6s.

TWISS.—*WORKS BY SIR TRAVERS TWISS.*

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NATIONS, considered as Independent Communities in Time of War. 8vo. 21s.

ON THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NATIONS IN TIME OF PEACE. 8vo. 15s.

TYNDALL.—*WORKS BY JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. &c.*

FRAGMENTS OF SCIENCE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

HEAT A MODE OF MOTION. Crown 8vo. 12s.

SOUND. With 204 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON THE FLOATING-MATTER OF THE AIR in relation to Putrefaction and Infection. With 24 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LECTURES ON LIGHT, delivered in America in 1872 and 1873. With Portrait, Plate, and Diagrams. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LESSONS IN ELECTRICITY AT THE ROYAL INSTITUTION, 1875-76. With 58 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

NOTES OF A COURSE OF SEVEN LECTURES ON ELECTRICAL PHENOMENA AND THEORIES, delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed 1s. 6d. cloth.

NOTES OF A COURSE OF NINE LECTURES ON LIGHT, delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth.

FARADAY AS A DISCOVERER. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

URE.—*A DICTIONARY OF ARTS, MANUFACTURES, AND MINES.* By Dr. URE. Seventh Edition, re-written and enlarged by R. HUNT, F.R.S. With 2,064 Woodcuts. 4 vols. medium Svo. £7. 7s.

VILLE.—*ON ARTIFICIAL MANURES,* their Chemical Selection and Scientific Application to Agriculture. By GEORGES VILLE. Translated and edited by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. With 31 Plates. Svo. 21s.

VIRGIL.—*PUBLI VERGILI MARONIS BUCOLICA, GEORGICA, ÆNEIS:* the Works of VIRGIL, Latin Text, with English Commentary and Index. By B. H. KENNEDY, D.D. Crown Svo. 10s. 6d.

THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Verse. By J. CONINGTON, M.A. Crown Svo. 9s.

THE POEMS OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Prose. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Crown Svo. 9s.

WALKER.—*THE CORRECT CARD;* or, How to Play at Whist; a Whist Catechism. By Major A. CAMPBELL-WALKER, F.R.G.S. Fcp. Svo. 2s. 6d.

WALPOLE.—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE CONCLUSION OF THE GREAT WAR IN 1815 TO THE YEAR 1841.* By SPENCER WALPOLE. 3 vols. Svo. £2. 14s.

WATSON.—*LECTURES ON THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF PHYSIC,* delivered at King's College, London, by Sir THOMAS WATSON, Bart. M.D. With Two Plates. 2 vols. Svo. 36s.

WATTS.—*A DICTIONARY OF CHEMISTRY AND THE ALLIED BRANCHES OF OTHER SCIENCES.* Edited by HENRY WATTS, F.R.S. 9 vols. medium Svo. £15. 2s. 6d.

WEBB.—*CELESTIAL OBJECTS FOR COMMON TELESCOPES.* By the Rev. T. W. WEBB, M.A. Map, Plate, Woodcuts. Crown Svo. 9s.

WELLINGTON.—*LIFE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.* By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Crown Svo. Portrait, 6s.

WEST.—*LECTURES ON THE DISEASES OF INFANCY AND CHILDHOOD.* By CHARLES WEST, M.D. &c. Founder of, and formerly Physician to, the Hospital for Sick Children. Svo. 18s.

WHATELY.—*ENGLISH SYNONYMS.* By E. JANE WHATELY. Edited by her Father, R. WHATELY, D.D. Fcp. Svo. 3s.

WHATELY.—*WORKS BY R. WHATELY, D.D.*

ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. Svo. 10s. 6d. Crown Svo. 4s. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC. Svo. 10s. 6d. Crown Svo. 4s. 6d.

LESSONS ON REASONING. Fcp. Svo. 1s. 6d.

BACON'S ESSAYS, with Annotations. Svo. 10s. 6d.

WHITE.—*A CONCISE LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY,* for the Use of Advanced Scholars and University Students. By the Rev. J. T. WHITE, D.D. Royal Svo. 12s.

WHITE & RIDDLE.—*A LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.* By J. T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. and J. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A. Oxon. Founded on the larger Dictionary of Freund. Royal Svo. 21s.

WILCOCKS.—*THE SEA FISHERMAN.* Comprising the Chief Methods of Hook and Line Fishing in the British and other Seas, and Remarks on Nets, Boats, and Boating. By J. C. WILCOCKS. Profusely Illustrated. New and Cheaper Edition, much enlarged, crown Svo. 6s.

WILLICH.—*POPULAR TABLES* for giving Information for ascertaining the value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, the Public Funds, &c. By CHARLES M. WILLICH. Edited by MONTAGU MARRIOTT. Crown Svo. 10s.

WITT.—*WORKS BY PROF. WITT,* Head Master of the Altstadt Gymnasium, Königsberg. Translated from the German by FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND.

THE TROJAN WAR. With a Preface by the Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, M.A. Head-Master of Westminster School. Crown Svo. 2s.

MYTHS OF HELLAS; or, Greek Tales. Crown Svo. 3s. 6d.

WOOD.—*WORKS BY REV. J. G. WOOD.*

HOMES WITHOUT HANDS; a Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to the Principle of Construction. With about 140 Vignettes on Wood. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

INSECTS AT HOME; a Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. 8vo. Woodcuts, 10s. 6d.

INSECTS ABROAD; a Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. 8vo. Woodcuts, 10s. 6d.

BIBLE ANIMALS; a Description of every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures. With 112 Vignettes. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

STRANGE DWELLINGS; a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands.' With Frontispiece and 60 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5s. Popular Edition, 4to. 6d.

OUT OF DOORS; a Selection of Original Articles on Practical Natural History. With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s.

COMMON BRITISH INSECTS: BEETLES, MOTHS, AND BUTTERFLIES. Crown 8vo. with 130 Woodcuts, 3s. 6d.

PETLAND REVISITED. With numerous Illustrations, drawn specially by Miss Margery May, engraved on Wood by G. Pearson. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

WYLIE.—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND UNDER HENRY THE FOURTH.* By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A. one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. Vol. 1, crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

YONGE.—*THE NEW ENGLISH-GREEK LEXICON*, containing all the Greek words used by Writers of good authority. By CHARLES DUKE YONGE, M.A. 4to. 21s.

YOUATT.—*WORKS BY WILLIAM YOUATT.*

THE HORSE. Revised and enlarged by W. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S. 8vo. Woodcuts, 7s. 6d.

THE DOG. Revised and enlarged. 8vo. Woodcuts. 6s.

ZELLER.—*WORKS BY DR. E. ZELLER.*


HISTORY OF ECLECTICISM IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE STOICS, EPICUREANS, AND SCEPTICS. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo. 15s.

SOCRATES AND THE SOCRATIC SCHOOLS. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

PLATO AND THE OLDER ACADEMY. Translated by S. FRANCES ALLEYNE and ALFRED GOODWIN, B.A. Crown 8vo. 18s.

THE PRE-SOCRATIC SCHOOLS; a History of Greek Philosophy from the Earliest Period to the time of Socrates. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 30s.



BS1197 .E943 v.7
The history of Israel ... : translated

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00046 5510

