THE TOWER OF BABEL.

GEN. XI. 1-9.

I.

In the chapter which precedes this story of the Tower of Babel, there is an account of the origin of all the nations known to the early Jewish people. The descent of the various races which occupied Central Asia, Asia Minor, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries in Africa, Cyprus, and the continent of Eastern Europe, is traced out from Noah, and his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet. The chapter is not a genealogical table—an account of the line of descent of individuals; it is an account of the origin and growth of different races. The names are the names, not of men, but of tribes and nations. This is apparent in many parts of the chapter even to unlearned readers. For instance, in chapter x., verse 15—"Canaan begat Zidon his firstborn, and Heth"—these might be the names of persons. But then follows a succession of names which we all recognise as belonging to races: "the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgashite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite," and so on. Scholars have recognised, even in the names which might seem to be the names of men, tribal and national names.

There is, however, one conspicuous exception. The interest of the early Jewish people in the great empire of Babylon was so great that a special account is given of Nimrod, its founder, and of the growth of his power.

But, taken as a whole, the chapter contains, not the genealogy of individuals, but the genealogy of the various races which occupied all those parts of the world that were
known to the early ancestors of the Jewish race; and the chapter closes with these words: "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and of these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."

The chapter, dry and uninteresting as it must be to many of us, has a great interest for men who are learned in the early history of mankind. It is full of difficulties,—partly because most of the countries to which it relates have been occupied during the last 4,000 years by a succession of races drifting towards the West. From Central Asia, where this story places the origin of the great migration which peopled the countries known to the ancient Jews, there have been successive movements, sometimes of a few families together, sometimes of whole tribes and nations, to take possession of the fair countries of Europe. Wave after wave of population has rolled over Asia Minor, and then over Bulgaria and the other countries lying between the Black Sea and the Atlantic. As these movements have gone on, tribe has blended with tribe, and nation with nation. In the absence of definite and trustworthy accounts of the races which occupied some of these countries in early times, it has, therefore, become extremely difficult to identify with any confidence many of the names preserved by this ancient chronicle. Ethnology, however, is a science which as yet is in its infancy. In the course of a hundred years or so, the narrative, even in its obscurer parts, may become as intelligible to all of us as it was to the people for whom it was first written. It was plain enough once: it will, perhaps, become plain again.

There are scholars who affirm that some of the statements in this chapter which seemed most perplexing, and which, to our earlier knowledge seemed inaccurate, are being confirmed by recent investigations. I am not anxious to seize testimony of this kind. The nervous
eagerness with which some Christian men clutch at every confirmation of the accuracy of the Scriptures occurring among the results of modern historical and scientific inquiry is unworthy of the calm and immovable faith in the spiritual substance of divine revelation which is necessary to the strength and joy of the Christian Church.

But why did the editor of the Book of Genesis insert this account of the origin of the nations known to the Jews? What was the use of it in relation to those great religious truths and laws which were intended to give inspiration and form to their national life? That is an interesting question. As far as we are concerned, the chapter seems, at present at least, of very little use. It cannot be of much use, since we are uncertain about the meaning of many parts of it. One of its great uses for the moment appears to be to remind us that, if we have discovered a great many things in recent centuries, we have also forgotten a great many.

But this book was not written yesterday: if it had been, it would, I suppose, have contained only those things that would have been of immediate religious service to ourselves or our contemporaries. It was written some 4,000 years ago: it preserves documents belonging to a still more remote time—documents intelligible then though unintelligible now. And this account of the origin of the nations with which the Jews had to do—the Assyrians, the Medes, the Persians, the people of Egypt, of Abyssinia, the Ionians, the nations that occupied Canaan before the Jews took it, and that still held the wild part of the sea-board even in the days of David and Solomon—this account, I say, of the nations with which the Jews had to do was of great moral and religious value.

When preaching on the first chapter of this book, I pointed out the grandeur of the religious ideas of which it is the expression. To the great nations which surrounded
the Jewish people the universe was full of mighty gods. The light was the creation of one God, and the darkness of another; if, indeed, light and darkness were not themselves divine powers. In the glorious Psalm of Creation, the Jew was taught that God—the God who had revealed Himself to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and whose earthly home was in the tabernacle and the temple—said: "Let there be light: and there was light. And God divided the light from the darkness." To surrounding nations, sun, moon, and stars were the separate creations and thrones of separate divinities: the Jew was taught that God created them all. The earth had its god, and the sea, the harvest, and the vintage. The Jew was taught on the first page of his sacred books, and he sang it in the noblest of the later psalms, that one God reigned over all. "In His hand are the deep places of the earth; the heights of the mountains are His also; the sea is His, and He made it, and His hands formed the dry land." "Fire, and hail; snow, and vapour; stormy wind fulfilling His word; fruitful trees, and all cedars; creeping things, and flying fowl," are all invoked to praise the one God. "For He commanded, and they were created; His name alone is exalted. His glory is above the earth and heaven." M. Comte insisted that monotheism was the result of the discovery that the same great natural laws bind into one system the whole of the material universe. But the Jews were monotheists long before science had made this great discovery, and of this obvious fact he found it hard to give any satisfactory explanation. They did not rest the unity of the Creator on the unity of the creature; for them the whole creation was one because there was but one God.

But the differences that separated different races of men from each other appeared to raise a difficulty in the way of monotheistic faith. Some races claimed descent from the gods they worshipped; others supposed that they had
sprung, they knew not how, from the soil of their native country. How different they were in their colour, in their physical conformation, in their customs and civilisation, and above all in their language! Had they not been created by different divinities? Had they not different origins? So far as the nations were concerned with which the Jews had to do, this tenth chapter of Genesis, with its account of the nations that sprang from the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, was an answer to such questions. These different races—the black races of Africa, the fair Ionians, the Assyrians, the Medes, the tribes of Canaan, had all descended from Noah; and Noah belonged to the race in which God had blended the dust of the earth with His own wonderful life. The universe had one Creator; the human race had one Creator; the kings of the earth and all people, princes and all judges of the earth, whatever descent they might claim from the divinities of their national worship, were created by the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and therefore the Jew called the whole of the human race to worship God. “Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands”—not merely India, but Egypt and Assyria, and all the lands of the heathen—“serve the Lord with gladness; come before His presence with sing­ing”; “Know ye that the Lord He is God”; “It is He that hath made us, and we are His”—all people and nations and tongues—“we are His people and the sheep of His pasture.”

Yes,—and if they had one Creator, and had descended from the same common ancestors, and had the same blood in their veins, they were all brethren; and it was no wonder that in electing Abraham and his descendants to special dignity and duty, it was God’s design that “all the families of the earth should be blessed.”

These are some of the moral and religious truths which the Jews were taught by this dry account of Gomer, and
Magog, and Madai, and Mizraim, and the rest of the families and nations that came from Noah.

II.

And now, passing from the tenth to the eleventh chapter, and coming to the story of the Tower of Babel, we find that we have really gone back to an earlier time. In the tenth chapter we see a great part of the world—all that part of it known to the early Jews—in the possession of different nations, some of them already great and famous. But at the beginning of the eleventh chapter we find the early families of mankind still living together, journeying East, or rather, as the margin reads, "journeying in the East"; they have not yet come to the coast of Asia Minor, much less into Europe and Africa. The nations are not yet separated from each other; and as yet there is only one language. In this chapter we are therefore to have an account of how these divisions among the one race originated, which have been already described.

There is a great contrast between the two chapters in one very important respect. In the tenth chapter the migrations of the descendants of Noah are narrated in a prosaic way, without any hint that God had anything to do with their division into separate nations with separate languages. The movement westward might have begun at the impulse of a spirit of adventure; or it might have been prompted by the necessity of finding fresh pastures for the cattle of a growing population, or by the hope of finding a more fertile soil for the simple products of early agriculture. The tenth chapter is commonplace history; the eleventh is something very different.

How did it happen that the unity of the race was broken up? Whence came the difference of national language? A reply to these questions is given in the story of the Tower of Babel; and the reply is an ethical and religious one.
There was a serious attempt to hold men together. As the descendants of Noah wandered across the plains of central Asia, they came to the land of Shinar. It was fertile, and gave pasture for their flocks and herds. And it occurred to them that instead of living in tents they might build houses for themselves, and make a permanent home. The writer of the story was accustomed to see houses built of stone; but these early builders had bricks for stone, and for mortar they had slime or bitumen. They resolved to found what would seem to them a great city and a powerful state—a city which was to be the centre of all their wanderings; for as yet they would still have to travel far to find pasture for their cattle. If, however, they built a city where the elders of their tribes might always live to administer law, and where perhaps their women and children might also live in ease, this would keep them from being broken up into separate communities. And in the city they resolved to erect a lofty tower which could be seen from a great distance and the sight of which would be welcome to them as they came home from their wanderings. It was a very natural project, and might have been a harmless one, but there was in it an ambitious temper: they meant to become famous as the creators of a city and a state. Had their only motive been the mutual affection which made them wish to remain together, and so contribute, by mutual services, to the comfort and happiness of the common life, the issue might have been different. But this great project for founding a city after the great catastrophe of the Flood was an ambitious one. There were traditions, no doubt, of the wealth and luxury, and the power of earlier races which had disappeared; and these shepherds and herdsmen determined that they too would do something that would give them enduring glory. This was not the true spirit in which to work. Cities and states should be founded and maintained, not for the glory of their founders and rulers, but
for the well-being of their citizens. The project must be arrested by Divine interference.

The Babylonian legend of Babel, found in the famous library of bricks, appears to attribute the anger of the gods with the builders of Babel to the same cause. The text is indeed very defective; it appears only in broken words; but it seems to declare that the building was stopped because the Divine anger was provoked by the presumption of the builders.

The story is told in Genesis in a highly picturesque form, and not without a distinct touch of irony. You see at once that the writer is telling it in a way to strike the imagination of men: indeed it was the imagination that formed the chief expression for the highest truths in those early times to which this story belongs. “And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said, Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language; and this is what they begin to do: and now nothing will be withheld from them, which they purpose to do.” Their scheme was to hold together and to become a powerful state: and God is represented as saying: “Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.” This would destroy all their hopes. And how did God confound their speech? I believe that the answer lies under the eighth verse: “So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city.” Some dissension broke out among the builders; or they quarrelled about their work or their policy; or one of their leaders assumed an authority which the rest resented. Any one of a score of accidents might have caused fierce strife and compelled the abandonment of the enterprise. And the quarrel, after the Hebrew method, is ascribed to God: it was His work; He so controlled and directed the passions
of men that they broke out into open and violent disorder, and so they were scattered abroad. In this way the end of God was accomplished: separated from each other, the common language they had spoken was modified, in one way among one tribe, in another way among another, till at last the earth was filled with different tongues.

Remembering the idiom of the early literature and its characteristic manner, that seems to me the natural meaning of the story. Look at it again: "Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city." That was the way in which He did it. It does not say that He confounded their language and in this way scattered them abroad. But after stating His purpose to confound their language, it goes on at once to say: "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city." It is true that the account of the Divine purpose reads: "Let us there confound their language," and that in the summing up of the story it says: "The Lord did there confound the language of all the earth"; but this is nothing more than a vigorous rhetorical figure: what God did at Babel resulted in the rise of different languages—was intended to result in it—and so it was there that He confounded "the language of all the earth."

Let me give you a parallel expression which is possible to us even in our more elaborate and prosaic tongue.

More than two hundred and fifty years ago, near the village of Scrooby, on the borders of Yorkshire, Nottingham, and Lincoln, there was founded a Congregational Church which had a wonderful history. The members were driven over to Holland by fierce persecution; they remained for many years in Leyden; half of them crossed the Atlantic in the Mayflower and founded the colony of New Plymouth.
The same principles of freedom which governed them in their Church life were acknowledged in the civil policy of the colony; they founded a colony in which all the colonists had equal rights and an equal share in the government. From New Plymouth free institutions spread over all the great territory of the United States.

If I were speaking of how it came to pass that at a time when England was suffering under the tyranny of James, of Charles, of Wentworth, and of Laud, the English settlements in North America were the home of the principles which have given a free constitution to the great republic of America, I might say: God gave freedom to America when He moved the hearts of Brewster, Smyth, and Robinson to found the Church at Scrooby. It was there, in Brewster’s house, where that Congregational Church met for worship, that the foundations of the American Republic were laid. It was there that God gave to the fifty millions of people who now inhabit the magnificent territory between the Atlantic and the Pacific the unrestricted political liberty which has made them the envy of the nations of Europe.

That would be very legitimate rhetoric; and in the early literature nothing was more natural than to describe God as doing at Babel what resulted, and inevitably resulted, from what He did there. He confounded the languages of the earth there, because it was there that by His providence He broke up the race into different nations.

I had come to the conclusion that this was the meaning of the story long before I saw the fragments of the Babylonian legend in Professor Sayce’s edition of Dr. Smith’s Chaldean Genesis. And what seemed to me the meaning of the story in Genesis also seems to be the meaning of the legend. It reads:

“To confound their speeches—He set His face:
He gave the command—He made strange their counsel.”
That seems to say that the confusion of tongues which was the Divine purpose was brought about by the hostility that arose in their counsels.

I repeat that, in my judgment, what happened was this—divisions among the builders of the city made it impossible for them to carry on their work; they separated from each other, settled in different countries, and so came to form different nations with different languages.

And all this was the result of a Divine purpose. The spirit in which these ancient tribes of men resolved to hold together made it expedient in the interest of the human race that their project should be defeated, and that instead of founding one great community under the same government and the same laws, they should be broken up and become the founders of separate nations.

III.

The wars, the mutual jealousies, the innumerable inconveniences which come from the existence of independent states have sometimes led great men to desire that all national distinctions should be broken down; but the nation, like the family, is a Divine institution, and has a great place in the development of the life of man. The different manners, the different traditions, the different political and social institutions of different nations, have contributed to a richer and more varied development even of the intellectual power of the race and of its moral character. Englishman and Frenchman, German and Spaniard, Italian and Russian, represent distinct types of intellectual and of moral life. The language of each nation—to say nothing of other national distinctions—transmits from century to century the intellectual and moral judgments and the results of the emotional and imaginative activity of the people. It is not only in schools and universities, by lectures and books, that the mind and conscience of a
nation are formed; its very language, the language of the home and the market-place, is a discipline by which unconsciously to itself every child, as soon as it begins to speak, receives a definite education; and the differences between languages impress themselves on the national life and conduct. We know that if the whole world had had the same soil and the same climate, the same winds, the same amount of rain and moisture, there would have been infinitely less variety in its products. Fruits and flowers and trees differ in different zones; animals which cannot live under some skies multiply and become strong under others. The variety of the conditions of physical life gives us an infinite variety in the forms of physical life itself. And the variety of intellectual and moral conditions arising from the existence of separate and independent nations give a corresponding variety to the intellectual and moral life of man. Something is due to race; but a great deal is due to political and social institutions.

The various types of national character have now become too precise and definite wholly to disappear, whatever may be the future fortunes of mankind; and I suppose that they will render possible in the crowning ages of the world a glorious variety of types of Christian perfection. The Divine word—the seed of all righteousness—is taking root in many soils; the good ground is not all of the same sort, and the growth will vary with the soil. It will not be English Puritanism, grand and noble as English Puritanism was in its more vigorous years, that will appear in China when China is penetrated by the spirit of Christ; and the perfection of a Chinese saint will differ greatly from the perfection of a saintly Hindoo. Persia will contribute one wonderful form of Christian character, Egypt another; Italy will retain its brilliance and grace in the supernatural life as well as in the natural; Germany its mysticism and its scholarly strength. The western nations will have their characteristic
virtues transfigured and glorified; the eastern will have theirs; and Russia, with its passion and strength, its mysticism and its vigour, will perhaps mediate between them. The national differences which have enriched the civilisation of the world will also enrich its devotion, its righteousness, and its faith.

The nation as well as the family is a Divine institution. It rests on no voluntary contract between its citizens themselves, or between its citizens and their rulers; it is part of the order of the world, and is intended to contribute to the perfection of human life. This should control and inspire all our schemes for improving the laws and administration of our country. We are separate parts of a great organism, and our supreme care should be for the good, not of a part, but of the whole. To secure the material prosperity of the whole community and of every class in it, to contribute to the intellectual development, not of a class, but of the state; to promote mutual trust and the spirit of brotherhood among the whole people—this should be the end of every Christian politician.

Nor can any man, without a grave neglect of duty, refuse to do his part towards promoting the general welfare of the state. In the family it is not a matter of choice whether parents and children, brothers and sisters, shall care for each other: we have our place in the family by the Divine will, and the obligations of our place are of Divine appointment; for the family is a Divine institution.

In the nation it is not a matter of choice whether the rich shall care for the poor, and the poor for the rich, and all men for each other: we have our places in the nation by the Divine will, and the obligations of our place are of Divine appointment; for the nation as well as the family is a Divine institution. We are politicians because we are Christians.

In our dealings with foreign states it is equally necessary
to remember that nations are Divine institutions intended for the general benefit of the whole human race. We can have no national enemies: by the laws of nature and of God all nations are friends. The spirit that should govern the foreign policy of nations is not a spirit of rivalry, much less of mutual suspicion and hatred, but of co-operation. Germany is necessary to England, and Russia to both. Destroy any race or any nation that has not given itself over simply to the devil, and the whole world will be the poorer. The industries of the different nations of the world in the eye of a Christian politician are but separate shops in one great factory, and the work of every shop is necessary to the success of the common enterprise. The intellectual activities of the different nations are but the different colleges in one great university; and the genius, the learning, the methods, of every college contribute to the intellectual wealth and vigour and glory of all the rest.

Not yet can this fair ideal be realised. But it is at this we are aiming. Through storm and darkness, driven by rough winds, tossed by rough waves, sometimes doubtful of our course, sometimes sure that we have lost it, with our very compass sometimes untrue, and sun and star hidden by dense fogs, the race is making its long voyage across the ocean of human history; but we shall make port at last. The great prayer will some day be fulfilled: “Thy will be done on earth even as it is done in heaven”; and it is the will of God that men should all be brethren and nations all be friends,—that enmity, strife, and suspicion should cease, and that the separate kingdoms of the world in their joy, prosperity, and mutual trust should be like the separate mansions in the House of our Father in heaven.

R. W. Dale.
JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

I. THE PROPHETIC PICTURE OF MATTHEW.

The three first Gospels present essentially the same view of Jesus as a preacher, a teacher, and the uncompromising foe of Pharisaism. Yet on closer study distinctive features reveal themselves in their respective delineations. In Mark, which may with much probability be regarded as the earliest Gospel, Jesus is presented realistically as a man, with marked individuality in experience, speech, manner, and action. In Matthew He is presented as the Christ, in His Messianic dignity, yet as a very human, winsome Messiah. In Luke He appears as the Lord, the exalted Head of the Church; still a true man, yet bearing the aspect of a saint with an aureole round His head; near us in His grace towards the sinful, yet in some ways wearing a look of remoteness like a distant range of hills softly tinged with blue.

The first Evangelist, as is well known to all readers, loses no opportunity of verifying his thesis: Jesus the Christ. Some of his prophetic citations are unimportant, referring to matters purely external, of no significance for the characterisation of Jesus. An extreme example of this class may be found in the closing words of the second chapter: "He shall be called a Nazarene." Apologists have busied themselves in trying to discover the Old Testament basis of the reference, and some in their despair have had recourse to the hypothesis of some lost book of prophecy whence the quotation was taken. Their labour is well meant but vain. Far better to confess that this is one of the weakest links in the prophetic chain of argument, and try to make an apologetic point of its weakness. That really can be done. It is obvious that no one would ever have thought of a prophetic reference in the instance before us unless the fact had
first been there to put the idea into his mind. If the home of Jesus had not been in Nazareth, who would have dreamt of searching among the Hebrew oracles for a prophetic anticipation? The fact suggested the prophecy, the prophecy did not create the fact. And this remark may apply to many other instances, where we have not, as in this case, independent means of verifying the fact. Sceptics have maintained that not a few of the Gospel incidents were invented to correspond with supposed Messianic prophecies. The truth probably is that in by far the greater number of cases the historical data were there to begin with, stimulating believers in Jesus as the Christ to hunt up Old Testament texts fitting into them as key to lock.

Some of Matthew's quotations reveal delicate tact and fine spiritual insight. Whatever may be their value as proofs that Jesus was the Christ, there can be no doubt at all about their value as indications of what the Evangelist thought of Jesus. These indications are all the more valuable that they are given unconsciously and without design. The Evangelist's aim in making these citations is to satisfy his first readers that He of whom he wrote was the Great One whose coming all Jews, Christian and non-Christian, expected. But in pursuing this design he lets us see how he conceives the character and ministry of Jesus, and this is really for us now the permanent religious use of these prophetic texts.

Three of these texts stand out from among the group as specially serviceable for this purpose. The first, quoted from Isaiah ix. 1, 2, is introduced in connection with the settlement of Jesus in Capernaum at the commencement of His Galilean ministry. The important part of the quotation lies in the words: "the people which sat in darkness saw a great light." 1 Jesus of Nazareth, the Light of the dark land of Galilee—such is the Evangelist's comprehensive concep-

1 Matt. iv. 16.
tion of the memorable ministry he is about to narrate. On examining his detailed account we perceive that in his view Jesus exercised His illuminating function both by preaching and by teaching: understanding by the former the proclamation to the people at large of the good news of the kingdom as a kingdom of grace, by the latter the initiation of disciples into the more recondite truths of the kingdom. But it is to be noted as characteristic of the first of our canonical Gospels that while the preaching function (kerygma) of Jesus is carefully recognised, it is to the teaching function (didache) that greatest prominence is given. "Jesus," we are told, "went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom." 1 But beyond such general statements little is said concerning the Preaching. On the other hand, of the Teaching, especially that given to disciples who were indeed its chief recipients, copious samples have been preserved. The "Sermon on the Mount," brought in immediately on the back of the general announcement just quoted, belongs distinctively to the Teaching. However many more might be present, disciples were the proper audience, insomuch that the more appropriate name for the discourse would be, not the Sermon on the Mount, but the Teaching on the Hill. There Jesus was the light of the few that they might become the light of the world. And He was their light by being their Rabbi. At the close of the discourse the Evangelist makes the comparison between Jesus and the scribes given in Mark in connection with the first appearance of Jesus in the synagogue of Capernaum. 2 The comparison implies resemblance as well as contrast. Jesus in the view of our Evangelist was a scribe or Rabbi in function, anti-Rabbinical in spirit, and in virtue of both facts the spiritual light of the land. Because He was a Teacher He might be compared with the other religious teachers of the people whose professed aim it was to com-

1 Matt. iv. 23. 2 Matt. vii. 29; Mark i. 22.
municate to their countrymen the knowledge of God. Because He differed utterly from these teachers in method and spirit, the light He offered was light indeed. For their light the Evangelist believes to be but darkness, the deepest, most ominous phase of the night that brooded over Galilee and other parts of the Holy Land, as he will take pains to show in the course of his story.

The conception of the Christ as the Light-giver implies that the leading Messianic charism is wisdom. But that the author of the first Gospel took no one-sided view of Messianic equipment, but fully recognised the claims of love, is shown by the prophetic quotation now to be noticed. It also is taken from the Book of Isaiah, and is in these words: "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." 1 In his general preliminary description of the Galilean ministry, Matthew gives a prominent place to a healing function: "healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people." 2 The words just quoted from the prophet show us the light in which the healing ministry presented itself to his mind. What struck him most was not the marvellous power displayed therein but the sympathy, the phenomenal compassion. This was not a matter of course; ordinary people did not so view the remarkable cures which were taking place among them. What gained for Jesus fame among them was, beside the benefit received, the preternatural power evinced by His healing acts. Only a deep glimpse into the heart of Jesus could enable any one to see in these acts something more and better than power, and to find in His curative function a fulfilment of the striking Hebrew oracle. Such a glimpse had the Evangelist. He read truly the innermost meaning of the acts, some of which he reports, and so laid his finger on the grand distinction of Jesus. And one who saw the central significance of love in the character of Jesus was not likely to suppose

1 Matt. viii. 17, from Isa. liii. 2 Matt. iv. 23.
that its manifestation was confined to healing acts. He would expect it to reveal itself also in "gracious words" spoken for the healing of sin-sick souls. And though fewer such words are reported in Matthew than we might have desired, there are some that mean much to one who duly considers them.

By far the most important of our three prophetic oracles is the one remaining to be mentioned. It presents, so to speak, a full-length portrait of Jesus, in prophetic language, which will repay detailed study, feature by feature. This citation, like the other two taken from Isaiah, occurs in Matthew xii. 18–21, and is in these terms: ¹

"Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; My beloved in whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my Spirit upon Him, And He shall declare judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry aloud; Neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall He not break, And smoking flax shall He not quench, Till He send forth judgment unto victory, And in His name shall the Gentiles hope."

The attractive picture is introduced by the Evangelist at this point in his narrative to show the true Jesus in opposition to the Jesus of Pharisaic imagination—a miscreant deserving to die for Sabbath-breaking and other offences against an artificial religious system. He sees in Jesus the realisation of one of the finest ideal conceptions in Hebrew prophecy—the Servant of God, beloved of God, filled with His Spirit, gentle, peaceable, sympathetic, wise, cosmopolitan, capable of winning the confidence and satisfying the aspirations not of Israelites only but of all mankind. It is the retiring non-contentious disposition of Jesus, manifested in connection with a sabbatical conflict, that recalls the prophetic ideal of Messiah to his mind. The

¹ I quote the Revised Version. The original is in Isaiah xlii. 1–4.
baffled foes of Jesus had left the scene of strife in a truculent temper, taking counsel "how they might destroy Him." Perceiving their threatening mood, Jesus withdrew from the place to avoid giving further offence and precipitating a crisis. In this procedure the Evangelist recognises the Messianic trait: "He shall not strive nor cry aloud, neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets." But he is not content to quote this one sentence: he reproduces the passage in full. Instead of a single trait he shows us the complete picture. It is not a case of loose quotation without considering whether the quoted matter be relevant or irrelevant. Of set purpose he brings in this fair portrait of Jesus just here, skilfully using as a foil to set off its beauty the hideously distorted ideas of Him current in the religious world of Judæa. He takes into his hand the sketch of the ancient Hebrew limner, holds it up to his readers, and says: Look on this picture and on that. This is Jesus as I see Him, that is Jesus as Pharisees misconceive Him. Which think you is the true Jesus?

How shall we qualify ourselves for judging what is to be the basis for verification? Must we confine ourselves to the immediate context, or may we roam over the evangelic narrative from its beginning up to this point? I think the Evangelist himself has the whole foregoing story in view, and that that may be the reason why he quotes at length and does not restrict his citation to the one point apposite to the immediate occasion. If so, then we may travel over the preceding pages, that by broad, large observation we may satisfy ourselves that the prophetic delineation answers to the character of Him whose story has thus far been told. The very position of the picture in the book—in the middle, instead of at the commencement—invites us to use the knowledge we have acquired for this purpose. Another Evangelist, Luke, has also presented to his readers an ideal portrait of Jesus, painted in prophetic colours. But his
picture comes in very early, serving as a *frontispiece* to his book.¹ Matthew's picture stands right in the centre, so that we cannot help asking, Is the painting like the original as we now know Him?

Let us then study the goodly image in the light of the history going before. "Behold My servant!"

The first trait is the Divine complacency resting on the person whose character is delineated: "My beloved in whom My soul is well pleased." The detested of the Pharisees is the beloved of God. A strong thing to say; what evidence of its truth? The evangelic historian points in reply to the baptismal scene at the Jordan with the accompanying voice from heaven: "Thou My beloved Son."² This, of course, would have been no evidence for Pharisees who were not there to hear, and who would not have believed on the report of another that the voice had really been spoken; even as there are many now to whom it is no evidence because of their unbelief in the miraculous. For minds of the Pharisaic type no evidence of any sort could avail to show that such an one as Jesus could possibly be the well-beloved of God. Such minds judge men by external tests and by hard and fast rules, with the inevitable result that they often mistake the best for the worst, and the worst for the best, and say of one who is a true servant and son of God: "Thou hast a devil." Happily there is evidence as to the character of Jesus available for all men of open, honest heart, whether they believe in miracle or not. There is the testimony borne by the unsophisticated spiritual instincts of the soul, which can recognise goodness at sight. Can we not see for ourselves, without voices from heaven, that Jesus of Nazareth, as revealed in His recorded words and acts, is a Son of God, if not in the metaphysical sense of theology, at least in the ethical sense of possessing a God-like spirit? Behold My

servant! Yea, a servant indeed: of God, of truth, of righteousness, of true truth, of real righteousness, with rare capacity for discerning between genuine and counterfeit—a brave, heroic, prophetic Man, fighting for the Divine in an evil time, when godlessness assumed its most repulsive and formidable form under the guise of a showy, plausible, yet hollow zeal for godliness. Truly, in the words of the Hebrew oracle, God had put His Spirit upon Him. The descent of the Spirit at His baptism, if not an objective fact, was at least a happy symbol of the truth.

The second trait in the picture is the retiring disposition of Jesus, described in the words: “He shall not strive nor cry aloud, neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets.” Interpreted in the light of the immediate situation these words refer to the peaceable spirit of Jesus evinced by His retirement from the scene of recent conflict to avoid further contention, and the intensification of existing animosities likely to result therefrom. But we may give to this part of the picture a larger scope, and find exemplifications in portions of the evangelic history having no direct connection with Pharisaic antagonism. May not the Evangelist have in view here the ascent to the mountain top and the teaching there given to an inner circle of disciples? The love for retirement among nature’s solitudes and for the special work of a master instructing chosen scholars was characteristic of Jesus. He did not indeed shun the crowd or the kind of instruction that tells upon, and is appreciated by, the popular mind. His voice was heard in the streets, in the synagogue, from a boat on the lake addressing an immense crowd on the shore. He gave Himself with enthusiasm to evangelism, visiting in succession all the synagogues of Galilee, and never grudging gracious speech to the people wherever they might chance to assemble. Still this was not the work He preferred, nor was He deceived as to its value. “Much seed little fruit”
was His estimate of it in the Parable of the Sower. He got weary at times of the crush of crowds, and longed for privacy, and made sundry attempts to escape into solitude. He felt the passion of all deep natures for detachment and isolation—to be alone with God, with oneself, with congenial companions capable of receiving truths which do not lie on the surface.

The retirement to the mountain top was one of these escapes, and the "Sermon on the Mount," as it has been called, shows us the kind of thoughts Jesus gave utterance to when His audience was not a street crowd, but a band of susceptible more or less prepared hearers. "When He had sat down, His disciples came unto Him, and He opened His mouth and taught them." 1 His first words were the Beatitudes, spoken in tones suited to their import—not shouted after the manner of a street preacher, but uttered gently, quietly, to a few men lying about on the grass, breathing the pure air of the uplands, with eyes upturned towards the blue skies, and with something of heaven's peace in their hearts. In these sayings of the hill we see Jesus at His best, all that is within Him finding utterance in the form of thoughts concerning citizenship in the kingdom, the righteousness of the kingdom, and the grace of the Divine King and Father, which are very new in emphasis and felicity of expression, if not altogether new in substance. "Why," we are tempted to ask, "should one capable of saying such things on mountain tops ever go down to the plain below to mingle with the ignorant, stupid mob, not to speak of descending lower still into unwelcome profitless controversy with prejudiced, conceited, malevolent religionists?" But such a question would reveal ignorance of a very important feature in the character of Jesus; viz., that He was not a one-sided man—a mere Rabbi, sage, or philosopher, caring only for intimate fellow-

1 Matt, v. 1, 2.
ship with the select few—but a man who had also a Saviour-heart, with a passion for recovering to God and goodness lost men and women, hungering therefore for contact with the weak, the ignorant, the sinful; making the saving of such His main occupation, and seeking in the companionship of disciples only His recreation.

To this Saviour-aspect of Christ's character the third trait points: "A bruised reed shall He not break, and smoking flax shall He not quench." Broadly interpreted, these words describe the compassion of Jesus. The pathetic emblems denote the objects of that compassion: poor, suffering, sorrow-laden, sinful creatures in whom the flame of life temporal or spiritual burnt low, and who in body or soul resembled bruised reeds, frail at the best, rendered frailer still by grief, pain, or moral shortcoming. The pity of Jesus is expressed in negative terms. It is declared that He will not do what many men are prone to do—crush the weak, blow out the flickering flame. The whole truth about Jesus is that He habitually did the opposite with reference to all forms of weakness represented by the bruised reed and the smoking wick. For verification of the statement we have only to look back over the history. Consider e.g., the ministry of healing. Think of the multitudes of sick in Capernaum and elsewhere cured of diseases of all sorts—fever, leprosy, palsy, blindness, insanity. Miracles or not, these are facts as well attested as anything in the Gospels. And the subjects of these healing acts might very appropriately be described as physically or mentally bruised reeds. Take, e.g., the man sick of palsy borne of four—what a wreck physically! or the demoniac of Gadara—what a sad tragic wreck mentally! Of moral wrecks also there is no lack of examples. The palsied man is one; a wreck morally not

less than physically, a man in whose life vice and disease appear to have been closely intertwined. How then did Jesus treat that man? Did He shun him, or blow out the little flame of goodness that might still be in him, or utterly crush the spirit of hope that was already sorely broken by a hard unfeeling word, or a merciless rebuke? No! He healed the wounded conscience and revived the drooping heart by the gracious word cordially spoken: "Courage, child; thy sins are forgiven." Or look in at that large assembly of "publicans and sinners" in the court of Levi's house in Capernaum. Here is a motley collection of bruised reeds and smoking wicks of all sorts: social outcasts, drunken men, frail women, irreligious, profligate, scandalous people. What is to be done with them? Throw them out into the social refuse heap to rot, or take them out in boats and drown them in the lake? Such may have been the secret thoughts of respectable inhuman people in Capernaum, as such are the thoughts of cynical persons now in reference to similar classes of our modern society. Not such were the thoughts of Jesus. Capable of salvation and worth saving even these, said He. Bruised reeds, yes, but the bruise may be healed; smoking wicks doubtless, but the flame may be made to burn clear. Was He too sanguine? No. How strong the reed may become witness the story of Zacchæus, thoroughly credible, though not told in Matthew; how bright the dying flame witness the woman in Simon's house with her shower of penitent tears, and her alabaster box of precious ointment. "Much forgiven, much love," was the hopeful creed of Jesus. His ideas on this subject were very unconventional. Religious people as He saw them appeared to Him very far from God, and not likely ever to come nigh. On the other hand, those who seemed hopelessly given over to immorality and irre-

---

ligion He deemed not unlikely subjects for the kingdom. The average modern Christian does not quite understand all this, and perhaps he hopes that Jesus did not altogether mean what He seems plainly to say. But He did mean it, and He acted upon it, and history has justified His belief and policy.

The last trait in our picture is what may be called the cosmopolitanism, or the universalism, of Jesus. "In His name shall the Gentiles hope." That is, He is a Christ not for Jews alone, but for mankind. The Hebrew original, as faithfully rendered in the English Bible, means: "the isles shall wait for His law." The two renderings coincide in sense in so far as they express the universal range of Messiah's functions; they differ only in so far as they point to varying aspects of His work. The one exhibits Him as a universal object of trust, i.e., a universal Saviour; the other exhibits Him as a universal Legislator: the Saviour of the world, the Lord of the world. Now, let it be noted, Jesus could be neither unless He possessed intrinsic fitness for these gigantic tasks. It is not a question of "offices" in the first place, but of character, charisms, endowments. It boots not to tell men that Jesus is Christ, and that as such He exercises the functions of prophet, priest, lawgiver, king, so long as they do not see that He possesses the gifts and the grace necessary for these high functions. He must have it in Him by word, deed, spirit, experience to inspire trust, and to make men look to Him for law, i.e., for the moral ideal of life. When men are convinced of His power in these respects, they will accept Him as their Christ; possibly not under that name, for some fastidious disciples may be inclined to discard the title as foreign and antiquated, and unsuited for the vocabulary of a universal and eternal religion. So be it; it matters not about the name (though it will always have its value for theology and the religious history of the
world), the vital matter is what the name signifies. If Jesus can be the spiritual physician, and moral guide of mankind, He is what the people of Israel meant by a Christ, one who satisfies the deepest needs and highest hopes of men. And so the great question is, Can the Jesus of the Gospels do this? The question is not to be settled by authority, or by apologetic evidences based on miracles and prophecies. Trust and moral admiration cannot be produced by such means. Orders to trust are futile, injunctions under pains and penalties to admire vain; proofs that a certain person ought to be trusted and admired inept, unless those to whom the commands and arguments are addressed perceive for themselves in the person commended the qualities that inspire trust and admiration. And if these qualities be there, the best thing one can do for his fellow-men is to let the object of faith and reverence speak for Himself. Hold up the picture and let men look at it. Set it in a good light, hang it well on the wall, remove from the canvas obscuring dust and cobwebs if such there be; then stand aside and let men gaze till the Friend of sinners, the Man of sorrow, the great Teacher, begin to reveal Himself to their souls.

Jesus has so revealed Himself to multitudes in all ages, and of all nationalities; He continues so to reveal Himself to-day. The success or non-success of His self-revelation has no connection with race, but only with moral affinity. Jesus came first to His own people, and for the most part they received Him not. The result condemned not Him but them. They had a veil of religious prejudice on their face, and they could not see Him. It needs an open eye and an open heart to see Jesus truly. The open eye and open heart may be found in any quarter of the globe; sometimes in very unlikely quarters: among barbarians rather than in the great centres of culture and civilisation. The proud, the vain, the greedy, the slaves of fashion,
however religious, know nothing about Jesus. Jesus was always on the outlook for the open eye and simple, open, honest heart, and He was greatly delighted when He found them. The classic example of this quest and delight is the story of the centurion of Capernaum, a Pagan, not a Jew, first-fruit of Gentile faith. What beautiful, sublime simplicity in that Roman soldier’s trust! And what a thrill of pleasure it gave Jesus! “I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.”

Not in Israel, the very people for whose benefit the Messianic portrait was painted in the olden time. Strange that the same people should produce men capable of such splendid artistic work in the sphere of moral delineation, and be so lacking in the power of appreciating the historical realisation of the prophetic ideals. They devoutly, fanatically believed in the Messiah in the abstract, but could not recognise Him in the concrete. We have to thank Jewish blindness for the unearthing of this ancient prophetic picture by a Christian historian, by way of protest against hideous caricatures of Jesus by His religious contemporaries. We have to thank Jewish unbelief for the tragic result of these deplorable misunderstandings, the crucifixion. Faith in a Pagan soldier, unbelief in the most religious Jews. Faith where you did not look for it, unbelief where faith should have been. As it was then, so it is still, so probably it always will be. All turns on the state of the heart. The pure heart, the unsophisticated conscience, is implicitly Christian everywhere. The men of impure heart, lacking in moral simplicity, may be very Christian in profession, fiercely on the side of Jesus, yet all the while they are really on the side of the Pharisees.

Wisdom, sympathy, modesty, gentleness, wide-heartedness, combined, such is the Evangelist’s conception of the

\[1 \text{Matt. viii. 5-13.}\]
Christ, and of Jesus. Surely a most winsome Jesus and a most acceptable Messiah!

"Behold My servant, whom I uphold," so runs the oracle in the English version of the Hebrew original. Whom I uphold: Jehovah backs His servant, ideal Messianic Israel, however despised, against all comers. So may we Christians feel in reference to our Lord Jesus. We may well uphold Him; we may with good right hold up our heads as believers in Him, as men who support a good cause. Comparative religion teaches nothing to make us ashamed of Him. The only thing we have cause to be ashamed of is our miserably mean, inadequate presentation of Him in theory, and still more in life. Two things are urgently required of us modern Christians: to see Jesus truly and to show Him just as we see Him. "Behold My servant." Try hard to get a fresh sight of Jesus, to behold Him "with open face." Then what you have seen show with absolute sincerity, not hiding your light for fear of men who are religious but not Christian. Clear vision, heroic, uncalculating sincerity, how scarce in these days of time-serving! And what power goes with them! Give us a few men whose hearts have been kindled with direct heaven-sent insight into the wisdom and grace of Christ, and who must speak what they know and testify what they have seen, and they will bring about a moral revolution, issuing in a Christianised Church and a righteous social state.

A. B. Bruce.