

Christ on the ruins. Down there He cast His lot among the industrious poor, the salt of whose life was honest, manly toil. The labourers in every field, and the women at every well, and the children at play down there all knew Him. That lake side was the loved home of His manhood. He taught by its rippling shore. He walked over its submissive waves. He spoke the dialect of the district, and the common objects that lay about Him became signs and symbols by which He communicated His message to all men. His Gospel speaks to man in forms of speech which had their natural birth by the shores of that peaceful lake. The customs of the district are woven into its texture. Its physical roots are in the homely phraseology of Capernaum and Bethsaida. The thoughts that guide our lives, and stir our hearts, and kindle our spirits into life and consciousness, took form and substance in the homeland of Jesus.

WILLIAM WRIGHT.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR RAMSAY.

IN the EXPOSITOR, September, 1896, pp. 194-201, Dr. Ramsay has called attention to an inscription found in old Carnuntum, in Pannonia (on the Danube below Vienna), in which an "Italic cohort" is mentioned. The inscription makes it probable, as Dr. Ramsay points out, that about 69 A.D. an "Italic cohort" was stationed in Syria. For this information I am very thankful, and I could contemplate the fact with an undisturbed joy. But Dr. Ramsay has for some time felt, and still feels, the need of refuting me on every possible occasion, and now this new find has stirred up anew his zeal for refutation. He thinks (p. 194) that the newly found inscription "will probably be held by most scholars as a sufficient proof that, in our present state of knowledge, the verdict of Dr. Schürer is

contrary to the evidence." I had asserted, namely, that under the Jewish king Agrippa (41-44 A.D.) an "Italic (*i.e.* composed of Roman citizens) cohort" could not have served in Cæsarea, and that this was improbable also for the period before 41, because the garrison of Cæsarea before the time of Agrippa was probably made up of the same troops as after his time, namely, of native Cæsarean and Sebastenian troops.¹ Now what does the inscription prove? (1) It proves that at the time to which the inscription refers, an Italic cohort was stationed in Syria to be sure, but as to Cæsarea—the garrison of which is the point at issue—the inscription is silent. (2) It refers not to the time before 41, nor to the time 44-66, but, as Ramsay himself holds, to the year 69 A.D. The inscription, therefore, proves absolutely nothing against my positions, and Dr. Ramsay, moreover, in his zeal has entirely forgotten to say *in how far* it could prove anything against me. What he introduces into his article besides this, consists of nothing but confident assertions and personal affronts.

I could therefore close here, had he not brought into the field against me the authority of Mommsen. He says, p. 197, "Dr. Schürer argues that even between A.D. 6 and 41 . . . an Italic cohort cannot have been stationed at Cæsarea." This assertion he bases on a series of conjectures as to the Roman forces stationed in Judæa during these years. It is fortunately unnecessary for me to discuss his conjectures; I need only point out (1) that they are in conscious and direct contradiction to the principles laid down by Mommsen, the supreme authority on the subject; (2) that Mommsen has now considered them and judged them to be "erroneous in every respect."

¹ *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i. 386. The English translation (First Division, vol. ii. p. 54) is here wrong. Instead of "in reference to a later period" it should read, "in reference to the preceding period."

To this I make the following reply:—(1) It is an error to say that I said: “between A.D. 6 and 41 an Italic cohort *cannot* have been stationed at Cæsarea.” I said only that it was not probable (*nicht wahrscheinlich*). (2) It is untrue that Mommsen pronounced the above quoted hard judgment upon my “conjectures as to the Roman forces stationed in Judæa during these years.” Mommsen’s words have reference only to what I said about the *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή*.¹ In giving Mommsen’s judgment a more general reference, Dr. Ramsay makes an entirely incorrect interpretation of that judgment. (3) Even Mommsen himself has in this case proceeded incautiously. He says my opinion is “erroneous in every respect.” In reality, my opinion differs from his in but one single point. He thinks that, among the five cohorts which formed the garrison of Cæsarea from 44–66 A.D., there were found one *cohors Ascalonitarum* and one *cohors Canathenorum*. I consider this impossible, because Josephus says positively that the troops at that time garrisoned in Cæsarea were for the most part Cæsareans and Sebastenians (Jos., *Antiq.*, xx. 8, 7: μέγα φρονούντες ἐπὶ τῷ τοὺς πλείστους τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους ἐκέισε [al. Ῥωμαίοις ἐκεῖ] στρατευομένων Καισαρεῖς εἶναι καὶ Σεβαστηνοὺς; cf. also xix. 9, 1–2). Since, on the other hand, there are no positive grounds for Mommsen’s opinion, I must hold to my own opinion even against his authority, and this too, all the more, inasmuch as it has been hitherto the usual opinion. But, be that as it may, there exists otherwise no differences of opinion between us worthy of mention. For as to what Mommsen further brings up against me in supposed polemic, that the adjective *Σεβαστή* is equivalent to Augusta, and that the meaning of it is, not that those troops came from Sebaste (were

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1895, p. 501: “Was Schürer über die *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή* der Apostelgeschichte ausführt erscheint mir in jeder Hinsicht verfehlt.”

Σεβαστηνοί), I can only remark that for more than twenty years (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1875, pp. 416-419; *Geschichte*, i. 385) I have advocated as positively as Mommsen the first view, and have combated the last; that is to say, I have affirmed exactly the same thing that Mommsen affirmed. And so it is only an inadvertence when he directs this polemic against me, and on the strength of it says my opinion is "erroneous in every respect." Dr. Ramsay would have done better had he corrected the oversight of the eminent scholar, instead of taking up, as he does, the judgment against me based on that oversight, and proceeding, as he does, to make a big story out of it.

E. SCHÜRER.