

ARTICLE II.

GALILEE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

BY REV. SELAH MERRILL, ANDOVER, MASS.

(Continued from p. 73.)

XIII. RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND MORALS AMONG THE GALILEANS.

We come now to speak of the religious character of the Galileans, with which may be associated the kindred topics of morals and education. On these points we would not presume to speak, except after the most careful study. It is a most difficult matter to separate the Galileans from the people of Judea, and say that they possessed this or that characteristic, in distinction from the latter. Still, there is evidence to enable us to do this to some extent; at least, it can be shown that the Galileans were equally interested with the Judeans in all matters pertaining to education and religion. Indeed, in some respects, the advantage in regard to religion and morals will be found to be on the side of the Galileans. The impression is often given that away from the Temple, in the far northern province, ignorance and irreligion prevailed. The statement is made that "they manifested less aversion to the religion and manners of the heathen than the people of the south, and less zeal for the religion of Moses."¹ Also, that "from their heathen neighbors the Galileans imbibed all sorts of superstitions. Nowhere else were there so many persons possessed and plagued with evil spirits as in Galilee; since the Galilean narrow-mindedness ascribed all forms of disease to the influence of demons."² Their religious character is further described as

¹ Mank, 33. col. 1. ² Graetz, 3. 395, who gives several refs. to Talmud.

a singular mixture of faith and superstition.¹ It is supposed that before the destruction of Jerusalem this province was especially poor in regard to means for disseminating knowledge (understand, *knowledge of the law*, the only thing which "knowledge" meant to the Jews), and on this account "the Galileans were stricter and more tenacious in regard to customs and morals" than the people of the south.² And by still another we are informed that, on account of the picturesque scenery and delightful climate of Galilee, the mind, away from the influence of the religious formalism which existed in Jerusalem, would naturally devote itself more to parables and legends.³ We are not prepared to accept these statements, nor any one of them, as final in this matter. The first two, those of Graetz and Munk, are decidedly wrong. But since, among the Jews, "education" meant merely *education in religion*, the two naturally blend together in our treatment of them. That passage in Josephus is very significant which states that during the reign of Queen Alexandra (79-70, or 78-69 B.C.) the Pharisees rose to power — "a sect reputed to excel all others in the accurate explanation of the laws."⁴ This means no less than that there was at that time a revival of biblical study. At the death of Herod the Great we hear of two celebrated teachers, Judas and Matthias, whose "explanation of the laws many young men attended."⁵ But they do not appear to have taught in any special school, nor to have belonged to any organized school system whatever. The famous Hillel was not trained for a teacher; but he began to teach, and the result proved his natural fitness for that work.⁶ Neither Hillel nor Gamaliel, the teacher of young Saul, belonged to any college or seminary or other institution of learning, i.e.

¹ Graetz, 3. 394.

² Ibid.

³ Neubauer, 185. In order to make Galilee appear as backward as possible, Neubauer, p. 75, states, on the authority of himself, that "this province possessed no wise men, and still less a school."

⁴ Wars, 1. 5. 2.

⁵ Wars, 1. 33. 2.

⁶ Hillel, 30 B.C. — A.D. 10. Simon, his son, A.D. 10—30; Gamaliel, son of Simon, A.D. 30—50.

in our meaning of those words. There could not be a school system where instructors (here the Rabbis) were not allowed to receive pay for their labor. Whoever understood the law thoroughly, and had facility in explaining it, provided he chose to teach, was regarded as a "learned man" — a Rabbi.¹ In Christ's time there were no schools which it was necessary to have attended, or at which it was necessary to have graduated, in order to be regarded as a learned man. The only schools were those connected with the synagogues. The only school-book was the Hebrew Scriptures. A synagogue presupposed a school,² just as in our country a church presupposes a Sunday-school. Church and district-school is not a parallel to the Jewish system of things, but church and Sunday-school is. Synagogues were found in every city throughout the land, and also in every village, unless the place was insignificant in size, and even in such cases they had their place or places of prayer. At one time Tiberias boasted of thirteen synagogues, and Jerusalem of four hundred and eighty. The method in the schools, so far as there was any method, was nearly as follows: Questions were asked and answered, opinions stated and discussed, and illustrations proposed in the form of allegories or aphorisms or parables; corresponding, perhaps, as much as to anything modern, to our adult Bible-classes.³ In the training of boys much responsibility and labor devolved upon the father.

¹ Ant. 20. 11. 2; Hausrath, 1. 77; full statement of this subject in Gfrörer, pp. 156-161, and names of a number of Rabbis given who supported themselves by some trade — as all did; yet a "schoolmaster" might take pay, *Ibid.* p. 158.

NOTE. — Of the statements of the Talmud in regard to schools and public instruction among the Jews it must be said that the Talmud is inclined to give too great antiquity to the Rabbinical school-system, which was developed and existed only long after the destruction of Jerusalem, and to make the impression that the systematic public instruction and training of youth prevailed long before Christ. Dr. Ginsburg in Art. "Education," in *Kitto's Cyclopædia Bib. Lit.* 1. 729, gives altogether too much weight to these statements of the Talmud, and thus, we think, greatly misrepresents the real state of the case at the time of Christ. Another instance in point is the statements of the Talmud in regard to coins; see Madden, *Jewish Coinage*, 334 sq. — "Counterfeit Jewish Coins."

² Conybeare and Howson, 1. 56.

³ *Matt.* xxii. 17-22; *Luke* ii. 46; *xx.* 2-4; Conybeare and Howson, i. 58.

The boy was afterward sent to these Bible-class meetings, which constituted the schools of the land, and which existed wherever there was a synagogue. Philo says: "What else are the synagogues than schools of piety and virtue?"¹ Hausrath calls them "the true schools of the nation."² Jerusalem, as the metropolis of the nation, would no doubt exert in many respects a dominant influence.³ The most eminent teachers would naturally go there, as in the case of Hillel and Gamaliel. But Sepphoris⁴ and Tiberias, the capitals in succession of Galilee, would have their eminent teachers as well; whilst every town and village might boast of its learned men — its local Rabbis or Rabbi. How often is it said that Christ went through all the cities and villages of Galilee, teaching in the schools or synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom!⁵ Again, on a certain occasion in Capernaum, "there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, who were come out of every town (κώμη) of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem."⁶ Sometimes the learned men of the south and the north would visit each other for friendly intercourse, when, according to Keim, they were treated with respect by the people, and given the places of honor in the synagogues.⁷ Sometimes the Scribes of the south would visit the north to watch Christ, not to see if the law was fulfilled, but to see if their traditions were violated.⁸ The Talmud charges the Galileans with neglecting tradition,⁹

¹ Edit. Mangey, 1742. vol. 2. 168, 458; Schneckenburger, 108. ² 1. 75.

³ Schneckenburger, 111; Synagogues in Jerusalem, etc., Lightfoot, 1. 78; in Tiberias, *Ibid.* 158; Hausrath, 1. 71; in Capernaum, Synagogue and School, Hausrath, 1. 73; Synagogues out of Judea, Ant. 16. 6. 2; vast Synagogue at Tiberias, in which assemblies of people were held in Jewish War, Life, 54; see Hausrath, 1. 5 and 295.

⁴ Under Gabinius, in B.C. 56, Sepphoris was the seat of one of the five Sanhedrins established by him, Ant. 14. 5. 4; Wars, 1. 8. 5; in the time of the War, the council (βουλή) of Tiberias numbered six hundred members, Wars, 2. 21. 9; Galilee had also its own arsenals, treasury, and archives, Life, 9; Wars, 2. 4. 1.

⁵ Matt. ix. 35, and many other places; Hausrath, 1. 388.

⁶ Luke v. 17.

⁷ Luke v. 17; Keim, 1. 314, and refs.; also, Hausrath, 1. 78.

⁸ Matt. xv. 1 sq.; Mark vii. 1, et sq.

⁹ Neubauer, 183.

and the passages in the Gospels just referred to show that there was some ground for such a charge in Christ's time. Further, this charge and the visits of the Jerusalem doctors just referred to, both show that while Jerusalem, where were the Temple and the Sanhedrin, exercised a dominant influence in reference to matters of religion, yet the Galileans were in a measure independent in regard to such affairs.¹ A just distinction to make is this, that in Jerusalem were the champions of tradition, and in Galilee the champions of the law.² Adherence to the strict letter of the law may be regarded as a prominent characteristic of the learned men of Galilee, in distinction from those of Jerusalem.³ In Jerusalem novelties were introduced and changes made, according to emergencies, and sometimes licenses allowed in regard to religious and other usages, which would not be tolerated in Galilee.⁴ If we may refer to Christ, in this connection, perhaps the remarks just made will be illustrated by his wonderful familiarity with the scriptures, his great regard for the law, and his contempt for tradition. The Scribes and learned men of Galilee, so far as we can judge, were familiar with the law; worship in the synagogues was strictly maintained; and there appears to have existed here a freer and healthier religious life than in the south. Among the different sects in Jerusalem Christ met with an atmosphere that was cheerless and dismal. In the freer north, far away from the bleak home of priests and Levites, there was a people less under the influence of the "straighter" sects, less hardened and narrowed by the dogmatic systems which prevailed in the holy city;⁵ among which people Christ for the most part found a welcome. Without seeking to draw too sharp a line of distinction between the people of Galilee and those of Judea, it is no doubt true that the former lacked the narrow prejudices of the latter towards the people of other nations; for, to mention a single instance, it is a

¹ Dominant influence of Jerusalem, see Schneckenburger, 111.

² Geiger, *Wrschrift*, 155. ³ *Matt. v. 17, 18*; Neubauer, 184; Graetz, 3. 394.

⁴ Neubauer, 184, 186, and note.

⁵ Hausrath, 1. 10; Keim, 1. 315.

worthy son of the north who, at Joppa, in a wonderful vision, first learns and teaches to his countrymen that great lesson of the Master, that the Gentiles, as well as themselves, may share in the new gospel of the grace of God.¹ And, in general, the influences in Galilee tended to develop and enlarge the national mind and character, while those in Judea tended to contract and dwarf the same. The peasants and shepherds on the rather poor uplands of Judea are spoken of as ignorant and narrow²—the slavish tools of the priesthood of Jerusalem—the fuel easily kindled into “uproars of the people.”³ In regard to the violation of the laws pertaining to marriage, public sentiment seems to have been a unit throughout the land.⁴ Also, that morbid sensitiveness of the Jews in regard to images and statues was shared in by the people of the whole country alike.⁵ Several particulars, however, are mentioned in regard to morals and certain other things which show a greater degree of strictness in Galilee than in Judea. For instance, the great care of the Galileans was for reputation, while the Judeans cared less for reputation, and more for money. Also, as to laboring on Passover eves, some synagogal rites, devoting goods directly to God, and not to the priests, funeral customs, provision

¹ Acts x.

² Hausrath, 1. 40. See case where brigands “drag a rustic from the country,” who “scarcely knew what the high-priesthood meant,” for the purpose of making him high-priest, Wars, 4. 3. 8.

³ Matt. xxvi. 5.

⁴ See case of Antipas and John the Baptist. Their custom a singular one: a man who did not marry a deceased brother's widow in case there were no children, was a criminal; but such marriage, in case there were children, was itself criminal! Again, a man might divorce his wife; but if a wife divorced her husband, it was a public abomination! Herodias divorced herself from Herod Philip (*not* the Tetrarch), “confounding the laws of our country,” Ant. 18. 5. 4. Archelaus also scandalized the nation by marrying his brother's widow, *when she had children by her first husband!* Ant. 17. 13. 1.

⁵ Ant. 15. 8. 1, 2. See Prideaux, Connexion, 2. 384, 385. People of Tiberias when Caius wanted his statue put up in the Temple, Ant. 18. 8. 3, 4, “stretched out their throats, and were ready to die”; “left off tilling the ground”; and “the land remained unsown,” etc.; Wars, 2. 10. 5. See case of Vitellius marching under orders from Tiberius to help Antipas against Aretas king of Arabia, Ant. 18. 5. 3; Keim's inference from this fact is hardly correct, 1. 316.

for widows, marriages being celebrated with decorum, a spirit of charity or benevolence, and as to regulations in regard to the intercourse of persons betrothed — in all these respects, greater strictness is conceded to the Galileans.¹

That the Galileans “manifested less zeal for the religion of Moses” than the people of the south, we have shown to be incorrect. Rather the contrary was true. The statement that they imbibed all sorts of superstitions from their heathen neighbors, as “possession of devils” and the like, has not the slightest evidence in its support, either in Josephus or the New Testament. The statement stands as an assertion without proof. As to “means for disseminating a knowledge of the law,” Galilee was as well provided as Judea; aside, perhaps, from certain eminent teachers in Jerusalem, with whom, however, it is not possible that all the learned men of Christ’s time could have studied. Still, it is said that they were less “sensitive to heathen influences,”² and that a “heathen city like Tiberias would not have been tolerated in Judea.”³ The facts will not justify these assertions. There were theatres and amphitheatres in many of the large cities of the country. In the splendid theatre and the vast amphitheatre at Jerusalem were enacted all the games that were known in Italy or Greece, while Tiberias, so far as we know, had only a stadium, or race-course.⁴ If by being “less sensitive to heathen influences” is meant that, apart from religious ideas, the commercial and social

¹ Lightfoot, 1. 169, and refs. to Talmud; Neubauer, 181–183, and refs. to Talmud; see also p. 286; Graetz, 3. 394; Delitzsch, *Handwerkerleben*, 40. This fact in regard to betrothed persons Delitzsch makes illustrate the surprise of the disciples when Christ talked with the woman at the well, *ibid.*

² Hausrath, 1. 10.

³ Hausrath, 1. 11.

⁴ At Jerusalem, Ant. 15. 8. 1; 19. 7. 4; Hippodrome in Tarichaea, Wars, 2. 21. 3; Life, 27, 28; Theatre in Scythopolis, Ritter, 2. 334; Gadara, Ritter, 2. 303; Our Work in Palestine, 194, 195; at Berytus, Ant. 19. 7. 5, also “amphitheatres,” “baths,” “porticos;” at Caesarea, theatre and amphitheatre, Ant. 15. 9. 6; difference between theatre and amphitheatre, see Traill’s Josephus, 1. xxxvii. In regard to Antipas’s palace at Tiberias, if it was hateful to the stricter Jews, why did they wait from his removal in A.D. 39, to A.D. 66, before they took any measures to destroy it? See Life, 12.

ideas of the Galileans were broadened and benefited by their intercourse with surrounding nations, then the statement is true. Such a result was produced by that intercourse. As to the influence of the morals of the rulers on those of the people, there are but few data from which to judge. Alexandra, Hyrcanus's daughter, seems to have been destitute of principle in her attempt to administer by her beautiful children, Aristobulus and Mariamne, to the lust of Antony, of whom she wanted some favor.¹ As to Herod the Great, whatever else may have been his crimes, he could never be charged with either lust or intemperance. Herod Philip was a man of whose morals no ill could be said. Archelaus's reign was short. Under the Romans, from 7 A.D. to 66, Judea, as we have seen, suffered in every way. Herod Antipas was neither lustful nor intemperate. His act in marrying Herodias (a violation of the law, because she had a child by her first husband, Antipas's brother) was universally condemned, and by no means imitated by his subjects. To the credit of both Herodias and Antipas, it should be said that they loved each other truly, and when Antipas was banished, and Herodias might have lived in ease in Rome or in Judea, she chose to follow her husband into exile² — an act which, if people were not prejudiced against her, would be spoken of as noble.

In addition to what has been said, we are to consider :

1. That Christ was, as a rule, well received in Galilee ; 2. That John the Baptist had here a strong party of adherents ; 3. That this was the home of Judas, the founder of the sect of the Galileans.³ This man's moral character cannot be

¹ Ant. 15. 2. 6.

² Ant. 18. 7. 2.

³ Mentioned in the New Testament only in Acts v. 37 ; his rallying theme was, that God alone was master, Ant. 18. 1. 6 ; paying tribute to the Romans was slavery ; they were " not to bow to mortals as their masters," Ant. 18. 1. 1 ; Wars, 2. 8. 1 ; Graetz, Sinai et Golgotha (French tr.), Paris, 1867, p. 267, says of this Judas that " in consequence of his life and deeds the masters of the world had so much more trouble to subdue the small Jewish people than they did to subdue the great nations of Europe." Judas must have founded his sect in Jerusalem. " The " census " in which he figured had nothing to do with

impugned; he was a Puritan of the strictest school; the platform of his sect or party looked well on paper, — a grand idea about which to rally, — but it was thoroughly impracticable in those unfortunate times; 4. That this was the home, also, of Eleazar, the missionary to Adiabene and the court of Izates. This man “was very skilful in the learning of his country.” His words, “not only to read the law, but to practise it,” represent the thorough style of his teaching. He seems to have been zealous, familiar with the law, skilful and eloquent in presenting his views, and perhaps we have a right to regard him as a representative man of Galilee.¹ Again, we hold the opinion that the Sermon on the Mount, whether regarded as one discourse, or as the substance of many discourses, could not have been preached in Judea, — at the beginning of Christ’s ministry, at least, — considering the fact that Jerusalem was the hot-bed of tradition, and considering, also, the excited state of the public mind there, wild as it was with dreams of the coming Messiah. The sermon presupposes the ability, and also a willingness, on the part of the listeners, to look beyond tradition and the mere letter of the law, to a somewhat new and enlarged application of old sayings and truths. Such a state of mind would not be looked for in Judea at that time; but we should expect just that in the region of Capernaum.²

XIV. THE POETICAL TALENT FINELY DEVELOPED AMONG THE GALILEANS.

Besides the physical and moral vigor of this people, we discover, also, an elasticity and freshness of spirit which did not prevail among the people of the south. On this account

Galilee. Herod Philip and Herod Antipas both settled the affairs of their respective provinces irrespective of Rome, Ant. 18. 2. 1. Judas proclaimed his doctrines and founded his sect in Jerusalem.

¹ Ant. 20. 2. 4; Keim, 1. 314; Graetz, 3. 334.

² On the general character of the people of Judea as distinguished from those of Galilee, and how easily they were misled by false Messiahs, — strange proceedings such as were never reported from Galilee, — see passage in Hausrath, 1. 41, 42. It would have been difficult for Christ to have planted himself in Judea.

it was, perhaps, that here the poetical talent was so finely developed. We have already quoted the statement that, "if nature could influence mind, if it could create genius, Naphtali would be a land of poets."¹ "The vine-covered slopes, the plains brilliant with flowers, the wooded glens and knolls, sparkling with springs," the beautiful lake deep within the bosom of the hills, the distant but ever visible "great sea" — symbol of the Infinite — would all contribute to awaken and stimulate the richest, and perhaps grandest, spirit of poetry.² One of the earliest triumph-songs of Israel, as well as one of the noblest, sounded forth from the hills of Galilee on the occasion of Barak's victory over the Canaanites in the plain of Jezreel. And, if we were to adopt the view held by many eminent scholars, the Song of Songs had also its origin among these beautiful scenes of nature — the music of a heart about which earth and sky had lavished their charms — the song of one whose eyes delighted in beholding the beauty of the flowers and the richness of the fig-tree, the olive, and the vine.³

XV. THE PROPHETS, JUDGES, AND OTHER FAMOUS MEN OF GALILEE.

In this connection, a brief notice must be taken of the famous persons whose birth-place, or home, was in this northern province. We may be obliged here to go beyond the strict limits of our period, in order to answer the flippant and prejudiced remark: "Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet"⁴ — a remark which should never have been believed at all, but which, being accepted without reflection, has had much influence in shaping the common notion of the character of Galilee. In the time of the Judges, Naphtali furnished Barak, the victor over the Canaanites, with whom should be mentioned Deborah, "a prophetess," the "mother in Israel," whose presence and words inspired those bold sons of the north to heroic deeds, and also Jael, "the wife of

¹ Porter, Bashan, 263.

² See Isaac Taylor, Hebrew Poetry, 73.

³ See Hausrath, l. 12. Gesenius and others hold this view. ⁴ John vii. 52.

Heber the Kenite," a heroine of that bloody day.¹ Zebulon furnished Ibzan, who judged Israel seven years,² and after him Elon, who judged Israel for ten years.³ Still later this country sent forth a number of prophets, whose memories were always cherished by the people, and whose tombs were built and guarded by a grateful posterity with pious care. If it is doubtful whether Elijah was born in Galilee, yet the scene of his labors was chiefly this northern region, and the home of his successor Elisha was in the tribe of Issachar. Hosea also belonged to Issachar; Jonah, the son of Amittai, came from Gath Hepher in Zebulon; and the prophet Nahum from Elkosh in Galilee.⁴ In the Assyrian captivity, under Shalmaneser, appears Tobit, from Naphtali. He was "a godly man," and "in the account of him we have a very instructive picture of his home and of his times."⁵ Alexander, the first renowned Jewish philosopher in Alexandria, — a peripatetic and the forerunner of Philo, — is supposed by some to have been born in Paneas.⁶ Nitai, a learned doctor of the Mishna, came from Arbela.⁷ Two other Mishna doctors also came from this region, and

¹ On these characters, see Ewald, *Hist. Isr.* 2. 374–379. Deborah and Barak "whose valor delivered the nation from a vassalage of twenty years" to Jabin king of Hazor, Ritter, 2. 225; Barak, *Judges*, iv. 3; Jael, *Judg.* iv. 17; Deborah judged Israel at this time, *Judg.* iv. 4.

² He was of Bethlehem in Zebulon, *Judg.* xii. 8.

³ *Judg.* xii. 11; Issachar furnished also Judge Zola, "who judged Israel twenty-three years," *Judg.* x. 1, 2; see Ewald, *Hist. Isr.* 2. 375 note. On Ibzan, see Keil, *Com. on Judg.* xii. 8.

⁴ This last statement has been disputed; but many able scholars hold the view expressed in the text; see Smith's *Dict. Bib.*, Art. "Elkosh," 1. p. 724.

⁵ Ritter, 4. 340; Keim, 1. 317; Tobit, 1. 1 sq.

⁶ Keim, 1. 317, is inclined to adopt this view; see his note on p. 318; Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* 3. 473; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 7. 32. See on Aristobulus Heinichen's ed. of Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* (Leipzig, 1828), vol. ii. p. 420, note 22, an important note. That Aristobulus was born at Paneas is made very doubtful. Graetz, 3. 40, 50, 51; Dähne, *Jüd. Alexand. Religions-Philos.* (ed. Halle, 1834), 2. 73 et seq., and note 6.

⁷ נִיטַי הָאֲרֵבֶלִי. Ginsburg, *Kitto's Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* 1. 729, places him b.c. 140–110. See Neubauer, 219; Chiarini, *Le Talmud*, 1. 117, No. 143, says, "lived towards the year 200 B.C." For the two other Mishna doctors from Galilee, see Chiarini, *ibid.* p. 106, No. 15, and p. 114, No. 103; see Graetz, 3. 107 for Nitai's rule of life: "Avoid a bad neighbor; associate not with sinners; and do not forget a future recompense."

king Alexander Jannæus, son of Hyrcanus, calls Galilee his fatherland.¹ In Christ's time, Anna the prophetess belonged to Asher, and, we may mention again, the missionary Eleazar and Judas the Galilean zealot, and with the latter his sons, James, Simon, and Manahem.² Perhaps Hezekiah, the brigand chief whom Herod slew, and his son Judas, who on Herod's death raised a revolt, and took Sepphoris, and was captured only after a hard struggle, may be mentioned as showing, though outlaws, the metal of the Galileans.³ There was also Eleazar, the son of Jairus, a kinsman of Manahem, and a descendant of Judas the zealot, just mentioned, and who was the founder of the sect of the Galileans. This Eleazar boasted of himself and his companions: "We were the first of all to revolt" against the Romans, "and we are the last in arms against them"; "We determined to serve as master no one but God; and the time has come for us to show the sincerity of our words by our actions"; and they all perished then and there, in the bloody slaughter at Masada.⁴ Galilee had Herod the Great for governor, and afterwards Antipas, the ablest of his sons, and still later, as military governor, Josephus. At that time flourished the famous John of Gischala; also, Silas, the governor of Tiberias by Josephus's appointment, and Joshua, in authority there, but opposed to Josephus; also, Julius Capellus, leader of the most respectable party in Tiberias, and his associates, namely, Herod son of Miarus, Herod son of Gamalus, Compsus and Crispus — these two the sons of Compsus; also, Pistus and his son Justus — the latter a friend of Greek learning, and the author of a history in Greek of his own times, but the implacable enemy of Josephus. Other names are given in

¹ Ant. 13. 12. 1; as soon as he was born he was removed to Galilee, and brought up there, because his father took such a dislike to him. See Keim, 1. 317.

² James and Simon crucified, Ant. 20. 5. 2; Manahem killed in Jerusalem, Wars, 2. 17. 9.

³ Wars, 2. 4. 1.

⁴ Wars, 2. 17. 9; 7. 8. 6; Graetz, 3. 452, makes him a descendant of Judas the Zealot.

the note.¹ We might, perhaps, include Nathanael of Cana of Galilee; Peter, as a representative man of Galilee;² Zebedee and his two sons, James and John—a family of wealth; Andrew and Philip, of Bethsaida in Galilee; Joseph and Mary; James, the brother of Christ and the first bishop of Jerusalem; also Salome, sister of Mary and wife of Zebedee.

And if we were to look beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, we should find Galilee the abode of many famous and learned men, and the seat of flourishing schools. From the second to the sixth century Galilee was the chief seat of Jewish learning.³

XVI. THE WEALTH AND MATERIAL PROSPERITY OF THE PROVINCE.

Of the wealth and material prosperity of Galilee it is difficult to speak, apart from the connection of this topic with the whole country. Of the wealth and prosperity of the whole country during the period covered by the reign of Herod the Great and the life of Christ very much might be said. The Jews throughout the world were a wealthy class. In wealth, as well as in numbers, they surpassed the Greeks

¹ Dession and Jannaeus, leading persons in Tiberias; Joshua and Jeremiah employed by Josephus; Joseph, "a turbulent person of Gamala"; see Life, 9; Traill's Joseph. 1. p. 27, "Designation of the persons mentioned in the Life of Josephus"; Keim, 1. 317, 318; Graetz, 3. 397; Simon "the leading person in Gabara," and the friend of John of Gischala, Life, 25; Aeneas "the person of greatest influence in Tarichaea," and the friend of Josephus, Wars, 2. 21. 3; also a woman is mentioned, a relative of Eleazar (of Massada fame), "in understanding and education superior to most of her sex," Wars, 7. 9. 1; Keim, 1. 427. There was in the early church a tradition that the parents of the Apostle Paul came from Gischala (see Arnaud, 577), in Galilee. It is given by Jerome (refs. in Arnaud, 577; Robinson, 2. 446). It is easy to reject the tradition; but quite difficult to see how such a tradition should become attached to this particular place; somebody at some time must have believed it, and perhaps with reasons.

² Keim, 1. 315. See fine passage on the men of Galilee in Stanley, Jewish Church, 2. 300; also, *ibid.* 308 and 413 for notice of Tobit.

³ Keim, 1. 318.

NOTE. — Graetz, on all occasions, takes decidedly the ground of John of Gischala as against Josephus, 3. 396; against Josephus he is always very bitter. This feeling sometimes warps his judgment of facts.

in Cesarea.¹ Those in Parthia, on the Euphrates, were rich.² Strabo, as quoted by Josephus, remarks upon their wealth and prosperity "in every city in the habitable earth."³ In Crete, Melos, and Rome, their wealth is spoken of.⁴ Vast sums from all parts of the world flowed into the Temple at Jerusalem. In B.C. 54 Crassus took from the Temple upwards of ten thousand talents in gold and silver, and one huge ingot of gold besides.⁵ In several other instances, the Temple was robbed by the grasping Roman governors or generals. Herod the Great was one of the best financiers the world has ever seen. He was always ready with money or provisions, in case any one was in need. He was a capital provider for his own family and kingdom. Measuring his revenue by his expenses, his kingdom must have been managed with great ability to have yielded so much. He was never in debt, always remarkably prompt in his payments, frequently assisting others who were in need of money; and from the outset of his governorship of Galilee, at the age of twenty-five, to his death, was constantly making valuable presents to various cities or persons.⁶

But we must confine our attention to Galilee. Its material prosperity has been hinted at in our notice of the industries of the province. Its numerous and flourishing cities and villages — some of which were elegantly built — indicate the very opposite of poverty and limited means. The "opulent" citizens of Gischala are spoken of.⁷ John of Gischala was a man of wealth, and unusually shrewd and capable in business.⁸ The people of Sepphoris are spoken of as possessed of "ample means."⁹ The tithes collected in Galilee

¹ Wars, 2. 13. 7; Ant. 20: 8. 7. ² Ant. 15. 2. 4. ³ Ant. 14. 7. 2.

⁴ Wars, 2. 7. 1. See Milman, 2. 20. ⁵ Ant. 14. 7. 1; Wars, 1. 8. 8.

⁶ The bier and bed and other furnishings at Herod's funeral indicate great wealth, Wars, 1. 33. 9; compare Wars, 2. 1. 1. The great wealth of King Agrippa I. is spoken of, Wars, 2. 11. 6; men went to Judea for adventure and speculation, Wars, 1. 26. 1; rich articles of gold and silver, and costly carpets, and vestments were sometimes bought in Rome for Judea, Wars, 1. 31. 2. The Romans in general had exaggerated ideas of the wealth of Judea; it was to them a sort of gold mine; just the place for greedy Roman politicians.

⁷ Wars, 2. 21. 2.

⁸ Wars, 2. 20. 6; 2. 21. 2.

⁹ Wars, 2. 20. 6.

are mentioned as amounting to "a large sum of money."¹ The treasure stored in the palace of Antipas at Tiberias was a large amount, and the furnishings of the palace were astonishingly rich and elegant.² Several times Galilee had to support a portion of the Roman army in winter quarters.³ The Talmud mentions three cities of Galilee which had "sent enormous treasures to Jerusalem — Sichin, Caboul, and Magdala."⁴ Zebedee, it is supposed, was a man of wealth and influence.⁵ Capernaum, as a centre of news, business, and commerce, was a place of luxury. It is a significant fact that Christ chose this very city as his residence.⁶ The fact that Christ was called a "gluttonous man and a wine-bibber" shows that a style of living prevailed here which was distasteful to certain ascetics of the time.⁷ Perhaps, in Christ's reproach of Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum, there may be a hint as to the wealth and luxury and consequent worldliness of these places.⁸ Along their "way of the sea" the rich fabrics, spices, and other products of Babylon and farther Asia would be carried, on their way to Egypt or to Rome, by rich merchants, seeking goodly pearls.⁹ Galilee would be benefited by the traffic carried on at the trading stations along this route of commerce.¹⁰ The contribution sent from Antioch, in A.D. 44, was for the brethren in Judea, or perhaps for "the poor saints in Jerusalem," as if no assistance was needed by the brethren in Galilee.¹¹ In B.C. 43, four years after Herod was appointed governor of Galilee,

¹ Life, 12.

² Life, 12, 13.

³ Under Silo, Ant. 14. 15. 3; Wars, 1. 15. 6; under Vespasian, Wars, 4. 2. 1, in Scythopolis, and in other cases.

⁴ Neubauer, 217, and refs.

⁵ Smith's Dict. Bib. 2. 1420, col. 2, Art. "John the Apostle."

⁶ Keim, 1. 597.

⁷ Matt. xi. 19; *φάγος καὶ δινωτόρης*, Luke vii. 34; see Matt. ix. 10; Hausrath, 1. 352.

⁸ Keim, 1. 597, who states the matter strongly; Matt. xi. 2-24.

⁹ Matt. xiii. 45, 46; Hausrath, 1. 351.

¹⁰ Trading stations, see Ewald, Hist. Iar. 3. 261, and 216 note; Capernaum was an important station, and had partly by this means become a place of luxury.

¹¹ Acts xi. 29; Rom. xv. 26.

Cassius came into Syria for the purpose of raising men and money. For the latter object there was, in his view, no richer gold-mine than Judea. The enormous sum which Crassus (B.C. 54) had taken from the Temple at Jerusalem convinced him of that.¹ He imposed a tribute on Judea (the whole province) of seven hundred talents (7000? See note). Antipater (Herod the Great's father) distributes this among several persons, that it may be raised with all possible despatch.² Herod, as governor of Galilee, was the first to bring in his share, which was one hundred talents, and thus he gained the favor of Cassius, who bestowed upon him the governorship of Coelo-Syria.³

As to mines, in Judea, as distinguished from Galilee and Samaria, there were none. The "iron mountain" of Josephus was east of the Jordan.⁴ Extensive copper-mines are found in the Sinaitic peninsula. Traces of a mine have been found on the south border of the plain of Esdraelon, which would be on the border of Galilee. The north part of Galilee, at least the Lebanon region, was rich in mines. The copper-mines of Cyprus were extensive, and Herod got

¹ Graetz, 3. 185.

² Wars, 1. 11. 2. The amount named in Josephus, 700 talents, seems small measured by other sums which were raised at other times, and by the great distress caused by forcing the collection of this money. Cassius needed money. He had wild ideas of the wealth of the country. Certain sections are slow in making their payments, and four cities are reduced to slavery which alone, on any reasonable computation, would yield a sum equal to, or greater than the whole amount required; cities reduced to slavery were Lydda, Thamna, Gophna, and Emmaus, Ant. 14. 11. 2; Wars, 1. 11. 2; Cassius has pressing need of money, Ant. 14. 11. 2. Herod, after being made King, subdues the robbers in Galilee, and upon the few places which they occupied levies a tribute of 100 talents for their good behaviour, Ant. 14. 15. 6. We conclude that Cassius was not so urgent for money as is represented, and consequently his levy was small, or else that the text should read 7000 instead of 700, as at present. Whiston, in his Josephus, has a note on this point, Wars, 1. 11. 2.

³ Ant. 14. 11. 4.

⁴ Wars, 4. 8. 2. See Ewald, Hist. Isr. 4. 192, and refs. to Old Testament; Lightfoot, 1. 189; Ritter, 2. 189; Smith's Dict. Bib. 3. 1911, col. 1. Art. "Metals," speaks of mines still worked in the Lebanon region; see *ibid.* Art. "Mines," p. 1937. See passage, too long to quote, on the metals and minerals of the Lebanon region in Capt. Burton's Unexplored Syria, 1. 31; also, vol. 2. 27; see Arnaud, 368 sq.

half the revenue from them and the care of the other half.¹ And if his honesty had not exceeded the honesty of some modern public men, there would have been little revenue left for the Roman government.

XVII. WAS GALILEE REGARDED WITH CONTEMPT BY THE PEOPLE OF JERUSALEM, AS IS SO OFTEN ALLEGED?

There is a very general impression that the Jews of Jerusalem regarded with contempt the people of Galilee, and even the province itself. And of this contempt Nazareth received perhaps the largest share. Supposing such contempt to have existed, all that we have hitherto said is a protest against the justice of it. In its climate, its fertile soil, and its charming scenery; in the abundance of its waters and the beauty of its lakes; in its numerous and often elegant cities and villages; in its hardy, industrious, and intelligent population; in the interest of its people in the law, in the Temple and its services, in the great national feasts, and in the general welfare of the nation; in its wealth and material prosperity, its various thriving industries, and in the unexampled patriotism and bravery of its sons, — what ground is there why the people of Jerusalem should regard Galilee or the Galileans with contempt? In order to show how universally it is taken for granted that this feeling existed, it is necessary to quote a few statements; including now Nazareth with Galilee: “Peter was a Galilean fisherman, brought up in the rudest district of an obscure province.”² “In this despised region, his home [Nazareth] was the most despised spot.”³ “An obscure village of despised Galilee,”⁴ — when the very Greek text which Dr. Wordsworth was editing says, “city” (*πόλις*, not *κώμη*)! “The roughness of its population.”⁵ “Nazareth, an outlying village,” which “had a bad reputation,” whose people were of “a somewhat depraved type.”⁶ “To be known to belong to

¹ Ant. 16. 4. 5.

² Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1. 115.

³ Delitzsch, Jesus u. Hillel, p. 13.

⁴ Wordsworth, Com. on Matt. ii. 23.

⁵ Stanley, S. and P. 358.

⁶ Stoppford A. Brooke, Sermons (Boston, ed. 1869), p. 120.

that country was of itself sufficient to prejudice Pilate against him" ¹ (entirely gratuitous; Pilate was Christ's friend). "The very villagers themselves spoke with a rude and uncouth provincialism that marked them at once as Nazarenes." ² (The dialect of any person from Nazareth is never alluded to; Peter, certainly, was not from Nazareth; on what possible ground is the statement just quoted based?) "That obscure Galilean village." ³ One who went from the Sea of Galilee to Judea "war ein Stichblatt des Witzes der dortigen Stammgenossen." ⁴ (How does Hausrath know that such a person became "a butt of ridicule"?) "A little country town of proverbial insignificance," "the darkest district of Palestine." ⁵ "The old scorn which rested upon the Galileans in Joshua's day." ⁶ These statements show the popular impression and teaching in regard to Galilee and Nazareth. And further, in regard to the "poverty" and "abject meanness" of Christ's earthly condition, and the nearly "destitute circumstances" of Joseph and Mary, and the "ignorance" and even "immorality" of the people of Nazareth, we read a great deal in books, and hear by far too much in sermons from the pulpit. ⁷ Abundance of quotations to this effect could be given, if necessary. But are these representations true? These statements, appearing everywhere, and so sweeping and positive withal, ought to have some foundation, for which we propose to look. First, as to the contempt for the Galileans on the ground of dialect, or difference of pronunciation. The passages in both Talmuds referring to this point are but few in number. Buxtorf,

¹ McClintock and Strong, Cyclopaedia, 3. 717, col. 1. Art. "Galilean."

² Recovery of Jerusalem, p. 354, in paper by Lieut. Anderson, R. E.

³ Plumptre, Christ and Christendom, 95.

⁴ Hausrath, 1. 11.

⁵ Schaff, Person of Christ, 34.

⁶ Ritter, 4. 332.

⁷ See a frightfully distressing picture of Christ's circumstances in early life, and during his earthly life in general, in Isaac Barrow's Sermon on Patience; Text 1 Pet. ii. 21, in vol. 1, p. 467 (New York, ed. 1845). Dr. Schaff, in the place just noticed, is bad enough. Meyer, Com. on John i. 47, makes *ἀγαθὸν* imply *immorality*!

Lightfoot, and Neubauer refer to the same passages. We have noticed that in all matters relating to Palestine the Jerusalem Talmud seems to be the most consistent and reliable. We should expect this, from the fact that it was compiled earlier than the other, and written in the country itself.¹ In this Talmud, this whole matter of dialect is reduced to the simple statement that the doctors (of Judea) did not distinguish between *He* and *Cheth*, nor between *Aleph* and *Ayin* — this simple statement, without comment. The Babylonian Talmud has the same. But the latter (completed about A.D. 500) has, in addition, several amusing stories illustrating the peculiar pronunciation of the Galileans. The late date of the compilation of this work would damage its evidence. Where the Jerusalem Talmud is silent, the later Babylonian Talmud cannot be brought forward to show that the Jews of Jerusalem treated with contempt or ridicule their brethren of Galilee on the ground of the pronunciation of the latter. It is a very significant fact that St. Jerome (331–422) considered himself peculiarly fortunate in obtaining a Hebrew teacher from Tiberias, because there Hebrew was spoken with such purity.² After thus collecting the facts, it looks as if the doctors in the schools of the East invented certain stories in regard to the pronunciation of the Galileans (and the Judeans as well) by which to amuse themselves or their pupils at the expense of their brethren in Palestine.³

The dialect of Galilee is referred to but once in the New Testament, namely, in connection with Peter at the trial of

¹ 350–400 A.D.

² See Gfrörer, 117; Ritter, 2. 258; Robinson, 2. 391 and notes.

Note on the difference of the two Talmuds here referred to: "Frankel shows that the Babylonian Talmud injures the more correct ideas contained in the Jerusalem Talmud by many unwarranted additions and inexact statements, and has given examples in different places of his new *Monatschrift*."—Steinschneider's *Jewish Literature* (Eng. Tr. London, 1857), p. 273.

³ Lightfoot, 1. 170–172; Graetz, 3. 395; Neubauer, 184, 185; Buxtorf, *Lexicon*, 224, 225, Art *לֵבִי*; Renan, *Lang. Semitiques*, 230 (his only authorities are, however, Lightfoot, Buxtorf, Fürst, Dukes, and Ewald). No blame to Renan, however, for the authorities can be reduced to a very few hints in the Talmud.

Christ. Of this event there are four accounts.¹ The "speech," or peculiar pronunciation of Peter is mentioned by Matthew only,² for the words "and thy speech agreeth" in Mark xiv. 70, are to be omitted. It is often alleged that Peter's "speech" was alluded to by way of contempt. This passage and the one in Mark are the only evidence which Hausrath produces to prove his assertion that "a man from the Sea of Galilee became in Judea," on account of his pronunciation, "a butt of ridicule."³ But no contempt was here either expressed or implied. Peter had denied a certain statement, and the bystanders to justify themselves, without any thought of ridicule or contempt, said simply: "Your speech reveals you to be a Galilean," as we have alleged.⁴ Sometimes Acts ii. 7 is referred to as supporting the view stated above. But there could hardly be a more unjust use of the passage. The point of surprise on the part of the audience was, that so few men, all coming from the same region, should speak all the languages of the world. The surprise would have been great if the speakers had all come from either Greece, Italy, or Babylon. In this case they were from Galilee. But nothing can be inferred from this passage which is in any way derogatory to the character of the Galileans. Besides the above, there are no other passages in the New Testament which bear upon the matter of the dialect of Galilee. On this point Josephus is silent—a significant fact. Thus, neither in Josephus, the New Testament, nor the Talmud, is there any ground, as regards dialect, why the people of Jerusalem should regard with contempt the people of Galilee; nor is there the slightest evidence that, *on this ground*, the people of Jerusalem regarded the people of Galilee with any such feeling at all. Yet this matter of dialect is one of the strongest arguments held up before the popular mind to prove the existence of this alleged feeling of contempt.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 69-75; Mark xiv. 66-72; Luke xxii. 54-62; John xviii. 25-27.

² Matt. xxvi. 73.

³ Hausrath, 1. 11.

⁴ Καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλιὰ σου δηλῶν σε ποιεῖ, Matt. xxvi. 73.

Further, what a splendid instrument this matter of dialect would have been in the hands of the enemies of Christ, to be used against him and his disciples! If this difference of dialect was the occasion of any feeling between the people of the two sections, if on this account the Galileans were really laughing-stocks in Jerusalem, then what stupidity on the part of Christ's enemies not to have used this most effective means for silencing him and counteracting his influence. The silence of Christ's enemies is a strong argument against the supposition that *on the ground of dialect* there existed among the Jews of Jerusalem a feeling of contempt for the Galileans. Another alleged ground is the "religious looseness" which is supposed to have prevailed in Galilee.¹ But we have seen that the Galileans were stricter in regard to morals than the people of Judea, and that the former adhered more closely to the law than the latter, while the latter put *tradition* foremost. These facts speak for themselves. Another ground is, that the people of the north were a mixed race.² We have shown that they are to be regarded as thoroughly Jewish. Another, because the Galileans would not be dictated to by the Doctors of Jerusalem.³ If this, in so far as it is fact at all, occasioned any feeling, it nowhere appears, or is even hinted at. Again, Keim makes the circumstance that John Hyrcanus sent his son Alexander Jannaeus, the subsequent king, to Galilee to be brought up, imply his contempt for Galilee.⁴ Whereas the only point in this fact is that Hyrcanus wanted his son out of his sight — in Galilee, or anywhere else, where he would not see him again. Again, Keim presses another fact altogether too far, when he says that "Antipater regarded his younger son, the youngster Herod [but he was then twenty-five!] *as smart enough* — für tüchtig genug — to govern Galilee," implying the very opposite of what the facts indicate as given by Josephus.⁵ Herod was sent to Galilee because, of the two sons of

¹ Hansrath, 1. 11; Keim, 1. 310.

² Hansrath, 1. 8. 9; Schneckenburger, 114.

⁴ Keim, 1. 310.

³ Keim, 1. 310.

⁵ Keim, 1. 310.

Antipater, he was the more shrewd, active, and capable. Delitzsch states the popular view as if it were a firmly established fact, instead of being, as it really is, a supposition with hardly a shadow of proof: his words are, "The Judeans regarded the Galileans with proud contempt, just as the Greeks regarded the Bœotians, or the Parisians the people of Gascogne":¹ which we are ready to admit as soon as any evidence can be adduced in support of it. The Christians are once called "the sect of the Nazarenes," and alluded to as such in one other instance;² as a sect obnoxious to the Jews; but in neither case is any contempt implied for Galilee or Nazareth. In John vii. 41 all that is meant is that the people universally expected Christ to come from Bethlehem, and not from Galilee. As to the statement in John vii. 52, it is possible that the speakers referred to *the* prophet alluded to in vs. 40, and also in chap. vi. 14.³ But if they really meant that no prophet ever came from Galilee they stated what they knew to be false, that is, supposing that they possessed even the commonest knowledge of their own history. There are besides the above, no other passages in the New Testament which bear at all upon our subject, except John i. 45, Nathanael's words, which will be considered later.

The grounds mentioned above, on which it is claimed by some that a feeling of contempt for the Galileans was based, are all suppositions of later times. We can readily imagine that, on the part of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, there was a feeling of superiority to Galilee and the Galileans. But that such a feeling (of the existence of which at all we have no proof) ever amounted to contempt, or even to sectional jealousy or prejudice, there is not the slightest evidence in either of the great authorities, namely, the New Testament,

¹ Jesus und Hillel, p. 18. We could help Delitzsch by pointing out to him a remark of the brilliant Heine — applicable to Delitzsch's view — a remark in regard to France: "By France I mean Paris, for what the provinces think is of no more importance than the opinions of a man's legs. The head is the seat of thought." — H. Heine's *De l'Allemagne*, Paris. 2 vols. 8vo. 1835. Preface, p. xii.

² Acts xxiv. 5; xxviii. 22.

³ Jahn, *Bib. Arch.* p. 25. § 22.

Josephus, and the Talmud. Yet, if such a feeling really existed, it must have appeared somewhere. On this point, the following summary of facts will be significant: 1. On a certain occasion of distress in the northern province, mentioned in 1 Mac. v. 14-23, the Maccabees, though belonging to the tribe of Judah, rallied nobly for the defence of the Galileans — their brethren of the north. There is no trace of sectional feeling here. 2. In A.D. 51 the Galileans were attacked at Ginaea by the Samaritans, while the former were on their way to a feast at Jerusalem. "When the assassination was reported at Jerusalem, the populace were thrown into a state of confusion, and, deserting the festival, hurried to Samaria," to revenge the outrage committed against their brethren of the north.¹ Here is the very opposite of sectional feeling between Judea and Galilee. 3. Had such a feeling existed, it would have cropped out at the great feasts, the common occasions for the display of ill-feeling or mad passions, if any existed, towards any person or party. But a friendly feeling always appears; for, 4. At the outbreak at Pentecost (May 31, in 4 B.C.) after the death of Herod, Galileans, Idumeans, men from Jericho and Perea, join with the Judeans in an attack upon Sabinus and the Roman troops, and apparently there is the greatest harmony among the different sections.² 5. During the governorship of Herod, and afterwards during his reign (years from twenty-five to seventy of his life), and during the long reign of Antipas (forty-three years), and the short reign of Agrippa I., and the governorship of Josephus, in all the events which transpired during these years, there is no trace of sectional feeling or jealousy. 6. The opposite of such a feeling is indicated by the visiting back and forth of the Scribes and Pharisees in Christ's time. 7. In the Jewish war, the greatest harmony prevails, for the most part, between Galilee and Judea. 8. The silence of the enemies of Christ. 9. The silence, on this subject, of the New Testament, of Josephus, and of the Talmud. If Galilee was a "despised province," if "the

¹ Wars, 2. 12. 3, 4.

² Ant. 17. 10. 2; Wars, 2. 3. 1.

Galileans were looked upon with contempt," ought there not to be hints of such facts *somewhere*?

XVIII. NAZARETH, ITS CHARACTER AND PROBABLE SIZE; ORIGIN OF THE NAME; NOT SO ISOLATED AS IS SUPPOSED.

But in regard to Nazareth, some have apparently felt that they were honoring Christ in proportion as they were able to make his earthly home appear insignificant and mean. The pictures which have been drawn of the "meanness" of Nazareth, and of the "poverty" of Christ's family, are as distressing as they are untruthful. It is a question whether the words of Nathanael have not been misunderstood. The Greek can be translated easily; but we refer to the *spirit* of the words. In common with all the pious at that time, Nathanael expected Christ to appear at Bethlehem.¹ Consequently, any one who should announce that he had appeared elsewhere, would be said at once to be mistaken. This is a striking case, we think, where too strict adherence to the letter does violence to the sentiments of the speaker and to the well-known facts of the time. Nathanael, in his surprise, said only, "The great good which we expect cannot come from Nazareth, because scripture has declared that he must come from Bethlehem." Thus the words of Nathanael are best explained. Thus, also, we do not make this man whom the lips of the Saviour declared to be "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile," guilty at that very moment of a contemptible spirit of neighborhood jealousy. Those who infer from the *τὸ ἀγαθόν* of Nathanael that Nazareth was an immoral place,² found their assumption on a mere fancy, which is supported by not a single fact, and, indeed, is contradicted by all that we know of the place and people.

Those who claim that Nathanael meant to contrast the insignificance of the place with the greatness of the Messiah³

¹ "The passage in Micah v. 2 (comp. Matt. ii. 6), left no doubt in the minds of the Sanhedrin as to the birth-place of the Messiah," i.e. it could occur only at Bethlehem. So Nathanael believed with the rest. See Smith's Dict. Bib. 3 1907, col. 1. Art. "Messiah."

² Meyer, John i. 47, on word *ἀγαθόν*. ³ Keim, 1. 323; Alford on John i. 47.

(as Alford and others) are equally wrong; for this could have been said of Bethlehem, where he was expected to appear, or, if one chose, of even Jerusalem itself, had he appeared there.

It is often said that Nazareth was not mentioned in the Old Testament, nor in Josephus; implying that hence it must have been an insignificant place. As to Josephus, he mentions only those places which he has occasion to; and out of the two hundred and four cities and villages of Galilee he mentions only about forty. Neither is Capernaum mentioned, either in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha, and but once (perhaps not that) in Josephus. Yet we know it was a place of importance.

As to the origin of the name "Nazareth," no one can decide definitely. At the same time, one explanation may be found to be more probable than any of the others. We reject that which derives it from נָצַר, *consecrated* or *devoted* to God. Also, that which makes it come from נָצַרְתִּי, *my Saviour*. Also, the very popular one which Hengstenberg in his *Christology* labors for, who derives it from נָצַרְתִּי, a *shoot* or *sprout*. But if the word were to contain a reference to the Messiah as a *sprout* or *branch* of David, it should have been some form of נָצַרְתִּי, the usual word for "branch," and which is supposed to have direct reference to the Messiah. But the explanation of Hengstenberg (and held by many others) is very improbable; for was it ever heard of to name a place from a certain prophecy, and from a certain word in that prophecy, and that years, and perhaps centuries, before that prophecy was fulfilled? A town could hardly have failed to have existed on so eligible a site from very early times. The hill just back of the present town is spoken of by every one as commanding one of the finest prospects in Palestine. It could not have failed of a name, as well as Hermon, Tabor, or Gilboa.¹ We have long had the impression, confirmed since we stood on the hill itself, that the name of the

¹ See Stanley, S. and P. 395, and note, about mountains in all countries being named from some peculiarity of themselves; also, Keim, 1. 320.

town and the hill must be intimately connected, or perhaps identical. If we had the name of the latter, we should know that of the former. We have already shown that to the New Testament writers this place was a *πόλις*, and never a *κώμη*, and hence of size and importance, in spite of modern commentaries and sermons, which insist on its insignificance. Keim puts the probable number of its inhabitants "at ten thousand souls, at least."¹ But if we receive the statement of Josephus, before quoted, as to the towns and cities of Galilee, we may suppose the number of its inhabitants to have reached fifteen or twenty thousand. We have, then, a mountain "city" of some importance and of considerable antiquity. We have the hill back of the town commanding that wonderful prospect. This hill must have had a name. We have the word *רָאָה*, to *behold, to see, to look*, and then to *watch, to guard*. In the latter sense (*watch* or *guard*), it is very often used in Hebrew (perhaps a dozen times). We have *רָאָה*, *one guarding*; and *רָאָה*, *one guarding*, respectively masculine and feminine. *רָאָה*, construct *רָאָה*, *one guarded* (fem.). If Nazareth is from *רָאָה*, it would signify the *watched* or *guarded one* (fem.), i.e. the hill-top seen or beheld from afar. If from *רָאָה*, we have the *one guarding* or *watching* (fem.), i.e. the hill which overlooks a vast region, — in this case land and sea, — and thus guards it. Both these facts are true of the Nazareth-hill. The view of Hitzig, as given by Tobler,² making the name refer to some helping

¹ Keim, 1. 318.

² Nazareth, 85; Isa. xi. 1, is the only place where *רָאָה* is used with reference to Christ; compare Alford's Com. on Matt. ii. 23. Both the forms *Nazara*, and *Nazareth* appear in the oldest Greek Mss. See Delitzsch's *Jesus und Hillel*, 14 note; Keim, 1. 319 note. In some cases Tischendorf adopts "*Nazara*." See full notes and refs. on this subject in Tobler's *Nazareth*, 34, 35. See Art. "*Nazarene*," Smith's *Dict. Bib.* 3. 2070, and authors there referred to. Keim, 1. 319, 320, and note, gives a very full discussion of the subject; also, vol. 2. 421, 422; where is a multitude of refs. to the literature of the subject. Neubauer, 85, 190. See Fürst's *Lexicon*, under *רָאָה*; he does not allude to the question here discussed; yet one cannot read his article without being impressed that if the word *Nazareth* is to be derived from the Hebrew at all, it must come from this root, and have the signification which we have given and adopted.

goddess of the old Canaanitish times, we cannot adopt. The view above presented is one which seemed to us most plausible, and which we had written out and adopted before we had seen Keim's first volume. We are gratified to find that he connects the city with the hill as to the origin of its name; and he gives, in substance, the view we have adopted. We submit this as the most natural explanation of the origin of the word "Nazareth." It cannot be charged, as every one of the others can, with being "far-fetched." It relieves the name from any theological or prophetic character. If it was to have a theological or prophetic import, it was a great mistake, as we have said, to derive it from נצר, instead of from נצרת. נצר is used but once in any such connection; while נצרת is used many times.

Much is said about the "absolute seclusion" of Nazareth as the home of Christ. In regard to this point the following facts are important: 1. We have mentioned the probable size of the place. 2. The Nazareth-hill was seen and known throughout all that province, in Samaria also, and by the sailors on the Mediterranean Sea. 3. Its distance from other places—three short days' journey from Jerusalem; about six hours from Ptolemais, the port at which news and merchandise from Rome first reached Palestine (as regards the early receiving of news and merchandise from Rome, Galilee had the advantage of Jerusalem and Judea); about five hours from the Sea of Galilee; two or three hours from Endor and Nain; two hours from Mount Tabor; about one hour and a half from Cana of Galilee; also one hour and a half from Sepphoris, which before Christ's time was the capital of Galilee, and even remaining so until Herod Antipas built Tiberias, in A.D. 28.¹ 4. Doubtless, roads led out from Nazareth in Christ's time in every direction, the same as to-day. "The main road for the land traffic between Egypt and the interior of Asia must have been the great highway

¹ On these distances, see Smith's Dict. Bib. 3. 2072, col. 2. in Art. "Nazareth." Tobler, Nazareth, 1-3, and his very full refs. Date of building of Tiberias, see Lewin, p. 173, No. 1163.

leading past Gaza," through the mountains at Megiddo, and across the plain of Esdraelon, passing Nazareth near the foot of Tabor, and thence on to the northern Jordan and Damascus. If the caravan routes from Tyre and Sidon passed to the north of Nazareth, that from Ptolemais to Damascus would no doubt make Tiberias and Capernaum on its line, and hence would pass very near to Nazareth.¹ 5. Its proximity to the capital of the province, Sepphoris, — which is in sight from the Nazareth-hill, and only one hour and a half to two hours distant, — and to other large cities, and its nearness to the great caravan routes of commerce, would bring it into constant intercourse with the centres of business and news (Ptolemais, Capernaum, Tiberias, Scythopolis, Sepphoris, and of course Damascus), and give it, in this respect, very important advantages, which they should consider well who insist upon the "great obscurity and isolation of the place" — a supposition wholly gratuitous, as is seen by the facts now presented.²

After what we have thus far learned of Galilee, it sounds strange enough to read, especially from an eminent author, that "Jesus grew up among a people seldom, or only contemptuously, named by the ancient classics, and subjected, at the time, to the yoke of a foreign oppressor; in a remote and conquered province of the Roman empire; in the darkest district of Palestine; in a country town of proverbial insignificance; in poverty and manual labor; in the obscurity of a carpenter's shop; far away from universities, academies, libraries, and literary or polished society," etc.³ The whole paragraph gives an entirely wrong impression in regard to the city and province where Christ lived, and as to the circumstances of his early life. The coloring of this picture is false.

¹ On Roads, Ritter, 4. 370; Keim, 1. 322; Ewald, Hist. Isr. 3. 261; Robinson, 2. 329; see full account in Arnaud, chap. xl. pp. 217-226, "Routes Anciennes et Modernes de la Palestine."

² Hausrath, 1. 4. 9; Keim, 1. 312, 322.

³ Schaaf, Person of Christ, 34. In regard to "manual labor," it should be remembered that in Christ's time it was a disgrace *not* to labor. The most eminent teachers engaged regularly in "manual labor." How far must Christ have gone to have found "universities, academies, and libraries"? Surely they did not exist in Jerusalem, if that is the point.

XIX. SUMMARY OF RESULTS: GALILEE PROVIDENTIALLY FITTED FOR THE FIRST RECEPTION OF CHRIST AND HIS GOSPEL.

After the careful review now closed, we feel justified in saying that Galilee at the time of Christ was one of the finest and most fertile portions of the earth. Stretching from the Mediterranean on the west to the Jordan and the sweet-watered Merom and Gennesareth on the east; abounding in springs, rivers, and lakes—among which its one hallowed sea was the gem and pride of the whole country, as it is forever dear to Christian hearts; possessing a rare and delightful climate, and scenery of great variety and beauty; its surface never dull or monotonous, but infinitely varied by plains and valleys, gentle slopes and terraced hills, deep ravines and bold peaks, naturally fortified eminences and giant mountains; its soil naturally fertile, but forced by skilful husbandry to the highest state of productiveness, until this province was noted for the perfection and abundance of its fruits; Galilee thus possessed features of richness and beauty rarely if ever combined in so small a country in all the world besides. The surface of the country was covered with wealthy cities and flourishing towns, and crossed in many directions by her “way of the sea” and other great thoroughfares, which were thronged with the caravans of commerce. Its agriculture and fisheries, wine and oil trade, and other industries were in the most flourishing condition, being managed with energy and skill by a people who knew well how to use to advantage the resources of their highly favored country.¹ Its synagogues and other public buildings were built often in splendid style and at great expense. Here money was abundant, and easily raised either for taxes, heavy tributes, military affairs, or for costly dwellings and palaces. Here all matters pertaining to the synagogal service and to the instruction of children were faithfully attended to, and here were found teachers, learned men, missionaries, poets, and patriots of the highest order.

¹ Graetz, 3. 394.

In regard to the character of the Galileans, it is claimed that gold and dross were lying side by side.¹ But even those who discover in them a great deal of exterior roughness,² are compelled to admit that beneath this rough surface they possessed a fund of strength and talent which entitled them to the highest regard. But much of a positive character can be said in their praise. Their patriotism in national emergencies; their enthusiastic loyalty to their country's interests; their general adherence to the law of Moses in preference to tradition, which ruled and hampered the public mind in Jerusalem; their interest in the Temple and its solemn feasts; their deep-seated and inspiring hope, which looked with steadfast gaze towards the future—"waiting for the redemption of Israel,"—these things show that the Jews of the north, at least equally with, and perhaps far beyond, those who dwelt beneath the very shadow of the Temple, maintained within themselves, in their integrity, some of the noblest traits of the Hebrew nation.³ But farther, we find the Galileans to have been a moral, intelligent, industrious, and enterprising people, possessed of vigorous minds and healthy bodies—"healthy as their own climate and cheerful as their own sky,"⁴—a people familiar with their own law and history, and not wanting in the finest poetical spirit;⁵ with the disposition and ability to appreciate in the main the teachings of Christ; a people among whom were found most devoted men, "Israelites indeed"; among whom also devotion to the national idea reached its highest development, till at last they rose, a solid wall of patriot hearts, to be crushed by the all-conquering power of Rome;⁶ both country and

¹ Keim, 1. 316.

² Hausrath, 1. 12; Graetz, 3. 395.

³ The character of the people is seen in the very great honor paid by them to the memory of Elijah; see this eloquently set forth in Hausrath, 1. 374.

⁴ Keim, 1. 312.

⁵ Besides the poets mentioned, Mary the mother of Christ should be named as possessed of the rarest poetical gifts.

⁶ Schneckenburger, p. 238, "Das Land fiel als Opfer der messianischen Idee, welche es gegenüber der Weltmacht Rom's realisiren wollte. Es war als ob die ganze Kraft des Judenthums an Einen Ort zusammengedrängt worden wäre, um es mit Einem Schläge zu vernichten."

people, one may say with truth, fitly chosen of God as the training place of those men — Master and disciples — who were to move the world; the proper soil in which first to plant the seeds of that truth which was destined, ere long, to be spoken by eloquent lips in the pulpits of Cesarea, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome.

ARTICLE III.

BAPTISM OF INFANTS, AND THEIR CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP.¹

BY REV. G. F. WRIGHT, ANDOVER, MASS.

THERE are some who regard the subject of this Article as puerile, and pertaining to the mere externals of religion — a question which is scarce worthy the attention of masculine intellect at any time, least of all after it has been worn so threadbare as this is supposed to have been. If any such read as far as this, we trust they will read two or three sentences more. For we would remind them that it is the part neither of humility nor of wisdom to treat as unworthy of our notice any question which has stirred the Christian world so profoundly as this has done. For oftentimes the importance of a subject does not appear on the surface, but in its connections with truths that are underneath it, and which it represents.

It will be found, on close inspection, that the question of baptism connects itself with one's whole system of divinity. Infant baptism, as we regard it, is a sacrament which has objective significance, and into which is compressed one half the New Testament theology. Theology is taught by it.

¹ It is well to caution the reader that the design of this Article is logical and philosophical rather than historical or exegetical. In the succeeding Number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, we will present a comparative survey of the modern views that have prevailed with respect to the connection existing between Baptism and Regeneration. For the early history of the rite, and its exegetical foundation, the reader must be referred to the standard treatises on the subject.