

ARTICLE VII.

BIBLICAL NOTES.

BY H. B. HACKETT, D.D., PROFESSOR IN NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

1. WHERE WAS CANDACE QUEEN ?

Dean Alford writes the brief Article in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible on Candace, who, in Acts viii. 27, is said to have been "queen of the Ethiopians" (*βασιλίσσης Αἰθίοπων*). The name, as nearly all admit, is not that of an individual, but a dynastic title, like Abimelech, Pharaoh, Ptolemy, and others. This critic follows those (Kuinoel, Winer, DeWette, Meyer) who suppose that the Candace to whom Luke refers reigned in Meroe, lying within the modern Nubia, not exactly an island, as often represented, but a peninsula, formed by the confluence of the Nile and the Astaboras. It is usual to appeal in confirmation of this statement to Strabo, XVII. 2; Dio Cassius, LIV. 5; and Pliny, Hist. Nat., VI. 35. But some difficulties lie in the way of this opinion. First, Strabo, in the passage referred to, says expressly (for it seems necessary to regard of *δ' ἐν Μερῶν* as the subject of *καθιστάσι*) that the inhabitants of Meroe appoint kings (*βασιλέας*) as their sovereigns, and appoint them for their personal qualities, so that they are elective; not hereditary. Second, Strabo declares that the royal residence of Candace was Napata (*τοῦτο ἦν τὸ βασιλεῖον τῆς Κανδάκης*), which was a different place from Meroe, eighty-six geographical miles farther north; and Dio Cassius (LIV. 5, though he writes erroneously *Τανάπη*) makes the same distinction, referring the queens who bore this title to Napata, and not Meroe. In accordance with these notices, Rawlinson (Herodotus, Vol. II. p. 41) makes Napata the capital of one part of Ethiopia, and Meroe the seat of another independent kingdom. The passage in Pliny does not disagree with this conclusion, though it is chiefly his language that has misled readers, if they have fallen into error here. His words are the following: "Inde Napata LXXX. mill. oppidum id parvum inter praedicta solum. Ab eo ad insulam Meroen CCCLX M. Herbas circa Meroen defumum viridiores, silvarumque aliquid apparuisse et rinocerotum elephantorumque vestigia. Ipsum oppidum Meroen ab introitu insulae abesse LXX mill. passuum: juxtaque aliam insulam Tadu dextero subeuntibus alveo, quae portum faceret. Aedifica oppidi pauca. Regnare feminam Candacem; quod nomen multis jam annis ad reginas transit." If "aedifica oppidi" refers to "Meroen," just before, then "regnare Candacem" does of course, and Candace reigned in the city and island of that name. But, on the other hand, Meroe was an important city, and could not well be said to consist of "a few buildings," and

Napata, might in a comparative sense be so described; and hence at this point we may suppose Pliny to go back to the remoter Napata, of which he has already spoken as "parvum," and so much the more as that is uppermost in the mind, as being the point from which he reckons the situation of the other places named.

According to this view Candace was queen in Napata, and not Meroe, precisely as the distinction which Strabo and Cassius make between them would also lead us to suppose. Add to this, as mentioned before, that Strabo speaks of the rulers of Meroe as kings, not queens. For a fuller statement of the case, the reader is referred to T. C. M. Laurent's *Neutestamentliche Studien*, pp. 140-146 (Gotha, 1866). It is proper to add that some, as, for example, Ritter (*Erdkunde*, I. p. 491) assume that Napata was only a province of Meroe, and that Strabo and Cassius speak of Candace in connection with the former place rather than the latter, because she had a noted palace there. It follows, then (to make the conciliation here complete), that Strabo must mean by "kings" rulers of both sexes.

The name Candace, says Rüttschi (*Hertzog's Real-Encyclopädie*, Vol. VII. p. 243), appears not to be of Shemitic origin, at least no satisfactory etymology has yet been assigned for it. The supposition that the Candace in Acts viii. 27 was the one who fought against the Romans B.C. 22 (Strabo XVII. 1, 54) is just possible, so far as the dates are concerned, but has every presumption against it. Some of the commentators suppose her to have been the same; in which case she must have reigned under the emperor Claudius, and have been nearly ninety years old at the time of Philip's baptizing the eunuch. Pliny's statement that Candace was a transmitted title of these Ethiopian queens renders so violent a supposition needless.

2. THE SITUATION OF EMMAUS.

The reference here is to the place of this name from which the two disciples returned to Jerusalem after the Saviour's appearance to them, on the evening of the first day after his resurrection (see Luke xxiv. 13). On his first journey to Palestine, Dr. Robinson was not inclined to identify this Emmaus with the present 'Amwäs, the ancient Nicopolis, at the foot of the mountains on the way from Yâfa to Jerusalem (*Researches*, Vol. III. p. 66). But on his second journey he was led to adopt that view, and defends it at length in his *Later Researches* (Vol. III. pp. 146-150). But for this purpose he must arbitrarily change the text of the Evangelist; for this Emmaus, on the border of the plain, is a hundred and sixty stadia from Jerusalem, whereas that of Luke is said to be only "three-score" or sixty stadia. The distance from Jerusalem would not be less than twenty miles, and could not be traversed in the time that Luke's narrative allows for that purpose.

New interest has been given to this question by a monograph on the subject by Dr. Herman Zschokke, entitled *Das Neutestamentliche Em-*

maus beleuchtet (Schaffhausen, 1865). He is a Catholic (Rector des Oesterreichischen Pilgerhauses in Jerusalem), and has made the subject a special study. He decides that the Emmaus of Luke (xxiv. 13) must have been el-Kubeibeh, about nine miles northwest of Jerusalem, where the Franciscan monks have placed it. Rector Zschokke relies on three main arguments for his conclusion. First, the distance agrees with that of Luke and Josephus (Bell. Jud. VII. 6, 6), viz. as a round number, sixty stadia or "furlongs" (in the English Version), as ascertained by actual measurement, i.e. taking the shortest of three ways, which differ only by a single stadium, it amounts to thirty-eight thousand and twenty English feet, equal to sixty-two stadia and five-eighths. Secondly, the two disciples of Jesus could easily return from Emmaus to Jerusalem after sunset, or from the close of the day (*κέκλιεν ἡ ἡμέρα*), and rejoin the apostles there in their secret meeting on the evening of the same day (John xx. 19). The journey was performed lately without difficulty within the time required, by Madam Anna C. Emmerich. Thirdly, the crusaders (though really, as appears from the author's own figures, not earlier than the eleventh century) were led to fix on Kubeibeh as the New Testament Emmaus, in consequence of finding the name applied to it by the native inhabitants, though the name, it is admitted, no longer exists among them. If this last link in the chain of evidence could be made stronger, it would almost settle the question in favor of Kubeibeh. It must be confessed that the existence of this early currency of the scripture name outside of the Christian communities of the East is not so fully made out as the confident tone of the writer would authorize us to expect. The Catholics, in their assurance that they have found the genuine spot, have recently bought the ground of the old "Castrum Arnoldi" (Kubeibeh), and are converting it into one of their holy places. Rector Zschokke makes it evident enough that the 'Amwās (Nicopolis) at the foot of the mountains cannot be the New Testament village of that name. That there was such a village in the time of Christ "sixty stadia" distant from Jerusalem, is evident from Josephus as well as Luke; but the site has been lost to us.

It seems there is a little history behind this brochure of the German author, which explains why this investigation has called forth so much earnestness. A rich and pious lady, a pilgrim to the Holy Land from Paris, inquired at Jerusalem for the site of Emmaus, with the view of erecting a sanctuary or chapel there. The Franciscans, in accordance with a tradition long maintained by them, referred her to Kubeibeh as the place in question. Accordingly, to obtain the desired spot on which were a few old ruins, she was required to pay Abu Ghoseh, the owner, one hundred and seventy thousand piasters, i.e. about eight thousand five hundred dollars. It was of little consequence that Protestant travellers held a different opinion; but as Dr. Sepp of München (Jerusalem oder Pilgerbuch, I. p. 55; 1862) and the Parisian Jesuit Bourquenoud, Catholics, also rejected

that tradition, it was necessary to find good reasons for Kubeibeh, in opposition to the testimony in favor of Kulonieh, on the route from Ramleh to the Holy City. To settle this question the special investigations referred to above were set on foot.

3. DISPUTE RESPECTING CAPERNAUM.

The later travellers in Palestine leave the question as to the spot on which Capernaum stood hardly less perplexed than it was before. "The disputed sites of the cities of Genesareth," says Dean Stanley, after his second visit to the East (*Notices of Localities, etc.*, p. 195), "must still remain disputed." Porter (*Handbook of Syria*, II. p. 425) accepts Dr. Robinson's conclusion in favor of Khan Miniyeh, so called from an old caravansary near a heap of ruins, on the northern edge of Genesareth. 'Ain-et-Tin is only another name for the same place, derived from a fig tree which overhangs a fountain in the neighborhood. Dr. Thomson (*Land and the Book*, I. pp. 542-548) and Mr. Dixon (*Holy Land*, II. p. 173; London, 1865) decide for Tell Hûm, at the head of the lake, about three miles northeast of Khan Mintyeh. The claim of 'Ain Mudawarah, or the Round Fountain, near the south end of the Plain of Genesareth, and so named from being "enclosed by a low circular wall of mason-work," has for some time past been kept in abeyance; but Mr. Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 442; London, 1865) has brought it forward once more, and certainly with reasons for it which are not without weight. He speaks with greater authority on some branches of the argument from his character as an eminent naturalist. Josephus states (*Bell. Jud.* III. 9, 8) that the fountain of Capernaum produced the *κορακίως*, a fish like that of the lake near Alexandria. Mr. Tristram now maintains that neither of the places except the Round Fountain furnishes this mark of identification. "The remarkable siluroid, the catfish or coracine (*κορακίως*), abounds to a remarkable degree in the Round Fountain to this day. We obtained specimens a yard long, and some of them are deposited in the British Museum. The loose, sandy bottom of this fountain is peculiarly adapted for this singular fish, which buries itself in the sediment, leaving only its feelers exposed. . . . Here, in the clear shallow water, it may, when disturbed, be at once detected, swimming in numbers along the bottom. But it is not found at 'Ain-et-Tin, where the fountain could neither supply it with cover nor food; nor could we discover it at 'Ain Tabighah" (the nearest fountain to Tell Hûm, though distant two miles to the southward), "where the water is hot and brackish." For other details of his able argument the reader is referred to his work, as above. Mr. Tristram thinks it worth while to mention that fever is very prevalent at this day at 'Ain Mudawarah (the Round Fountain), whereas "the dry, elevated, rocky ground of Tell Hûm" would be comparatively free from it. "Peter's wife's mother lay sick of a fever" at Capernaum (*Mark* 1, 30).

Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, I. p. 544) admits that "this fish (coracinus) was actually found in the fountain of Capernaum," and says "that this is a valid reason why the Round Fountain could not be" that of Capernaum, that is, because it contains no such fish. Dr. Robinson makes a similar statement. It will be seen, therefore, that there is a flat contradiction between different travellers as to the fact in question; and the dispute having assumed this form will no doubt be soon brought to an issue, so far as this point is concerned. It may be mentioned with reference to Khan Miniyeh that the English Exploring Expedition in Palestine have been making excavations there, but (as reported in the *Athenæum*, March 31, 1866), have discovered no remains of antiquity, but only some "masonry and pottery of comparatively modern date."

4. PLACE OF BETHABARA IN THE HARMONY.

The situation of Bethabara or Bethany (since they denote the same place) beyond the Jordan, excites the greater interest from its supposed connection with the place of our Lord's baptism. The question is important also for the harmonists in settling the order of certain events at the beginning of the Saviour's ministry. There are two views here. One is that Jesus after his temptation returned to John at Bethabara, where he had been previously baptized; and the other is that John in the meantime had changed the scene of his labors, so that when Jesus rejoined him it was at a different place from the one where he himself had been baptized. The determination of this point depends chiefly on the situation or limits of "the wilderness of Judea" (*Matt.* iii. 3), where John made his first public appearance. Bleek (*Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien*, I. p. 141) states, undoubtedly the only reliable conclusion respecting this somewhat controverted phrase. He represents it as designating the plain, not exactly desolate, but yet little cultivated, and serving as pasture land, on the east side of Judah and along the Dead Sea, in which, according to *Josh.* xv. 61, Engedi and other towns were situated. It is natural enough, he adds further, that the phrase thus defined should occur with some fluctuation; and hence the region to a certain extent north of the Dead Sea on the west of the Jordan, which Josephus likewise designates as *ἐρημος* (*Bell. Jud.*, IV. 8; II. 3; III. 10, 7), might be reckoned as belonging to the "wilderness of Judea." According to this view, the wilderness (*Matt.* iv. 1 and *Luke* iv. 1) into which Jesus went to be tempted, could be either the desert in this wider sense, or the northern part of it, viewed as distinct from the other. See also Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, II. p. 699. But if John baptized in this desert, we must infer that Jesus himself was baptized there; for, after reading that the forerunner baptized the crowds who came to him "in the wilderness of Judea" (*Matt.* iii. 1, 5), we read also, without any intimation of a change of place, that Jesus came to him and was baptized in the Jordan (*Matt.* iii. 13).

On the other hand, Bethabara or Bethany (as the case may be) was "beyond the Jordan," i.e. on the east side (John i. 28); and hence must have been a different place from that of the Saviour's baptism, where the first interview occurred between him and the Baptizer. Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 304) represents the places as one and the same; but for this purpose he must, contrary to the evidence, make "the wilderness of Judea," lie in part on the east of Jordan. It is not just to regard ἡ ἐρημος τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Matt. iii. 1) as explained by ἡ παραχρᾶτος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Matt. iii. 5); for the latter, which describes no doubt the Ghôr or Valley of the Jordan in general, denotes in that passage the region from which the people resorted to John's baptism, and not that to which they came; and as used in Matt. iii. 5, points out the entire circuit of John's labors, which he performed now on this side of the river and now on that: the Judean desert being a part only of this more extended region. We must rely, of course, on the usage for the exact extent of these geographical terms; but it deserves to be noticed that the different expressions differ in such a way as to indicate their application; the one (παραχρᾶτος) being territory about the Jordan i.e. on both sides of it; and the other (ἐρημος τῆς Ἰουδαίας) territory limited to Judea.

To understand that John not only baptized Jesus at Bethany, but baptized him there at the time when he received the deputation of priests and Levites (recorded only in John i. 19 seq.), leaves no interval for the temptation, which Mark says (i. 12), took place immediately after the baptism and continued forty days. We thus not only array the sacred writers against each other without reason, but overlook the distinct allusion which John makes to the Saviour's baptism as a previous occurrence, when he reminds those present of the descent of the Spirit on Jesus, which had been vouchsafed to him as a sign that he was the expected one (John i. 32). This would be even less correct than to suppose that Jesus was baptized at Bethany, and then, after the forty days, returned to him at the same place. Stier (*Reden Jesu*. I. p. 27) notices the use which a captious criticism has made of this failure to recognize the baptism and temptation of Christ as antecedent to the events related in John i. 19 seq.

A few recent writers, as Stanley, Ellicott, incline to place the temptation on Mount Nebo, east of the Jordan. This would be possible, and perhaps not improbable, if Jesus was baptized at Bethany, as the wilderness of Nebo then might be sufficiently near to be the one into which he was led by the Spirit to be tempted. But the ground for this opinion falls away if John was preaching in Judea when Christ came to him to be baptized. The desert where he was already, afforded retreats which he would naturally seek for fasting and prayer, without crossing the Jordan into the wilds of Moab, and thus deviating so far from his more direct course in returning to Galilee. The part of the desert which lies back of Jericho, and

is known as Kūruntūl or Quarantana, a corruption of *quadraginta*, with reference to the duration of the fast, may well have been the spot where the Son of God was to show, in the words of Milton:

“his filial virtue, though untried
Against whate'er may tempt, whate'er seduce,
Allure or terrify or undermine.”

It is a mountain cut off from the plain by a wall of rock twelve or fifteen hundred feet high, is frightfully desolate, is infested with wild beasts and reptiles, and thus answers fully to Mark's significant intimation (i. 13) respecting the wildness of the scene (*μετὰ τῶν θηρίων*).

As to the more precise situation of Bethany or Bethabara there is nothing to add, except it be that if Jesus went from there to Galilee in a single day (John ii. 1), it must have been on one of the upper fords of the Jordan (Bethabara signifies such a place), not far from the south end of the sea of Tiberias, and not so low down as opposite to Jericho. Stanley urges this note of time as a decisive reason for placing Bethany there. But the mode of reckoning “the third day” in John ii. 1 is uncertain. On Kiepert's Wandkarte des Palæstina, Bethany or Bethabara appears farther south, on the opposite side from the plain of Jericho. The “third day” may be the third after the arrival in Galilee, and not the one spent on the way thither; or, as Lücke thinks (*Evangelium des Johannes* I. p. 467), “the third” from the calling of Nathanael (John i. 45 seq.) With these last computations as our guide, we have two days or more for the journey back to Galilee, and must place the site of the lost Bethabara much further south than the position below the sea of Tiberias. After all, it will be seen that the question *where* Christ was baptized is a distinct one from that of the situation of Bethany or Bethabara, though so often confounded with it.

5. THE “QUARRIES” NEAR GILGAL.

It is stated in Judges iii. 18, 19 that Ehud, after bringing his present to Eglon king of Moab, withdrew in order to dismiss his attendants, whom he accompanied a short distance, and then returned “from the quarries that were by Gilgal” (as rendered in the English version) in order to execute the meditated murder. It is not known to the writer that any remains of “quarries” have been found in that vicinity, and the meaning of the word so translated is obscure. Professor Cassel, in his note on this passage (*Richter und Ruth*, p. 37, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1865), offers another explanation. He understands that the *בְּאֵיבָרִים* were landmarks (consisting of pillars, or heaps of stone, *στήλαι*) which marked the boundary between the territory of the Moabites on the west of the Jordan (held by them as conquerors at that time) and that of the Hebrews; and it was “from” these stone heaps or pillars (not “the quarries”) that Ehud turned back

after parting with his servants, so as to have the advantage of greater secrecy. "Pesilim," in this sense, would be nearly allied to that of "images," idol-gods (compare Dent. vii. 25 and Isa. xlii. 8), since boundaries (*lapides sacri, termini*) were regarded as properly inviolate, consecrated. To the heathen they were hardly less than objects of religious veneration. The Hebrews would naturally speak of them with reference to the feelings of their foreign oppressors, though we need not altogether acquit the Hebrews of a similar superstition.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF RECENT GERMAN PUBLICATIONS.

FROM OUR GERMAN CORRESPONDENT.

Die Christologie des neuen Testaments (The Christology of the New Testament). *Ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch*. Von Prof. Dr. Beyschlag, Halle. Berlin: L. Rank; London: Asher and Co. 1866. — Professor Beyschlag's work comprises a long preface, in which he defends himself against ungenerous attacks on the lecture delivered last year before the Kirchentag, in Altenburg (noticed in a previous number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*), an introduction, and the following chapters: The Idea of the Son of Man; The Testimony of Jesus concerning himself, according to the Synoptics and John; the Christology of Peter, of the Apocalypse, of John, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of Paul.

We shall best employ the limited space at our disposal by describing Professor Beyschlag's point of view. While believing firmly — what we beg our readers carefully to remember — that Jesus Christ is the living, personal bond between God and man; that in his person Deity and humanity are perfectly united; he is of opinion that the formula, "Two natures in one person" — a formula which originated in the endeavors of the Council of Chalcedon to reconcile the two opposed schools of Alexandria and Antioch — can no longer be received as a satisfactory expression of the facts of the case. At the time when it was adopted, the divine and the human were regarded as two incommensurable, mutually exclusive quantities. Whereas the true teaching of the scriptures, of Christianity, and of the most enlightened modern theologians is that humanity is essentially related or akin to deity. On the one hand, God bears within himself an image of himself, in the likeness of which he created man; in other words, his own eternal image is the archetype of man. On the other hand, that which constitutes man a person, that which makes him man, is the divine image implanted in him in the form of a capacity, that breath