A Concise Summary of Alfred Edersheim's *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*

Part I
Jewish Background

INTRODUCTION

The following paper is a summary of Alfred Edersheim's *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. In it Edersheim has put the gospel accounts into a proper chronology, as far as possible. But most importantly he brings us into an understanding of why Jesus had such harsh denunciations of Jewish Traditionalism in all its branches and representatives. This Traditionalism was the basis and substance of Rabbinism for which such unlimited authority and absolute submission was claimed.

This paper aims to present the general teaching and tendency of Rabbinism, to explain the bearing of the religious leaders of Israel from the first towards Jesus. It is also necessary to trace the historical development of thought and religious belief until it issued in the system of Traditionalism, which by internal necessity was irreconcilably antagonistic to the Christ of the Gospels. A full portrait of Jewish life, society, and thinking seems also requisite.

From this background we shall perceive that the words of Christ were wholly of their time, their cast Jewish. But notwithstanding their similarity of form, there is not only essential difference but absolute contrariety of substance and spirit. Jesus spoke as a Jew to the Jews, but not as their highest teachers would have spoken.

THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST

Among the outward means by which the religion of Israel was preserved, one of the most important was the centralization and localization of its worship in Jerusalem. It is doubtful whether monotheism could have survived without it. In view of the state of the ancient world, and of the tendencies of Israel during the earlier stages of her history, the strictest isolation was necessary in order to preserve the religion of the Old Testament from that mixture with foreign elements which would speedily have proved fatal to its existence. The dispersion during the time of Christ of the greater part of the nation among those whose manners and civilization would necessarily influence them rendered the continuation of this separation of as great an importance as before in Old Testament times. In this respect, even Traditionalism had its mission and use as a hedge around the Law to render its infringement or modification impossible. The history of Israel and all her prospects were intertwined with her religion. History, patriotism, religion, and

hope all alike pointed to Jerusalem and the Temple as the center of Israel's unity.

During this period the Palestinian Jews were indeed a minority. The majority of the nation constituted what was known as the dispersion, a term which, however, no longer expressed its original meaning of banishment by the judgment of God, since absence from Palestine was now entirely voluntary. And even though the Jews were living in all parts of the world, they had but one metropolis, Jerusalem, the Holy City, with its Temple dedicated to the Most High God.

The dispersion consisted of the Western (or Hellinist) and Eastern (Or Trans-Euphratic[1]) segments. In Palestine the former were commonly referred to as "Grecians" while the latter were termed "Hebrews". The Trans-Euphratic Jews, who inhabited Babylon and many of the other satrapies,[2] were included with the Palestinians and the Syrians under the term "Hebrews" because of the common language which they spoke.

But the difference between the Grecians and Hebrews was far deeper than merely language. There were mental influences at work in the Greek world from which it was impossible even for Jews to withdraw themselves. Yet at the same time these Hellenists intensely wished to be Jews equal to their Eastern brethren. On the other hand, Pharisaism, in its pride of legal purity and possession of traditional lore, made no secret of its contempt for the Hellenists and openly declared the Grecian far inferior to the Babylonian dispersion. That such feelings had struck deep into the popular mind appears from the fact that even in the Apostolic Church in her earliest day disputes broke out between the Hellenists and the Hebrews, arising from suspicion of unkind and unfair dealings grounded on these sectional prejudices.

ROMAN HATRED OF THE JEWS

The educated Roman regarded the Jew with a mixture of contempt and anger. According to his notions, the Jew no longer had a right to his religion since his subjection to Rome. All the more bitter was the fact that wherever a Roman might go, he was confronted with the despised race whose religion was so uncompromising as to form a wall of separation, and whose rites were so exclusive as to make them not only strangers but enemies. Such a phenomenon was nowhere else to be encountered. In consequence, the Jew was a constant theme of popular merriment, and the theater would resound with laughter as his religion was lampooned.

As a proud Roman passed through the streets on the Sabbath, Judaism would thrust itself upon his notice by the shops that were closed and by the strange figures who idly moved about in holiday attire. The Jews were strangers in a strange land, not only unsympathetic with what

1 In the Babylonian area, east of the Euphrates River.

2 A satrapy is a province within an empire ruled by a satrap or governor. These divisions were originally used by the Median and Persian empires and by the succeeding Greek empire. However, the term continued to be used under Roman rule.

passed around, but with a marked contempt and abhorrence of it. There was about their whole bearing the unspoken feeling that the time of Rome's fall and of their own supremacy was at hand.

Augustus had assigned the fourteeneth region across the Tiber to the Jews as their special quarter in Rome. This seems to have been their poor quarter. But indeed, the Jewish residents in Rome must have spread over every quarter of the city, even the best, to judge by the location of their synagogues.

The special importance of the Jewish community in Rome lay in its contiguity to the seat of the government of the world where every movement could be watched and influenced. Thus, upon the death of Herod a deputation from Palestine appeared in the capital to seek the restoration of their Theocracy under a Roman protectorate, and no less then 8,000 of the Roman Jews joined it.

In truth, there was no law to prevent the spread of Judaism. Except for the brief period when Tiberius banished the Jews from Rome, they enjoyed not only perfect liberty but exceptional privileges. They were not to be disturbed in their religious ceremonies nor in the observance of their sabbaths and feasts. The annual Temple-tribute was allowed to be transported to Jerusalem, and the Jews were free from military service. When the public distribution of corn or of money among the citizens fell on a Sabbath, the Jews were to receive their share on the following day.

THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE WEST

It was not only in the capital of the Empire that the Jews enjoyed the rights of Roman citizenship. Many in Asia Minor could boast of the same privilege. The Seleucidic rulers of Syria had previously bestowed kindred privileges on the Jews in many places, and thus, they possessed in some cities twofold rights, the status of Roman and the privileges of Asiatic citizenship. In Syria, where, according to Josephus, the largest number of Jews lived, they experienced special favor. In Antioch their rights and immunities were recorded on tables of brass.

Antioch, the capital of Syria, was one of the Jews favorite resorts. It lay just outside what the Rabbinists designated as "Syria," and was still regarded as holy ground. Thus it formed an advanced post between the Palestinian and the Gentile world. Its chief Synagogue was a magnificent building to which the successors of Antiochus Epiphanes had given the spoils which he had brought from the Temple. The connection between Jerusalem and Antioch was very close. All that occurred in Antioch was eagerly watched in the Jewish capital. The spread of Christianity there must have excited deep concern. Careful as the Talmud is not to provide unwelcome information, we know that three of the principal Rabbis went To Antioch on a mission for the purpose of arresting the progress of Christianity.

But whatever privileges Israel might enjoy, history records an almost continuous series of attempts on the part of the communities among whom they lived to deprive them not only of their immunities, but even of their common rights. Foremost among the reasons for this antagonism is the absolute contrariety between heathenism and the Synagogue, and the social isolation which Judaism rendered necessary. It was avowedly unlawful for the Jew even "to keep company, or come unto one of another nation." The recognition of the fact that as Jews they were strangers in a strange land made them loyal to the ruling powers and procured for them the protection of kings and Caesars. However, it also aroused the hatred of the populace.

That these widely-scattered members of Israel should have been united in one body is a unique fact of history. The links which bound them together were a common creed, a common life, a common center, and a common hope. Wherever the Jew sojourned, monotheism, the divine mission of Moses, and the authority of the Old Testament were to all unquestioned articles of belief. But deepest of all feelings was the love which bound them to Palestine and to Jerusalem: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth." Views and feelings of this kind help us to understand how, on some great feast, as Josephus states on sufficient authority, the population of Jerusalem within its ecclesiastical boundaries could have swelled to the enormous number of nearly three million.

It is worthwhile to trace how universally and warmly both Eastern and Western Judaism cherished this hope of all Israel's return to their own land. The Targumim bear repeated reference to it, and although there may be questions as to the exact date of these paraphrases, it cannot be doubted that in this respect they represented the views of the Synagogue at the time of Jesus. Israel's persecutions had served to keep her from becoming mixed with the Gentiles. Heaven and earth might be destroyed, but not Israel. And their final deliverance would far outstrip in marvelousness that deliverance from Egypt. The winds would blow to bring together the dispersed. If there were a single Israelite in a land, however distant, he would be restored. The nations would bring them back with every honor. The patriarchs and all the just would rise to share in the joys of the new possession of their land. Neither would that possession be ever taken from them nor those joys be ever succeeded by sorrows. In view of such general expectations we cannot fail to mark with what wonderful sobriety the Apostles put the question to Jesus: "Wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"

Hopes and expectations such as these are expressed not only in Talmudic writings but are found throughout the Pseudepigrapha. The Book of Enoch and the Sibylline Oracles are equally emphatic on this subject. During the time of Jesus the Messiah, we find reference to the future glory in the Book of Jubilees. There it is stated, that though Israel was scattered for her wickedness, God would "gather them all from the midst of the heathen, build among them His Sanctuary, and dwell with them." A century later, in the Fourth Book of Esdras, the end is described when the ten tribes will be restored by God to their own land.

What is noted in these writings is that all anticipated the deliverance of Israel, her restoration,

and future preeminent glory, and they all connect these events with the coming of the Messiah. This was "the promise." It was this which gave meaning to their worship, filled them with patience in suffering, kept them separate from the nations around, and ever fixed their hearts and thoughts upon Jerusalem. At any moment the gladsome tidings might burst upon them that He had come, when their glory would shine out from one end of the heavens to the other. All the signs of His Advent had come to pass. Perhaps, indeed, the Messiah might even now be there, ready to manifest himself, as soon as the voice of Israel's repentance called him from his hiding.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JUDAISM AND CHRIST

The pilgrim who entered Palestine from another country must have felt as if he had crossed the threshold of another world. Manners, customs, institutions, law, life, nay, the very intercourse between man and man, were quite different. All was dominated by the one all-absorbing idea of religion. It penetrated every relation of life. Moreover, it was inseparably connected with the soil as well as the people of Palestine, at least so long as the Temple stood. To the orthodox Jew the mental and spiritual horizon was bounded by Palestine. It was "the land"; all the rest of the world, except for Babylonia, was "outside the land." Not that the soil itself, irrespective of the people, was holy; it was Israel that made it such. God had created the world on account of Israel, and for their merit, making preparation for them long before their appearance on the scene. Israel had been in God's thoughts not only before anything had actually been created, but even before every other creative thought. If these distinctions seem excessive, they were, at least, not out of proportion to the estimate formed of Israel's merits. In theory, the latter might be supposed to flow from "good works," which included the strict practice of legal piety and the "study of the law." But in reality it was "study" alone to which such supreme merit attached.

The boundary lines of the Kingdom which Jesus traced were essentially different from those which the Jews had fixed and within which they had arranged everything for the present and the future. Had he been content to step within them, to complete and realize what they had indicated, it might have been different. But according to the Jews, the past, present, and the future alike as regarded the Gentile world and Israel were irrevocably fixed. God had offered his Law to the heathen nations, but they had refused it. And even their repentance would prove hypocritical. But as for Israel, even though their good deeds should be few, yet, by accumulating them from among all the people they would appear great in the end. God would exact payment for their sins as a man does from his friends, taking little sums at a time.

It is very difficult to define the boundaries of Israel since an accurate demarcation of them was determined by ritual and theological, not geographical, considerations. Not only the immediate neighborhood, as in the case of Ascalon, but the very wall of a city, as of Acco and Caesarea, might be Palestinian and yet the city itself be regarded as "outside" the sacred limits. Ideally the "land of promise" included all which God had covenanted to give to Israel, although never yet actually possessed by them. An inner band was formed around "the land" in its narrowest and

only real sense, and this was called Syria, a kind of outer Palestine. It can be understood why Jewish zealots would have concentrated their first efforts here when its capital of Antioch became the place where the name Christian was first used. Egypt, Babylon, Ammon, and Moab formed an outer band. These lands were heathen, and yet not quite heathen, since the dedication of the first-fruits in a prepared state was expected from them. Syria shared almost all the obligations of Palestine except those of the "second tithes," and the fourth year's product of plants. But the wavesheaf at the Paschal Feast and the two loaves at Pentecost could only be brought from what had grown on the holy soil itself. This latter was roughly defined as "all which they who came up from Babylon took possession of, in the land of Israel, and unto Chezib."[3]

Within the holy land itself there was a gradation of sanctity. Ten degrees are enumerated, beginning with the bare soil of Palestine and culminating in the Most Holy Place in the Temple. And although the very dust of heathen soil was supposed to carry defilement, like corruption or the grave, the spots most sacred were everywhere surrounded by heathenism, even in Jerusalem itself. The reasons for this are to be found in the political circumstances of Palestine and in the persistent endeavor of its rulers, with the exception of a very brief period under the Maccabees, to Grecianize the country so as to eradicate that Jewish particularism which must always be antagonistic to every foreign element. In general, Palestine might be divided into the strictly Jewish territory and the so-called Hellenic cities. These were constituted after the model of the Greek cities having their own senates and magistrates, each city with its adjoining territory forming a sort of commonwealth of its own.

The strictly Jewish territory consisted of Judea proper to which Galilee, Samaria, and Perea were joined as Toparchies.[4] Civil administration fell to the Scribes. Judea itself was arranged into nine Toparchies, of which Jerusalem was the chief. While, therefore, the Hellenic cities were each independent of the other, the whole Jewish territory formed only one "*Civitas.*"[5]

Herod the Great and his immediate successors built a number of towns which were inhabited chiefly by Gentiles and had independent constitutions like those of the Hellenic cities. Herod himself built Samaria in the center of the country, Caesarea in the west, Gaba in Galilee, and Esbonitis in Perea. Philip the Tetrarch built Caesarea Philippi and Julias (Bethsaida-Julias on the western shore of the lake). The object of these cities was twofold. As Herod, knowing his unpopularity, surrounded himself with foreign mercenaries and reared fortresses around his palace and the Temple, so he erected these fortified posts which he populated with strangers as so many outworks to surround and command Jerusalem and the Jews on all sides. Despite his profession of Judaism, he reared magnificent heathen temples in honor of Augustus at Sebaste (Samaria) and Caesarea. These cities were really intended to form centers of Grecian influence within the sacred territory itself.

3 Mentioned in Gen. 38:5, probably the same as Achzib, a town in the Shephelah or plain country of Judah (Josh. 15:44).

4 A toparchy is a small state, such as Judea, consisting of a few cities or towns and ruled by a toparchy.

5 Latin for state, citizenship, or city-state.

Although each of these towns and districts had its special deities and rites, the prevailing character may be described as a mixture of Greek and Syrian worship. But Herod and his successors encouraged the worship of the Emperor and of Rome.

This abhorrence of everything connected with idolatry and the contempt entertained for all that was non-Jewish will in great measure explain the code of legislation intended to keep the Jew and Gentile apart. To begin with, every Gentile child, as soon as born, was to be regarded as unclean. Those who actually worshiped mountains, hills, bushes, etc., in short, gross idolaters, should be cut down with the sword. But as it was impossible to exterminate heathenism, Rabbinic legislation had as its goal (1) to prevent Jews from being inadvertently led into idolatry; (2) to avoid all participation in idolatry; (3) not to do anything which might aid the heathen in their worship; and (4) not to give pleasure nor even help to the heathen. The Mishnah even goes so far as to forbid aid to a mother in the hour of her need or nourishment to her baby in order not to bring up a child for idolatry.

In truth, the bitter hatred which the Jews bore to the Gentiles can only be explained from the estimate held of their character. The most vile, and even unnatural, crimes were imputed to them. They should be altogether avoided, so far as possible, except in cases of necessity or for the sake of business. Jews were to avoid passing through a city where there was an idolatrous feast. They were not even to sit down within the shadow of a tree dedicated to idol worship for its wood was polluted. If used in baking, the bread was unclean. If a shuttle had been made of it, not only was all cloth woven on it forbidden, but if such had been inadvertently mixed with other pieces of cloth, the whole garment became unclean. Milk drawn by a heathen, if a Jew had not been present to watch it, was unlawful, as was bread and oil prepared by them. The mere touch of a heathen polluted a whole cask of wine, and even to put one's nose to heathen wine was strictly prohibited.

THE SCRIBES

In trying to picture to ourselves New Testament scenes, a most prominent figure is that of the Scribe. He seems ubiquitous. We meet him in Jerusalem, Judea, and even in Galilee. Everywhere he appears as the mouthpiece and representative of the people. He pushes to the front, the crowd respectfully giving way and eagerly hanging on his utterances as those of a recognized authority. He has been solemnly ordained by the laying on of hands and is the Rabbi, 'my great one,' Master. He puts questions, he urges objections, he expects full explanations and respectful demeanor. Indeed his hyper-ingenuity in questioning has become a proverb. There is no measure to his dignity nor limit to his importance. His order constitutes the ultimate authority on all questions of faith and practice, and along with the chief priests and elders he is a judge in the ecclesiastical tribunals, whether of the capital or in the provinces. Although generally appearing in company with the Pharisees, he is not necessarily one of them, for they represent a

religious party, while he has a status and holds an office. In short, he is the *Talmid* or learned student, the *Chakham* or sage, whose honor is to be great in the future world. He is to be absolutely believed, even if he were to declare that which was on the right hand to be on the left.

Also exerting such decisive influence upon the Jew and so effectually opposed to the new doctrine of the Kingdom was "the traditions of the Elders." Traditionalism declared these to be of even greater obligation than the Scripture itself since tradition was equally of Divine origin with the Holy Scriptures and authoritatively explained its meaning. Tradition gave application to cases not expressly provided for in the Scriptures, perhaps not even foreseen in Biblical times, and generally guarded its sanctity by extending and adding to its provisions. The greatest merit a Rabbi could claim was the strictest adherence to the traditions which he received from his teacher.

According to the Jewish view, on Mount Sinai God had given Moses both the oral and wirtten Law, that is, the Law with all its interpretations and applications. From Exodus 20:1, it was inferred that God had communicated to Moses the Bible, the Mishnah, the Talmud, and the Haggadah, even to that which scholars would in latest times propound. Why had Moses written down the Bible only? Moses had proposed to write down all the teaching entrusted to him, but the Almighty had refused him to do so on account of the future subjection of Israel to the nations who would take the written law from them. Then the unwritten traditions would remain to separate between Israel and the Gentiles. But Traditionalism went even further and placed the oral actually above the written Law.

This body of traditional ordinances forms the subject of the *Mishnah,* or second, repeated law. On one side is placed the Law of Moses as recorded in the Pentateuch and standing by itself. All else, even the teaching of the Prophets and of the Hagiographa, as well as the oral traditions, bore the general name of *Qabbalah*, "that which has been received." The sacred study, or *Midrash*, in the original application of the term, concerned either the *Halakhah*, traditional *ordinance*, which was always "that which had been heard" (*Shematha*), or else the *Haggadah*, "that which was said" upon the authority of individuals, not as legal ordinance. It was illustration, commentary, anecdote, clever or learned sayings, etc.

The Mishnah comprises only a very small part of Traditionalism. In the course of time, the discussions, illustrations, explanations, and additions to which the Mishnah gave rise, whether in its application or in the Academies of the Rabbis, were authoritatively collected and edited in what are known as the two *Talmuds* or *Gemaras.* The oldest of these two Talmuds dates from about the close of the fourth century of our era, and the second is about a century younger.

The Halakhah, however varied in its application, was something fixed and stable, while the Haggadah was given the utmost latitude. It is sadly characteristic that practically the main body of Jewish dogmatic and moral theology is really only Haggadah, and hence of no absolute authority. The Halakhah indicated with the most minute and painful punctiliousness every legal

ordinance as to outward observances, and it explained every bearing of the Law of Moses. But beyond this, it left the inner man, the spring of actions, untouched. What he was to believe and feel was chiefly matter of the Haggadah.

And here we may mark the fundamental distinction between the teaching of Jesus and Rabbinism. Jesus left the Halakhah untouched, putting it, as it were, on one side, as something quite secondary, while he insisted as primary that which to them was chiefly matter of Haggadah. And this rightly so, for, in his own words, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth," since "those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart, and they defile the man." The difference was one of fundamental principle and not merely of development, form, or detail. The one developed the Law in its outward direction as ordinances and commandments; the other in its inward application as life and liberty. Thus Rabbinism occupied one pole, and the outcome of its tendency to pure externalism was the Halakhah, all that was internal and higher being merely Haggadic. The teaching of Jesus occupied the opposite pole. Its starting point was the inner sanctuary in which God was known and worshiped, and it might well leave the Rabbinic Halakhoth aside as not worth controversy, to be in the meantime "done and observed," in the firm assurance that in the course of its development, the spirit would create its own appropriate forms. Rabbinism started with the demand of outward obedience and righteousness and pointed to sonship as its goal. The Gospel started with the free gift of forgiveness through faith and of sonship and pointed to obedience and righteousness as its goal.

In truth, Rabbinism as such had no system of theology, only what ideas, conjectures, or fancies the Haggadah yielded concerning God, angels, demons, man, his future destiny and present position, and Israel with its past history and coming glory. Accordingly, by the side of what is noble and pure, Rabbinism placed before the people a terrible mass of utter incongruities, conflicting statements, and too often debasing superstitions, such as the Almighty Himself and his angels taking part in the conversations with the Rabbis and the discussions of the Academies, forming a kind of heavenly Sanhedrin; the miraculous merging into the ridiculous and even the revolting; miraculous cures, miraculous supplies, miraculous help, all for the glory of great Rabbis who by a look or word can kill and restore to life.

Israel had made void the Law by its traditions. Under a load of outward ordinances and observances its spirit had been crushed. The religion as well as the grand hope of the Old Testament had become externalized. So both heathenism and Judaism, each following its own direction, had reached its goal. All was prepared and waiting. Only one thing was needed, the coming of the Christ. As yet darkness covered the earth and gross darkness lay upon the people. But far away the golden light of the new day was already tinging the edge of the horizon. Presently would the Lord arise upon Zion, and His glory be seen upon her. Presently would the Voice from out of the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, herald the Coming of His Christ to Jew and Gentile, and that Kingdom of heaven which, established upon earth, is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

WITHIN THE CITY OF JERUSALEM

Altogether Jerusalem covered, at its greatest, about 300 acres. As of old, there were still the same narrow streets in the business quarters, but in close contiguity to bazaars and shops rose stately mansions of wealthy merchants and palaces of princes. In the streets and lanes, everything might be purchased whether the production of Palestine or goods imported from foreign lands. Ancient Jewish writings enable us to identify no fewer than 118 different articles of import. Articles of luxury, especially from abroad, fetched enormous prices. On the other hand, the cost of common living was very low.

The population of Jerusalem, computed from 200,000 to 250,000, was enormously swelled by travelers and pilgrims during the great festivals. The Temple called thousands of priests, many of them with their families, to Jerusalem, while the Academies were filled with hundreds of scholars and students. In the city there must have been many large warehouses for the near commercial harbor of Joppa, and from there, as from the industrial centers of busy Galilee, the peddler would go forth to sell his wares. More especially would the markets of Jerusalem, held in bazaars and streets, be thronged with noisy sellers and bargaining buyers. There were special inspectors for these markets who tested weights and measures, officially stamped them, tried the soundness of food and drink, and occasionally fixed or lowered the market prices, enforcing their decision, if need be, with a stick. The official market days were Monday and Thursday, and afterwards Friday. But one may suppose that in Jerusalem the sellers would be in the markets every day.

In Jerusalem was a peculiar mixture of two worlds: not only of the Grecian and the Jewish, but of piety and frivolity also. The devotion of the people and the liberality of the rich were unbounded. Fortunes were lavished on the support of Jewish learning, the promotion of piety, or the advance of the national cause. Thousands of votive offerings and the costly gifts in the Temple bore evidence of this. These townspeople, Jerusalemites as they called themselves, were polished, witty, and pleasant. There was a tact in their social intercourse and a considerateness and delicacy in their public arrangements and provisions nowhere else to be found. Their hospitality, especially at festive seasons, was unlimited. Their homes were luxuriously furnished, and they provided sumptuous entertainments. But evidence comes to us that all this luxuriousness led to moral corruption.

GALILEE

Greater contrast could scarcely be imagined than between the intricate scholastic studies of the Judeans and the active pursuits that engaged men in Galilee. Galilee was to Judaism "the Court of the Gentiles;" the Rabbinic Schools essentially its innermost Sanctuary. The natural

disposition of the people, even the soil and climate of Galilee, were not favorable to the all-engrossing passion for Rabbinic study. In Judea all seemed to invite to retrospection and introspection, to favor habits of solitary thought and study, until it kindled into fanaticism. No Hindu fanatic would more humbly bend before Brahmin saints, nor devout Romanist more venerate the members of a holy fraternity, than the Jew his great Rabbi. Reason, duty, and precept alike bound the Jew to reverence him.

It was quite otherwise in Galilee. The smiling landscape of Lower Galilee invited the easy labor of the agriculturist. The highlands of Upper Galilee were gloriously grand, free, fresh, and bracing. A more beautiful country could scarcely be imagined than Galilee proper. According to the Rabbis, it was easier to rear a forest of olive trees in Galilee than one child in Judea. Corn grew in abundance, and the wine was plentiful. The cost of living was about one-fifth of that in Judea.

In Galilee religious observances were simpler in practice. As regarded canon-law, they often took independent views and followed the interpretations of those who had a more mild and rational application of traditionalism. They were in fact looked down upon as neglecting traditionalism, unable to rise to its speculative heights and preferring the attractions of the Haggadah to the logical subtleties of the Halakhah. There was a general contempt in Rabbinic circles for all that was Galilean. Although the Judean or Jerusalem dialect was far from pure, the people of Galilee were specially blamed for neglecting the study of their language, charged with errors in grammar and especially with absurd mispronunciation.

Among such a people, and in that country, Jesus spent by far the longest part of his life upon earth. Generally, this period may be described as that of his true and full human development, of outward submission to man, and inward submission to God, with the attendant results of wisdom, favor, and grace. Necessary as this period was, it cannot be said that it was time lost, even so far as his work as Savior was concerned. It was more than the preparation for that work, it was the commencement of it. Subjectively (and passively) it was the self-abnegation of humiliation in his willing submission. Objectively (and actively), it was the fulfilment of all righteousness through it. But into this mystery of piety we may only look afar off. These thirty years of *Human Life* were needed by us also that the overpowering thought of his Divinity might not overshadow that of his Humanity.