

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XLIV.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1912.

522ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN THE ROOMS OF THE INSTITUTE ON MONDAY
DECEMBER 4TH, 1911, AT 4.30 P.M.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON BERESFORD POTTER IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and signed.

The SECRETARY announced that the following had been elected Members since the last meeting :—

Rev. W. C. Minifie, D.D.; Charles Phillips, Esq.; Rev. A. M. Niblock; and the Bishop of Llandaff,

and the following twenty Associates :—

Rev. W. Banham; Rev. E. Blackburn; Rev. H. Howson; Rev. Gifford H. Johnson; Peter Whitfield, Esq.; Rev. J. C. Mansel-Pleydell; Rev. J. C. Fussell; Dr. Philip Rice; C. H. Wingfield, Esq.; Miss E. M. Baumer; Miss M. R. Strange; John Graham, Esq.; Lord Balfour of Burleigh; Rev. W. B. Norris; Rev. A. Cochrane; Sir Charles Bruce, G.C.M.G.; W. C. C. Hawtayne, Esq.; Rev. J. W. ff. Sheppard; Mrs. Holmes; and Miss Manson (Life Associate).

The following paper was then read :—

THE GENEALOGIES OF OUR LORD.

By Mrs. A. S. LEWIS.

THE Gospels occupy a central point in the citadel of Divine revelation. If their authority could be refuted, or even seriously doubted, the interdependence of the books which comprise the Old and New Testaments would become a thing of nought. The Bible would be like a splendid Gothic arch from which the top stones have fallen, or like a bridge without a key stone, by which we could never cross any stream.

It is not therefore surprising that the strongest battering rams of rationalistic criticism and the artillery of those who are trying to eliminate the supernatural from the region of possibility should be unceasingly directed against them.

Where were all our pleasures?
Where our hearts' deep love?
If the herald angels
Ne'er had sung above?
If in Bethlehem's manger
Christ had never lain,
Joy were but a phantom,
Life a sob of pain.

At the beginning of the Gospels we meet with difficulties which seem almost incapable of solution and have given rise to discussions which would be interminable, were it not for the

fact that everything must have an end at some time or another in this transitory world.

We have:—

I. Verses 8, 9, of chapter i, in the Gospel of Matthew :

II. The difficulty of reconciling the genealogy in Matthew i, 1-16, with the genealogy in Luke iii, 23-38.

Some have tried to get rid of the second difficulty by asserting that Matthew i, 1-16, is a later addition to the Gospel and no real part of it. Others think that the genealogy is primitive, but that chapters i, 18, to ii, 23, of Matthew are a later addition.

If both these sections be integral parts of the Gospel and have suffered little at the hands of scribes, we ought not to find it quite impossible to explain away discrepancies, and bring the whole story into a harmonious whole. I must begin by saying that the view which I intend to put before you is not original. It has been published by Dr. Joseph Michael Heer in parts 1 and 2 of the fifteenth volume of *Biblische Studien*. Dr. Heer is, I am told, a Roman Catholic; there cannot therefore be perfect similarity of view between him and ourselves on all points; and I am both surprised and pleased to find so fearless an investigator within that very old bottle, the Roman fold of the Church Catholic.

I. Let us look at our first problem. It is, that whilst there were forty-two generations between Abraham and Jesus, the name of the first progenitor, and the last-mentioned name, that of the Messiah, being (in accordance with Semitic custom) counted into the number, and while it is easy to divide forty-two by the sacred number of three, producing three times the sacred number of fourteen, or twice seven, we know from the books of II Kings and II Chronicles that the second group had seventeen, not fourteen, members, and that the names of three of the Jewish kings, who were actual forefathers of Joseph, are omitted from the list. These names are Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah. Is this the result of a blunder? or is there any deep-seated reason for it?

Dr. Heer finds the explanation in the curse pronounced upon the house of Ahab, king of Israel, in I Kings xxi, 21, and II Kings ix, 8. There it is declared that because of Ahab having introduced the worship of the Baal into Israel, his male descendants should be cut off. This curse, like the one which is attached to the second commandment (the very commandment which Ahab had so flagrantly disobeyed), extended only to the first four generations of his children, and as his daughter Athaliah was married to Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, the priests of the temple in Jerusalem, who were also keepers of its

records, thought themselves justified in excluding from the genealogy of their kings the names of Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah. With Amaziah the curse was extinguished; and Jehoram was not a descendant of Ahab.

This explanation seems to me the more convincing, inasmuch as Dr. Heer has found it in Hilary's *Commentary on Matthew*, and in Jerome also on Matthew i, 8.

But it may be asked: Have we any proof that such temple-records existed?

i. Dr. Heer tells us that the Hebrews from very early times paid great attention to genealogical tables. In the books of Genesis, Samuel, Chronicles, Ruth, and Nehemiah, we find ample confirmation for this statement. The motive for their doing so was naturally the blessings and promises given by Jehovah to the patriarchs, their ancestors; and the wish to preserve them must assuredly have become more intense in the minds of those who were looking for a Messiah to appear in the line of David. It is possible that during the Babylonian captivity, and after it, many families may have become negligent in the preservation of their genealogical trees. When desolation had passed as a ploughshare over the land; when the heaven over their heads was as brass and the earth under them as iron, they may well have said, What use is it? But two family lines, that of David and that of Aaron, had enough of innate vitality to resist all adverse influences.

ii. The existence of private family registers is proved by the recent discovery of Aramaic documents concerning the Jewish colony at Elephantinè, near Syene (Assouan) of the years 471-411 B.C.

iii. Flavius Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, i, 7) speaks of the great care which was taken to keep the line of the priests pure. When a priest took a wife, he must not have respect either to money or to honours, but must choose a maiden of ancient lineage, who could bring forward sufficient witnesses for her ancestry. For 1,300 years the names of the High Priests had been written in the lists from father to son. The greatest care was exercised even in those priestly families who lived in exile, for example, in the temple of Leontopolis in Egypt. When a scion of one of these families wished to marry, he had to send a list of his nearer ancestors and of his more remote ones to Jerusalem, and also the names of witnesses who could vouch for their accuracy. Jerusalem thus became naturally the storehouse of all family archives which belonged to the tribe of Levi.

iv. We learn from Julius Africanus (in Eusebius, *H.E.* i, 7)

that Herod the Great (son of Antipater) caused most of these registers to be burnt, because he was himself of a plebeian family, and wished to conceal from the Roman Emperor that he had no blood relationship with either the royal line of David or the priestly one of Levi. The private family registers would not, however, all disappear in this catastrophe. Some of them were rewritten from memory, and duplicates may have been preserved in more than one household.

The custom of the *damnatio memoriae* was practised also in Imperial Rome and was carried out in a striking manner against the Emperor Commodus. He, or rather his memory, was condemned in a night sitting of the Senate within twenty-four hours of his death, the same sitting in which Pertinax was nominated as Emperor. It was decreed, amidst the acclamations of the people, that his body was to be thrown into the Tiber, the statues of him were to be destroyed, his name was to be abolished, and erased from every private and public monument.

The Athenians pronounced a like doom on the memory of Alcibiades, and of Philip V. of Macedon, in the year 200 B.C.*

In a far more remote antiquity, about 1450 B.C. under the 18th Dynasty, quite near to the time of Moses, the Egyptian priests cursed the memory of Amenhotep IV., the heretic king, whose strange behaviour appears to have been responsible for both the building of Tell-el-Amarna and for its ruin.†

But what have these stories to do with the omission of three kingly names from our Lord's genealogy in Matthew's Gospel?

We have allusions to this practice in the Old Testament. It cannot, therefore, have been non-existent among the Hebrews. At the time when the Golden Calf was made, "Whoso hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book": Exodus xxxii, 33 (see also Deuteronomy ix, 14; xxv, 19; xxix, 20; II Kings xiv, 27).

Psalm ix, 5, "Thou hast rebuked the nations. Thou hast destroyed the wicked, Thou hast blotted out their name for ever and ever."

Psalm lxix, 28, "Let them be blotted out of the Book of Life."

Revelation iii, 5, "I will in no wise blot out his name out of the Book of Life."

* See Livy, Book xxxi, cap. 44.

† See *New Light on Ancient Egypt*, pp. 63 ff.

These three kings, it will be said, were not worse than others of their line. One of them, indeed, Joash, was decidedly good during the first part of his reign. The genealogy, which included Manasseh, might well have included him.

True, but they, viz., Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, were the descendants of Ahab and Jezebel in the second, third, and fourth generations.

We owe this explanation to Hilary and to Jerome.* So when Matthew copied "Joram begat Ozias," it was only what he found written in the official genealogy, and he made no mistake about it. With Amaziah the curse was extinguished. We must recollect that the descendants of Ahab and Jezebel in the male line, seventy persons, actually perished (II Kings x, 11) by the hand of Jehu.

Those who wish to understand the explanation of how the number 42, that is three times fourteen, would convey to a Jewish mind a confirmation of our Lord's claim to be the Messiah, and also of how 72, the number of generations by which He descended from God (see Luke iii), would signify that He was the Saviour of all mankind, must consult Dr. Heer's book for themselves. This is a region which I have no great wish to explore.

At the very beginning of the third group, verse 12, during the Babylonian captivity, we are told that Jechonias begat Salathiel, although of him it had been said in Jeremiah xxii, 30, "Write ye this man childless." Yet in the very same verse these words are explained to mean not that he was to have no children (see I Chronicles iii, 17, 18), but that no man of his seed should prosper. Perhaps Salathiel, his son, died young, and also Pedaiah, son of Salathiel. Matthew Henry remarks that as Pedaiah probably died in his father's lifetime, his son Zerubbabel, was called the son of Salathiel. Thus the curse on Jechonias died out in the third generation, for Zerubbabel had the high privilege of returning to Jerusalem and helping to build the temple and also of restoring the dynasty to its ancient thrones (see Ezra ii, iii, iv, v; Nehemiah vii, xii).

The official registers were probably drawn up according to the form of which we have a specimen in Ruth iv, 18-22, where the style is remarkably like that in Matthew's Gospel. If so, it is not difficult to see that the statement of our Lord's birth must have been nearly as it is in the Sinai Palimpsest, "Joseph begat

* Hilary (Migne's *Patrologia*), vol. ix. Comm. on Matt. i, 8. Jerome, vol. vii, c. 10. Comm. on Matt. i, 8 (Migne, vol. xxv).

Jesus, who is called the Christ," perhaps from Mary his wife, "the daughter of Heli," being added.

We must remember that Joseph had already exercised the right of a father in naming the Child (see Matthew i, 25), and that any indication of our Lord's real descent would have brought upon Mary the terrible punishment of stoning (see Deuteronomy xxii, 21), which was exactly what Joseph sought to avoid.

II. Referring now to our second problem, more than one explanation has been given by commentators in different ages, as to why the genealogy in Matthew differs so completely from the genealogy in Luke. I think that Dr. Heer, like Matthew Henry, has adopted the true explanation. Matthew, having received the story of the Nativity from Joseph, gave also Joseph's genealogy, through which our Lord's claim to be the Messiah and the official descendant of David is asserted, for Matthew's aim in writing his Gospel was chiefly to convince his Jewish countrymen of this fact. Luke, on the other hand, gives us Mary's account of the Nativity, and therefore he gives us also Mary's genealogy. His chief aim was to convince his friend Theophilus and other Gentiles that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God. Our Lord's claim to the Messiahship would have had very little weight with them. I cannot think that the story of the Virgin Mary's parents being named Joachim and Anna rests on any secure foundation. It is derived from a fabulous book called the *Protevangelion Jacobi* (which I have myself edited in its Syriac dress), and which, though embodying early traditions, was excluded from the list of canonical, and even true books, by the *Decretum Gelasii* in the sixth century, but upon which the whole worship of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Church rests. Anna may have been the name of Mary's mother, though it has obviously been suggested to the mind of the romancer, either by the story of the prophet Samuel or by that of Joachim and Susanna.

The Talmud tells us that the name of Mary's father was Heli.* Men, says Dr. Heer, were often called the immediate fathers of their daughters' children. We can find more than one instance of this for ourselves in the Old Testament. Athaliah was the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, yet in II Kings viii, 26, II Chronicles xxii, 2, she is called the daughter of Omri, who was Ahab's father. Also Salathiel is called the father of Zerubbabel, although Pedaiah came between them: Ezra iii, 2, v. 2; Matthew i, 12. I love to think that our Lord was not an

* Jerusalem Talmud, Chagigah, fol. 77, 4.

actual descendant of the gorgeous Solomon, nor of any Jewish crowned head excepting David, the sweet singer of Israel, whose poetic gift seems to have been inherited by the most blessed among women. No. He sprang from a line of more modest ancestors, amongst whom we find no kingly names save those of Zerubbabel and Salathiel, names which may possibly represent quite different people from those in 1 Chronicles and in Ezra. Possibly Mary may have sprung from a more consistently God-fearing stock than Joseph did. In Zechariah xii, 12 ff., it is remarkable to find the names of Nathan, Levi, and Shimei following one another, all of these being in Luke's genealogy. Justin Martyr* and Irenæus† both assume that the genealogy in Luke is that of Mary. Justin, indeed, tells us that amongst the Jews a man was often called the father of his daughter's children (*Dial.* 43), and it is possible in reading Luke iii, 23, to shift the bracket and make the parenthesis begin with "being," and end with "Joseph." We should then read, "And Jesus Himself was the son of Heli." "When He began" is absent from some of the best Latin MSS. and from all the Old Syriac versions.

And now we must speak further of the startling verse which led many English scholars to think that the text of the Sinai Palimpsest is heretical, before it was subjected to the minute investigations which it has since undergone. I think it is Mr. Conybeare of Oxford who observed in the *Academy*: "If this verse had been altered by a heretic, why did he not make a clean sweep of verses 18-25, which are so contradictory to it?" The text shows no trace of a like heresy elsewhere. We must therefore seek for another explanation.

It is quite possible, as Dr. Burkitt and others have suggested, that verse 16 may spring from a misreading of the MS. which underlies the Ferrar group of Greek cursive MSS. But I think that my explanation is a much simpler and more probable one. The phrase, "Joseph begat Jesus," is very probably what Matthew found in the Temple register, the words "to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin," and "who is called the Christ," being the evangelist's own additions to it. That some such statement had to be explained away is shown by the opening clause of verse 18, which in Greek reads: But the birth of the Christ was on this wise. (*Ἰησοῦ* is omitted also by all the oldest Latin MSS.) To what does that "But" refer? King James' translators and our own English revisers did not know, for

* *Dial. cum Tryphone*, 43, 88, 100, cf. Migne, vol. vi, pp. 567, 686, 710.

† Book III, cap. 22. Migne, vol. vii, p. 955, seq.

verse 16 had been altered in the early centuries, and so they translated it "Now."

Is "Now" right? I allow that the small particle δὲ might be so rendered, and that it is not so emphatic a disjunctive as ἀλλὰ, but it is surely significant that our revisers have rendered δὲ as "but" in Matthew i, 20, Matthew ii, 19, 22, and in 162 other passages of the same Gospel.

If you will accept my "But" the whole narrative is brought into harmony; and the quibbles of those who find in it two narratives pieced together are rendered useless.

There are also other considerations. Joseph was more than the foster-father of our Lord. He was a legal parent. Without him there would be no sense in Matthew's giving us that genealogy, and a very insufficient basis for the claim of Jesus to be the son of David. Descent in that royal house was never through a woman, and never is so, even in our own enlightened age, except where the male line has utterly failed. Joseph deserved the high honour, for he threw the shield of his protection over Mary at a most trying time, and his faithfulness to her brought it about that our Lord was born in wedlock.

Semitic custom invariably gives the child of a woman's first husband to her second one. This rule is the same in old Arab custom, in Moslem law, and in Hindu law. For proof of this I refer you to Robertson Smith's *Kinship and Marriage in Ancient Arabia*, pp. 109-120, to Sir Henry Maine's *Dissertation on Early Law and Custom*, p. 20.

The Syriac versions bring out the position of the Virgin Mary in regard to Joseph much more clearly than the Greek MSS. There is an unfortunate ambiguity about the *μεμνηστευμένην* of Luke i, 27, and a still greater one about our word "espoused." I hold that the claim of the Ferrar reading found in the Greek versions of that group 13 ἡ μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος *Μαριάμ ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν*, to be the original reading is greatly weakened by its being rendered in the Latin of Codex Bezae, "*Cui desponsata virgo Maria peperit Christum Jesum.*" This is quite at variance with the facts. Mary was much more than betrothed to Joseph at the time of our Lord's birth. She had the full legal status of his wife; else how, I may ask, could she have travelled with him to Bethlehem? All Oriental ideas of propriety would have been outraged if it had been otherwise. The early Syriac versions leave us in no doubt on this point. When the visit of the Angel to Mary is related by Matthew, whether in the old Syriac of the second century or in the *Peshitta* of the very early fifth, the

word by which she is described is $\kappa\iota\tau\alpha$ "betrothed." Both MSS. of the Old Syriac fail us in Luke ii, 5; because they are defective, through the loss of a leaf; the *Peshitta*, however, uses the same epithet. In Luke i, 56, it will be observed that Mary, after her visit to Elizabeth, returned to her own house, which she would surely not have done had she been then married. When she travelled to Bethlehem she is distinctly called by our Syriac witnesses the wife of Joseph. Not "espoused wife," nor any ambiguous title of that kind: such as we have in the Authorised Version, and in the Greek MSS. which underlie it. And here I must enter an emphatic protest against the rendering of the Revised Version. In spite of the great debt which we owe to the distinguished scholars who have given it to us, I think that here they have displayed a great lack of imagination by rejecting the word $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}$, "wife," and keeping only $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, "betrothed." I cannot help wondering if any one of that learned company was familiar with the ways and ideas of Eastern people at the present day? If such an one had been amongst them, he would surely have pointed out the absurdity, nay, the impossibility, of such a circumstance.

I am aware that the oldest of the Greek MSS. (A and B) support the word "betrothed" without "wife," and Tischendorf has lent to this reading the weight of his authority. But the oldest of the Latin MSS. support the Syriac "wife," and as the Syriac is racy of the soil, and was our Lord's mother tongue in its Palestinian or Galilean form, I think that on a point like this, where it has some strong corroboration from other sources, it ought to command attention.

And in weighing the evidence of these MSS., would it not be well to take into account the balance of probability? The late Dr. Frederick Blass would certainly have agreed with me, for he thought that any reading which takes no account of literary style must be doubtful.

The Sinai Palimpsest also tells us that Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem to be enrolled there, because they were both of the house and lineage of David.

This statement appears also in the Armenian version of the *Diatessarōn*, edited in its Latin translation by Moesinger, in the Commentary of Ephraim and in Aphraates.

The chief interest, I might rather say "value," of the Sinai text lies in its uncommon and often suggestive variants, variants such as "We are servants," in Luke xvii, 10, the word "unprofitable" appearing to be in itself an unprofitable

interpolation; the statement that our Lord, though He was sitting on the well when His disciples left Him at Sychar, was found by them when they returned, standing and talking to the woman, and many other little points of a like kind. A recent critic of my book *The Old Syriac Gospels*, the Rev. Dr. Moffatt, who has shown himself slow to adopt new theories like Sir William Ramsay's South Galatian one, judges them to be due to revision rather than to an original text. I do not think so. It cannot be due to revision when the supposed discrepancy between St. John and the Synoptists as to the scene of our Lord's trial has quite disappeared by the rearrangements of the matter in the XVIIIth chapter of St. John's Gospel,* whereby verse 24 is restored to its true place after verse 13; my discovery, partly at Sinai and partly at home, that the Greek word *πρώτος* or *πρώτου* (for **Σ** and **B** differ) in John i, 41, was originally *πρωϊ*, that the two dots over the last letter of this word caused it to be mistaken for a **τ**, and that Andrew found his brother Simon not after the tenth hour, but at the dawn of the next day after his meeting with the Saviour (a reading found also in three of the best Latin MSS. *a.e.r.*) as "mane." Dr. Burkitt accepted this reading immediately after I had published it in the *Expository Times*, and he made the further suggestion that Luke vi, 1, with its impossible grammar (in some MSS.) is capable of a similar solution. Dr. Wilkins, of T.C.D., has pointed out another instance in the *Odyssey*, book xxiv, line 24, where for the last twenty years all editors have printed *πρωϊ* instead of *πρώτος* or *πρώτου*. These and many other things cannot surely be due to revision; quite probably they are records from the memory of some of the early disciples. Dr. Moffatt approves of those in John i, 41, John xviii, 13, 24, 14, and Luke xvii, 10. These might have predisposed him in favour of the others. To one of these I wish to draw your attention, before I close, as it is connected with the Birth story. The Sinai text makes the wise men say in Matthew ii, 2, "We have seen His star from the east, and are come to worship him." One day I happened to be transcribing this passage: and I asked myself, "What can 'from the east' mean?" Is there any justification for it in the Greek? Looking closely at the original text, I saw that if you take it to be a loose construction, common in popular speech, you might just as easily read, "We, being in the east, have seen His star," as you might say, "I have seen Brooks' comet in Cam-

* This was perceived by Dr. Martin Luther in his translation of the Bible into German, edit. 1558, 1664.

bridge." And at once there flashed on me the solution of a difficulty which I have often felt. How could a star visibly move in the sky? And if the wise men saw a remarkable star to the east of them; why did they not go off to India? The fact that they travelled to Palestine shows that the star was in the west when they saw it. They went to Palestine, over which the star appeared to stand, and they could not go further west, because of the sea.

It happened curiously enough that Dr. Deissmann was visiting us at that time, and as he is one of the first living authorities in Biblical Greek, I took the passage to him. He asked me at once for a Greek Testament, went off to his room to look at it, and in two minutes he returned saying: "You are quite right, the passage may be read just as well, 'We, being in the east, have seen His star.' Such loose constructions are quite common in English." We have not quite forgotten Miss Hobhouse's "To continue the concentration camps is to murder the children," and how an evil suggestion was read into this which she herself has repudiated.

On the origin and value of these variants opinions must differ. Some further discovery may perhaps tell us whether the Sinai text is older or younger than Tatian's *Diatessarōn*; and that will no doubt influence greatly the verdict of scholars on this point. What I am anxious about is that the question shall not be prejudged; and any attempt to fix either the date of the translation or the name of the translator from the evidence we now have appears to me to be fraught with nothing but mischief; for it discourages people from trying to investigate the facts. Rather let us be content to say "We do not know," when we have not a scrap of evidence to guide us to a true solution.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said that he felt much indebted to Mrs. Lewis for her able paper: but would not detain the meeting long as the subject was one to which he had not given much study. He thought the instances given of a grandfather being called the father helped one much, and made it easier to understand how different names should appear in the two genealogies. Doubtless what happened was that at first the original "nucleus" was the record of the Evangelists; but later, when new material came to be added from different sources—

these sources caused the variety. But the fact that no attempt was made in early times to make the two genealogies agree by cutting out, or adding, spoke well for the honesty of transcribers. He understood that the usually accepted theory was that both were genealogies of Joseph: but the other theory made the matter easier of reconciliation. Mrs. Lewis' explanation of the vision of the star as suggested by the Sinai MS. was very interesting, and quite reconcilable with the Greek. The only difficulty was, as the star in this case would be in the west, why did not the wise men travel on from Bethlehem till they reached the sea. He asked Mrs. Lewis to explain on what grounds the revisers had rejected "wife" for "betrothed."

Canon GIRDLESTONE said: All will join in thanking Mrs. Lewis for her interesting paper on a subject of very ancient dispute. If I differ from her it will not be taken that I do not appreciate her case, and it may add interest to the discussion. Our subject involves the study of Jewish methods of registration. St. Matthew traces the line of Joseph down from the patriarchs; St. Luke traces it up to our first parents, and so to God. If we turn to 1 Chron. vi, we find two genealogies of Samuel, one going down and the other up, and with several variations of names. I discussed them in the *Expositor* for November, 1899. In Josephus' life there is a reference to the fact that at certain times genealogies had to be re-copied, and this would possibly lead to mistakes and omissions. The first of the three missing names in St. Matthew begins with the same letters as the name that follows (whether in Hebrew or in Greek), and this may account for the omission, though the theory held by Mrs. Lewis seems quite a reasonable one. The complications round Zerubbabel's name are considerable. Salathiel was probably son of Neri of Nathan's line, and Zerubbabel the son of Pedaiah was adopted by him. Something similar happened in the case of Joseph. This view was worked out by Julius Africanus, one of the most learned men of his age. Hammurabi's code deals with adoption and is at the root of Jewish law. The 188th section orders that if a man teaches his adopted son a handicraft no one can take the lad away from him. This was evidently done by Joseph in the case of Jesus, who was his legally adopted son. Two royal lines converged in the carpenter. If the crown of David had been assigned to his successor in the days of Herod it would have been placed on the head of Joseph. And who would have been the legal successor to Joseph? Jesus of

Nazareth would have been then the King of the Jews, and the title on the Cross spoke the truth. God had raised Him up to the house of David.

Mr. MARTIN ROUSE said : It is a pleasure indeed to listen to the result of new research made by one of those two ladies who brought to light the most ancient Syriac version of the *Diatessaron* and who, to establish and enlarge their discoveries, made three more pilgrimages to the remote library of Sinai where they had found it.

The most remarkable and delightful thing in Mrs. Lewis' paper is that she has found in the Jerusalem Talmud the statement that Mary, the mother of our Lord, was the daughter of Heli. This confirms my own previous conviction that, as Matthew's genealogy is the official one—of Joseph, who took the place of a father to Jesus, so is Luke's the natural one—of Mary, the only earthly parent of the Saviour. For her omission from it and the mention of her husband alone we find two analogies—the first in 1. Chron. ii, 35 f., the second in Ezra ii, 61–63. In the first case Sheshan, having no sons, gives a daughter in marriage to his Egyptian servant Jarha ; and the son of this marriage is next mentioned and all his descendants, the pedigree being thus throughout Sheshan's, not Jarha's. In the second case a priest named Hakkoz marries a daughter of Barzillai, the succourer of King David, and takes her family name, so that when his descendants on returning from the Babylonian captivity claim to be priests their male or priestly ancestry beyond Hakkoz can no longer be traced. In neither case is the daughter's name mentioned ; but the genealogy goes on from father-in-law to son-in-law and thence to grandson or later descendant, just as in Luke iii, 23, the genealogy passes from the father-in-law Heli to the son-in-law Joseph and thence to the grandson Jesus.

It is deeply important to prove that Mary was herself descended from David. I once met and tried to re-establish in the faith a thoughtful young man who had been unsettled by a remark of the late Chief Rabbi Adler that the evidence for the Messiahship of Jesus failed in the most important item, since both the pedigrees given of Him in the Gospels traced His ancestry up through Joseph, while there was otherwise no evidence that His mother was a descendant of David.

Yet there is other evidence, though it is immensely strengthened

by establishing, as has been done to-day, that the second Gospel pedigree is that of Mary.

When the angel was foretelling to Mary the birth of the Holy Child, he said, "The Lord God shall give Him the throne of His father David." Now if Joseph, her betrothed, had alone been descended from David, Mary would have answered, "I am not yet married to Joseph," whereas she did answer simply, "I am an unmarried woman," which plainly implies, *if* I were married, since I am descended from David, I could infuse my royal blood into a son, but how can I have a royal son while I am a virgin?

Again, Joseph was a poor man; he would not have spent a longer time from his trade at Nazareth than was needful for reporting himself at Bethlehem to the census-taker and for saluting a few friends there; so when he started Mary must have been very near her time of delivery—say two or three weeks. He surely would not have taken her on that three days' mountainous journey to Bethlehem when she was in that condition, unless she as well as he was "of the house and lineage of David." And this view, as we learn from the paper (p. 17) is strikingly confirmed by a reading in the Sinaitic Syriac Version.

The Revised Version of 1 Chron. iii, 17, 18, makes it clear that both Salathiel and Pedaiah were sons of Jeconiah, the name Assir just following Jeconiah's in the Authorized Version being rendered, as it may lawfully be, "captive," and verse 17 being thus brought into the same form as verse 16. Salathiel and the second son Malchiram doubtless both died before having children, Pedaiah then taking Salathiel's place, and one of the other sons mentioned Malchiram's place, in raising up children to their brothers; and so Zorobabel was later called the son of Salathiel, though he was really (ver. 19) the son of Pedaiah.

On the other hand, the Zorobabel, son of Salathiel, in Luke's pedigree can hardly be the same as Zorobabel, son of Salathiel, in Matthew's; for the former stands twenty generations back from Joseph inclusively, while the latter stands only twelve back; and this difference is out of all proportion to the whole number of generations in the respective pedigrees, which in Luke is forty-two from Joseph back to David, and in Matthew (when the three expunged kings are restored) is thirty-two. There is analogy enough for the repetition of such a combination of names even in

two pedigrees from the same remote ancestors; for in one of the priestly pedigrees in Chronicles we have two Elkanahs, and in another two Zadoks, two, if not three, Azariahs, and two Ahitubs, sons of Amariah and besides Isaiah's witness Zechariah, son of Jeberechiah, there seem to have been two Zechariahs, sons of Berachiah, known to history—the prophetic writer and a martyr who must have suffered long after that writer's period of religious revival: Isa. viii, 2; Zech. i, 1; and Matt. xxiii, 35.

Colonel MACKINLAY said: Our heartiest thanks are due to the learned lady who has so kindly responded to our invitation to lecture to us. Her deep knowledge of Syriac MSS. gives great value to all her papers, but specially perhaps to her remarks about the true meaning of Luke i, 27.

With regard to the star (p. 18), allowing that the words of Matt. ii, 2, *may* mean "We, being in the east, have seen His star," it does not necessarily follow that the star had been in the west because the Magi had journeyed in a westerly direction. We are *not* told that they were *led* by the star to Jerusalem; they evidently came there because they expected to find those who could tell them where Christ was to be born. *Afterwards* we are told the star "went before," this seems to be mentioned as a striking fact, and naturally suggests that during the long journey to Jerusalem the star had *not* been in front of them.

The star would be more likely to be seen in the east than in the west, the place of power rather than of decadence.

Colonel Mackinlay then gave his reasons for believing that the star was an exceptionally bright appearance of the planet Venus, and concluded by again thanking the Lecturer for her interesting paper.

Dr. THIRTLE: Much of the Bible criticism of our time is vitiated by a lack of sympathy with Oriental ideals and modes of thought on the part of critics and expositors. The learned lecturer this afternoon has come to us with an equipment which, in this important respect, is altogether exceptional; and we cannot but express our gratitude to her for the paper she has read.

I desire to make a few remarks upon the passage in which Mrs. Lewis dealt with the relation subsisting between Joseph and Mary at the time of the journey to Bethlehem, for the enrolment mentioned in Luke ii. Was it a state of betrothal or marriage? or might it not, very properly, be described by either of these terms?

In the Authorized Version we read that Mary was "the espoused wife" of Joseph; in the Revised Version that she was "betrothed" to him. The word in the Greek is a participle of the passive voice of the verb *mnêsteuô*. The event specified in Matt. i, 24—he "took unto him his wife"—was assuredly antecedent to the journey to Bethlehem; yet in connection with the latter event, the Evangelist Luke seems to find no difficulty in describing Mary as "betrothed" to Joseph (Luke ii, 4, 5, Revised Version)—the same term as is used in the previous chapter in the story of the Annunciation (Chapter i, verse 27). The circumstances as thus brought before us make it necessary to inquire what the Jews understood by betrothal.

In the article on "Betrothal" in the *Jewish Encyclopædia* (vol. 3) by Rabbi Dr. Drachman, of New York, it is made clear beyond question that the ancient practice in this particular was much different from that which prevails in Israel at the present time. Speaking of the negotiations requisite for arranging marriages, the Rabbi says: "When the agreement had been entered into, it was definite and binding upon both groom and bride, who were considered as man and wife in all legal and religious aspects, except that of actual cohabitation." Note the situation: the betrothed were *considered as man and wife*, one condition alone being excepted.

Dr. Drachman proceeds to show that the Hebrew word *ârdâs*, "to betroth," must be taken in this sense, *i. e.*, to contract an actual though incomplete marriage. "In two of the passages in which it occurs, the betrothed woman is directly designated as 'wife'—II Sam. iii, 14, 'my wife whom I have *betrothed*'; and Deut. xxii, 23, 24, where the *betrothed* is designated as 'the wife of his neighbour.'" Another such reference is I Macc. iii, 56, "them that were *betrothing wives*." The Rabbi continues: "In strict accordance with this sense, the Rabbinical Law declares that betrothal is equivalent to an actual marriage, and only to be dissolved by a formal divorce." He goes on to explain the "home-taking" of the bride, whereby the marriage was completed, in ordinary circumstances at the end of twelve months, in cases where either of the parties had previously been married, at the end of thirty days.

In the light of these facts we can trace without difficulty the progress of the events set forth in the Gospel story. After receiving from the angel of the Lord the message "Fear not," Joseph "took

unto him his wife" (Matt. i, 20, 24). To the world this step would seem to mark the completion of the marriage; it was, at least, the formal *home-taking*. The Evangelist Matthew, however, proceeds to record another fact: Joseph "knew her not till she had brought forth a son" (verse 25). This statement shows that, in truth, for the time, the betrothal had not eventuated in marriage as the same is contemplated in Rabbinical Law. See "betrothal" and "taking" distinguished in Deut. xx, 7; xxviii, 30.

On a review of all the facts, we conclude that, while it was not incorrect to speak of Mary as the *wife* of Joseph, as is plainly implied in Matt. i, 24, yet, in view of the pious resolution which lies behind the words of verse 25, there was a refined propriety in the use of the Greek word *mnēsteuō* in the sense of "betrothed," thus suggesting an incomplete marriage. Accordingly, the Syriac versions, of which Mrs. Lewis has spoken, in referring to Mary as Joseph's "wife" express the ostensible fact; but the Greek text in maintaining the relation of the betrothal takes account of the heart and soul secret of the parties, whereby the nuptial contract was reverently qualified until the birth of our Lord.

The Rev. E. SEELEY said: May I draw attention to another interesting genealogy which in some points illustrates the difficulties in our subject to-night? Our King George, and also nearly all the royal families of Europe, trace their descent backwards through many of the great men of past ages to the Odin of legendary glory but somewhat misty history. If we compare these various pedigrees and look for their point of contact, we may be struck by the interlacing of the pedigrees and puzzled by many difficulties.

The Gospel genealogies go back to more remote ages and we have fewer side-lights to help us; while we know that sometimes a man was known by two different names, and in other cases several men all bore the same name; so it is quite natural that we puzzle over such pedigrees for want of knowledge.

There is one statement, on p. 12, in the highly interesting paper read this afternoon, with which I cannot agree. "The private family registers would not, however, all disappear in this catastrophe. Some of them were re-written from memory, but in these cases they could hardly go beyond the fourth generation upwards." The last clause seems to me highly unlikely in the case of David's royal line. To me it seems much more likely that each

branch of that family would keep careful memory of its own descent.

Prebendary FOX said: I am ill qualified on literary grounds to discuss the problem before us, but I desire to thank Mrs. Lewis for the suggestion that "These genealogies, as part of inspired scripture, have their spiritual as well as historic uses"; such, for example, as the lesson conveyed by the omission of the three names in the second group, and the reason for that omission. Old Thomas Fuller, quaintest of English divines, writes somewhere: "How fruitful are the seeming barren places of scripture. Wheresoever the surface of God's word doth not laugh and sing with corn, there the heart thereof within is merry with mines, affording, where not plain matter, hidden mysteries." And he illustrates this elsewhere in his *Scripture Observations*, by a reference to the very chapter which we have been considering. "Lord, I find the genealogy of my Saviour (Matt. i, 7, 8) strangely chequered with four remarkable changes in four immediate generations.

1. Roboam begat Abia; that is, a bad father begat a bad son.
2. Abia begat Asa; that is, a bad father, a good son.
3. Asa begat Josaphat; that is, a good father, a good son.
4. Josaphat begat Joram; that is a good father, a bad son.

I see, Lord, from hence, that my father's piety cannot be entailed; that is bad news for me. But I see also that actual impiety is not always hereditary; that is good news for my son."

COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. GEORGE CREWDSON writes:—

There can be no doubt that the anticipation that Christ would be descended from David was very general in our Lord's time (St. John vii, 42, etc.). It is also clear that it was believed, at least by the disciples, that Jesus was actually descended from him (St. Matt. i, 1; Acts ii, 30, xii, 23; Rom. i, 3; Rev. xxii, 16, etc.). The genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke are apparently inserted to prove that this is the fact. But at first sight it would appear that the two genealogies were mutually destructive, and that one or both are entirely untrustworthy. They both appear to be genealogies of Joseph, but they start from two different sons

of David, and end with a discrepancy, which cannot be ascribed to a copyist's error, in the name of Joseph's father.

Further investigation shows that the two lines are distinct from the time of Solomon to the captivity; after which they show agreement for about five generations from Salathiel to Abiud. A similar succession of names may be rather more dimly traced in 1 Chron. iii, as far as Hodaiah, who is the last of David's line who is named by the Chronicler. (See pp. 28 and 29.)

From this point they are again distinct till we reach Matthan or Matthat (if we may take these as variants of the same name), the (apparent) grandfather of Joseph; after which they again apparently diverge; St. Matthew giving Jacob as the name of Joseph's father, while St. Luke gives the name of Heli. It is scarcely credible that this could be due to an error on the part of the evangelists, for they were almost if not quite contemporaries of Joseph and Mary. It must also be noticed that St. Luke qualifies his statement of the parentage of Jesus by the words, "As was supposed."

The problems before us then are four—

1. To account for the coalescence of the two lines in Salathiel, etc.
2. To account for the similar coalescence in Matthan.
3. To explain how it is that Joseph has apparently two fathers.
4. To find what St. Luke means by his qualifying clause.

1. This can be easily explained by assuming that St. Matthew throughout traces the succession through the leading branch of the family, which of course at first is the line of Solomon; and that this line died out in Jehoiachin, the curse of Jeremiah that he should be childless being literally fulfilled. I do not see that the following words in Jer. xxii, 10, prove that this supposition is wrong, as Mrs. Lewis seems to think. If the royal line thus became extinct, the next senior branch would take its place, and Salathiel, son of Neri, would become the representative of the family. To suppose that Salathiel was Jehoiachin's own son would leave unexplained the remarkable coincidence which occurs at this period between the genealogies of St. Matthew and St. Luke and greatly discredit the latter.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE.

<i>I Chron. iii.</i>		<i>St. Matt. i.</i>		<i>St. Luke iii.</i>
David	”	David
Solomon	”	Nathan
Rehoboam	”	Mattatha
Abijah	”	Menan
Asa	”	Melea
Jehoshaphat	”	Eliakim
Joram	”	Jonan
*Ahaziah	”	Joseph
*Joash	”	Juda
*Amaziah	”	Simeon
Uzziah	”	Levi
Jotham	”	Matthat
Ahaz	”	Jorim
Hezekiah	”	Eliezer
Manasseh	”	Jose
Amon	”	Er
Josiah	”	Elmodan
*Jehoakim	”	Cosam
Jeconiah or Jehoiachin	”	Addi
†				
				Melchi
				Neri
Salathiel	Salathiel	Salathiel
† Zerubbabel	Zerubbabel	Zerubbabel
	§ Rhesa
Hananiah	Joannan

GENEALOGICAL TABLE.

<i>I Chron. iii.</i>	<i>St. Matt. i.</i>	<i>St. Luke iii.</i>
Shechiniah		
Shemaiah		
Neariah		
Elioenai		
¶Hodaiah Abiud	Judah

	Eliakim	Joseph
	Azor	Semei
	Zadok	Mattathias
	Achim	Maath
	Eliud	Nagge
	Eliazar	Esi

	<i>Line extinct</i>	Nahum
		Amos
		Mattathias
		Joseph
		Janna
		Melchi
		Levi
	Matthan	Matthat
	**Jacob	**Heli

	††Joseph	Mary

* Omitted in St. Matthew's list.

† Line extinct.

‡ Said, 1 Ch. iii, 19, to be son of Pedaiah, Salathiel's brother.

§ Omitted in 1 Chronicles and Matthew.

|| Omitted in Matthew and Luke. There is evidently confusion in the list in Chronicles at this time. The identification of Hananiah with Joannan is pretty clear, that of Hodaiah with Abiud more doubtful.

¶ End of line in Chronicles. Possibly identical with Abiud and Judah.

** Brothers.

†† Son of Jacob by Levirate marriage, Joseph dying childless.

2. The second coincidence, which supposes Matthan (St. Matthew) to be identical with Matthat (St. Luke), which I think most probable, can be explained in the same way—that the senior branch of the family followed, as was his custom, by St. Matthew became extinct in Eliazar, Matthan, of the junior branch, becoming head.

3. Joseph's parentage also, I think, admits of an easy explanation. If we suppose that Matthan had two sons, Jacob and Heli, and that Jacob died childless, then Heli would take his wife under the Levirate law. If Joseph were the fruit of this union, St. Matthew would be quite correct in calling him the son of Jacob, and I believe he would be reckoned as first cousin to Mary the daughter of Heli by a regular wife, and therefore Joseph and Mary would not come within the prohibited degrees of relationship.

4. If Joseph and Mary were living together under one roof, as they probably would be under the circumstances, it is easy to understand how Joseph discovered Mary's condition before his marriage (St. Matt. i, 18). This explanation also gives an intelligible meaning to St. Luke's qualifying words (iii, 23), and also corroborates the remarkable statement of the Talmud to which Mrs. Lewis refers, that Mary was the daughter of Heli.

Dr. KENYON writes: As one would expect from the writer, this paper is both learned and stimulating. I do not think there is anything that I could usefully add to it, nor indeed have I time to write at length on the subject. One point only, which Mrs. Lewis makes, I should like to emphasize; namely, that we have no business to assume that records of what one may call generally the Old Testament period were scanty. All recent discoveries go to prove that the knowledge and use of writing were much more widely spread than used to be supposed. The tablets of Babylonia and Assyria, the papyri of ancient Egypt, the correspondence between Syria and Egypt found at Tell-el-Amarna, the records discovered by Sir Arthur Evans at Gnosso, and in later times the Aramaic and Greek papyri found in Egypt, all these go to prove a very general use of writing in the ancient world, so that one is now entitled to argue that, when direct evidence is wanting, the presumption is in favour of the original existence of records, not against it.

This is a consideration which has a wide bearing on the criticism of Old Testament history, not confined to the genealogies with

which Mrs. Lewis deals; but there need be no hesitation in assuming that these genealogies were derived by the Evangelist from written, and possibly official, records.

Dr. MARGOLIOUTH writes:—

“The genealogies of our Lord,” which you have kindly sent me, I am unfortunately not able to study closely at present, being rather in bad health just now. From the cursory perusal, however, of it which I have been able to make, I gather that the subject is treated in it in a very interesting and instructive way. One point that struck my attention was this: If the report of Julius Africanus that Herod the Great caused most of the Temple registers to be burnt be true, is it likely that such a document as the genealogy given in St. Matthew would have escaped destruction if it had been one of the records preserved in the Temple at that time?

Mr. E. J. SEWELL writes:—

Mrs. Lewis is of opinion (p. 14) that St. Luke gives us Mary's genealogy.

So far as this rests upon the statement on the same page that—“the Talmud tells us that Mary's father was Heli,” it is, I think, open to very grave doubt. Dr. Gore, now Bishop of Oxford, in his *Dissertation on the Virgin-birth of our Lord* says (p. 39) that the statement—“. . . is based on a quite untenable translation.” He quotes the Hebrew of the citation from the Talmud referred to by Mrs. Lewis. It is, of course, unpointed. Lightfoot adopted one possible pointing and rendered it: He saw Miriam the daughter of Heli among the shades. “But,” says Dr. Gore (p. 40), “I am assured that the only legitimate translation is: He saw Miriam, the daughter of Onion-leaves (a nickname of a kind not uncommon in the Talmud); and there is no reason to suppose any reference to our Lord's mother.”

Without the support of this statement from the Talmud there is very little reason to connect Heli with Mary. This is not, of course, urged as *any* reason for doubting that the Virgin Mary was, in fact, descended from David. Mrs. Lewis' very interesting and important statement that “the Sinai Palimpsest tells us that Joseph and Mary . . . were both of the lineage of David” and that the Armenian version of the *Diatessaron* has the same reading strongly support the inference which one would draw independently of them from St. Luke i, 32; Rom. i, 3, and other passages that through His

earthly mother our Lord was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh."

As regards our Lord's descent from David there may be added to the considerations on pp. 11 and 12 of Mrs. Lewis' paper the statement of Ulla, a Jewish Rabbi of the third century, that Jesus was treated exceptionally because of this royal extraction. (Bishop Gore quotes as authority for this the Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin 43 (a): *cf. Derembourg*, p. 349, n. 2.) See also Farrar's *Life of Christ*, vol. i, p. 9, note, and *Renan Evang.*, p. 60.

Dr. Gore further quotes (*Dissert.*, p. 380, the authorities there quoted) that the great Hillel, grandfather of Gamaliel, who belonged to a family of Jewish exiles in Babylon, and came to Jerusalem about 50 B.C., was recognized as of David's family, and that "appeal was made in vindication of his claim to a pedigree found in Jerusalem."

REPLY.

I am asked by Archdeacon Potter why the Revisers of our English Version left out the word "wife" in Luke ii, 5? They doubtless did so chiefly on the authority of \aleph and B; which, though the oldest of our extant Greek MSS., are probably not older than the Sinai Palimpsest, nor than the old Latin *a* and *b*, which have "wife" always, like the *Diatessaron* and the *Peshitta*. I appreciate the arguments used by Dr. Thirtle; but yet I hold that the phrase "who was betrothed to him" must convey the impression, to plain English people, that Mary was not yet legally married to Joseph. Probably the "his espoused wife" of the Authorized Version describes the situation better than any other phrase would do.

I cannot agree that the Virgin Mary would require a fortnight to travel from Nazareth to Bethlehem. The path was probably, as now, a frequented mule-track, over soft grass. My sister and I have done it, very leisurely indeed, in seven and a half days. Mary perhaps thought that there would be ample time to allow of her return to Nazareth before the expected event; and the usual rate of progress, three miles an hour, did not necessarily put any great strain on her.

I agree with Canon Girdlestone that we must try to understand Jewish methods of registration if we wish to explain the genealogies

of our Lord. I agree also that Ochozias and Ozias begin with the same letter. But as we are told in v. 17 that the generations from David until the carrying away to Babylon are fourteen generations, we see that the omission of the three names, which would bring the number up to seventeen, must be deliberate.

The explanation which is given to us by Julius Africanus one hundred years after the time of Irenæus and one hundred and fifty after that of Justin (A.D. 250) is considerably qualified by his statement (*Eusebius*, H.E., i, 7), Καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτῆ μελέτω, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐμμάρτυρός ἐστι, τῷ μὴ κρείττονα ἢ ἀληθεστέραν ἔχειν εἰπεῖν. This I translate, "And this is for us to consider, although there is not sufficient evidence for it, as there is nothing better or more true to be said."

The statement of Africanus, which he heard from a remote kinsman of our Lord two hundred and twenty years after the Resurrection, is thus summed up by himself. "Matthew of Solomon's line begat Jacob. Matthew having died, Melchi of Nathan's line begat Heli of the same woman. Heli and Jacob were therefore brothers, and had the same mother. Heli having died without children, Jacob raised up seed unto him, having begotten Joseph, his own child by nature, but legally the son of Heli. Thus Joseph was the son of both."

It seems to me that we have to choose between the accuracy of St. Luke, who probably got his information for the rest of the story directly from our Lord's mother, and that of some unknown kinsman of the family two hundred and twenty years later, in whom Africanus did not himself place implicit trust. For St. Luke puts at least two generations between Melchi and Heli.

Mr. Crewdson suggests a Levirate marriage between Heli and the widow of Jacob. But this is not what Julius Africanus reports. Is this second version of the story founded on any evidence? or is it purely conjecture? Both versions cannot be true.

I am greatly obliged to Canon Girdlestone for drawing our attention to the law in Hammurabi's code, which binds an adopted son more closely to his adopted father, when the latter has taught him a craft, such as that of carpentry.

I fear that some of my audience are under the impression that the Syriac MS. which I found on Mount Sinai is a copy of Tatian's *Diatessarôn*, or *Harmony of the Gospels*. Not so. It is the *Four*

Gospels of the Separated, expressly so called; being really an older form of the Old Syriac, or Curetonian Version. It is called Mepharresha, *i.e.*, "Separated," exactly the same word, and I think the same grammatical form, as the fourth word which Belshazzar saw written by a mysterious hand on the wall. But as I am ignorant of Babylonian Semitic I cannot be quite sure of this. The *Diatessarōn* is not extant, either in Syriac or in Greek. We have only Ephraim's Commentary on it, with numerous quotations, in an Armenian version translated into Latin by Moesinger. And we know its structure from two very late Arabic MSS., which have in the course of ages been so closely assimilated to the *Peshitta* that they have lost much of their value for textual criticism.

The examples of sons-in-law being called sons, as they were in the families of Sheshan and Barzillai, are most valuable for my argument, and I thank Mr. Rouse for them.

I agree with the Rev. G. Crewdson that I ought to withdraw my agreement with Dr. Heer's idea that a Jewish family would probably not recall its genealogy upwards for more than five generations. But when we find contradictory statements about the childless Jeconiah having children (Jer. xxii, 30; 1 Chron. iii, 17) how are we to interpret it? Surely that these children died young.

It is by no means proved that the Shealtiel and Zerubbabel of Luke's genealogy are the same people as those who bear similar names in Matthew's. They cannot, in fact, be so, if we allow to Luke even a moderate degree of accuracy. For he gives twenty names between Shealtiel and David, whereas Matthew gives fourteen. Between Zerubbabel and Heli, Luke gives seventeen names, while Matthew has eight between Zerubbabel and Jacob. Allowing for many mistakes of transcription, we cannot put the Shealtiel and Zerubbabel of Luke into the same period as those of Matthew.

It may be my want of perception, but I cannot see that the two genealogies show agreement for about five generations from Shealtiel to Abiud. I am very familiar with the mangling which Semitic names undergo on Greek lips, and *vice versâ*, and I see a likeness between Hananiah and Joannan; also between Hodaiah and Judah. There is a very slight one between Abiud and Judah, but none at all between Abiud and Rhesa. Nor can we even be sure that Matthan and Matthat are identical.

There may be a difference of opinion as to whether "Mary the daughter of Heli," who is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud, is Mary the mother of our Lord, or Mary Magdalene. She is represented as suffering great torture in Gehenna, and I would submit that this really fiendish idea must have sprung from the spite which many of the Jews undoubtedly felt for the most blessed among women, and which nothing in the history of Mary Magdalene could have been sufficient to awaken. We know that in their blind hate they confounded the two Marys, and gave out that the Virgin Mary had earned her living as a woman's hair-dresser, the verb *gadal* in Hebrew meaning "to plait." Jewish tradition says that after the Virgin-birth had been spoken about at Pentecost, she had to bear with many gibes and insults from her fellow-countrymen. May it not have been for this reason that she perhaps ended her days at Ephesus, as well as for the purpose of being under the care of her sister's son, the Apostle John, to whom her Divine Son had entrusted her?

To Mr. E. Sewell I reply, that the question as to which Mary is mentioned in the Talmud would be best decided by Jewish scholars. He will find the subject discussed in Dr. Dalman's book, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud*, translated by Dr. Streane. I cannot see that Dr. Gore's authority, although great, is final, nor is Lightfoot's, because new editions and translations of the Talmud have appeared since his day.

The legends about Mary in the Talmud are certainly a tissue of confused nonsense; but still it is remarkable that the name of Heli should be brought into connection with Mary's at all.

Amongst the German scholars who support the Heli theory, I may mention Drs. Zahn, Laible, Vogt, and Bardenhewer. One of these, I think it is Dr. Zahn, points out that the name Joseph is not part of Luke's genealogy, for in that genealogy the name of each member is preceded by $\tau\omicron\upsilon$, whereas the word *vids* stands before Joseph to express the supposition that our Lord was his son.

I cannot help thinking that Joseph would have clearly been included in the genealogy if $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ had stood before his name, *i.e.*, if we had read *vids* $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\iota\omega\sigma\eta\phi$. $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ has the same effect in Greek as the Irish "O" in names like O'Donnell, or as I am told that the Northumberland miners put it when they call a boy "Jack o' Jim," "Tom o' Jack," without any further surname. I would point out

that we may read verse 23 thus: "And Jesus Himself, at about thirty years old (being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph), was of Heli, of Matthat, of Levi, of Melchi," etc.

Our English translators ought not to have inserted the explanatory words "which₂ was" into that genealogy at all.

I have little space left to speak of the star. My one great objection to the theory of its having been Venus is that the varying appearances of that brilliant planet must have been long familiar to the Magi; for Venus is supposed to be older than our earth itself. Whether the star was a comet, or the appearance of a conjunction of stars seen in the same line, it is impossible now to ascertain. Astronomical calculations cannot help us much, for as my friend Sir Robert Ball said to me the other day, "We are not told from what country the Magi started." Dr. Zahn points out that the star is said to have stood, not over the house, but over the place, or rather "over where the young child was," "And when they came into the house," etc. Probably arriving at the gate of Bethlehem, the Magi inquired if there "were any children in it who had been born so many weeks ago," according to the time when they had first observed the star.