

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES, EPIPHANY, AND BAPTISM.

MOST of this paper was written before Dr Bernard's article on the Odes of Solomon appeared in this JOURNAL in October 1910. His investigation tends to shew that they are nothing more or less than *Hymns of the Baptized*, and to my mind is quite conclusive. It does, however, occur to the reader that what is a commonplace in early Christian literature (as, for instance, illumination in Heb. vi 4 implying baptism, the white robes which accompany it, and many more symbolic phrases and usages) itself demands an explanation, all the more so if it is as early as the time of Justin Martyr. Assuming the date of the Odes to be about A.D. 100, the question arises, how all this wealth of symbolic phrase and usage can be found in its flourishing exuberance around the ceremony of Christian baptism. Could it possibly have grown up in sixty or seventy years? If it did, out of what did it grow?

The train of thought pursued in the following paper may perhaps throw some light upon this question, and in brief it is this. The imagery of baptism has been taken over from that of the Feast of Tabernacles, and more especially from the unique ceremony of the water-bearing from Siloam, the literature connected with it, which is chiefly to be seen in the *Greek version* of Isaiah lx, lxi, lxii, having served as a guide to the tradition.

Of the three great Jewish festivals, two, the Feast of Passover and the Feast of Weeks, have been taken over into the Christian Church, which has transformed them into Easter and Whitsunday; but the third, though 'far the greatest and holiest', as Josephus¹ calls it, has been so far discontinued that we know not what is become of it.² As a document it is neglected. Yet it was the great rejoicing of the year; it was solemnized by memorial and immemorial rites; it was thronged by a huge concourse; it was the most picturesque and the most joyous of the feasts. 'He who has never seen the rejoicing at the pouring out of the water of Siloam'—so ran the proverb—'has never seen rejoicing in his life.'

¹ *Antt.* viii 4. 1.

² 'No counterpart in the Christian year', Edersheim *Life and Times of Jesus* IV vii.

Though the duration of the feast was, strictly speaking, seven days, they were followed by a day of holy convocation, or κλητῆ ἀγία, or what Heb. xii 23 might very well call πανήγυρις, which was sometimes considered an eighth day. The biblical account of the origin of the feast is in Neh. viii 14 ff, 'for since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun until that day had not the children of Israel done so.' Now, since the days of Jeshua were precisely those in which the actual practice of dwelling in booths by supposition ended, it is plain that the practice at Jerusalem had never been part of a commemorative feast, in other words, never existed, till the time of Nehemiah, when it was brought into connexion with history by means of a legislative order issued as the Law of Moses. From that moment it received new significance and life.

The first feature that we notice is the reading of the law. A wooden pulpit being erected for the purpose in the Court of the women, the assembly being summoned by trumpet, Ezra reads the law 'day by day from the first day to the last day'. We may speculate on a connexion of Ps. cxix with this fact.

Next, the water-bearing was destined to be connected with ideas of the first importance. On each day of the feast the water was taken from the healing fount of Siloam, and brought by a priest in a golden flagon through the water-gate with the blare of trumpets. At the outer gate of the Temple other priests received it from him with the words of Is. xii 3, 'With joy ye shall draw water from the wells of salvation', the priests and people joining in acclaim. The water was then mixed with wine and poured into a silver basin by the altar, whence it flowed by a pipe to Kedron and so theoretically to Jordan. The reference to this in 'living water' (Jo. vii 37 f) is admitted. R. Akibah gave the reason thus: 'Bring the libation of water at the Feast of Tabernacles, that the showers may be blessed to thee. And accordingly it is said, that whosoever will not come up to the Feast of Tabernacles shall have no rain.' This saying supports the idea that here was an ancient rain-charm. On the other hand R. Levi¹ (*Jerusalem Talmud*) says: 'Why is it called the drawing of water? Because of the drawing or pouring out of the Holy Ghost, according as it is said, With joy,' &c., quoting Is. xii 3.

Thirdly, illumination by night followed the water-drawing. Four huge beacons were erected and lighted up with plenty of oil and yarn, and the priests' disused garments. The reference of the words in Jo. viii 12 is admitted, when on the last day of the feast they went about the altar seven times.

This procession took the place, fourthly, of the torch-dance on the other days, performed by the leading priests and elders and scribes and rulers of synagogues with psalms and trumpets.

¹ Lightfoot *The Temple Service* xvi, ed. Pitman, 1823, vol. ix.

Fifthly, the great Hallel (Ps. cxiii-cxviii) was sung daily, and at the words, 'O give thanks unto the Lord', all the company shook their branches, Ps. cxviii 27: 'Marshal the procession with the boughs up to the horns of the altar', says Dr King, and he shews that *hag* involves a sacred dance.

The use of these branches and the thick boughs will be noticed presently. Meanwhile, we observe that R. Akibah's saying has provided no answer to the question, Why from Siloam? That of R. Levi is a spiritualizing explanation which fails as history. There was no period at which the Jewish people would have been familiar with the notion of drawing the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, we may perhaps learn something from Isaiah, as R. Levi did, by way of answer to our question, Why from Siloam? Following Nehemiah's account we may suppose that the founders of the Feast at that time had before them the solemn warning in Is. viii 6, 'Forasmuch as this people refused the waters of Siloam that go softly . . . now, therefore, behold the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the River, strong and many, the king of Assyria and all his glory . . . and he shall pass through Judah: he shall overflow and pass through.'

Nehemiah and Ezra had resolved to check an unseasonable burst of penitence on the part of the people, and to claim the Feast of Tabernacles for joy and festivity, a tone which it never ceased to bear. But the tone of merriment made it all the more important to guard the solemn thought of the past,—'Lest we forget.' The magnitude of the sacrifices, the uproarious crowds waving their *thyrsi*, the big bonfires in the temple court, must find their contrast in a very simple performance, the carrying of a small quantity of water. And as the Passover was associated with the very ancient deliverance out of Egypt, so the Booth-feast was to be associated with the more modern but equally memorable deliverance from Assyria. The world-power of the South had been overcome by the Exodus; the world-power of the East had been overcome by the Anointed of Jehovah, Cyrus, whom, with his successors, the chosen people had to thank under God for their present prosperity and their future hopes. The one thing that must never again be refused by them was the waters of Siloam that go softly; and from that healing fount, and no other, must they be drawn with humility and the shout of thanksgiving.

The Siloam-water was therefore a sort of protest against the idea that Isaiah's warning (viii 6) should ever be required again: the ceremony was intended to enshrine that warning in a public act. Nevertheless, as we look back upon the history of the century preceding A. D. 70 we can see how the Jewish people did again disregard the warning: they allowed the ceremony to become a superstition; therefore, behold, the

Lord brought up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, the king of Assyria in the person of Herod and his hellenizing successors, who threw the devastating power for the second time in Jewish history into the hands of Babylon, but this time Babylon was Rome.

We may now pass on to consider the three chapters of Isaiah, lx, lxi, lxii, that have hitherto been in search, as it were, of their mother, the occasion which brought them forth. We shall see how very close is their connexion with the great feast. I can find no recognition of the parallelism by commentators or expositors. This is the more strange because the date of the composition of Is. lx is placed upon independent grounds near to that of the book of Nehemiah. Cheyne¹ says: 'Chapters 56-66 contain no works of the second Isaiah, but, with the possible exception of lxiii 7-lxiv 12, belong to nearly the same period—that of Nehemiah. Duhm, indeed, assigns all these eleven chapters to a single writer of Nehemiah's age, whom he calls Tritto-Isaiah.' It seems then to be most probable that the Feast and the chapter (to which it will be admitted that chapters lxi and lxii are companions) originate in the same period.

First of all, then, Is. lx is a hymn or ode so entirely appropriate to the illumination that it seems impossible to doubt the reference. Let us imagine the appearance of the Temple at the rise of the full harvest moon after the fifteenth day of the seventh month (Lev. xxiii 34). Theoretically the Feast was timed to cover the autumnal equinox, and on one evening of it the effect would be sublime, when no sooner had the sun plunged in the west than the full moon—

'That orb'd maiden, with white fire laden,
Whom mortals call the moon'—

rose into view in the east. The symbolism of these two luminaries, the one succeeding the other, could have no closer commentary in words than those of Is. lx. If the 'glorious morning face' had been radiant with the welcome at sunrise, 'Arise, shine, for thy light is come', at eve the moon's companion light keeps open the gates for the world's wealth to enter the city (lx 11), 'Thy gates shall be open continually: they shall not be shut day nor night.' And yet both luminaries are seen to pale before some greater light: 'The sun shall be no more thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory' (lx 19). This is the contrast, and yet the contrasted lights of the sky by their very succession suggest also a similitude. 'Thy sun shall no more go down, nor shall thy moon withdraw itself: for the Lord shall

¹ *Enc. Bib.* s.v. 'Book of Isaiah' 21.,

be thine everlasting light' (lx 20). 'I have set watchmen (the sun and the moon¹ as they rise and set) above thy walls: they shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that are the Lord's remembrancers, keep ye not silence, and give him no silence, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth' (lxii 6). The thought recalls Ps. xix 2. The beacon-fires also receive a reference in Is. lxii 1, 'until her righteousness go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a lamp that burneth', where the 'brightness' is that of the morning sun (Is. lx 19) bursting through the night, and the 'lamp' is rather a blazing beacon. It follows that when night is thus turned into day the city is made a blaze of light, an 'eternal splendour' (Is. lx 15), and yet there is no fear of a hostile attack, though the gates are open. The crowds that are to throng them are crowds of proselytes to be, and we can well understand their singing in antiphon the verse of the great Hallel (Ps. cxviii 19), 'Open for me the gates of *righteousness*.'

This leads us to the main theme of Is. lx, 'the abundant access of the Gentiles.' 'The Gentiles shall come to thy light' (lx 3). The future sons and daughters of Jerusalem are seen carried in the arms and on the shoulders of the admiring eager crowd, which is not merely a common people, for 'kings' also 'walk to the shining of her rays'. 'Lift up thine eyes round about and see,' says the prophet, 'the abundance of the sea, the wealth of the Gentiles, the camels, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah, the gold and frankincense from Sheba, the flocks of Kedar, the ships of Tarshish.' What could be more graphic and picturesque? What could be more particular and less general? The description is that of a festival, not of a typical Eastern day by any means. Now the Talmud² says that the Hallel was instituted for a twofold object, to celebrate festival days, and to commemorate deliverance from a great danger. The date of the composition of the Hallel seems to be fixed as late as hellenizing times by the description of the idols to which Ps. cxv 4 ff refers with a scornful sarcasm. The idols of silver and gold, with mouth, eyes, ears, nose, hands and feet, are Greek and not Babylonian or Assyrian images. And yet, though two or three centuries later than Is. lx-lxii, the Hallel emphasizes the presence of gentiles at the great feast, 'the *fearers* of Jehovah' (cxv 13), 'praise ye Jehovah, ye *nations*' (cxvii 1), 'let the *fearers* of Jehovah now say, For his mercy,' &c. (cxviii 4), 'open me the gates of *righteousness*' (cxviii 19), and 'He maketh the barren to keep house as the children's joyful mother' (cxiii 9).

Another point of contact between Is. lx-lxii and the Hallel is obvious

¹ Is it not rather prosy and insipid here to say they are either prophets or angels?

² *Pesachim* 117, as quoted by Cheyne *Origin of the Psalter* p. 18 note.

—the conversion of names of Zion which follows upon her converted state after the large admission of the Gentiles. 'All they that despised thee shall bow down at the soles of thy feet, and *they shall call* thee The city of Jehovah, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel' (Is. lx 14); '*Thou shalt call* thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise' (Is. lx 18); '*I will make* thy officers Peace, and thy taskmasters Righteousness' (Is. lx 17); '*Ye shall be named* The Priests of Jehovah: men shall call you The Ministers of our God' (Is. lxi 6); '*Thou shalt no more be termed* Forsaken, nor thy land Desolate; but thou *shalt be called* Hephzi-bah (my delight is in her), and thy land Beulah (married)' (Is. lxii 4); '*And they shall call* them The holy people, The redeemed of the Lord: and thou *shalt be called* Sought out, A city not forsaken' (Is. lxii 12); The Hallel shews the same feature in Ps. cxiii 9 quoted above, '*Judah became* His Sanctuary' (Ps. cxiv 2); '*Who turneth* the Rock into A pool of water, the Flint into Water-springs' (Ps. cxiv 8); '*Gracious* is Jehovah and Righteous; yea, our God is *Compassionate*' (Ps. cxvi 5).

The next point that we notice is the reference made in Is. lx 5 to the noise of the sacred water flowing into the silver basin whence it was conducted towards the Dead Sea: 'Then shalt thou see and flow as a river, and thine heart shall tremble and be enlarged, because the noise of the sea shall be turned toward thee, the wealth of the Gentiles shall come unto thee.' 'The daughter of Zion is compared to a river into which tributary streams (the Gentile nations) suddenly pour themselves.'¹ So the Siloam water delivers 'its tribute wave' to the Jordan. The noise as it plashed into the silver basin was made further to symbolize the flow of the sea and the abundance of its merchandise turning from the Western isles of the Mediterranean eastwards to Zion. The word for *noise*, which equally means *abundance*, is finely chosen for its double meaning. Any one who will consult Madden's *Coins of the Jews* will see how the flagon for the water-bearing is frequently depicted on the shekel, half-shekel, and copper coins. It is best seen on coins of the date A.D. 66, 67, which were copied in the time of Barcochba, A.D. 132-135. In the age of Simon the Maccabee the design was a cup (Ps. cxvi 13 'I will take *the Cup* of Salvation'²), and the cup was developed in the design, as probably in historical fact, into a flagon later. The legend is *The Redemption of Zion*, which takes us back to Is. lx 16 'I the Lord am thy Redeemer' and Is. lxii 12 'And they shall call them The Redeemed of Jehovah'.

Another characteristic feature of the great feast is presented on the copper coinage of the same age 141-135 B.C., to which the reference in

¹ King on Ps. xxxiv.

² The word is $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{D}$, cognate with $\text{H}^{\text{I}}\text{D}$, flagon. So R. V. in Ex. xxv 29, xxxvii 16; and so probably in Num. iv 7.

Is. lx is rather less certain until the actual reproduction in Madden is consulted. This is the *lulab* or bunch or *thyrsus*¹ already mentioned. The *lulab* was strictly speaking a palm-branch in its immature stage before the fronds have separated and while it retains its sceptre-like condition so well suited to symbolize kingdom. It was bound up with the sprig of myrtle and the sprig of willow.² But the palm is not indigenous at Jerusalem and was not always procurable. The Barcochba coinage represents the *lulab* as more like a plant than anything else, with root, leaves, and flowers, not unlike a mangold, resting on a squat base. The coinage of 270 years earlier shews something like the flower of this *lulab* alone, and was conjectured by Madden to represent Aaron's rod, though doubtfully. It is perhaps more likely to represent three sprigs of willow used at the feast.

Now there is in the Hebrew of Is. lx–lxii a trace or two of reference to the use of the *lulab*. Is. lx 21 'The branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified'; lxi 3 'to give unto them [that mourn in Zion] a coronet³ for ashes . . . that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified'; lxi 11 'For as the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth; so the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations'. The latter words are especially appropriate to the occasion of the feast, at which the swarming myriads of men and women, each bearing the *lulab* in one hand and the citron in the other, must have made the Temple and its neighbourhood to appear like a living and moving garden or plantation.

So far the Hebrew: but when we come to the Greek of Is. lx 21 we find a strange translation, '*maintaining the plant* (*φυλάσων τὸ φύτευμα*), the works of its hand (or their hands⁴) unto glory.' Here, as in lx 1, the Greek translator seems to be awake to the fitness of the Ode to the occasion, no less than the Hebrew, of which, however, he has changed the sense. The Hebrew represents the people as 'the branch of my

¹ The *thyrsus*, a Greek or pagan implement, was a pole with an ornamental head formed by a fir-cone or by ivy or by vine-leaves (see Rich *Dict. of Antt.* s.v.), and to call a *lulab* a *thyrsus* is only a loose if convenient use of the term. There was a resemblance, which in after years caused the confusion at Alexandria between the Jewish feast and that of the appearance of Dionysus observed on January 6 (*Enc. Bib.* s.v. 'Nativity' § 10). But the exact appearance of the *lulab* must be seen on the coinage, where it appears in company with the *ethrog* or citron, another characteristic emblem of the feast.

² Buxtorf *Lex. Chald.* 1143.

³ **כִּתְרֵי** is cognate with **כִּתְרֵי**, 'sprigs' or 'branches' (six times in Ezekiel).

⁴ This, the Sinaitic MS reading, makes no difference whatever to the sense, which in any case is 'the people's hands', not the Lord's.

planting', 'the sprout of my plantations': the Greek says 'the people maintains the plant which its hands have made'. The 'plant' I claim to be the *lulab*, which closely resembled a plant, as the coinage shews. The translator of Is. lx at Alexandria had probably visited the great feast at Jerusalem, or at least was aware of the exact appearance of the *lulab*. Impressed with the immemorial ceremony he translated with the emphasis on the traditional side of it, and on the characteristic emblem. And four verses later (Is. lxi 3) he goes on to recognize the name of the people: 'They shall be called Generations of righteousness, A plant of the Lord for glory.' He has therefore made *two* ideas where the Hebrew has one, which it repeats.

As to the willow there can be no doubt as to the origin of its use; it was (Is. lxi 1) 'to proclaim liberty to the captives' by a reminder; it was the emblem of the Captivity that was now turned into Deliverance. 'By the willows in Babylon we had hanged our harps' (Ps. cxxxvii 2). In later times the closing day of the feast was called 'the day of willows'. This, it seems, is the explanation of the device on the shekel of Simon the Maccabee, 'the Redemption of Zion.' But the bundle of branches, the bunch of palm, willow, and myrtle—the 'work of the people's hands', because tied together with gold or silver twist or twigs so as to resemble (as it is here suggested) 'the plant'—was named *lulab* after the predominant palm. This was *maintained*, carried continually in the hand. These are some of the details which the Ode passes over in a poet's bird's-eye sweep.

Not so the vast quantities of branches that the feast required for the making of booths, for outside the booths they might neither eat nor drink nor sleep throughout the feast. 'The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee in the cypress and pine (*rather* plane) and cedar together, to glorify the place of my sanctuary, and to make the place of my feet honourable' (Is. lx 13), i. e. good shelter was provided by the spreading cedar and cypress branches, 'the boughs of *thick* trees' (Lev. xxiii 40). The city must have presented a bosky appearance to the beholder from the hills round about it, 'like a garden' (Is. lxi 11), 'that they may be called Oaks of righteousness, the Plantation of Jehovah that he might be glorified' (Is. lxi 3).

Lastly. If the booths required much material, the provisioning of the thronging multitudes on this occasion required more.¹ Now it is

¹ The normal accommodation was extremely limited. Fergusson, from the architect's point of view, observes (*Dictionary of the Bible* s.v. 'Jerusalem') that 'the population of Jerusalem in the days of greatest prosperity may have amounted to from 30,000 to 45,000 souls, but could hardly ever have reached 50,000; and assuming that in times of festival one half were added to this amount, which is an extreme estimate, there may have been 60,000 to 70,000 in the city when Titus

not beneath the prophet's poetical pen to describe a sheep-fair in connexion with the provisioning. 'And all the sheep-flocks of Kedar and the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee' (Is. lx 7), 'they shall come up acceptably upon mine altar.' 'Strangers shall stand and feed your flocks' (Is. lxi 5), i. e. the flocks destined to become yours. And then he strains his gaze across the western sea to descry the purveyors of merchandise about to attend the feast (Is. lx 9), bringing their silver and their gold which they will offer and will spend for the benefit of trade. The idea of mercantile prosperity is certainly present: 'Instead of copper I will bring gold and instead of iron I will bring silver, and instead of wood copper, and instead of stones iron' (Is. lx 17).

We now pass suddenly from the Tabernacles at Jerusalem to the Benediction of the Waters as performed at Petersburg in modern times, and we shall hardly fail to recognize a very close resemblance between the two ceremonial observances. The Petersburg ceremony is performed at Epiphany, which is called 'The Lights'. This name is now generally supposed to be due to the array of torches and tapers accompanying the service, symbolizing as they do 'the spiritual illumination to which our Lord by His baptism in Jordan consecrated water'.¹ But at present we are dealing not with the symbolism but with the history. The torches illustrate the meaning of the name of 'The Lights', but do not explain its origin. Dr J. G. King describes what he saw in or about 1780 as follows:—

'On the river upon the ice a kind of wooden church is raised, painted and richly gilt, and hung round with pictures, especially of S. John Baptist; this is called the Jordan, a name used to signify the baptistery or font. The Jordan is surrounded by a temporary hedge of the boughs of fir-trees; and in the middle of it a hole is cut through the ice into the water: a platform of boards covered with red cloth is laid down for the procession to pass upon, also guarded with a fence of fir boughs. . . . The Clerks, the Deacons, the Priests, the Archimandrites, and the Bishops, vested in their richest robes and carrying in their hands lighted tapers, the censer, the Gospel, and the sacred pictures and banners, proceed from the chapel to the Jordan, singing the hymns appointed for the office; followed by the Emperor and the whole court. All the troops of the city are drawn up round the place. The artillery and soldiers fire as soon as the service is finished, and then are sprinkled with the sanctified water. The water is held in such

came up against it'. This difficult question is here beyond our scope, but the relative proportion of mouths to be fed for eight days would be very great, for in September the weather permitted of encampment on the hills outside the city.

¹ Neale *History of the Holy Eastern Church* part i p. 754.

estimation by the common people that they look on it as a preservative from, as well as a cure of, not only spiritual but natural infirmities. The aged, the sick, and especially children, are brought in numbers to receive the benefit of these waters, by drinking them at the place, or by aspersion or immersion. Vast quantities are carried home by them in bottles. It is considered to have great efficacy to drive away evil spirits.'

For the purpose of illustrating this graphic description many details can now be conveniently read in Mr F. C. Conybeare's *Rituale Armenorum*, which includes the Epiphany Rite of the Blessing of the Waters. A few of the more obvious traces of the Skenopegia in that Rite are here noted, out of an abundance:—

'O thou who hast said to us through the prophet Isaiah, With joy shall ye draw water from the wells of salvation' (see p. 226 above).

'To-day the moon is brightened with (the sun) with bright rays for the world' (see p. 228 above).

'To-day we are set free from our ancient lament, and are saved as a new Israel' (see pp. 227, 230 above).

'To-day is the holy and resounding (or illuminated) general assembly (πανήγυρις) of the orthodox' (see pp. 226, 229 above).

'Make the water a fount of immortality, a gift of sanctification, a ransom from sins, preventive of diseases, destructive to demons, inaccessible to the adverse powers, fulfilled with angelic strength' (see pp. 230, 231, 232 above and p. 240 below).

Further the Armenian rite speaks of the waters themselves as Theophaneia, an adjectival substantive (θεοφάνεια), while it proclaims that God sanctified the Jordan streams by His immaculate Epiphany.¹ It says, 'To-day the grace of the Holy Spirit sanctifying the waters appeareth (ἐπιφαίνεται) upon these.' 'On behalf of them that drain and draw unto the sanctification of souls and bodies we beseech thee.'² Throughout the rite there is the incessant repetition of the idea of Light and Lights in connexion with that of Waters. 'To-day the darkness of the world is destroyed by the Epiphany of the Holy Spirit.' 'To-day the fountains of the waters were sanctified when Christ appeared (ἐπιφανέντος) in glory in Jordan river.' The priest enters wearing a stole for the laver with the censer and tapers.³ The usual word for font in the Greek Church is κολυμβήθρα which refers undoubtedly to the Pool of Siloam (κολ. occurs thrice in St John, of Bethesda and Siloam, and nowhere else in N. T. : of Siloam in O. T. and also of other Pools). The saving and healing effect of the waters after benediction is conveyed incessantly, recalling the beneficial powers of Siloam. But it

¹ Barberini *Euchologion* Conybeare p. 415 foll.

² Grotta Ferrata MS p. 421 foll.

³ Bodl. MS p. 430 foll.

would be vain to disentangle the various trains of thought which this Rite has combined—God *appears*, Christ *appears*, the Holy Spirit *appears*, each of the Three Persons has His *Epiphany*. The framers of the Rite did not understand the origin or the original purpose of it, but blindly and faithfully had they resolved to perpetuate a tradition which had enjoyed an immemorial existence connected with Lights and Waters.

The identity of this ceremony with that of the Feast of Tabernacles is beyond dispute. No less than eight characteristic features of the Jewish feast are represented at Petersburg. (1) The name of The Lights which is reflected in the abundant use of torches and tapers reproduces the bonfires in the Temple, and the torch-dance by the priests, elders, scribes, and archisynagogi, to whom the clerks, the deacons, the priests, the archimandrites correspond. (2) The drawing of the saving waters from the Neva for the Jordan reproduces the drawing of the water from the saving fount of Siloam which was made to flow to Jordan. (3) The use of fir-boughs and a wooden booth reproduces the boughs of thick trees, 'cedar, plane, and cypress', at Jerusalem. (4) The reading of lessons which include 'Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of Salvation' (Is. xii 3), the selfsame time-honoured text of the great Feast, reproduces the solemn reading of the Law by Ezra and his successors. (5) The fence of fir-boughs guarding the wooden platform covered with red cloth reproduces the wooden pulpit erected in the Court of the Women. (6) The singing of hymns perpetuates the use of the great Hallel, which though not precisely part of the canon of the Benediction is reproduced in a free running commentary¹ of varying phraseology in the Armenian and Syrian Rites. And to these six parallels we may add (7) the blare of trumpets by the army (p. 226 above) to say nothing of (8) the presence of 'Kings' (Is. lx 3). Could one, after eighteen centuries, expect a closer resemblance? And this ceremony takes place on January 6, the day which in the Constantinopolitan calendar of the Jewish Church is called the Holy Theophany. The relative importance of this festival as tested by its four days of vigil is second only to Easter and Pentecost in the calendar. The Armenian Church observes on the same January 6 the Nativity, the Epiphany, and the Baptism, for which observance the

¹ The correspondence of the Hallel and the Ritual Hymn may here be briefly indicated in regard to the main themes—God's humiliation has raised His people (Ps. cxiii) = pp. 171, 186 (Conybeare *Rit. Arm.*). All nature was moved, Jordan was turned back (Ps. cxiv) = pp. 174, 190, 314. Scorn of idolatry (Ps. cxv) = pp. 186, 188, 'the futile *worship of pillars*'—but the usages of the Eastern Church are hardly iconoclastic. Uplifting from captivity by the compassion of God (Ps. cxvi) = pp. 188, 305. Loving-kindness (Ps. cxvii) = p. 305. The Head of the Corner (Ps. cxviii) = pp. 312, 317. The above are only samples of many more.

Greeks and Latins bring against it the charge of heretical practice. Yet it seems, as Neale remarks, to be an original custom of their Church.

But after discovering the essential identity of our Epiphany with the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, the question arises whether we can discern the means and the occasion of the transition. For this purpose we may again refer to Is. lx in order first of all to explain the difference of name.

The Eastern Church has Theophany and Epiphany, ours only the latter. It is worth while to point out that the name Epiphany is not correctly translated—perhaps translation was not intended—by the alternative title in the Book of Common Prayer, ‘Or Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles.’ This would not be Epiphany, but Phanerosis.¹ The meaning of Epiphany is appearance, and especially that of dawn or other light. The Roman Missal has given the name with its right translation: ‘*In apparitione seu Epiphania Domini nostri I. C.*’; and so the Breviary: ‘*In festo apparitionis Domini.*’ It is applied to the first and to the second coming of Christ, but it is wholly inapplicable to this manifestation to the Gentiles in the person of the Magi or others. To the star which appeared to the Magi it would apply correctly, but the infant Christ did not come to the Gentiles or (except in a figure) appear to them. They came to Him. The name is a misnomer in this connexion. But when, dismissing the explanation in our Prayer-book, we compare the names Epiphany and Theophany, we begin to see that there is a meaning in both: there was a Dawning, there was a Dayspring in which God appeared. Now Is. lx 2 contains the thought as we have already seen it applied to the Jewish Feast. ‘Lighten thou, lighten thou (*φωτίζου*), Jerusalem, for thy light hath come, and the glory of the Lord hath risen upon thee (*ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν*). Behold, darkness shall cover the earth, and gloom upon the nations; but upon thee shall appear the Lord (*ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται Κύριος*), and his glory shall be seen upon thee.’ Here is the origin of the name of The Lights. The prophecy of Is. lx is the middle point between the Eastern term Theophany and the Anglican Epiphany. But what is much more important than that, it is the middle term between the Skenopegia and the modern festival of The Lights.

But there is some further light to be obtained on the actual transition from the Skenopegia to Baptism in the observance of the date of the Lord’s baptism by the followers of Basilides. Clement of Alexandria gives the first mention of this observance. In reference to the date of His birth he says (Strom. i 21, 340 B): ‘And there are those who have determined not only the year of our Lord’s birth but also the day:

¹ Justin M. *Dial.* 53 uses the term—*μετὰ τὴν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἡμετέρου Χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ γένει ἡμῶν φανέρωσιν καὶ θάνατον.*

and they say that it took place in the 28th year of Augustus, and on the 25th day of Pachon (May 20). And the followers of Basilides hold the day of his baptism also as a festival, *spending the night before in readings*. And they say that it was the 15th year of Tiberius Caesar, the 15th day of the month Tybi (Jan. 11), and some that it was the 11th of the same month (Jan. 7). . . . Further, others say that he was born on the 24th or 25th of Pharmuthi' (Apr. 20 or 21). This is conclusive evidence against a general recognition of the festivals of the Nativity and the Baptism in Clement's time about A.D. 200. On the other hand, Clement was in a position to speak with knowledge of the observance of the day of Christ's Baptism, for the followers of Basilides lived at Alexandria, and fixed the day as the 15th of the month. There may very well have been a preference for the 15th day on the ground that the Feast of Tabernacles began on the 15th of a month, though this was changed from autumn to winter.

The night before being spent in readings reminds us of the reading of the law from the wooden pulpit at the Skenopegia in Jerusalem. But since lights were kept burning for the purpose all night, we have a second feature of the Feast here implied—the Lights. There is no question of the reason why the Basilideans honoured the day of the Baptism—because their master held that the light¹ came down from the Hebdomad at the Baptism, as well as at the Annunciation, 'upon Jesus the Son of Mary', that 'he was enlightened because kindled in union with the light (*συνεξαφθεις τῷ φωτι*) that shone upon him at the Baptism'. The allusion to the traditional 'light on Jordan' can hardly be questioned.

The significance of these facts appears from the position of Basilides. That he claimed to be an inheritor of Jewish prophecy as well as a Christian is proved by the fact² that 'he mentions Barcabbas and Barcoph as prophets, and invents others for himself that never existed'. Now it is certain that these two names mentioned by Eusebius as given by the orthodox champion Agrippa Castor are ironical parodies of the true names of Basilides' prophets, for no man would own prophets called 'Son of a curse' and 'Son of apes'. It is probable that their authorized names were 'Son of glory' and 'Son of my hand', and that the perversion was due to the temptation of controversy. Just in the same way the mock Messiah, Simon, surnamed by the people Bar-kokeba, Son of a star, in this same time of Basilides (A.D. 117-138) came to be known before he fell as Bar-kosiba, Son of a lie.

No orthodox Christian of A.D. 135 would have ventured to authorize

¹ *Dict. Christian Biography*, 'Basilides' (Hort).

² So says Agrippa Castor (Eus. *H. E.* iv 7) 'one of the most famous writers of the time', the first writer against heresy, who refuted Basilides.

prophets of his own: much less would he have called them by Jewish names suggesting Barjesus, the alternative name of Elymas the sorcerer. But in fact Agrippa Castor charges Basilides with jugglery (*γοηρείας*) which is not far short of sorcery: here again allowance must be made for controversy. For on the other hand Basilides wrote twenty-four books 'on the Gospel', and however full of perverted interpretation this work was, 'its general character appears', says¹ Dr Lightfoot, 'from the fact that Clement of Alexandria quotes it under the title of *Exegetics*'. He also says: 'The Gnostic leaders were in some instances no mean thinkers: but they were almost invariably bad exegetes.' Basilides at any rate had this much in common with Justin, who wrote rather later, that he associated the Baptism of Christ with the idea of lights, going further than Justin in holding that the 15th day of a certain month should be fixed for the observance of it.

Further it is incontestable that Basilides was a Jew, whose Greek name conceals a Jewish name like Ben-melech or Barmelech. For no Gentile Christian would have chosen prophets 'of his own' bearing Jewish names. No Gentile Christian would have invented a name for the universe in which the Saviour descended and ascended called Caulacau (Is. xxviii 10, *line upon line*: LXX 'hope upon hope'). Of no Gentile could it be said² that 'they profess to be no longer Jews, though not yet Christians'. And yet Basilides and his son Isidorus said that Matthias³ communicated to them secret discourses which by special instruction he had heard from the Saviour. The Jewish origin of Basilides joined him to those who knew and had attended the Tabernacles at Jerusalem before A.D. 68. He might indeed have witnessed it himself. His life fills the time when the Feast of Tabernacles ceased to be what it was and the Feast of Lights began as such.

Now there is one fragment of his teaching which shews that the question of light and lights was one that particularly occupied his thought⁴:—

'But God spake and it was done, and this is that which is said by Moses: Let there be light, and there was light. Whence came the light? Out of nothing: for we are not told whence it came, but only that it was at the voice of him that spake. Now he that spake was not, and that which was made was not. Out of that which was not was made the seed of the world, the word which was spoken, Let there be light: and this is that which is spoken in the Gospels, There

¹ *Essays on S. R.* 161.

² *Iren.* i 24. 6.

³ Hippolytus, *Ref. Haer.*

⁴ Hippol. *l.c.* 'He says' interrupts this passage frequently. Doubtless Basilides is he.

was the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world. He derives his originating principles from the seed, and obtains from the same source his enlightening power.'

And during the lifetime of Basilides, Ignatius was writing:—

'He was born and was baptized that by his passion he might cleanse water' (Ign. Eph. 18)! Here is the first reference to something like the Blessing of the Waters. And he continues:—

'... How then were they made manifest to the ages? A star shone forth in heaven above all the stars, and its light was unutterable, and its strangeness caused amazement... From thenceforward every sorcery and every spell was dissolved... the abolishing of death was taken in hand.'

Thus does Ignatius connect the Epiphany Light with the waters.

Now we come to the close correspondence between the Odes of Solomon and the literary picture of the Skenopegia in the Greek of Is. lx–lxii, and observe the natural development of the one by direct tradition into the other. I follow Dr Bernard's order ('Odes of Solomon' in *J.T.S.* Oct. 1910).

(p. 5) *The use of φωτισμός*, 'baptism', and φωτισθέντες, 'baptized persons', originates in Is. lx 1 ff. Φωτίζου, φωτίζου, Ἱερουσαλήμ, which had come to mean the Christian Church as early as Gal. iv 26, 'the mother of us all', who are baptized. 'Behold thy children gathered together' (Is. lx 4).

(p. 5) *The white robes* of the newly baptized originate in Is. lxi 3, 'a raiment of glory to be given to them that mourned in Sion.' 'I was clothed with the covering of thy spirit' (Ode 25) is the idea of Is. lxi 10. 'Let my spirit rejoice upon the Lord: for he hath clothed me with the garment of salvation and the vesture of gladness.' One may hesitate to touch the question of the words which follow: 'and thou didst remove from me the raiment of skin.' And yet one is tempted to think whether the Baptism of John is not intended in this Ode. In the case of a convert from John's Baptism (Acts xix 3) would not these words be very appropriate? One may imagine that the disciples of John wore leather aprons for baptism, and that there is a reference to this in Apoc. iii 18, 'white garments that thou mayest clothe thyself *instead of the shame of thy nakedness* being manifested.' This is speculation, but there is some ground for a conjecture that when Justin speaks in the same context of 'fire actually being kindled in the Jordan when Jesus had gone down to the water', he is influenced by the story of *Elijah's* ascent from Jordan, of which Papias or some early Christian writer discovered a fulfilment in the Baptism of Jesus.

(p. 7) 'They who put on me shall suffer no harm, but they shall gain the whole world that is incorruptible.' This reproduces Is. lx 21, 'For

ever shall they inherit the world', and 18, 'wrong and harm shall not be heard of in thy world.'

(p. 7) 'He is as a *garland on my head*.' 'An *everlasting* crown for ever is Truth.' The crowning of the newly baptized has its original in Is. lxii 3, *καὶ ἔσῃ στέφανος κάλλους ἐν χειρὶ Κυρίου καὶ διάδημα βασιλείας ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ σου*. 'Come into this Paradise and make thee a garland from its tree, and put it on thy head and *be glad*', is framed upon Is. lxi 7 *καὶ εὐφροσύνη αἰώνιος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν*.

(p. 8) *The Living Water* is doubtless based upon Ezek. xlvi, but the point is that *the water of remission* as there described must of necessity be identified with Siloam. Not, of course, that Ezekiel was thinking of the water-bearing, which was not instituted when he wrote, but he pointed to a mode of utilizing the water of Siloam. The water is so full of life, he says, that, even where the brook Kedron which it feeds debouches into the Dead Sea near Engedi, the fish are abundant. Then the LXX of xlvi 3 caused it to be believed that the Siloam water was *water of forgiveness*—a very important point for baptism—though they only meant *water let off* (*ὑδωρ ἀφέσεως*). That Barnabas, Melito, and Ephrem should discern in the passage a clear reference to Christian baptism is entirely natural. And Barnabas joins with this fulfilment another, τὸ *ὑδωρ αὐτοῦ πιστόν* (Is. xxxiii 16) of baptism.

There is one important feature of the Siloam water-bearing which has not yet been noticed. The *water was mixed with wine* at the altar and then poured out. This seems to me to be behind Jo. xix 34 f. Christ, the Rock of Ages, is smitten and pierced, and 'thereout came blood and water'. The great emphasis which is laid upon the fact—'he that hath seen'—shews its importance. 'Not by water only but by water and blood' (1 Jo. v 6); not by baptism only but by baptism and the cross. But the two are seen by Barnabas (*Ep. of Barn.* 11) also to be inseparable. 'Ye perceive how he pointed out the water and the cross *together*.' The 'Tree planted by the water-side' is the cross beside baptism; and he quotes Ps. i.

But where is there a similar thought in the Odes? Ode 38¹³ has the single reference to wine. And it is quite enough. 'The wine of their drunkenness, who are deceived of the Deceiver.' And then in sharpest contrast he continues: 'But I was made wise not to be deceived. I was established, and lived, and was redeemed.' After which follows the unmistakable language of Ps. i 3—the tree planted and watered and blessed, and its fruits and green leaves. 'It struck deep and sprung up and spread out and was enlarged.' This tree, then, also is the symbol of the cross, and the blood of it though not expressed is implied in the strong contrast with the Deceiver's wine—the wine of *the True Vine*.

And what does Isaiah give us? In Is. lxii 9 'they that bring them together shall drink them in thy holy courts' is now a clear reference that one could not understand before. 'They who *bring together* the *water of baptism* and the *wine of the cross* shall live upon the two together' seems now quite clearly the sense that the Odist would read in the words. Thus the Odist and Barnabas and St John (all of the same approximate date) all agree upon the basis of Ps. i which is confirmed and illustrated for their purpose by Is. lxii 9.

If a digression may here be permitted on the much-disputed question who is the first person who speaks in Is. lxi, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me' even as 'the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters' from the first . . ., it may here be suggested as worthy of consideration whether the supposed speaker is neither the prophet nor the servant nor Messiah, but 'Siloa's brook' itself. It is anointed with healing properties by God; it is sent for good tidings to the poor, since the ceremonial of water-bearing was the assurance of rain and fruitful seasons: it does invite the acceptable year of the Lord, for there is a new hope for every year that comes, and of good return for labour, hope of wealth, gladness and comfort: it tends to moral as well as to physical, especially agricultural, welfare; to rebuilding and restoring of estates; to increase of flocks and fields and vineyards. This proposal will not easily obtain favour because it seems to materialize where the Master has spiritualized. Nevertheless He could spiritualize better than we, and His quotation stopped at verse 2. Now the verses which follow, especially 4 and 5, are very much harder to spiritualize; they are in fact frankly material, by any but the most forced and unnatural interpretation. Why should we not admit that the original as it left 'Isaiah's' hand was equally material throughout, and much more poetical than we have been wont to suppose? When Ode 11⁶ says '*Speaking waters*' touched my lips from the fountain of the Lord abundantly', why not admit that the fountain speaks? The use of the first person in Hebrew poetry by inanimates finds a parallel and a precedent in Lam. i 18 ff where Jerusalem is the speaker. In Job xxviii the sea saith, It is not with me; Destruction and Death also speak. It is but one step higher in poetry to make the one saving waterspring of Jerusalem to be vocal in its own name, as Shelley made the Cloud, and Tennyson the Brook.

Again, if we suppose that the water-bearing from Siloam bore any relation at all to the use of water in Baptism, and the passage in Barnabas proves conclusively that he saw the relation of the Siloam water as such to Baptism, then it is certain that other texts of O. T. would be studied by the Christian prophets in the same connexion with

¹ Harris refers to Ign. *Rom.* 7 ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν; so Jn. iv 11 ζῶν.

Siloam. Using the Greek Bible they would find in Neh. iii 15 the pool of Siloam¹ described as 'the pool of skins for the king's wool' (*κολυμβήθρας τῶν κωδίων τῆ κουρᾶ τοῦ βασιλέως*: in other words, the king's sheep-shearing pool), which might have been translated in Latin as *piscina pellicea tonsorum regis*. But does not this take us on to the obscure expression given by Dr Ryle and Dr James from Schwartz's version of *Pistis Sophia*—'fui super vestes pelliceas' = 'I have survived, grown out of, put off, my sheep-shearing raiment'? And does not this mean 'my Jewish affection for the water of the sheep-shearing pool Siloam and all my former Pharisaic faith'? The cosmic reference, which was known as long ago as John Lightfoot, does not dispense us from finding some local colour in the expression, for the cosmic meaning was very probably lost long before the Odes were written.

One feature of the Odes is clear, that they are allusive and allegorical throughout. History and geography are not permitted to enter their vocabulary. When, therefore, we read in Ode 6 'there went forth a brook and it became a great broad stream and it flooded and broke up (or overwhelmed) everything and brought to the temple', we feel that the temple is not to be taken in its natural meaning of the Temple of Jerusalem, any more than the brook and the stream have their natural meaning. In this case it is quite clear from the previous verse they mean the 'Holy Spirit': 'our spirits praise his holy Spirit.' It would jar one's poetical nerves to think that this very poetical writer said of the river of spiritual life that it poured forth 'and roll'd the floods in grander space' till it overwhelmed the earth in order to bring men to the Temple. But however such a discord may strike the literary sense, if such *should* be the interpretation, then it would follow almost certainly that the brook must be Siloam, for it is described as doing precisely what Siloam does. 'The conduit of it', we are told, 'is dangerous to explore, as the water is apt to enter unexpectedly and fill the passage.' 'In a rainy winter it flows three, four, or five times daily, in summer twice, in autumn once.' And, as we have seen, Siloam brought its water to the Temple at the Skenopegia by the priest's hand, and was held by Ezekiel to be capable of becoming a great river. That Siloam has prompted the idea of Ode 6 seems to be almost certain, but that the Temple here has its own allegorical meaning, like the other terms, seems necessary: so that the meaning would be that the rite of baptism shall become universal in the earth, as the means of bringing men into the Church of Christ (Jo. ii 21, 2 Cor. vi 16).

And along with this, Neh. iii 16 LXX mentions 'the garden of the tomb of David' as adjacent to the pool. What is this but 'the paradise', which suggests in contrast that of Ode 11¹⁴ 'where is

¹ See Lightfoot *Chorographical Inquiry* v.

the abundance of the pleasure of the Lord'. But in this connexion there is in 11⁷, a line that seems to have puzzled both Dr Harnack and Dr Harris, 'And I drank and was inebriated with the living water.' But may we not suppose that the origin of this expression is very simple? The garden, the heavenly garden, which *fulfils* the king's garden at Jerusalem and far surpasses it, was found to be described in Is. lviii 11, 'and it shall be as a *garden inebriate* (κῆπος μεθύων) and as a *spring* (πηγή) of unfailing water.'

(p. 10) 'Blessed are the διάκονοι of that draught, to whom his water has been entrusted' (Ode 6¹⁹ ff). This seems once more to be a fulfilment of the priest bearing the water in the flagon through the water-gate into the Court of the Priests, where he was joined by another Priest bearing the wine for the drink-offering. But it is called forth by two passages, Is. lx 17 'and I will set thy officers (ἄρχοντας) in peace and thy overseers (ἐπισκόπους) in righteousness', and Is. lxi 6 'and ye shall be called priests (ιερείς) of the Lord, *ministers* (λειτουργοὶ) of God'.

(p. 13) 'He carried me to His paradise, or *garden*. Blessed are they, O Lord, who are *planted* in Thy land.' So Is. lxi 11 καὶ ὡς γῆν αἰξουσάν τὸ ἄνθος αἰτῆς, καὶ ὡς κῆπος τὰ σπέρματα αὐτοῦ. And here we cannot forget *In Memoriam* xliii :—

'So then were nothing lost to man :
So that still garden of the souls
In many a figured leaf enrolls
The total world since life began.'

(p. 14) '*Like the arm of the bridegroom over the bride*, so was my yoke over them that know me.' Compare Is. lxii 5 ὃν τρόπον εὐφρανθήσεται νυμφίος ἐπὶ νύμφῃ.

(p. 15) *The seal*. There may perhaps be a suggestion of this idea in Is. lxii 'because he hath anointed me'. Tertullian¹ is the first to mention the chrism after baptism as used in a definite ceremony ; but that fact does not shew that the unction was a usage that we could say *crept* into the Church in the second century. It leaves us free to suppose it existed in the first. From Eph. i 13, iv 30 we learn that the term σφραγίζω was then in use and applied to baptism. But on referring to 1 Peter, which is the companion letter to Ephesians² and serves as a commentary upon it in more than 100 expressions, we find that the parallel to the latter verse is 1 Pet. iv 14 'The Spirit of God resteth upon you', which very closely reproduces Is. lxi 1 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me'. The close connexion between χρίσας and σφραγισά-

¹ *de Bapt.* 7.

² See *St Luke the Prophet* pp. 184-210.

μενος is fully exemplified in 2 Cor. i 21 f. But to treat the matter of σφραγίς rather more broadly, its idea is the outward and visible sign (σημείον) of a promise or favour or grace, and such, for instance, was circumcision (Gen. xvii 10, quoted in Rom. iv 11, where σημεῖον and σφραγιδα are interchangeable terms, the latter being more picturesque and precise than the former, which bore the meaning of 'miracle', and others that might cause ambiguity). When, therefore, the ideas of circumcision were taken over by the Church and 'fulfilled' in baptism, that of σφραγίς though not a LXX word was taken with them. There is a very close connexion therefore between the sign of baptism and the new name which is mentioned in Is. lxii 2 'and Gentiles shall see thy righteousness and kings thy glory, and (one) shall call thee by the new name which the Lord shall name'. (That the figure of unction should pass into a material practice is not unnatural to those who read Is. lxi 6 'Ye shall be called priests of the Lord'.)

(p. 13) The idea of *rest in baptism* flows naturally from what has been said of Is. lxi 1 taken with Is. xi 2 'And the Spirit of God shall rest upon him', and 10 'And his rest shall be honour (or, a precious thing)'.

(p. 16) The comparison with *milk* derives some support from Is. lx 16 'And thou shalt milk the milk of the Gentiles'.

(p. 20) *Loosing of the bonds*. The idea so incessantly reproduced in the Eastern rites of Baptism and the Blessing of the Waters is found in Is. lxi 1 'to proclaim remission to the captives'. If we supposed this chapter to be the poetical utterance of the personified brook of Siloam, it would follow that the Skenopegia was the occasion of a release of prisoners (and in the absence of other information the existence of such a rule is exceedingly probable in order to remove if possible every drawback to the universal rejoicing).

(p. 21) *The fluttering of the dove*. 'The birds dropped their wings.' Ode 24 is so obscure that nothing more can be noticed here than this:—Justin (whom Dr Bernard quotes) has a term in describing the Baptism which is not found in the Gospels, ἐπιπτήναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Whence did he derive ἐπιπτήναι? He drew it from Papias's *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord* or from some similar collection of prophecies which quoted Is. lx 8 'Who are these that fly (πέτονται) as clouds, and as doves with their young ὑποῦν με (ἐπ' ἐμέ)'?

(p. 26) The catechumens faced *eastward*. The reason of this was to face the Dayspring from on high which 'shall appear upon thee', Is. lx 1 f ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται Κύριος.

(p. 26) 'I stretched out my hands and approached my Lord, for the stretching of my hands is His sign.' So Is. lxii 10 f 'Lift ye up an

ensign (*σύσσημον*) for the Gentiles . . . Behold, thy Saviour hath come to thy side'.

(p. 27) The *torchlight procession* is another materialized figure of Is. lxii 1 'Till her righteousness goes forth as a light, and my salvation shall be kindled as a torch'.

(p. 27) '*Sicknesses removed* from my body' is a very considerable extension to the body of the 'healing of them that have been bruised in their heart' of Is. lxi 1. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the Odist has more than a general support for his thesis in these three or four statements (18³, 21³, 25⁹, 6¹⁸). But in Is. lxi where there is so much *σωτηρίου* and *εὐφροσύνης* there must have been implied therewith good physical health.

A few other Isaian thoughts (from lx-lxii) in the Odes may be noticed : some of them occur more than once.

Ode 5⁶ 'A cloud of darkness shall fall upon their eyes (my persecutors'), and mist of dimness shall darken them' = Is. lx 2 'darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness upon the heathen'.

Ode 7¹⁸ 'for his redemption's sake' = Is. lxii 12 'a people redeemed of the Lord'.

Ode 8⁶ 'ye that were despised, lift yourselves up' = Is. lxii 4 'ye shall no more be called Forsaken', and lx 15 and lxii 12.

Ode 8²¹ 'I have set my Elect ones on my right hand' = Is. lx 16 'who electeth thee', with lxii 8 'the Lord sware by his right hand' (sense if not also reading).

Ode 8¹¹ 'guard ye my mystery' = Is. lx 21 'guarding the plantation' (*φύτευμα*, but see above).

Ode 8²² 'and they shall not be deprived of my Name' = Is. lxii 2 'the new name which the Lord shall call'.

Ode 9³ 'in the Will of the Lord is thy salvation' = Is. lxii 4 'for thee there shall be called my Will (*θέλημα*)'.

Ode 10^{6 f} 'the gentiles . . . were gathered together . . . and the traces of the light were laid upon their heart' = Is. lx 3 'kings shall journey at thy light and gentiles at thy brightness'.

Ode 11¹⁵ 'blessed are they that are planted in thy land', and many other references = Is. lxi 3 'a plant of the Lord unto glory'.

Ode 15^{1 f} 'as the Sun is the joy of them that look for their day . . . the Lord is my sun' adapts Is. lx 1 ff to the thoughts of personal devotion. 'Sun of my soul, thou Saviour dear.'

Ode 18¹⁹ 'they have proclaimed the truth at the prompting of the Most High' = Is. lxi 1.

Ode 20¹ 'I am a priest of the Lord and do Him priestly service' = Is. lxi 6 'ye shall be called priests of the Lord'.

Ode 41^{7 f} 'Let us exult with joy before the Lord. All who see me

shall be astonished: for of another race am I' = Is. lxi 9 f 'Their seed shall be known among the nations, and their offspring in the midst of the peoples. All who see them shall recognize them, that they are a seed blessed of God: and with gladness they shall be glad unto the Lord.' This is a passage on which Dr Harnack resorts to the Christian interpolator, but there is no more room for a Christian interpolator in the Ode than in Isaiah.

What has been said above concerning the Temple (Ode 6^a) holds true of Ode 4¹ 'No man changeth thy holy place, my God, ² and none can shift it and set it in another place, because he hath no power over it. ³ For thy holiness hast thou designed before thou madest the places; ⁴ the older (place) shall not exchange with those that are younger than it. ⁵ Thou hast given thine heart, O Lord, to thy believers . . . ' Here 'thy holy place' is not the Jewish Temple, but the fulfilment of it, the Church of God in Christ. The expression is allegorical like all the rest of the Odes; if it were not so it would be intolerably prosaic. From this it follows that no conclusion can be drawn from verse 1 that the Temple was standing when the Ode was written, much less that there is intended a very frigid disparagement of the rival claims of Leontopolis or Gerizim. Rather the opposite is true: a change of God's Holy place would not have been a topic of poetic thought at all unless and until the Temple, hitherto held to be the Holy place, had been removed out of its place. The ruin of it proved the absolute truth that God dwelleth not in temples made with hands. And till this point is clear, no wonder if the larger second portion of the Ode beginning with v. 5 should seem to 'stand in no connexion with the first' (Harnack) and to suggest duality of origin. But in fact the coherence is close and natural: the Church is not removable because the abode of God's holiness is from everlasting the hearts of His faithful. And once more, how can Ode 22¹¹ mean anything but that the destruction of Jerusalem was past already? 'Thou hast brought thy world to utter destruction, that all should be dissolved and made new and that the foundation for all should be thy Rock, and upon it thou hast built thy kingdom, and it is the abode of the saints.' The people of God has been 'cast down' by the dragon of Rome as the Jewish nation, but its dead bones are covered with life in Christ. So far from having nothing Christian about it, the Ode is entirely Christian. Tertullian, discussing the Jewish interpretation of the Dry Bones, admits that 'God was reconstructing the faith, which the people was destroying' (*de Res. Carn.* 31).

Of the numerous correspondences noticed by Dr Bernard between the Odes of Solomon and known baptismal forms of expression, nearly all have now been shewn to correspond with the ideas underlying or

closely related to Is. lx–lxii as interpreting the Skenopegia. The last pages of this paper, in which the correspondence has been exhibited, have been tacked on to it without involving the least alteration in what the previous pages contained. Before concluding it may be worth while to notice two or three passages of the N. T. in the light of what has been said above, and to mention some possible sources of difficulty. We want to know what use was made of Is. lx–lxii by the apostles and prophets before A. D. 70 when the Skenopegia ceased to be observed at Jerusalem. When did they begin to discern in those chapters the manifold applications which they offer to the events of the Lord's life? Did they apply to Him as the Light of the world, and the Fountain of living purity, other ideas of these chapters as He applied some, according to St John, to Himself?

There is one passage which seems to contain a pointed reference to the popular gathering of all faithful Jews at the great Feast. The writer to the Hebrews (within a year of 65 A. D., Westcott) says (xii 22) 'Ye are not come to Mount Sinai, but ye are come to Mount Sion'. In contrast with Sinai, the calcined volcano, amidst ashes and 'the poring dark' and thunder and appalling words, the mountain that could not be touched, he presents Sion alive and heavenly and thronged with a concourse both human and divine,

'Saying, O heart I made, a heart beats here',

the seat of *God as universal Judge*, whose justice is like the strong mountains, and who has in mercy provided a *mediator* greater than Moses (xii 21). But it is the Sion of the *Panegyris* (Hos. ii 11, ix 5, Am. v 21, Ezek. xlvi 11), the general *assembly* of the Great Feast,—it is *Sion the city* (Is. lx 14) *of a living God*, when the Temple Court was crowded with booths,—it is *Jerusalem* (Is. lx 1) *of the heavenly orbs* of sun and moon (Is. lx 19), not of thunder and lightning,—it is the Sion where glory is instead of ashes (Is. lxi 3),—it is the Sion of *myriads* of men keeping the Feast, all organized into obedient *angels* and evangelists (Is. lx 6),—it is the Sion which turns her eyes round upon *her gathered children*, her firstborn (Is. lx 4, 9), whose *names are recorded* in line with *the Holy Name* (Is. lx 9) *righteous all* as He is righteous (Is. lx 21), and destined to inherit the earth (*ib.*) according to His *new will* in Jesus,—it is the Sion whose high festival is kept with *better sacrifices than those which speak* after all of vengeance, for its *sacrifice* speaks of forgiveness and prayer and acceptable offerings (Is. lx 7). No parallel could easily be closer or fuller between a compressed passage of six lines and a chapter of fifty lines than that of Heb. xii 22 ff with Is. lx in the Greek. And yet there is not one quotation commonly so called. Why? Because the writer of Heb. had been present at the Feast as well as

his readers, who knew the meaning of his contrast in all its bearings from their own experience of the *Panegyris*. They had been of those ideally *righteous men brought to maturity* ('made perfect', Heb. xii 23) like the fruits of the earth whose ripeness in autumn they celebrated themselves. Along with Is. lx they would feel the full meaning of Is. iv 3 'Holy shall be called all they who were *written for life* in Jerusalem'.

A solemn and suggestive contrast to this description penned in sober sense¹ is presented to us in the ecstatic vision of Apoc. xxi. And yet the Seer in depicting the new Jerusalem brings into prominence precisely those features of the city which we have seen to belong to it during the Skenopegia, as drawn in Is. lx-lxii. She is prepared as *a bride adorned* for her husband (Is. lxi 10, lxii 5). Where all things are made new, a *new name* must be included for the new city (Is. lxii 2). It is *the tabernacle* of God that is proclaimed by the great voice out of the throne (*ταῖς ἐπαύλεισιν ταῖς ἀγίαις μου*, Is. lxii 9, is a distinct reference to the booths). The details of the doublet of this vision (Apoc. xxi 10) are far more elaborate, and they open with the description of *her luminary* (φωστήρ).²

She has *the glory of God* (Is. lx 19). Therefore she *has no need of the sun nor of the moon to shine in her* (Is. lx 19) when *God's glory has risen upon her* (Is. lx 1). Moreover, *the Gentiles shall walk in her light* (Is. lx 3), and *kings shall bring their glory into her* (Is. lx 10, 11). *And her gates shall not be closed by day or by night* (Is. lx 11), so that *they shall bring the wealth of the nations into her*. *And there shall no more enter there aught that is unclean or whoso doeth abomination and falsehood—her people shall all be righteous* (Is. lx 18, 21).

Heb. xii and Apoc. xxi both include a reference to the 'names having been written in heaven'. Where does the idea originate? The answer must be in Is. lx 21 'For ever they shall inherit the earth', and lxi 7 'Thus a second time they shall inherit the earth', and lxi 8 'I will make an everlasting will for them'. For inheritance implies that the names have been written in the New Testament or will of God as heirs

¹ ἐν καταστάσει is the technical term correlative to ἐν ἐκστάσει (Justin *Dial.* 115).

² The term here cannot mean the sun or the moon: it must mean 'her blaze or light'. But this again cannot well mean daylight, since it is compared to a jasper-stone, which is more or less clouded and coloured. We are therefore compelled to take it of a nocturnal blaze of beacon fires, namely those of the Skenopegia (Is. lxii 1 λαμπάς). This is not surprising when we observe that she has just been described as a bride, and the wedding-escort takes place at midnight. Far less reasonable is it to suppose that the blaze of light is that of early dawn brightening into a clear ice-like noon of powerful heat! But if this explanation were adopted, we should have an equally clear reference to the Φατίζου, φατίζου, Ἱερουσαλήμ of Is. lx 1.

of His estate. The Seer has described the instrument of this will as the book written within and without, sealed with seven seals (Apoc. v). Heb. viii refers to it—also in connexion with the right hand of the throne—basing his teaching on Jer. xxxi 31 ff. The idea of the ‘fresh will’ underlies our ‘New Testament’. But from an early time Is. lx 21, lxi 7 were found by the Christian prophets to receive their explanation in Is. iv 3, which mentions *the remnant* (τὸ ὑπολειφθέν, τὸ καταλειφθέν) in Sion, as being ‘written for life’, while Is. lx 15 says, ‘because thou hadst been left as *a remnant* in it’ (ἐγκαταλειμμένην): the two references therefore were taken as both referring to the ‘little flock’ of the Church, for it was their ‘Father’s good pleasure to give them the kingdom’. Now in Ode 23 the will is introduced as the Letter, sealed with one seal which no man could loose, addressed as a circular to all the world, caught and held fast by the Wheel, which is the Church Triumphant. It is strange that Dr Harnack should find ‘the description quite unintelligible’. That the Letter is a will is made quite plain by Ode 23¹⁷ ‘the Son inherited all’, to the disappointment of others.

It is therefore apparent that we have found in the years preceding 70 A.D. some of the same literary phenomena that characterize the Odes of Solomon as the precursors of the orthodox Epiphany rites and kindred offices. If these phenomena are not exactly baptismal, they might perhaps be called sub-baptismal. If this is so, the ideas which centred in baptism were beginning to colour the whole of Christian thought. But indeed that they had begun to colour it many years earlier still is the conclusion which appears to follow from a close examination of St Peter’s vision at Joppa. If two writers so utterly distinct and characteristic and mutually independent as Heb. and Apoc., the one so Hellenic, in spite of the title of the Epistle, the other so Hebraic, in style, thought and treatment, are found to agree in sub-baptismal interpretation of Is. lx ff, then this interpretation was not very recent. Time must be allowed for diffusion of such ideas as they imply. Again, if we find that St Peter’s vision at Joppa can only be understood by assuming the same method of treating the holy scripture of Isaiah, we are, it seems, carried some years further back still. And it does not surprise us to read in Eph. v 14 a fragment of a baptismal ode which contains ἐπιφάνσει σοι ὁ χριστός, the very idea of Is. lx 2 ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται Κύριος, along with a clear reference in *he that sleepeth* to the context *Behold darkness shall cover the earth*.