

devoted; He devotes Himself.' And if we should fail to see how this perfect obedience of Christ can be of any advantage to us, Professor Adeney suggests the analogy of intercessory prayer. 'Why should a mother pray for her son, except that the

devotion of one soul may bring blessing to a kindred soul? But St. Paul goes farther in profound mysticism, teaching that faith in Christ is union with Christ, and never dissociating the work of Christ for us from the life of Christ in us.'

The Judaean Ministry of Jesus.

BY THE REV. T. D. BERNARD, M.A., CANON OF WELLS.

How little is known of the first stage of our Lord's ministry! and yet how decisive it proved! It was the first act in the grand sad drama, and the earnest of its end. 'He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.' Then was tested and proved His relation with 'the Jews' at the centre of their national life. Then were laid the foundations of all else that happened at Jerusalem, and of all that was done there at the last; and the issue of that effort was the departure to the freshness and freedom of the Galilean life and of the ministry which we know so well. Yet the evangelists who record that ministry make no mention of the previous work, and scarcely give an intimation of it. Only we are told that 'when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, He departed into Galilee' (Mt 4¹², Mk 1¹⁴, Lk 4¹⁴). 'He departed,' but from what place? and where had He been, and what had been His work up to the time that John was cast into prison? It is left untold; yet the same writer records the words, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together?' in a narrative which has made no previous mention of any work at Jerusalem or even of any visits there. These are tokens of the larger knowledge present to the mind of the evangelist, and of his definite limitation of purpose.

It is in the Fourth Gospel, which records later scenes in Jerusalem, that we have the mention and the estimate of this earlier ministry. Yet even there it is given briefly, and in an almost casual manner, which scarcely impresses its real importance. The general account of it is little more than the setting of two selected incidents, the act and prophecy in the temple, and the interview with Nicodemus. It may be useful to

offer now some considerations on this general account, and hereafter on each of these incidents.

There is nothing accidental in the brief manifestation of the Son of God. Christ presents Himself to His people on a deliberate plan, but one that judicially adapts itself to the response or the perversity of men. His mission in the flesh has the same starting-point as His message in the spirit, 'beginning at Jerusalem.'

He had gathered disciples and confirmed their trustful faith by the first miracle, significant of the change He came to make, and which, being wrought in a family circle, was also a gracious farewell to private life.

'After this He went down to Capernaum, He, and His mother, and His brethren, and His disciples: and they continued there not many days.'

Having chosen this place to be the centre of work in Galilee whenever He should return, He proceeded to open His mission to His people at the headquarters of the nation, amid the concourse and animation of the Passover. Here was the first ministry. Its activity and effect are told us, but not the details. Passing by the two incidents which are related, and leaving them for separate treatment, we observe a frequent mention of the signs which He did, in 'beholding which, many believed on His name,' which convinced the more candid of the Pharisees that He was 'a Teacher sent from God,' which impressed also those who came from other parts; as later on we read that 'when He came into Galilee the Galileans received Him, having seen all the things that He did in Jerusalem at the Feast; for they also went unto the Feast' (4⁴⁵). The signs were, as always, and as indeed we are told, the accompaniments of the teaching, and of the proclamation of the coming

kingdom of God. They were also the supports of that presentation of Himself to the faith of men, which is fully expressed in the first subsequent visit to the same scene of action, recorded in chap. 5, the language of which is sufficient to show how far the mission of the Son from the Father had been already revealed in Jerusalem.

The ministry was not confined to the city. After a time 'came Jesus and His disciples into the *land of Judea*, and there He tarried with them, and baptized' (3²²). He tarried (*διέτριψεν*), spent time; and the time must have been considerable, as appears from all that occurred. Large numbers resorted to Him, professed disciples were multiplied, and baptisms administered by the hands of the original disciples became so numerous as to awaken the jealousy of the followers of John (3²⁶) and the hostility of the Pharisees (4¹).

The work of the Baptist was not ended, but his scene of action was changed. No longer 'beyond Jordan,' but 'in *Aenon* near to Salim, where there were many waters,' he continued his ministry, and men 'came, and were baptized.' This Salim which is mentioned as defining the locality must be the same which is described in the earliest tradition by its measured distance from Scythopolis, and which is noticed by recent travellers (Robinson, Tristram, Palestine Exploration) in this connexion. It could not be the alternative Salim of Jos 15³² (adopted by Hengstenberg, Godet, and others). Far to the south of Judah, and on the edge of Edom, it was distant from Herod's observation and dominion; whereas the Salim on the confines of Samaria and Galilee was within easy reach of his capital at Tiberias, where all public action would be known and canvassed. Herod 'feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy,' and it seems as if in uneasy curiosity he had sought an interview, in which he heard the words which Herodias would find her time to avenge, 'It is not lawful for thee to have her.' Perhaps John's removal northwards was connected with the public appearance of Jesus in *Judea*; and he might well pursue his work, as it was still serviceable for its purposes, and he had received no intimation that his mission was over. But the contemporary baptism by Jesus, as a feature of His *Judean* ministry, is more remarkable. It was, it seems, the same as that of John, a baptism of repentance for remission of sins in preparation for the coming kingdom. But on the part of those who

sought it from Him rather than from the Baptist, it must have expressed some recognition of those claims to which John had testified, and to which their own hearts responded. Why was it adopted thus provisionally, being no part of the Lord's permanent action? We cannot say; only we can see that it publicly associated the first stage of his ministry with the work of the Precursor. When the one ceased so did the other, and then a broad interval separated this earlier rite from the Sacrament instituted by the risen Lord in His commission to the Church for ever. Christian baptism, including all that the provisional baptism expressed, is also the initiation into the Church and body of Christ, with inheritance in its powers and promises, as contained in the revelation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

The baptisms thus administered, not only at a distance but now in *Judea* itself, awoke fresh discussions 'about purifying,' that great subject of Jewish law, custom, and thought. The question was agitated between disciples of John and a Jew, presumably learned in such matters, who appears to have found new arguments in the action of Jesus. They carried their difficulties to their master, feeling sore that his methods should be appropriated and his influence superseded by another. 'Rabbi,' they said, 'He who was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou hast borne witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to Him.' They spoke with the natural exaggeration of jealousy, and they received an answer which showed the truth of the situation, and disclosed the deep secrets of their Master's soul.

John answered, saying, 'A man can receive nothing, except it have been given him from heaven. Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but, that I am sent before Him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease.'

Noble and touching words! on which it would be delightful to dwell, as a study of a great character, and for the profit of their deep instruction. But they are cited here as evidence of the activity and power of the Lord's *Judean* ministry. There is a sound to which John is listening, the sound of spiritual movement, the sound of a voice which awakens it; and if the company

of believers, the little band of hope which is gathering, is in part of his own preparation, that is as it ought to be. ‘He that hath the bride is the bridegroom.’ The friend who has done his part in the preliminaries, standing to listen for the bridegroom’s voice, rejoices greatly when he hears it. ‘This,’ he says, ‘is my joy, and it is now fulfilled.’ All the same he foresees and accepts the future of the one ministry and of the other. ‘He must increase;’ in fact He has done so, through all the world and all the ages. ‘But I must decrease.’ He recognised it as the necessary incident of his work as a precursor; but how quickly it came! and how worthily! Not by gradual effacement, but by a sudden arrest for a word of faithfulness and truth, he who had swayed multitudes and moved the nation was in the prime of his powers lost to the world in imprisonment, silence, and death.

‘When John was cast into prison’ the Lord ended his Judæan ministry. From that event the Synoptics date His departure into Galilee. John gives another reason for the change in the scene of action. ‘When the Lord knew how that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John, He left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee’ (4¹). It is evident that the arrest of the Baptist by Herod was followed by proceedings of the Pharisees against Jesus. It was time, they thought, to end these unwelcome movements, so disturbing to Judæic prejudice, so dangerous to the predominant party. One mighty influence has been silenced by the royal power within its own jurisdiction. The other in a region under a different rule may equally be crushed by the exertion of hierarchical authority. The Lord was forced to the conclusion that He ‘would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews sought to kill Him’ (7¹). If He remained there the end would be precipitated before its time. So this first stage of ministry was closed, only to be taken up again in brief visits at the feasts, visits made with ever-increasing danger.

How long must we suppose this ministry to have lasted? Considering the decisive importance of the issue to the nation, we should expect that full time would be given to the great experiment. Reviewing the facts which have been mentioned, we see that they naturally imply that so it was. There is one expression which may seem to fix its duration, but not with certainty. In the

passage from Judæa to Galilee, at the well of Sychar, we hear the words, ‘Say not ye there are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest?’ That might be the citation of a common proverb as dating from seed-sowing to harvest. But the interval named is too short, and no such proverb is known, and the word ‘yet’ more naturally betokens an observation that might be made at the moment. Such is its natural character, and in that case (since the harvest lasted from the middle of April to the end of May) the words would be spoken in January or February, giving some nine or ten months for the sojourn in Jerusalem and Judæa, dating from arrival there at the previous Passover (see Westcott, *in loc.*).

Whatever the length of time, it was sufficient to give that people their opportunity and to test their disposition. The result was clear: ‘His own received Him not.’ The general mind was cold and antipathetic to His teaching; large classes were antagonistic from interest or bigotry, and the representative powers of the nation were rancorous and plotting His death. It was a world of which the Lord could say, on the whole, ‘It hateth Me, because I testify of it that the works thereof are evil.’ Yet was it a mingled world, with its varieties of character and its side of promise. When it has been said, ‘No man receiveth His witness,’ the remembrance occurs of those who did so; ‘He that received His witness, sealed that God is true;—that is to say, he attested by such reception his own personal sense that this witness of Christ was according to the truth of God’s nature and of His previous promises.

There were, there naturally would be, some who received it with uncertainties, with limitations, with imperfect apprehensions, with adhesion that would prove insecure. So it is said, ‘when He was at Jerusalem at the Passover, during the feast, many believed on His name, beholding the signs which He did. But Jesus did not trust (or commit) Himself unto them, for that He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify concerning man; for He knew what was in man’ (3²³⁻²⁵).

This believing is described as a believing ‘on His name,’ and as the consequence of ‘beholding the signs.’ Both expressions suggest a faith that might often prove unsound. Faith based mainly on miracles may have an imperfect estimate of

the person who wrought them, and the name may represent a Messiah after their own ideas. Such faith might be more deep or more shallow, might grow in truth and elevation, or might prove a mistake at last. Doubtless these differences existed among the adherents thus described, and as time went on, fresh tests brought them to light; as when offence was caused by hard sayings, and 'many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him' (6⁶⁶). Impressions easily received often easily fail. It is the observation of experience, that 'it is mysterious and humiliating to find so often in the history of missions that first converts disappoint the missionary' (*History of the C.M.S.*, vol. ii. p. 602). Such failures are various, betraying some the weakness, some the falseness of the mind.

The saddest case before us is that of the Judæan apostle (the only one, as it seems). Judas, son of Simon, surnamed Iscariot, as belonging to Kerioth, a township in Judæa, must have adhered to the Lord during His ministry in that region, and followed Him in the departure to Galilee. There, as a forward and capable disciple, he might seem fit for inclusion among the chosen twelve. But, whatever were the reasons for the selection, St. John is careful to note that it was not made under a mistake. 'Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed, and who should betray Him' (6⁶⁴). If this man's faith depended on miracles, where would it be when, at the great crisis, miracle gave no help? If it was faith in a name, where would it be when he saw that the name did not mean what he had once supposed? When faith had thus proved false, he was left to his native meanness, to the temptation of the hour, and to the influence of his former masters in Jerusalem. Up to that time his faith may have appeared to his fellow-disciples as real as their own; but from the first, the Lord, who knew them all, read him as he was.

To penetrate character and motive, to know what men are, and to forecast what they will prove, is a rare power even in the partial and doubtful measure in which some persons may possess it. In its true character it rises from observation and experience, but more from an inward fellowship with truth and goodness, an instinctive perception of the worth of words and semblances, a sense of the difference between feelings, however at the time sincere, and

principles that become part of life, and from a sympathy which understands and allows for the changing processes of thought. To a perfect human nature such a power would belong in an extraordinary degree, and this was one of the spiritual endowments which dwelt in the Son of Man. It is apparent in the synoptic narratives; but St. John loves to record his own observation of it on various occasions, and the impression which it made on his mind. For ourselves, we are mostly guided in our relations with others, not so much by the judgment of knowledge as by half-conscious impressions; and we have every reason to be careful that the mind which receives them should be free from egoistic and perverting influences, and possessed by truth and charity, and under habitual reference to the only Searcher of hearts.

Doubtless there is admonition for us in what is said of our Lord's conduct. In the words, 'He did not commit, or trust, Himself to them,' the evangelist appears to have noticed a reserve towards persons, and a guarded action on occasions when he should himself have expected more ready confidence; conduct which (as he saw afterwards) preserved the cause of truth from being compromised by the faults or foolishness of men. It is a lesson which may well be studied, especially by those who have responsibility in guidance of affairs, for the honour of the Word intrusted to them, and in the interest of souls under their influence.

More pleasant it is to end this review of the earliest ministry by reverting to the mention of those in whom it bore sound and lasting fruit. We may be sure that the seed sown found good soil here and there, in some cases perhaps with a secret vitality to be afterwards disclosed to sight. Of the 'many who believed on His name,' of the many who were baptized, a fair proportion became a genuine nucleus of the future Church. Tokens of the presence of unnamed followers appear by accident, as in the owner or keeper of Gethsemane, the man who willingly lent the ass and colt at the word 'the Lord hath need of them,' or the master of the house where the Last Supper was held, and which was the probable place of assembly where the risen Lord appeared. There were thoughtful and convinced disciples, like Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, whose position held them back till events forced them

into action. And conspicuous above all is the family in Bethany, the sisters and the brother whom 'Jesus loved,' and whom we seem ourselves to know so well. He who knew what was in men knew their true hearts and pure affections, and the sincerity with which in that house He was revered as Master, loved as Friend, and believed in as 'the Christ, the Son of God, which cometh into the world' (11²⁷). Here He found a ready welcome and a congenial home. Here it was joy to receive Him, to minister to Him, and

to sit at His feet and hear His word. Here were shed the precious tears of sympathy for human grief, and here was wrought the crowning miracle at the grave. To this door the Lord turned His steps when He came to die at Jerusalem, and under this roof, through the week of conflict and suffering, He had at night His last lodging upon earth. So then in this house at Bethany we can end our review of the Judæan ministry, and feel that, amid surrounding disappointments, we here find rest to our souls.

A New View of Deuteronomy.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. G. G. CAMERON, D.D., ABERDEEN.

IN his second volume of *Old Testament Theology* Professor Duff of the United College, Bradford, has given a new and peculiar explanation of the origin of Deuteronomy.¹ Years ago, Wellhausen, with characteristic confidence, announced that, to scientific critics, Deuteronomy no longer presented an unsolved problem.² His critical penetration, great as it is, did not foresee what was to be disclosed at Bradford. Either the great German savant made a mistake, or Professor Duff is not a scientific critic according to the Wellhausen standard.

The subject announced in the title of this second volume of *Old Testament Theology* is 'The Deuteronomic Reformation.' But the greater part of the book is used for a transcription (in English) of the Jehovistic and the Elohistic documents. The real discussion regarding the Book of Deuteronomy, which, according to Dr. Duff, was the 'Charter of the Reformation' under Josiah, is postponed, and will be given in another volume. In these circumstances, detailed examination of the solution of the Deuteronomic problem proposed by Dr. Duff is out of the question. The ground on which the opinion rests

has not been properly exhibited. The arguments by which it is to be supported still lie (largely) in the womb of the future. But the proposed explanation itself has been announced with sufficient distinctness. And it may be of some interest and advantage to direct attention to it at once. All that is intended in this paper is to state the impression—formed after a somewhat hurried reading of the book—regarding Professor Duff's proposed solution of a difficult problem.

To the critic the Book of Deuteronomy may be regarded either as a godsend or as a thorn in the flesh, according to the point of view. If the date of the book and the occasion of its production could be conclusively proved, the history of Israel might be more satisfactorily constructed (or reconstructed) than it has been in some of the books which have been recently produced. But for proof there is little else than conjecture, and conjectures are nearly as numerous as the critics. It is true that critical opinion is in substantial agreement as to the time when the Deuteronomic legislation became *operative*. But the exact date when the code was prepared, and the circumstances which led to its production, are matters of dispute, and, till this dispute is settled, the Book of Deuteronomy cannot be used with confidence in a scheme for the reconstruction of the history of Israel. Of the various opinions which have been propounded regarding the origin of Deuteronomy, it may be of some interest to place that of Ewald alongside of the new solution suggested by

¹ *Old Testament Theology; or, The History of Hebrew Religion.* Vol. ii. The Deuteronomic Reformation in Century vii. B.C. By Archibald Duff, LL.D., B.D., Professor of Old Testament Theology in the United College, Bradford, Yorks. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1900.

² *Prolegomena*, Eng. trans., 1885, p. 9.