

rily frightened. If they were in Nazareth, why was it necessary to flee into Egypt? Herod's rage was directed against Bethlehem, not Nazareth. And the presumption is, that they would have been safe at the latter place.

Joseph understood by angelic announcement that Jesus was to reign on David's throne. So he made his home in Bethlehem, and at once, after the presentation in the Temple, returned to that village. This supposition is strengthened when we find that even after the return from Egypt he still held the purpose to live in Judea rather than Galilee. It was through God's interference that he finally settled in Galilee. His purpose was to go to Judea, but was afraid. God confirmed his fear, and he withdrew into Galilee. Bethlehem, then, was to be his home; and from Jerusalem, after the presentation in the Temple, the holy family returned to that place.

Within two years after Christ's birth the Magi made their visit to Jesus. Then Herod felt mocked and angered, and determined to destroy all children under two years of age, "according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men." Then follows: (1) the flight, (2) Herod's death, (3) the return. All this was according to the law, or commandment, of the Lord. Luke hastily passes over the minor incidents of the two years, giving only the circumstances omitted by Matthew. He includes the whole narrative under the words: "And when they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord they returned into Galilee to their own city, Nazareth" (R. V.).

Matthew had in view the fulfillment of the prophecy, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." He recorded only the circumstances leading thereto. Luke had in view the prophecy, "He shall be called a Naz-

arene," and omitted the circumstances not entering into its fulfillment.

This would not have prevented the parents of Jesus having gone every year to the feast at Jerusalem, both preceding and after the flight into Egypt. Yet Luke's reference, perhaps, only considers the years after they arrived in Nazareth; for of that time only is Luke speaking. The two years spent in Judea does not enter into the account.

The text Luke ii: 39 does not necessarily demand that an immediate departure from Jerusalem to Nazareth be understood. It simply means to show that they finally dwelt in Nazareth. But when we are acquainted with the impetuosity of temper of that tyrant, King Herod, reason demands that we do not allow two years for him to fume and fret before his rage bursts out; but that his anger appears at once, close on the heels of the departing Magi.

HUDSON, IA. V. A. CARLTON.

Is the Application Legitimate?

In the August HOMILETIC REVIEW we have Matt. xi: 12 used in the following connection (see page 182): "The trouble with a great many clergymen is, they wait for what they term 'the moving of the waters,' . . . forgetful of the fact that, in the language of Scripture, 'the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force'; or, again, that the 'effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.'"

It is a question as to whether this quotation can be used to emphasize the need of Christian activity in behalf of others, as is the evident intent here. We venture the opinion that Christ was not here commending the violence of the violent, in the context from which this is taken; yet these words are frequently used to enforce by Scriptural authority the need of penitential and Christian earnestness.