

Romans (Chap. ix. 5) of "*Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever;*" and again to the Corinthians (i Cor. i. 24) of "*Christ as the power of God and the wisdom of God.*" So much has been said about the late origin of the Fourth Gospel, and that it contains doctrinal developments (and the passages alluded to in these charges are exactly those which speak of the divinity of Jesus) which belong to the second century, that too much attention can hardly be given to these quotations from St. Paul, which anticipate the thoughts, and in many cases the very expressions of St. John, and thus prove that both thought and language date back to a time much nearer to the death of Jesus than the earliest date which has ever been assigned to St. John's Gospel; they shew us that the Gospel teaching, even in its sublimest phases, was communicated everywhere where Christian preachers came, long before it became needful to put down in writing an account of such points in the history of Christ "as were most surely believed" among the early disciples.

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

---

*THE MARRIAGE IN CANA OF GALILEE.*

GREAT harm has been done to the cause of truth by an imperfect apprehension of the nature and object of our Lord's miracles. They have too often been regarded as arbitrary violations of natural order, and have been looked at in a hard and mechanical way, so as to present the strongest possible contrast to experience and the testimony of the natural reason. And the narrative of our Lord's beginning of signs in Cana of Galilee is rather an instance in point

than an exception. The method of most commentators has been to represent that miracle as an arbitrary, preternatural, and enforced conversion of water into wine, by which a large quantity of superfluous and intoxicating drink was provided at the close of a wedding feast for a number of guests who did not require it. That which was water before was miraculously, and in defiance of all our powers of conception, changed into wine, and so remained. But though we must not set limits beforehand to the working of the Almighty, it may be interesting to note certain particulars in St. John's narrative, which may serve to make us question whether in that particular case *this* was the way in which He who was the express image of the Father was pleased to work. Let us briefly note the circumstances. The third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, or perhaps there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee in its third day. The Jewish wedding feasts lasted for about a week, and it was the third day of this particular feast when Jesus and his disciples, Andrew and Peter, James and John, Philip and Nathanael, joined it. Our Lord had already commenced a circuit in Galilee, and had gathered these disciples about Him. His mother appears to have had authority in the house where the marriage was celebrated. It seems to be very uncertain from what date the third day is to be calculated, if we do not understand it thus, while there appears to be no strong reason why we should not do so. The sudden and possibly unexpected accession of a party of seven doubtless sorely taxed the capabilities of the household and its store, and consequently we hear of their wine

having failed before the feast was over. We are told that there were set there six waterpots of stone, containing water for the purifying purposes customary among the Jews, such as their frequent ablutions and the like, and holding two or three firkins apiece. The quantity, which is thus described somewhat vaguely, may be estimated at about one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty gallons. Some of the water had already been used, and the vessels were not full; but our Lord's first injunction to the servants was to fill them up to the brim, so that there can be no question that the actual quantity was very large. He then says, *Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast* (*Ἀντλήσατε νῦν*). And they did so, having previously been enjoined by Mary, the mother of our Lord, to do whatsoever He should say to them. They therefore were in ignorance of his intentions, but acted simply as He had told them to do. When therefore the ruler of the feast had tasted the water which had now become wine, and knew not whence it was, though the servants which *had drawn the water* (*οἱ ἠντληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ*) knew, he called the bridegroom, &c. Now we observe here that the same word is used by the Evangelist of the action of the servants as that which had been used to them by our Lord. The drawing of the water, therefore, refers not to their drawing it from the well to fill the vessels, but to their drawing from the stone vessels as the Lord had bidden them. And we observe also that when they thus draw it the writer still calls it *water*, not, as he afterwards does, *water that had become wine*, for at that time it was as yet unchanged. At all

events, this is the inference we draw from a strict attention to the language used. The servants who had drawn the water from the vessels knew that what they had drawn was water, and that they had drawn it from the stone vessels, which the ruler of the feast did not know; but more than this they also did not know: and therefore all that the ruler of the feast could do was to compliment the bridegroom upon the excellence of the wine which had graced his table. There remained, moreover, no room for collusion. The servants knew that what they had drawn was water, and that what was left remained water. Every guest knew that the wine he had last tasted was better than any he had had before, and there was no way of accounting for the incident but by the presence of the mysterious Guest, who thus displayed his glory. Let us inquire, then, into the circumstances of the miracle on the ordinary supposition that all the water in the vessels was turned into wine before it was drawn off. We are at once struck by the enormous quantity of wine provided, no less in fact than a pipe. Of what use would it be? Some answer that it was an act of Divine benevolence to supply a large quantity of wine for the *future* use of the newly-married pair and their friends. And with characteristic simplicity Wordsworth observes that "the 'good wine' of Cana might be preserved for many years. How many persons may it have afterwards refreshed in body and soul! *Perhaps it may have served for some holy eucharistic celebration in the infant Church of Galilee*"!! One thing at all events is clear, that the supply was far greater than the pre-

sent wants would require; so much so, that some have suggested that a *portion* only of the water in the stone vessels was changed. This would be to add miracle to miracle; for how should water be kept distinct from wine in the same vessel? Others have asked, Is it consistent with the Divine character of Christ to produce what would only be wasted, or possibly become an occasion of excess? And probably all who sympathize with the extreme position assumed by certain advocates of the temperance movement have been secretly conscious of something approaching to a *σκάνδαλον* in the most obvious features of the marriage in Cana of Galilee. And though we by no means think that on this supposition the conduct of our Lord requires vindication, or that parallels to it may not be found in the boundless prodigality of nature, and in other works wrought by Christ Himself, as, for example, when seven *σπυρίδες*; and twelve *κόφιννοι* full of fragments were taken up after the feeding of the four and the five thousand respectively, yet we believe that if there are indications of his having worked, in this instance, upon other principles, we shall certainly lose by failing to note them. And such indications, we believe, exist. For there is nothing in the letter of the narrative to compel us to believe that the entire quantity of water was changed into wine before it was drawn out, since the Evangelist seems to hint that it was still water when it was drawn out; or that, when the feast was over, what remained was wine, and was left to be disposed of. The ordinary mechanical view of miracles, as direct violations of nature, prepares us to deduce this from the narrative as the easiest.

and most probable supposition ; but perhaps a closer view of the actual circumstances, and a more exact attention to the language used, may suggest a way of understanding the incident which shall even be more excellent and more according to the analogy of our Lord's other works. And, indeed, the cognate miracles of feeding the four and five thousand may serve to illustrate what is meant ; for in those cases no one, probably, supposes that the loaves and fishes were first of all and at once converted into a mass of provision adequate to the supply of the vast multitudes, but rather that the miracle consisted in the secret and unobserved increase of the food, which developed itself in the very process of distribution. Our Lord gave the loaves to the disciples, and as He brake them they were multiplied; and as each disciple broke and distributed what he had received, what he broke was still further multiplied, so that the more he wanted the more he had, and those who ate had bread enough and to spare. And so we suppose, at the marriage in Cana, as each of the servants filled his chalice at the waterpots of stone, what he drew off was water and what remained was water; but as each guest received his replenished cup, he knew that what he drank was wine, and wine that was better than before; but no man knew, save Christ alone, at what particular point of time, any more than he knew in what particular manner, the change was wrought. All that was known was that Jesus had turned the water into wine, and that the supply was commensurate with the want, and was limited only by the want. And thus, as it seems to us, the special glory of the Lord was more especially

manifested forth, and an illustration given of the universal principle of his mode of action. For are we not taught to ask, "Give us this day our daily bread"? and doubtless to many that is a petition which has but little point, for their supplies of daily bread are regular and unfailling. Their store is inexhaustible, or, at least, bears no signs of defection. But not so with all; for there are those to whom the supply of their daily bread is a matter of constant and intense anxiety. Now what light does the Lord's conduct at Cana of Galilee throw upon such cases? Just this: that when we have no visible means of subsistence, the arm of the Almighty is not shortened. We may not be able to see beforehand the store from which provision is to come, nor the water turned into wine before we draw it; but *as we draw it* the water becomes wine, and as we make the appointed effort, or employ the prescribed means, the succour comes: in the very act of distribution the bread is multiplied, and in the act of drinking the water is turned to wine. Many, doubtless, can bear witness that in praying, "Give us this day our daily bread," they have not been able to discern the quarter from which it was to come; but they have, nevertheless, been filled.

And this we hail as the special glory of the Son of man, and for this reason the marriage in Cana as the special manifestation of that glory. It is not the manner of Christ to reveal the method of his working. He works in secret, and reveals Himself only to faith. The seed is sown, and in a night it grows up and becomes a plant; but the methods and processes none can tell. There is no visible resource from

which He draws; but, as He draws, the means are forthcoming and the end is produced. And certainly it is evermore in a like way that the water of this world becomes the wine of the kingdom. There is no visible antecedent supply to which we may resort; but as we take of the gifts provided for us, however meagre and insufficient or inadequate they may seem, the cup is found to be full, and that which we only knew as water has, by being received from the hands of Christ, become new wine, even the wine of the kingdom, of which it may ever be said, "Thou hast kept the good wine until now."

STANLEY LEATHES.

---

*THE CHRIST OF THE RESURRECTION.*

FOR eighteen centuries the garden of the Arimathæan has been well trodden, and around the door of its "new sepulchre" the Saracens of Unbelief have made their fiercest onsets. As to that other Garden, again and again have bands of Doubters come, and carrying before them the glimmer of Reason's "lanterns," they have sought to bind the Christ and to lead Him away. But Faith seeks that sepulchre with soft and reverent foot, and bringing in her hands the sweet unguents of love and trust, she pours them out on the feet of her Lord and God.

Of the fact and the manner of the Resurrection, it is not our purpose to treat in this paper. We wish rather to follow the footsteps of the risen Lord from the tomb to the Ascension, and to trace out the points of difference between the Christ of the Resurrection and the Christ of the Gospels.