

Nicodemus advised his countrymen not to reject Jesus before hearing Him, and they answered by accusing him of being a Galilean. Finally, Nicodemus is brought into the narrative once again as contributing an enormous quantity of myrrh and aloes to Christ's burial (xix. 39). This may indicate that the rich Jews who were only semi-Christians contributed largely in a financial way to the poor Christians.

If there is anything in the theses here presented the historical reconstruction would be as follows. There actually lived, in Ephesus or Pergamos, or at any rate in that region, a certain Nicolaos, who may or may not have been the Nicholas the deacon and proselyte of Antioch mentioned in Acts. He taught that a man might be a Christian while still remaining a Jew, no startling doctrine in those days when we know that many men thought the same. By the reign of Nero, however, when persecution had broken out, and the distinction between Jew and Christian had been emphasized by Paul, his followers became odious to those who felt themselves primarily Christians, even though they may, like the John of the Apocalypse, have detested the new-fangled Gentile Christianity of Paul. The author of Revelation denounced them with the unqualified hatred that he had for all but his own stripe, but when the more tolerant and loving Ephesian Evangelist came to write, he regarded them with more forbearance and tried to show in his book how such an attitude as that of Nicolaos and his disciples was at least psychologically comprehensible. For obvious reasons he concealed his defense of him under the exactly equivalent name of Nicodemus.

## A NEW DISCOVERY REGARDING NAZARETH.

BY A. KAMPMEIER.

AS is well known, doubts have been expressed for some time regarding the existence of Nazareth in the first century. The writer's belief in its existence has never been overthrown thus far, not because of sentimental or traditional, but for quite sound and valid reasons, which I will not repeat here as I have expressed them to a large extent in my article "Nazareth, Nazorean and Jesus" (*The Open Court*, XXIV, pp. 375 ff).

The doubts concerning the existence of Nazareth, shown by some scholars, have been made use of especially by Dr. William Benjamin Smith, in his theory denying the historical character of

Jesus and claiming that the name *Jesus*, in conjunction with *Nazoraios*, is only an attribute of God. The matter has become more complicated by the attention that author has bestowed upon the pre-Christian *Nasareans* of Epiphanius who, he claims, were identical with the Jewish-Christian *Nazoreans*.

The writer of this note, in going over the matter again, has recently made the discovery that there is an *En Naṣāra* (pronounced *naṣāra*) on the map of Palestine besides the *En Nāṣira* (pr. *nāzira*) accepted traditionally as the old Nazareth. And what is interesting, if not significant, this *En Naṣāra* is in the district of Gilead east of the Jordan, where, according to Epiphanius, the pre-Christian Nasareans had their origin. This *En Naṣāra* is southeast from *En Nāṣira* and is given on the very accurate map of modern Palestine in Benzinger's *Hebräische Archäologie* (J. C. B. Mohr, Freiburg and Leipsic, 1894). Whether this *En Naṣāra* existed at the time of the pre-Christian Nasareans of Epiphanius of course cannot be proved. But in the Orient, we know, things change but little, and sites remain inhabited for thousands of years. *En* is Arabic for "spring," beside which a town would spring up naturally in Palestine. The *en* at *Naṣāra* may have existed for thousands of years, as probably also the *en* at *Nāṣira*. The possibility is that the pre-Christian Nasareans of Epiphanius, rejectors of meat as food, of sacrifices, and of the Mosaic law as laid down in the Pentateuch, took their name from that locality, just as the Jewish Christians are considered to have been named from Nazareth, the home of their founder. The possibility also exists that the expression "Nazareth of Galilee," used in the New Testament, was used to distinguish it from the town in Gilead bearing a similar name, just as there was a Bethlehem both in Galilee and Judea. The distinction, further, which Epiphanius makes between the *Nasaraioi*, the pre-Christian Jewish sect, and the *Nazoraioi*, the Christian Jewish sect, may after all not have been his invention, but one delivered to him as a fact.

The Greek rendering *Nazoraioi*, the one occurring most often in the New Testament, need not trouble us much, even if the Aramaic (the language spoken in Palestine at the beginning of our era) *Naṣorath* (pronounced *naṣōrath*) for Nazareth, as given in Winer (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, 1820), should not be correct. We should find difficulty neither in connection with the *ō* in the second syllable, for the Greek rendering often differs very much from the Hebrew in regard to vowels in the Septuagint (e. g., Gr. *Thamni*, Hebr. *Thimni*, Gr. *Galaad*, Hebr. *Gilead*); nor in regard to the *ṣade*, rendered by zeta in *Nazoraioi*, as we have seen (cf. my article men-

tioned above) that there are exceptions to the rule that *şade* is generally rendered by sigma, and as even in Hebrew *şade* and *zayin* are interchangeable, words being written either with *şade* or *zayin* with no difference in meaning.

As to whether my discovery has any value in the question under consideration, I will leave this to the judgment of readers interested in the matter.

## THE ZEN ORDINATION CEREMONY.

BY BEATRICE SUZUKI.

ON Sunday, July 11, 1915, the ordination ceremony took place of an English gentleman who was admitted to the Buddhist brotherhood, the first Occidental to become a Mahayanist monk. There have been monks admitted into the brotherhood in Ceylon of the Hinayana, but never before had the Mahayana opened its doors to a Westerner.

The novice was an English gentleman who had lived many years in America. In 1913 he came to Japan for the purpose of studying Buddhism and went to Kyoto where for a time he was a teacher of English in a Buddhist college of the Shin sect. He had, however, become interested in the tenets and practice of the contemplative Zen sect, and in May, 1914, became a disciple of the Right Rev. Soyen Shaku, former Abbot of Engaku-ji and Kencho-ji, one of the most popular and brilliant priests of the Zen sect, who came to Chicago in 1893 as a delegate to the World's Parliament of Religions, and in 1905 paid a further visit to the United States and Europe.

In April, 1915, the novice came to Rev. Shaku's temple, Toke-ji, at Kamakura, and received instruction from him. He was then formally received into the brotherhood, and is now a Buddhist monk. The ceremony was interesting, a few guests only were invited. The formalities took place in the Kwannondo of Toke-ji, Rev. Shaku officiating. The novice, clad in a simple white dress, came before his master who applied the razor to his head and with solemn words and with the prayers of those present received the priestly robes and bowls. A little later he returned, now the monk Sokaku, clad in his flowing black *koromo* and *kesa*, to receive the benediction of his teacher and pay his respects to Shakyamuni