---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHY was Moses told to put off his shoes in front of the Burning Bush? Mr. W. R. Paton, writing in *The Classical Review* for July, seems to say that it was because they were made of the skin of an animal.

Mr. Paton is discussing the inscription upon a stone which has been found at Eresos in Lesbos. The inscription has to do with ceremonial defilement. It distinguishes degrees of such defilement. And Mr. Paton discovers that when a child is still-born, the mother's impurity is understood to last longer than when it is born alive. It is contact with death that causes the uttermost of impurity. And so a person wearing shoes is impure not because he wears shoes, but because he wears shoes made from the skin of a dead animal.

The conclusion is a little precarious. And so Mr. Paton strengthens it by stating the practice among Hindus. He wrote to Mr. Mahajani of the Berar Educational Department, and asked what was the reason for baring the feet on holy ground in India. Mr. Mahajani replied, 'The theory underlying the taking off of shoes is that all parts of dead bodies, whether of men or of cattle or of animals generally, that is, bones, skins, hair, teeth, nails, etc., are considered unclean, and are not to be touched when a person is ceremonially pure. . . . When a person is ceremonially pure, he is allowed to wear wooden shoes, which he may take even within the precincts of an inner temple. So it is not the shoes by themselves that are considered impure, but the fact that they are made of hide.'

The *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archæology published in July is a double number. It is understood to contain the official report of the Meeting held on the 11th of June. But it contains much more than that. Among the rest it contains an article by the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, B.D., on the Sacrifice of Isaac.

The questions which interest Mr. Oesterley in the Sacrifice of Isaac are really archæological questions, so that the *P.S.B.A.* is a fitting enough place for the article. Why was this story written? When? What has it to do with the practice of human sacrifice in Israel? These are the questions which Mr. Oesterley is interested in and asks.

That human sacrifice was once practised in Israel he has no doubt. It was practised among nearly all primitive races. It was certainly practised among the Semites. In Ball's *Light from the East* (p. 152) will be found an excellent reproduction of a Babylonian seal-engraving, the scene of which

is unmistakably a human sacrifice, whether actual or symbolical. And, what is still more to the point, the Old Testament is sufficient witness to Mr. Oesterley's mind that the practice was well-known in Israel.

---

The leading place, apart from the Sacrifice of Isaac itself, is the Sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter. Mr. Oesterley has no doubt that Jephthah's daughter was offered in sacrifice. He has little doubt that Jephthah deliberately proposed to sacrifice some one, though he hoped that it might not be his only child. For though the translation of Jephthah's vow even in the Revised Version (Jg $11^{31}$) is *whatsoever*,—'Then it shall be that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, it shall be the LORD'S, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering,'—yet Mr. Oesterley holds that the natural rendering of the Hebrew (אשר היוצר) is 'whosoever cometh forth,' as the margin of the Revised Version has it.

---

Another place is the death of Agag. Mr. Oesterley is not so sure that this was a sacrifice. But he looks upon that as at least the most probable explanation of the words, 'Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord' (1 S $15^{33}$). The Hebrew word translated 'hewed' is nowhere else employed in the Old Testament, but there is a cognate root used for sacrifice in Lv $1^{17}$, and in this very place the LXX renders the Hebrew by the Greek word meaning to sacrifice (ἔσφαξε). Moreover, the scene of the occurrence was Gilgal. Now Gilgal was one of the most notable sanctuaries in the land, 'just the place where sacrifices of especial solemnity would be offered.'

---

But more than that, there is evidence in the Old Testament of the sacrifice of children. Mr. Oesterley does not use the death of the firstborn in Egypt, because there the children were slain by God, not offered in sacrifice to Him. But he uses the prohibition in Lv $18^{21}$ $20^{2-4}$, 'Thou shalt not give any of thy seed to make them pass through the fire to Moloch'; and the transgression of that prohibition in 2 K $16^{3}$, where Ahaz, the king of Judah, is condemned for causing his son to pass through the fire 'according to the abominations of the heathen.' He finds other references to the practice; among them Mic $6^{7}$, 'Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?'

---

He finds also in the remarkable notice of Hiel the Bethelite building Jericho, a case of the sacrifice of children. For Mr. Oesterley does not understand the reference there to be to a judgment of God on Hiel, whereby he lost his children under God's avenging hand. Jericho had been rebuilt by some one else long before the time of Hiel. For in 2 S $10^{5}$ David bids his messengers stay at Jericho until their beards, cut off by Hanun, were grown again. Mr. Oesterley holds that when Hiel is stated to have laid the foundation of Jericho in his firstborn, and set up the gates thereof in his youngest son, the meaning is that he sacrificed his children to God, according to a widespread custom of offering human sacrifice on the site of a new building.

---

Mr. Oesterley also mentions the sacrifice of his eldest son by the king of Moab when he was hard pressed in the siege. This was not an Israelite sacrifice, and he does not use it as if it were. But the effect of it shows that though the Israelites had by this time abandoned the practice of human sacrifice, they were still capable of being impressed by its special efficacy. The king of Moab did not slay his son as an act of desperation meant to move the enemy to pity or disgust. He sacrificed him to his god, as the narrative plainly tells us: 'Then he took his eldest son, that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall' (2 K $3^{27}$). Its purpose, says Mr. Oesterley, was to secure the help of his god at this grave crisis. And the enemy, recognizing that this purpose had been attained, immediately raised the siege.

By a coincidence there is an article in *Church and Synagogue* for the same month which deals with the sacrifice of Isaac. In that article, which is written by the Rev. Edmund Sinker, M.A., the same view is taken of the purpose of the king of Moab. He offered the sacrifice upon the wall. The allied forces saw it, and considered that he took a most unfair advantage of them. For now he had attached his god Chemosh so firmly to his cause that to fight against him was useless. Judah and Edom were indignant with Israel for even bringing them into such an impossible situation. And they departed from him and returned to their own land.

---

Well, it is settled in Mr. Oesterley's mind that human sacrifice was practised once in Israel, and the sacrifice of the eldest son in particular. Was it practised throughout the whole history of the nation, or when did it cease? Mr. Oesterley believes that it ceased about the time of David. Up to that time there are at least the cases of Agag, of Jephthah's daughter, and of Isaac. After that there are none. Between David and Ahab there is not the slightest reference to anything in the shape of human sacrifice.

---

This leads Mr. Oesterley to fix the date of this particular narrative in Genesis. When this story was written there was no child sacrifice in Israel. That is evident, he says, in the story itself. Therefore it was written, or at least assumed its present form, after the time of David. On the other hand, there is no protest against human sacrifice in it. Therefore it was written before the time of the prophets, to whom such a thing is utter abomination. Had the writer lived in the time of Micah he would have represented Abraham's temptation to offer his son in sacrifice as a temptation not of Jehovah, but of the Evil One.

---

Accordingly Mr. Oesterley believes that the narrative of the sacrifice of Isaac arose in this way and for this purpose. There was an ancient tradition that the patriarch Abraham had offered up his son in sacrifice to God. A writer of the time between David and Ahab knew this tradition. But human sacrifice had ceased ere his day. What had brought that about in Israel? It had not ceased in other lands. He conceived that this very incident had brought it about. The Israelites were always inclined towards the customs of their neighbours. To deliver them from the danger of returning to human sacrifice he wrote the story down and made it tell in such a way that God was seen Himself interposing and putting an end to such a method of approaching Him.

---

Thus far Mr. Oesterley. Before leaving the subject we must add a sentence from Mr. Sinker. Mr. Sinker writes in *Church and Synagogue*, as we have said. Now *Church and Synagogue* is edited by Mr. Oesterley. Yet in *Church and Synagogue* Mr. Sinker expresses just the opposite conclusion from Mr. Oesterley.

---

Mr. Oesterley says that the sacrifice of Isaac shows human sacrifice to have once been common in Israel, but to have ceased before this narrative was written. Mr. Sinker says, 'We see that the Israelites are becoming more used to human sacrifice, and even have begun to admit the utility of it. From this admission to practising it is a very short step indeed.'

---

The *Quarterly Statement* for July to September of the Palestine Exploration Fund contains a report by Dr. Schumacher of recent discoveries near Galilee.

---

In March, Professor Sellin of Vienna commenced to excavate the site of the ancient city of Taanach. Dr. Schumacher was of his party of excavators, which consisted of four or five Europeans, an Imperial commissioner, and from seventy to a hundred and fifty workmen and women. Taanach, which is now *Tell Ta'annek* (not *T'annuk*,

as even the Fund maps give it), was chosen by Sellin's practised eye from the promise of its shape. The tell rises 120 to 140 feet above the surrounding plain. It has distinctly terraced slopes, and on its summit there is a large pear-shaped plateau of 1050 feet by 450, its highest point being nearly 800 feet above the sea.

In this tell, from the plateau on the top, four large trenches were cut. They were carried down till they reached the rock, which in one instance was a distance of 36 feet. As the trenches descended, the débris was examined. It showed the remains of different cities, one above the other, each occupying from 5 to 6 feet of the mound in thickness. One or two of these cities had been burned to the ground, or at least partially destroyed by fire.

Much pottery was discovered. And it was of all ages, except that of Rome. No Roman remains whatever were found. But there were Phœnician remains, Jewish remains, Amorite remains, and even pre-Amorite remains.

Amongst the pottery were found some Jewish jars. They contained the ashes of very young children. The spot must mark an ancient Jewish children's cemetery. No adult remains were found. Near this infant cemetery was laid bare a rock altar, with a rock-cut step, dishes for offerings, and channels for carrying away the blood.

The work was still going on when Dr. Schumacher wrote. He hoped that yet greater results would reward the workers before it came to an end for the season.

The same *Statement* contains an account by Sir Charles Wilson of the excavations that have recently been made by Dr. Bliss and Mr. Macalister on behalf of the Fund itself. Three sites have already been investigated. The first he mentions is *Tell Zakarîya*, above the Vale of Elah, 'whence a striking view may be had of the battlefield upon which David slew Goliath.' Here a town was laid bare of which no name has survived, though the remains showed that it had been founded in the late pre-Israelite period (say, 1500 B.C.); that it had been fortified in Jewish times, possibly, says Sir Charles Wilson, by Rehoboam; that it had been occupied during the Seleucid period; and that it had been deserted after a short Roman and Byzantine occupation. Dr. Bliss thinks it may be Azekah or Socoh.

The next site is *Tell eṣ-Ṣâfi*. It stands at the mouth of the Vale of Elah, and may be the site of Gath. A modern village and cemetery, occupying most of the summit, confined the area of excavation. But enough was done to prove the existence of a city in the early pre-Israelite period, that is, at least seventeen centuries B.C., which continued right down to the days of the Seleucids.

The third site is *Tell ej-Judeideh*. It lies to the south of *Tell Zakarîya*. It disclosed a city which must have been founded in the early pre-Israelite period, abandoned long before the Hebrew conquest, reoccupied during the Jewish monarchy, and apparently fortified in Roman times. In the centre of the mound a Roman villa was found. No clue was obtained to the name of the city.

A mile south of Beit Jibrin is the fourth site. It is *Tell Sandahannah*. The remains are almost all Seleucid, but the Seleucid town was built on the ruins of a Jewish town, 'which is almost certainly the biblical Mareshah.' The name still clings to a small suburb about three-quarters of a mile distant, *Khurbet Mer'ash*. Mareshah was plundered by Judas Maccabæus, it was taken by John Hyrcanus, it was restored to the Idumæans by Pompey, and it was finally destroyed by the Parthians in 40 B.C. Much pottery was found here, and many limestone inscriptions.

One of the inscriptions is on the base of a statue of a queen Arsinoë, whom Clermont-Ganneau identifies with the lady who was sister

and wife of Ptolemy IV., and who played an important part in the battle of Raphia, in which Antiochus the Great was defeated. Another bears the name of Berenike, possibly the mother of Ptolemy IV. But most of the inscriptions were ancient imprecations. In one a man's marriage is cursed, in other two the bridegroom himself, 'possibly by a disappointed lover.' The material is always limestone, which seems to have had in Palestine the significance for cursing that lead had in Greece and the sacred papyrus in Egypt. Is it possible, as Dr. Wünsch, who assisted Dr. Bliss in the decipherments, suggests, that there is a reference to this cursing limestone in the 'white stone' of Rev $2^{17}$?

---

Then Sir Charles Wilson turns to the future work of the Fund and its excavators. The site next to be attacked is Gezer. It is the most promising site of all. For the periods of its history are already known, and it has to be seen whether the excavations will agree with them. In particular, it is known that one of the Pharaohs burned Gezer, and gave the site to his daughter, the wife of Solomon, and that Solomon then rebuilt the city. Will the débris show the ashes of a burned city, and at the very spot where they ought to be shown? If they do, a fixed date will be found, and history and archæology will confirm one another.

---

But the excavation of the site of Gezer will require some money, and Sir Charles Wilson ends his address by a direct appeal to his hearers' and readers' generosity. He asks, and surely he does not ask too much, that the work so heroically pursued in Palestine by the English excavators may receive a financial support not less than that which is accorded by Austrians and Germans in the case of their excavations at Tannach, Megiddo, and Ba'albek.

---

'Then said they, It is his angel' (Ac $12^{15}$). What did they mean? Did they believe in ghosts, as we do? And did they think that Peter was dead, and here was his ghost at the door to tell them?

---

They did not believe in ghosts as we do. They believed in spirits certainly. When they saw Jesus walking on the water, they cried out and said, 'It is a spirit.' And no doubt a spirit is a ghost, though a ghost is not always a spirit. But here they did not say that it was Peter's spirit. They said, 'It is his angel.' What did they mean?

---

They meant his guardian angel, say the commentators, well-nigh unanimously. Olshausen says something different, and is sharply taken to task by Meyer for 'rationalizing in an unbiblical manner.' But Olshausen is as often right as any commentator we know, and we may find that he is not very wrong here. That in a moment.

---

The commentators say they meant Peter's guardian angel. This is Page's note (and Page is usually an accurate penetrating commentator on the Acts): 'It was a popular belief among the Jews that each man had a guardian angel. Cf. the *genius* of the Romans, and Horace, *Epistles*, II. ii. 188—

> Genius, natale comes qui temperat astrum,
> naturæ deus humanæ, mortalis in unum
> quodque caput, voltu mutabilis, albus et ater.

And Pindar, *Ol.* xiii. 148, δαίμων γενέθλιος. Mt $18^{10}$ is important as regards the validity of this belief.' It is a simple note, but it seems to contain some assumptions. How does Mr. Page know that the Jews at this time had a popular belief in guardian angels? What makes him think that our Lord refers to guardian angels when He speaks of the angels of the little ones who always behold the face of His Father which is in heaven? Neither assumption can be proved, and both are unlikely. Moreover, what could Peter's guardian angel be doing at the door of Mary's house? If Peter was still alive, he was never more in need of a guardian angel at his

side. If he was dead, the work of the guardian angel was done on earth.

---

We are in need of another explanation. Olshausen suggested another long ago. And now Dr. J. H. Moulton, quite independently of Olshausen, and differing somewhat from him, gives a full account of another in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July. The title of his article is, 'It is his Angel.'

---

Dr. Moulton says that in the Bible there are two kinds of angels mentioned. The one we know. He is God's messenger to men—sent forth to minister to them that shall be heirs of salvation. The other we are mostly ignorant of. He appears for the first time clearly in the Book of Daniel. There in the tenth chapter, verses 13, 20, 21, and again in the first verse of the eleventh and twelfth chapters, we read of a 'prince' of Persia, a 'prince' of Greece, and of Michael the 'prince' of the house of Israel. Clearly these 'princes' are angels. Yet they are not the messengers of God to men; they are too closely identified with these nations for that. Rather are they the counterparts or impersonations of these nations, and represent them in heavenly places.

---

We at once think of the 'angels' of the Churches in the Apocalypse. And we could not do better. That these are not angels in the ordinary sense of messengers from God to these Churches every one has to admit. Nor are they what is called guardian angels, as if sent by God to watch over the interests of the particular Church. They are not sent by God at all. They come rather from the Church to God. They stand before Him, representing the Church, and in some strange close way identified in responsibility with it. If the Church does well, the angel is praised; if ill, the angel suffers.

---

Yet the angels of the Churches are not so absolutely identified with the Churches as to be no more than a figurative name for them. The angel of the Church in Ephesus is warned to repent and do the first works, almost as if he were the Church; but the warning is, 'or else I come to thee, and will move thy candlestick out of its place.' The warning is that the Church may be destroyed. Clearly the angel of the Church is one, and the Church or candlestick is another. Notice, says Dr. Moulton wisely, that 'I come to thee' is not coming to a place (πρός σε), but ethical coming to one's disadvantage (ἔρχομαί σοι).

---

Is there reference to this 'double,' if it may be so called, elsewhere in the Bible? Dr. Moulton believes there is. And not only to the double or supersensual counterpart of nations and Churches, but of individuals also. Those who assign a very late date to Ps 82 find a reference in it to the representative angel. Others see him in Ps 58[1] by following the reading 'O ye gods,' noticed in the margin of the Revised Version. More explicit, however, than these passages is Is 24[21] 'And it shall come to pass in that day that the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth.' Expositors cannot agree as to whether the reference is to stars or to angels. It makes no matter. Clearly supernatural beings are intended, and clearly they are closely identified with, if not the very counterpart of, certain transgressing persons upon earth.

---

In Sir 17[17] we read, 'For every nation he appointed a ruler,' where the ruler is no doubt the 'prince' of the Book of Daniel. And then in the New Testament we have the passages already referred to, before we pass to the Rabbinical writings, where the idea is frequently and unmistakably set forth.

---

Now this representative 'angel' is not properly a guardian angel. He is not sent forth to minister, he stands in God's presence. When our Lord spoke of the angels of the little ones, He did not say that they were always encamped round the

little ones to guard them from 'offence,' as we should have expected Him to say if they had been their guardian angels. He said that their place was in heaven: 'In heaven they always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven.' And so, when those who were gathered for prayer in the house of Mary said, 'It is his angel,' Dr. Moulton believes that they must have meant his spiritual counterpart.

Olshausen, as we have said, is somewhat different. He held that the angel was the archetype or ideal of every man's life laid up with God in heaven. To that ideal he had to correspond, and it kept him in constant touch with the world of spirits. This is also Maurice's idea, quoted by Dr. Moulton from the *Unity of the New Testament* on the passage about the angels of the little ones: 'The little child, the humblest human creature, was dear to His Father in heaven. He did not look upon it merely as a fallen corrupted thing. Its Angel, its pure original type, that which it was created to be, was ever present with Him, was ever looking up into His face.' And who forgets Browning's

> My times are in thy hand,
> Perfect the cup as planned?

But Dr. Moulton shows that this is not altogether his thought. This is Platonic rather than scriptural. In the references to the 'angels' as he understands them there is nothing 'ideal,' there is simply identification.

Now this conception is wholly foreign to the religion of Israel in its purity. The religion of Israel knows only one kind of angel, the messenger of God to men. Where did this idea come from? Dr. A. B. Davidson dealt with it in his article ANGELS in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. He thought that it might have arisen on Israelite soil by the tendency which appeared in later times to personify abstract conceptions, such as the spirit or 'genius' of a nation, and to locate such personified forces in the supersensible world, whence they ruled the destinies of men. But Dr. Moulton believes that it came to the Israelites from the Persians.

He believes that the Zoroastrian *fravashis* 'answer exactly to what we desiderate as the original hint for these representative angels.' For in later Parsism, man is divided into body, life, soul, form, and *fravashi*. The soul at death unites with the *fravashi* and becomes immortal. The *fravashi* is that part of a man which is always in the presence of Ahura. It is not the man's guardian spirit; it is an inseparable part of him, the part that is hidden with God. So this belief, 'which actually has the seal of the Lord Christ's approval, had not been a special revelation to Israel, but was derived originally from the Magi, the very people whose representatives, generations later, were destined to offer the first tribute of the Gentile world before the infant Son of Man.'

'Who then is this?' (Mk $4^{41}$ R.V.). The question was natural after what they had seen. They had seen that even the wind and the sea obey Him. Their idea of the wind and the sea was not ours. It was neither our popular nor our scientific idea. It was religious. The stormy wind fulfilled the pleasure of God; the sea was His, He made it. They feared exceedingly when they saw that the wind and the sea obeyed Jesus. They thought that they obeyed God directly, and God alone. So the question was natural after what they had seen: 'Who then is this?'

The question is asked still. There are four answers to it worth considering.

The first answer is found in Mt $13^{55}$, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' It is the answer of the people among whom He dwelt. Ordinary people themselves, He must be ordinary too, for He was one of them. The obedience of the wind and the sea is puzzling, but no wonder can alter the fact that He is the son of the carpenter. First impressions remain with people. Others

who did not see Him grow up among them may give Him honour, but in His own country and among His own kindred and in His own family He will always be just the carpenter's son. Do we wonder at them?

The great gods pass through the great Time Hall
Stately and high;
The little men climb the little clay wall
To watch them by.
'We wait for the gods,' the little men cry,
'But these are our brothers passing by.'

The great gods pass through the great Time Hall
With veiled grace;
The little men climb the little clay wall
To bow the face.
'Lo! these are our brothers passing by,
Why tarry the gods?' the little men cry.

The great gods pass through the great Time Hall,
But none can see;
The little men nod by the dull clay wall,
So tired they be.
''Tis a weary waiting for gods,' they yawn,
'There's a world of men, but the gods are gone.'

---

And yet there was a way in which they were right. He *was* one of themselves. He was a man with a man's responsibilities, a man's work to do, a man's burden to carry. Somewhere He must do His work and carry His burden. Why not in this village and in this rank of life? He must belong to some family, why not the family of the village carpenter?

---

Jesus was one of a family. The family had its own customs and traditions. It had its own place in the village. It had more concern for its own members than for others. The people knew His brothers and could name them—James and Joseph and Simon and Judas; and His sisters were all with them. He was one of a family. His sisters might marry and bear children, and their children could call Him uncle. One of His brothers might go wrong, and yet come to Him with his damaged reputation and say to Him, 'I'm your brother.'

And He took His place in the family. He was the eldest, we suppose. The burden of the eldest daughter when the mother dies is a sore one, so is the burden of the eldest son if the father dies early, as it seems quite likely Joseph did. He accepted the burden. He worked at the bench. He made and mended for the women of Nazareth. And He remained at this work till the brothers and sisters were up and doing for themselves. Was this why He did not begin His public ministry till He was about thirty? Why was it if it was not this?

---

So they were right enough when they said, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' if only they had said it at the right time. When they said it they were wrong. He was not the carpenter's son then.

---

No one has done more for the family than Jesus. And He did it just in the way it is open to us all. He took His place in it, did His work, and loved its members. If He had done less, He might have been more thought of by His family. When He ceased to belong to the family and appealed to them to recognize that, they refused. His brethren did not believe in Him. Yet afterwards James and Judas believed in Him. And so probably did all the rest who were alive. For He was able to reveal Himself to them. It is St. Paul who happens to tell us. 'Then He appeared to James,' says St. Paul. And James was satisfied. He was not satisfied earlier, because Jesus was too much one of the family. He had taken His place so naturally in the family and did so much for it, that James could not get over the feeling that He belonged to the family still.

---

Yet Jesus did actually cease to belong to the family. And He who has done so much for family life came to burst the family bonds and make the members of the family free.

---

For there is nothing upon earth that can set itself more thoroughly in opposition to Christ

than the family. We see it all through the life of some men, though they never see it themselves. Has not George Eliot taken us aside in the *Mill on the Floss* and shown us what family pride can be, and the mischief it can work? And is not every family a family of Dodsons in its little way until Christ has made the members free? But we see it best at death. The newspaper makes the simple announcement that the estate was left to the members of the family, and we neither wonder nor lament.

---

Christ came to proclaim the opening of the prison to them that are bound. And they are as often bound within the family prison-house as anywhere. 'Who is My mother,' He said, 'and who are My brethren?' And He looked round upon the disciples. 'Behold, My mother and My brethren! For whosoever doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother and sister and mother.' It was not simply the formation of a new spiritual family. It was the stripping off from every earthly family all that made its members selfish and narrow. It was saying to James, wherever he is found in the family, that henceforth he is not to regard Judas or Simon with more affection than he gives to the members of the family on the other side of the street. And when the time came for Him to be taken up, He committed His mother Mary not to the keeping of James her own son according to the flesh, but into the keeping of John, her son and His according to the Spirit.

---

That is one of the answers to the question, 'Who then is this?'

# Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter: A Comparison and a Contrast.

By the Rev. Martin Lewis, B.A., Fellow of University College, London.

## I.

There is a singular parallelism between the careers of these two great contemporaries. Born almost at the same time—the one at Cambridge in 1613, the other in Shropshire in 1615—their lives ran side by side like sister streams, divided indeed by the great political frontier of that era of contention, but both making steadily for the same great and wide sea in which all the rivers of God meet. The good Bishop's earthly course was the shorter of the two. He was carried off by fever in 1667 in his Irish diocese. The good Presbyter lingered on until 1691, though harassed by incessant persecutions, privations, and infirmities. In social rank Baxter had the advantage, for he belonged to an old county family. His father squandered his property at the gaming table until a profound conversion turned him into a serious Puritan Christian a few years before Richard was born; but the boy was brought up under the roof of his maternal grandfather, Richard Adeney of Rowton, a small landed proprietor. Jeremy Taylor's father was a barber at Cambridge, and the son entered the university with the free commons of a sizarship. In scholarship, however, the balance inclined in favour of the lad who had the good fortune to be born in a university city. He was sent to school at the early age of three, and entered Caius College at thirteen. A distinguished university course laid up the ample stores of classical learning which in after years enriched his writings with their marvellous opulence. Baxter received little help from any of his teachers. His education was utterly mismanaged. He was intrusted as a private pupil to ignorant and sottish curates, and through bad advice his parents refrained from sending him to Oxford. Sir James Stephen says he quitted school at nineteen 'destitute of all mathematical and physical science, ignorant of Hebrew, a mere smatterer in Greek, and possessed