



BS 413 .B55 1901

Biblical and Semitic studies

Pale Bicentennial Publications

BIBLICAL AND SEMITIC STUDIES

Yale Bicentennial Publications

With the approval of the President and Fellows of Yale University, a series of volumes has been prepared by a number of the Professors and Instructors, to be issued in connection with the Bicentennial Anniversary, as a partial indication of the character of the studies in which the University teachers are engaged.

This series of volumes is respectfully dedicated to

The Graduates of the University



BIBLICAL

AND

SEMITIC STUDIES

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS
BY THE MEMBERS OF THE
SEMITIC AND BIBLICAL FACULTY
OF YALE UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
LONDON: EDWARD ARNOLD

1901

Copyright, 1901,
BY YALE UNIVERSITY

Published, October, 1901

UNIVERSITY PRESS · JOHN WILSON
AND SON · CAMBRIDGE, U. S. A.

P R E F A C E

THE greater number of the essays published in this volume have been presented as papers before the Semitic and Biblical Club of Yale University, and are included, after proper revision and expansion, in this volume as fairly representing the varied type of work done in that long established and highly useful organization. This origin explains the diverse character of the themes discussed. They have been arranged for printing in an order which is fairly historical, beginning with a discussion of the earliest Semitic movements which resulted in the organization of Israel, and closing with a history of one of the latest achievements of Semitic energy.

CONTENTS

THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL

	PAGE
I. THEIR MENTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT :	
1. In the Priestly Writings (P)	3
2. In the Deuteronomic Writings (D)	5
3. In the Historico-prophetical Writings (JE)	5
II. THE GENEALOGICAL ORIGIN OF THE TRIBES :	
1. The Origin and Purpose of their Genealogy	7
2. The Separate Members of Israel's Genealogy	11
III. THE SEPARATE TRIBES :	
1. The Sons of Leah, — Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issa- char, and Zebulon	18
2. The Sons of Rachel, — Joseph and Benjamin	22
3. The Sons of the two Maids, — Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher	27
IV. THE SETTLEMENT OF THE TRIBES IN CANAAN	31

THE GROWTH OF ISRAELITISH LAW

I. ISRAEL'S ORIGINAL HERITAGE OF CUSTOMS AND LAWS . .	41
II. INFLUENCES WHICH LED TO THE REVISION AND EXPANSION OF THE LAW :	
1. The Settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan	45
2. The Babylonian Exile	46
3. Contact with Other Peoples and Fusion with the Canaanites	46
4. Changed Political and Social Conditions	48
5. New Religious Institutions	49
6. The Development of Higher Ethical Standards	49
7. The Teaching of the Prophets and Wise Men	50
8. The Divine Influence in the Growth of the Law	51
III. CONDITIONS BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM .	54

	PAGE
IV. ISRAELITISH LAW IN THE MAKING :	
1. The Decisions of Judges	56
2. Moses' Relation to the Law	59
3. The Share of the Priests in developing the Law	60
4. The Different Stages in the Growth of the Law	63
V. THE GROWTH OF THE WRITTEN LAW :	
1. Original Motives for committing Laws to Writing	65
2. The Origin and Date of the Decalogues	67
3. Private Codes embodying New Principles and adapted to New Needs: the Deuteronomic Code	72
4. The Public Ratification of the Deuteronomic Code	76
5. Theoretical Private Codes: Ezekiel, 40 to 48	77
6. Formative Ceremonial Codes	78
7. The Public Ratification of the Priestly Code	81
VI. THE GROWTH OF THE ORAL LAW	84
VII. CONCLUSIONS	87

THE *YEÇER HARA*: A STUDY IN THE JEWISH
DOCTRINE OF SIN

I. INTRODUCTORY	93
II. CRITICISM OF WEBER'S TREATMENT OF THE <i>YEÇER</i>	98
III. THE RABBINICAL CONCEPTION :	
1. The Seat of the Good and Evil Impulses	110
2. The Nature of the Evil Impulse	111
3. The Origin of the Evil <i>Yeçer</i>	117
4. The Conquest of the <i>Yeçer</i> by Man	123
5. The Removal of the <i>Yeçer</i> by God	130
6. Summary	132
IV. THE PRESENCE OF THE CONCEPTION IN EARLIER SOURCES :	
1. The Book of Sirach	136
2. The Apocalypse of Ezra	146
3. The Apocalypse of Baruch	152
4. The Secrets of Enoch	154

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION

I. NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES REFERRING TO THE TRANS- FIGURATION :	
1. The Account in Mark	159
2. The Account in Matthew	164
3. The Account in Luke	166
4. Mark's Account the most Primitive	169
5. The Account in the Fourth Gospel	171
6. The Account in Second Peter	171

II. VARIOUS EXPLANATIONS OF THE TRANSFIGURATION :	PAGE
1. The Vision Theory	176
2. The Dream Theory	178
3. The Naturalistic Theory	179
4. The Theory of an Objective Reality	180
5. The Mythical Theory	181
6. Oscar Holtzmann's Theory	186
III. THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION :	
1. The Meaning and Importance of the appearing of Moses and Elijah	189
2. The Events of this Period Reviewed	193
3. The Relation to Peter's Confession	200
4. The Importance of the Witness of the Old Testament to the Early Christians	203
5. The Jewish Conception of a Suffering Messiah Post-Christian	204
6. The Details of the Gospel Narrative	206
7. Possible Objections Considered	208
8. Conclusion	209

STEPHEN'S SPEECH : ITS ARGUMENT AND DOCTRINAL RELATIONSHIP

I. RELATION OF THE SPEECH TO ITS NARRATIVE SETTING .	213
II. STYLE AND VOCABULARY	230
III. DOCTRINAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE SPEECH AND THEIR LITERARY AFFINITIES	237

THE MOHAMMEDAN CONQUEST OF EGYPT AND NORTH AFRICA (643-705 A.D.)

THE HISTORY AND ITS AUTHOR	279
I. THE STORY OF THE CONQUEST :	
1. The Conquest of El-Fayyûm	283
2. The Conquest of Barca	284
3. The Conquest of Itrâbulos	285
4. 'Amr's Request for Permission to Invade Africa	287
5. The Removal of 'Amr from the Command in Egypt	288
6. The Violation of the Treaty by the Alexandrians	290
7. The Destruction of Khirbet Werdân	293
8. Further Traditions relating to this Campaign	294
9. 'Amr's Visits to the Caliph 'Omar	295
10. The Death of 'Amr ibn el 'Âsî	297
11. 'Amr's Last Commands	299

II. THE CAMPAIGNS OF 'ABD ALLAH IBN SA'D:	PAGE
1. The Conquest of "Africa"	301
2. How the Tidings were brought to Medina	304
3. The Conquest of Nubia	307
4. The Victory of Dhû 's-Sawâri	310
5. The Garrison of Alexandria	313
 III. SUBSEQUENT COMMANDERS AND EXPEDITIONS IN NORTH	
AFRICA :	
1. Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij	315
2. 'Oqba ibn Nâfi'	317
3. Abû 'l-Muhâjir	320
4. 'Oqba's last Campaign	322
5. Hassân ibn en-No'mân	325
6. The Death of Zuhair ibn Qais	327
7. Mûsâ ibn Nosair	329

THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL

EDWARD LEWIS CURTIS, PH.D., D.D.

HOLMES PROFESSOR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL

I

THEIR MENTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. *In the Priestly Writings (P.)*

THE priestly writings of the Old Testament are those portions of the Hexateuch written (unless certain laws are excepted) after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. and the still later books of First and Second Chronicles. In these is the fullest mention of the tribes of Israel. According to them Israel already in Egypt consisted of twelve or thirteen organized tribes representing the descendants of the twelve sons of Israel. This appears from the use of the word "hosts" in connection with their departure from the land of Egypt (Ex. 6: 26; 7: 4; 12: 17, 41, 51). On the basis of such an organization their entire life in the wilderness is also pictured. Each tribe is divided into families which are again subdivided into households (cf. Num. 1: 2, 18, 20; Josh. 7: 14 *et al.*)¹; and on this basis, at the beginning of their second year in the wilderness, on the eve of their first attempt to enter the land of Canaan, a census is taken of all men of a military age (Num. 1), and again at the close of the forty years of wandering in the desert (Num. 26). According to their tribes also were the people marshalled for their journey through the wilderness (Num. 2), each tribe having its fixed station about the tabernacle. Representatives from the twelve tribes go forth to spy out the land (Num. 13: 4-15), and by a selection of an equal

¹ The terms used are מטה (also older שבט) tribe, משפחה family, בית אב household (plural בתיאבות). Nowack *Arch.* Bd. I. p. 300 f.

number of men from each, an army for the conquest of Midian is formed (Num. 31: 4 f.).

Under such a complete united tribal organization Canaan is conquered and the tribes settling west of the Jordan receive their territory by lot (Jos. 14: 1-5), and the boundaries of each portion are given in detail (Jos. 15: 1-12, 20-61; 16: 4-9; 17: 1-10; 18: 1; 18: 11 to 19: 46; 19: 48 to 21: 42).¹ This representation of such a perfect tribal organization of Israel is ideal, resting not upon contemporary documents, but arising when Israel's past existence was conceived under the form of a highly developed ecclesiasticism.

Historically there was no such regular movement or precise constitution of the people. In general the only facts worthy of heed, given in these priestly narratives, are those respecting the elements of each tribe and their geographical location. Tribes were made up of families, and these again of households, but even these terms, however, were not early used with precision.² Sharp verbal distinctions belong to the exilic literature. The boundaries assigned to the tribes (in Jos. 14-19) may be generally accepted, although it is true that having a map of Canaan before him a late writer could easily apportion the land. Yet geographical reminiscence is naturally enduring and there is no serious reason for questioning that here preserved. The idea, however, frequently advanced,³ that since the boundaries given in the book of Joshua can be retraced in modern surveys, therefore the record is ancient, is a *non sequitur*. Such a fact only proves that the writer had a correct knowledge of the geography of Palestine, and, indeed the suspicion that the boundaries did come from the priestly writer, although preserving a true tradition, seems confirmed by the fact that those located in Southern Palestine, where he probably resided, are less confused than those in other sections.⁴

¹ These priestly sections are given according to Carpenter and Battersby, *The Hexateuch*, London and New York, 1900.

² Buhl, *Social Verhältnisse in Israel*, s. 37.

³ See, for example, Stewart's *The Land of Palestine*, 1900, p. 36.

⁴ Steuernagel, *Joshua*, p. 200.

Of similarly little historical value are the notices of the tribes given in First and Second Chronicles. Here again the writer pictures the movements of the people carried forward by the distinct twelve or thirteen tribes mentioned by name. Each tribe represented by a definite number of warriors appears at Hebron to make David king over all Israel (1 Chr. 12: 23-40), and a list is given of officers over each tribe under David (1 Chr. 27: 16-22). Such a regularity of tribal organization does not appear in the earlier accounts of David's reign and is plainly an ideal sketch of the Chronicler. In any discussion, then, of the early tribal life or history of Israel the material found in the priestly writings can be almost entirely ignored. Its significance is theological rather than historical, since it furnished a vehicle for the eschatological conceptions of Judaism and early Christianity (cf. Ezek. 48; Rev. 7: 5-8).

2. *In the Deuteronomic Writings (D.)*

In the writings of the so-called Deuteronomic school, which flourished during the century following 650 B. C., the conception of the early organization and life of Israel is of the same general nature as that in the priestly writings, although the idea is not worked out so in detail or with such specific reference to the individual tribes. They appear all together mentioned by name only in connection with the blessing and curse pronounced from Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal (Dt. 27), but the solidarity of Israel moving as one man is plainly brought out in the Deuteronomic accounts of the conquest of Canaan (cf. Jos. 10: 28-43; 11: 10 to 12: 24).

3. *In the Historico-Prophetic Writings (JE.)*

In the prophetic narratives of the Hexateuch (known as J and E or as combined JE.) and the kindred portions of the subsequent historical books, are found the earliest accounts of the tribes of Israel. These narratives, however, were written not earlier than the middle of the ninth century and give

reminiscences of the past and theories based upon later conditions, in genealogies and stories which in their interpretation open a wide field of conjecture and uncertainty. From these legendary materials must the history of Israel's tribes be constructed. Three documents also of special value have been preserved treating specifically of the tribes of Israel: (1) The song of Deborah (Judges 5). This is one of the oldest extant pieces of Hebrew literature if not quite the oldest, and is generally received as a document contemporary or nearly so with the events which it describes. (2) The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49). This sketch of the twelve tribes is clearly from the primacy given to Judah (vv. 8-12) not earlier than the time of David. Its date otherwise is difficult to determine, except that it antedates the special priestly office of Levi or the Deuteronomic conception of the tribe. (3) The Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33). This document is considerably later than the previous one, as the silence concerning Simeon and the change in the reference to Levi plainly show. Judah also occupies a different position. Driver places it shortly after the rupture under Jeroboam I. The majority of critics, however, assign it to the reign of Jeroboam II.

II

THE GENEALOGICAL ORIGIN OF THE TRIBES

1. *The Origin and Purpose of their Genealogy*

THE tribes appear as the descendants of the sons of the patriarch Jacob-Israel, who in turn is the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, the son of Teraḥ. And Teraḥ is not only the father of Abraham, but also of Naḥor and Haran (Gen. 11: 27)¹; and Haran is the father of Lot, the father of Moab and Ammon (Gen. 19: 30-38); and Naḥor is the father of a group of Aramean tribes (Gen. 22: 20-24). Abraham also is not only the father of Isaac, but of Ishmael, the father of a group of Arab tribes (Gen. 25: 12 ff. P.); and Isaac is not only the father of Jacob, but also of Esau, who represents Edom. The origins are given in this genealogical way because primitive peoples were wont thus to explain their beginnings. The Greeks thus traced their descent from Hellen, who had three sons: Dorus and Æolus, from whom came the Dorians and Æolians, and Xuthus, from whose sons, Ion and Achæus, came the Ionians and Achæans. This method prevails especially among Israel's kinsmen, the people of Arabia. According to their writers the inhabitants of Arabia are patriarchal tribes formed by the subdivision of the original stock on the system of kinship through male descendants. In process of time this stock broke into two or more tribes each embracing the descendants of one of the great ancestors' sons and taking its name from him. These tribes were again divided and subdivided upon the same principle. Between a nation, a tribe,

¹ This verse is from P., but vv. 28 f. from J. show that this source contained the same genealogical scheme.

a sept or sub-tribe, there is no difference on this theory except in size and distance from a common ancestor.¹

This theory prevailed in Israel in the later genealogies. Jacob-Israel, who stood for the people as a whole, is the father of twelve sons representing the twelve tribes. Each son again is the father of another group of sons, representing the families or clans of the tribe. Each of these sons in turn is the father of another group representing the households of the clan, and from these households come sons representing individuals. This appears in the story of Achan.² He is the son of Carmi the son of Zabdi (household), the son of Zerah (family or clan), the son of Judah (tribe), the son of Israel (nation). These facts seem quite sufficient to show that the patriarchs of Genesis cannot in general be regarded as real persons. Tribal names, it is true, are sometimes derived from historic heroes,³ but such a scheme of persons as appears in Israel's genealogical tree cannot be readily conceived as having existed. "No nation known to us in history can be traced back to a single progenitor. The spaces of time that intervene between the progenitor or progenitors and the nation are always too vast and the complications and tribal mixtures too varied and numerous to allow of the development being traced back to those ancestors. The life and thought of a later time are also woven into the story of Genesis. The characters of Ishmael and Esau are derived from the people whom they represent. Ishmael, the wild son of the desert, is a type of the Bedouin of the desert. The rough hunter Esau, whom Jacob cozens and deprives of his birth-right, is the model of the Edomites who reached an independent existence before Israel, but were subdued by the latter."⁴

This simple form of explanation that lines of descent represent peoples, tribes, and families does not entirely cover the

¹ Cf. W. R. Smith, *Kinship in Arabia*, pp. 3 f.

² Cf. *Joshua*, 7: 16 ff. D.

³ R. Smith, *Kinship*, p. 15. Sprenger, *Mohammed*, iii. p. cxxxvi. *Jour. Bibl. Lit.* vol. xi. 1892, p. 120.

⁴ Kittel, *Hist. of Israel*, vol. i. p. 169.

case when we examine the genealogy of Israel's origin. Terah cannot be recognized as a great people or race subdivided into tribes represented by his sons Abraham, Nahor, and Haran, and these in turn subdivided. Only in the latest members of this genealogical tree are historical tribes clearly recognizable. Israel and the twelve or thirteen tribes are historical, and thus also while much obscurity exists in regard to the twelve sons of Nahor (Gen. 22: 20-24), it is beyond question that the writer derived their names from tribes, peoples, or districts of his own day. Uz (to be distinguished from the one connected with Edom, Gen. 36: 28; Jer. 25: 20; Lam. 4: 21) is mentioned in Job 1: 1; Buz in Jeremiah 25: 23; and Maacah in Deuteronomy 3: 14; Joshua 12: 5; 13: 11; Second Samuel 10: 6, 8. Hazo occurs probably on an Assyrian inscription (Del. Par. 306 f.). Bethuel, house of God, perhaps equivalent to Methuel (מֵתוּאֵל), man of God (BDB Lex., Enc. Bib. 568), suggests from its meaning a mythological or religious origin; still, names ending in *el* are tribal. This fact of historical tribal representation is seen also in the twelve sons of Ishmael (Gen. 25: 12-16). They too, although all of them have not been identified, represent historical peoples. Nebaioth is mentioned in Isaiah 60: 7, and on the Assyrian inscriptions (though probably not to be connected with the later Nabatheans); Kedar in Isaiah 21: 16 f.; 42: 11; 60: 7; Jeremiah 49: 28; Tema in Jeremiah 25: 23; Job 6: 19; Jetur appears in the Itureans of the Roman period. Moab and Ammon, the children of Lot, are well known peoples. Ishmael undoubtedly as well as Israel represented a people. The name occurs as gentile in the story of Joseph (Gen. 37: 25, 27, 28), showing that such a tribe or people had at some time a real existence, but since they are only mentioned thus in the legends of Israel or figuratively (Ps. 83: 6.(7)), they probably early fell into the background or disappeared.

The earlier members of a line of descent may not only be tribes, but also genealogical links derived from other sources, especially from deities. These deities were the survivals of the ancient polytheism of Israel and its neighbors. The poly-

theism of Israel is abundantly witnessed by the Scriptures in the references to the gods served "beyond the River and in Egypt" (Jos. 24: 2, 14, 23), in the teraphim stolen by Rachel (Gen. 31: 19, 30 ff.), and the strange gods in Jacob's household (Gen. 35: 2 ff.), to say nothing of the evidence in the stories of the constant relapses into Baal worship recorded in the book of Judges, and which continued even until the exile. Tribal gods long remembered and cherished in song and story, and from whom the people had once reckoned their descent easily, would be transmuted into ancestors and framed in genealogies. This would be especially favored from the ancient Semitic conception of a people being the son of its god. Thus Israel is called the son of Yahwè (Ex. 4: 22; Hosea 11: 1). The Moabites are called the sons and daughters of Chemosh (Num. 21: 29). Hence each tribe might have a double ancestry, that of the tribal patriarch or eponym, or that of the tribal god, whose son the former, however, would most naturally or necessarily be, or both might be represented under the same name. This last appears in the case of Gad, which is not only the name of a tribe and hence of an eponym or patriarch, but also of a deity (Isa. 65: 11; cf. also the place names Baal-Gad, Jos. 11: 17; 12: 7; 13: 5, and Migdol-Gad, Jos. 15: 37).

Israel's genealogy also arose as a whole to express kinship as well as to give an origin. The people of Israel recognized, through community of speech and customs, that they were closely related to the Aramean tribes north and east of Palestine, the Arabian tribes east and south, and their near neighbors, the Moabites and Ammonites and the Edomites. The reminiscence of an early association with these people may also have remained, and through these two influences came the genealogy. It was mainly an explanation of facts of the period of its composition, somewhere probably between 900 and 700 B.C.

An exact solution of all the varieties of genealogical relationships given is not at hand. Mothers and daughters seem to represent the same class of facts as fathers and sons, there

being no generic difference between them. Both tribal life and probably tribal mythology appear under the form of a family experience. Elder sons may represent earlier and more powerful tribes and families; marriages their coalitions, the weaker being perhaps the wife, and an inferior a concubine; untimely deaths, their disappearance; different relationships of the same person, different political or geographical changes. But many genealogical stories and relationships originated evidently in folk tales, and hence they present a mingling of fact and fancy, of mythology and history, and the relationships of father, mother, wife, son or daughter cannot be interpreted upon any uniform theory in respect to the precise meaning of each. Especially open to criticism is the notion that wives represent weaker tribes and marriages coalitions. Wives or concubines are necessary when children appear. They spring from a necessity in the genealogy or the folk-tale, and hence one must be on guard against thinking marriages necessarily arose from actual, historical unions. Wives may be wholly due to the imagination and their names derived from various sources.

2. *The Separate Members of Israel's Genealogy*

Terah has been identified with an ancient deity (Tarḥu, Turgu) whose worship was widespread in Northern Mesopotamia and adjoining districts¹ and whose name is preserved apparently in the element *ταρκ* of many Sicilian Greek names.² Whether Nahor was originally also the name of a deity³ or merely that of a lost tribe resident about Haran⁴ is yet uncertain. Perhaps Nahor was both a deity and tribe. Milcah, his wife, the daughter of Haran (Gen. 11: 29; 22: 20, J), assumed by Driver to have been a tribe, in name at least, represents *Milkatu*, the Istar or Venus of Haran. That Haran

¹ Jensen, *ZA*, vol. vi. p. 70, *Hittites*, p. 153.

² See article by Sachau, *ZA*, vol. vi.

³ Jensen, *ZA*, vol. xi. p. 300. Skipwith, *JQR*, vol. xi. 1899, p. 254.

⁴ Driver, article "Nahor," *Hastings DB*.

was a deity has been inferred by the name Beth Haran (Num. 32: 36). Etymologically it suggests (בֵּית הָרָן coming from הָר, mountain, BDB Lex.) a mountain people or district. More likely, however, Haran is only a deviated spelling of Ḥaran the original home of Israel¹ according to JE. This last explanation fits in well with Milcah, a goddess worshipped at Ḥaran, being Haran's daughter, and that Haran died in Northern Syria.

Lot (לוֹט) is very obscure. Among the Horites, the ancient inhabitants of Seir or Edom, Lotan (לוֹטָי) appears as a prominent clan or tribe (Gen. 36: 20, 29), and this clan may be the origin of Lot, the cave dweller, the father of Moab and Ammon, or Lot may be a humanized deity from whom the Moabites and Ammonites traced their descent. Cainan (Gen. 5: 9), equivalent to Cain (Gen. 4: 17), has been thus identified.² The story of the origin of Moab and Ammon through incest has ordinarily been regarded as having arisen from an expression of the hatred and contempt of Israel for the people of Moab and Ammon, and very likely this thought explains its preservation in the Hebrew Scriptures, but originally it probably was a tale of womanly strength and thus of tribal glory and honor, since the daughters of Lot, being with their father the sole survivors of some great catastrophe, were heroic enough to become mothers in an unnatural way and thus preserve their race.³

Abraham can only be understood by first considering Jacob and Israel. Historically the twelve tribes appear as the twelve sons of Jacob, probably first at the time of David. Earlier than this we cannot find the twelve grouped together as Israel. None of our general sources are of an earlier date and the one earlier document, the song of Deborah, accords with their late grouping, since this song makes no mention of Judah, Simeon, Levi, or Asher, and suggests thus that the idea of an Israel of

¹ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the Hist. of Israel*, p. 313. Budde, *Urgeschichte*, p. 443.

² W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 43.

³ Gunkel, *Handkomm. zum A. T.*, Genesis, p. 197.

twelve tribes corresponding to the twelve sons mentioned in Gen. 49, and the stories of their birth, were not yet current. The number twelve is an artificial one, derived, according to some, from the twelve signs of the zodiac; but more likely because twelve was a standard way of reckoning peoples, as appears in the twelve sons of Nahor (Gen. 22: 20-24), and of Ishmael (Gen. 25: 13-15).

Israel's *twelve* tribes always fluctuated according to the reckoning of Joseph as one or as two (Ephraim and Manasseh), Levi being omitted. The children, or sons of Israel, is the name by which the people called themselves (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). Israel, then, was their proper national name. This name, however, belonged *par excellence* to the Northern Kingdom, the kingdom represented especially by the tribe of Ephraim. Israel accordingly is preëminently the father of Joseph. Jacob clearly is an older figure than Israel, as appears from the story of the change of his name to Israel (Gen. 32: 28; 35: 10). Who, then, was Jacob? Most naturally he represents an ancient tribe later incorporated or transmuted into Israel, or at least later known by that name. The fact of the antiquity of Jacob seems to have met with confirmation in the mention of Jacob-el in the list of places conquered in Palestine by Thothmes III. Jacob-el is a tribal or place name formed like Israel, Ishmael, Jeraḥmeel, Jezreel. Meyer regards the name that of a tribe. His theory is that the old tribe disappeared, as later Amalek and Midian did, and then Edom and Moab, and, in the middle ages, the old Arabian tribes. Thereupon elements of it entered into Israel, probably through their preservation in Judah, and thus the name was preserved.¹ W. Max Müller, on the other hand, protests against the assumption that the name can be otherwise than that of a town or city, since the Canaanites had then long since passed in civilization beyond the tribal stage.² Whether Jacob-el represents a tribe or place, Jacob is in Palestine in the sixteenth century. This fact is significant. Jacob has also been regarded as

¹ ZATW, 1886, 9.

² *Asien und Europa*, s. 164.

originally a deity,¹ in view of the wrestling with God (Gen. 32: 22-30) and the expression "Mighty One [of] Jacob" (אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב Gen. 49: 24). The wives and concubines of Jacob are not easily understood. They may represent Aramean tribes which pressing forward into the home of Jacob or Jacob-Israel became amalgamated with that stock. Leah (לֵאָה), meaning "wild cow," has been regarded as a tribe whose totem was that animal, and the same also as the tribe of Levi (לֵוִי), the latter being the gentile designation.

Mythology seems to have contributed the name of Rachel (רַחֵל), since a ewe is the symbol of the goddess Ash-toreth (cf. עֲשֹׁתְרוֹת צֹאן, ewes of the flocks, Dt. 7: 13; 28: 4, 18, 51). "Rachel, then, is the Ashtoreth, the divine ewe, the goddess of the flock and the moon, the type of bride and mother and patron of the female sex."² Laban is also a mythical figure, since his name is the masculine form of the Hebrew word for moon (לְבָנָה לְבָן, moon). His city Haran was famous for its moon worship. These coincidences cannot be accidental. With the mythical origin of Laban accords also the name of his father Bethuel, mentioned above, showing likewise the influence of mythology.

That which underlies the concubines Bilhah and Zilpah is not clear. They may represent Aramean tribes that coalesced with the other elements of ancient Israel, or districts where tribes dwelt (as the wives of Caleb, 1 Chr. 2: 18, 19; cf. the article *Genealogy* B. iv. 35 *Hast. DB*, vol. ii.), or some mythology may be hidden in them. Bilhah may have some connection with the clan Bilhan of Benjamin (1 Chr. 7: 10, the name also of a clan of Edom, Gen. 36: 38). That Bilhah was the maid of Rachel, and Zilpah of Leah, would seem to imply some special connection between the tribes Dan and Naphtali and the sons of Rachel, and Asher and Gad and the sons of Leah. The stock of these four tribes is supposed to have been less pure than that of the other tribes, and hence their mothers

¹ Luther, *ZATW*, vol. xxi. s. 68 ff.

² Skipwith, *JQR*, vol. xi. p. 256 ff.

were called concubines. This fact, alone, however, would not be sufficient, since Judah was a tribe with a large admixture of non-Israelitish elements. The four tribes must have had other marks of inferiority, or else their inferior birth is due to their late origin or incorporation into Israel. Wellhausen regards Israel before the settlement in Canaan to have consisted of only seven tribes, Benjamin, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher having been recognized either as tribes or a part of Israel later on. The close geographical union between the sons of Rachel, points to their original homogeneity and is a sufficient reason for their common mother. The final grouping of the six sons of Leah probably took place under David, not, however, without an earlier connection between some of them.

Isaac probably represents a tribe whose original name may have been Isaac-el (יצחקאל) corresponding to Ishmael, Israel, etc. This tribe seems to have dwelt in Southern Judah, since the home of the patriarch is placed there. Why the tribe should form a link in the genealogy and become prominent in the story is not clearly known. The relationship, however, between Edom and Israel clearly demanded for both a common father, and he might well be seen in an ancient tribe which had its home near the land of both, and which later disappeared, perhaps through an absorption into both. A deity has also been seen in Isaac¹ through the occurrence of the expression "Fear [of] Isaac" (Gen. 31 : 42, 53, פחד יצחק) and the meaning of the name, "God smiles," has suggested an underlying solar myth.² In the story of Rebecca, the wife taken from Paddan-Aram (Gen. 25 : 20), is probably another reminiscence of an ancient wandering from that land, Rebekah being a tribal name.

Esau has been identified with an ancient hunter god.³ He was probably then a representative deity of Edom.

Abraham is more difficult of explanation or identification than the other patriarchs. Since his name, equivalent to

¹ Luther, *ZATW*, vol. xxi. s. 73.

² Goldziher, *Mythology of the Hebrews*, p. 92.

³ Cheyne, article "Esau," *Encyc. Biblica*.

Abiram² is personal rather than tribal, many have seen in him an ancient Semitic hero, the historic leader of a migration from Northern Mesopotamia which resulted in the growth of the peoples Ishmael, Moab, Ammon, Edom, and Israel. This is possible. Such an ancient migration probably took place and the memory of such a leader might have long lingered. The revealed religion of Israel has also been thought to require a great leader antecedent to Moses. The mention of Abraham in Genesis 14 in connection with historical kings (especially Amraphel, who has been identified with Hammurabi) has suggested that Abraham was a real hero; but this chapter is held with probability to be a midrash, and thus one of the latest portions of Genesis, into which was woven with historical names the legendary one of Abraham. The chapter then really proves nothing respecting the historic character of Abraham, although the inference is reasonable that, some of the names being historical, the others are also. This, however, is not a necessary conclusion. The truth is that Abraham is too early in the genealogy to have any real claim for historicity as a real person. The historical elements of genealogies, we have seen, are the latest.

The kinship of Edom and Israel having been expressed through Isaac, and of Moab and Ammon through Lot, it remained to find an expression of the kinship between these groups and other groups of kindred tribes. Thus appeared Abraham and Teraḥ in the genealogy. The latter, we have already seen, came from an ancient deity, and it is not unlikely that Abraham arose in the same way, coming from a deity worshipped in Southern Judah, especially at Hebron, since the narratives place there principally the ancient home of Abraham. This deity not unlikely was Ram, "lofty" (cf. 'Elyon, Most-high, the name of the god of Melchisedek, Gen. 14: 22). A southern Judean clan bore the name of Ram (1 Chr. 2: 25). Abiram signifies also, "Father of Ram," or "My father is Ram." Our Old Testament narratives, we have seen, are later than the time of David and represent throughout the Israel united

¹ *Hastings DB.* vol. i. p. 17; *Encyc. Biblica*, vol. i. col. 23.

through him; and from a humanized God, possibly of Hebron, where he first reigned, could have arisen most naturally the ideal religious ancestor of the united people. Sarah (princess), the wife of Abraham, has been clearly identified as bearing the name of a goddess.¹

The historical character of Abraham, however, is maintained by Ewald, *History of Israel*, vol. I., pp. 300 ff.; Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, vol. I. § 16; Cornill, *History of the People of Israel*, p. 34; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*; McCurdy, *History Prophecy and the Monuments*, § 444-448; Ryle, article "Abraham" in *Hastings DB*, and others: but in spite of these authorities the basis for this belief has always seemed sentimental rather than scientific. Abraham's character is a creation of the prophetic period. For a clear treatment of the subject, see the article on "Abraham" by B. W. Bacon, in the *New World*, December, 1899.

Hagar seems to have been derived from a people who appear in the post-exilic literature as the Hagarites (הַגָּרִים or הַגָּרִי'אִים, 1 Chr. 5: 10, 19; cf. 11: 38; 27: 31). Whether the term represents an actual tribe bearing such a name (such a one is mentioned in South Arabian inscriptions²) or whether it was simply a designation given to nomads is uncertain. (The root הַגָּר seems connected with the Arabic one meaning to forsake, retire; cf. *Hegira*.) Hagar's Egyptian origin most likely is due to the fact that the tribes of the Sinaitic peninsula were known to have an admixture of Egyptian blood, derived possibly in part from runaway slaves.

¹ Jensen, *ZA*, vol. xi. s. 299.

² Winckler, in *Mitt. der Vorderas. Ges.* 1898, Heft I. 51.

III

THE SEPARATE TRIBES

1. *The Sons of Leah: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun*

REUBEN, according to all tradition, was the eldest of the sons of Jacob, which seems to indicate some early tribal pre-eminence. But this he early lost. How or when is unknown. In legend he held intercourse with Bilhah, the concubine of his father (Gen. 35: 22), but the history lying back of this story is not clear. Such an act points to some unlawful hegemony exerted by Reuben, since to take a father's wife or concubine is equivalent to claiming the father's place (cf. 2 Sam. 16: 21; 1 Kgs. 2: 21 ff.). In some way Reuben may have endeavored to unlawfully coerce the other tribes, especially the sons of Bilhah; and thereby the tribe may have suffered loss. The story of the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram suggests also some ancient act of unlawful usurpation (Num. 16: 1). In the song of Deborah, Reuben is represented as slothful and inactive (Judg. 5: 15-17). In Jacob's blessing his excellency is gone (Gen. 49: 4), and in the blessing of Moses the tribe is approaching extinction (Dt. 33: 6). The tribe probably disappeared early through the encroachments of the Moabites and Ammonites, although according to the Chronicler (1 Chr. 5: 1-6), families existed until the time of Tiglath-pileser (746-728). Many of the cities assigned to Reuben in Numbers 32: 37f. and Joshua 13: 15-23 appear in the inscription of Mesha (about 850 B.C.), in Isaiah 15, 16, and in Jeremiah 48, in the possession of Moab. From clans of the names of Hezron and Carmi ap-

pearing both in connection with Judah and Reuben (Num. 26: 6, 21; 1 Chr. 4: 1; 5: 3), it has been conjectured that remnants of the latter tribe took refuge in the former. But *Hezron* is a name derived from a permanent encampment, (*חֶזְרֹן*), and is equivalent to "villager" and thus might easily arise in connection with either tribe; and *Carmi* in First Chronicles 4: 1 is suspicious, probably a textual corruption for *Caleb*.

Next to Reuben in age among the sons of Jacob are Simeon and Levi (Gen. 29: 31 ff.). They are associated together in Jacob's blessing, in which it is clearly implied that these tribes, through some united deeds of violence, have met with some disaster which has left them only scattered remnants in Israel (Gen. 49: 5-7). The historical occasion of this is intimated in the story of the destruction of the inhabitants of Shechem related in Genesis 34. The facts appear to have been these. *Dinah* (the daughter of *Leah*), a kindred clan or small tribe, was forcibly brought into an alliance with a Canaanite clan, *Ḥamor*, dwelling in Shechem. This act was resented by the kindred tribes Simeon and Levi, who treacherously destroyed the Canaanite people of Shechem, and then in turn, almost annihilated by a coalition of the Canaanites, they became scattered in Israel. (The retaking of Shechem by the Canaanites is confirmed by the story of *Abimelech* (Judg. 9). The people of the city at that time were in a large degree evidently of Canaanitish descent.) The remnants of Simeon obtained a home in the south of Judah. So dwindled and insignificant became the tribe that the author of Deuteronomy 33 passes it over in silence. In First Chronicles 4: 24-43, however, raids by families of Simeon, either made or recorded in the days of *Hezekiah*, are mentioned. The inheritance of Simeon was regarded, in part at least, within the bounds of Judah (Jos. 19: 1-9; 15: 20-32 P).

The fate of Levi was quite different from that of Simeon. The tribe grew not as a political community but as a priestly caste. This development took place between the composition

of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33. In the latter Levi possesses the Thummim and the Urim, or means of divine communication (v. 8), and the old legend of fierceness against the Canaanites is transmuted into zeal for Yahwè. The original remnants of Levi may have found refuge along with those of Simeon in the tribe of Judah, and from their abode in sacred cities taken up the calling of priests. Possibly also some original connection of Moses with the tribe may have contributed in this direction. The whole development is obscure. In early stories Levites are associated with Bethlehem-Judah (Judg. 17: 9; 19: 1) and in the later genealogies Levitical families bear names connected with the Judean towns, Hebron, Libnah (Libni), and Korah (Ex. 6: 17f., 21). The fact that these towns were probably sanctuaries is sufficient, however, to give these names to priestly families without any real historical Levite tribal connection with them.

In Genesis 38 Judah is said to have separated himself from his brethren, allied himself with a certain Adullamite named Hirah, and married a Canaanitish woman, Shua, by whom he had three sons: Er, Onan, and Shelah; the two elder of these Yahwè slew; and afterwards Judah, by his daughter-in-law Tamar, had two sons, Zerah and Perez. These three surviving sons, Shelah, Zerah, and Perez, represented, in later Jewish history as given in the priestly writings, three clans of Judah, that of Perez being the most important. The history back of this story seems to have been the settlement of Judah in the neighborhood of Adullam and its union with a Canaanitish population. Two early clans thus formed seem also to have perished. The loss of these clans has also been connected with the disaster which overtook Simeon and Levi at Shechem, in which Judah is thought to have shared. This is possible. Judah appears in early times to have had none of its later prominence. With Simeon and Levi he is not mentioned in the song of Deborah. The tribe was in a large degree at that time separated from the other tribes by a Canaanitish enclave consisting

of the territory of the Gibeonites and of the Jebusites, who occupied Jerusalem. No exploits of the tribe are recorded in the original stories of the middle portion of the book of Judges.¹

The Calebites and the Jerahmeelites, recorded in First Chronicles 2 as descendants of Perez, are mentioned in First Samuel 27: 10; 30: 14 as though distinct from Judah, and there is little doubt but that these two clans, not yet regarded as belonging to the children of Israel, were incorporated into Judah by David, and that it was through some such enlargement under the influence of the shepherd king that Judah obtained the later superiority which the priestly writers gave the tribe from the first. Caleb in the narratives of the Hexateuch and Judges is the Kenizzite or son of Kenaz (Num. 32: 12; Josh. 14: 6, 14; 15: 17; Judg. 1: 13; 3: 9, 11), who appears in Genesis 36: 40, 42 among the tribes of Edom, and Caleb is represented as having joined Israel or been a member of Israel during the sojourn in the wilderness. The true union, however, clearly took place under David. The later history of the tribe of Judah is that of the southern kingdom of Israel.

In the song of Deborah both Issachar and Zebulun are mentioned in terms of especial honor. The princes of Issachar were with Deborah. Out of Zebulun came rulers and Zebulun was a people that jeopardized their lives unto death (Judg. 5: 14, 15, 18). Clearly in that struggle with the Canaanites these two tribes took a most noteworthy part. This ancient prowess Issachar seems to have lost under the Hebrew monarchy, for in Genesis 49 the symbol of the tribe is a strong ass crouching down beneath the sheepfolds, and a servant under task-work (vv. 14f.). Zebulun in this chapter is simply described in reference to its dwelling-place on the sea-coast (v. 13). Marked is the change of tone toward these tribes in Deuteronomy 33: 18f., where a note of prosperity is sounded, and it is said:

¹ The story of the judgeship of Othniel is from the Deuteronomic editor, and of doubtful historicity.

“They shall call the peoples unto the mountain;
 There shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness:
 For they shall suck the abundance of the seas,
 And the hidden treasures of the sand” (v. 19).

These statements indicate commercial prosperity associated with gatherings at some mountain sanctuary. Religious festivals were probably utilized as fairs or opportunities of trade by the surrounding peoples, and thus the tribes infected with the mercantile spirit of the adjoining Phenicians became prosperous. Issachar's name is mentioned as that of one of the districts from which Solomon derived his revenue (1 Kgs. 4: 17). Baasha is said to have belonged to the house of Issachar (1 Kgs. 15: 27). Among the minor Judges was Tola, the son of Puah, the son of Dodo, a man of Issachar (Judg. 10: 1). In First Chronicles 7: 1, both Tola and Puah are the names of clans. The minor judge probably was an eponymous hero. But of special interest is the fact that Dodo (דודו) is his father, since this word and the mandrakes (דודא'ים) through whose gift was brought about the conception of Issachar (Gen. 30: 16 f.) represent the root or word which appears in the name of a divinity, דודד, on the Moabite stone (l. 12). The worship of this deity, then, was probably part of the early religion of the tribe. Strangely enough, no mention is made of Zebulun in the genealogies of First Chronicles, neither is the tribe mentioned in First and Second Samuel or First and Second Kings. A minor judge is assigned to the tribe in Judges 12: 11 and the name is conjoined in Isaiah 9: 1 (8: 23) with Naphthali.

2. *The Sons of Rachel: Joseph and Benjamin*

According to the narratives of Genesis, Rachel bore Joseph in Paddan Aram (30: 23), and later Benjamin in Canaan (35: 18), and Joseph had two sons born in Egypt, Manasseh and Ephraim (41: 50 ff). The simplest explanation of these statements is that the tribe Joseph when in Egypt developed into two tribes and that the tribe Benjamin arose after the

settlement in Canaan. This last consideration is confirmed by the name Benjamin, son of the right hand, that is, of the South. Benjamin was the most southerly of the divisions of the sons of Rachel or the house of Joseph. But the development of Manasseh and Ephraim in Egypt is uncertain. The preference of the younger Ephraim over the elder Manasseh in the story of their presentation before the dying Israel (Gen. 48: 13 ff.), reflects the prominence of Ephraim in the later history of Israel. From the time of the monarchy onward Ephraim clearly surpassed Manasseh in political importance. Jeroboam, who established the northern kingdom of Israel, was an Ephraimite and in the prophets Ephraim is repeatedly used to designate the northern kingdom. In the blessing of Moses, Ephraim has his ten thousands and Manasseh only thousands (Dt. 33: 17). In the early history it was probably the other way, since the tribe of Manasseh appears to have been very large, occupying territory on both sides of the Jordan. This importance may have given it eldership. It has also been suggested that Manasseh's eldership may have arisen from a kingship exercised by Gideon, but this kingship is uncertain.¹ A more plausible conjecture is that the name Ephraim was originally geographical: the term "hill country of Ephraim" (הר אפרים) occurs some thirty times. Hence the idea of the tribe Ephraim may have been an afterthought following the settlement of the tribe of Joseph in Canaan. In the early history of Israel the tribe of Joseph seems to have been undivided; ² even Benjamin was clearly reckoned as belonging to it (2 Sam. 19: 20). The one tribe appears in Genesis 49, where there is no reference to Ephraim and Manasseh, but only to Joseph. In the song of Deborah, however, Ephraim and Machir, representing Manasseh, are mentioned. This silence in our earliest source concerning a tribe Joseph favors a conjecture of Winckler³ that Joseph, like Jacob, according to a

¹ Moore, *Comm. on Judges*, p. 239.

² Jos. 16: 1; 17: 14 JE (the added words "Ephraim and Manasseh," Jos. 17: 17, are probably a gloss).

³ *Geschichte Israels*, Theil II. 67-77. Cf. Hogg in *Enc. Bib.* 2582.

view mentioned above, has a mythological significance and that he is a personification of the northern kingdom, and that Ephraim and Manasseh are the proper tribal names.

The early tribe Joseph, however, the early clan Manasseh developing into a tribe, and the location Ephraim giving rise to a tribe of the same name, is the more satisfactory view. Apparent testimony to the antiquity of the tribe is also found in a Joseph-el appearing in the Egyptian lists with Jacob-el (see page 13). Part of the tribe may at that early period have been in Palestine as well as in Egypt, or this may be a memorial of its previous existence left after the descent into Egypt.¹

According to Deuteronomy 3: 13 and Numbers 32: 33 (P) the territory of Manasseh, on the eastern side of the Jordan, was acquired in the time of Moses before the tribe crossed the river. Many scholars, however, believe the order of possession to have been the reverse. The argument for this view is as follows: (1) Gilead is said to have been possessed by Machir, the son or clan of Manasseh (Num. 32: 39 JE), but in the song of Deborah (Judg. 5: 14), Machir is alluded to in terms which show that he probably represents the tribe west of the Jordan, hence that location was then his home and his settlement in Gilead was subsequent. (2) Bashan is also represented as the conquest of Jair the son of Manasseh (Num. 32: 41 JE), but since this Jair appears among the judges of Israel (Judg. 10: 3), his conquest also would naturally be placed later than the western settlement. (3) The house of Joseph is mentioned (Joshua 17: 14) as having only one lot, *i. e.* the territory west of the Jordan. This representation is also regarded as inconsistent with the tribe of Manasseh having already a lot east of the Jordan. Putting, then, these three coincidences together, it has been held that Gilead, Bashan, and Argob were conquered from the west of the Jordan. This view has failed, however, to win acceptance from Driver and George Adam Smith.²

¹ The reading Joseph-el, however, is not entirely certain.

² See the article "Manasseh" in the *Hastings DB* and *Hist. Geog. Holy Land*, p. 577, n. 1.

The mention of Machir in Judges 5: 14 proves at once the antiquity of this clan, which is also confirmed by the story of Genesis 50: 23, where the children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, are said to have been born on the knees of Joseph, *i. e.* adopted by Joseph. The clan Machir, then, at one time was reckoned a son of Joseph. Possibly from Machir (מכיר, stem מכר, to sell) arose the story of the sale of Joseph into Egypt. Back of the story of Joseph in Egypt probably lie two facts: (1) the tribe of Joseph sojourned in Egypt, and (2) a member of that or a kindred Semitic tribe rose to distinction at the court of a king of Egypt. Famine also was a cause of the sojourn of the tribe of Joseph in Egypt.

No tribe after Joseph, Judah, and Levi, is more prominent in the Old Testament narratives than that of Benjamin. The explanation of the name and late birth has already been given. The tribe according to Genesis was the latest of the twelve, and located on the southern slopes of the hill country of Ephraim. In the patriarchal legends the son of Jacob was not only called Benjamin by his father, but also Ben-oni, "son of my sorrow," by his mother, because she recognized at his birth her approaching death (Gen. 35: 16-20 JE). This story is probably a folk endeavor to explain the name of a clan Ben-oni, having some connection, in all likelihood, with Beth-aven or more properly Beth-on (בית און), "house of wealth," a town near Ai. From a change of spelling or pronunciation the place became Beth-aven (בית און) "house of vanity," a term used in the prophets, apparently in scorn, of Bethel (Hos. 4: 15; 5: 8; 10: 5). Beth-on, "house of On," has been also regarded as identical with Bethel, "house of God," the last member of the name being that of the Egyptian sun-god On.¹ In this neighborhood most likely the tomb of Rachel was pointed out, and hence her death was associated with Ben-oni; and this story of Rachel's pains may also have suggested the idea of Rachel weeping given in Jeremiah 31: 15.

The tribe of Benjamin seems to have been especially warlike,

¹ Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 191.

being likened in Genesis 49: 27 to a ravening wolf. This arose in part perhaps from the location of the tribe. Its territory was "the site of more fortresses, sieges, forays, battles, and massacres than perhaps any other part of the country."¹ The ground of Benjamin was the scene of the struggle between Saul and the Philistines, and of the border wars between Israel and Judah. Here also resistance was felt when Israel pressed into Canaan. The battles of Ai and Aijalon were fought within its territory. The land might be attacked from the east by way of the valleys extending toward Jericho — as occurred early in the Moabite domination back of the story of the Benjaminite Ehud (Judg. 3) — and from the west by the Philistines — hence their garrisons and the counter ones of Saul within the land of Benjamin — and close at hand also were the cities of the Canaanitish Gibeonites and also Jerusalem of the Jebusites. It is possible indeed that through the warrior king Saul, Benjamin first obtained its true tribal significance, although this supposition² is opposed by the mention of the tribe in the song of Deborah (Judg. 5: 14). At the dismemberment of the kingdom Benjamin seems to have adhered to Jeroboam, but gradually in the later history the territory passed under the control of Judah, so that the tribe was reckoned as having adhered to the house of David; and in the post-exilic period, Jewish territory embracing that of the ancient tribe, Benjamin, after Judah and Levi, has the most prominent place in the genealogies (cf. 1 Ch. 7: 6–11; 8; 9: 35–44). The story of the almost complete annihilation of the tribe recorded in Judges 20–21 belongs in its present form to the priestly writings. Some real history undoubtedly is behind it, for it is improbable that it could have originated simply from any early Judæan hatred or contempt of the tribe; but the history itself is unknown.

¹ G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of Holy Land*, p. 289.

² Made by Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, Theil II. See "Benjamin," *Ency. Bib.* 534.

3. *The Sons of the two Maids: Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher*

The suggestion of the late or mixed origin of these tribes has already been mentioned in connection with their mothers. The original home of Dan on the southeast border of Ephraim and Benjamin points to an identity of stock with the house of Joseph, and the early kinship reflected in the relation of the mothers need not be doubted; and perhaps Naphtali's territory is sufficiently contiguous to that of Manasseh to point in the same direction; or a close bond of brotherhood may have been formed between the northern colony of Dan and the adjoining people of Naphtali, and thus may the two tribes have been grouped as the sons of the maid of Rachel. The home of Dan on the frontier probably contributed to race-admixture. The story of Samson seeking a wife among the daughters of the Philistines may represent a not uncommon occurrence. The expansion of the tribe was not only hindered by the resistance of the Canaanites, but it seems to have been unable to hold its own against them and to have been crowded into a small district about Zorah and Eshtaol (Judg. 1: 34 f).

This led to the migration of a portion of the tribe and their forcible colonization at Laish near the headwaters of the Jordan (Judg. 18). The remnant left behind was probably ultimately absorbed into Judah. The possession in the north from the tribal name of their city, famed as a sanctuary, is very frequently mentioned as the extreme limit of Israel. The tribe, however, was very small. According to the tradition preserved in Numbers 26: 42 f, it had only one family, and it is not mentioned by the Chronicler unless enigmatically under the name Aher "other" (1 Chron. 7: 12^b).

In Judges 5: 17 Dan is represented as taking no part in the rising against Sisera and the question is asked, "Why does he sojourn in ships?" The reference to ships is difficult of explanation. Assuming the text to be correct and the reference to the southern Dan, it would imply that the tribe at

some early time reached the sea-coast.¹ Joppa then might be regarded as having at one time belonged to Dan. But the parallelism seems to require a reference to the northern Dan. Then the words would mean a dependency upon the sea-going Phenicians² or service perhaps as soldiers upon their vessels.³ In Genesis 49: 16, Dan, it is said, shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel. The reference is not probably to the judgeship of Samson, but to tribal activity, *i. e.* Dan shall have tribal right in Israel. This expression would imply a small people whose tribal right the author would vindicate. The tribe is also compared to an adder in the path and in Deuteronomy 33: 22 to a lion's whelp. Like the men of Benjamin, the Danites clearly were of a fierce and warlike disposition, a fact suggested by their treatment of Micah (Judg. 18: 14-27).

The tribe of Naphtali figures but little either in the reminiscences or history of Israel. Barak, the hero of the song of Deborah, was probably of the tribe, but otherwise the tribe is not known through deeds, but was distinguished chiefly for its location. It is mentioned as a district in connection with Solomon's government (1 Kgs. 4: 14). The exact text of the figurative reference in Genesis 49: 21 is uncertain; but whether we find therein a hind or a terebinth, the reference is to the fruitfulness of the land.⁴ This appears also again in Deuteronomy 33: 23. Ancient and modern writers vie with one another in praising the soil and climate of the territory owned by Naphtali. It was abundantly irrigated and its productions were rich and varied. The territory of Naphtali (Josh. 19; 32-39) extended from the far North close under Lebanon along the west side of the Jordan to a point a little south of the lake of Gennesareth.

The full brotherhood of Gad and Asher may have arisen from some ancient actual close kinship, which their geograph-

¹ George Adam Smith, *Hist. Geog. Holy Land*, p. 220.

² G. F. Moore, *Judges*, p. 155.

³ Budde, *Kurzer Hand Commentar Richter*, p. 46.

⁴ The AV and RV of v. 21b is certainly wrong. There is no reference to eloquence.

ical separation does not forbid, as is seen in the instance of the southern and northern Dan. More likely, however, the connection may be drawn from their names, since both Asher and Gad are deities of good fortune and the grouping of the two tribes under the common name Zilpah may be a memorial of a common worship of those deities.¹

Gad is a tribe that emerges late rather than early, as the story of its birth might indicate. It is not mentioned in the song of Deborah, Gilead apparently taking its place (Judg. 5: 17). In Genesis 49 it is only mentioned with a play upon its name, as a tribe engaged in border warfare (v. 19), but the Moabite stone of the middle of the ninth century speaks of the men of Gad (l. 10) and in Deuteronomy 33: 20 a wide extent of territory is clearly indicated as belonging to the tribe. The tradition of the prowess of the men of Gad, also mentioned in Deuteronomy 33: 20, is preserved in First Chronicles 12: 8, 14: "Their faces were like the faces of lions and they were as swift as the roes upon the mountains." "He that was least was equal to a hundred, and he that was greatest to a thousand." According to JE (Num. 32: 34-38)² Gad (vv. 32-36) possessed cities both north and south of those of Reuben, whose territory, then, was an enclave within the other tribe. According to P, Gad's possessions were entirely north of those of Reuben (Josh. 13: 15 ff.).

The name Asher or its equivalent appears in Egyptian records or inscriptions among the peoples or districts conquered in Palestine by Seti and Raamses II. about 1400 B.C. and located just where the tribe of Asher dwelt.³ This coincidence of name and place cannot be accidental. One tribe of Israel, in name at least, was in Canaan long before Israel is supposed generally to have crossed the Jordan. A solution of this fact has been found in the supposition that the Israelite Asher left the land of Goshen earlier than the other tribes and migrated

¹ See the article "Gad," *Ency. Bib.* 1579-1587.

² Num. 32: 1-38 represents a free working over by a priestly writer of a JE narrative.

³ Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 236 ff.

directly to its site in western Galilee.¹ A simpler solution is that the Asher of Israel took its name from the ancient one and perhaps was largely of the same stock as well as locality. This Canaanitish element in Asher, suggested not only by its accredited descent from a concubine, seems confirmed by its non-participation with its immediate neighbors Zebulun and Issachar in the struggle under Barak against the Canaanites. According to the song of Deborah, Asher "sat still at the haven of the sea and abode by his creeks" (Judg. 5: 17).

But this is not the only link connecting Asher with ancient Canaan. Heber and Malchiel are clans of Asher (Gen. 46: 17; Num. 26: 45; 1 Chron. 7: 30, 31), and both of these names appear in the Amarna tablets of the fourteenth century B.C. The former is identical with that of the Ḥabiri whose invasion alarmed the Egyptian viceroys of Palestine, and the latter with Milkili, the writer of several of the letters, and who also seems to have finally allied himself with the Ḥabiri. This coincidence may, however, be entirely accidental and there may be no connection between the Amarna people and the Hebrew tribe. In 2 Sam. 2: 9 (if *הַאֲשֵׁרִי* is the true text) the Asherites are mentioned among the adherents of Ishbaal. In the blessings of Jacob and Moses the tribe is only celebrated for the fruitfulness of its soil and for its mineral wealth (Gen. 49: 20; Dt. 33: 24 f). Beyond being mentioned in First Kings 4: 16 as a district, Asher does not appear later in the non-priestly writings of the Old Testament in connection with the history of Israel. No distinguished person is recorded as having come from the tribe.

The tribes of Israel practically disappeared after their final acquisition of Canaan. They had no importance under the new order of things. The bond of union between men became the city or the factions of state created by rivalries for kingly power. The old tribes seem essentially to have vanished save in song and story until resurrected in the Jewish community through the zeal to prove the legitimacy of the true members of Israel.

¹ Hommel, *Ancient Heb. Tradition*, p. 226.

IV

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE TRIBES IN CANAAN

ACCORDING to the priestly and Deuteronomic narratives all of the tribes of Israel sojourned in Egypt, — their tribal growth from simple families having indeed there taken place, — left at the same time, received the law at Sinai, wandered some forty years in the desert, principally south or southeast of Judah, encompassed the land of Edom, and passing through or around the territory of Ammon and Moab, conquered the districts of Sihon, king of the Amorite, and Og, king of Bashan, where two and a half tribes settled, and then the remainder, with also the warriors of the two and a half tribes, crossed the Jordan near Jericho, destroyed that city and Ai, and then in two vigorous campaigns defeated the allied Canaanite kings in the South and in the North, capturing thus thirty-one kings and subduing the entire land, which, bereft of its inhabitants (except the Gibeonites with whom a treaty had been made), was apportioned by lot among the nine and a half tribes. The older documents J and E, which are preserved only in fragments, represent the conquest as being far less complete and in certain instances undertaken by tribes separately (cf. *Judg.* 1). But none of these accounts, as already mentioned, are based apparently upon contemporary records, and all are more or less ideal in character and give a memory of the past shaped in a certain degree by later history; hence the problem of determining the real course of events. The materials, however, are very scanty for reconstructing this early history of Israel, and all suggestions must be received as mere tentative endeavors to arrive more nearly at the truth.

The very sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt has been questioned, and the opinion has been advanced that the

story of this sojourn may have arisen from a confusion of names, since the region of Edom and the Sinaitic Peninsula where Israel dwelt had a name, Muzri, essentially the same as the Hebrew word for Egypt (Mizraim).¹ But the story of the sojourn in Egypt seems to be too thoroughly embedded in the Old Testament literature not to have some real historical basis. It is an open question, however, whether all of the tribes under their later names dwelt there or whether the sojourn was not principally confined to the tribe of Joseph, since its patriarch is so prominent in the story of the descent into Egypt. We have already seen reason for assuming that Benjamin and the four sons of the maids represent tribes indigenous to their so-called later homes in Canaan. The Canaanites and the children of Israel racially were of the same stock, speaking the same language in the end, and readily amalgamating together, and Canaanitish communities becoming Israelitish through the yoke of a common government and the acceptance of the worship of Yahwè, could readily be imagined, through a patriarch eponym, as once having formed part of the early stock of Israel. That indeed which took place in the case of the Calebites, although not forming a distinct tribe, whereby Caleb becomes a hero of the sojourn in the desert, may have especially taken place in the case of the Asherites, Gadites, or Danites, and thus their eponyms or patriarchs have been given a place among Jacob's sons and a part in the descent into Egypt. All tribes, then, need not be thought of as having sojourned in Egypt, some being of a later origin, and this later origin may be due in some instances in reality to an earlier one. This we have seen probably to have been the case in respect to Asher. Jacob and Joseph we also have found to have been very early in Canaan. This fact of Jacob, however, being thus there, accords with the Old Testament tradition; and within recent years also Israel has been found in Canaan just when the people ought, according to the most general view, to have been in Egypt. The period of the Exodus is usually assigned to the reign of Merenptah or shortly following, in

¹ Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, I. s. 50.

the thirteenth or not later than the beginning of the twelfth century. The reasons for this assignment have been, first, the domination of Palestine by Raamses II. and his predecessors, thus giving no opportunity apparently for Israel's settlement at the same time there without some inkling of the fact in the Old Testament stories; and secondly, the discovery of Pithom, a store city built, according to Ex. 1: 11, by Israel, in a city built by Raamses II. Hence the period of the sojourn and Exodus seemed fixed. But in 1893 was discovered an inscription of the reign of Merenphtah mentioning Israel as though at that time dwelling in the central or northern part of Palestine, and as being an agricultural people. Either, then, the customary date of the exodus is too late, or a portion of Israel went earlier from Egypt to Palestine, or a portion never went down at all. Accepting one of the two latter alternatives as the most probable, it illustrates the simple fact that the Biblical accounts are accustomed to present as a united movement of the entire people that which represents the history of only a fraction. This furnishes another reason for believing that not all of the tribes of Israel sojourned in Egypt. This sojourn, then, may have been confined principally to the tribe of Joseph and even some elements of this, as we have found, may have been left in Palestine.

Another source of confusion in regard to the sojourn in Egypt may also have arisen from the fact that Goshen is not only a district name of Egypt, but also of Southern Palestine along the borders of Edom (Josh. 10: 41; 11: 16; also the name of a city of southern Judah, 15: 51). Tribes which had dwelt there might in the later tradition have been thought of as having sojourned in Egypt. Here from the possible connection between the Habiri, whose dwelling in southern Judah is supposed to be witnessed in the name Hebron, and in the clan names of the tribe of Asher (see above), has been placed the early home of the latter, whose people are thought later to have migrated to their home north of Carmel.¹

¹ Hommel, *Ancient Heb. Tradition*, pp. 225 f.

Likewise has the theory been advanced that the entrance into Canaan, related in the fragments of JE in the book of Joshua, represents only that of the tribal sons of Rachel, or properly the house of Joseph which, under the leadership of Joshua, conquered the southern part of Mt. Ephraim. This event, it is said, was later amplified in tradition to represent a movement of all Israel and the conquest of the entire land. The Leah tribes are held to have entered earlier and to have been among the Ḥabiri of the Amarna tablets.¹ A possible connection between the Ḥabiri and clans of the tribe of Asher has already been mentioned. A further connection has been claimed by identifying the Labaya, whose sons allied themselves with the Ḥabiri, with Levi (the consonants of the two words having a similar sound). The name Hebron as mentioned above, (having the same root as Ḥabiri חֲבֵר), is supposed also to have originated from these invaders, and its capture by them has been pointed out by identifying a city, Rubuta, which they took, with Kiriath-arba, the ancient name of the city Hebron. Hebron, as already mentioned, is also given as a clan of the tribe of Levi. From all of these coincidences, since the words 'Ibri (עִבְרִי) "Hebrew" and Ḥabiri (חֲבֵרִי) are quite similar, some connection between the entrance of the Leah-tribes and the Ḥabiri into Canaan seems plausible. The great objection to any identification of the Ḥabiri with Israel has usually been that the Ḥabiri entered Canaan from the northeast while the tribes of Israel came from the southeast. This, however, is removed when we find a double entrance of Israel; and that of the Ḥabiri might also be regarded as hidden in the story of the earlier emigration of the family of Jacob from the northeast. Steuernagel, however, regards Jacob-Israel as originally the father of only the Rachel tribes. Leah and her sons, then, would primarily have come into the family of Jacob only by adoption. A reminiscence of this may be seen in the story of Jacob's love first for Rachel and his service for her, and then his later union with Leah; but since the Leah tribes

¹ Steuernagel, *Handkomm. zum Alt Test. Joshua, Einl.*, s. 150.

were historically earlier in Canaan than the Rachel-tribes, in the patriarchal story, the marriage with Leah and the births of her sons were placed first, although the love and preference for Rachel came earlier. The song of Deborah from its non-mention of the three Leah tribes, Judah, Simeon, and Levi, is thought to confirm also this theory.

Under this view Moses would be regarded as originally a member of the tribe of Joseph, and whatever history is in the sojourn in Egypt, the exodus, the stay at Sinai and Kadesh-barnea, would be primarily also an experience of this tribe only. Yahwè would also have been first of all its tribal god. One would think, then, of the worship of Yahwè as having been introduced in all Israel especially through the statecraft of David, who perhaps paid marked homage to the god of Northern Israel, to weld them to his house. This may have been the course of history, and is favored by the fact that the early sanctuary of Yahwè was at Shiloh within the bounds of Ephraim, and that his worship was the bond uniting the tribes which fought under Barak and Deborah. It is doubtful, however, whether this reconstruction as a whole will gain general consent. The religious bond between the Rachel and Leah tribes seems to have been far earlier than David's time, and the identification of the Habiri so closely with Israel is still very questionable, although it is hard to believe that there is no connection between them.

Whether Hebron is to be associated in any way with the Habiri or not, its capture by Caleb probably represents a movement from the south northward and not the reverse. An indication of this lies clearly in the story of Caleb's proposal at once to enter the land (Num. 13: 30). The bringing of Caleb in by way of the crossing at Jericho seems a part of the unifying process of ancient tradition. The general Hebrew tradition, however, as a whole may be accepted, that tribes came out of Egypt, sojourned and consolidated as worshippers of Yahwè in the pasture lands south of Judah, and then gained their territory east of the Jordan. A motive for this last act has been seen in the encroachments of the Canaanitish

Amorites upon the Moabites and Ammonites driving these people southward, according to the statement :

“ Fire is gone out of Heshbon,
 A flame from the city of Sihon :
 It hath devoured Ar of Moab !
 Woe to thee, Moab !
 Thou art undone, O people of Chemosh.” (Num. 21: 28 f.)

The children of Israel, then, are thought to have come forward to assist their kinsfolk, and to have defeated Sihon, and thus to have made a home for themselves east of the Jordan, whence they crossed to western Palestine, the first attempt having been made by Judah, Simeon, and Levi.¹ The last two of these tribes, if not the three, suffered a defeat at Shechem, and they turned southward and there dwelt quite by themselves. (See page 19.) The second attempt whose tradition underlies the story of the book of Joshua, was made by the other tribes, especially Joseph, Issachar, and Zebulun, and was more successful. Mount Ephraim was gained and a good portion of northern Palestine, although the cities were left largely in the possession of the Canaanites. This view² has strong support in Judges 1 taken with Genesis 34 and 38. The final conquest of the cities, or rather their absorption, generally by peaceable means, probably did not take place until the time of David, when the tribal life of Israel ceased and the national began.

It has also been thought that the settlement of the tribes of Israel west of the Jordan arose, not from forcible conquest, but by a peaceable immigration due to the natural increase of population in the transformation of the people east of the Jordan from nomadic herdmen into settled agriculturists. Much certainly can be said in favor of such a theory. The patriarchal stories, as a whole, reflect an ancient friendly intercourse between Israel and the Canaanites. The deed of Levi and

¹ Cf., for Judah and Simeon, Judges 1 : 1, where “ after the death of Joshua,” is a late gloss.

² Essentially that of Wellhausen, *Proleg. to the Hist. of Israel*, p. 431 f.

Simeon at Shechem is given as an exceptional one of treachery. The ancient population of the land became certainly, in a large degree, absorbed by the Israelites in a friendly way. Their sanctuaries became Israel's, and no hostile, bitter, vindictive feeling as a whole seems to have been cherished between them. The later story of the forcible entrance under Joshua might have grown from the religious motive of magnifying Yahwe's assistance of the people in the past and of sharpening the distinction between Israel and other people, which comes out so vividly in the spirit of the later Judaism. The story of the crossing at Jericho with the destruction of the city, it is argued, is also untrue because Eglon, king of Moab, is represented as subsequently living there (Judg. 3: 13).

To this theory (that of Stade) it has well been forcibly said in reply that all Israel's traditions are contrary to the notion that her possession of Palestine was occasioned by such an unconscious drift of the population with so little a sense of national unity and of the leadership of Yahwe.¹ And in respect to the existence of Jericho during the Moabite rule of Eglon, it is doubtful whether that city fits into the story of Ehud, and hence may be in the text through a mistake. There does, however, remain in favor of the peaceable occupation of a part at least of the land, the fact² that no tradition has come of the conquest of the hill country of Ephraim, and that there is a tradition of a peaceable purchase there (Gen. 33: 19), as well as a possession by force of arms (Gen. 48: 22).

¹ G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 559 ff.

² Noticed by G. A. Smith, article, "Joshua," *Hastings DB.*

THE GROWTH OF ISRAELITISH LAW

CHARLES FOSTER KENT, PH.D.,
WOOLSEY PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE,

AND

FRANK KNIGHT SANDERS, PH.D., D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

THE GROWTH OF ISRAELITISH LAW

I

ISRAEL'S ORIGINAL HERITAGE OF CUSTOMS AND LAWS

IN considering the origin of Israel's laws, the fact is often overlooked that the Hebrews were among the youngest of the Semitic peoples to acquire and maintain a well-defined position in western Asia. For at least twenty centuries before the age of Israel's great organizer, Moses, southwestern Asia, as a result of conquest and commercial intercourse, had been permeated with the customs and culture of Babylonia. For several centuries before the Hebrew tribes were united into a nation the dominating influence in Palestine and the Sinaitic peninsula was Egyptian. Whatever and wherever may have been the origin of the Hebrews, their ancestors could not have failed to be more or less influenced by these civilizations, from which proceeded virtually all of the impulses making for culture in western Asia prior to 1000 B. C. If in the earliest stages of Hebrew history the people were but slightly affected by the higher culture of their powerful neighbor nations, their descendants were all the more susceptible to its influences when brought into close contact with it. That they yielded in a marked degree to these influences is the testimony of Hebrew history and institutions.

This fact of the inheritance of important laws and customs on the part of the Hebrews is well illustrated in the domain of civil law. The law of revenge, expressed tersely as "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe"

(Exod. 21: 24, 25), was already old when the Hebrew nation was born. Even the right of altar asylum (cf. 1 Kgs. 1: 50; 2: 28, 29), which was intended to correct certain of the abuses of the firmly established institution of blood revenge, had been long in force. Similarly much of the Hebrew legislation in regard to marriage and divorce, inheritance within the tribe or clan and the treatment of slaves must have been recognized as binding — if it were not in some sort of permanent form — long before the beginnings of Hebrew history proper. Striking analogies of undoubted antiquity may readily be cited from Babylonian or Egyptian literature. In regard to the proper treatment of a slave, for example, it is enacted in a very old Babylonian code, the origin of which is attributed to the yet more ancient Sumerian period, that “if a man hires a servant and kills, wounds, beats, or ill-uses him or makes him ill, he must with his own hand measure out for him each day half a measure of grain”¹ (cf. Exod. 21: 26, 27).

Even a larger proportion of Israel’s ceremonial legislation must be regarded as an inheritance from the centuries which antedate the organization of the nation. The prophetic narrators of the beginnings of Hebrew history, whose contributions form the oldest portions of the Hexateuch, clearly state that the institution of sacrifice, for example, was recognized and maintained long before the inception of the national life. Cain and Abel present their offerings to Yahwè; Noah, on emerging from the ark, “builded an altar unto Yahwè; and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar” (Gen. 8: 20). The patriarchs built many altars and called upon the name of God. The frequently repeated law against eating the blood of slain animals (Deut. 12: 16, 23–25; 15: 23; Levit. 17: 10–14; 19: 26) was, according to the priestly author of Genesis 9: 4, first revealed to Noah. The important distinction between clean and unclean animals is regarded by the prophetic writer of Genesis 7: 2 as antedating the flood.

¹ Quoted by Sayce, *Babylonians and Assyrians: Life and Customs*, p. 196.

This conviction of Israel's historians that many of their religious rites and the laws which regulated them were not peculiar to their race but an inheritance from ages more or less remote is confirmed beyond question by contemporary and earlier Semitic literature. Old Babylonia, Egypt, and Phœnicia had highly developed rituals and hierarchies, similar in many respects to that in use by the Hebrews. The Babylonians and Egyptians had their sacred arks,¹ in which the gods were borne in procession at the sacred festivals. The rite of circumcision, so significant to the Hebrew people, was practised by many peoples of antiquity. The consecration to God and prompt sacrifice of the first-born of domestic animals was a very ancient Semitic custom, regularly practised by the Arabs.² The agricultural thanksgiving days and festivals which the Hebrews observed as the fundamental ritual requirement of Yahwè — of unleavened bread, first-fruits and ingathering (Exod. 23:14-19 ; 34:18, 22, 23) — were in all probability borrowed from the Canaanites when the Hebrews made the important transition from nomadic to agricultural life.³ It is difficult, indeed, to find an important ceremonial among Israel's religious usages which does not have a parallel, more or less close, among the recognized institutions of other Semitic peoples.

A full appreciation of how great and important was Israel's legal heritage from the past is absolutely essential to an understanding of the growth of its law as a whole and of the real nature of that growth. Far from being a spontaneous and untrammelled development, and therefore straightforward and well defined, it was in reality the result of a process of selection, modification and elimination, affected by many and varied influences. Many statements preserved in the Old Testament clearly indicate that Israel's enlightened teachers also recognized that their law and customs were a gradual and progressive growth. The prophet Jeremiah

¹ For a convenient summary of data, see *Encyc. Bib.*, i. 306-7.

² W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of Semites*, appendix.

³ See Budde's interesting discussion in *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, p. 39 ff.

ironically declares in Yahwè's name: "Add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers and gave them no command in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice" (7:21-23^a). An earlier prophet, Amos, declares explicitly that in the old days in the wilderness, when Yahwè showed his love for Israel, no sacrifices were offered to him, or, at least, were of small moment (Amos 5:25). Jeremiah even recognizes that agencies exist which are liable to alter the law to serve their own base purposes (8:8).

Hebrew legislation was therefore a growth, and fortunately one that can be traced. By the study of analogies among other ancient Semitic peoples and by means of certain suggestions contained in the laws of the Old Testament themselves, it is possible, conjecturally at least, to determine the influences and methods whereby under divine Providence the remarkable legal system of the Hebrews came into being. In some instances the Old Testament has preserved the complete biography of a given law. In other cases the historical records of the nation present the situation or quote the precedent out of which the law grew. A comparison of kindred laws in the successive codes not infrequently suggests the genesis of the later enactments.

II

INFLUENCES WHICH LED TO THE REVISION AND
EXPANSION OF THE LAW1. *The Settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan*

THE first powerful influence affecting the original body of customs and laws recognized by the Hebrew tribes was the transition from a career essentially nomadic in which the clan was the social and political unit, to the settled, agricultural, community life of Canaan. The new occupations and environment could not but give rise to a host of judicial questions not provided for by the simple but persistent customs of a nomadic people. The laws, for example, which relate to the possession and transfer of property in land (Deut. 19:14; Levit. 25), fixing a compensation for injury done to real property (Exod. 22:5, 6) and containing the injunction to let the land lie fallow during the seventh year (Exod. 23:10-12), had no relation to the needs of a nomadic community and must have been developed to meet the changed needs of the Hebrews. The same transition marked a great increase in the ceremonial laws. As wanderers in the trackless desert they had a patriarchal organization and a simple religious system, under which but few places ranked as sanctuaries where God had made his presence known. When they conquered Canaan they took possession of many Canaanitish holy places which became to them hallowed by Yahwè's presence and were made the centres of their more complex religious life. About these sacred places grew up a local priesthood and a detailed ritual, and, in time, a body of customs and regulations very different

from the simple usages observed in connection with the ark which had proved adequate during the earlier wilderness life. In its way the transition was almost a revolution.

2. *The Babylonian Exile*

The Babylonian exile and the absolutely altered conditions which grew out of it also proved active forces in leading to the further revision and expansion of the law. The destruction of the temple at Jerusalem broke the continuity of traditional usage; new needs suggested new regulations. Deprived of its independence and unable to participate in affairs of state, the attention and energy of the race were devoted to questions of religion and ritual. The leisure of the exile gave ample opportunity for the study and further development of the law; while the bitter experience of the nation seemed to suggest the desirability of an emphasis upon ritual as a means of religious progress. Ezekiel with his comprehensive and somewhat revolutionary programme for the restored Jewish state (Ezek. 40 to 48) stands as a representative of a broad movement which was supported and fostered by many influential minds and led to the probable formulation of an important proportion of the laws of the Pentateuch.

3. *Contact with Other Peoples and Fusion with the Canaanites*

Of Ahaz, King of Judah, it is recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Second Kings that while in Damascus he saw an altar whose style attracted him. Securing a pattern, he caused one like it to be erected in the place of the brazen altar which hitherto had stood in front of the temple at Jerusalem. In order to conform to Assyrian fashions he also made many sweeping innovations in the order of the sacrificial service and in the equipment of the temple. If such revolutionizing changes as these could be made without apparent protest in a late period when usages had become

firmly established, it is easy to appreciate how powerfully the Hebrews must have been influenced in their earlier formative period by the relatively much higher civilization with which they came into intimate contact. At first the Canaanite and then the kindred Phœnician influence was closest and most potent. From the Canaanites the Hebrews, as a nation at least, learned the art of cultivating the soil and with that art undoubtedly received many of the customs which are reflected in the laws found in the primitive codes of Exodus, whose background is clearly the life of agriculturists.

Adopting as they did the sacred places and sanctuaries of the Canaanites and freely intermarrying with them, it was inevitable that they should also take from them many of their ceremonial laws and customs. At Shechem during the period of the Judges, both peoples worshipped together for a time at a common shrine which was called the temple of Baal of the covenant (Judges 9: 4). After the victory under Deborah and Barak, when the Hebrews became masters of the land, Canaanitish priests may have continued to minister at the sanctuaries which henceforth were reconsecrated to Yahwè. The record, at least, has been preserved that the Gibeonites were made "hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of Yahwè" (Josh. 9: 23). The whole system of the Israelitish priesthood seems to have been developed almost entirely after the Hebrews entered Canaan and not improbably as the result of contact with a civilization which, though politically weak, was vastly in advance of the experience of the Hebrews in organization and culture.

In his attack upon hypocritical formalism Amos exclaims: "Did you bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness for forty years?" (5: 25). The answer obviously implied is, "No." The oldest and most authentic Hebrew records make no reference to the existence of priests in the pre-Canaanitic period and strongly imply that there was no such caste as appears in later times and writings. According to the early passage in Exodus 33: 7-11 Moses himself consulted Yahwè at the tent of meeting and Joshua took

charge of it. The account of the priesthood of Aaron and his family is found in the latest stratum of priestly records and evidently represents the projection of late institutions and laws into the early period (cf. p. 82).

Later their Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors brought to the Israelites ideas and religious customs which they adapted and in time legalized. The elaborate temple and ritual of Babylonia especially impressed the minds of the Jewish exiles who framed the laws which regulated the second temple. In many of his strange visions the priest-prophet Ezekiel shows that his mind has been deeply affected by the glory and glitter of Babylon. Cast, as were the Hebrews, into the great currents of ancient life, they could not remain stationary; and as they reacted or responded to the powerful influences which came from without, their customs and laws were gradually transformed and expanded.

4. *Changed Political and Social Conditions*

If Israel's laws were moulded by forces from without, even more powerful were the transforming influences which proceeded from within the nation. After the settlement in Canaan, city and national organization gradually took the place of that of the clan. For some time the old habit of delegating the functions of community government to a council of elders or heads of families persisted (Judges 8:14; 11:5), but the superior advantages of an organization which really unified the people led in time to the kingship.¹ Hence new laws, like those defining the constitutional limitations of the king (Deut. 17; 16-20) or establishing a supreme court of appeal (Ex. 22:8; Deut. 17:8-11; 19:16-19; 21:1-7) were required and provided. Growing distinctions between classes made necessary definite enactments protecting the rights of the poor and resident aliens (Exod. 22:21-24; Deut. 24:19-22). After the sixth century B. C., when the kingship was

¹ Not, however, to the abolition of the influence of the "elders." See 1 Kgs. 21:8, 11; Ezra 10:8; Isa. 3:14; 9:15.

no more and the civil and religious authority became finally centralized in the heads of the hierarchy, other new and revolutionizing regulations had to be enacted which were adapted to the new order of things.

5. *New Religious Institutions*

When changed religious ideas and institutions began to prevail in Israel the laws based upon the old order proved insufficient and were either set aside or further expanded. Thus the centralization of religious worship in Jerusalem consummated in the days of Josiah not only made illegal the offering of sacrifices at the altars found at the high places scattered throughout the whole land, but also made it necessary by means of the cities of refuge to provide a substitute for the right of altar asylum which had previously served to correct certain evils incidental to the institution of blood-revenge.¹ Later still, when the offering of sacrifice by the private individual was made illegal in the interests of purity and propriety, a large increase in the number of officiating priests was called for and laws in minute detail to define their qualifications and duties.

6. *The Development of Higher Ethical Standards*

As in the case of all progressive races, the moral standards of the Hebrews were constantly being raised and, as a result, practices countenanced in one age were condemned by that which succeeded. Their literature contains many examples of the ancient custom of visiting upon the entire family or tribe punishment for the sin of a single offender. The children of Benjamin (Judges 19-21) are held responsible for the outrage committed at Gibeah. The sons of Rizpah and Saul and five of his grandsons are taken by David (2 Sam. 21:1-14) and given up to the Gibeonites to be executed because

¹ The context in Exod. 21:12-14 seems to indicate that the refuge of v. 13 is the altar of v. 14. The law of Dt. and P. (Dent. 19:1-13; Num. 35:9-34) is a reformulation and adaptation of the time-honored (1 Kgs. 1:50; 2:28) custom to the needs of a more complex civilization.

of a wrong done by Saul to the Gibeonites long before, with which they had absolutely nothing to do. It was not injurious to the moral sense of primitive Israel to "devote" a whole community and its possessions (1 Sam. 15:18). But Deuteronomy 24:16 presents a law which distinctly enacts that none but the culprit shall be punished for his crime and that the earlier usage shall fall into abeyance. The later laws regarding slavery aim, in the main, to alleviate the hardships of their lot under the earlier regulations and are clearly the expression of a developing ethical consciousness.

7. *The Teaching of the Prophets and Wise Men*

That which distinguished the Hebrews from other peoples of antiquity was not their political institutions nor their ritual, but the presence and work of the true prophets within their midst. To the quiet but strong influence of these real men of God can be traced most that is unique and characteristic in Israelitish life and law. They represented the enlightened conscience of the race, enunciating higher principles of action and pointing out in what respects current practices were defective. Because of their zeal for absolute righteousness they were not only champions of that which was good in the life and laws of their nation, but also unsparing critics of that which was imperfect. Unlike most of their contemporaries, they were unfettered by the bonds of tradition. Precedent had no authority over them, if it did not accord with their conceptions of right. Personal interests were completely forgotten in their zeal to proclaim their message. Thus they stood the embodiment and expression of higher ideals. They were the pioneers proclaiming, as Yahwè's spokesmen, new and transforming principles. The wise men, who as teachers of the individual came into closer touch with the people, applied to the everyday problems of life the same prophetic truths.

The prophets and the wise men each had their *torah*¹ as

¹ That is, a body of authoritative teachings.

well as the priests, and claimed for it the same authority. "If you will not hearken to me and walk in my law (*torah*) which I have set before you, to hearken to the words of my servants the prophets, whom I send unto you sparing no effort . . . then will I make this city a curse to all the nations of the earth" (Jer. 26:4-6; cf. 9:13; 16:11; Isa. 1:10). Deuteronomy solemnly enacts, under penalty for non-fulfillment, that the people should heed the message of the true prophet (18:18, 19). Many a wise man exhorted his disciple:

My son, forget not my *torah*;

But let thy heart keep my commandments.

(Prov. 3:1; 4:2; 6:20).

Even though the people did not at once follow the exalted *torah* of the prophets and wise men, their thought and action were gradually transformed thereby, until that which they at first rejected as too radical or heretical, because of the irresistible influence of matured public opinion and deliberate usage, and because of its appeal to the enlightened conscience of the nation, became embodied in the legal *torah* of the nation and became the definite norm to which their life was more and more conformed.

8. *The Divine Influence in the Growth of the Law*

This general survey has shown that the influences which led to the growth of the laws of the Israelites are clearly discernible and in most cases analogous to those which produced the legislative system of other nations. The Hebrews, however, in common with most peoples of antiquity, in time attributed the origin of their law directly and solely to their God. In like manner the Babylonians regarded Ea, the god of culture, as the author of their first law book and a deity who would enforce the keeping of his laws. The same tradition appears in the writings of the late Chaldean priest, Berosus, and is to the effect that Oannes (corresponding to Ea, the god of the deep) emerged from the waters of the Per-

sian Gulf bringing the elements of civilization and the code of laws which were in force henceforth in Babylonia. Diodorus (I. 94, 75) states that the sacred books of Egyptian law had been composed by Thoth, the god of wisdom. Among the Aryans, following the period of natural law came the *Dharma* period, or the period of divine law.¹ All the institutions of the Hindus, Greeks, and Romans were colored by the idea that their oldest laws were given to them directly by the gods. The Hindus had their so-called code of Manu, who was described as an emanation from the deity. In Plato's *Laws* a Kretan is made to assert that Zeus is held to be the author of their laws, and that their king Minos, as Homer says, went every ninth year to converse with his Olympian sire and made laws in accordance with his sacred words. In one instance the Hebrews give expression to this widespread belief in the divine origin of the law by means of the tradition that their decalogue was originally written by the finger of Yahwè (Ex. 31:18; Deut. 4:13). Elsewhere Moses is regarded as the divine amanuensis, writing down as Yahwè dictated. As in the case of all ancient peoples, the belief is old but cannot be traced to the very earliest period.

In a very true sense the Israelites were right in their underlying idea. Blind indeed is the historian who does not see the hand of God shaping their institutions and laws. It was not, however, by a finger of flesh on tables of stone, as the ancient Hebrews naïvely thought in an age when they conceived of the deity as a man, but by the varied and thrilling experiences of their national life and by means of the messages of devoted, courageous prophets and wise men that Yahwè wrote upon the hearts of his people his divine laws. It is because of their remarkable history and because of the inspired teachers in their midst that, until the canon of the written law was closed, the Israelites — unlike many other peoples — experienced no prolonged period of mental and religious stagnation. The laws of a progressive people were necessarily constantly developing and expanding. Growth

¹ Botsford, *The Athenian Constitution*, 25.

was the evidence and result of life, and the complexity and frequent contradictions in the law were in turn but the evidence and result of growth, so that the confusing codes preserved in the Pentateuch are effective witnesses to the remarkable history of the Hebrews and to the exalted divine purpose being revealed and realized through them.

III

CONDITIONS BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
KINGDOM

OF law in the sense of a definite body of rules and regulations — written or unwritten — applied indifferently under like conditions to all members of the community, there is little trace in Hebrew history before the establishment of the monarchy in the days of Saul. As the editor of the Book of Judges, in speaking of the period, plainly declares: "In these days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes." The law of might — well illustrated by the story of the stealing of the priest and ephod of Micah the Ephraimite by the Danites (Judges 18), and the rape of the daughters of Shiloh by the Benjaminites at the vintage feast (Judg. 21:16-23) — was apparently the one oftenest observed. This of course is but evidence of the absence of well defined regulations. In certain respects it corresponded to the *Rta* period (or period of natural law) in primitive Aryan history. Most of the commands which we find in the decalogue of Exodus 20 were constantly disregarded by the representative heroes of the age. The absence of any attempt on the part of the early historians to excuse or condemn these acts is significant evidence that this decalogue, which embodies the essence of exalted prophetic teachings, was unknown to them. Thus Ehud's treacherous murder of Eglon king of Moab is implicitly commended (Judg. 3:16-23). Gideon's slaughter of the Hebrews of Peniel is recorded without comment (Judg. 8:17). Although condemned by the later editor, his setting up a

molten image at his capital Ophrah and the popular practice of worshipping at the temple of Baal-berith (Judg. 8:26, 27; 9:6) seem to have been regarded as permissible by the contemporaries of Gideon. The popular hero Samson repeatedly transgressed the laws guarding social morality (Judg. 16), yet, according to the ancient narrative, the spirit of Yahwè, his God, continued to move him. The laws later regulating the temple and priesthood were still in the germ. Micah the Ephraimite with the eleven hundred pieces of silver, which were under a curse because he had formerly stolen them from his mother, established a private sanctuary of Jehovah with a molten image as its central object of worship. At first one of his sons was appointed its priest, but later when a wandering Levite appeared, he was hired to care for the shrine (Judg. 17).

The period, however, was not one of complete lawlessness. Certain obligations were recognized as binding upon every member of the community, as is shown by the uprising of the Hebrew tribes to punish an act of gross immorality committed by the Benjaminites (Judg. 19-21). A few customs — chiefly inherited from the Semitic past — like those of blood revenge (Judg. 8, 18-21) and the obligation to fulfil a vow (Judg. 11:29-40) were universally recognized and may be said already to be crystallizing into an unwritten law. That they had not yet attained to the authority of an unchangeable custom is well illustrated by the incident recorded in First Samuel 14:24-45; where the vow laid by Saul upon his followers, and which called for the death of Jonathan, was set aside because their moral sense revolted at the thought of such manifest injustice. Each tribe probably had its peculiar habits of doing certain things; but in general law was still only in the making.

IV

ISRAELITISH LAW IN THE MAKING

1. *The Decisions of Judges*

THE derivation of the common Hebrew word for law, *torah*, suggests the process of its growth. It comes from a root whose original meaning is to throw or cast. In First Samuel 20:36 it is used of shooting arrows and in Joshua 18:6 of casting the lot. Its common meaning, to direct or point out, seems to have resulted from its frequent use to describe the casting of the sacred lot or arrows in determining and pointing out the will of the deity.¹ *Torah* therefore means a pointing out, a direction, an authoritative decision, originally given only after consulting the deity. It closely corresponds in origin and content to the Greek word *Themis* which was "the divine agent, suggesting judicial awards to kings or to gods. *Themistes*, *Themises*, the plural of *Themis*, were the awards themselves, divinely dictated to the judge. Kings are spoken of as if they had a store of 'Themistes' ready to hand for use; but it must be distinctly understood that they were not laws but judgments" (Maine, *Anc. Law*, 4). The meaning of the Hebrew word *torah*, therefore, strongly suggests that the definite directions or decisions rendered by authoritative judges — elders of the tribe, leaders, priests, or kings — who either consulted the deity in each case or else were understood to represent him, mark the first stage in the development of ancient law. This conclusion is confirmed by the meaning of the other common synonym for law, *mishpat*, which was originally

¹ Cf. Welhausen, *Skizzen*, III. 143 (2d ed.); Benzinger, *Arch.*, 408.

simply a decision given in an individual case, then later regarded as a precedent for similar cases. Finally it was employed to designate a custom or ordinance.

Exodus 18:13-27 contains a striking illustration of this first stage of law-making, which is all the more interesting because it belongs to one of the earliest strands of the prophetic history (E) and because it is associated with the name of Moses. It introduces us to the great leader seated to judge the people and surrounded by them from morning until evening, eagerly presenting their various questions. In reply to his father-in-law's inquiry as to the meaning of the scene, Moses explains: It is "because the people come unto me; and I judge between a man and his neighbor and I make them know the statutes of God and his directions (*toroth*)."

Evidently each case was treated independently and a decision rendered by Moses which was recognized as expressing the divine will. Naturally as the same cases repeated themselves he applied the same principles; as yet, however, the people were not so well acquainted with them but that they must refer each case to the leader. As the same decisions were repeatedly rendered under similar conditions they constituted precedents which became the basis of custom and then of law. His father-in-law, recognizing that Moses' time and energy were being exhausted by the petty judicial duties, wisely advised him to associate with himself able, impartial men, familiar with the principles of justice which he had already established by his decisions, and to allow them to judge very small matters. "Hard cases," that is, cases presenting new problems and involving new principles, were still to be referred to Moses. Jethro's words to Moses in this connection vividly present both the theory and fact in regard to the origin of primitive law: "Be thou for the people to Godward (i. e., stand as the representative of God before the people), and bring thou the causes unto God: and (thus) thou shalt teach them the statutes and the directions (*toroth*, usually translated laws), and shalt show them the way wherein they must walk, and the work which they must

do." Those who officiated as judges were at first the natural leaders of the people, the heads of families or those (Exod. 24:14) recognized as possessing executive powers. This is indicated by the term "judge" applied to the brave champions of Israel raised up in times of need after Joshua's death. As the priesthood grew in numbers and importance, its members frequently exercised judicial functions. The elders of each community were recognized as being responsible for punishing the crime of any member of it (1 Kgs. 21: 8-13; cf. 2 Kgs. 10: 1). In process of time, however, the regular needs of the larger and better organized communities or cities gave rise to a recognized set of officials, very similar to the judges of to-day. The Chronicler (2 Chr. 19: 5-11) ascribes to Jehoshaphat the appointment and encouragement of such incumbents, and curiously supplements this arrangement by the simultaneous appointment in Jerusalem of a sort of court of last resort composed of Levites, priests, and elders, with two presidents, one for religious, the other for civil cases. The latter provision seems more like the well-ordered usage of post-exilic times than the rude methods of the days of the kingdom. The priestly law does not refer specifically to the work of judges,¹ and probably takes it for granted that the omnipresent priest or Levite will act in that capacity.

The different steps in the growth of primitive Israelitish law are now clear. When particular cases were referred to early judges they decided them as their judgment, guided by an endeavor to ascertain, in the various ways known to them, the will of the deity, dictated. Decisions thus rendered were regarded as having divine authority. Earlier decisions would naturally constitute precedents which would be followed in recurring cases. A series of similar decisions would in time reveal the underlying principle and establish a custom; later the custom would be expressed in the terms of a law.

¹ Lev. 19: 15, 35, 36 are general in character.

It is interesting to note that the original term *torah*, direction or decision, was retained in later time as the comprehensive designation of the laws as a whole — written and unwritten, civil, moral and ceremonial — and was even employed by the prophets and wise men to designate their characteristic teaching.

Among the Greeks who were more exact and did not impose upon the same word so great a variety of meanings, the different stages in the growth of the law are more clearly distinguished. The early term *Θέμις* (*Themis*, plural *Themistes*, judgments) later became the designation for the god of justice. A body of judgments merging or merged into a usage or custom were designated by *δική*; while *νόμος*, which was not known in the primitive period, was employed to describe the collective body of rules regulating the life of the nation and individual.

2. *Moses' Relation to the Law*

In the light of these conclusions the nature of Moses' relation to Israelitish legislation as a whole becomes evident. In the earliest records he is represented not as a law-giver, but as a prophet, leader, and judge (Exod. 15:22; 24:1; Hosea 12:13; Exod. 18). By virtue of his unique authority and superior enlightenment he was called upon to make many important decisions, and thereby established by means of these precedents certain fundamental principles which became the basis of the complex system of legislation which was in time reared upon this substructure. The acorn contains the oak. In a broad and very real sense the entire system may be called Mosaic, although Moses himself may possibly never have written a word or formulated one of the laws which have been preserved in the Pentateuch in the phraseology familiar to us. It is probable, however, that he not only established principles but also embodied them — in so far as the scanty resources of the desert and the nomadic forms of life would permit — in simple regulations. That

he established a simple ceremonial system of Yahwè worship seems established by the references in the earliest sources to the sacred tent, the ark, and to common ceremonial usages.

3. *The Share of the Priests in Developing the Law*

Because of their peculiar place and function in the community, the Israelitish priests did a unique work in developing the law of their race. Their opportunity arose because to them the people resorted to learn through the oracle the will of Yahwè. As guardians also of the sanctuaries they became an established and recognized caste. In accordance with the regulations laid down by Moses (Exod. 18) ordinary cases and questions of right were referred to the local judges, elders, and tribal chieftains and decided according to the principles already well established by earlier precedents. Their decision tended still further to confirm existing usage and to give to it the force of a definite law. Occasionally they may have rendered decisions which became the basis of new customs, but as a rule they probably kept within well beaten paths, since they were commanded to refer all difficult cases to a higher tribunal.

One example has been preserved of a law growing out of a ruling of a military chieftain; after overtaking and conquering the Amalekites who had spoiled their city Ziklag, the rough retainers who followed David in his outlaw days refused to divide the booty with their companions who had been compelled to remain behind. David ruled that, "As his share is that goeth down to battle, so shall his share be that tarrieth by the stuff: they shall share alike" (1 Sam. 30:24). The author of Samuel also adds: "And it was as from that day forward that he made it a statute and an ordinance of Israel unto this day" (1 Sam. 30:25).¹ In the days

¹ The law here ascribed to the decision of David, is referred by the priestly historian to Mosaic precedent (Num. 31:27) on the occasion of the holy war against Midian.

of the monarchy the Hebrew kings, like all oriental rulers, sat in judgment, and, as the highest civil authority in the state, must have been called upon to decide many difficult cases which involved new principles and in turn established new precedents and usages.

It is significant, however, that the Book of Deuteronomy which is also the first code to recognize and define the duties of the king, makes not the king but a tribunal at the central sanctuary, composed chiefly if not entirely of priests, the supreme court of final appeal. The law is addressed to local judges and enacts that when in any of their towns a case is brought before them too difficult for them to decide, they shall take it to the central sanctuary and lay it before "the priests, the Levites, and the judge, that shall be in those days" for their "sentence of judgment." Failure to act in accordance with the tenor of the decision which they shall render shall be punished with death (Deut. 17: 8-13). The language seems to suggest that lay judges were associated with the priests in this court, although the judge referred to as announcing the decision may have been chosen from the ranks of the priests. The inference is that the priests were at least in the majority and therefore in civil as well as ceremonial questions cast the deciding vote.

It was probably under the monarchy largely by means of this supreme tribunal that questions not provided for by existing customs and laws were settled and new precedents established as the basis for further legislation. Like the Sanhedrin of later times it virtually combined legislative and judicial and probably executive functions. It was the lineal descendant of Moses, and its authority was derived not primarily from the king or civil government but from the fact that it was composed chiefly, if not entirely, of priests who were recognized as the guardians of the oracles of Yahwè (compare, e. g., Deut. 33: 8, 10). In theory at least all difficult cases were laid directly before the divine judge. "If one man sin against another, God will judge him" (1 Sam. 2: 25) was the thought of the latest times as well as the earliest.

Prophets proclaimed the divine will and in early days were eagerly consulted by the people in regard to subjects hidden from the sight of ordinary man, but it was the priests who were able at all times to render by the use of the sacred lot a definite decision (Deut. 33: 8, 10). To them, therefore, throughout all Israelitish history the people looked for the *torah* of Yahwè. Jeremiah speaks of them as "they that handle the *torah*" (Jer. 2: 8); his contemporaries declared, indicating the especial field of activity of each of the three classes of enlightened teachers: "The *torah* shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet" (Jer. 18:18). Micah complains that the priests render their decisions for money (3:11). Ezekiel in defining the functions of the priests in his picture of an ideal Jewish state says: "They shall teach (by their decisions) my people the difference between the holy and common, and cause them to discern between the unclean and clean" (44:23). The prophet Haggai asks and receives a characteristic *torah* or decision from the priests in regard to a ceremonial question (Hag. 2:11-13). In Malachi 2:7 it is clearly stated: "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the *torah* at his mouth, for he is the messenger of Yahwè of hosts." Until the days of Nehemiah at least, the priests were regarded as the original fountain of justice; they were expected to render decisions on all undecided questions, and the authority of the spoken was apparently regarded more highly than that of the written *torah*. They were therefore the class who transformed principle into practice, and as judges were also the legislators of ancient Israel. Aside from them the Hebrews had no legislative body like the *thesmothetae* of Greece or the *decemvirs* of Rome, possessing authority as the representatives of the people and deliberately enacting and promulgating laws which were at once accepted as binding upon the nation.

Israelitish law grew rather as the early common law of England, being based originally upon cases and precedents rather than upon statutory enactments. The influence of

the supreme priestly tribunal upon the growth of the law corresponded closely to that of the Court of Chancery in England.

4. *The Different Stages in the Growth of the Law*

In the manner of its growth early Israelitish law was not the exception but the type of the corresponding development among all primitive peoples. In the list of judges who sat upon civil cases in ancient Babylonia the names of priests appear nearly as frequently as those of lay officials. Religious questions were decided altogether by the former. Mommsen describes the Roman *leges regię* as mostly rules of the *fas* which were of interest not merely to the pontiffs but to the public. Pomponius's statement that they were enacted by the *comitia curiata* is now generally regarded as a later theory rather than an historical fact. Certainly the oldest Roman writers accord to that assembly a very small share in the work of legislation.¹

As in Israel, customs rather than statutory enactments seem to have been, during the regal period also, the chief basis of *jus* as well as *fas*. Muirhead maintains that the majority of the laws of Servius Sulpicius were nothing more than the formularizations of customary law for the use of private judges in civil causes. Back of all ancient customary law — as the Hebrew writers plainly tell us — were the decisions of the primitive judges. As the growth of custom belongs in the Aryan as well as the Semitic world to the Dharma period or the period of divine law, it takes little imagination to recognize here also by analogy the work of the priests, the guardians of the divine oracles. In the light of this study it is now possible to distinguish the different stages in the growth of all ancient law.

(1) A period of natural law or lawlessness.

(2) The period of divine law, or the period in which all

¹ Muirhead, *Roman Law*, p. 20.

questions were referred to and decided by men or classes regarded as representing the deity.

(3) The period of customary law when usages sprang up in harmony with the divine decisions. It was in reality the age of unwritten law.

(4) The period of codes when the more important laws were cast in written form. This was the age in which the living *torah* began to be crystallized.

V

THE GROWTH OF THE WRITTEN LAW

1. *Original Motives for Committing Laws to Writing*

It is obvious that while the people believed that they could through their priestly judges lay each case directly before Yahwè, they never felt a strong need for a written law. Until long after the exile an authoritative *torah* could always be secured on application to the priests. As a rule Semitic peoples even to the present day have little use for a written code, since custom and oral law suffice. Of the many documents and exact methods of procedure which characterize the occidental law court there are few traces in the Orient. The result was that among the Hebrews there never appears to have been a popular demand for a written law as among the Greeks and Romans. The motives which led to the committing of certain laws to writing came rather from Israel's teachers. The first was the desire to provide memoranda primarily for the guidance of local and tribal judges in order to insure justice and uniformity in their decisions.

It is illustrated by the primitive code found in Exodus 20:1 to 23:13 which is introduced by the suggestive formula: "Now these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them" (the people). The Hebrew term translated "judgments" is *mishpatim*, which recalls the earlier judgments or decisions upon which the regulations were based. The detailed directions are introduced by *if* or *when*, and present typical cases with the penalty to be inflicted for each individual offence, as for example: "If a man steals an ox or a sheep and kills it, he shall pay five oxen for an ox and four

sheep for a sheep" (22:1). The form is precisely the same as that used in the ancient Sumerian code adopted by the Babylonians, and in force centuries before the age of Moses: "If a son denies his father, his hair shall be cut, he shall be put in chains and sold for silver. If a wife hates her husband and denies him, they shall throw her into the river. If a husband divorces his wife, he must pay her fifty shekels of silver." So also many of the laws of the Twelve Tables: "Si in jus vocat, ito. Si calvitur pedemve struit, manum endo jacio." The same formula is frequently employed in the ancient Gortynian code recently discovered in Crete.¹ As in the case of the primitive Roman and Greek codes, this early collection of Hebrew laws may have been accessible to the people, but it is evident that it was intended rather for official judges than for the general public.

Although representing the work of priests, its laws have been preserved in the records of the Elohistie prophetic historian or historians who are generally supposed to have done their work about 750 B. C. Whether these laws were then first committed to writing cannot absolutely be determined. It is probable that they were copied from an earlier written version prepared in priestly circles. Some of them undoubtedly reflect customs and rulings which are as old or older than Moses. The absence of any reference to the institution of the kingship points to an early period in Hebrew history. There is also no clear evidence of the influence of the eighth century prophets which becomes very apparent in the Book of Deuteronomy and in the decalogue of Exodus 20.

On the other hand, they reflect a degree of moral enlightenment greatly in advance of that represented by the Book of Judges. The people who lived in accordance with these laws had made considerable progress in civilization. The historical background of many of them is not the primitive conditions of the desert, but the peculiar mingled pastoral and agricultural life of Canaan. The people live not in

¹ *Am. Jour. Arch.*, i. 333 ff., ii. 27 ff. See also Post's edition.

tents, but houses (22:7). Possessions consist not merely of flocks, but also of grain fields and vineyards (22:5, 6). The people are commanded to offer Yahwè of their first-fruits (22:29) and to let the land lie fallow on the seventh year, probably in recognition of the ancient communal right of ownership which otherwise had fallen into abeyance (23:10, 11). Evidently the Hebrews had long been residents of Canaan before these regulations were completely developed. The laws were also probably current in oral form for a considerable period before they were committed to writing, so that the code as a whole cannot reasonably be dated before the reign of David or later than that of Jeroboam II. If it was of northern Israelitish origin, as its position in a history usually attributed to an author living in the north suggests, it may well come from the reign of Omri the builder of Samaria or from that of the Yahwistic revolutionist, Jehu.

2. *The Origin and Date of the Decalogues*

Another primitive motive producing written laws was the desire to bring forcibly to the attention of the people important principles which they were in danger of ignoring. According to Deuteronomy 27:11-26, this motive found one expression in the order given to the Levites to proclaim publicly with a loud voice to Israel certain commands, presented in the form of curses, as, for example, "Cursed be the man that maketh a graven image or molten image, an abomination unto Yahwè, the work of the hands of a craftsman, and setteth it up in secret;" or "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark." To each of these prohibitive commands all the people were to respond "Amen." The other method of keeping important laws before the minds of the people was to express them in concise form so that they could easily be remembered. Representative of this method are the decalogues found in the Pentateuch. In their original form they evidently consisted of simple, short sentences.¹

¹ For a view of the decalogues differing in many respects from the conclusions expressed in this article and defending in large measure the current popular in-

The longer versions consist of the original command and later explanatory or parenetic comments which have been combined by late editors. The original brevity of the commands of the decalogues suggest that they were at first intended to be preserved in the popular memory. For centuries this may have been considered sufficient. Certainly when our present versions of the most familiar decalogue were committed to writing two variants of the last command were in vogue and several of the "words" had been supplemented by explanatory and hortatory material which also presented important variations, as for example in the reasons given for the observation of the Sabbath (cf. Exod. 20: 10, 11, and Deut. 5: 14, 15). Exodus 20:23-26 together with 23:14-19 also apparently represents an expanded variant version of the decalogue of Exodus 34:10-26.

The question of when the different versions of the different decalogues were first put into writing is obscure and comparatively unimportant. The tradition that the "ten words" found in Exodus 20 were written on tables of stone and placed in the ark cannot be traced to a very early date, and finds no support in the earliest historical sources.¹ The object of such an inscription as is described would be attained not by storing it away in an ark, but by putting it up before the eyes of the people. There are certain suggestions that the custom illustrated among the Greeks by the Gortynian code and among the Romans by the Twelve Tables was also in vogue among the Hebrews, although the fact that no stone was found in Palestine suitable for public inscriptions added to the difficulties of publishing even a brief decalogue. Joshua 8:32 states that after building an altar of unhewn stones, Joshua "wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel." Deuteronomy 27:2-4 also provides that after

terpretation, see Professor G. L. Robinson's inaugural address as incumbent of the chair of O. T. Literature and Exegesis at McCormick Theol. Sem., May, 1899, entitled "The Decalogue and Criticism."

¹ Cf. Benzinger, *Arch.*, 368, 369.

crossing the Jordan great stones were to be set up and plastered with plaster and then that upon these were to be written all the words of the law. The tradition and the law are both comparatively late, but they may well have had a basis in practice at least during the literary period of Israel's history. Isaiah's writing an important message, which he wished to impress upon the minds of the people, on a great tablet (Isa. 8:1) and the divine command to Habakkuk to "write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it" (Hab. 2:2) establish at least a probability that the decalogues were in time set up at the sanctuaries where they could be seen by all the people.

Of these decalogues, that preserved by the oldest prophetic historian (J) and found in Exodus 34: 10-26 appears to be the most ancient. In its original simple form it probably read:

1. Thou shalt worship no other god.
2. Thou shalt make thee no molten image.
3. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep.
4. Every firstling is mine.
5. Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks.
6. And the feast of ingathering at the end of the year.
7. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven.
8. The fat of my feast shall not be left until the morning.
9. The best of the firstfruits of thy land shalt thou bring to the house of Yahwè, thy God.
10. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.¹

The position of this decalogue in a document which itself dates from about 850-800 B. C. indicates its comparatively early origin. The fact that it emphasizes ceremonial rather than moral duties also points to the early stage common to all primitive cults, when religion was regarded as conforming to a ritual rather than to the laws of ethical righteousness. The references to the firstfruits of the land and to the house of Yahwè presuppose on the other hand the settled agri-

¹ For a slightly different arrangement see Carpenter and Battersby's *Hexateuch*, i. 256.

cultural life of Canaan. The establishment of three great feasts, two of which corresponded to those observed by the Canaanites, suggests that the Hebrews had been subject to Canaanitish influence for a considerable period. Certain of its injunctions probably date from the beginnings of Israelitish history — as, for example, not to seethe a kid in its mother's milk, which is probably old, because it reflects the usages of nomadic life — but as a whole this decalogue cannot be earlier than 1000 or later than 800 B. C.

The more familiar decalogue found in Exodus 20 (with its later variant version, Deuteronomy 5) also comes not from the nomadic but from the settled period of Hebrew history, as is indicated by the references to the neighbor's house and to the institution of the Sabbath, both representing the settled life of an agriculturist.¹ Unlike the preceding decalogue it embodies not ceremonial laws but the essential ethical teachings of Amos and the great prophets who followed him. The first commandment, if it means to have no other gods *in comparison with* Yahwè, may be relatively early. The second refers to graven images, but any definite objection to the worship of Yahwè in the form of an ox cannot be assured before the time of Hosea, who, indeed, seems (3: 4) to take for granted the use of the "pillar, the ephod and the teraphim" in popular worship. The third, which deals with the thoughtless vulgarizing of the Divine name, is a mark of enlightenment, scarcely characteristic of a primitive community. The sabbath, moreover, is of virtually no significance to the nomad. He always has an abundance of leisure and the kinds of activity which he does pursue cannot be remitted for even a day. It is a provision for the agriculturist and the man of commercial or social business. The decalogue, therefore, finds its most natural setting in the later period. Its position in the latest prophetic document (E) and the absence of any reference to it in the memoranda for the guidance of judges (Exod. 20: 1 to 23: 13) tend to confirm the conclusion that in its complete written

¹ Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, i. 139 f.

form it was first promulgated in the eighth century B. C., although the majority of its commands may well have been enunciated by Israel's first great prophet-judge, as the tradition associated with them suggests.

Traces of other decalogues have been found in the Pentateuch. Concise, clear commands, prescribing single acts, binding alike upon all members of the community, and regarded as essential for the preservation of their religious and civil life, mark one of the earliest stages in the development of the written law among the Hebrews as among most ancient peoples, as for example the Egyptians and Assyrians. They represent the formulation or publication of distinct decisions or of customs already more or less firmly established.

With the Hebrew decalogue it is interesting to compare, as illustrative of the peculiar genius of each race, Leist's formulation of the commandments of the ancient Aryans.¹

1. Thou shalt honor the gods.
2. Thou shalt honor thy parents.
3. Thou shalt honor thy country.
4. Thou shalt honor the guest or the man needing protection.
5. Thou shalt keep thyself pure.
6. Thou shalt not give way to thy sensual nature.
7. Thou shalt not kill.
8. Thou shalt not steal.
9. Thou shalt not lie.

The groups of commands and *mishpatim* including both *jus* and *fas* grouped together without any thoroughgoing attempt at systematic arrangement and now found in Exodus 13:20 to 24, and 34, may be designated as the primitive Israelitish codes. They represent — although only partially — the growth of Israelitish law from the earliest times to about 750 B. C.

¹ *Altarisches Jus Gentium*, 172 ff.

3. *Private Codes, embodying New Principles and Adapted to New Needs — The Deuteronomic Code*

Before decisions and customs were crystallized into codes, Israelitish law grew unconsciously and naturally, adapting itself to new needs, new conditions and new standards; but when ancient regulations assumed written form they held the field with that persistency which characterizes an institution hallowed by tradition. Meantime Hebrew life and thought were undergoing rapid and sweeping transformations, especially during the latter part of the eighth and the earlier part of the seventh century B. C. Assyrian armies overran Judah, and all the Palestinian states were annexed to the great conquering empire. New political, social, and religious problems called forth the epoch-making sermons of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. A wealth of new principles was revealed to the consciousness of the nation. Although they did not meet with general acceptance, they were, nevertheless, cherished in the hearts of certain disciples of the great prophets. The reactionary reign of Manasseh not only silenced the true prophets and led them to seek other methods of teaching, but also rendered glaringly apparent the inadequacy of the primitive codes to meet the needs of the changed conditions and to save the Hebrew people from the new temptations which were overwhelming them.

The existence of written codes, coming from a less enlightened past and therefore partially sanctioning customs which were at length recognized as debasing, complicated the problem. In the rank and file of the priesthood which was under the patronage of the monarchy and naturally interested in conserving existing conditions and customs there were few to take the initiative.

Yet in the face of these obstacles there was found a man, or more probably a group of men, whether priests or prophets, at least broad enough to be in sympathy with the noblest ideals of both classes of teachers, and bold enough to prepare during the period of enforced silence, when, under Manasseh

and his son, Amon, Assyrian religion was all the fashion in Judah, a new code of laws calculated to remove prevalent evil practices. The result was the so-called Book of the Covenant represented by the majority of the laws found in chapters 12 to 26 and 28 of the Book of Deuteronomy.¹

A study and comparison of these with those of the primitive codes reveal the aim and method of their unknown author or authors. Every earlier law or custom that was regarded worthy of preservation was allowed to stand. A detailed comparison shows that the primitive codes of Exodus 20: 22 to 23: 13 are used as the foundation of the new legislation found in Deuteronomy 12 to 26; while Deuteronomy 5 to 11 is chiefly a hortatory expansion of the first command of the decalogue found in Exodus 20. With a very few exceptions (Exod. 20: 25-27; 21: 18 to 22: 15; 22: 28, 29^b) every law contained in the earlier codes is represented in the later.² The exceptions relate to the penalties to be inflicted for certain injuries and were probably omitted because they were of interest to judges rather than to the general public for whom the new code was intended. In only one or two cases is an entire law quoted verbatim (cf. Ex. 23: 19^b; 34: 26^b and Deut. 14: 21^c). Frequently portions or clauses of the older laws are quoted literally (cf. Exod. 21: 2-7 and Deut. 15: 12-17; Exod. 23: 4, 5 and Deut. 22: 1-4). More often the ancient ruling is recast in the peculiar language of the Deuteronomic law-giver and explanations and exhortations added (cf. Exod. 21: 2-7 and Deut. 15: 12-18). In other cases the principle underlying the older enactment is expanded and differently applied (cf. Exod. 21: 12-14 and Deut. 19: 1-13).

Undoubtedly many ancient customs and unwritten laws also for the first time appeared in writing in the new Book of the Covenant (e. g., Deut. 21: 15-17). Certain existing laws, however, were dangerous and had to be absolutely set aside. The most familiar were those which, conforming to

¹ The original code was probably augmented at an early date by certain insertions and by the addition of the laws found in chapters 5-11.

² Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, Introd. iv-viii.

earlier usage, sanctioned the many high places scattered throughout Judah (cf. Exod. 20: 24-26), and presided over by local priests who conserved many of the harmful customs of less enlightened times. New laws were therefore devised absolutely abrogating the older (Deut. 12: 1-28). Characteristic of the new code were a large number of enactments embodying the great principles advocated by the prophets of the eighth century. In many cases it is easy to trace the new law directly back to its fountain source in the writings of Amos, Hosea or Isaiah. Hosea, for example, condemns the northern Israelites because they "sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, and under the oak and the poplar, and the terebinth, because the shade thereof is good" (4: 13; cf. Isa. 1: 29); and the Deuteronomic code enacts: "You shall surely destroy all the places, wherein the nations that you shall dispossess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree" (12: 2). The emphasis which the new law placed upon the duty of love to God and man (6: 5; 10: 19; 25: 1-3) is manifestly an echo of Hosea's sublime teaching regarding Yahwè, whom he represents as a God of love and as demanding that his people shall reveal the same attribute in their relations to him and to each other. The prominent humanitarian and philanthropic element, frequently enforced by exhortations and historical illustrations, which renders unique this remarkable code, is simply an earnest attempt to realize in Israelitish life the moral and religious ideals of the prophets. The new code was projected for the guidance not primarily of judges but of the mass of the people. Its enactments are carefully expanded, lucidly formulated and made definite. Exhortations and reasons why a given law should be observed are frequently appended. Little is said about legal processes. The exact penalty to be inflicted for a given crime is often left to the judges. Definite conditions and needs, and the principles calculated to meet them are at all times clearly before the eyes of the law-giver. Prepared in secret, the work of a

man, or at most of a small group of men, unknown and unauthorized, except by God himself, and aiming to set aside some of the most firmly established laws and institutions of the race, its popular acceptance and enforcement must have seemed a very dim and distant possibility. When confronted with the necessity of modifying existing written laws, the law-givers of most ancient nations resorted to what might be called, in the broad sense defined by Maine,¹ "legal fictions," for they aimed to conceal the fact that the earlier codes had been fundamentally revised or set aside. Legal fictions of this type proved valuable aids to human progress, for they enabled the ancients, who were very reverential toward the traditions inherited from their past, to break with them easily and almost unconsciously. New regulations were simply regarded as expansions of the old, which as a matter of fact they often superseded. Although the fiction was transparent, the Twelve Tables continued for centuries nominally to be the sole foundation of Roman law. The author or authors of the Deuteronomic code employed a peculiar and characteristically Hebrew form of legal fiction to reconcile the new with the old. The new laws were all put into the mouth of Moses (5:1), and the historical point of view of the desert was retained throughout, even though the majority of the regulations are manifestly incongruous with the life of nomads and contemplate conditions which did not arise until centuries after the Hebrews entered Canaan. In this way the unity of Israelitish law was maintained, even though conflicting enactments were attributed to the same traditional father of Hebrew legislation.

If legal fictions or assumptions concealing or affecting to conceal the fact that a rule of law has undergone alteration are ever justifiable — and it is now generally admitted that at certain stages in the growth of law they conserve very important ends — that devised by the authors of the Deuteronomic codes was legitimate. It incorporated a large body

¹ *Ancient Law*, p. 25. In modern law the term "legal fiction" is used in a much more limited sense.

of ancient laws and customs which they and their contemporaries believed to have come from Moses, so that not to have acknowledged the debt would have been in itself unjustifiable. The new elements were the necessary expansion of the old or else the application of principles enunciated by Moses' successors, the great prophets of the eighth century. The code as a whole represented in general what the great Israelitish prophet and judge would in all probability have enacted had he been confronted by the conditions prevalent in Judah during the latter half of the seventh century B. C. It was most natural that his authority should have been invoked to insure the acceptance and enforcement of what would otherwise probably have been only a "paper" code.

4. *The Public Ratification of the Deuteronomic Code*

The manner in which the private codes now preserved in the Book of Deuteronomy became and continued for two centuries to be the one law acknowledged by the Israelites in Palestine is recorded in Second Kings 22 and 23. Back of the record of its discovery in the temple, of its presentation to King Josiah, and its solemn acceptance by the people can plainly be seen the gradual decline of Assyrian influence in Palestine, the reaction against the heathenism of Manasseh's reign, and the quiet but earnest work of priestly and prophetic reformers, like Zephaniah, Jeremiah, and probably Hilkiah, who prepared the minds of king and people for the sweeping changes which resulted from its promulgation. The sermons of the prophets and the authority of Josiah did not suffice to secure its permanent enforcement, however, until the exile impressed indelibly upon the consciousness of the Jewish race the prophetic principles underlying the new code.

With its public presentation in 621 B. C. the period of Israelitish written law may be said to have begun. As before, many unwritten laws, not committed to writing, continued to guide judges and people, and, as the new code

distinctly decrees, cases not directly provided for were referred to an authoritative priestly tribunal (Deut. 17); but henceforth the great majority of the acts of the people were definitely regulated by a fixed system of laws which they could readily consult and with which they were expected to be reasonably familiar.

5. *Theoretical Private Codes (Ezekiel 40 to 48)*

The regulations of Deuteronomy would probably long have sufficed for the needs of the Israelitish race had not the Babylonian exile put a sudden end to the monarchy and the religious customs which centered about the first temple. The catastrophe of 586 B. C. and the radically changed conditions introduced by the exile among the leaders of Israel made necessary new laws and called forth from private sources a series of new codes. Traces of three or four distinct groups of laws have been discovered. The first was devised by the prophet Ezekiel, who was carried from Jerusalem at the first captivity in 597 B. C. The fact that he was a priest and probably acquainted with the ritual of the second temple explains the prominence which he gives to regulations relating to the sanctuary and its services. He also lived at the beginning of a period when, excluded from all participation in political affairs, his race devoted itself to its religious problems. The prophets had declared that the nation was being punished for its failure to serve God aright; the problem was how best to remedy the situation. In his code, found in chapters 40 to 48 of his collected writings, Ezekiel sets aside many of the regulations of the Deuteronomic law, as freely as the authors of that code abrogated still earlier usages. The prince, who corresponds to the king of pre-exilic times, he makes little more than the financial agent of the temple (45:8-17). Instead of giving, as does Deuteronomy, the priests of the destroyed high places practically equal rights with those who had originally ministered at the temple in Jerusalem, he designates them as Levites and

entrusts to them only the more menial duties in connection with the temple (44:4-31). In his plan for the restored community the land is to be allotted arbitrarily with the temple in the center, the property of the priests and Levites located next to its reservation, and outside of all the territory of the different tribes. The chief aim in this unique code is to correct certain evils in the pre-exilic constitution and to emphasize the authority and holiness of Yahwè by making his temple and the priests who represent him the center of the national life, and by protecting them from close contact with anything which would ceremonially defile.

Ezekiel's code unlike that of Deuteronomy is not that of a man dealing with present conditions, but rather that of a theorist who planned an ideal set of adjustments for the future. Like the productions of most theorists it was never practically adopted. Possibly the fact that it was not associated with the name of Moses may explain in part why it was ignored by the Jewish leaders when they undertook the actual work of reconstruction. It, however, exerted an indirect influence in various ways. Its plan for the arrangement of the temple, the priestly customs upon which it laid stress and the longing to promote national holiness which it embodied affected strongly certain later codes, and through them was effective in moulding Jewish legislation and practice.

6. *Formative Ceremonial Codes*

Ezekiel gave expression to the strong tendency toward ritualism which was beginning to be felt among the Jewish priests exiled in Babylonia. Others following his example devoted themselves to developing more definite and practical laws, embodying, like those of Deuteronomy, many customs observed in connection with the first temple, and at the same time enforcing objectively by precepts and ceremonials Ezekiel's dominant idea of the holiness of Yahwè and the complementary truth that his people must likewise be holy. At

last the teaching of the earlier prophets that the woes which had overtaken their race were due to their wilful disobedience of Yahwè's commands was popularly accepted. All the life of the nation was therefore shaped with a view to atoning for the sins of the past and guarding against anything which would pollute it in the future. Being priests, and influenced by the powerful example of their Babylonian masters, it was natural that the Jewish lawgivers should especially emphasize ceremonial righteousness. The words of Yahwè addressed to the nation: "Sanctify yourselves and be ye holy, for I Yahwè your God am holy" (19: 2; 20: 7, 26) was the refrain and the watchword of the body of laws formed chiefly in Leviticus 17 to 26 and commonly known as the "Holiness Code." Its kinship with Ezekiel's code indicates that it came from the same general period and point of view. Like the Deuteronomic code, it undoubtedly incorporated many earlier unwritten laws. It was evidently written at an earlier date than the remaining laws found in Exodus (excepting of course 13; 20-24; 34), Leviticus, and Numbers, and known as the Priestly Code. The preservation of the portions of the Holiness Code which we possess was apparently due to the fact that it was quoted by the authors of the later Priestly Code and incorporated in their more elaborate system, or else placed there by its final editors. There are no indications that the Holiness Code by itself was accepted by the Jews, but, like that of Ezekiel, it appears to have continued for a long time to have been only a private system in the keeping of the priestly exiles.

The fact that its laws, like those of Deuteronomy, were put into the mouth of Moses undoubtedly gave to them a growing value and authority, as the prestige of the great leader grew in the esteem of succeeding generations. Also legalizing as they did, the tendency of the Palestinian Jews and those of the dispersion toward increased ceremonialism, it was most natural that the framers of the complete Priestly Code should make them the foundation of their system.

To the Holiness Code they appear to have added material

drawn from certain other minor codes. These are introduced by such formula as: "This is the *torah* of . . ." or "This shall be the *torah* of . . ." (cf. Lev. 6:9, 14, 25; 7:1, 11; 11:46; 12:7; 14:2, 32, 54, 57; 15:32; Num. 5:29; 6:13, 21; 19:14). These smaller collections evidently embody the *toroth* or teachings of the priests regarding such subjects as sacrifice, leprosy, personal impurity and the Nazirite vow. That they are frequently based on the earlier usage of the pre-exilic temple is suggested by their character and by the recurring phrase "according to the ordinance." Differences in language, points of view, and teachings indicate that they are not all from one hand but from a kindred group of writers. Similarly, minor variations distinguish them in turn from the Holiness Code. They have been appropriately designated collectively as the "Priestly Teaching" (P^t). They are found chiefly in Leviticus 1 to 3, 5 to 7, 11 to 15, and Numbers 5, 6, 15, and 19:14-22. They have been freely re-edited and often expanded by the later priestly compilers; but in their original written form they probably came, like Ezekiel 40 to 48 and the Holiness Code, from the priestly exiles in Babylon who wrote not long after Nebuchadrezzar transported them from Judah. No exact date can be fixed, for these codes were naturally not all developed at once. They antedate, however, the work of the author or authors of the ceremonial laws and customs, which constitute the main body of the Priestly Code, for the latter presents a still further expansion of the ritual. The evidence indicates that the completion of the main body of the Priestly Code and its fusion with the earlier Holiness Code and Priestly Teaching took place not long before the reformation instituted in Judah by the combined efforts of Nehemiah and Ezra. In setting aside usages which were sanctioned by the Primitive and Deuteronomic Codes — which continued until Nehemiah's appearance to be the only ones recognized in Judah — the reformer never appealed to the new Priestly Code, but repeatedly showed by his acts that he was familiar with the principles to which it gave definite expression. Thus in selling

their children into slavery the Jews were justified by the laws of Exodus 21:2-6 and Deuteronomy 15:12-18. In condemning their action (Neh. 5), Nehemiah interpreted the regulation of Leviticus 25:39-41 which enacts that no Hebrew shall be made a "bondservant."¹

In some instances Nehemiah's reform measures reveal his ignorance of certain of the priestly laws. While he reversed the ruling of Deuteronomy (14:22-29; 26:12-15) and provided that all the tithes should be given to the Levites (Neh. 13:11-13), there is no indication that he was acquainted with the law of Numbers 18:24-28 which provided that a tithe of the tithes should be handed over to the priests.

7. *The Public Ratification of the Priestly Code*

The evidence is conclusive that until after the preliminary reformatory measures of Nehemiah, the Priestly Code was unrecognized and probably unknown to the Jews of Palestine.² Like the Deuteronomic Code before 621 B. C., it was originally only a private code, except in so far as it embodied earlier usages. The manner in which the two codes gained popular acceptance is strikingly similar in each case. Before they were publicly presented, the people were prepared for them by the preaching of earnest prophets and reformers. The Book of Malachi and the closing chapters of the Book of Isaiah contain stirring reform sermons coming from the age of Nehemiah. The vigorous rebuilders of Jerusalem himself did as much in rebuilding its morals and religion as its wall of stone. On his own authority and initiative, he instituted reforms and established precedents which must have influenced the makers of the completed Priestly Code. At least he prepared the Jews of Palestine for its more radical enactments, so that when, about 400 B. C.,³ Ezra appeared

¹ For other examples see Kent, *History of the Jewish People*, 184-199.

² Note the admirable summary of Carpenter in Carpenter and Battersby, *Hexateuch*, i, 135 ff.

³ For the evidence that the work of Nehemiah preceded that of Ezra, see Kent, *History of the Jewish People*, 195-198.

with the new law book in his hands, they were ready to receive it.

Since in the post-exilic period the priest had absorbed the power of the king, it was natural that it should be a priestly scribe who publicly presented the new law to the people. Nehemiah 10 records its solemn acceptance by the community. As in the case of the Deuteronomic Code, its authority was derived nominally from Moses, to whom each of all of its enactments were attributed, but in reality from its adaptation to existing conditions and its public adoption by the people. Henceforth the life of the Jewish community was conformed to it and thereby transformed.

The oath taken by the people and recorded in Nehemiah 10:30-39 emphasized the most important elements in the new law. It is significant that five out of the eight regulations therein recounted appear for the first time in the Priestly Code. The law book of Moses brought by Ezra from the land of the exile was therefore none other than the Priestly Code in its original form. Its growth, however, does not appear to have immediately ceased when it was accepted by the Jewish community. The Pentateuch contains regulations unknown in the days of Ezra. The poll tax, for example, for the support of the temple was later increased from one-third to one-half of a temple shekel (Exod. 30:11-16; 38:26). Later still it was commanded to bring to the temple a tithe of the herd and flock (Lev. 27:30-33) as well as of the field. The elaborate law in regard to the day of atonement (Lev. 16) seems to have been added later still. It was natural that the process of revision and expansion which had already gone on for at least four centuries should not cease at once. New needs still arose and new tendencies which in a legalistic age required and produced new enactments. In succeeding generations the tradition of the Mosaic authorship of all Israelitish legislation became more and more firmly established. No law associated with any other name was regarded as possessing authority. Individual regulations, whose origin was forgotten by later generations were

soon classified by tradition as Mosaic and added to the older code. Later law-makers desiring to promulgate a new law could hope to attain their end only by introducing it into the larger Mosaic code.

How long the expansion of the Priestly Code continued cannot be definitely determined. Not until the different codes were combined, as they now appear in the Pentateuch, and the canon and text of the law began to be carefully guarded, did it cease. The Greek period is the earliest date that can be assigned with assurance. At least by 250 B. C. when the Septuagint translation was made, after five centuries of development, the Israelitish written law was complete.

VI

THE GROWTH OF THE ORAL LAW

WITH the unchallenged dominion of the completed priestly law there arose a peculiar social condition among the Jews who dwelt at or near the sacred city. They may be said to have developed a sort of abnormal passion for the legalistic formulation of all activity. A sense of dependence upon exactly phrased laws for the proper regulation of community and personal life grew upon them. This habit of mind at once created a difficulty more embarrassing still. The written law, by its very ascription to the great founder of Israel's organized life, tended rapidly to become fixed in form and substance. On the other hand the habit of legalism fostered a dependence upon law which called for new formulas to meet the freshly realized needs of the community.

It is often supposed that from the days of Nehemiah and Ezra to the time of our Lord the Jewish nation was in a state closely resembling coma. Nothing could be further from the truth. For half a century or so the little "province," as it is called, enjoyed a relatively uneventful, peaceful, and happy existence, but it was rudely awakened first by the later Persian kings, then by Alexander, later by those who were interested in forcing Hellenic customs, culture, and cultus upon it. The four centuries that intervened were exceptionally active and thoughtful periods, introducing the Jewish people to novel and fascinating impulses and ideals, not merely through their enemies who would force these upon their acceptance but through their own kinsmen, some of whom by long residence in the great commercial centres of the world had become imbued with a deep respect for Hel-

lenism and the progress which it embodied, while others, native to Palestine, had been taken captive by its sensuous and intellectual attractions.

The changes thus brought about within Judaism, had the effect, on the whole, of intensifying the allegiance of the Jewish people to what they regarded as the unaltered standards of the past. But this loyalty could be maintained only by the maintenance of another legal fiction. According to their constant declaration, the Mosaic law could not change, and must cover every possible case of religious or social need. As a matter of fact it did change and failed to offer a regulation for many problems which the altering conditions raised.

Such a situation could not fail to give rise to some expedient which would meet the need yet respect the sentiment. The people were unwilling to trust to the passing decision of a judge or priest; they turned to the scribes whose duty it had become to copy, study, and teach the law. They became its interpreters, recognized as qualified to determine in what way the provisions of the law, universally accepted as binding upon loyal Jews, could be extended to cover a situation not directly contemplated by the older regulations. This duty they accepted with hesitancy; their authority they used with moderation. The greatest and wisest among them were, according to Rabbinic tradition, the only ones permitted to promulgate decisions. They sought at first to merely extend to new cases old and well established principles.

This process gave in course of time, an exaggerated, almost fantastic importance to the written law. Obedience to it came to mean a closely literal compliance with its exact commands. The theory gained ground that complete obedience even for a day might serve to bring about the long expected messianic age. Little by little, therefore, the scribes developed a scheme by which each definite precept of the law was made certain of observance by being included within a series of practical regulations which were more exacting than the original. This was termed by them "raising

a hedge about the law." Excellent as was the motive which inspired such attempts, it led to deplorable results in the lapse of time.

In the first place, it made religion, in any adequate sense, a profession. The ordinary man who earned his living honestly by hard work, could hardly hope for recognition as one who met the complete requirements of the law, so minute and technical, so varied and innumerable did these become. Again, and for the same general reason, religion became a burden, to be borne with resolution or resignation, as the type of personality was buoyant or sad. Widely it differed from the happy, festive religious experience of earlier days. Finally the oral law came so to overlay the written law on which it was based as to overshadow it in importance in the estimation, not merely of the scribes themselves but of the people, their dupes. It is this diseased condition of mind to which our Lord addresses himself in his public declarations regarding the law. With the spirit and often the letter of the genuine law he was in real harmony; with its perversion through the ingenuity of the rabbis he had little patience.

VII

CONCLUSIONS

MODERN investigation has clearly demonstrated that the laws found in the Old Testament came not from one author but from a myriad; not from one generation but from not less than eight centuries of generations. Israelitish law grew gradually and progressively. "First the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear." It grew as new needs and new conditions arose, and as new political, ethical, or religious principles were apprehended by the nation or by its leaders. In proclaiming ever-broadening conceptions of God and duty, ever higher and nobler standards of life, the prophets were the precursors and inspirers of the law-makers. Without their constant and powerful influence Israelitish law would probably never have risen far above its common Semitic source.

The priests as guardians of the sanctuary, teachers of the people, judges of important causes, and the mouthpieces of Yahwè's will were the real law-makers of Israel, transforming principles into definite regulations. By authoritative decisions they established binding precedents which gradually moulded custom, and this in time crystallized into clear, concise, readily remembered decalogues or else into simple laws for the guidance of local judges. New laws were constantly taking form as new cases were referred to the priestly tribunal connected with the temple, and new decisions, establishing new precedents, were rendered.

Beginning at an early date all primitive laws were attributed to Moses precisely as proverbs were attributed to Solomon and psalms to David. This tendency, resting as it did

upon a large basis of fact and upon the vitally close connection of the later and earlier legislation, promoted the harmless and helpful legal fiction whereby later law-givers associated the whole body of reformulated and enlarged legislation with the name of Israel's first great organizer and judge, and were thus able to secure their ready popular acceptance and authoritative application. It recognized the preservation of Mosaic ideals and precedents in the new legislation and gave to the legal system of Israel a nominal unity much desired by ancient peoples tenacious of early traditions, while enabling them to modify or set aside regulations which time and change had made inoperative or unwise.

Later codes like the Deuteronomic, the Holiness legislation and the Priestly Code were prepared privately and existed for some time before they were submitted to the nation. In each case their adaptation to the new needs of the race and their supposed Mosaic authorship facilitated their public adoption. In many instances they simply formulated principles and customs established by recent precedents. Before the new codes were adopted their champions prepared the minds of the people for them by means of public and private instruction and exhortation. Their final ratification was by a representative national assembly.

While the Israelites retained ancient laws on the statute books, they usually enforced those of the latest code, whenever this (as in the case of the law regarding sacrifice) invalidated ancient customs and regulations. Our Lord in openly rejecting early laws, such as those relating to divorce or retaliation, was acting in perfect accord with the spirit and methods long followed, not in theory but in practice, by Israel's law-givers. He was no more of a destroyer of the law than they were, for it was the sifting of the best from the comparatively imperfect, and the substitution, in place of the latter of new laws embodying higher ideals which constituted their real contributions to Israel's law and which in time imparted to it its value and uniqueness. The teaching of Jesus, therefore, in the truest sense represented not the

destruction but the fulfilment, the bringing to completion, the final goal of the growth of Israel's legislation.

The student of the history of Israelitish law must recognize its deep indebtedness to the historic past. As a Semitic people, closely akin to the Assyro-Babylonians, the Phœnicians, the Arabs and the Canaanites, the Israelites began with a body of inherited tendencies, traditions, and usages which the study of the social and religious life of these nations, as revealed to us by archæological research, is making more and more definite and important. The original element in Israel's legislation is not to be found in particular provisions so much as in its spirit, and in the standards which it upheld.

The progress of Israelitish legislation was, moreover, greatly affected by the historic environment of the nation. The Hebrews were a people which did not hesitate to utilize the resources and opportunities presented to them from any outside source. In all but their religious development they did not materially differ from the nations about them. The Canaanites, the Phœnicians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians and the Greeks in turn exercised upon them a perceptible influence. Even in religious matters, particularly as regards the forms of religious life, this influence can be traced. The Hebrews were not at all a hermit nation in pre-exilic days; although the Judaism of the fourth century B. C. and later was reserved, suspicious, and sufficient to itself. In the earlier times the nation was singularly open to impressions and hospitable to progress, a disposition which enables the student to understand the rapid changes in social, political, and religious life, which are mirrored in Israel's legislation.

The growth, so characteristic of Hebrew legislation during the centuries from the establishment of the nation in the land of Canaan until the development of Judaism, which we have already noted as continuing in some measure to the beginnings of the Christian era, did not even then come to an absolute conclusion. Christendom while virtually adopting

from the Jews their view of the importance and eternal validity of the written law, followed as well the example of Jesus in seeking to obey it in the spirit rather than in the letter. His teachings were at the same time regarded as of equal validity and of more direct application to the needs of every-day life. Hebrew law thus interpreted from a Christian standpoint had no little influence upon the legal thinking of subsequent centuries.

An historical study of Israelitish legislation only serves, after all that can be said in regard to influences which led to modifications and reformulations, to bring out in boldest relief the divine share in these changes. That God was a factor in this growth is a profound and significant fact, not because it affords an easy and mechanical explanation of the actual origin of important changes in Israel's legal history, but because it adequately expresses the truth, which every student of Israel's remarkable history must admit, that the consciousness of the immediate presence and power of God, the righteous, holy, and only ruler of the universe, which gradually became the sure possession of the leading minds among the Hebrew race, was the working factor which can never be ignored in the consideration of Israel's progress, and was the determining element in that broader outlook and deeper insight which forced the nation to ever readjust and reformulate its political, social, and religious constitution.

THE YEÇER HARA

A STUDY IN THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF SIN

FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER, PH.D., D.D.,

WINKLEY PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE YEÇER HARA

A STUDY IN THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF SIN

I

INTRODUCTORY

IN the study of the Jewish background and environment of New Testament theology no problem is more important and difficult than that presented by the interaction between Hebraic and Greek modes of thought which had gone on, within Judaism, during the last three centuries before Christ. The influence of Greek ideas upon the Jews was most diverse both in degree and in kind, and is, not only because of this variety and complexity, but also because of the nature of our sources, very difficult to retrace. Yet the failure to recognize it where it is present, on the one side, and the unreflecting assumption of its presence where it does not exist, on the other, lead to serious faults of interpretation, and prevent a true understanding of the history of religious thought in New Testament times.

Among the contrasts between Hebrew and Greek thought, one, which has far-reaching consequences, relates to the nature of man. Man was to the Hebrew a unity. Body and soul were but the outer and inner sides of one being. Man's body was of the dust, while the breath of God was the principle of life within him; but man himself was the single product of these two factors. On the other hand, Greek thinkers, influenced especially by Plato, had developed a strongly dualistic conception of man. Body and soul were regarded as two essentially contrasted and really unrelated things. The soul is the man. It existed before its entrance into the body, and

will continue to exist after its departure from the body at death. The body is foreign to the soul's nature and even hostile to the soul's purity and higher life. The resulting eschatology, the conception of the immortality of the soul, and the resulting ethics, the idea that virtue is to be attained by the conquest and subjugation of the body, in which evil has its seat and its power, were each radically opposed to Hebrew thought, yet each had a strong influence on certain late Jewish and on Christian conceptions. The effort to trace the interaction of Hebrew and Greek conceptions in the region of eschatology sets one upon the right path through the mazes of that fascinating and significant subject, and only on this path can the history of late Jewish and early Christian thought regarding future things be intelligently traced. Less perhaps has been done to make clear the relations of Hebrew and Greek thought in the region of ethics, and it is to a corner of this field that the following study is given.

The interest of the problem has centered, so far as the New Testament is concerned, in Paul's contrast of spirit and flesh. Is this a Hebrew contrast, and therefore essentially moral and religious in contents, or is it Greek, and so psychological or metaphysical in nature? Is Paul's contrast of spirit and flesh essentially the contrast between God and man, the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man; or is it essentially the contrast between soul and body, the holiness of the soul, and the sinfulness of the body; or is it some sort of union of the Hebrew and the Greek dualisms? It is not the purpose of this essay to discuss these questions, but only to examine a Jewish conception in which some have found a parallel to Paul's doctrine, and a clue to its meaning. The conception has, indeed, an interest of its own apart from its bearing upon the interpretation of Paul.

Pfleiderer, revising his treatment of Pauline theology in the light of Weber's well known book on the Doctrines of the Talmud,¹ based his interpretation of Paul's conception of

¹ A posthumous work by Dr. Ferdinand Weber, published first by Delitzsch and Schnedermann with the title, *System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theo-*

spirit and flesh upon the rabbinical doctrine of the good and evil impulses.¹ In a summary of Jewish Palestinian Theology, based on Weber, he says: "The natural ground of sin lies in the fact that the soul, in itself pure by creation, is in each man defiled by the impure body. The body, however, is impure, not merely because it consists of perishable earthly material, but especially because it is the seat and source of the evil impulse. For from the beginning of the creation God endowed man with a double impulse, the impulse to good in the soul and the impulse to evil (*Yeçer Hara*), which adheres to the body and expresses itself first in the form of the impulse to sense enjoyment which man has in common with all animals." This impulse, "because it belongs to the nature of the body," was present in man from the first but gained predominant power through the fall. "But man possesses also the good impulse innate in his soul, and therewith the possibility of withstanding the evil impulses of the body" (*Urchristenthum*, pp. 166 f).² Again, Jewish theology "ascribed to human nature, corresponding to its two sides, body and soul, a twofold impulse: the evil impulse, which has its seat in the body, springing from impure earthly matter, and the good impulse, which dwells in the rational soul, springing from God" (p. 181). With this doctrine Pfeiderer finds Paul, in Romans 7: 7-24, wholly in accord. The good impulse dwells in the inner man (*νοῦς*); the evil impulse has its seat in the body which consists of impure flesh-material. The conflict is between "the sinful impulse in the flesh" and "the good impulse of the reason" (p. 182 ff.). "The flesh is the seat of a positive power antagonistic to spirit, the evil impulse, or sin as a potency." "This νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ ὄν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου (Rom. 7 : 23) is precisely the same as that which Jewish theology calls 'the evil impulse which dwells

logie (1880), then with the title *Die Lehren des Talmud* (1886), and finally in a 2d edition by Schnedermann, with corrections, under the title, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften* (1897).

¹ *Das Urchristenthum* (1887), *Der Paulinismus*, 2d ed. (1890).

² So in *Paulinismus*,² pp. 20-21, 57, 65, with reference to Weber §§ 40, 46, 48-50.

in the body,' and the νόμος νοός μου is the same as 'the good impulse which dwells in the soul.'"¹

Later writers on Pauline theology have in part adopted Pfeiderer's view. Those who have questioned or rejected it have done so, as far as I have observed, on the ground that the sources of Weber's book are post-Christian, and that the doctrine of the good and evil impulses belongs only to post-Christian Judaism, and is itself due to Greek influence. So Gunkel² simply refuses to use Weber's material for the pre-Pauline period. Holtzmann³ regards the analogy offered by the rabbinical *yeşer hara* as "only very general and weak, also questionable in respect to contemporaneity, and perhaps already testifying to Greek influences." Schmiedel⁴ agrees that Paul thinks of sin as a power bound by nature with the material of the body, but says that at this point Paul stands on the ground of Greek philosophy, with its metaphysical dualism between the spirit springing from God and matter evil in itself. Against Pfeiderer's appeal to the Jewish doctrine of the evil impulse stands the "pressing suspicion" that this also is derived from Greek philosophy. "If this doctrine, provable only from post-Pauline sources, is pre-Pauline, then the indirect way through this for the explanation of the Greek element in Paul's conception of the σάρξ would certainly be preferable, since the direct points of contact with Philo are not significant."

But is it true that the Jewish doctrine of the two impulses has this dualistic character, which, in its contrast to the Old Testament view, we must regard as of Greek origin? Does the good impulse inhere in the soul, the evil impulse in the body? It appears to me clear that Pfeiderer is responsible for a certain misrepresentation of Weber at this point, and also that Weber himself has fallen into a serious misuse of his sources, giving a Greek coloring to a conception which

¹ *Paulinismus* ², pp. 66-67.

² *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, p. 107 (2 ed., p. 98).

³ *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, ii. p. 39 n. 1.

⁴ *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament* ², II. i. p. 255.

was and remained genuinely Hebraic in character. The importance of Weber's treatise and the fact that his fault in this matter is not without parallel at other points in his book may justify a somewhat detailed criticism before we turn to a more positive treatment of the rabbinical doctrine of the *yeçer*, and finally raise the question whether it is, as Holtzmann and Schmiedel affirm, attested only by post-Christian sources.

II

CRITICISM OF WEBER'S TREATMENT OF THE YEÇER

Against Pfeiderer's summary of Weber it is to be noticed that Weber nowhere says that the good impulse has its seat in the soul. On the contrary he says, "God created also in the human body a good impulse (*yeçer tob*)," and "the body is called the seat of a *yeçer ra* and a *yeçer tob*" (p. 204 [2211]). The accuracy of this expression will be questioned hereafter, but in any case Pfeiderer should not have put the expression "the good impulse which dwells in the soul" in quotation marks, for it is his own invention. It is essential to his parallelism (Rom. 7: 23) but it is not in his only authority. The impression which Weber's discussion makes at this point (§§ 46, 47) is that the soul, the free moral agent, comes into a body endowed by nature with good and evil tendencies, and has the task of suppressing the evil and making the good prevail.

It must, however, be acknowledged that Weber has made such an interpretation as Pfeiderer's possible by the emphasis with which, especially in §§ 48, 49, he connects the evil impulse with the body. When he argues that while the soul is pure by nature the body is impure, "not only because it is perishable, but because it is the seat of the evil impulse" (220 f. [2228f.]), the inference is natural, though it is not expressed, that the good impulse has its seat in the soul. Weber in one passage seems inclined to identify the soul with the good impulse. He says that it is the soul which keeps the Law, and holds communion with God, while "it is the *yeçer hara* of the body which desires and effects sin."

“Yet,” he continues, “there exists a close relation between body and soul. The soul is called, with the powers of wisdom that dwell in it, to be *yeçer tob* against the *yeçer ra*, to further goodness, and thereby to weaken the *yeçer ra*” (p. 222). An effort is made to clarify this awkward sentence in the 2d ed. (p. 230), but the meaning remains the same. The language is Weber’s own and is supported by no reference.

But though he wavers in regard to the seat of the good impulse, there is no obscurity in regard to the evil. It is defined as “the impulse inherent in the body to fulfil bodily functions which are directed to maintenance and propagation” (p. 204 [2211]). Let us, then, examine the references which Weber cites to justify the view that the body, in distinction from the soul, is the seat of the evil impulse.¹

We read:—

“That the *yeçer hara* dwells in the body according to its nature by creation is shown by *Genesis rabba*, ch. 34.² Here the question whether this impulse arises in man before or after birth is decided in the former sense; but of the soul it is said that it unites itself with the body only after birth” (p. 204 [2211]).

This would seem indeed to be conclusive proof that the evil impulse belongs to the body and not to the soul,³ but unfortu-

¹ The haggadic parts of the rabbinical literature, which here concern us, have been made in considerable measure accessible to those who are not rabbinical scholars, by translations. See especially Wünsche’s *Der jerusalemische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen*, 1880; *Der babylonische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen* 1886-89; *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, 1880-1885; and Goldschmidt’s *Der babylonische Talmud* (text and translation) 1897 + [not yet complete]. The chronological and critical study of the teachings of the rabbis has been greatly advanced by W. Bacher’s *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer*, 1878; *Die Agada der Tannaiten* [from Hillel to the conclusion of the Mishna, 30 B. C. -220 A. D.], 1884-90; and *Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer* [from the close of the Mishna to the beginning of the fifth century], 1892-99. Many of the citations made in this article are from Wünsche or Bacher; some are from other translations, though the intention has been to consult the original at all points of doubt or of critical importance.

² See Wünsche, p. 152.

³ It is cited, from Weber, in that sense by Clemen, *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, 1897, p. 185 f.

nately Weber has reversed the sense of the passage he cites.¹ It is one of the reported conversations between Rabbi Juda I. and (the emperor?) Antoninus, found also in the Talmud.² Antoninus asked when the evil impulse begins to rule in men, at conception or at birth. Rabbi answered, at conception. Antoninus replied, In that case the child would violently come forth out of the womb; I say therefore rather, at birth. Rabbi acknowledged that Antoninus was right, and found proof of this view in Gen. 4:6, "Sin lurks at the door," *i. e.*, of the womb. Antoninus then argued against Rabbi that the soul is joined to the body not at birth but at conception, since, as flesh cannot be preserved three days without salt, so the body could not endure even before birth without the soul. Rabbi yielded again, and found proof of this view — to him new — in Job 10:12. It is interesting to notice that these two questions are asked and answered independently of each other, as if the coming in of the evil *yeçer* had nothing to do with the relation of body and soul; and also that such questions are asked by a heathen, that the Jew has no fixed view in regard to them but is ready to change his first impression and to look for the necessary scriptural proof of the position maintained on the grounds of common sense by the heathen. The question when the soul enters the body is discussed elsewhere and differently answered, but is brought into no connection with the question of the *yeçer*.

Weber proceeds: —

"God has, however, created in the human body, on the other hand, a *good impulse* also. This is inferred, in *Berachoth* 60^b, from the two *yods* in ייצר (Gen. 2:7). Man has two reins; the one counsels to the good, the other to the evil (Ps. 16:7) *Berach.* 61^a, 61^b. *Nedarim* 32^b therefore calls the body the seat of an evil *yeçer* and a good *yeçer*."

Let us examine these references. In *Berach.* 60^b [61^a] we find three answers to the question why there are two *yods* in

¹ He cites it more correctly on p. 221 [² 229], but there also with unjustified inferences.

² *Sanh.* 91^b, cf. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, II. 457-459.

וַיִּצַר (Gen. 2:7). R. Nachman b. R. Chisda said: Because God created (ברא) two impulses (יִצְרִים), the good and the evil. R. Nachman b. Isaac answered: In that case animals would not possess the (evil) impulse, since only one *yod* is used in their case (Gen. 2:19); but in fact they have it, since they bite and kick. So the explanation of R. Simon b. Pazzi is preferred: Woe to me before my creator, and woe to me before my *yeçer* (אוי לי מיוצרי ואוי לי מיצרי).¹ Or also that of Jeremiah b. Eleasar: Two faces God created in Adam, as is written: Thou hast formed me (צרתני) behind and before (Ps. 139:5). It is evident that the first of these interpretations of Gen. 2:7, even if it had not been set aside for others, would not justify the inference which Weber seems to draw that because וַיִּצַר refers to the body before the breath of life had entered it, therefore the two impulses were supposed to have their seat in the body in distinction from the soul. The inference might indeed have been made, but it was not. Still less does the passage justify the statement which Hamburger strangely bases upon it, that the two impulses were identified with the two parts of man's nature, the evil with the dust of which he was formed, and the good with the breath of life by which he became a living soul. In fact the passage has nothing to do with the question whether the impulses inhere in soul or body.

I have not noticed any other rabbinical sayings which bring Gen. 2:7 into connection with the problem of the *yeçer*, and of these two the one which has a dualistic appearance is less acceptable than the other. This fact is in itself significant, suggesting that the problem was one of ethics, not of psychology; for scarcely any other passage in the Old Testament was so well adapted to form the foundation of a theory that connects sin with the physical and good with the psychical side of man's nature; and the use of the root יִצַר, and also the suggestion of Ps. 103:14, might have made such a use of the passage the more natural.

¹ Found also in *Erubin*, 18^a. See Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 441 f.

² *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, II. 1231.

The next citation (*Berach.* 61^{a-b}) reads: The rabbis taught, Two reins are in man, the one counsels him to good and the other to evil, and it is probable that the good is on his right and the evil on his left, for it is written, "A wise man's heart is at his right hand; but a fool's heart is at his left" (*Eccles.* 10: 2).

Here we have, of course, not a literal identification of the impulses with the two kidneys. The word reins (כליות) is used in the Old Testament prevalingly, as the word heart is used almost exclusively, not of the physical organ, but of the inner man, the inmost self. In the saying before us the two kidneys in the physical man suggest the two impulses in man as a moral being. The word *yeçer* is not used in this sentence, but it is discussed in the context. The same interpretation of *Ecclesiastes* 10 : 2, with the use of the word *yeçer*, is found, in connection with several other interpretations of the verse, in *Num. rab.* 22 (Wünsche, p. 527). That the two impulses reside in the body in distinction from the soul the passage does not prove.

But what of *Nedarim* 32^b, which "calls the body the seat of an evil impulse and a good impulse?" The passage is R. Ammi b. Abba's interpretation of *Ecclesiastes* 9: 14, 15, and is found also, anonymously, after many other interpretations, in *Kohel. rab.* 9: 14, 15. The little city, he said, is the body, the few men in it, the members; the great king who comes against it, the evil *yeçer*; the bulwarks, sins; the poor wise man in it, the good *yeçer*; his wisdom which delivered the city, penitence and good works. The passage contains no justification for Weber's statement. If the figure were to be pressed so as to yield any result as to the seat of the impulses it would be that the good impulse resides in the body while the evil impulse comes against it from without. But any such use of the passage is a misuse. That the city is called the body rather than the soul or heart is perhaps to provide for an casier explanation of the citizens. At all events the passage does not "call the body the seat of an evil impulse and a good impulse."

The next passage in Weber to be examined is as follows: —

“This sin [Adam’s] in its final ground has God for its cause. For he created the corporeity with the *yeçer hara*, without which sin would not have been possible (*Gen. rab. 27 Jalkut Shim. Gen. 44, 47*). In the latter passage we read: Repentance came upon me that I had created man of earthly substance (מלמטה); for if I had created him of heavenly substance he would not have become a rebel against me. And further: Repentance arose in my heart, said God, that I created in him the *yeçer hara*; for if I had not done this he would not have become a rebel against me (p. 214 [²221 f.]).”

I have not verified the reference in the later source, *Jalkut* (thirteenth century), but the earlier form of the sayings reveals the serious misuse of them of which Weber is guilty. The passage (*Gen. rab.*, 27; Wünsche, pp. 122, 565; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 245) gives various interpretations of Genesis 6 : 6^a (and it repented [וינחם] Yahwè that he had made man on the earth [בארץ]). R. Juda b. Ilai interpreted thus: I repent that I created man below (מלמטן, *i. e.*, on the earth), for if I had created him above (מלמעלי, *i. e.*, in heaven) he would not have fallen away from me. R. Nehemiah answered: I console myself (מתנחם אני) that I created him below (מלמטה), for if I had created him above he would have seduced those above (העליונים, *i. e.*, the angels) to fall away from me, as he has seduced those below. According to R. Ibo the meaning was: I repent that I created in him the *yeçer hara*, for if I had not created it in him he would not have risen up against me (Bacher, *Amor.* III. 68).

Weber’s rendering of מלמטה, “von irdischer Substanz,” and of מלמעלי, “von himmlischer Substanz,” is wholly unjustifiable; and so also is his blending of two distinct interpretations of Genesis 6 : 6, and his connection of the evil impulse in one with the supposed earthly substance in the other, and of the good impulse with the heavenly substance. Of “corporeity” and any connection of the evil impulse with the body the passage says absolutely nothing.

Again Weber says:—

“That the body is impure, not merely as perishable, but because it is the *seat of the evil impulse*, we see from what is said in *Num. rab.* 13 (Wünsche, p. 312): God knew before he created man that the desire of his heart would be evil from his youth (Gen. 8: 21). ‘Woe to the dough of which the baker himself must testify that it is bad.’ This Jewish proverb can be applied to the Jewish doctrine of man. Then the dough is the body, which God (the baker) worked and shaped, and the impurity of the body is grounded in the fact that it is the seat of the *yeçer hara*, which is in the body that which leaven is in the dough (שְׂאֹר שְׂבַעִיסָה), cf. 1 Cor. 5 : 7 f.), a fermenting, impelling power (*Berach.* 17^a)” (p. 221 [229]).

Here the identification of the dough with the body, in distinction from the soul, is mistaken. The dualistic psychology is supplied by Weber, not suggested by the source. God’s judgment upon man in Gen. 8 : 21 is likened to a baker’s condemnation of his own dough. The proverb is found also in *Gen. rab.* 34 (Wünsche, p. 152) as a saying of R. Chiya the Great (Bacher, *Tan.*, II. p. 530). The comparison of the evil impulse with leaven is an entirely distinct saying which should not be connected with the other. But in this case also the dough is man, human nature, not the body. It is in the prayer of R. Alexander (*Berach.* 17^a): “It is revealed and known before thee that our will is to do thy will. And what hinders? The leaven that is in the dough and servitude to the kingdoms. May it be thy will to deliver us from their hand.”¹

There are only two sentences, so far as I have discovered, in which Weber’s connection of the *yeçer* with the body is confirmed by the text which he cites. In these cases, however, the word גוף is not used of the body in contrast to the soul, and Weber’s view remains without proof.

¹ Taylor’s translation, in *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 2d ed. p. 128. See also Bacher, *Amor.*, I. p. 196; cf. *Tan.*, I. p. 112.

The passage begins:

“From the entrance of bodily maturity the *yeçer hara* deserves the name of a strange god (אל זר) in the body of man. *Sabbath* 105^b.”

The passage gives no ground for the words “from the entrance of bodily maturity.” It is a saying of R. Abin’s: “What means Ps. 81 : 10, Let there be in thee no strange god? What is the strange God which is in the body of man (שיש בגופו של אדם)? It is none other than the *yeçer hara*.” The passage will meet us again in its connection. Anger and idolatry, not bodily sins, are the effects of the evil *yeçer* which are discussed in the context. The expression *בגופו* is nothing but a paraphrase of the “in thee” (בך) of Ps. 81 : 10.¹ So Taylor (p. 130) translates “in a man’s body (or self),” and Levy (*Wörterbuch*) “in dem innern des Menschen.” Nothing suggests that the body is specified in distinction from the soul. The word here as in other instances is equivalent to “person” or “self” (See Levy and Jastrow’s *Dictionary*). The same remark applies to the next citation.

Weber proceeds:—

“It occasions sins in the body, as *Exod. rab.* 15 says: Sins spring from the evil impulse which is in their body (גורף).”

The passage (Wünsche, p. 107) sets forth various points of likeness between angels and Israel. Among them is this: “The angels renew themselves daily and return, after they have praised God, to the stream of fire out of which they came (Dan. 7 : 10), and God renews them and makes them as before (Lam. 3 : 23 [cf. *Lam. rab.* 3 : 23]); so Israel smitten with sins from the evil *yeçer* which is in their body,² if they turn in repentance God every year forgives their sins

¹ The same interpretation of Ps. 81 : 10 is ascribed to R. Jannai in *Jer. Nedarim* 41^b (IX. 1), where the expression “within thee” (בקרבך) takes the place of *בגופו*, with which it is wholly synonymous.

² משתמעין בעונות מיצר הרע שיש בגופו.

and renews their heart to fear him, as it is written in Ezek. 36:26." The Old Testament citation strikingly illustrates the remoteness from Hebrew thought of the idea that sin belongs to the flesh in contrast to the soul. The passage before us does not prove that rabbinical Judaism had at this point departed from its traditional mode of thought. Even if the word גוף were used in its literal sense, these rare and late occurrences would not justify Weber's repeated use of the phrase "the evil impulse of the body," and the dualistic inferences which he draws from them. But it is altogether probable that even in these instances the translation "body" is misleading.¹

Weber continues: —

"The angels are free from it [the *yeşer hara*] because they do not carry the earthly corporeity; their holiness is therefore only single, that of man double, because gained in conflict with evil lusts (*Lev. rab.* 24)."

Here again the words regarding earthly corporeity are Weber's own. The passage says only that the evil impulse is not found in the angels (העליונים, "those on high"), but it rules in men (התחתונים, "those below"). Of the bearing of this passage upon the doctrine more will be said below.

Weber is inclined throughout his discussion of the two impulses to interpret them in terms of a dualistic psychology, but the passages which he cites do not take us out of the ethical region. They do not justify his definition of the evil impulse as "the impulse inherent in the body to fulfil bodily functions which are directed to maintenance and propagation" (p. 204 [2211]), but rather support the simple definition of Taylor (p. 37): "The *yeşer ra* is the evil nature or disposition in or of a man; the *yeşer tob* his good nature or disposition." It is difficult to excuse Weber's use of some of the passages cited, and the suggestion of caution in the use of his book is one that should be enforced before we

¹ Cf. Aboth, 4 : 10 : Whosoever honors the law is *himself* (גופו) held in honor.

leave him. The vitally important question of the nature, the stages, and the degree of Greek influence upon the conceptions of the Jewish rabbis is one that cannot be answered by the help of one who is so inclined to put Hebraic ideas into Greek and modern forms of expression. Nor is this the only point at which this book, so often used as if it were equivalent to the sources of rabbinical theology, needs to be controlled by reference to the sources themselves.

It is unfortunate that Weber wrote with an apologetic aim, and wished to set Jewish views over against Christian in an unfavorable, though unexpressed, contrast. This may explain his tendency to put the teaching of passages in language which the passage itself does not suggest. It is furthermore a serious fault of method that he does not cite the authors of the sayings by name, and so fails to give us light on the relative age of different opinions, and that he seldom informs us whether the opinion cited was controverted by others, and what opinion, if any, prevailed. With all its undoubted learning and great value the book must be said to be deficient in accuracy, and its method not well adjusted to the nature of its sources.

III

THE RABBINICAL CONCEPTION

In order to understand the Jewish doctrine of the *yeçer* we must remember that it is not at all a speculative but wholly an exegetical product. It rests for its origin upon Genesis 6 : 5; 8 : 21 (J.). "Yahve saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth and that *every yeçer of the thoughts of his heart was only evil every day*" (וכל-יצר מחשבת לבו) (רק רע כל-היום); "the *yeçer of the heart of man is evil from his youth.*" The first of these verses gives the ground of God's resolve to destroy man; the second, the ground of his decision, after the flood, not to curse the ground and smite the living again. So that we meet already the suggestion that the "evil *yeçer* (of the thoughts) of the heart of man" is in part, or in one aspect, his fault and in part his misfortune; that the evil *yeçer* lies on the borderland between the choice and the nature of man. This prepares us to recognize the fact that in later discussions of the *yeçer* the question at issue is not the speculative question of the relation of body and soul to the fact of sin, but the religious question of the relation of God and man to sin, and the practical question of the way of escape and victory.

It is never doubted that God made the evil *yeçer*, yet man is responsible for controlling and subduing it. The word itself suggested these two apparently contrary conceptions. The verb יצר means to form, or fashion, and also, to form inwardly, to plan. It was used as the technical word for the potter's work. It was frequently used of God's forming of nature and of man, and also of his planning or purposing. The יצר of man could therefore suggest either his form, as

God made him, his nature (so Ps. 103 : 14), or his own formation of thought and purpose, "imagination" as the word is rendered in several Old Testament passages (Gen. 6 : 5; 8 : 21; Deut. 31 : 21; Isa. 26 : 3; 1 Chr. 28 : 9; 29 : 18). In Deuteronomy 31 : 21, and probably Isaiah 26 : 3, the word is used without the further definition, "of the thoughts," "of the heart," which First Chronicles retains. The word had gained therefore, already in the Old Testament, a certain independence as meaning the nature or disposition of man, and this could be regarded as something which God made (Ps. 103 : 14), or as something which man works (Deut. 31 : 21).

It is evident that the word was fitted by Old Testament use for further development in discussions of the origin of sin, and the responsibility of man. This development by the rabbis was carried forward by exegetical processes, through which many texts besides those in which the word occurs were brought to bear upon the doctrine. In some cases the explanation of a difficult text was found in some characteristic of the *yeçer*, and in other cases difficult facts of experience with reference to the evil power of the *yeçer* in man were explained by appealing to some enlightening text.

The fundamental passages pronounce the *yeçer* of man's heart evil, and it is with the evil impulse that the rabbis chiefly deal. The good impulse is rarely spoken of, and probably cannot be traced so far back, and *yeçer* frequently stands unmodified and always in the evil sense. This in itself suggests the error of connecting the evil *yeçer* with the body, the good with the soul, making them expressions of the character of two equally essential parts of man. Rather it is the nature of man as a whole that is in mind, and in it the evil tendency, or disposition, dominates. ✓

Without attempting completeness, I wish to state the teachings of the rabbis about the *yeçer* somewhat fully in their own words.¹ It should be remembered that we have to do

¹ Some of the passages in which a number of sayings regarding the *yeçer* are collected are *Berach.* 60-61, *Succa* 51^b-52^a, *Kiddushin* 30^b, 81, *Baba Bathra* 16^a, *Yoma* 69^b-70^b, *Sanhed.* 20^a, *Gen. rab.* 22, 34.

Taylor cites many passages, and makes interesting suggestions as to New

with a variety of individual opinions, and with the views of rabbis of earlier and later times during a period of several centuries;¹ and also with a great mass of anonymous and pseudonymous sayings; so that an elaborate rabbinical doctrine is not to be looked for, but rather a rabbinical way of thinking on this subject.

1. *The Seat of the Good and Evil Impulses*

The seat of the good and evil impulses alike is neither body nor soul in distinction from each other, but rather, as Genesis 6 : 5; 8 : 21 suggest, the heart, — not, of course, the physical organ, but the thinking and willing subject, the moral person, the inner self. The close association of the *yeḡer* with the heart is as abundantly attested as its connection with the body is meagerly. Heart is even used in the sense of *yeḡer*, as in *Gen. rab.* 67 (Wünsche, p. 324), where Genesis 27 : 41 “Esau spoke *in his heart*” is interpreted thus: The wicked are in the power of their heart, as in Psalm 14 : 1, “The fool speaks in his heart,” and here “Esau spoke in his heart”; also Jeroboam (1 Kings 12 : 26) and Haman (Esther 7 : 6). But the righteous have their heart in their power, as Hannah (1 Sam. 1 : 13), David (27 : 1) and Daniel (Dan. 1 : 8).² Often the word heart in an Old Testament verse is interpreted of the *yeḡer*, and since the word heart occurs in the two forms לב and לבב, the rabbis were not slow to see in the double *beth* a hint of the two impulses, and in the single *beth* of the one. Here belongs the ancient interpretation of the phrase “with all thy heart” (בכל-לבבך) in Deuteronomy 6 : 5. The two

Testament parallels. See his *Sayings*, 2d ed., pp. 37, 63 f., 70, 77, 82, 98, 140, 147–152, and cf. 128–130, 186–192.

¹ On the rabbinical method of interpretation see, e. g., Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*, Cincinnati, 1894; for the names and dates of famous scribes, also Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, § 25 IV.; Strack, *Einleitung in den Talmud*, 2d ed., 1894, ch. VI.; and Bacher, cited above.

² That is, the wicked speaks *in his heart* (בלבו), the righteous speaks *unto or against his heart* (על לבו, or אל).

beths indicate the two impulses, and the meaning is that we are to love God with our two *yeçarim*, with the *yeçer tob* and with the *yeçer ra* (*Sifrê* and *Mishna Berach.* IX. 5).

Psalm 109 : 22 "my heart (לִבִּי) is wounded within me" is interpreted to mean that his evil *yeçer* has been wounded, or slain; hence David is to be reckoned with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob over whom the evil *yeçer* had no power (*Baba bathra*, 16^a). The same interpretation of this verse is found in a saying of Jose the Galilean (Bacher, *Tan.*, I. p. 368). Deuteronomy 6 : 6 is interpreted in *Sifrê*: Let these words be against thy heart (עַל-לִבְּךָ), that is against thy *yeçer*. Psalm 86 : 11 "unite my heart (לִבִּי) to fear thy name" means unite the evil to the good impulse that it may be controlled (R. Isaac, Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 289). "The northern," or "the hidden" in Joel 2 : 20 is the *yeçer hara* which is hidden (צִפּוֹן) and stands in the heart of man (יעומד בלב) (של אדם) (*Succa* 52^a). Rab said: The evil *yeçer* is like a fly and sits between the two openings of the heart, as it says in Ecclesiastes 10 : 1 (*Berach.*, 61^a). "These my words shall ye take to your heart" (Deut. 11 : 18), i. e., the law is balm for the wound of the evil *yeçer* (*Kiddushin*, 30^b).

2. *The Nature of the Evil Impulse*

The question next arises, what sins are ascribed to the *yeçer*? If it is the *yeçer* of the heart we should expect all sins of the heart, i. e., all sins, to be attributed to it. No doubt sensual sins are with special emphasis ascribed to the *yeçer*, but this appears to be not because these are sins of the body, but because they are conspicuous among the sins that come upon man and overmaster him as if by an outside force. Passion is often an accurate translation for *yeçer* in this connection. As such a power from without, in the form of lust, the evil *yeçer* can momentarily master even the best of men. R. Akiba mocked at those who could not withstand the *yeçer*, but he was saved from falling before the tempter in the form of a woman only by heavenly intercession. Of

R. Meir a similar story is told (*Kiddushin*, 81^a). "The tendency of these legends is to show that the greatest moral strength without divine protection is not enough to keep one from the assaults of passion" (Bacher, *Tan.*, I. p. 284).

A long collection of sayings about the *yeçer* (*Succa*, 51^b-52^b) is occasioned by the Mishnic rule that at the celebration of the festival the women should sit in the gallery, the men below. Rab justifies the rule by appealing to Zechariah 12 : 12. If even in mourning, when the evil *yeçer* has no power, it says, "the men apart and the women apart," how much more in festal times, when the evil *yeçer* has power.

In the saying of R. Jehoshua (*Aboth*, 2 : 15, Taylor's *Sayings*), "An evil eye, and the evil *yeçer*, and hatred of the creatures put a man out of the world," the *yeçer* as passion seems to be coördinated with greed and hatred of men.¹ It is not necessary, however, even here, to limit it to sensual passion. See further the interpretation of Isaiah 3 : 16 in *Sabbath* 62^b (Bacher, *Amor.* III. 720).

Lust is certainly by no means the only manifestation of the evil *yeçer* in men. R. Josia interprets Deuteronomy 6 : 6 thus: Let these words be for an oath against thy heart, *i. e.*, thy *yeçer*. Man is to expel his *yeçer* by an oath,² (adjure it, or bind himself to war against it), as did Abraham (Gen. 14 : 22 f.), Boaz (Ruth 3 : 13), David (1 Sam. 26 : 10) and Elisha (2 Kings, 5 : 16); while the wicked by an oath strengthen their evil *yeçer*, as did Gehazi (2 Kings 5 : 20).³ In these examples revenge and avarice appear by the side of lust as deeds of the *yeçer*. Jose b. Chalaftha said: Three men fortified themselves by an oath against the *yeçer*: Joseph (Gen. 39 : 9), David (1 Sam. 26 : 10) and Boaz (Ruth 3 : 13) to whom Proverbs 24 : 5 applies.⁴

¹ Compare the similar saying in 4 : 30: jealousy and lust (התאוה) and ambition put a man out of the world. And see First John, 2 : 16.

² להשביע את יצרו

³ *Sifré*, Deut. 6 : 6, Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 360.

⁴ *Lev. rab.*, 23; Wünsche, p. 158; *Ruth rab.*, 3 : 13. A similar view as to David is ascribed to R. Jochanan; as to Boaz to R. Judan and R. Chanina. See Bacher, *Amor.* III. 237, 249, 705.

Anger is especially ascribed to the *yeçer* in an interesting saying in *Sabbath* 105^b. It is part of a discussion of the Mishnic rule regarding the rending of one's clothes (when this is commanded or allowed). The question has come up whether this is sometimes justifiable in order to calm "the spirit of one's *yeçer*."¹ It is reported that Jochanan b. Nuri said: Let one who in anger tears his garments, breaks vessels, casts away money, be in thine eyes as one who practises idolatry. For this is the craft of the *yeçer hara*; to-day it says to him do this, to-morrow do that, till it says to him, Go practise idolatry; and he goes and does it. R. Abin said, What says Psalm 81 : 10 (i. e., How does this passage prove this?), There shall be in thee no strange God, etc? What is the strange god which is within [בגופו] man? It is the evil *yeçer*. It (tearing one's clothes) is allowed, however, when it is meant to compel the respect of one's servants. So R. Juda pulled the threads of his garment, R. Acha b. Jacob shattered broken vessels, etc. In *Aboth di R. Nathan* 26, Jochanan's saying is ascribed to R. Akiba (Bacher, *Tan.*, I. 284); and in *Jer. Nedarim*, 41^b, R. Jammai is quoted as saying: One who obeys his *yeçer* practises as it were idolatry. "Let there be no strange God within thee," Psalm 81 : 10, i. e., make not the stranger within thee (זר שבקרבי) to be ruler over thee (Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 38).

From a rabbi of the same period, b. Zoma, comes the saying in *Aboth*, 4 : 2: Who is mighty? He that subdues his *yeçer* (הכובש את יצרו) (Taylor, nature); for it is said, He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit (מושל ברוחו) than he that taketh a city (Prov. 16 : 32). The saying was probably applied not to anger alone, but to the inner power of sin in general. In the sense of anger it was even possible to speak of God's *yeçer*, and say: This is his strength, that he suppresses his *yeçer*, and grants forbearance.²

רקעריד נחת רוח ליצרו¹

² *Yoma*, 69^b, reading יצר in the place of כעס. See Rabinovicz *Variae Lectiones*, IV. 202.

It is not only bodily appetites and the more violent passions that are ascribed to the *yeçer*, but all other sins as well. When the evil *yeçer* sees a conceited man it says, He is mine; as Proverbs 26 : 12 says, The fool (evil *yeçer*) has hope of him.¹ It is the evil *yeçer* that makes Jews object, as heathen do, to the irrational precepts of the law, such as the prohibition of swine's flesh, of wearing goods of linen and wool mixed, the scape goat, the red cow.² The *yeçer* may cause disbelief in the judgment after death: Let not thy *yeçer* assure thee that Sheol is a house of refuge; for perforce wast thou framed and born, perforce dost thou live and die, and perforce thou art to give account and reckoning (*Aboth*, 4 : 32).

Idolatry would have been the chief work of the *yeçer* if it had been a current sin. It was sometimes said that God created two *yeçarim* in his world, the *yeçer* of idolatry and the *yeçer* of unchastity,³ but the former had long ago been rooted out of Israel.

But is it *only* sin of which the evil *yeçer* is a cause? Is it altogether evil? In explanation of the words, And behold it was very good (Gen. 1 : 31), R. Samuel b. Nachman refers "behold" to the good *yeçer*, "and behold" to the evil. Is the evil *yeçer* then very good? Certainly, for without it man would not build a house, nor marry nor beget children nor engage in trade, as it says (Eccles. 4 : 4), Then I saw all labor and every skilful work, that it is the zeal (rivalry) of one against another.⁴ This passage does not justify the definition which Weber bases in part upon it, that the evil *yeçer* is "the impulse innate in the body to the accomplishment of bodily functions, directed to maintenance and propagation" (p. 204 [221]), for the scripture appealed to,

¹ R. Ammi, in *Gen. rab.*, 22, Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 156.

² Tannaitic tradition, *Sifrê* 86^a; *Yoma*, 67^b; Bacher, *Tan.*, I. 42; cf. *Amor.*, II. 317.

³ יצר עבודה זרה and יצר זנות. *Cant. rab.* 7 : 8. See Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 541; *Amor.*, III. 212, 694; also *Yoma*, 69^b, cited below.

⁴ *Gen. rab.*, 9; *Eccles. rab.*, 3 : 11; Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 487 f.

perhaps the source as well as the proof of the saying, does not refer to bodily functions. The thought seems rather to be that a certain self-seeking, the impulse not only to sensual pleasure, but also to gain and power, evil though it may easily become, is essential to the continuance of the world as it is. This is an attempt to justify God (see further below), with which not all would agree. The usual view was that the *yeçer* was good only to be subdued, and that the best men were without it, or free from its rule. There is indeed a sense in which it is essential to the present world order, but this rests not upon the material nature of the present world, but upon the place of the passions in human life.

The evil *yeçer* belongs to men and not to angels, to this world and not to the world to come. We read of "the higher beings in whom the evil *yeçer* does not rule."¹ Why does death come upon the righteous? Because as long as they live they have to fight with the evil *yeçer*, but when they have died they have rest, Job 3 : 17 (*Gen. rab.* 9). Abraham said to the angels (Gen. 18 : 5), Comfort ye your heart (לִבְכֶם לֹא לִבְנֵיכֶם), hence, said R. Acha, it is known that in angels the evil *yeçer* does not rule. R. Chiya adds, Psalm 48 : 14, Set your heart [לִבְכֶם] to her bulwarks; from which we see that in the world to come the evil *yeçer* will not rule (*Gen. rab.*, 48). But this is not because that world is incorporeal. It is true that the command, Be fruitful and multiply (Gen. 1 : 28) is for this world only, and that angels do not marry (cf. *Enoch* 15 : 3-7; Mark 12 : 25, etc.); but it is not exclusively bodily functions that mark the difference. "It was a commonplace in the mouth of Rab. that in the world to come there is neither eating, nor drinking, nor procreation, nor barter, nor envy, nor hatred, nor strife" (*Berach.*, 17^a; Taylor, p. 60). Moses argues that the law is needed on earth, not in heaven, for this among other reasons: The law says, thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; is there then envy among

¹ *Lev. rab.*, 26; Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 419.

you, is there an evil *yeşer* among you? (*Sabbath* 89^a).¹ Nowhere do the rabbis say what Philo says so emphatically that it is the absence of the bodily nature that makes the difference between the angelic and the human realms.

The rabbinical discussions in regard to the presence of the evil *yeşer* in children and animals prove still further that the *yeşer* belongs to the moral, not to the physical nature. The Jews did not see in children types of virtue. The *yeşer* was evil from man's youth (*Gen.* 8 : 21). We have already reported the discussion as to whether the *yeşer* entered man before or at birth.² Reuben b. Aristobulus says: The evil *yeşer* in man arises at the moment of conception and lurks continually at the door of the heart (*Gen.* 4 : 7). When a child in the cradle puts his hand on a serpent and is bitten, or on coals and is burned, it is the evil *yeşer* already ruling in the child which prevents caution before what is harmful; and when a lamb or kid at sight of a pit avoids it, that is due to the fact that in animals there rules no evil impulse.³ *Eccles. rab.* 4 : 13; 9 : 15 holds that the good *yeşer* does not arise in man until the thirteenth year, and is therefore thirteen years younger than the evil *yeşer*. It is therefore exceptional when in *Tanch.*, *Gen.* 3 : 22, it is said that a child knows nothing of sin until it is nine years old; and then the evil impulse awakens (*Hamburger*).

If bodily functions are the sphere of the activity of the *yeşer*, it must be present in animals, constituting though not man's brute inheritance yet the brute side of his nature. Yet, as we have just seen, one rabbi denies that the *yeşer* rules in animals. Another, cited above p. (101), decides that the *yeşer* is in animals, not, however, because of their corporeality, but because they kick and bite, giving evidence of a bad disposition (*Berach.*, 60^b).

¹ R. Levi said (*Lev. rab.*, 26; *Bacher, Amor.*, II. 419): The upper beings, in whom the evil *yeşer* does not rule, need only a single command (*כאמר*, *Dan.* 4 : 14 [17]); the lower beings have never enough even of repeated commands (*יאמר*, *Lev.* 21 : 1).

² *Gen. rab.*, 34; *Sanh.*, 91^b.

³ *Aboth di R. Nathan*, 16; *Bacher, Tan.*, II. 384. See also *Amor.*, II. 141, n. I.

3. *The Origin of the Evil Yeçer*

God is always regarded as the creator of the evil *yeçer*. This appears to be the most radical departure from the basal texts, Genesis 6 : 5; 8 : 21, in which the *yeçer* seems to be a man's own shaping of his thoughts or character. Yet the second of these texts suggests a certain innateness of the *yeçer*, and the belief that God made it agrees with the Old Testament and Jewish view, which was opposed to a radical dualism. We have already met (p. 101) Nachman b. Chisda's interpretation of the two *yods* in ךַּׁׁ (Gen. 2 : 7), "God created man with two *yeçarim*, the good and the evil" (*Berach.*, 61^a). Also that of Simeon b. Pazzi which follows, and seems to be preferred: "Woe is me for my creator. Woe is me for my *yeçer*."¹ According to this the two *yods* mean two woes (ׁׁ), one for the *yoçer*, one for the *yeçer*. The God who made and will judge man and the evil impulse that leads him to sin are his two fears. Only in Nachman's interpretation therefore is Genesis 2 : 7 cited to prove that God created the evil *yeçer*. It is, however, elsewhere stated, and not, so far as I know, disputed. See the comment on Genesis 1 : 31, cited above (p. 114), and that on Genesis 6 : 6 (p. 103). The rabbis did not grapple in a fundamental, philosophical way with the difficulty involved in the goodness of God and the evil disposition of man as God made him. God pronounced all good (Gen. 1 : 31), yet called the *yeçer* of man's heart evil (6 : 5; 8 : 21), and repented that he had made man, or that he had so made him. Starts toward various theoretical solutions of the problem are made by different rabbis, without agreement or consistency. We cannot indeed blame them for not solving a problem which no one has solved, but their discussions of it often seem more like play than like serious and worthy labor. The simplest way of escape from the difficulty lay in the conception of the *good yeçer*. This is opposed to the suggestion of Genesis 6 : 5; 8 : 21, and indeed

¹ Found also in *Erubin*, 18^a, in the reverse order.

most of the discussions of the *yeçer* take no account of it. The doctrine that God made man with both good and evil instincts and dispositions, and that it is man, not God, who made the evil prevail is sometimes expressed, though it cannot be the original form of the doctrine, and never appears to be accepted as a sufficient account of man's moral condition. The interpretation which found the two impulses in the two *yods* in י"ד, Genesis 2 : 7, gave way to one in which the *yeçer*, simply as evil, was contrasted with God. The idea that man is to bless God with the evil *yeçer* as well as with the good (*Berach.*, IX. 5) indicates that the problem of the evil *yeçer* was not solved by the supposition of the good. The evil *yeçer* must itself be explained and justified.

The Jews never regarded the idea that the *yeçer* became evil solely through man's sin as adequate. It does not appear that its rise was traced to Adam's sin. It must rather have explained his sin. Hamburger cites, indeed, from a late source (*Tanch.*, Gen. 3 : 22) this answer to the question: God calls the *yeçer* evil (Gen. 8 : 21), who can make it good? God did not make the *yeçer* evil but only man, and since man made it evil it is in his power to make it good. But it was not the origin but the undue power and persistence of the evil *yeçer* that was generally ascribed to the fault of men. Thus its continuance in Israel even after the giving of the Law is due to Israel's want of religious courage or faith. According to R. Juda, when the Israelites heard the first word of the Decalogue, I am Yahwè, thy God, they received an inner knowledge of the law, but lost it when they asked Moses to mediate between them and God. It cannot be restored now but will be hereafter (Jer. 31 : 32). R. Nehemiah added, When the Israelites heard the second word, Thou shalt have no other gods beside me, the evil *yeçer* was rooted out of their heart; but when they begged Moses to be a mediator, the evil *yeçer* returned to its place, not to be removed now but only hereafter (Ezek. 36 : 26).¹ R. Meir interpreted Canticles 2 : 4 (*Cant. rab.*) thus: Israel said, By wine the evil

¹ *Canticles rab.*, 1 : 2; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 273.

yeçer overmastered me; then I called the calf my god (Ex. 32 : 4).

Man is, however, not only responsible for making the *yeçer* more evil by submission to its power; he is also capable of putting it to good uses. Here we meet another theory of the origin of the *yeçer* which has been already hinted at in the saying that men are to bless God with their evil *yeçer* as well as with the good. The evil *yeçer* is in some sense good, or necessary to the existence of this world. God pronounced it very good, for without it men would not build, or marry, or trade (see above, p. 114). "The *yeçer*, the child, and the woman, the left hand shall reject while the right hand draws them near," said Simon b. Eleazar.¹ Other sayings in which the possibility of turning the *yeçer* to good account is recognized are cited below (p. 125).

It is perhaps worth while to give with fulness the legend which explains the continuance of the *yeçer* under the second temple as due no longer to Israel's fault, but to the necessities of this world. It is found in *Yoma* 69^b and in part in *Sanh.* 64^a.

In Nehemiah 9 : 4 it says, And they cried with a loud voice to the Lord their God. What did they say? Rab [*Sanh.* R. Juda], or as others say R. Jonathan said: They cried, Woe, woe (ב"י א ב"י), it is he that destroyed the sanctuary, burned the temple, killed the righteous, drove the Israelites out of their land, and still dances among us. Why hast thou given him to us? Only that we may receive reward (i. e., for conquering him). We wish him not and we wish not the reward. Then there fell a leaf on which stood — Truth (אמת). From this, according to R. Chanina, it is proved that the seal of the Holy One is Truth.² They fasted three days and three nights; then he was delivered up to them. He came forth like a fiery lion out of the holy of holies. Then spake the prophet to the Israelites: This is the *yeçer* of idolatry, for it is written, Zech. 5 : 8, And he

¹ *Sota*, 47^a; *Sanh.*, 107^b; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 427.

² On this saying see Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 8 n. 3.

said, This is Wickedness (הרשעה). When they seized him a hair went out of him and he lifted up his voice and it went 400 parasangs. Then they said, What shall we do that there may be no more pity for him in heaven? The prophet said: Shut him up in a leaden vessel and stop its mouth with lead, for lead does not let the sound through, as it is written, This is Wickedness, and he cast her into the Epha, and cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof. Then they said, Since this is a favorable time we will pray also against the *yeçer* of sin.¹ They prayed and it was delivered up to them. Then said he (the prophet), Take heed, for if you slay this one the world will cease. They bound him three days, and when they searched for a fresh egg in all the land of Israel they found none. Then they said, What shall we do? If we kill him the world will cease. If we pray that only a half be left us, halves are not kept in heaven. Then they covered his eyes with eye-paint [or put his eyes out], and let him go; and that was at least of this much good to them, that he did not inflame men against their blood relations.

The meaning of this legend appears to be that the Israelites from the time of the second temple were free from the temptation to idolatry, and from the grosser forms of unchastity, though the *yeçer* of sexual passion cannot be altogether destroyed lest the world come to an end.

Over against this theory, if it can be called such, that the *yeçer* is good, or at least indispensable to the existence of the world, as God made it, and becomes evil by man's fault, we meet a different view, according to which God regrets having made it. R. Ibo's interpretation of Gen. 6 : 6 has already been cited (p. 103). Our rabbis taught, It stands ill with the evil *yeçer*, since even its creator calls it evil (Gen. 6 : 5; *Kiddush.*, 30^b). Woe to the dough of which the baker himself testifies that it is bad (Gen. 8 : 21). Wretched is the leaven which its maker calls bad (Ps. 103 : 14). Wretched the plant which the planter himself calls bad

(Jer. 11 : 17).¹ According to Pinchas b. Jair, there are three things which God repented having made: the Chaldeans (Isa. 23 : 13), the Arabians (Job 12 : 6), and the evil *yeçer* (Mic. 4 : 6, "and what I have done ill" והרעתי).² He also interpreted Isa. 46 : 4, "I have created, I will take away" of the evil *yeçer*.³ Abahu found the interpretation of Gen. 6 : 6 in the words, "was grieved at his heart," i. e., at man's heart, the evil *yeçer*. God lamented as one who had made something that was not good: I am he that put the leaven into the dough, for the *yeçer* of man's heart is evil from his youth.⁴

It is not so easy to determine whether the connection of the *yeçer* with Satan is more than an isolated and perhaps figurative expression. The *yeçer* is often spoken of as if it were an outside power. Although it is in man it is in some sense foreign to him, "a strange god within him," so that yielding to it is a sort of idolatry (p. 113). "God made man upright" (Eccles. 7 : 29), then rose up the evil *yeçer* and polluted him.⁵ The names applied to it in *Succa* 52^a by Joshua b. Levi⁶ suggest an outside force. The evil *yeçer* has seven names: God called it *evil* (Gen. 8 : 21); Moses called it *uncircumcised* (Deut. 10 : 16); David, *unclean* (Ps. 51 : 12); Solomon, *enemy* (Prov. 25 : 31); Isaiah, *stumbling-block* (Isa. 57 : 14); Ezekiel, *stone* (Ézek. 36 : 26); Joel, *hidden* (Joel 2 : 20). In a number of passages in Psalms and Proverbs "the wicked" or "the enemy" has this interpretation. Thus Ps. 13 : 5 in the *Targum* (Taylor, p. 130); Ps. 37 : 32 by R. Simon b. Lakish (*Succa* 52^b, *Kiddushin* 30^b); Ps. 91 : 10 by R. Chisda (*Sanh.* 103^a): The evil *yeçer* will not rule over thee. And finally we have the same

¹ *Num. rab.*, 13; *Gen. rab.*, 34.

² So J., *Taanith*, 66^a. In *Succa*, 52^b, the saying is assigned to the school of Rab. and the Exile (Isa. 52 : 5) is added.

³ Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 498 f.

⁴ *Tanch.*, Gen. 6 : 6; Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 140. Bacher thinks Abahu may have been influenced by Christian thought in his emphasis on man's depravity.

⁵ *Tanch.*, Gen. 7; Weber, p. 206 (2 213).

⁶ Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 132.

rabbi's saying: "Satan, evil *yeçer* and the angel of death are one." This is proved from Job 2 : 6 where Satan has power to take Job's soul, like the angel of death, and from the word רק, used in Job 1 : 12 of Satan, and in Gen. 6 : 5 of the *yeçer*.¹ In *Sifrâ* 86^a it is the *yeçer* that objects to certain prescriptions of the law (p. 114), but in the *Baraita*² and in *Joma* 67^b, it is Satan. *Jalkut* unites the two. The *yeçer* seems to have taken to itself the chief function of Satan, that of temptation. It is against its assaults that the righteous man's efforts are directed. To be delivered from it he prays. Taylor, after gathering rabbinical material illustrative of the prayer, Deliver us from the evil, hesitates whether to interpret it of the evil one, or of the evil *yeçer*, but thinks the latter should at least be included.³ Evil (רע) is its original designation, the name given it by God. Some of the prayers against it will be cited below. From R. Jonathan a striking saying is reported in which fully Satanic deeds are ascribed to the *yeçer*: It misleads men in this world and testifies against them in the world to come (based on Prov. 29 : 21).⁴

If the *yeçer* in a measure displaces Satan in the rabbinical account of sin it must be regarded as a movement in the direction of a more ethical and rational conception. For the *yeçer*, however vividly it is personified, always remains the tendency and disposition of a man's own heart. Satan cannot be appealed to for the purpose of explaining the origin of the *yeçer*.

As to God's responsibility for the evil *yeçer*, then, opinions waver between various explanations. God made the good *yeçer* also, and man is responsible for the evil, or at least for its persistence in Israel and for its power over the good; or the evil *yeçer* itself is good, or at least inevitable in

¹ *Baba bathra*, 16^a; Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 324.

² Bacher, *Tan.*, I. 42, n. 3.

³ *Sayings*, pp. 128-130, 186-192.

⁴ *Succa*, 52^b. See Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 61, and note by Goldschmidt explaining the exegesis according to which כַּיִן is made equivalent to סְרֵרָה.

this world, and men are to turn it to good uses; or it is essentially evil, a mistake or miscarriage in creation, which God regrets and will hereafter remedy. It is noteworthy that among the various efforts to explain God's responsibility for the evil *yeçer* it is never said that it inheres in an eternal matter by whose properties God was limited when he made the world, that is, the Hebrew never gives place to the Greek explanation which Philo adopts. The important question to a Jew was not how it came to be, but how men are to master it, and how God is at the end to destroy it. It is as true of rabbinical as of Old Testament theology that it is weak in theories of the origin of sin, but strong both in effort and in hope for its conquest.

4. *The Conquest of the Yeçer by Man*

The conquest of the evil *yeçer* is a hard task because of its power, but is possible because of man's moral freedom and especially because of Israel's possession of the Law and the help of God given in answer to prayer.

a. The power of the *yeçer* is often set forth. Though it is in man from his youth, it increases in strength as man grows to maturity, and it persists in its hold even to old age.

The power of the evil *yeçer* is set forth by various sayings in *Succa*, 52^a^b. Of the "hidden one," Joel 2 : 20, it is said, "because he hath done great things," Abaji said, Most of all to the scribes. Then as he grieved because the evil *yeçer* in the form of lust had greater power over him than over some common man, an old man came and taught him, One who is greater than his neighbor, his *yeçer* is also greater (cf. *Kiddushin*, 36^b).¹ In its connection this cannot refer merely to native energy, but must be understood of sensuous passions. The greater the man the harder his moral struggles.

¹ The saying reminds one of Sir, 28 : 10 : According to the fuel of the fire, so will it burn ; . . . according to the might of the man will be his wrath (*δ. θυμός*) ; which, however, may mean that men measure their anger by their capacity to give it effect.

R. Isaac said: A man's *yeçer* overmasters [or, renews itself in] him every day (Gen. 6 : 5). R. Simon b. Lakish, Man's *yeçer* overmasters him daily and strives to kill him (Ps. 37 : 32); and if the Holy One did not help him he could do nothing against it (Ps. 37 : 33).¹ R. Huna said, At first the evil *yeçer* befools men (Hos. 4 : 12), then it dwells in them (5 : 4). Raba said, At first it is called traveller, then guest, then man [*i. e.*, the man of the house] (2 Sam. 12 : 4). The same thing is said, in *Gen. rab.* 22, of *sin* by R. Isaac. There we find also Akiba's interpretation of Isa. 5 : 18 as applied to *sin*, which in *Succa* 52^a is ascribed to R. Asi and applied to the *yeçer*: At the beginning it is like a thread of the spinning web, but at the end it is like a cart rope. *Gen. rab.*, 22, gives us also this inference from the fact that the word "sin" in Genesis 4 : 7 is masculine, elsewhere feminine: In the beginning sin is weak as a woman, but afterward it becomes strong as a man.²

According to *Gen. rab.*, 54, R. Josua b. Levi based on Proverbs 16 : 7 the saying: If one lives with his neighbor two or three years they become friends; but the evil *yeçer* lives with man from his earliest youth and will destroy him even in his seventieth or eightieth year if it finds opportunity.³ Ecclesiastes 4 : 13 is interpreted of the two impulses. The poor, wise youth is the good *yeçer*; a youth, because it does not stir in man until he is thirteen years old; poor, because not all obey him; wise, because he teaches man the right way. The old, foolish king is the evil *yeçer*; king, because all obey him; old, because he has to do with man from youth to age; foolish, because he teaches men the bad way and will not be warned of the suffering that is coming upon him (*Eccles. rab.* 4 : 13, cf. 9 : 14-15).

But though in one sense the *yeçer* belongs to the nature of

¹ The two last sayings are found also in *Kiddushin*, 30^b.

² Cf. R. Abin's interpretation of ^לרע in Dent. 7 : 15: It is the evil *yeçer* which is sweet in the beginning and bitter at the end (*J. Sabb.* 14^o, *Lev. rab.* 16, Bacher, *Amor.* III. 408.)

³ Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 132 n. 5.

man, and though its evil power is great, yet it is not such as to dominate over man against his will, and there are those in whom it has no ruling power. All men, says Jose the Galilean, are divided into three classes, the righteous, who are under the rule of the good impulse (proved from Ps. 109 : 22, My heart is wounded in me, *i. e.*, my evil *yeçer* is slain); the wicked who are ruled only by the evil *yeçer* (Ps. 36 : 2, Sin speaks to the wicked, etc.); and a middle class, ruled now by one, now by the other (Ps. 109 : 31, "Those who judge his soul" are the two *yeçers*).¹ Or, according to *Eccles. rab.* 4 : 15, 16, there are two classes; those who walk with the good *yeçer* are the righteous, and those who submit to the evil *yeçer* are the wicked. — Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were free from the evil *yeçer*, and in David also it was slain (above, p. 111).

This mastery of the righteous over their *yeçer* is described in two ways, according to the varying conception of the *yeçer* itself. Regarded as in some sense a good and indispensable part of creation, it is to be turned to good uses; regarded as the impulse to sin, it is to be suppressed. The latter is the prevailing point of view. The former is expressed in the saying already quoted: *Yeçer*, child and woman, the left hand shall reject while the right hand draws them near. The same rabbi, Simon b. Eleazar, says: The evil *yeçer* is like iron. From iron one may make all sorts of vessels if only he cast it into the fire. So one can make the evil *yeçer* useful by the words of the Law. This is proved by Proverbs 25 : 21 f.: If thou soothe thine enemy (the *yeçer*) with bread and water (the Law), God will make it thy friend (Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 436).² R. Isaac said: A man had two cows, one meant for ploughing, the other not. If he wants the latter to plough he puts the yoke on both. Should you not also join the evil impulse to the good, and so be able to turn it whither you will? So David prays (Ps. 86 : 11), Unite the double *yeçer* of my heart (לִבִּי)

¹ *Ab. di R. Nathan*, 32, and in variant form, *Berach.*, 61^b, Bacher, *Tan.*, I. 368.

² The same saying is ascribed to R. Berachiah, Bacher, *Amor.*, III. 381 f.

cf. p. 119

to fear thy name (Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 289 f.). We are to praise God with the evil *yeçer* as well as with the good.

But the evil *yeçer*, regarded simply as sin, it is man's moral task to subdue. "Thou hast given it to us that we may by it (by conquering it) receive reward" (*Yoma*, 69 : 6). The passage most quoted in proof of man's power to master his *yeçer* is Gen. 4 : 7. It lurks at the door of thy heart, a constant menace, and toward thee is its desire, but thou shalt rule over it (e. g., *Kiddushin* 30^b). "Who is mighty? He that subdues his *yeçer*" (Prov. 16 : 32; *Aboth*, 4 : 2, Taylor). It is only one who delicately brings up his evil *yeçer* in his youth who will have to lament it in his age (R. Abin on Prov. 29 : 21, *Gen. rab.* 22; Bacher, *Amor.*, III. 407). One of several interpretations of Psalm 41 : 2, Blessed is he that considereth the poor, is that of R. Meir: The poor is the good *yeçer* in man, which is poor and weak over against the evil *yeçer*. Blessed is he who makes the good *yeçer* rule over the evil (*Lev. rab.* 34).¹ R. Josua b. Levi interpreted Ps. 50 : 23 thus, He who sacrifices his *yeçer* and makes confession (תורה) over it, Scripture reckons it to him as if he had showed God double honor, in this world, and in the world to come (*Sanh.* 43^b). And on Psalm 112 : 1, he says, Blessed is he who as a man overcomes his *yeçer* (*Aboda Zara* 19^a).² *Gen. rab.* 22 reports a saying of Abba b. Kahana's (?) how the evil *yeçer* had brought to destruction many generations, that of Enoch, of the dispersion of nations, of the flood, but Abraham saw that this great robber had no real power so he struck him down (Ps. 89 : 24 [23]). A similar saying of Chama b. Chanina's is reported, interpreting Job 24 : 22: The evil *yeçer* "draws away the mighty," i. e., the race of Enoch and of the flood and of the confusion of languages and of the Sodomites; therefore "riseth up" the pious and God "believes him not so long as he lives" (cf. also Job 15 : 15).³

¹ Wünsche, p. 234; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 64; *Amor.*, III. 523.

² Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 132. See further sayings in *Amor.*, III. 152, 315.

³ Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 465.

It must be added that the idea of the evil *yeçer* as belonging to man by nature, and having not only great power over him but also a sort of right in this world, led sometimes to the use of it as an excuse for sin. On Isaiah 22 : 26 Rābba bar bar Chana said: The prophet said to Israel, Return in penitence! They said, We cannot for the evil *yeçer* rules over us. He said to them, chasten your *yeçarim*;¹ they answered, His God teaches us (that this cannot be).² In *Tanch.* on Gen. 4 : 9, Cain charges God with being guilty of his crime because God created in him the evil *yeçer* (Taylor, p. 37). On the Mishna, He who does not spare the honor of his creator, it were better for him if he had not come into the world, R. Joseph said, This refers to one who commits a sin in secret, according to the teaching of R. Isaac, who said that when one committed a sin in secret he stamps upon the feet of the Shekina, for it is written, Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool (Isa. 66 : 1). R. Ilai the elder, however, said, When a man sees that his *yeçer* has the mastery over him,³ he goes to a place where he is not known, clothes himself black, veils himself black and does what his heart desires, and does not profane the name of heaven openly. — That is no objection (to Isaac's saying), it is answered, for one is valid for him who can bend his *yeçer*, the other for one who cannot (*Chagiga*, 16^a).⁴

b. The Law is the great cure for this malady in human nature. Raba says, If God created in man the evil *yeçer*, he created also a remedy for it, the Law (*Baba Bathra*, 16^a). This is the answer of Eliphaz (Job 15 : 4) to Job's complaint (10 : 7). So in *Kiddushin*, 30^b, the words, Ye shall take these my words to your heart (Deut. 11 : 18) are interpreted as meaning that the Law is a remedy⁵ for the *yeçer*. It is like a father who smote his son and then put a plaster on the wound and said to him, My son, as long as the plaster

¹ יסרו יצדיכם

² Sanh. 105^b, Wünsche, p. 244.

³ שיצרו מתגבר עליו

⁴ הא דמצי כייף ליה ליצריה הא דלא מצי כייף ליצריה

⁵ ושמם Ye shall take = סם תם, a perfect remedy.

is on your wound you may eat and drink what you please; you may wash in warm water or in cold, and need have no fear. But if you take it away an evil ulcer will come forth. So God said to the Israelites, My sons, I created the evil *yeçer*, I created for it the Law as a remedy (תבלין, literally, spice or seasoning). If you are occupied with the Law you will not be delivered into its hand¹ (Gen. 4 : 7^a); but if you neglect the Law you will fall into its power (v. 7^b); yet if you will you can rule over it (v. 7^c).

From the school of Ishmael the saying is reported: If this hateful thing (the *yeçer*) meets you, draw it into the school (*beth ha-Midrash*); if it is stone, the Law, which is like water (Isa. 55 : 1) will wear it away (Job 14 : 19); if it is iron it will break it in pieces (Jer. 23 : 29).² God has made statutes not only for heaven and earth, sun, moon, etc., but also for the evil *yeçer* (or graven statutes upon it)³ prescribing its bounds (Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 451). Upon this saying of Chama b. Chanina, R. Levi remarks, It is like a desert place occupied by troops; the king sets desert troops (beduins) to watch it. So God says, The Law is called a stone (Ex. 24 : 12), and the evil *yeçer* is called a stone (Ezek. 36 : 26). One stone shall guard the other stone (*Lev. rab.* 35; *Cant. rab.* 6 : 11). With this may be compared the interpretation of Isaiah 26 : 3, ascribed to R. Simon and R. Chanina b. Papa (*Gen. rab.* 22):⁴ If the evil *yeçer* comes and will make you frivolous, watch it (or, repel it)⁵ with the words of the Law. If you do so I (God) reckon it to you as if you had created peace in this world, peace in the coming world.⁶ But say not the *yeçer* is not in your power, for I have already written in the Law, Toward thee is its desire, but thou shalt rule over it (Gen. 4 : 7). R. Chama b. Chanina, in one of six

¹ Perhaps based on Sir. 21 : 11. See below p. 140 f.

² *Succa*, 52^b; *Kidduschin*, 30^b; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 337.

³ חקים שהם חקוקים על יצר הרע

⁴ Bacher, *Amor.*, II. 443.

⁵ Taking תצור (*Isa.* 26 : 3) from נצר, watch, or from צרר, press upon.

⁶ Taking תצור in this case from יצר, fashion, and applying the repeated *Shalom* to the two worlds.

interpretations of Gen. 29 : 2, likens the stone to the evil *yeçer*. As the stone is rolled away from the well's mouth (v. 3) so the evil *yeçer* departs when men go into the synagogue to drink of the Law, but when they go out the evil *yeçer* returns to its place (*Gen. rab.* 70, Wünsche, p. 341). That the Law did not take the place of moral and religious struggle in the conquest of the *yeçer* is suggested by the directions for its overcoming which Simon b. Lakish found in Psalm 4 : 5¹ Let a man always bring the good *yeçer* in wrath against the evil *yeçer* ("be angry and sin not" [*i. e.*, that ye may not sin]). If he conquers it, well; if not, let him occupy himself with the Law ("speak in your heart"). If he conquers it, well; if not, let him read the Shema ("upon your bed"). If he conquers it, well; if not, let him remind it of death ("and be still, Selah").

c. Most frequently, however, Prayer and divine help are recognized as necessary to man's victory over the *yeçer*. "The evil *yeçer* seeks constantly to get the upper hand over man and to kill him; and if God did not help him he could not resist it, Ps. 37 : 32-33 (*Succa* 52^b, Simon b. Lakish.) Of the nature of prayer are the oaths by which in the passages already cited (p. 112) various men of the Bible overpowered or exorcised their evil *yeçer*.

The prayer to be said in connection with the *Shema* upon retiring at night contains the petition, "Bring me not into the power of sin, or temptation, or shame; and let not the evil *yeçer* rule in me;² and guard me from evil lot, and from evil sicknesses. Let not dreams and evil thoughts (הרהורים) disturb me," etc. (*Berach.*, 60^b). The morning prayer contains a similar clause: Bring me not into the power of sin, temptation, or shame: and bend my *yeçer* to submit itself to thee;³ and keep me far from evil man and evil associate; and let me hold fast to the good *yeçer*,⁴ and to the

¹ *Berach.*, 5^a; Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 354.

² ועל ישלום בי יצר הרע

³ וכוף את יצרי להשתעבד לך

⁴ דבקני ביצר טוב

good associate (*Berach.*, 60^b). These petitions are found in the Jewish Prayer Book.

Among the private prayers which various rabbis added to those prescribed, some include similar petitions. Thus Rabbi used to pray that God would keep him from evil man (evil event, evil *yeçer*), evil associate, (evil neighbor, and the destroying Satan).¹ R. Eleazar (according to Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 244, R. Jochanan) prayed that he might be furnished with good associate and good *yeçer* (בַּחֲבֵר טוֹב וְיֵצֶר טוֹב) (*Berach.*, 16a). R. Alexander's prayer was as follows: Lord of the worlds, it is open and known to thee that it is our will to do thy will. And what hinders? The leaven in the dough (i. e., the *yeçer* in man), and servitude under the (world) kingdoms. May it be thy will to humble these before us and behind us (and that thou remove the evil *yeçer* from us and humble it out of our heart) that we may fulfil thy will again with a perfect heart.² Mar b. Rabina prayed, Keep me from evil event, from evil *yeçer*, from evil wife, and from all evils (*Berach.*, 17^a). R. Jochanan, Grant us a good associate and a good *yeçer*.³ R. Isaac interpreted "the Lord bless thee and keep thee" to mean, from the evil *yeçer*.⁴ Rabbi understood the phrase "that it be not to my sorrow" in the prayer of Jabez (1 Chr. 4 : 10), that the evil *yeçer* hinder me not in study.⁵ R. Chiya b. Ashi used to pray, Save me from the evil *yeçer*; yet the prayer did not save him from falling before temptation (*Kiddushin*, 81^b).

5. *The Removal of the Yeçer by God*

The evil *yeçer* is to be at last removed and destroyed by God. The passage upon which this hope chiefly rested was

¹ *Berach.*, 16^b. But Bacher, *Tan.*, II., 463 f., omits the bracketed phrases on manuscript evidence (see Rabbinovicz, *Variae lectiones*, etc.).

² *Berach.*, 17^a; and Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 196, who defends the fuller text.

³ *Berach.*, 7; Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 245.

⁴ *Sifré*, Nu. 6 : 24; cf. *Prov.* 3 : 26; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 399.

⁵ *Mechilta*, 18 : 27; *Temura*, 16^a; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 483.

Ezekiel 36 : 26 (cf. 11 : 19). This verse is in itself a striking proof that "no idea of corrupt inclination attaches to the term, flesh" in Old Testament usage;¹ and its frequent use with reference to the final removal of the evil *yeçer* from men still further confirms the view that this is not inherent in matter as such. The mourning in Zech. 12 : 12 was said by some to be for Messiah b. Joseph, who was slain, by others for the evil *yeçer*, that was slain. Why should there be mourning and not rather joy when the *yeçer* is slain? R. Juda b. Ilai said: Hereafter the Holy One will bring the evil *yeçer* and slay it before the face of the righteous and the wicked. It will seem to the righteous like a high mountain, to the wicked like a hair. Both will weep. The righteous will weep, saying, How were we able to conquer this high mountain?² The wicked will weep, saying, How were we not able to conquer this hair. And the Holy One also will be astonished with them, according to Zech. 8 : 6, "also in my eyes will it seem wonderful."³ God said to Moses: Because in this world the evil *yeçer* is in them they fall away to idolatry, but hereafter I will root out of you the evil *yeçer* and give you a heart of flesh (Ezek. 36 : 26).⁴ To Israel he said, In this world you will be torn from the commandments by the evil *yeçer*, but hereafter I will tear it out of you (Ezek. 36 : 26).⁵ There is indeed a sense in which the evil impulse is already slain in the righteous (proved by Ps. 109 : 22, above, p. 125). In another sense only death delivers the righteous from it, and is therefore included in the things that are very good;⁶ while the end of its power can come only with the end of the world (based on Ezek. 36 : 26, above, p. 118). God created the evil *yeçer*, but will hereafter take it away (Isa. 46 : 4, above, p. 121). Rabbi said, The evil *yeçer* in man is like a robber who anticipates punish-

¹ A. B. Davidson on Ezek. 36 : 26.

² Cf. 4 Ezra 7 : 92.

³ *Succa*, 52^a; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 223.

⁴ *Exod. rab.*, 41, end.

⁵ *Num. rab.*, 17, end.

⁶ *Gen. rab.*, 9, on Job 3 : 17.

ment, and since he cannot escape it accuses his companions of being accomplices. So the *yeçer* thinks, since I am destined to destruction in the world to come, I will bring men to destruction with me.¹ R. Simai on Hos. 12 : 2 offers this parable: A great rock stood on a forked road and hindered commerce. The king commanded that it be gradually crumbled up. He would, when the time was come, wholly remove it. So the *yeçer* to sin forms the great rock over which Israel stumbled. It is gradually crumbled, but will be finally removed by God, according to Ezek. 36 : 26.² In *Gen. rab.* 89 (beginning) we have this exposition of Job 28 : 3: As long as the evil *yeçer* is in the world darkness and the shadow of death are in the world. But if it is rooted out these will be no more.³

6. Summary

The result of our review is that in rabbinical usage the *yeçer* is hardly other than a name for man's evil tendencies or inclinations, the evil disposition which as a matter of experience exists in man, and which it is his moral task to subdue or control. It does not contain a metaphysical explanation of the fact, a theory as to its source or nature. The proof of the various things that are said of the *yeçer* is always found, in the fashion of the rabbis, in Old Testament passages more naturally or more artfully applied. In some cases the passage, rather than experience and reflection, is itself the source of the saying. These evil inclinations go all the way up from sensual passions through anger and revenge to various forms of selfishness such as greed, deceit, and pride, and on the other hand to religious unbelief and idolatry. These propensities are deeply implanted in man's nature and are not due to his will, though the will can rule over them.

¹ *Ab. di R. Nathan* 16; Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 461.

² Bacher, *Tan.*, II. 546.

³ The application of the "stone of darkness" in this verse to the *yeçer* is ascribed to Simon b. Lakish in *Tanchuma* (Bacher, *Amor.*, I. 354).

They must therefore, in a monotheistic view of the world, be ascribed to God's creation. Moreover at almost every stage it can be seen that these inclinations are not wholly evil, but are in some sense necessary to human life and progress. Not only the impulse that aims at the continuance of the race, but also a measure of self-assertion, and even of anger and other passionate impulses, though they easily overmaster men and lead them to sin, are yet necessary to the life and progress of humanity in this world. But though a theodicy can rest on such considerations, the moral task of man is to control these impulses of his nature. For this end man has full freedom and is wholly responsible. Moreover, God has implanted good impulses and inclinations in men, to which they can, if they will, give the upper hand. God, however, has provided a definite remedy in the Law. Against one who studies and observes its precepts the evil impulse has little power. Further, in answer to prayer, the help of God may be gained in this struggle, which always remains a severe and uncertain one. Men are sustained in this warfare by the belief that there is another world in which the evil impulse does not exist, that the righteous enter this world after death, and that hereafter, in the Messianic age, the powers and qualities of heaven will have exclusive dominance.

All this, it is evident, has nothing to do with a dualistic contrast of body and soul. Hamburger's remark must rather be accepted as in the main just: "In contrast to the dualism of Plato, Philo, and the Gnostics, Judaism in these phrases [the evil and the good *yeçer*] stated and developed the Biblical doctrine of evil and good." A quotation may also well be made from Lazarus's *Die Ethik des Judenthums* (1898), p. 268: "The Jewish view of the world in general, and Jewish ethics in particular, is everywhere grounded upon the *actuality of existence* and upon the *actualization of the idea*; in both, however, we meet always with soul and body in connection and in common activity. So in the Biblical writings we see the contrast of good and evil unceas-

ingly discussed and emphasized; but almost never does the contrast of soul and sense there come before us. The same manner of thought meets us in the rabbinical literature. The "Sayings of the Fathers," for example, has not unjustly been called a sort of compendium of ethics; but in all the five (or six) sections of which it is composed *hardly a single time* is the contrast of spirit and body suggested" (p. 266). He cites Aboth, 4 : 1 (Taylor, 4 : 2), as proving that the *yeqer* is not sensuousness, since the "patient one" is its conqueror, and the parallel speaks expressly of control and inner freedom in the spirit itself. "Eben so wenig wie יצר טוב das Rein-Geistige bedeutet, ist יצר הרע die Sinnlichkeit." Lazarus is right too in saying (p. 264) that the important thing in the rabbinical view of man is not that his natural impulse is twofold, that originally, by the side of the evil impulse, stands the good. More important is the thought: God has created the evil impulse, he has also created the Thora as a remedy against it. The main thing is not the natural disposition of man — even to good — but the Law that redeems from the impulse of nature. Only we must doubt whether he is historically just in taking this Law to be primarily or solely the *moral* law, the creation of the ethical, which surpasses all nature.

It must, moreover, be evident, apart from any positive explanation of Paul's doctrine, that the parallelism between his contrast of spirit and flesh and the rabbinical contrast of the good and evil impulses is remote and insignificant. Of course Paul in Rom. 7 is describing the same experience of struggle between two opposing forces in man upon which the Jewish doctrine rests, but his way of expressing the struggle as a war between the law (of sin) in his members, and the law of his mind (*νοῦς*), or between that which he possesses and does in his flesh and in his mind, is widely different from the Jewish conception, and seems to rest on a different view of the world and of man.

It is especially evident that Paul's conception of the Spirit has almost nothing in common with the relatively unimpor-

tant rabbinical idea of the good *yeçer*. On the other hand there is a closer, though still remote, parallelism between his contrast of spirit and flesh, and the Jewish conception of the Law as the divinely given remedy for the evil nature of man, the power before which it must yield.

IV

THE PRESENCE OF THE CONCEPTION IN EARLIER
SOURCES

A distinct and significant Hellenistic element in the Jewish doctrine of the *yeçer* may be confidently denied. It remains to inquire after the time of its development. Is it attested only for the post-Christian period? This development must certainly have begun in the Old Testament period, for though First Chronicles 28 : 9 and 29 : 18 only cite the phrases of Genesis 6 : 5; 8 : 21, yet in Deuteronomy 31 : 21 (Exilic or post-Exilic), and probably in Isaiah 26 : 3 (late post-Exilic) *yeçer* is used, without modification, of the disposition, or mind. In Psalm 103 : 14 the word may mean "frame" as the second clause suggests (Gen. 2 : 7; 3 : 19); but the context suggests a wider sense, "nature," as Wellhausen renders it.¹ That which characterizes the rabbinical use in distinction from the Biblical is not the contrast of two *yeçers*, a good and an evil, and not a radical departure from the sense "mind" or "disposition" already found, but rather the choice of this word,² with its emphatic use and partial personification, for the seat and power of temptation and sin in man.

1. *The Book of Sirach*

We must turn to the Book of Sirach for light upon the early stages of the transition from the Biblical to the rabbinical use of the word.³ From the parts of this book now

¹ Haupt's Bible. So Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, 1899, translates it *Wesen*.

² Especially in place of "heart," "evil heart," etc., or "thoughts (מחשבות) of the heart," and similar expressions.

³ It is important to observe that there was no Greek word with which the

known in the original Hebrew we are able in a measure to confirm and correct hypotheses already put forth as to the occurrence and meaning of the word.¹ The most important passage for our purpose is 15 : 14. It reads, in its connection, in Taylor's version of the Hebrew, as follows:—

- “11. Say not, My transgression was of God;
For that which he hateth he made not.
12. Lest thou say, He it was that made me stumble;
For there is no need of men of violence.
13. Wickedness and an abomination the Lord hateth;
And will not let it befall them that fear him.
14. For (?) God created man from the beginning;
And put him into the hand of him that would spoil him
And gave him into the hand of his inclination [*yeçer*]²
15. If thou choose, thou mayest keep the commandment;
And it is understanding to do his will.
15⁽¹⁾. If thou trust in him, thou shalt even live.
16. Fire and water are poured out before thee:
Upon whichsoever thou chooseth stretch forth thy hands.
17. Death and life are before a man:
That which he shall choose shall be given him” (15 : 11-17).

various meanings of the Hebrew *yeçer* could be rendered. In its literal meaning the verb was commonly rendered in the LXX by *πλάσσω*, and the noun by *πλάσμα* in Isa. 29 : 16, Hab. 2 : 18, Ps. 103 : 14. Aquilla and Sym. use it also in Dt. 31 : 21, Isa. 26 : 3. But this word could not bear the figurative meaning of the Hebrew. In Gen. 8 : 21 *yeçer* of the heart” is rendered *ἡ διάνοια*; so in 1 Chr. 29 : 18 “in the *yeçer* of the thoughts of the heart” = *ἐν διανοία καρδίας*; while in Gen. 6 : 5 (“every *yeçer* of the thoughts of his heart”) *πᾶς τις διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*. But in 1 Chr. 28 : 9 “every *yeçer* of the thoughts” becomes *πᾶν ἐνθύμημα*. The word is rendered by *ἡ πονηρία* in Dt. 31 : 21, and is passed by in Isa. 26 : 3, unless indeed our Hebrew text itself is corrupt.

¹ See Cowley and Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus* (39 : 15-49 : 11), 1897; Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben-Sira* (3 : 6^b-7 : 29^a, 11 : 34^b, 12 : 2-16 : 26, 30 : 11-31 : 11, 32 : 1^b-33 : 3, 35 : 9-20, 36 : 1-21, 37 : 27-38 : 27, 49 : 12-51 : 30), 1899; G. Margoliouth, in *Jewish Quar. Rev.*, xii. p. 1-33 (31 : 12-31, 36 : 22-37 : 26; E. N. Adler, *J. Q. R.*, xii. p. 466-480 (7 : 29-12 : 1); and further fragments in *J. Q. R.*, xii. p. 456-465, 688-702, and by Levi in *Revue des Études juives*, xl. 1-30. All these fragments are reproduced in *Facsimiles of the Fragments, etc.*, 1901. See the commentaries of Fritzsche and Edersheim (before the discovery of the Hebr.), and of Ryssel in Kautzsch's *Apocryphen* (after Cowley and Neubauer's ed.).

² וישתיהו ביד חותפו ויתנהו ביד יצרן

The occurrence of the word *yecer* in this passage (15 : 14) had already been surmised on the basis of the Greek, *καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ*, and Syriac, *כִּדְן צַרְהוּ*.¹ If the second and third lines of the verse in Hebrew are doublets (Schechter), the Greek decides in favor of the third as the more original. Since the second line is wanting in the Greek, we should not, perhaps, put weight upon the personification of the *yecer* which it implies. It is quite possible, however, that the line was omitted by the translator, or by later Christian scribes, as suggesting too much intention on the part of God that man should fall into sin. It is not easy to make out the exact views of Edersheim and Ryssel as to the relation of the word in this passage to its earlier and later uses.² Edersheim says that it is used here "not in the later application of it to either the good or the evil impulse in man, but in the earlier meaning of disposition, mind, counsel (*Sinn, Gesinnung*)."³ This earlier use must be the Old Testament use. Yet on 17 : 6, where the Greek translator, mistaking, as the Syriac indicates, the verb for the noun, renders *צַר* again by *διαβούλιον*,³ Edersheim translates it as before, "disposition, mind = *צַר*." Then, after reviewing its use in LXX in the plural, in the sense of "counsels," "purposes," and "thoughts" (Ps. 5 : 11; 9 : 23 [10 : 2]; Hos. 11 : 6; cf. 4 : 9; 5 : 4; 7 : 2), he adds: "We infer that the use of *διαβούλιον* and of *צַר* in that sense [i. e., counsel, purpose, etc. ?] was post-biblical, and, as regards the Greek term, we would suggest, Alexandrian." Does this mean that *διαβούλιον* became identified with *צַר* in its Old Testament meaning (disposition), and then was carried over with it to the later meaning (counsel, etc.)? and what had Alexandrian influence to do with the transition? In fact, there is no evidence of a fixed habit of rendering *yecer* by this word.

¹ Edersheim, and Taylor, *Sayings*,² p. 151 f.

² It should be noted that Ryssel as well as Edersheim wrote before the Hebrew of this part of the book had come to light, but both recognized the *צַר* of the original.

³ Hence read "He created also," for R. V. "counsel and."

Ryssel seems to rest in part on Edersheim, but makes assertions quite contrary to his. In 15 : 14 he translates the word, "self-determination" (Selbstentscheidung), and remarks: "= διαβούλιον, which word renders not the original significance of צַר', which is certainly intended also by the author, *i. e.*, disposition (Gesinnung, so Syriac), but the later, new-Hebrew significance of this word: 'the impulse to good or to evil.'" And on 17 : 6 he says that διαβούλιον "cannot, however, here, as in 15 : 14, designate freedom of choice, but perhaps reflection (Ueberlegung. Luther, Vernunft)." But surely freedom of will is not a translation of צַר' in its rabbinical sense. And if the Hebrew author meant to use the word in the older sense of disposition, why does not Ryssel so translate it? The Greek translation, by the writer's grandson, was probably made in 132 B. C. (Schürer). Does Ryssel mean that the Old Testament meaning of *yeçer* prevailed until after 190 B. C. and the late rabbinical meaning from some time before 132 B. C. onward? Neither Edersheim nor Ryssel makes clear his views at these points, nor the grounds of them.

What does the sentence itself in its connection mean? The writer, like James 1 : 13 ff., after him, is arguing against those who would ascribe their sin to God (*i. e.*, to their nature as God made them, or to circumstances which God ordained?). God would not make what he hates (so also Wisd. 11 : 24). Yet sin is a fact in God's creation. How is it to be accounted for without making God morally responsible for it? The answer is: God created man and gave him into the hand of his spoiler, *i. e.*, his *yeçer*, an evil disposition or inclination which has power over him. But if men choose they may keep the commandment, obey God's will, not their own *yeçer*. Two things are put before them, the *yeçer* and the Law. These are the fire and water, the death and life between which men must choose. The צַר' is not the free will, but man is free to choose between this evil nature or disposition in him and the Law. This is the rabbinical meaning of the word *yeçer*, which stands over against

the law as a power of sin, strong but never overpowering man's will. Only in this sense is the word properly parallel to the "spoiler" of the preceding line.

But does not this make God responsible for sin? In a sense it does, and so did both the Old Testament and the author of our book. See 11 : 14-16,¹ "Good things and evil, life and death, poverty and riches are of the Lord. . . . Sin and upright ways are from the Lord;" but (here is his theodicy) "folly and darkness are created for the wicked, etc." See further 39 : 13-35.

Now what of the Greek translator? His *διαβούλιον* does not render the original meaning of *yezer*, but means, practically, freedom of will (deliberation or determination) as Ryssel renders it. Taking the word in this sense and so interpreting the meaning of the verse, he cannot do anything but omit the second line, which is now restored to us. So in 11 : 15 he changed "sin" to "love," while some found it easier to omit vv. 15-16 altogether (so R. V. with the best MSS.). In 17 : 6 the translator could well have given the same meaning to צַר', read as a noun, and put deliberation or purpose among the powers with which God endowed man.

If our understanding of *yezer* in 15 : 14 is right, the word was already used, in the evil sense, to explain man's tendency to sin in a way consistent with monotheism, since God put men in its power, and yet consistent with legalism, since man is able to choose God's will. God created him, and put him in the hand of an evil disposition, but "did not command a man to sin" (v. 20). Nor is it only by sheer choice of the law that men are saved; for the writer can also say: "If thou trust in him thou shalt even live."²

Next in importance is a sentence, 21 : 11a, not yet recovered in Hebrew, but already rightly amended on the basis of the Syriac by Edersheim. The Greek is, ὁ φυλάσσων νόμον κατακρατεῖ τοῦ ἐννοήματος αὐτοῦ (R. V., He that keepeth the law becometh master of the intent thereof). The Syriac gives

¹ Hebrew in *Jewish Quar. Rev.*, xii. 466 ff.

² Only in Hebr. Cf. Isa. 26 : 3.

as the undoubted original, He that keeps the law gets the mastery over his *yeçer*. Fritzsche already rendered the Greek, *beherrscht sich seiner Gedanken*, or *beherrscht seine Gedanken*. The Greek translator's choice of *ἐννόημα* renders it doubtful whether he meant, "becomes wise," or "masters the thought or inner meaning of the Law." But there can be no doubt about the meaning of the author. In this passage Edersheim translates the word by "inclination," and speaks of it as used "in the peculiar sense of **יצר**," i. e., in the rabbinical sense; and Ryssel follows with "Trieb," so that what seemed to be implied by their comments on 15 : 14 could not have been meant to apply to the history of the development of the rabbinical sense of the word, but only to the interpretation of that verse. In fact, it is unmistakably the so-called rabbinical sense of the term that meets us here. Indeed one of the most important rabbinical sayings about the *yeçer* can be regarded either as a parallel to this or as a free citation of it: "I created the evil *yeçer*; I created for it the Law as a remedy. If ye are occupied with the law ye shall not be delivered into its hand."¹ The expression "masters his *yeçer*" occurs, e. g., in *Aboth*, 4 : 2 (**כביש**), in *Berach.*, 60^b (**שלט**).

The next passage is one in which the word was not suspected: Hebr. 6 : 22⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾ = Gr. 27 : 5-6. Taylor translates: "A potter's (**יוצר**) vessel is for the furnace to bake (?); And like unto it, a man is according to his thought (**איש על חשבונו**). Upon the bough (?) of a tree will be its fruit; So the thought of a man is according to his mind (?) (**חשבון על יצר אחר**)." This follows Schechter's text, but both the Hebrew and the Versions read **עבדת**, labor, tillage, or husbandry, not **עברת**, Aram. bough, as Schechter emends. There seems no good reason for the emendation. Greek and Syriac read **אחר** for **ארם**. We may therefore read: According to the husbandry of the tree will be its fruit; So the thought is according to the *yeçer* of man. With doubts regarding the text go difficulties in the interpretation. The

¹ *Kiddushin* 30^b. See above p. 127, and Cowley-Neubauer, p. xxiii.

Greek translator seems to have got the meaning of the first verse, but missed that of the second. A potter's vessel is both tested and made by the fire, so a man is tested by his inner thought, it is this that both tries and makes him (cf. Prov. 23 : 7). If now the second verse follows in this direction we might understand the thought to be: The husbandry of a tree, i. e., the digging and pruning, both tests the life of the tree and is the condition of its fruitfulness. So the thought-life of man is tested and developed by the *yeçer*, which like the fire of the potter's furnace and like the labor of the husbandman is severe and may prove destructive, but is essential to the making of a vessel and the growing of fruit. A man is tested and made not by appearances or deeds but by his thought or reasoning, and his thought is tested and made to be of worth by the evil inclinations within him, i. e., by moral struggle.¹ If this is the thought of the passage, the word *yeçer* means here what it means in 15 : 14 and 21 : 11. If, on the other hand, the meaning is that behind the man is his thought, and behind or beneath his thought (sustaining it as the bough sustains the fruit?) is his *yeçer*, then *yeçer* must mean *nature*, the fundamental character or tendency of each man, whether good or bad. The former sense, however, answers better to the comparison of the potter's vessel, to the actually attested reading in v. 6, and to the other uses of the word. The *yeçer* is the labor which gives man his moral discipline and cultivation; not man's own labor, but, ultimately, God's.

The Greek renders *yeçer* here, as in 1 Chronicles 28 : 9, by *ἐνθύμημα*, or *ἐνθύμημα καρδίας*.

The next passage, 17 : 31, is one in which the use of the word *yeçer* is made probable by the Syriac, but the Hebrew text is not yet recovered. The Greek reads, "What is brighter than the sun? yet this faileth; And an evil man will think on flesh and blood" (*καὶ πονηρὸς ἐνθυμήσεται*

¹ Cf. the verse which precedes in Greek (27 : 4), "When the sieve is shaken the refuse remains; so the filth of man is in his reasoning" (*λογισμός*), which also has to do with the testing of man.

σάρκα καὶ αἷμα). The Syriac renders, "When the sun after the end of a bright day goes down, even it is darkened. So the man who does not subdue his *yeçer* because he is flesh and blood." This suggests that the Greek took צר' as a verb and rendered it by ἐνθυμήσεται. Horowitz (Frankel's *Monatschr.*, XIV.) suggested as the meaning of the Hebrew, "How much more the thoughts (מחשבות) of man who is flesh and blood," or "How much more the evil *yeçer* of man who is flesh and blood." As the use of *yeçer* is favored by the Syriac and would account for the Greek, it is preferred by Ryssel, who, however, puts ἀνὴρ ὅς in the place of πονηρός, and reads, How much more man, whose impulse (*yeçer* [= nature?]) is flesh and blood.¹ He suggests that Syr., because it seemed strange to say that the *yeçer* of man is flesh and blood, assumed that לא כבש had fallen out.

One is not inclined, at present, to put great weight upon conjectural restorations of the text of Sirach. The bearing of the passage upon the conception of the *yeçer* would depend upon which one of the reconstructions we adopt. The context suggests that man, not *sinful* man, is spoken of. In no case does the association of the *yeçer* with flesh and blood imply its connection with the body in contrast to the soul, for flesh and blood is only the familiar phrase for man himself (cf. 14 : 18). The possibility that the *yeçer* is here called "evil" is to be recognized.

The next passage is one in which the Greek seems to imply the word *yeçer*, but the Hebrew does not contain it. In 37 : 3, speaking of false friends, the writer exclaims, "O wicked imagination (ὦ πονηρὸν ἐνθύμημα), whence camest thou rolling in to cover the dry land with deceitfulness." Ryssel supposed the original to be: יצר רע על-מה נגלות and translated, O thou evil (human) nature! Wherefore hast thou rolled in (like a flood), etc. The Syriac reads: Hatred and evil, why were they created, etc.;² and hence does not confirm the use of *yeçer*. The Hebrew text is unfortunately

¹ אף כי אנוש אשר יצרו כשר ודם

² סנאא וכישא למנא אתכריו

blurred in the first half of the line (*Jewish Quarterly Rev.*, XII. p. 8), but G. Margoliouth reconstructs as follows: **י נוצרת** (הו רע שאמר) מדוע כן נוצרת and translates “(Alas! for a friend who says) Why have I thus been created,” with the remark, “Not a satisfactory clause; but the Hebrew, going by the remaining portions of the letters, must be read as in the text” (p. 18). Schechter confirms this reading, and Levi’s text, called D in the Facsimiles, finally establishes it. Schechter suggests that Syr. read **שנאה** (hatred), for **שאמר**; and that Greek misread **נורצה** (from **רוי**) for **נוצרת** (*do.* p. 270). Levi’s text, however, is pointed thus: **הוי רע יאמר**, Woe to the wicked (who) says. Levi prefers the Greek, and supposes the Hebrew to have run thus: **הוי רע יצר**. “O wickedness of the *yeçer*, why wast thou created?” (**נוצרת** with a play on the word **יצר**). He suggests that the original **יצר** became **יאמר** in our copy, and was read as **וצר** by the Syriac translator. If, on the other hand, our Hebrew texts represent the original at this point, the Greek translator must have read **יצר** for **שאמר**, or **יאמר**, perhaps by conjecture, and it is only to him and not to the Hebrew author that we can ascribe this anticipation of the question so deeply felt by the author of Fourth Ezra as to the origin of the evil power in man’s nature. Perhaps, after 15 : 14 we should not expect our author to ask the question. He did not feel the difficulty of ascribing the *yeçer* directly to God, and seeing its good end, evil though it was in itself. So the figure of the potter, just discussed (27 : 5 = Hebr. 6 : 22⁽¹⁾), is developed further of God’s relation to man in 33 : 13, in a passage that emphasizes God’s authorship of evil as well as good, all his works being two and two, one against another (v. 15).

It is possible that the recovery of the Hebrew would reveal the word in other passages (e. g., 23 : 2 *διανόημα*) or would restore to the text such verses as 17 : 16, 21 (“Knowing their *πλάσμα*” = Ps. 103 : 14). On the other hand, the Hebrew in 5 : 4 is like the Greek, and the rabbinical saying

cited by Cowley-Neubauer (p. xix.), "If the evil *yeçer* say to thee, Sin, for the Holy One excuseth, do not believe," is independent of Sirach at least in form (Bacher, *Amor.*, III. 578).

Allowing for all remaining uncertainties we have definite proof of the use of the word *yeçer*, almost two centuries before Christ, in the rabbinical sense. For the later doctrine is essentially a fuller and varied expression of the thought of Sir. 15 : 14 as to the source of sin in man, and God's relation to it, and of Sir. 21 : 11 as to the means by which it is to be overcome. The current view, that the doctrine was shaped or modified under Greek influence, and that it is post-Christian in its development proves to be at both points erroneous.

The limits of this essay exclude the effort to trace in detail the development of the conception of the *yeçer* between Sirach and the rabbinical literature. Since the word had no Greek equivalent and no uniform Greek rendering, and since the Hebrew and Aramaic writings of the period are known to us for the most part only in Greek, or in oriental or Latin versions of the Greek, the use of the word is naturally obscure.

It seems certain that the Greek idea of the material body as the seat and source of sin gained difficult and limited access to the Jewish mind. Even among Greek-speaking Jews this conception, so contradictory to Old Testament religion, and so dangerous to monotheism, could have gained few thoroughly consistent adherents. Even Philo may be defended, as he is by Drummond,¹ from a consistently anti-Jewish development of his Greek belief in the eternity of matter, and its evil power. The Wisdom of Solomon accepts creation out of formless matter (11 : 17), and the idea that the corruptible body weighs down the soul, and the earthly frame lies heavy on the mind, making a knowledge even of earthly things difficult and of heavenly things impossible,

¹ *Philo Judaeus*, I. 297-313, II. 296-306.

without divine help (9 : 13-18). The author believes in the immortality of the soul, and in this shows the large influence of Greek modes of thought upon him. Yet on the other hand he can speak of wisdom as entering into the soul, and dwelling in the body, in parallel clauses (1 : 4), and the passage often cited to prove his acceptance of the idea of the pre-existence of the soul (8 : 19-20) can hardly bear such a weight. The birth of the wise king is described first as if he were the goodly body that received by lot a good soul, and then by a better afterthought, as if he were the good soul that came into a pure body. This involves a dualistic psychology, but the pre-existence of the soul is hardly implied except in the sense in which the body also pre-existed before birth. Sin and virtue are everywhere properties and functions of the soul.

2. *The Apocalypse of Ezra*

The most serious and even impassioned struggle with the problem of sin and evil from a Jew of this period is recorded in the Apocalypse of Ezra, 2 Esdras, chs. 3-14, in our Apocrypha.¹ The conception of the "wicked heart" in this book is obviously allied to that of the *yeçer*. Various and striking points of contact are also evident between the mind and experience of the writer and that of Paul. So that this book deserves especially close study, for an explanation of the Jewish element in Paul's thought. The problems presented by the book are, however, far too difficult and involved to permit of an attempt here to discuss them in detail.

¹ Commonly cited as 4 Ezra. Texts: The Latin in the Bensly-James edition, 1895; other versions and an attempted reconstruction of the Greek from which they were made, by Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869; commentaries by Lupton (Wace's *Apocrypha*, 1888), and Gunkel (Kautzsch's *Pseudepigraphen*, 1901). Introductory discussions by Schürer (*History*) and Kabisch (*IV. Ezra*, Göttingen, 1889). I assume the substantial unity of the book (Gunkel, against Kabisch and Charles); the probability of a Hebrew original (Wellhausen, Charles, Gunkel); the improbability of positive Christian influence upon the doctrine of the book (Schürer, Gunkel, against Edersheim, Charles).

According to this writer Adam transgressed and was overcome because he had a wicked heart (*cor malignum*),¹ and so all who were born of him (3 : 21). "A grain of evil seed" (*granum seminis mali*) was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much (fruit of)² wickedness has it brought forth until now, and will bring forth until the threshing come (4 : 30, cf. 31). It is hardly correct to say that, through Adam's sin, "a hereditary tendency to sin was created, and the *cor malignum* developed" (Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, p. lxx.). The evil heart explains Adam's sin, but is not explained by it. Men continued to do even as Adam did because they also had the wicked heart (3 : 26). Adam's sin had indeed fateful consequences. The decree of death, and the sorrowful and toilsome nature of the present world (*saeculum* = αἰών) are attributed to it (3 : 7; 7 : 11, 12). "O thou, what hast thou done, Adam? for when thou didst sin there came to pass not thy fall only but also ours who came from thee" (7 : 118). Evil is traced to Adam's sin, but his sin is itself traced to an evil seed sown in his heart from the beginning, which has indeed grown and is called a root (*radix* = ῥίζα, 8 : 53; cf. 3 : 22). Whence then came the wicked heart? The prophet's angel guide promises an answer to the question (4 : 4), but the answer is not easy to find.

Kabisch argues that the evil heart is seated in the body, on several unconvincing grounds. It cannot be, he says, in the spirit of life from God, and hence must be in the dust of which the body is formed (3 : 4-5). But it may be in *man*, who is not a juxtaposition of these two, but a new creation out of them. The evil heart is inherited, Kabisch says, and must therefore belong to the body, for souls pre-exist, and come in ever anew out of the upper world (p. 23). But 4 : 36, to which he refers, has nothing to do with pre-existence; nor does 4 : 12 prove it, on which Gunkel remarks cautiously, "The expression (to come into the world)³ pre-

¹ πονηρὰ καρδία.

² Syr. See Gunkel.

³ See also 7 : 132.

supposes, originally, the belief in the pre-existence of the human soul." The evil heart, Kabisch argues, belongs to this material world and passes away with it (4 : 26-32). But the rabbis also taught that the evil *yeqer* belongs to this world and not to the world to come, and for the strain in which Kabisch develops his thought our book furnishes no warrant. Souls, he says, cannot do good so long as they carry the material body; for all matter is infected with evil, and in the world, which consists of matter, there can be no goodness nor happiness nor virtue (p. 32-33). Now as a matter of fact the evil heart is never once expressly connected with matter, or the body; nor in the many contrasts of this world (*saeculum*) with the next do the ideas of materiality and immateriality appear. The nearest approach to them is in the frequent references to corruption and incorruption as characterizing the two worlds. It is true that the book is strongly dualistic in its contrast of the two worlds (7 : 50), and also that it contains a somewhat marked dualistic anthropology. In 7 : 88 the death of the righteous is described as separation from the corruptible vessel, and the un-Hebraic conception of death in 7 : 75-101 is significant. But in spite of this the solution of the problem of the book, the origin of sin and evil, is not found in matter and its inherent properties. The great debate, which makes up the book, between the author's Jewish faith, on the one side, voiced by the angel, and his doubts on the other, between his mind and his feelings, his convictions and his sympathies and fears, turns on the question whether God or man is responsible for the sorrow and sin of this world, and the torments of the next. No third agent is summoned in, not Satan or any spirit-power, not an eternal matter which conditions God in creation. Indeed our writer seems expressly to exclude any such outside agency. His monotheism is emphatic. God's entire responsibility for man's creation is set forth at the beginning (3 : 4-5), and often urged, and that in terms which expressly include the body (8 : 7-14, 24).

If it is said that the earth (*terra*) or dust brought man

forth, yet it is at God's command (3 : 4; 5 : 48, 50-55; 6 : 53; 7 : 63, 116; 10 : 9-14), and the earth, the mother of man, is itself made by God (11 : 46), and has its own sorrow (10 : 9 ff.) and hope (11 : 46). Chaos itself (Gen. 1 : 1) was created by God (6 : 38^b, Gunkel). God and he alone planned and made and will consummate all (5 : 56 — 6 : 6).

Nor can evil be ascribed to malignity in the all-ruling God. His love to Israel and to man far exceeds that of the prophet who protests against his ways (5 : 33, 40; 8 : 47).

Is it then God who sowed the grain of evil seed in Adam's heart from the beginning? Who else could it be? Yet this is not expressly said. The prophet does indeed ask why God did not restrain men from wilfulness and sin (3 : 8); why he did not take away the wicked heart from Israel when he gave him the law (3 : 20); why earth produced Adam at all if it were not to restrain him from sinning (7 : 116). Yet the tendency of the angel's replies is always to put the responsibility for sin upon man. The solution which the book offers, so far as one is reached, is Jewish, and not Greek or Indian. In this solution three points are clear.

a. God implanted in the heart of Israel his law. "I sow my law in you, and it shall bring forth fruit in you" (9 : 31). The writer feels the problem of the condition of the rest of mankind, but assents to the proposition that the world is made for Israel (6 : 55; 9 : 13). But for Israel also the law has not proved able to produce its fruit. "Yet tookest thou not away from them the wicked heart that thy law might bring forth fruit in them . . . and the law was in the heart of the people along with the wickedness of the root; so the good departed away and that which was wicked abode still" (3 : 20, 22). "There has grown up in us an evil heart (*cor malum*), which has alienated us from these (statutes) and brought us into corruption and into the ways of death, showed us the paths of perdition, and made us far from life; and this not a few but almost all that have been created" (7 : 48; cf. 9 : 31-37).

b. To this difficulty faith answers with a second vindica-

tion of God. Man is free and can escape the power of the evil heart. It is true that the writer feels difficulty in assenting to this essential dogma of a legal religion, but Mr. Charles is surely wrong in ascribing to him even a *practical* denial of human freedom (p. lxx.). He assumes that some obey the law. His lament is that they are so few (7 : 48-61; 8 : 1, 3; 9 : 14-16, etc.). In one mood he does indeed declare all men sinners (7 : 46, 68; 8 : 35), but he does not mean this literally.¹ He is assured against his fears that he is himself righteous and will attain salvation.² He insists upon man's freedom and responsibility,³ and if it is hard to keep the divine law, yet the reward is all the greater (7 : 127-131).

The first of seven reasons for the joy of righteous souls after death is "because with much labor they have striven to conquer the evil thought formed with them, that it should not seduce them from life unto death" (7 : 92). In this expression *cum eis plasmatum cogitamentum malum* we may with great probability recognize the word *yeçer* itself (Gunkel). The effort to conquer the evil heart may be made effectual through prayer (8 : 6).

c. Yet the writer is perplexed and distressed at the difficulty of keeping the law, and must resort to a third vindication of God, — the promise that in the coming age the evil heart will be taken away. "The Most High has not created one world but two" (7 : 49), is the answer to the lament over the evil heart (v. 48). The evil that is sown must be reaped, and the place where it is sown pass away, before the field can come where the good is sown (4 : 29). Before the end, Elijah, and others like him, will change the heart of men to a different nature (6 : 26); and the "root" will be sealed up for those for whom the time to come is prepared (8 : 53). That the new age is near at hand is sometimes

¹ See e. g., 3 : 11, 36, 7 : 18, 21-24, 45, 46; 8 : 26-30, 33.

² See 7 : 76-77, 8 : 48 ff.; 10 : 57; 13 : 54-56, and compare 7 : 48, 64, 118, 126; 8 : 17, 31.

³ See 7 : 20-24, 72 f.; 8 : 56-62; 9 : 7-13; 14 : 22, 34 f.

the fear, but in general the consolation of the writer and the practical solution of his problem.

Now these three lines of escape from the problem of the evil heart are precisely like the rabbinical treatment of the evil *yeçer*. This is offset by the law which God gave Israel; men are free to obey the law in spite of the acknowledged power of the evil propensity; and God will hereafter remove it, change men's hearts (Ezek. 36 : 26), and bring in an age to which the evil does not belong.

Yet the origin of the evil heart is not explained by these considerations of the ways of escape. We have seen that the rabbis sometimes resorted to the extreme expedient of saying that God repented having made it, and there is even some suggestion that its rise or at least its dominance was a surprise to him. There is a hint of this sort in 4 Ezra.

God's fashioning of sinners and of the righteous, says the angel, is like the husbandman's sowing much seed and planting many trees. Not all that is sown is saved, and not all that is planted takes root. So they that are sown in the world shall not all be saved (8 : 38-41). But the prophet finds fault with the parable. The husbandman's work fails because God sends too little or too much rain. Furthermore, men, in God's image, are not to be compared with the husbandman's seed (8 : 42-45).

Yet again the figure is used. God speaks of the time of creation when none spoke against him, and adds, "But now they that are created in this world that is prepared . . . are corrupted in their manners. I considered my world, and behold it was ruined, and my earth, and behold it was in peril on account of the devices (*cogitationes*) (of those)¹ that had come into it. And I saw . . . and saved me a grape out of a cluster, and a plant out of a great forest. Let the multitude therefore perish which is born for naught, and let my grape be saved and my plant, because with great labor I have perfected them" (9 : 17-25). It is as if evil had come in from without, and spoiled the plan, so that the salvation

¹ So Gunkel.

of a few (Israel, or the righteous in Israel) was all that God could do. Yet it is man and not matter or evil spirit to whom the disturbance is traced. So also in 8 : 59-60.

In Fourth Ezra, then, we have a certain dualistic element, Greek, or perhaps rather Oriental in origin, but in spite of what must have seemed to the writer the great temptation to find escape from his unsolved problems in the acceptance of an evil principle inherent in the corruptible substance of this world, his view of evil remains substantially Jewish, i. e., monotheistic, and ethical in the legalistic sense of that word.

The question whether the word *yeçer* occurred elsewhere in the book upon the assumption of a Hebrew original (e. g., in 14 : 34, *sensus*) can hardly be answered. Nor does any very simple reason suggest itself why the word "heart" was preferred by this writer, unless it is because, like Jeremiah, feeling the sinfulness of man to be deep-seated, he preferred to ascribe it directly to the inner self, the rational and moral nature itself, and not to one of the propensities of that nature.

3. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*

In the Apocalypse of Baruch,¹ which stands in some as yet undetermined literary relation to Fourth Ezra, the effects of Adam's sin are often spoken of,² but the "evil heart" is noticeably absent. Mr. Charles affirms that this book teaches the thoroughly Jewish doctrine of free will and individual responsibility in spite of Adam's sin; while Fourth Ezra contains a partly Christianized doctrine of man's "practical incapacity for righteousness in consequence of his original defects or Adam's sin" (p. 92-93). It is doubtful, however, whether Baruch ascribes less serious results to Adam's sin than does Fourth Ezra (48 : 42; 54 : 14-15, 19; 56 : 6); and on the other hand Fourth Ezra does not deny man's freedom and responsibility, even though it does not explicitly affirm that "each one

¹ Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 1896. Ryssel in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigraphen*, 1900.

² 4 : 3; 17 : 2-3; 18 : 2; 19 : 8; 23 : 4; 48 : 42, 43, 46; 54 : 15, 19; 56 : 5, 6, 10.

of us has been the Adam of his own soul" (Ap. Bar. 54: 19). The principal difference between the two writers at this point is that while Ezra, with a deep sense of sin, feels impelled to go back of the sinful deed to the grain of evil seed planted in Adam from the beginning, which explains though it does not really excuse sin, Baruch is satisfied to deal with sin as a fact and with its consequences in a more purely legal spirit. Since men possess the Law, they sin knowingly, and are therefore justly punished (15 : 5-6; 19 : 1-4; 55 : 2).

As in Fourth Ezra, the ruling dualism of the book is the contrast between the present and the future world-age. The contrast centers in the thought that death, sorrow, and corruption mark this world, and in increasing measure as it grows old (83 : 9-23; 85 : 10; cf. 4 Ezra 5 : 50-56; 14 : 10), while the coming world is undying and incorruptible. In it the present bodily life will be not simply restored (ch. 50), but transformed into an angelic nature (ch. 51). Yet it does not appear that the writer ascribed sin to the body, to which corruption and death belong. Even in 49 : 3 it is evil, not sin, that pertains to the "members of bonds" with which men are now clothed.¹ The body must, indeed, be transformed, in order to have part in the coming incorruptible world. But it would be an entirely different thing to say that the soul must be delivered from the bondage of the body in order to escape sin; and this our writer, with his strict legalism, could never say. Nor even in his definition of the two worlds does he carry his dualism to a point that seems to him inconsistent with the creation of all things by God. The soul does not pre-exist, but souls are predetermined as to number and place; and no chaotic matter precedes and limits creation (23 : 4, 5; 48 : 6; 21 : 4; 48 : 2-8).

The most surprising thing about these two related books is not that Jewish conceptions are displaced in them by foreign, but that the foreign elements are so largely adjusted or subordinated to the old Jewish view of the world; that men could be so influenced by dualistic conceptions and yet escape

¹ The word is *בישתא*, and the meaning is clear from 51 : 16; cf. 15 : 8.

a real dualism. The two worlds appear to be distinguished from each other by physical properties, one being corruptible, the other incorruptible, one human and the other angelic and unearthly; yet it is never said that one is physical, material, and the other spiritual, immaterial. Indeed Baruch's doctrine of resurrection, like Paul's, denies pure immateriality (ch. 50-51). The contrast of the worlds remains at the end essentially the Jewish contrast of ages, the present and the coming, interpreted by the contrast between the earthly and the heavenly realms. In a dualism like this it is not possible to connect sin essentially with the material body and holiness with the soul. The author of Fourth Ezra would have had more reason for tracing sin to the body as its seat and source, because the legalistic doctrine of freedom troubled him more, and sin seemed to him more inevitable. The writer of Baruch, on the other hand, more often contrasts the two worlds in physical terms, and more definitely connects the evils of this present age with the corruptible body. But neither writer adopts this solution of the problem, although it has been too readily attributed to them. The two books are therefore especially instructive illustrations of the deep-seated aversion of the Hebrew mind to any theory of sin which ascribes it to the physical organism, an aversion due partly, perhaps, to a non-speculative cast of mind, but probably more to the power of the Old Testament over their religious thinking, and the virtual denial of Old Testament monotheism and ethics involved in such a theory.

4. *The Secrets of Enoch*

According to its editor, Mr. Charles, the Slavonic "Secrets of Enoch"¹ contains a Platonic rather than a Jewish account of sin; but this will, I think, prove to be another illustration of a too ready ascription of Greek conceptions to Jewish

¹ Translation by Morfill and notes by Charles, 1896; also *Das slavische Henochbuch*, by Bonwetsch, 1896.

writers. Here we read of Adam: "I [God] knew his nature. He did not know his nature. Therefore his ignorance is a woe to him that he should sin, and I appointed death on account of his sin" (30 : 16). Mr. Charles understands this to mean man's ignorance of his nature with its good and evil impulses; and these he defines in a dualistic sense, after Plato and Philo, as follows: (1) The soul was created originally good. (2) It was not predetermined either to good or ill by God, but left to mould its own destiny (see 30 : 15). (3) Its incorporation in a body, however, with its necessary limitations, served to bias its preferences in the direction of evil.¹ (4) Faithful souls will hereafter live as blessed, incorporeal spirits, or, at all events, clothed only in God's glory (22 : 7); for there is no resurrection of the body (p. 43). According to Charles, further, the writer, like Philo generally, teaches not an absolute creation of the world by God, but its formation out of pre-existing elements.² But it is difficult to justify this Hellenizing version of the teachings of the book. The original goodness of the soul, in distinction from the body, is nowhere taught, but only the original authority and prerogatives of Adam (ch. 30-31). The pre-existence of the soul is affirmed in Morfill's rendering of 23 : 5, "Every soul was created eternally before the foundation of the world." But Bonwetsch renders "prepared" (alle Seelen sind bereitet vor der Welt).³ In other places the author says only that the number and final places of souls are predetermined.⁴ The idea of a pre-existent material out of which God formed the world is not a necessary inference from chs. 25, 26; and on the other hand creation is everywhere affirmed to be absolute; the monotheism of the book is emphatic.⁵ God, belonging to the invisible realm (24 : 4;

¹ See also Charles's *Apoc. of Baruch*, p. 92.

² See notes on 24 : 2; 25 : 1-2; 26 : 1; 48 : 5; 65 : 1.

³ See Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 104 ff., 245 ff., on the relation of the word "prepared" to the idea of pre-existence.

⁴ 49 : 2; 53 : 2 (?); 58 : 5; 61 : 2; just as in Ap. Bar. 23 : 4, 5; 48 : 6; 4 Ezra 4 : 36, 37.

⁵ 2 : 2; 32 : 1^b; 33 : 3-4, 7-8; 34 : 1; 36 : 1; 47 : 3 ff.; 58 : 1; 66 : 4-5; 65.

48 : 5), created the visible out of the invisible (24 : 2; 25; 26; 48 : 5); but both visible and invisible were made by him (47 : 4; 64 : 5; 65 : 1, 6; 51 : 5). "I have blessed all my creation, visible and invisible" (32 : 1, cf. 52 : 4-5). The peculiarity of man's nature is that it consists of both visible and invisible (30 : 10, 16); hence his place in the visible creation is supreme (65 : 2, 3; 30-31; 44 : 1). His moral duty is to choose the light, and because he chooses darkness he must die (30 : 15-16). This sin is traced to his free choice, but never to his dual nature. Neither is the body the cause of Adam's sin, nor is Adam's sin the cause of the sinful nature of men. The ignorance which causes man to sin may be ignorance of himself, but Bonwetsch conjectures that it was ignorance of God. "I saw his nature, but he did not see *my* nature" (30 : 16). The only theory of sin that is clearly taught is that man alone is responsible for it. It does not belong to either part of his nature as God made him, the visible or the invisible, but to the vain thoughts of his heart (ch. 53). All the works of God are good, but the works of man are some good, but others evil (42 : 14).

This understanding of the writer's view of sin according to which it is far more Jewish than Greek, is confirmed by a study of his ethical teachings. The ideal is not the subjection of the bodily passions to the rule of reason, as thoroughgoing Hellenists teach (Philo, 4 Maccabees). Asceticism does not appear. Virtue consists in justice and a charity that is disinterested and prompted by love; in patient forbearance and endurance; and in sincerity before God, who knows the heart.¹

¹ Ch. 9; 42 : 6-13; 44 : 4; 50-52; 60; 63.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE
TRANSFIGURATION

WARREN JOSEPH MOULTON, B.D., PH.D.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION¹

I

NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES REFERRING TO THE TRANSFIGURATION

THE account of the transfiguration is given in all the Synoptists and in substantially the same chronological setting. Within the narratives themselves, however, there are differences of detail so marked as to demand a preliminary consideration, even if it be but the brief recapitulation of familiar observations. In each instance we meet words and phrases characteristic of the writer's diction, and there are, furthermore, differences of conception so marked as to influence our whole understanding of the event, according as we regard one or the other gospel as being on the whole the best guide for our interpretation.

1. *The Account in Mark*

The second evangelist records (9 : 2-13) that after six days (i. e., on the sixth day [cf. 8 : 31] after the incident of Peter's confession) Jesus takes Peter and the brothers (a single *τόν*), James and John, and conducts them (and them only, *μόνους*) up (*ἀναφέρει*) into a high mountain, away from all interruption (*κατ' ἰδίαν*, cf. 4 : 34; 6 : 31). This exact

¹ It was only after the presentation of this paper before the Semitic and Biblical Club that I learned from Professor Bacon that he was investigating the same general subject. Through his kindness I had the privilege of reading in MSS. his brilliant and suggestive article which will probably soon be published. Not being able to assent to his main contention, however, I venture to print my original paper, hoping it will be of service in helping to a better understanding of a very important section in the gospel history.

designation of the time, so unusual in the second gospel, as well as the very explicit mention of the isolation, are both noticeable. For Jesus and his disciples were apparently still in the vicinity of Caesarea Philippi, and would under any circumstances experience little difficulty in finding seclusion. The mountain in question was doubtless unknown to our writer, or was not considered important enough for his purpose to deserve especial mention. The *εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν* recalls the same indefinite designation in the account of the third temptation, as narrated in Matthew (4 : 8). In both instances tradition made Tabor in South Galilee the mountain. From the time of Cyril of Jerusalem¹ the acceptance of this place as the scene of the transfiguration came to be as wide² as is its rejection at present. It was based possibly on a citation from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* in Origen.³ Lacking the context from which the citation was taken we cannot be sure as to the event there alluded to, but it seems not improbable that it was the temptation.⁴

Tabor cannot be regarded as the probable locality of the transfiguration, not only because it was a fortified camp⁵ at that time, but because no mention is made of the entrance of Jesus and the disciples into Galilee until after this incident (9 : 30).

Three stages are indicated in the description of the experience on the mountain.

(a) Jesus is so transformed in the presence of the disciples that even his garments become of such excessive glistening whiteness (om. *ὡς χιῶν*, cf. Dan. 7 : 9; Matt. 28 : 3; Rev. 1 : 14) that the work of no fuller on earth can be compared with them. To describe this change Mark employs the unusual verb *μεταμορφοῦν*. Thus far we know of its use by

¹ *Cat.* XII. 16.

² Cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Tal.*, ad loc. "For who ever doubted of this thing."

³ *Joann.*, tom. II. 6, cf. Resch, *Agrapha*, S. 383; and Ropes, *Die Sprüche Jesu*, u. s. w., S. 99.

⁴ Zahn, *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.*, II. 690 ff.: Ropes, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Josephus, *B. J.*, IV. 1, 8.

the Old Testament translators only once.¹ In the New Testament, outside of the parallel in Matthew, it occurs only in Second Corinthians 3 : 18 and Romans 12 : 2, where it has a moral or ethical significance. As in all these instances, so in the infrequent usage of Greek writers, mostly late, it is found in the passive. It seems to be a near synonym with μετασχηματίζειν. Its abrupt appearance in the gospel narrative with so little explanation shows that at the time of writing it had become a *terminus technicus* for the scene on the mount.² The glistening of Jesus' garments is described in a way peculiar to Mark and without New Testament parallels.³ Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς clearly intends a contrast to the heavenly glory.

(b) (vv. 4-6). Nor was Jesus seen alone, but there appeared to them Elijah, together with Moses, and they were conversing with Jesus. Peter, stirred by what he sees, says to Jesus, "Rabbi, it is fortunate we are present.⁴ Let us make here three tabernacles: for thee one, for Moses one, and for Elijah one." This he did, not at all realizing the meaning of his rejoinder (ἀποκριθῆ),⁵ for they all became thoroughly frightened (ἐκφοβοῖ γὰρ ἐγένοντο).

The abrupt transition to this second phase of the experience is noticeable. There is no description of the coming of Elijah and Moses, but it is simply said that Elijah appears, or shows himself with Moses.⁶ In this first allusion Elijah precedes,⁷ whereas in the next verse Moses' name

¹ Symm. Superscription of Ps. 33 (34) 1. LXX, ἀλλοιοῦν, Heb. נִשְׁחָח.

² Cf. Weiss, *Mar.*, S. 296, an. 1.

³ Στρίβειν not otherwise in N. T. but in LXX. So also γραφεύς, but cf. Mk. 2:21 (Mt. 9:16). In O. T. we hear of the fuller's field, 2 K. 18:17; Isa. 7:3; 36:2; and of fuller's soap, Mal. 3:2. The reference here in Mk. (cf. Isa. 1:18; Rev. 7:14) must be connected with the art of bleaching, of course, and not with the process of fulling or reducing of the shrinkage of woollen fabrics.

⁴ Cf. Mark 7:27; I Cor. 7:1, 8.

⁵ Cf. Mark 14:40, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ.

⁶ ὤφθη is the word used of the appearing of Yahwè, Gen. 12:7; Acts 7:2; of angels, Jud. 6:12; Luke 1:11; of Jesus after his resurrection, Luke 24:34; I Cor. 15:5 ff., and also of visions, Rev. 11:19; Acts 16:9.

⁷ This can hardly be attributed to the order of the LXX text in Mal. 4:4 ff. (3:23).

comes first, as in all the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke. Ἀποκριθεὶς (v. 5) does not refer to anything said by Jesus, for there is no mention of any word of his in Mark until they are descending the mountain (v. 9), but it is here used of a response called forth by the situation (cf. 11 : 14; 15 : 12). Σκηνή, according to LXX usage, a tent (cf. Heb. 11 : 9), or temporary structure of boughs, is chosen also possibly because of its association with the divine presence. Peter's proposal evinces a distraction (cf. 14 : 40) which the evangelist explains through excessive fear (ἐκφοβοί), although the words seem to be expressive of excessive joy.

(c) The answer to this proposal was precluded by the sudden appearance of a cloud which overshadowed Jesus and his associates (αὐτοῖς), and from out the cloud came forth (ἐγένετο) a voice (om. λέγουσα), "This is my beloved son, hear ye him." And then the whole appearance vanishes, for, looking round about, they suddenly become aware there is no longer any one with them, save (εἰ μὴ) Jesus only.

The transition to this third phase seems even more abrupt than the preceding one. The cloud appearing with such suddenness is the familiar Old Testament symbol for the divine presence (cf. I Kings 8 : 10; Ex. 16 : 10; 19 : 9 ff.; Lev. 16 : 2; 2 Mac. 2 : 8, etc.), and the heavenly voice clearly marks it as such in this case. The logical sequence demands that the ones overshadowed (αὐτοῖς) be Jesus and his associates, while the disciples are the witnesses and auditors without. The words spoken repeat the declaration at the baptism, not, however, in the form of direct address to Jesus (so Mark 1 : 11; Luke 3 : 22), but in the third person (so Matt. 3 : 17). There is in Mark no equivalent for the ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. In common with the others he has the added injunction ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ, recalling Moses' promise of a future prophet and the admonition to hear him (Deut. 18 : 15 ff.). Ἐξάπινα (for the more usual ἐξάλφνης) indicates the suddenness with which the whole scene changed, and is possibly best taken with the verb.¹

¹ So Weiss, *Mar.*, S. 298.

Without added comment or explanation, or note of time or movement, the evangelist passes from this scene and tells us forthwith of Jesus' injunction, given while they were descending (*καταβαινόντων*) the mountain, that they tell no man what they had seen, except whenever the Son of Man should rise from the dead. The following verse, peculiar to Mark, is difficult of interpretation. Many¹ understand *καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν* to state that the disciples were obedient to Jesus' command (cf. Luke 9 : 36). But it better suits the usual meaning of the verb to translate, "And they laid fast hold of the saying, among themselves (*πρὸς ἑαυτούς*), questioning what the rising from the dead is," i. e., of course, in this context, the rising from the dead just referred to. In any case, the verse represents a comment of the writer who again emphasizes the lack of comprehension on the part of the disciples. It interrupts the course of the narrative. This goes on in the next verse to tell not of discussions among themselves, but how they continued questioning (*ἐπηρώτων*) Jesus as to the lessons of the recent experience. Something in it seemed to contradict the current rabbinical teaching as to Elijah, and so they remind him that (*ὅτι*) the scribes (om. *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ*) say Elijah must first come (cf. Mal. 3 : 23 [4 : 4]). How this topic is connected with the preceding narrative, and just what the difficulty in question was, we shall have occasion to consider at length later on. Whatever it was, Jesus did not share it, but said (*ὁ δὲ ἔφη*) to them, "Elijah, to be sure (*μέν*), coming first restores (cf. Matt. 2 : 4) all things." Far from denying, he confirms the prophetic necessity of Elijah's advent. Then, apparently recurring to their objection, he continues, Do you then ask, "How (*πῶς*) it is written with reference to the Son of Man that he suffer many things and be set at nought (*ἐξουδενηθῆ*, cf. Isa. 53 : 3 Symm. *bis*, Aq., Th.; Ps. 21 [22], 7). But I say unto you this is possible, yea, more than probable, for Elijah also has come (*ἐλήλυθεν*), and they

¹ So, e. g., Holtzmann and Weiss, cf. Mark 7 : 3, 4, 8.

worked their will on him,¹ as it was written regarding him. In absence of any passage in the Old Testament, containing an express prediction suiting this last *καθὼς γέγραπται*, it is usually held that the fate intended for Elijah (I Kings 19 ff.) was typical of that which overtook John.² This seems to be in harmony with Jesus' view of prophecy and to suit various other allusions (e. g., Matt. 23 : 37 [Luke 13 : 34]; Mark 12 : 2 ff. and parallels), as well as the fact that he saw in John the promised herald (cf. Matt. 11 : 10 [Luke 7 : 27], 14; 17 : 13). Furthermore, early Christian apologetics moved along this same line of interpretation. We do not then necessarily need to seek an explanation of these words in any tradition of an express prediction of such a fate.³

2. *The Account in Matthew*

Turning now to the first gospel (17 : 1-13), we find a somewhat longer account, with much the same content, but with many differences in detail.

v. 1. John is not only named, but further described as the brother of James (*τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*), as elsewhere in Matthew and usually in Mark (note *μόνους* is not used).

v. 2. Beside the *μετεμορφώθη* appearing in Mark, we have

¹ For this phrase as descriptive of deeds of violence, cf. Dan. 8 : 4; 11 : 16, 36; 2 Mac. 7 : 16.

² Dalman objects to such an assumption. He points to the use of the phrase "and he shall do according to his will," Dan. 11 : 16 and 36 (Mark 9 : 13, *καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον*), and thinks it probable Jesus includes Elijah among those alluded to in Dan. 11 : 33. *Der leidende u. der sterbende Messias*, S. 29 f.

³ Attention has been recently called anew to a Jewish writing of unknown authorship, which belongs possibly to the first century A. D. It was wrongly ascribed to Philo. It gives a peculiar version of biblical history from Adam to the death of Saul. In speaking of Phineas, the son of Eleazar, it says that when he passed 120 years of age he was commanded by God to withdraw into a certain place where he should be fed by an eagle. Later he was to come down among men and then be taken up to be with those like him. At the end he was to come to earth again and then should taste death. Tradition identified Phineas with Elijah and so we have here really a description of the lot of Elijah. Accordingly we see this writer knows of the death of Elijah at the time of his final mission. v. *Independent*, 1898, p. 1218; *Jewish Q. Review*, vol. x., 1898, p. 277 ff.

the added description *καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος* (cf. Matt. 13 : 43; Rev. 10 : 1; Enoch 14 : 20). The change in Jesus' raiment is described more simply, as becoming *λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς* (cf. I Tim. 6 : 16; Enoch 14 : 18 ff.).

v. 3. An *ἰδοῦ* marks the first transition. Here it is "Moses and Elijah" who appear and are talking "with him" (*μετ' αὐτοῦ*).

v. 4. Beside minor differences (*δέ* [Mark, *καί*]; *εἶπεν* [Mark, *λέγει*]; *κύριε* [Mark, *ῥαββεὶ*]) we find the smoother construction, *εἰ θέλεις* (cf. 11 : 14) *ποιήσω ὧδε* (Mark, *καὶ ποιήσωμεν*). Peter thus speaks for himself alone, but notice the preceding *ἡμᾶς*. It is striking that an added *ὧδε* should immediately follow the preceding one, which also appears in Mark.

v. 5. Matthew does not make mention of Peter's confusion, nor does he speak of the fear of the disciples at this juncture. Nothing in his account suggests that Peter's proposition to construct the tabernacles is irrelevant. He describes the transition to the third phase of the experience with more elaboration: *ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοῦ* (cf. 12 : 46). This *ἰδοῦ* is in Matthew alone, as is also the description of the cloud as *φωτινὴ* (cf. 6 : 22; Luke 11 : 34 ff.). Another added *ἰδοῦ* introduces the voice, as it did the voice at the baptism; in fact, v. 5^b reproduces verbatim 3 : 17, with the substitution of the necessary *τῆς νεφέλης* for *τῶν οὐρανῶν*, and with the added *ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ*.

vv. 6 and 7. These verses, peculiar to the first gospel, describe the effect of the voice on the disciples. It is by reason of the cloud and voice that fear first seizes upon them. Their conduct accords with that so often depicted under like circumstances in Biblical writings (cf. Jud. 6 : 22; Dan. 10 : 9; Isa. 6 : 5; Rev. 1 : 17). Indeed, quite a close verbal parallel exists between these verses and Dan. 8 : 16-18.¹ Jesus here addresses the disciples as he nowhere does in the other accounts.

v. 8. According to this narrative it is while they are pros-

¹ Cf. Volkmar, *Marcus*, S. 460; cf. also Dan. 10 : 9 ff.

trate on the ground that the change takes place, and when, encouraged by Jesus' voice, they raise their eyes (*ἐπάραντες*), they find themselves alone with him.

v. 9. The subject is here expressed (*ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων*) and the command given in the direct form. (Note *ἐνετείλατο* [Mark, *διεστείλατο*]; *εἶπητε* [Mark, *διηγῆσονται*]). Especially noteworthy is the *τὸ ὄραμα* (Mark, *ἃ εἶδον*), a word used to describe the visions of the prophets in the Old Testament and in the New Testament used otherwise only of the visions in the book of Acts (but cf. Acts 7 : 31). (Note *ἕως οὗ* [Mark, *εἰ μὴ ὅταν*]; *ἐγερθῆ* [Mark, *ἀναστῆ*]).

v. 10. Here we have the Aor. *ἐπηρώτησαν* (Mark, Imp.) and the expressed subject *οἱ μαθηταί*, although only the Three can be intended. The question takes the direct form (*τί οὖν*).

v. 11. The same is true of Jesus' rejoinder (*ἀποκριθεὶς*). (Note *εἶπεν* again [Mark, *ἔφη*]). In his answer Jesus says that Elijah comes (*ἔρχεται* [Mark, *ἔλθων*]), and *will* restore (*ἀποκαταστήσει* [Mark, *ἀποκατιστάνει*]) all things. This was interpreted by many of the Church Fathers and later writers to teach the real coming of Elijah before the second advent.¹

v. 12. Over against (*δέ*) this affirmation is put the statement, Elijah has come already (*ἤδη ἦλθεν* [Mark, *ἐλήλυθεν*]), and Matthew adds, they did not recognize him (*καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν*). (Note the *ἐν αὐτῷ*, *ἰ* [Mark om. *ἐν*] and Aor. *ἠθέλησαν* [Mark, *ἤθελον*]). Matthew further adds to Jesus' answer, "And thus the Son of Man is about to suffer at their hands" (*ὑπ' αὐτῶν*).

v. 13. The incident ends with the comment, found only in Matthew, that then the disciples (again *οἱ μαθηταί*) understood that he spoke to them of John the Baptist.

3. *The Account in Luke*

Turning now to the third gospel (9 : 28-36), we find variations in detail which are even more significant than those just considered.

¹ Cf. Chrys., ad loc.; Aug., *Tract. in Jno.*, 4 : 5 and 6; Justin M., *Dial. w. Trypho.*, 49; Olshausen, *Com.*, ad loc.

v. 28. The account is here prefaced by the introductory formula *ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τὸν λόγον τούτους*. Then follows the elliptical phrase *ὥσει* (cf. 9 : 14; 23 : 44; Acts 2 : 41, etc.) *ἡμέραι ὀκτώ* which is usually understood as the comprehensive designation of an interval of a week. (Note *παραλαβὼν* [cf. 9 : 10, Mark and Matthew, *λαμβάνει*]; *ἀνέβη* [Mark, Matthew, *ἀναφέρει*]). The *ὑψηλόν* standing after *ὄρος* in Mark and Matthew does not appear here.

In the enumeration of the names of the disciples John precedes James (so also 8 : 51; 9 : 28; Acts 1 : 13), an inversion of the earlier order (cf. 5 : 10; 6 : 14; 9 : 54 and Matthew and Mark always), which was no doubt originally that of seniority and distinction. The change probably came about later and was occasioned by the prominence of John in apostolic history. Thus James, who was then regarded as the less distinguished, came to be described as the brother of John (Acts 12 : 2). Luke alone tells us that the purpose of Jesus' retirement was for prayer (*προσεύξασθαι*, cf. 3 : 21; 6 : 12).

v. 29. The change in Jesus' appearance is described as taking place while he was engaged in prayer. To indicate what this change was the writer does not employ the *μεταμορφοῦν* of Mark, nor the added phrase of Matthew, but only says, the form of his countenance became different (*ἐγένετο . . . τὸ εἶδος* [cf. 3 : 22] *τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον*) and his garment (sing.) became white, flashing forth like lightning.¹

v. 30. He does not speak directly of the appearance of Moses and Elijah, but says, "And lo! two men (*ἄνδρες*) were talking (*συνελάλουν*) with him who were (or who were such as, *οἵτινες*) Moses and Elijah."

vv. 31-33^a. In these verses, which are peculiar to the third gospel, we are told: (a) that Moses and Elijah also appeared in glory (*ἐν δόξῃ*); (b) that they were telling (*ἔλεγον*) him of his exodus (*ἔξοδον*)² which he was about to

¹ *ἐξαστράπτων* only here in New Testament. In LXX, Nah. 3 : 3; Ez. 1 : 4, 7.

² For the usage of this word for death, cf. Wis. 3 : 2; 7 : 6; II Pet. 1 : 15 and contrast *εἰσόδος*, Acts 13 : 24; Wis. 7 : 6; v. Zahn, *N. T. Einleit.*, II. S. 56.

fulfill (*πληροῦν*) in Jerusalem; (c) that Peter and his companions (*οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ*, cf. Acts 2 : 14, 37; 5 : 29) were weighed down with sleep (*βεβαρημένοι* [cf. Matt. 26 : 43; Mark 14 : 40] *ὑπνω*) and, having with an effort remained awake, or probably better, having become awake (*διαγρηγορήσαντες* only here in New Testament and LXX), they saw Jesus' glory and the two men (*δύο ἄνδρας*) standing with him; (d) that the occasion of Peter's words was the movement of the visitors to depart (*διαχωρίζεσθαι*) from Jesus. It is evident that the writer conceived of the event as taking place at night (cf. also v. 37, *τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ*). The allusion to the sleep of the disciples recalls the later scene in Gethsemane (22 : 45 and parallels).

v. 33^{b. c.} The impulse of Peter is to detain the visitors, and hence his proposition, which is given essentially as in Mark. (Note *εἶπεν* [so Matthew, but Mark *λέγει*]; *ἀποκριθεῖς* [Mark, Matthew] not used; *πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν* [Mark, Matthew, *τῷ Ἰησοῦ*]; *ἐπιστάτα* [cf. 5 : 5; 8 : 24, etc.] peculiar to Luke, Mark has here *ῥαββεί*, Matthew *κύριε*; *μίαν* precedes the designation of person [follows in Mark and Matthew]; *μὴ εἰδῶς ὃ λέγει* [Mark, *οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τι ἀποκριθῆ*, Matthew om.]).

v. 34. (Note *ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος* [Matthew, *ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος*, Mark om.]; *ἐγένετο* [so Mark; Matthew, *ἰδοῦ*]; *καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς* [Mark, *ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς*, Matthew, *ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς*]).

In Mark the fear is mentioned in connection with Peter's remark and so before the description of the cloud. In Matthew, as we have seen, it is spoken of at the end, after the voice, being occasioned by the divine presence. Here in Luke it comes after the cloud, but before the voice. (Note *ἐφοβήθησαν*; so Matt. v. 6; Mark *ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο*.) Its motive, apparently the same as in Matthew, is explained by the added phrase *ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτούς εἰς τὴν νεφέλην*. The preceding *αὐτούς* is ambiguous, as in the parallels, but probably here and in the following instance designates Jesus and his companions in distinction from the disciples.

v. 35. The description of the voice and its message is

given exactly as in Mark, except that *φωνή* here precedes the predicate, *λέγουσα* is used, *αὐτοῦ* precedes *ἀκούετε*, and *ἐκλελεγμένος* (cf. 23 : 35 *ἐκλεκτός*) stands where Mark and Matthew have *ἀγαπητός*.

v. 36. In place of the more descriptive passages with which the experience closes in Mark and Matthew, Luke merely says, "And after the voice had come (*γενέσθαι*, cf. 2 : 27; 3 : 21, etc.) Jesus was found alone" (*εὐρέθη* [cf. Acts 8 : 40] *Ἰησοῦς μόνος* [Mark, Matthew, *οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον*]). He makes no mention of the descent of the mountain, nor does he record any subsequent conversation or prohibition, but says that they were silent of their own accord and did not tell (*ἀπήγγειλαν*, cf. 8 : 20, 34, 36, 47, etc.) any one in those days (cf. 2 : 1; 4 : 2; 5 : 35, etc.) anything of what they had seen.

4. *Mark's Account the most Primitive*

Such a review of our narratives makes it evident that no two of the writers entertained exactly the same conception as to the order and significance of the events occurring during this retirement of Jesus with the three disciples. No one of them is without able defenders who are prepared to champion his relative originality. In many instances the choice of the writer to be thus defended is determined by the theory held regarding the origin and interdependence of the gospels. Otherwise it may depend on the line of interpretation which is adopted. If we look first at the experience on the mount which all three relate, it is certainly true that the narrative in the second gospel is the briefest. It evidently has the least amount of what may be termed editorial comment and amplification, and in so far is the most original. Whether it has taken up and preserved most faithfully the content of some hypothetical, primitive source, is an entirely different question and one that cannot be satisfactorily settled until we are in possession of such a source. In each instance it is probable, and to such a degree probable

as to amount almost to a certainty, that later experiences and developments in the Christian community have in some measure influenced the choice of expressions and the form of the narrative. It is not, primarily, as biographers seeking to impart information that the evangelists write, but as those who are striving to influence the conceptions of their readers. This holds true of Mark, as well as of the others, but in the case of the narrative of the transfiguration the balance of evidence from a comparative study supports those who claim that the influence of such a purpose is least discernible in the second gospel. Without entering upon a detailed discussion at the expense of great repetition we may assume that it has been adequately shown that its brevity and obscurity are not of a character to make necessary the supposition of dependence on a fuller account, such as may be thought to be implied in either of the other gospels. That such an account ever existed has yet to be shown. Mark's conciseness does indicate that he is not now for the first time telling of something before entirely unknown, but rather of something which he had often heard recounted. The obscurity grows out of this familiarity. In the case of Matthew the added details and clearness are not to be attributed so much to more accurate information as to the introduction of conceptions germane to his theme which appear elsewhere in his own writing, or in writings current in his time. This cannot be asserted in exactly the same way in the case of the third gospel, but it is true of some of its most characteristic variations. In others the tendency which is discernible in the author to literalize and interpret and translate into the terms of his vocabulary is a more plausible explanation than the claim of relative originality. The prominence of John (v. 28) and of Peter (v. 32 ff.), the statement that Jesus withdraws for prayer (v. 28), the giving of the theme of conversation as his exodus (v. 31), the putting of the scene in the night and the allusion to the sleep of the disciples, the assertion that Moses and Elijah also appeared in glory (v. 31), the prosaic close of the account

with the statement that the disciples kept silent of their own accord, do not commend themselves as original features.

As for the conversation which took place as they came down from the mountain, which is recorded only in Mark and Matthew,¹ the text of Mark is generally conceded to be more original than that of Matthew or any other text which an eclectic process has thus far constructed from the material present in both. The difficulties and obscurities of Mark (9 : 9, 11, 12) are absent in Matthew, and we find again natural comment and explanation added (Matt. 17 : 12, 13) for the improvement of the narrative.

5. *The Account in the Fourth Gospel*

The fourth gospel has no record of this northern sojourn and withdrawal to the Mount of Transfiguration, but the section 12 : 20-36 bears in several particulars² such striking resemblance to the synoptic narratives which we have been considering that it is by some regarded as a parallel. It is possible, indeed, that this experience constitutes a much closer parallel than is generally supposed, and that investigation may show it does not necessarily include beside all the commonly assumed reminiscences of the night in Gethsemane. But such a study may more properly follow our present undertaking than be included in it, and we will accordingly not venture here upon any further discussion of the witness of the fourth gospel.

6. *The Account in Second Peter*

There remains one other New Testament passage which must be considered together with the preceding sources, namely, Second Peter 1 : 12 ff. Apart from all questions of authorship, its early date gives it great importance. The writer is setting forth the assured certainty of the *parousia*

¹ Cf. Luke 7 : 18 ff. especially v. 27 ; 1 : 17.

² Cf. especially John 12 : 25, 26 with Mark 8 : 35 ff. and parallels ; also John 12 : 28 with Mark 9 : 7 and parallels, not only in form, but also in content.

and says (v. 16 ff.), "For not in pursuance of cunningly devised fables did we make known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but as eye-witnesses of his majesty. For when he received honor and glory from God the Father as a voice like the following came to him from the Excellent Glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; and this voice we heard come out of heaven, being with him in the holy mount."

The traditional interpretation finds here a reference to the transfiguration. v. Hofmann¹ disputed this, maintaining that λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν must be understood rather of the glorification of Jesus through the resurrection and ascension. The whole context, however, opposes this explanation, and it is not strange that it has met with slight favor. It is also opposed by the fact that we have no record of a glorification of Jesus after the resurrection, but are told that he was seen in a body like in appearance to his earthly form. The objections of v. Hofmann to the current exegesis are of greater importance than his constructive contribution, and are sanctioned, among others, by Spitta.² The real center of difficulty is the unfinished sentence in v. 17^b. The generally accepted rendering makes the time expressed by the Gen. absolute φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης synchronous with that of λαβὼν κ.τ.λ., and affirms that, in part at least, the honor and glory mentioned are to be found in this declaration of the heavenly voice (Bath-Qol). Against such a view it is urged that, were it true, we should have rather a Part. with imperfect signification (φερομένης), and, further, that the being an *eye-witness*, which is so important in the passage, would then really be transformed into being an *ear-witness*. Λαβὼν κ.τ.λ., it is asserted, refers rather to something other than the reception of the divine declaration, to something that was perceptible to the eye. If this be admitted, and it is still held that the words uttered by the voice and the expression "holy mount" make it prob-

¹ *Die hl. Schrift, N. T.*, V, 1873.

² Friedrich Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus*, etc.

able that the reference is to the transfiguration, rather than some other event, then, it is said, we must postulate an account of the transfiguration differing from that preserved in the Synoptists, and probably on the whole a simpler one. For in the gospels the voice comes last and is a less important feature, whereas in Second Peter the voice precedes (*ἐνεχθείσης*) the glorification, and, secondly, in the gospels the source of the glorious illumination of Jesus is not at all indicated, standing, as it does, before the voice and out of all connection with the *νεφέλη φωτινή*, whereas in Second Peter it follows the voice and is naturally connected with the *μεγαλοπρεπῆς δόξα*, *i. e.*, it comes from the radiance of the divine presence. There are likewise other considerations of lesser weight which favor the originality and simplicity of the account presupposed by the references in Second Peter. In the gospels the incident of Moses and Elijah and the remarks of the disciples connected with this stand so prominently in the foreground, that the real purpose of the transfiguration to confirm the belief of the apostles in Jesus' *δύναμις καὶ παρουσία* is not at once apparent, but needs the historian's eye to detect its connection with the preceding eschatological discourse. That it was originally so intended is shown by the careful indication of time in all the accounts. The fact that the writer of Second Peter has such a complete apprehension of this central truth points to the use by him of a clearer and more explicit source. The *ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ* appearing in the Synoptists, but not found in Second Peter, is connected with the saying of Moses (Deut. 18 : 15), and has also the further meaning there, that God will give the message to the Messiah, as he did to his type Moses, and this does not all suit the purpose of giving assurance to the belief of the disciples in Christ's coming in majesty and power. Furthermore, according to the record in Matthew, which, Spitta holds, preserves the original at this point, the transfiguration made no impression on those present, as is shown by the irrelevant words spoken by Peter about the tabernacles, which words Mark has sought to fit into this setting by the mention of fear. All

this serves to strengthen the previous impression, that the incident of Moses and Elijah is really an intrusion, suggested possibly by the remarks of the disciples in Matthew 17 : 10 ff. The fact that they are not mentioned in Second Peter, while not positive proof that the writer was unacquainted with this feature, makes this a possibility. It is the introduction of this foreign element that has apparently brought about the confusion and caused the separation of Jesus' glorification from the cloud of light and so deprived the incident of its real significance. The result has been to increase the supernatural element, as over against the simple, modest event presupposed in Second Peter. To the objection that the expression "holy mount" points to the later apostolic age, it is justly answered that it is a most natural designation, in view of the experience of Jesus and the disciples. As often in the Old Testament, so here the place is hallowed by the divine presence.

Much that Spitta develops, starting from the suggestions of v. Hofmann and Wiesinger, commends itself, but his main thesis does not. It rests almost entirely on an unwarrantable use of the anacolouthon in v. 17. For, accepting the translation "After the voice had sounded forth" (*nachdem eine Stimme erschollen war*) it does not follow that this clause is to be considered relatively to the *λαβών* and not rather, together with this, as its position suggests, be connected with the main predicate which is left unexpressed. We need not speculate as to what this was. Certainly the course of the thought does not appear to have been broken by the next verse, and there are various possibilities¹ which better suit the context than those suggested by Spitta.

With this difficulty out of the way there is no longer any adequate reason for postulating an order of events differing from that related in the Synoptists. Nor do the minor differences pointed out indicate that the record of Second Peter is independent of that in the gospels. All these can be better explained as arising from the adaptation of that incident to

¹ Cf. Zahn, *Einleit.*, II. S. 58.

the writer's purpose. Looked at in this light, they become significant indications of the way in which he understood the incident and are accordingly important for our present purpose. We shall later recur to this and also suggest an explanation of the absence of any mention of Moses and Elijah.

II

VARIOUS EXPLANATIONS OF THE TRANSFIGURATION

1. *The Vision Theory*

Explanations as to the nature and significance of the experience on the Mount of Transfiguration have differed, and still differ widely. Some of them hardly deserve enumeration, while others have still a living interest. It is not strange that from earliest times men have said that the disciples beheld a vision. So Tertullian,¹ who speaks of the "vision and voice," and so, among many others in modern times, Bernhard Weiss.² He holds that a simple account in the apostolic source has been much amplified and, as usual, finds this account, on the whole, best preserved in Matthew, although the extended Marcan interpolations and Lucan touches make its exact phraseology to a large degree uncertain. What was originally described was beyond all question a vision sent from God, for no human eye could look on the celestially transfigured Jesus. Visionary is the manner in which the men appear and are recognized. Then in what immediately follows we clearly have but a partial repetition of the vision of the Baptist. Visionary is again the manner in which the experience ends. The eyes of the disciples which had been closed to the external world are suddenly opened, and they behold nothing of all that had just engaged their attention, but only Jesus alone with them, as usual. We could not understand this if an actual beholding of sensible phenomena were intended. It was the recognition of

¹ *Adv. Marcion*, IV. 22.

² *Leben Jesu*, 2. Aufl., II. S. 306 ff. (English, III. p. 98 ff.); *Com.*, ad loc.; *Die vier Evangelien*, ad loc.

such a difficulty that led the first evangelist to explain that they fell on their faces.

Against this idea of a vision and the kindred view that it was a dream, it is urged that a vision or a dream is an individual matter and cannot be the common possession of three persons. To this Weiss rejoins: we are not concerned here with a vision induced by merely natural causes, but with one directly mediated by God. But even then Jesus' previous conversations remain an important factor in producing the susceptibility to the divine influence indispensable in such an experience. Admitting this, provision is made for the individual factor which is demanded. But the change of the pictures in the vision which in none of the accounts are closely interrelated, and the words of Peter, intruded into its midst, contradict the idea of a unity. The correspondence of the three parts to the three witnesses suggests that originally there was a description of three different visions of the three apostles, and that after the interchange of experiences they became, as it were, a common property and were transmitted as one common experience. If to Peter it was shown that Jesus was in full accord with Moses and Elijah, then it may well be that to John it was given to see him in his future majesty, as later, in a grand vision, he sees his future advent. Then James, the first Christian martyr, would receive from God himself the witness that the one who from this time onward, with increasing earnestness, demands obedience, even in suffering, is the Messiah. As for Peter's words about the booths which occasion so much perplexity in any theory, just as they seem to have perplexed the evangelists, Weiss says they were possibly spoken by Peter after his dream, whereas now they have become inserted in this difficult way between two parts of the vision. Otherwise he repudiates any conception which would introduce objective reality, or blend vision with reality, or one which would so interpret the occurrence as to find it primarily significant for Jesus. Its purpose is rather to prepare the apostles for the severe trial awaiting them, by showing

Jesus in that glory in which a few days before he had promised to return. Beside this primary lesson there are the others above alluded to, namely, the agreement of his death with Old Testament authorities and the duty of obedience to the Messiah under all circumstances. Weiss holds that the *πρῶτον* gives us the key to the understanding of the difficulty of the disciples, expressed in their question regarding Elijah, as they descended the mountain. They had, no doubt, previously found it sufficient to regard the prophecy of Malachi as fulfilled in John the Baptist. Jesus does not meet their question by entering upon a discussion aiming to correct their false conception of a literal fulfilment of Malachi or of their view of the recent appearance of Elijah, but uses the opportunity to turn their attention to the question of the hour. Upholding the interpretation of the scribes, and declaring that Elijah had already come, he answers the real difficulty, that even so the Messiah must still meet a fate of suffering, by saying that the nation, by its attitude, had thwarted the efforts of the forerunner, and that consequently the Messiah could not hope for a better fate.

The explanation of Weiss deserves especial attention because his championship of the vision theory has greatly influenced modern popular interpretation, even when his detailed exegesis has seemed too fragmentary and arbitrary. He makes too extreme a use of analysis to do justice to the sense of unity in the scene, as it was evidently conceived of in the mind of the writer of the second gospel.

2. *The Dream Theory*

The idea that the narrative of the transfiguration is in its essence the record of a dream involves a somewhat different point of view. It naturally puts Luke forward as the writer who has kept the true tradition in the particular relating to the sleepiness of the disciples, a trait which it is said no one would have ever invented. The content of the dream is traced to the influence of the thoughts of the waking hours

just preceding, and its particular form is often accounted for by the environment on a mountain side amid the elements. Neander,¹ one of the soberer exponents of this view, held that Jesus withdrew for prayer and would naturally pray concerning those things of which they were all thinking during those days. This prayer made a deep impression on the consciousness of the disciples. "Die Herrlichkeit, in welcher er sich ihnen darstellte, strahlte auf seine ganze Erscheinung zurück, und er erschien ihnen wie verklärt von einem himmlischen Lichte" (S. 372 ff.). Wearied, they fell asleep. The prayer and conversation gave rise to dreams (Traumgesichte). Moses and Elijah appeared in heavenly glory beside Him who was the goal of the Law and Prophets, as also a transforming (verklärendes) light was destined to shine back from him upon the Old Testament, and announced to him his impending fate at Jerusalem.

They awoke full of this picture, and, while thus half awake, "sahen und hörten sie das Uebrige." As to the fact that all had the same dream, Neander says that possibly the account in which Peter is the main personage came from his report and is synecdochically connected with all those who were present.

3. *The Naturalistic Theory*

The hypothesis of a dream seeks an objective foundation, but, in doing this, falls far short of the postulates of the old naturalistic explanation, favored, for example, by Schleiermacher. When recalled at all, this latter view is often connected with the name of Paulus. He held² that Jesus withdrew from the disciples for prayer. Not being asked to join in this they fall asleep. As they awake in the early morning they see Jesus standing higher up above them in conference with two men. The topic is his exodus, a subject which had agitated Peter, who now calls out, being in a

¹ *Leben Jesu Christi*, 6. Aufl., II. Bd., S. 371 ff.

² *Leben Jesu*, u. s. w., 1828, I. Theil, II., S. 7 ff.

confused, half waking state, and not realizing, himself, what he is saying. Why his thoughts suggested Moses is not clear. A radiance comes from the light of the early dawn, reflected from the snow. A morning mist envelops the men as they are about to go. The words which sound forth from the cloud were spoken, possibly, by one of them as a reminder to him and an injunction to the disciples.

This explanation is a specimen of a method of interpretation which is deservedly little regarded to-day. It has, however, something more than an antiquarian interest, because of its effort to establish an objective reality without the use of miraculous elements.

4. *The Theory of an Objective Reality*

In contrast to this naturalistic explanation there has always been a considerable number who have held to an objective reality, but one of miraculous origin. The event thus becomes the supreme and manifold miracle of the New Testament, far surpassing the resurrection or any other therein recorded. Olshausen, who may stand as an exponent of this view, says,¹ "the simple literal sense of the narrative" intended by the narrators "vindicates itself perfectly to every Christian intelligence." Holding to the Christian teaching as to the resurrection of the body and its glorification, there are no essential difficulties. In his detailed interpretation he finds a place for all the particulars of the different narratives. He thinks there was an outward radiance illuminating all and also an inward one, shining forth from Jesus. Peter, rapt in ecstasy, voices with his words a longing for the kingdom of God. With the coming of the cloud the disciples are overwhelmed with terror, partly at its presence and partly because they feel themselves thus severed from their Lord. With the coming of the voice they lose all consciousness and sink forward on their faces. Peter had hoped Elijah would remain and enter upon his labors, and, since he

¹ *Com. on N. T.*, I. p. 556. This is the translation of the fourth edition.

has disappeared, the question arises, what is to be made of the teaching of the scribes. Jesus' answer shows them that the prediction is not to be understood absolutely, and explains why John, working in the spirit and power of Elijah, had failed to carry out his mission. Olshausen held that neither the coming of the Baptist nor this appearance of Elijah exhausted the prophecy of Malachi, but that it still awaited its fulfilment at Christ's future coming.

The significance of the transfiguration, thus conceived of, is made to be twofold. It was for the confirmation and instruction of the disciples who saw, as it were, the solemn installation of Jesus into his holy office. Secondly, it was an epoch in the development of the spiritual life of Jesus himself, just as the baptism and the temptation were. Jesus, at the same time that he was actively redeeming, was also advancing to his own perfection. It was only by degrees that his humanity received into itself the fulness of the Godhead. The transfiguration marks an important stage in this process.

In all this Olshausen is far from logical. He ignores or does not feel the many difficulties which present themselves to others who are equally earnest in their search for truth. He leaves an open door for doceticism and other theories equally inconsistent with that held at present regarding the person of Jesus.

5. *The Mythical Theory*

Passing by the view which holds to a historical basis, but a figurative representation in oriental style, whose details are to be interpreted allegorically,¹ we may next consider one which differs from all these others in assuming neither a subjective nor objective reality, but holds that our record is a literary fiction. This so-called mythical view had a grow-

¹ i. e., the outward radiance stands for the inward illumination in the minds of the disciples; the high mountain represents the height of knowledge which they attained and the overshadowing cloud its fading away, etc.

ing acceptance throughout the last century, especially toward its close, when the reaction against Strauss had lost something of its intensity. It is to-day widely accepted in its essence by scholars outside the ultra-conservative school. It was ably and clearly formulated by Strauss, but has been somewhat elaborated since his time. Some particulars put forward by him as tentative suggestions have become incorporated as essential parts of the theory. H. Holtzmann is a distinguished representative of this view,¹ asserting that the narrative of the transfiguration is the most brilliant of all the poetic didactic productions of primitive Christianity. We, however, may do best to turn to the writings of another eminent exponent, Professor Pfeiderer, who formulates his exposition very clearly and concisely.² To be sure, in many of the details his view is individual rather than representative, but his main contention can stand as typical. He not only finds the account in Mark relatively the most original, but considers the entire narrative a composition of this writer. After the manner of historians and biographers the evangelist pauses, as he reaches the culminating point which marks the transition in his presentation, and sets forth the significance of this moment in itself and in view of developments which are impending. This he does, according to older custom, partly by discourse put into the hero's mouth and partly by the employment of allegorical imagery. It is evident, at a glance, says Pfeiderer, that we do not have to do here with real history, but with religious ideas clothed in the form of apocalyptic vision and Old Testament myth. As the Galilean ministry opened with such an idealistic presentation, in like manner it closes with this account of the transfiguration.

The elements employed by the evangelist can be quite fully indicated. The fundamental motive, underlying all, is the dogmatic idea of Paul set forth in Second Corinthians 3 : 1 to 4 : 6. The glory shining from the face of Moses on Sinai

¹ *Com.*, ad loc.

² *Das Urchristenthum*, u. s. w., S. 387 ff.

was only a transient manifestation, while the risen Lord, who is spirit, is the abiding revelation of this glory. The transfiguration scene sets forth by way of anticipation the glorification of the risen spiritual Christ and his exaltation above Moses and the prophets. The individual features in this representation are derived from the Old Testament legend of Moses' transfiguration on Mount Sinai (Exod. 24). The three intimates who join in the ascent, the six days, the reflected heavenly glory, the scene at the foot of the mountain, when they descend, standing in contrast to what has just happened, all suggest at once the relationship. This heavenly form of light is the one in which Christ appeared as the risen one, and is also that into which his followers will be transformed. As in Enoch, God's garment is brighter than sun or snow, so here the raiment of Jesus surpasses in its brilliant whiteness the work of any fuller on earth. Moses and Elijah appearing as representatives of the old covenant, witness to Jesus' exaltation to lordship of the new and bring their homage, as the firstfruits of the Old Testament congregation (Gottesgemeinde). Peter, misunderstanding this, thinks it means that henceforth Law and Prophets and Gospel shall dwell together. This seems to him a beautiful union of the old and new covenants and the ideal for Christian life, as it probably really did to the historical Peter and to the Jewish-Christian community. To the writer of the gospel, who was imbued with Pauline thought, this view seemed to rest on defective knowledge which sprang from a timid faint-heartedness (*ängstlichem Kleinmuth*), just as Peter's conduct appeared to Paul in Antioch in this same light. This explains his use of *ἔκφοβοι ἐγένοντο*, which, taken literally in the context, involves a strange contradiction. In opposition to such a conception, the truth of the gospel is declared to the disciples by the heavenly voice, "*This one*, i. e., Jesus and *only he*, is my beloved son — hear ye *him*." This declaration repeats once more that given at the baptism, with the added admonition to recognize him henceforth as the only authority for the new church (Gottesgemeinde). That even

the highest authorities of the old covenant must give way before him is then set forth (*veranschaulicht*) by the sudden vanishing of Moses and Elijah, so that the disciples who sought to assure an abiding union of these witnesses with Jesus find themselves suddenly alone with him. How, asks Pfeleiderer, can one symbolize more clearly the thought of Second Corinthians, that the majesty of the old covenant vanishes before the abiding majesty of Christ, as the Lord who is the Spirit? The evangelist, by his record of the injunction of Jesus to tell no man what they had seen till the Son of Man be risen from the dead, together with the added statement that they did as commanded, and continued to wonder what the rising from the dead should mean, makes it sufficiently intelligible that what he here intended to relate is not a real incident in the earthly life of Jesus, but a pictorial representation, anticipating that transfiguration of Jesus into the spiritual Son of God and Lord of the Church (*Gemeinde*) which resulted after his resurrection and from the increased apprehension of the significance of his death and resurrection. And this again is but another formulation of the Pauline view, Second Corinthians 5 : 16 f., "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more." There is, then, no doubt that in the account of the transfiguration we have an allegorical fiction (*Dichtung*) of the evangelist which is calculated to set forth Pauline conceptions in imagery borrowed from sacred tradition. This meaning of the narrative stands out in full clearness only in Mark, who is its author. The other accounts introduce foreign elements and show that the original meaning was no longer understood.

The question about Elijah probably had to do with a dispute between the oldest communion and its Jewish opponents and is introduced here by Mark because he has just spoken of an appearance of Elijah.

When we consider Pfeleiderer's view and examine the account in Mark in the light of Exodus 24 and 34, we find that the points of affinity are not so striking as those of differ-

ence. Three special companions are there named, to be sure, but with them are also the seventy elders. And, finally, it is Moses who goes alone up into the mount. It was when he came down from the mountain, according to the account of Exodus 34, that the skin of his face shone. These details are not very suggestive, for a much better explanation of the three companions is found in Mark 5 : 37 and 14 : 33. They constitute an inner circle, which shares the privacy of these most sacred of Jesus' experiences. The radiance finds a parallel in many accounts of divine manifestations given in the biblical and apocryphal writings. It should be noticed that Mark uses a very different word in his description (*μεταμορφοῦν*) from that appearing in the LXX translation of Exodus 34 (*δοξάζεσθαι*). Further, had the writer aimed to give the representation of such glory as was reflected in the face of Moses, he would most naturally have formulated his description more nearly like his model. Especially would the glory be expected to be of greater continuance and magnificence. Strauss cites¹ a passage from a late Jewish writing which alludes to Moses' glory, and says that Jesus must have shone from the one extremity of the world to the other. Since he was not endowed with brightness of any kind, but altogether like other men, it is clear we are not to believe in him. In his *Popular Life of Jesus* Strauss introduced this citation into the body of his work and makes it the starting-point for the explanation of the origin of the transfiguration myth.²

To this proposition it can be answered that the details in the gospels show no evidence of such a purpose. It is only when we consider the description of Yahwè's descent in the cloud and the appearance of his glory on the mountain, together with his calling from out the midst of the cloud that we seem to meet with details that have noticeably influenced Mark's portrayal. And it is probable that they did so, but this can be readily understood in view of the use by

¹ *Leben Jesu*, 1840, 4. Aufl., II. S. 256 (English, p. 613).

² *Das Leben Jesu, für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864, S. 516 f.

New Testament writers of Old Testament conceptions and imagery. The descriptions of the later theophony are naturally conformed to these existing models. In the present account this is doubtless the case, but at the same time there are enough peculiar features to attest its individuality and show that it is not a mere mechanical reproduction without further content. The narrative of Mark, being, as it is according to Pfeiderer, the original, does not bear the traces of such a manufactured product. It has too many difficulties and obscurities. It furthermore still remains to make clear the presence of an adequate motive to explain the composition of such an account. If one could succeed measurably in this he must meet the great objection, no more lightly to be overcome here than elsewhere, that such a pure fiction could not be passed off and accepted at such an early date.

6. *Oscar Holtzmann's Theory*

Since this paper was begun, the *Leben Jesu*¹ of Oscar Holtzmann has appeared, and we may well add his view to those already mentioned. He thinks that the understanding of the transfiguration can be best attained by approaching it from the conversation occurring on the way down the mountain. He compares Jesus' prohibition at that time with the similar one after the confession of Peter, and also the mention in both instances of impending suffering and rejection, as if, he thinks, for the first time. There is a further resemblance in the location of the two incidents in the mountains of the region of Baniyas (Paneas). Furthermore, Jesus, through his words confirming Peter's confession, was undoubtedly elevated in the eyes of the apostles to a luminous height and close to the greatest men of the past. From this time forward they recognized in him the Son of God, whose word must be heeded. All these are points of resemblance so marked that they make the experience at Peter's

¹ Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901, S. 267 ff.

confession to be duplicated in the incident of the transfiguration.¹ The latter cannot occupy an independent position alongside of the former in the life of Jesus, but must be taken rather as a companion piece portraying the same event from a subjective point of view. It represents what was experienced inwardly by the disciples, or some one of them, possibly Peter, while the outward incidents were taking place, as described in the narrative of Peter's confession. Rejecting the conception that the disciples could have thought Elijah's appearance a fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi, he says it is not easy to see what their question had to do with the transfiguration, but, put after the Messianic confession, it is a trustworthy historical reminiscence of a question of one of the disciples who had evidently previously taken Jesus for Elijah. As for the exact designation of time with which all the accounts open and which seems to point to a subsequent independent event, he says that in the case of Luke, anyway, and also, probably, in the parallels, this has reference to the reading of the section of the gospels containing the transfiguration for the lesson of the Sunday following that on which Peter's confession was the regular pericope. As an example of a like instance in the gospels he cites John 20 : 26. That such a highly organized scheme of church service could not have existed when Mark was written he thinks is not shown by any extant evidence. According to this view of the relationship, it appears that Peter's confession took place during a conversation between Jesus and the three intimates.

Holtzmann's mode of interpretation, we thus see, is allied to the visionary hypothesis, in holding to a subjective experience. There is also an element of the allegorical conception in the interpretation of some details. The main support for his position is found, not so much in the resemblance of the accounts themselves, as in that of the conversations which immediately follow in both cases. But such similarity

¹ This position agrees strikingly with that of Professor Bacon in the article previously referred to.

does not suffice for the purpose. It is, in the first place, too general, and, secondly, that which does actually appear can be adequately accounted for by the great theme of reflection and conversation during these momentous days. Jesus' prohibitions would simply attest an underlying purpose which remains unchanged. The explanation offered of the explicit dating of the incident will hardly commend itself, until proof is forthcoming of such a highly developed order of Sunday service at this early date. As for the identification of the geographical situations, these are expressly contrasted. In the first instance they were proceeding on the way, and in the second they had drawn aside from this and were on a high mountain. So also the persons are carefully distinguished in the second scene, as being different from the preceding grouping. And, over and above these and like differences which might be pointed out, is the difference in detail and content in the main accounts. The importance given to Moses and Elijah in the transfiguration cannot be even remotely traced in the confession of Peter. In other respects, also, the details are outwardly so unlike and of such different import as to preclude the idea of identification or intimate relationship. Jesus is undoubtedly a central figure in both instances, but this does not seem at all striking. If, as Holtzmann suggests, it is possibly Peter's inward experience which has been handed down to us, and he was the authority for Mark's narrative, then it is hard to believe that the evangelist was in doubt as to the true relationship of the events, and that he could have failed to make this intelligible in his report.

III

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE
TRANSFIGURATION1. *The Meaning and Importance of the Appearing of Moses
and Elijah*

IN seeking to interpret the meaning of the transfiguration we must turn, first of all, it seems to me, to the narrative itself and ask what is to be considered the feature of central importance. With all their points of difference, the evangelists seem to agree in making this the appearance and conversation of Moses and Elijah. For it is not so much set forth that Jesus was transfigured, as that while in this state these men appeared and talked with him, and the heavenly voice (Bath-Qol) connected with their departure is linked by the ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ with the appearance of Moses. These words contain that which is new in what is otherwise a reproduction of the message given at the baptism. What, then, can the coming and conversation of these men, thus associated, mean? According to New Testament usage, when Moses speaks, it is the voice of law which is heard. His name is often connected with its commands and testimonies.¹ Sometimes the word book or law appears also, while at others we have simply "Moses commanded" or "Moses said." We can hardly think of him in any capacity other than that of promulgator and representative of Old Testament legislation.

The presence of Elijah, however, leads us to think most naturally of the prophecy of Malachi and the widespread ex-

¹ Cf., e. g., Mark 1: 44; 7: 10; 10: 3, 4; 12: 19, 26 and parallels.

pectation of his work of restoration as messianic forerunner. This is suggested in the later inquiry of the disciples. But we have already seen that almost without exception expositors have found it difficult to explain the relation of this reference to the preceding appearance. It has been forgotten that Elijah had another significance for later Judaism. He was before all others *the* prophet in Jewish tradition.¹ And not without reason, for he appears in Biblical history as the first great prophetic leader. The Old Testament narratives show that he was early given an exalted place in the national history. It was but natural that he should come to stand as the inaugurator and typical representative of the grand prophetic succession that never ceased to voice the demands of a jealous God.

The companionship of Moses and Elijah, striking as it is, is not an unnatural one. We find their names often linked together in Jewish tradition. The likeness of certain of their experiences was wont to be pointed out. Various localities became celebrated by reason of their presence. Both had been rapt away from the world of mortals in such a mysterious manner that Moses, as well as Elijah, was by some thought of as not having tasted death.² One was venerated as the giver of the law, and the other as its restorer.³ If they came to talk with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration it seems but natural, under these circumstances, to think that they would bring to him the message of the Law and the Prophets. If Moses was to undertake this mission for the law, who more appropriately than Elijah could be his companion and render a like service for prophecy? These two, together, would then represent the body of Old Testament writings elsewhere spoken of as the Law and Prophets.⁴

¹ Cf. *Wisdom of Jesus Sir.*, 48: 1 ff.

² Cf. Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, p. 208.

³ For this rabbinical reference and others dealing with their relationship, cf. Wetstein, *N. T. Com.*, p. 436. Cf. further, *Esth. rab.*, 3, 9.

⁴ Cf. Luke 16: 29: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." Acts 26: 22: "Saying nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come."

The only other way in which we could seek to find some special meaning in their presence would be to take our starting-point from the office of messianic herald or witness, so prevalingly connected with Elijah. But in nearly all the earliest Jewish and Christian references he is alone in this work.¹ So far we know of nothing pointing to a contrary tradition in pre-Christian Judaism.² There is, however, later on in Fourth Ezra (6 : 26), evidence of a Jewish tradition that all the illustrious heroes of old, who had been translated and had not tasted death from the time of their birth, would appear³ at the end of the world. Then the hearts of the dwellers of earth would be changed and receive a new spirit. It is perhaps just to infer from the juxtaposition of these statements that the writer thought the change of heart was to result from the preaching of these men who would appear as witnesses.⁴ We also find it affirmed repeatedly in the Apocalypse of Baruch⁵ that Baruch (and perhaps others also [?], 13 : 5 ; 24 : 2 ; 25 : 1) was to be preserved to the consummation of the times that he might be for a testimony. As evidence that Moses in particular was to be associated with Elijah we have, so far as I am aware, only a late rabbinical reference of doubtful interpretation⁶ and the passage in Revelation 11 : 3 ff. For the two witnesses, who are here spoken of as standing before the Lord, would seem, from the power assigned to them (v. 6 f.), to be Elijah and Moses. In spite, however,

¹ Cf. Bousset, *Offenbarung*, S. 375, and *The Antichrist Legend*, pp. 207 and 210. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, 3. Aufl., II. S. 524 ff.

² Just what Bousset means (*Offenbarung*, S. 375 f.) by saying the idea of the return of Moses is found (findet sich) in John 1 : 21 ; 6 : 14 ; 7 : 40, etc., I do not understand.

³ Probably אֱלֹהִים. Cf. Gunkel in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, II. S. 366 an. h.

⁴ So Gunkel, loc. cit.

⁵ 13 : 3 ; 25 : 1 ; 76 : 2 ; and cf. 43 : 2 ; 46 : 7 ; 48 : 30. For references to the translation of Elijah, Enoch, Moses and Ezra, v. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (1896), p. 73, note to v. 7.

⁶ *Deut. rab.*, 3, near the close. This saying is assigned to R. Jochanan, who belongs to the last third of the first century.

of the clear allusion to the Egyptian plagues, early Christian interpretation made Enoch to be here the companion of Elijah.¹ Bousset, who has given much attention to the early traditions, is at a loss for an explanation of the origin of the idea of the two witnesses. It cannot, he thinks, in any case have emanated from a Jewish source.² In the course of his remarks he refers to the account of the transfiguration as a passage where the idea is already present. He does not enter upon a discussion of its significance, but apparently thinks it has come in from some non-Jewish source, or from an account influenced by such a source.³ Without adequate proof, however, we are not warranted in assuming such an influence here in the Gospels whose earlier presence is nowhere apparent. Furthermore, an examination of the time and circumstances, when these men appear, and the office assigned to them shows the parallelism to the passage in Revelation is more apparent than real. All the weight of tradition is against such an identification of the conceptions. Finally, and most convincingly of all, if the disciples had regarded Moses in such a light, they must have mentioned him together with Elijah in their question.⁴

Assuming now that it is as representatives of the law and of prophecy that Moses and Elijah appear, what does it mean when it is merely said that they were talking with him? To understand this we have to remember *when* it was that they were doing this. It was six days after Jesus had welcomed the declaration of Peter and for the first time plainly pointed out the rejection and suffering which was soon to be his lot. The narrative gives us the impression that after that time this subject was uppermost in the minds of Master and disciples. How the intervening days were spent, and what other experiences came to them, we are not told, but are left

¹ Bousset, *Offenbarung*, S. 376; *Antichrist Legend*, p. 203 f.

² *Antichrist Legend*, p. 210. This seems to be a conjecture of doubtful value in view of the above passages from *Baruch* and *Fourth Ezra*, to which Bousset makes no reference.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 207.

⁴ This of course presupposes that Mark 9 : 13 continues the previous narrative.

to infer that this same strange theme was still filling their thoughts six days later, when Moses and Elijah appeared. Thus the context seems to indicate that these, too, came to take part in its consideration, bringing that which was appropriate from out the law and out of prophecy. This was evidently the understanding of the third evangelist when he adds: "They were telling him of his exodus which he was about to fulfil in Jerusalem" (9 : 31). In the other gospels the mention of the mere fact that they were talking with Jesus is apparently felt to be enough. This was what was significant in the scene. It was not so much what they said as that they spoke at all to one who saw such a future opening before him.

Omitting for the time all other details, we find, then, that what is primarily set forth in the transfiguration is the sanction given to Jesus by the Law and the Prophets in this dark and threatening hour of his ministry. This is the meaning of the approval of Moses and Elijah, shown by the fact of their conversation with Jesus.

The first impression may not unnaturally be that such an interpretation is entirely inadequate for an incident to which so much prominence is given in the gospel history. Many expositors have always been ready to assume without question this much as incidental, before setting out to find the real meaning. But to find too many meanings is often to find no meaning at all. We shall be better prepared to estimate the importance which this interpretation really gives to the transfiguration, if we review the historical setting in which it appears.

2. *The Events of the Period Reviewed*

Our synoptic narratives are quite closely parallel in their presentation of the events of this northern sojourn. Whatever uncertainty there may be elsewhere as to the arrangement and sequence of details in the life of Jesus, these writings have made the place of this incident of Cæsarea

Philippi so clear, that there is universal agreement in understanding their testimony. It is also as generally recognized that this period marks a culminating point in the lives of both Master and disciples. That Jesus should withdraw from Galilee was inevitable. He did not go forth until the growing opposition and hostility made all further open activity an impossibility. To have remained longer would have been to invite destruction. Since the feeding of the multitude popular enthusiasm ceased to offer the requisite protection. A crisis was at hand which could not be longer deferred. As often before, so now especially, it would seem that Jesus felt the need of retirement for communion with the Father. He turns northward with the few companions who still recognize in him their master. Where else could he turn, when in his own nation he was everywhere met with this opposition of indifference and open hostility? But not only did he seek retirement for himself, but more especially for this little company that still clung to him. How had all the recent experiences affected them? Other men had heard of his fame, felt the power of his presence, wondered at his strange teaching, and been led by all this to think of John the Baptist come again in other form, of Elijah appearing as the promised herald of the messianic age, or of the prophet so long expected, and that was all. And what did these think who had been so closely connected with his work and ministry? "But who say *ye* that I am?" Peter answereth and saith unto him: "Thou art the Messiah." We do not wonder at the exultation on the part of Jesus, called forth by this rejoinder. For what did this simple answer mean? It meant that one, at least, had so far entered into the secret of Jesus' life and been so mastered by it that the present apparent contradiction in outward circumstances did not shake his confidence. He felt that the promised one was present in that familiar form before him. He saw the truth, and yet not altogether. He so far comprehended it that apparent failure in the present did not make him doubt, but from what follows we see that he had

reached only a partial comprehension. In his conception the future must be glorious still. Just how he thought the Master was to consummate his kingdom, or in what way he conceived of it as dependent on his will, is not apparent, but there is nothing to suggest that the usual messianic picture of his contemporaries had been essentially modified. The nature of the kingdom and the office of its King was doubtless thought of in no new way. He was still far from ready to enter into the real mind of the Master. And Jesus, while welcoming the divinely-sent insight set forth in his confession, was no doubt conscious of this. He proceeds forthwith to point out that the immediate future would bring to light a side of his messianic office which Peter had not at all anticipated. Jesus could now do this for the first time with the hope of being properly understood. Peter and those of his companions who were like-minded were now ready for further instruction and must receive it. They must come to face the problem which rose within Jesus' own mind and had been engaging him during all this period. As he had watched the growing opposition, more and more openly expressed, the possibility of his final rejection and violent death had become clearer every day. And now at last there was no longer room to hope that the message of love which he proclaimed would gain entrance into the hearts of any considerable number of his nation. Remaining here in the North, away from the centres of his teaching, he was virtually in exile. He could not continue in this remote district. To do this, or turn anywhere outside to the Gentiles or to the Jews of the dispersion, would mean the confession of failure and mistake, the giving up of the earthly mission which the Father had intrusted to him. To go away was manifestly impossible. Nothing remained but to return and face the issue among his own people, in their own land and in its most influential centre. Some such formulation as this seems demanded for the problem which pressed itself in upon his consciousness, and in some such way as this it had apparently found its solution. Dark as the present seemed, it

was not without its brightness. His labor had not been in vain. Peter's confession was an outward attestation that the Father's will was being done. That these, to whom had been revealed so much that was hidden from others, might share and understand his further mission, was a prospect which must have brought joy and gladness. The time had come to point out to them why the only way remaining was to return and labor where love called, and meet the inevitable issue. What this would be he could not doubt. "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected." Peter was utterly unprepared for any such words as these. They did not at all fit into his conception of what the future must be. Nor is this strange, for until that day the thought of the possible suffering and death of the Messiah had apparently never entered his mind. It may seem strange that, regarding Jesus as he now did, he so utterly failed to perceive the teaching of the events of the previous ministry. Possibly he had never once imagined that these could influence the manner of the coming of the kingdom, or indicate what the immediate future had in store. He was too near the events themselves to understand their significance. He could but faintly realize the meaning of that great fact which had recently found lodgment in his mind. Long before he had recognized in Jesus the Christ he had possessed clearly defined conceptions of the messianic future which he longed to share. It is no wonder, then, that he expostulated and declared that Jesus' foreboding was unthinkable. It was a strange, crushing, bewildering conception, that God's chosen nation, after so many centuries of waiting, should ultimately set at naught and persecute his chosen Messiah. Jesus' answer seems to indicate that latterly there had been waged a struggle in his own mind closely associated with this very thought. Peter's words but reiterated the arguments which, he had come to see, derived their force from the philosophy of the world of darkness. It was this worldly view that dominated his nation and blinded them to his message of

truth and love. How he had struggled against such conceptions, as they had presented themselves in his own thoughts, and as he met them at every turn in the world about him! Did he not number a Zealot among his immediate followers who had perhaps not yet thought of laying aside his sword? No wonder this clinging to outward glory and worldly power was branded as satanic. Continued conflict with such gross and material conceptions had served to show how incompatible they were with the true conception of God's kingdom. It is not strange that Peter's words received an answer weighted with feeling. Of the means employed to unmask this persistent foe and show the real nature of its allurements, we know very little. The context which follows seems to indicate that Jesus spoke to them again of the supreme place of service in a successful life, and of the slight importance of the suffering that this might involve. The sayings here recorded are in part repeated elsewhere.¹ They are possibly to be regarded as topically grouped rather than originally thus connected in the present context, appropriate as they are to the occasion. The allusion to the "multitude with his disciples" (Mark 8 : 34) and to some "of them that stand by" (Mark 9 : 1) suggest a larger audience. We can believe, however, that the evangelists are correct in finding in these verses a theme of the teaching of these days. Knowing so little of the circumstances and immediate surroundings and how their time was spent we can only conjecture what further passed between them. Jesus may have turned the attention of the disciples to the history of the past, especially to that of the centuries just preceding, and pointed out how it taught that the outcome which their hope demanded was not compatible with the plan of God. They had then enjoyed a large measure of the worldly power which they coveted, and what had been the outcome of it all? A deeper degradation, self-achieved. His rebuke to Peter recalls the account of his struggle in the

¹ Matt. 10 : 38 (Luke 14 : 27) ; Matt. 10 : 39 ; Luke 17 : 33 ; John 12 : 25 ; Matt. 10 : 32, 33 (Luke 12 : 8, 9).

desert and it has been shown that it was very probably during this period that he unfolded that chapter of his own experience for their help and instruction.¹ We can think of no other time previously when they were ready to receive such confidences, and it was only from Jesus himself that they could gain a knowledge of these events. He would unfold to them how the great truth, set forth in Peter's confession, had previously come to him and how he had struggled with the problems which this revelation introduced.² All this would be helpful so far as they could understand its import, but it did not meet what was to them no doubt the most serious difficulty of all. Transmitted from the fathers and treasured in every heart were the Old Testament promises which had been woven into that precious picture of the future for which they lived. These promises were God's own message to his afflicted people. They all pointed to a future filled with the glory and successes of the Messiah. With his coming the night of sorrow and affliction would have an end. How then can Jesus accept this confession of Peter and thereby proclaim that God's power is about to be manifested as foretold of old, and then forthwith proceed to picture the future in a way entirely at variance with all that had been promised? In striving to make clear to them the true nature of the abiding kingdom, Jesus could not fail to meet this supreme difficulty. And so there came a day which stood out from all others in this northern sojourn, when, in the mountain solitude, apart from all that could bind their hearts to earth, he unfolded to them the mystery of God's word. He showed to them that along with the promise of the future realization of

¹ Prof. B. W. Bacon, *Am. Jour. of Theol.* II. No. 3, p. 527 ff. Cf. O. Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu*, S. 257 f.

² If it be objected that the later view of Jesus' divinity and the attitude of worship preclude any such confidences, then one can answer that there can never have been anything to indicate human weakness or indeed mere humanity in the life of Jesus. How are we then to account for the allusions in our gospels? It is furthermore coming to be held with growing certainty, as a great fundamental principle, that in being divine Jesus did not cease to be human.

their noblest aspirations there was also shadowed forth the impending suffering of him who should come as the Messiah. Not only was this suffering not inconsistent with his office but absolutely indispensable to its accomplishment. Through the words and experiences of how many of his servants had God set forth this truth! The grandest lives in all their history foreshadowed the suffering of that one for whom the nation waited. We can think that on this day they first began to see the message so plainly written in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, and that found such a wonderful expression in the life of Jeremiah. Then they began to realize that it was not so utterly inconceivable that the Messiah might appear and be set at naught. It was a most important moment when this conception first flashed upon their consciousness, but it could not change at once all those conceptions that generations of teaching and tradition had left behind. Their minds were opened, but not transformed. It needed more than one hour of insight to accomplish this. It was still, however, a day memorable above all others in this period of their experience. They never forgot it, and later history made it stand out in greater glory. They came to understand the comfort and companionship with the saints of old which the Master had known in the hours of seeming humiliation, and how, communing with them, he saw the glorious end. But only experience could make this fully clear to them. For the present there was more of perplexity and uncertainty. Many things needed readjustment.

One of the most unquestioned articles of the national faith had been the teaching regarding the reappearance of that prophet who had vanished in the heavens, to accomplish the work of preparation and restoration. How, then, can it be possible that the Messiah, in fulfilling his very mission, is to be despised of men and suffer at their hands? Have the Scribes been wrong in maintaining so confidently and without contradiction that Elijah must first come? Is the Messiah to appear, after all, unheralded and receive such an ungracious welcome from his nation? Not so! Jesus

answers. One has already come who stands as the noblest in all the prophetic succession. He closed the epoch of the old. If this be true, do you still ask — “How is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at naught?” It is so written because the same is written of his great herald. This one has come and found men unwilling to receive his message and to co-operate in the discharge of his mission. It is their blindness and unreadiness that have made his efforts vain. Instead of heeding him, they have laid violent hold on him and given full play to their carnal impulses. This treatment of the forerunner was but a confirmation of what the future was bound to bring to him whose advent was to follow. To the disciples who asked the question this explanation must have brought a new and strange conception. It might help them to better understand the work and fate of John the Baptist, but with the help there would come further perplexity. It was only the days of sad, discouraging experience, which were to follow, that could make plain the truth that Jesus unfolded to them during these days.

3. *The Relation to Peter's Confession*

If this sketch has correctly interpreted the connection of the few events that are known to us from this period of the northern sojourn, then it is evident that the transfiguration stands in vital relationship to the confession of Peter, and that the testimony of the Law and the Prophets to the truth of Jesus' forecast of the future was of the utmost importance. Other details of less significance dropped out of remembrance, but this episode in the instruction of the disciples was preserved and handed down. The record of Peter's confession, taken alone, is incomplete. Looked at apart, by itself, it is not the significant experience it is sometimes made to be, but rather simply one important moment in this experience, and was so recalled in after years. It imperatively demands the further developments which the narratives in part indicate.

The account of the transfiguration is thus seen to stand in organic connection with what precedes.¹ We fail to understand Peter's words, if our reading and thinking stop with these. They mark without doubt an important epoch, but it is made clear that, after all, Peter had not risen so far above the many who "went back and walked no more with him" (John 6 : 66). His declaration evinces possibly some purification of his messianic hopes and a spiritualizing of them, which had resulted from the days of companionship and patient teaching of his Master. A discouraging present did not shake his confidence, but his vision was by no means clear. Far from reaching the goal, he was only at the point of taking another step and not so ready to do this as his words might seem at first to indicate. His vision of the glorious future was still bright and had no place in it for the darkness of Jerusalem and Calvary. There can be no doubt that Jesus understood the situation and sought by all possible means to lead those on who had followed him so far. He knew that the greatest difficulty lay in the contradiction of what he announced to them to all that they found in the witness of the Law and the Prophets. No one realized this better than he after these months of teaching. Before all else the disciples must come to find this strange message in these writings, even as he had found it there. We must, I think, attach more importance than has been done in the past, to the part that the Old Testament had in developing Jesus' own ideas regarding his suffering. He was made increasingly conscious at every turn that the whole course of his ministry and the outcome which he was now compelled to face contradicted the current expectations which were apparently just deductions from the Old Testament promises. There must be a reconciliation for any devout Jew, and it does not seem too much from such a point of view, if from no other, to assume that Jesus had felt this need. We can-

¹ This is often disputed ; e. g., Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, I. S. 27 "aber in eine eigentlich organische Beziehung zu dem Inhalte dieses Abschnittes sind sie (i. e., 9 : 2-29 and 10 : 1-12) nicht gebracht."

not think that in this respect his experience was so unlike that of his disciples. As reality took shape in his daily life he was led to look deeper, and it can have been no trivial or unimportant matter to discover the witness which was given by these scriptures, where the work of redemption that had been wrought in the past and the promise of that for the future stood recorded. Just when and how Jesus came to perceive their deepest lesson we do not know. He always seemed to read the scriptures in a way very different from that of his contemporaries. On repeated occasions he urged them to turn and read again, while with unanswerable logic he set forth some all-important teaching which their Scribes had thus far overlooked. If we cannot, from the data left to us, fix on the period when he himself came to this understanding of the Law and the Prophets, we can with reasonable certainty determine that in which he first unfolded to the disciples the witness which he found therein. For there must have been a day when first they became aware that a suffering Messiah was not a strange conception, but one long ago foretold, and where in all the gospel history can a time be pointed out more natural for this than the one at which we have arrived? The idea of the impending rejection and being set at naught is expressly stated as coming now as something new and inconceivable. In showing that such was not the case, but must needs be, how could *the* proof, for them, of all others be neglected? That it was not, seems to be unquestionably indicated in the brief narratives which we possess. In the conversation which took place while they descended the mountain there are unmistakable references to Old Testament prophecy. Jesus, in meeting the difficulty which came from the understanding of the words of Malachi, alludes to some previous knowledge on their part of the prophetic announcement of the suffering that was to come to the Messiah — "How is it written with reference to the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at naught?" This implies they had already heard that it was so written, but at the time of Peter's con-

fession this was to them an unheard-of conception. It can then only have been revealed, so far as our narratives show, when they saw Moses and Elijah talking with Jesus. It would further be only after the discussion of such prophecies regarding the Messiah himself that those relating to a like treatment of his forerunner would be naturally introduced. The *γέγραπται* and *καθὼς γέγραπται* (Mark 9 : 12, 13) show that it is the witness of prophecy that is the theme of the hour. Luke previously (9 : 31), in the material peculiar to him, indicates that he thinks this to be the case, by the use of *πληροῦν*. This *terminus technicus* implies that it is in accordance with what had been foretold that Jesus was about to fulfil his exodus. The *ἑξουδενηθῆ* (Mark 9 : 12) suggests to us in view of the later interpretation that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah had been under consideration.

4. *The Importance of the Witness of the Old Testament to the Early Christians*

It might seem to be an unwarranted assumption, which was the product of mere speculation, to insist thus on the central importance of the witness of the Old Testament, if there were no further evidence to sustain the contention. When, however, we recall the many New Testament passages which take up this very question, we feel there is little danger of exaggeration. How often throughout the Gospels, in John as well as elsewhere, in the Acts and in the Epistles, is the witness of the Old Testament adduced as the unanswerable proof for the necessity of Christ's suffering! What an element this same witness is in the preaching of the Apostle to the Gentiles! And it should be noted that he does not introduce it as something new and now for the first time proclaimed, but says — "For I delivered unto you first of all *that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures*" (1 Cor. 15 : 3; cf. Acts 26 : 22; 1 Pet. 1 : 11, etc.).

Nor was it alone for these earlier followers that such wit-

ness was all important, but in the writings which follow the apostolic age we find it again greatly expanded and emphasized. Turn for example to the *Epistle of Barnabas* and read such sections as 6 and 11, or glance through Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*. As we review these writings to-day and go over the familiar records of the gospels, especially Matthew, so knit together with prophecies and interpretations pointing to the suffering and death of Jesus, it is hard to realize there was a time when this was all new. It is, however, becoming each year more certain that there was such a time, and that it belongs to the period of Jesus' ministry. If our deductions are correct, we can go further and say this teaching was first set forth on the Mountain of Transfiguration.

5. *The Jewish Conception of a Suffering Messiah Post-Christian*

Those whose study of Jewish messianic prophecy properly entitles them to speak with authority, agree to-day, almost without exception, that all ideas of a dying or of a suffering Messiah are post-Christian. The opposing view of Wünsche¹ and earlier writers has now few advocates. It is not until the second century after Christ that we find in Jewish writings any express reference to the idea that the Messiah is to be killed or pass through suffering. The fifty-third of Isaiah was not in earlier times understood to refer to him, nor did it ever come to be universally so interpreted. In the Targum of Jonathan we meet the striking anomaly of treating this passage messianically and at the same time dissociating all the sorrow and suffering from the Messiah himself. The presence of a Messiah Ben Joseph or Ben Ephraim whose special office it was to suffer and die seems to fur-

¹ *Die Leiden des Messias*, Leipzig, 1870, per contra v. Dalman, *Der leidende u. der sterbende Messias*, u. s. w., Berlin, 1888 and *Jesaja 53*, u. s. w., Leipzig, 1890; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 2 Auf., S. 144 ff: cf. further Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, u. s. w., 3. Auf., II. S. 553.

nish an indication how impossible it was felt to be to connect such a fate with the mission of the real Messiah Ben David. Just what led to the development of the Jewish tradition of the dying Messiah is not clear. Dalman considers it conceivable that Christian polemic may have induced a deepened apprehension of messianic prophecy on the part of the Jews and led to the postulating of a dying Messiah (Ben Joseph) to take away the force of the Christian interpretation of Zechariah 12 : 10.¹ Proof cannot be adduced to show this, nor can we discover from existing sources whether this whole doctrine of the dying and suffering Messiah is fundamentally of Jewish origin and independent of Christian influence, or whether it sprang originally from an attempt at adjustment to Christian polemic. If this last were true, we could hardly hope to find certain indications of it in the Jewish writers. It is of course true that the *post hoc* has not the force here of the *propter hoc*, but none the less it would be possible to advance several considerations that favor, *a priori*, a partial identification. The whole subject is treated far too sparingly in the sources to admit of any very satisfactory deductions. There is no uniformly attested tradition that can be said to be the property of Judaism as a whole.² In the case of the idea of the dying Messiah which appears earlier and is always kept distinct from the tradition of the Messiah Ben David, there seems to be especial justification in assuming the presence of Christian influence. If, however, it could be shown that such an idea was present much earlier in the minds of some, it would still remain a fact, clearly evidenced by the New Testament writings, that it was utterly strange to the disciples; that apparently, following Mark, who is our only guide in obtaining an historical order, it was first revealed to them here on the mountain side. They could not at once grasp its meaning, but the change began which was in due time so complete that this rock of offence became the corner-

¹ *Der leidende u. sterbende Messias*, S. 21 f.

² Dalman, *loc. cit.*, S. 86 ff.

stone of the Christian church. And so firmly was it laid that the Jews, or at least a considerable number of them, although not convinced, confessed by their changed interpretations the error of their long cherished exegesis and their failure to read aright the Law and the Prophets. And thus, independently of what it meant to Jesus and the disciples, that hour in the northern sojourn may possibly be further significant in marking what fell little short of being a revolution in a nation's thought.

6. *The Details of the Gospel Narratives*

We have given our whole attention thus far to what seems to be the central theme of the transfiguration and have striven to set forth its importance. What now of the details? It does not seem reasonable, in view of our present knowledge, to hope for an adequate explanation of many of them. We cannot consistently employ a method here which we have agreed to abandon in the case of the narratives of the baptism and the temptation. These accounts especially, and also such passages as Luke 10 : 18, where Jesus cries out in his exultation, "I beheld Satan falling as lightning from heaven," together with the many other descriptions of like nature in the New Testament and the Jewish-Palestinian literature, prepare us to find experiences of real life set forth in oriental imagery. And we cannot all agree, with Strauss, that one is bound to choose between the grossest literalism and the mythical point of view. Rather, the more one studies these early writings, the more evident it becomes that such an experience as we find set forth in our passage, must be clothed in some such literary form. The writers never analyze their experiences in a philosophical manner, but set them forth descriptively. And there is no reason to doubt that this was done in oral communications dealing with kindred themes. In the present instance it has been so deftly done that we can but admire the insight which is revealed. How far the setting may be due to the actual experience and

to the circumstances of the occasion we have no means of judging, and shall probably do best to refrain from the tempting speculation which is invited. Another thing that experience has taught us is, that one often goes far astray, if he seeks his key to the understanding of a representation in the *literary* connections of descriptive details. More is demanded of an interpreter than to merely point out the use of Old Testament or apocalyptic words and imagery. We are guarded in a measure from such an error in the case of the transfiguration by the possession of a threefold narrative. We can trace the modification of details, to some extent, that came with a changed emphasis of interpretation. It is probable that such an influence had been at work before we can trace its presence. At the time when the gospels were written the importance of what we have considered the central teaching of the transfiguration was not so unique as it had been at first. A partial adjustment of Jewish opposition would follow, when the principle was once recognized. There were now objections to the resurrection and the *parousia* which must be also met. It is possible the author of the second gospel found in the transfiguration an attestation of the promise of Jesus' coming which is recorded in the verse immediately preceding his narrative of this event, and that this influenced the description which he gives of Jesus' appearance in glory. We have left to us in the gospel history only this one picture of a glorification of Jesus, and consequently it was but natural that later teachers should make use of it in discussing the resurrection and second coming. We know of at least one instance where this was very early done, that is in the section of Second Peter, which we have previously considered. The writer expressly announces it as his aim to show the certainty of Christ's future coming. He has in mind those doubters who ask incredulously, "Where is the promise of his coming?" (3 : 3) In his answer he cites the transfiguration, as offering a guarantee for the fulfilment of this promise. In doing this he recapitulates those features which are important for his pur-

pose, and omits the others as irrelevant. This explains why he makes no mention of Moses and Elijah. It is the procedure of the advocate, rather than that of the historian, and as such is perfectly comprehensible.

7. *Possible Objections Considered*

As an objection to the view we have presented it may be said that it is improbable that Elijah would be thought of in two such different offices in the same immediate context. These offices are, however, both natural to him and, as they are introduced, their association does not seem strange. It must also be borne in mind how difficult it has been found, almost without exception, to find a possible bond of connection between the disciples' question and the preceding appearance on any other basis of interpretation. Usually the question is regarded as historical, to the prejudice of what precedes. How, it is said, could the disciples ask about Elijah's coming, if they had just seen him? Or the *πρώτον* is made to express their wonder that he has come so late, after the Messiah has already appeared. But surely the disciples can be credited with enough sound understanding to distinguish between the momentary appearance of a shadowy form and the continued historical presence of the Restorer of all things which the prophecy of Malachi was understood to demand. A mere vision or phantom could be associated with little preparatory work.

Sometimes it is said that the account was composed to prove to Jewish objectors that Elijah had come as predicted. If this be so, it was certainly a very poor success, for there is no indication that the disciples, their opponents, or any one else, except the expositors, thought of this event as the expected coming of Elijah. Rather in the New Testament and early Church Fathers we have seen the opinion is that the prophecy was fulfilled in John the Baptist,¹ or was

¹ Beside references given above, cf. Luke 1:17.

still to be fulfilled before the *parousia*, or both (cf. Matt. 17 : 10, 11).

If again we should look on Moses and Elijah as standing for the two witnesses of the Apocalypse, it is just as difficult to find any reason for their introduction. What would their appearing mean to the writer or to the readers? How could it be related to the following question? In the view we have suggested, the inquiry springs from their perplexity as to how it can be written, regarding the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things and be set at naught, when there is also the promise of the Restorer. The *πρῶτον* thereby gets its due recognition, and the words thus interpreted are not difficult, but the natural outcome of the consideration of the preceding topic.

8. *Conclusion* ¹

Looking at the transfiguration as we have interpreted it, we find it has its place in the course of real history, and that the history of a most important period. We are here in the domain of fact and not in that of the imagination. And if this be so, we can ill afford to lose this account from our records, or relegate it to the realm of post-Christian myth. It has been seen that it does not at all correspond to the kind of product that any such hypothesis demands. Some such experience as we have found narrated here is not only possible, but is demanded by the change that takes place in the conceptions of the disciples. The earliest apologists of the Christian faith appearing in the New Testament history are ready to meet their opponents with arguments that shortly before were incomprehensible to the defenders themselves. The transfiguration is thus found to be primarily significant in marking the time and the experience when this new conception first gained lodgment in their minds. The meaning was gradually apprehended, until these early disciples were able to stand forth and show the scriptural warrant for their faith in their risen Lord. Viewed from another side it would be possible to develop more at length, along lines suggested

in sketching the history of the period, how the transfiguration is incidentally of great importance in helping to an understanding of the consciousness of Jesus. As an experience in this period of struggle and temptation, it shows us one of the sources from which help and comfort came to him. It was not the prospect of the suffering and death that would be terrible and occasion the evident anguish, but to stand thus, contradicting all the national belief in God and his relationship to his chosen people, to stand at seeming variance with the most treasured messianic promises and yet be conscious of the holy office entrusted to him, this was a temptation hard to meet, when a knowledge of men's need and of the hardness of their hearts but intensified that yearning love that felt no sacrifice too great to bring them succor. In these mighty temptations of love Jesus found help in the message of the Law and the Prophets, where his deep insight showed him the truth that not as a king welcomed and honored, but only as a despised and suffering prophet, could he bring this succor to his people.

STEPHEN'S SPEECH:

ITS ARGUMENT AND DOCTRINAL
RELATIONSHIP

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, LITT.D., D.D.

BUCKINGHAM PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND
INTERPRETATION

STEPHEN'S SPEECH:

ITS ARGUMENT AND DOCTRINAL RELATIONSHIP

I

RELATION OF THE SPEECH TO ITS NARRATIVE SETTING

EVERY careful reader is impressed with the fact that Stephen's speech (Acts 7 : 1-56) is but imperfectly adapted to the situation the author of Acts makes it fill.¹ We expect the accused to make more than a latent and indirect reply to the two items of the indictment against him. We do not expect him to indulge in a general review of the history of Israel: The story begins as a formal trial before the stately Sanhedrin. It ends with a scene of mob violence. Later on, in 22 : 20, and 26 : 10, words placed in the mouth of Paul (ἐψήφισα) suggest something more like orderly procedure, and in a single clause at the end of the story (7 : 58^b), the witnesses of 6 : 13 momentarily reappear. But this clause itself is introduced in the language of 22 : 20 and in a manner so awkward as to suggest interpolation even to Blass.² Were we to omit here a clause or two (v. 58, 8 : 1^{aa}, 3), which, as Blass's comment suggests, serve to connect Paul

¹ Cf. Meyer's *Commentary*, and Spitta, *Acta*, p. 105, citing Calvin: "Stephani responsio prima specie absurda et inepta videri posset," and adding similar observations from Baur, Nitzsch, De Wette and Overbeck.

² Ceterum haec καὶ οἱ — Σάβλου satis apparet ab auctore ipso, Pauli comite, narratione inserta esse; post quae, ex more scriptorum, repetitio fit priorum: 59 καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν. *Commentarium*, ad loc. See also my *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 211 ff.

with the story, and which seem to be connected with 22 : 4 f., 20, the impression produced would be quite contrary to the historical setting created by 6 : 11 to 7 : 1. We should conceive no longer the *Beth Din*, with its necessary respect for at least the forms of orderly procedure (cf. 4 : 5-21; 5 : 26-40), but "the synagogue of the Alexandrians" or some popular assembly provoked to violence by Stephen's harangue.¹ Such a scene, in fact, as we derive from Hegesippus (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, II. 23) and Clement of Alexandria (*Hypot.* VI. ap. Eus., *H. E.*, II. 1) for the death of James, the Lord's brother.² In fact, Hegesippus in this account employs many traits clearly connected with the Lucan writings, though he does not of course derive them thence. Of these are the public harangue "to Jews and Greeks" at the challenge of "the Jews and scribes and pharisees" made from the "pinnacle of the temple;"³ the exclamation "Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus, the Son of Man? He himself sitteth at the right hand of the great Power, and is about to come upon the clouds of heaven;" the stoning, and the prayer of the martyr, who "turned and knelt down and said, I entreat thee, Lord God our Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."⁴

¹ For the documentary analysis of Acts 6 to 8 see especially the article by Hilgenfeld, *Z. W. Th.*, 1895, p. 411, and the authorities there referred to. Hilgenfeld attributes vv. 55, 56, along with 58^b, 59; 8 : 1 (first and last clauses) and 3, to R, on the ground that 7 : 57 connects directly with v. 54 as its motive. With 55, 56, 59, 60 we may compare Luke 22 : 69, 23 : 46, 34^a (β text). For Spitta's view, and the synagogue of the Alexandrians as the real scene, see below.

² It is curious to observe how the account of the martyrdom of James in Josephus (*Ant.* XX. 9, 1) presents the same contrast of judicial procedure vs. mob violence, as the two elements of Acts 6-7.

³ Τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ (v. l. ἱεροῦ). Perhaps an assimilation to Luke 4 : 9 = Matt. 4 : 6 from ἀναβαθμούς. See the note below.

⁴ The later texts in inserting this prayer in Luke 24 : 24^a are probably undoing the work of the Autor ad Theophilum, who will have struck it out from the source he followed because of the duplication in Acts 7 : 60. Scribes acquainted with the precanonical form of the story replaced it, as in the Ferrariani they have replaced the Pericope Adulterae (rightly discerned by Blass to be "Lucan," i. e., akin to the material of our Luke, cf., e. g., Luke 7 : 36-50) after Luke 21 : 38, but without cancelling verses 37, 38, which were apparently written by the Autor ad

This account, while undeniably related to the Lucan narrative, is obviously not derived from it. On the contrary, it has a connection tolerably clear, though indirect, with that of *Clem. Recogn.*, I. 64-70, where, after the apostles have taught that the sacrificial system is done away, and the temple to be destroyed, James, on the proposal of Gamaliel, becomes their spokesman before the whole people on the temple stairs and "brings to light whatever things are in Scripture concerning Christ, showing by most abundant proofs that Jesus is the Christ and that in him are fulfilled all the prophecies which related to his humble (i. e., first) advent." A later hand appends an account of how the multitude, incited by one whom the narrative later reveals to be Saul of Tarsus, raises a tumult, in the midst of which "that enemy" attacked James, threw him headlong from the top of the steps, and left him for dead.¹

Whatever the source of the account of a formal trial of Stephen (Acts 6 : 11-7 : 1, 55, 56, 58^b-8 : 1, first clause), its introduction here cannot be independent of that of the trial of Jesus (Luke 22 : 66-71); for the author of Luke-Acts, in transferring to the pages of his own gospel Mark's narrative of this event, is careful to omit all reference to the "false witnesses," the charge of "blasphemy," even the saying about "destroying the temple and building it in three days." These we find introduced in Acts, together with parallels to Luke 22 : 69; 23 : 34^a (β text), 46, in almost the very lan-

Theophilum as a substitute; cf. John 7 : 53-8 : 2, and see my *Introduction*, p. 220, note 10. Zeller, *Acts*, vol. ii. p. 176, considers these "coincidences [of Acts 7 : 60, etc., with Hegesippus ap. Eus., *H. E.*, II. 23 : 7] scarcely likely to be accidental."

¹ This portion of the *Clem. Recogn.* is probably based upon the Ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου (Lightfoot, *Gal.* 10, III. pp. 330, 359) mentioned by Epiphanius (XXX, 16) as in circulation among the Ebionites. According to Hilgenfeld these chapters (I. 27-72) of *Clem. Recogn.* were taken from the *Kerygma Petri* (see *Clem. Recogn.*, III. 75). Both may be true, the *Kerygma* being inclusive of the *Anabathmoi*. For the (Seven) steps in the temple (*ἀναβαθμοί*), from the top of which James addresses the people and down which he is thrown, see Acts 12 : 10 (β text) and 22 : 35. Whether this and the *περὺγιον τοῦ ναοῦ* (v. 1. *ἱεροῦ*) refer to the same spot in the temple we do not know. On the *περὺγιον* see Zahn, *Forschungen*, Teil VI. p. 233.

guage of Mark. To regard this as accidental is inadmissible. The omissions of Luke 22 : 66-71 may be regarded as due to conflict of another source with Mark, or it may be supposed, though less probably, that R of his own motion preferred to attach these traits to the martyrdom of Stephen. Their omission in the gospel *must* be connected with their appearance here.¹ Their appearance in the post-canonical sources in connection with the martyrdom of *James* favors the view that R found them in a second narrative, perhaps even twice employed, once in connection with the passion of Jesus,² and a second time in the martyrdom of Stephen or some other apostolic "witness."

Again in 6 : 1-3 the Autor ad Theophilum³ is distinguishable from the source he employs by the fact that he treats (in the β text designates) the seven appointees of the church as mere *διάκονοι*, whereas the story of their career itself reveals the fact that in it they were really *evangelists*, this title being expressly applied to Philip in 21 : 8, and by implication to the rest of "the seven." Their Greek names, so constant an occasion for comment by interpreters, and the particular local association of Nicholas with Antioch, the first great Gentile Christian church (*Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχέα*, cf. 11 : 19-21), with the clear connection between 8 : 4 and 11 : 19, indicate that the source attributed the earliest evangelization of the Greek communities in Africa (? cf. 8 : 27), southern and northern Syria to these Hellenists and those who with

¹ It is characteristic of the Lucan method not (intentionally) to repeat, but to omit in one place what is reserved for another; cf. Luke, 1 : 17 with Mark, 9 : 12 f. and parallels; Luke 4 : 16 ff. with Mark 6 : 16 and 11 : 11; Luke 5 : 3 with Mark 4 : 1 and 11 : 11; Luke 7 : 36-50 with Mark 14 : 3-9 and 11 : 11; Acts 1 : 7 with Mark 13 : 32, etc.

² This would account for the introduction of the prayer in Luke 23 : 34* by later "Western" scribes.

³ We thus designate the final compiler of the two Lucan "treatises" not as necessarily accepting the view of Hilgenfeld, author of the designation, but to avoid the commonly assumed identity of Luke, author of one of the sources of Acts with the Redactor (R) who is probably the author of the dedication to Theophilus. As to the relation of the Lucan R to his sources, see my *Introduction*, pp. 218 ff.

them "were scattered abroad by the persecution which arose about Stephen." In fact the story of Stephen and Philip shows a constant tendency to run away from the *Autor ad Theophilum*, treading upon the heels of his subsequent narrative, which more decorously allows the *apostles* to supervise, if not originate, the extension of the gospel to Samaritans and heathen (cf. 1 : 8). We have thus a constant prolepsis in his account of the process, followed each time by qualifying redactional supplements: 1. Evangelization of the Samaritans, 8 : 5-8 (cf. the Petrine version in 8 : 14 ff.); 2. First Gentile convert, 8 : 26-39 (Petrine version, 10 : 1-11 : 18; Petro-Pauline in 13 : 1 ff.); 3. Founding of the earliest Gentile churches of southern Syria (the Philistine cities and Cæsarea), 8 : 40 (Petrine version, 9 : 32-11 : 2 [β text]); 4. Northern Syria (Antioch), 11 : 19-21 (Petrine version represented by the correction, in v. 20, of "Ἑλληνας to 'Ἑλληνίστας,¹ and by vv. 22 ff.; cf. 8 : 14 ff.). R reduces these "evangelists" to the rank of mere administrative officers of the apostolic church, Hebrew *and* Hellenist,² reserving to the apostles, in his division of labor, the functions of "prayer and the ministry of the word." In R's introductory description, accordingly, the apostles are to turn over the "service of tables" to the Seven. In the actual story the Seven, in spite of R's limiting additions, "turn the tables" on the apostles. They "give themselves to the ministry of the word," in particular play the part of ἀπόστολοι³ or missionaries; while the apostles remain in charge at Jerusalem (8 : 1, last clause), and the

¹ The true reading: though the original (i. e., the source employed) so manifestly requires Ἑλληνας that this emendation of some later texts has even been adopted by critical modern editions.

² The β text again shows consciousness that this was not the original sense by representing that the seven were appointed "deacons" of the Hellenists, as against certain previously appointed deacons of the Hebrews.

³ The reservation of the term to the Twelve belongs to the later ecclesiasticism. Outside Luke it is applied but twice in the gospels to the disciples. Paul employs it of others, the *Didache* of the travelling evangelists of the later time. The earliest fathers seldom apply the title to the "beloved disciple," to whom they attribute no missionary career.

administrative *διακονία* either falls upon them (8 : 14) or, as in the case of the provision for "the poor saints" contributed by Antioch, is committed to "elders" (11 : 30). Thus R shows the interest of his time in his conception of the part played by the Twelve in the spread of the gospel,¹ and more particularly his interest in the origin of the later ecclesiastical institutions of "widows," the *καθημερινή διακονία*² and the "deacons." But all this later officialism is imposed by literary violence upon the source, which has other views,³ and in the actual story is perpetually escaping from and contradicting these pragmatic restrictions.

The story of Acts 6-8 of the spread of the gospel beyond the barriers of Judaism is thus seen to be one whose universalism, in spite of R's restraining hand, far outstrips not only the Petrine, but even the Petro-Pauline elements of the work. Far from being content to resign to the apostolic body, as R's theory requires (1 : 8), or to Peter the chief apostle, as his Petrine source (Acts 9 : 32-11 : 18) requires,⁴ the credit of having been God's chosen instrument to proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 15 : 7), this element will not even resign it to Paul. From the very outset, it maintains, Hellenists like Stephen and Philip perceived the

¹ Cf. Acts 1 : 21-26 for our author's conception of "apostleship" and its necessary qualifications.

² See Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, lxv.

³ Note the characterization of the Seven as *πλήρεις πνεύματος και σοφίας* (v. 3; cf. Luke 21 : 14, 15), and of Stephen in particular as *άνδρα πλήρη πίστεως και πνεύματος* (v. 5) in contrast with v. 8; and their actual work (6 : 10; 7 : 2-53; 8 : 5 ff., 12, 26-40; 11 : 19 f.) with the formal ordination (v. 2 f). The ordination scene should be compared with 13 : 1-3, which reduces the evangelistic work of Paul in a similar unhistorical way under ecclesiastical form and authority.

⁴ N. B. the β text of 11 : 2^o *Ο μὲν οὖν Πέτρος διὰ ἰκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησεν πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα· καὶ προσφώνησας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, καὶ ἐπιστήριξας αὐτοὺς λόγον ποιούμενος διὰ τῶν χάρων [Nestle, δι' αὐτῶν ἐχώρει?] διδάσκων αὐτοῦς.* Here Peter is engaged normally in mission work, contrary to R's representation (8 : 1, 25), but in harmony with the implications of the source (9 : 32, 38; 11 : 12). The style also is too thoroughly Lucan to be mere scribal corruption. We are therefore probably nearer the source than in the α text. It is significant, then, that the parallel with the Pauline source (cf. 15 : 1 ff. etc.) is so close as to require that a careful editor of the two in combination should modify the β text to the form of α .

inherent universalism of the gospel, and that not by a change in the divine economy through the death of Christ, but as the inner and spiritual sense of the Old Testament itself, brought to light in the appearance of Christ as the giver of the New Law, the second Moses.

Thus the story of the seven Hellenistic evangelists, despite constant modifying and qualifying additions, appears to proceed from a type of Christian universalism more radical in some respects than Paulinism itself. The original narrative appears indeed to have undergone drastic readjustment. In view of this, and of the unmistakable fondness either of R, or one of his sources, for scenes of Christian *ἀπολογία* before tribunals (Acts 4 : 5-22; 5 : 17-42; 18 : 12-17; 19 : 33-41; 22 : 1-22; 23 : 1-10; 24 : 1-23; 25 : 23-26 : 32) we have reason to look upon the setting of Stephen's speech as more or less editorially recast and adapted. In particular, 6 : 11-7 : 1, reproducing the elements of Mark 14 : 55-60 (omitted in the "former treatise"), and 7 : 55, 56, 58^b-60; 8 : 1 (first and last clauses), 3, reproducing Acts 22 : 4, 5, 20; 26 : 10; Luke 22 : 69; 23 : 34, 46, appear to be in disagreement with the discourse both as to form and substance, and are adapted, on the contrary, to adjust it to the general scheme. We may regard it as probable, therefore, that in the original, instead of the "great signs and wonders" of v. 8, for which we are not prepared by the description of Stephen in v. 5 as *ἄνδρα πλήρη πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, nor by his actual history, but only by the altered form of the characterization in v. 8, *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως*,¹ there will have stood the substance of that which R has transferred in 9 : 29 to the account of Paul — quite unhistorically, as we learn from Galatians 1 : 21-24² — "Stephen spake and disputed with

¹ See Spitta, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

² There is scarcely need to demonstrate the drastic treatment the author of Luke-Acts has elsewhere given to his material. Familiar illustrations are found in the Gospel and in Acts 2 : 1-11, where the phenomenon of glossolaly referred to in the incorporated speech 2 : 14-40 (cf. 10 : 44-46; 11 : 15) is developed into a parallel to midrashic accounts of the giving of the Law from Sinai at Pentecost in seventy languages at once (Spitta, *op. cit.*, and Haussrath, *N. T. Times*, II, ii. p. 117).

the Hellenists." This view of R's activity here has further corroboration in the historical objections encountered by the trial scene he has produced; for so disorderly a judicial murder on the part of the Sanhedrin at this time is unlikely in itself and still more unlikely to have been overlooked by Pilate.

The result of our critical scrutiny of the present setting of the discourse will be that its original setting was more like the scene depicted in 6 : 8-10, where Stephen, nobly playing his part as an "evangelist," proves "the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake, disputing against" certain of the synagogue called "Synagogue of the *Libyans*, Cyrenians and Alexandrians."¹ Its imperfect adaptation to its present setting will be due to alteration, not of the discourse, but of the *narrative*,² by R.³

Again the *speech* (2 : 14-40) presents the Ascension as an inference from Scripture (Ps. 110 : 1) and from the charismatic outpouring (so Eph. 4 : 7 ff.), whereas in the *narrative* (1 : 9-11) it rests on the testimony of the senses. Similarly the Pauline *speeches* reveal a knowledge of the true significance of the final visit to Jerusalem (24 : 17). In the *narrative* the "ministration to the saints" (Rom. 15 : 25-31) is transferred to an earlier (unhistorical) visit (11 : 39 f.).

¹ For *Λιβερτίωνων* read with Cœumenius, Lyra, Beza, Clericus, Gothofredus and Volckenaer, *Λιβυστινων* (see Blass, *Philol. of Gospels*, p. 69 f.); there will thus appear to be but two synagogues concerned, an African, comprising Jews from northern Egypt, and an Asian comprising those of Paul's native province and vicinity. But even this is one more than was contemplated by the writer of the opening words *ἀνέστησαν δὲ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς . . . (Ἰσραὴλ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῶν λεγομένων)*. I judge *καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας* to be an addition from the hand which introduces Saul in 7 : 58 and 8 : 1 (D and A have *Κιλικίας* only). This *one* synagogue of the Egyptian Hellenists with which the original story was apparently concerned will doubtless be none other than that known to us from Talmudic sources as existing in Jerusalem, viz., "the Synagogue of the Alexandrians" (*Megill.*, f. 73, 4).

² It need hardly be pointed out that alteration of the discourse is not only less likely a priori, than of the narrative, but that this is the actual practice of all the synoptic writers, whose closest coincidence is always in the discourse, and widest variation in the narrative context. It is of importance, however, to emphasize the fact in this instance, because of the recent attempt of Harnack (*Das Magnificat*, 1900) to prove the Autor ad Theophilum himself the composer of the Lucan psalmody.

³ The question whether, as Spitta holds, R had a second source, parallel to that containing the speech, as his authority for the new setting, or — as maintained by Weiss, Hilgenfeld, and others — incorporated the embellishments from

Thus, while none of the proposed source analyses of Acts 6-8 may satisfy, enough is made probable to forbid our taking the indictment of the court scene, 6 : 11-14 as our starting-point for the interpretation of the speech, according to the usual method. We shall be compelled, on the contrary, to remove the speech from its present forensic setting and determine its inherent structure and logical sequence. To any one at all familiar with the loci classici of early Christian apologetics this task should not be difficult. For as soon as we review the speech independently it declares itself as dealing with the three institutions the right to which is disputed between Jews and Christians: (1) THE ABRAHAMIC INHERITANCE, the κληρονομία, of which circumcision was the seal (v. 8). (2) THE MOSAIC REVELATION, the λόγια ζῶντα (v. 38). (3) The Davidic PRESENCE OF GOD IN ZION, the *Shekinah* or Inhabitatio Dei, the σκῆνωμα (more exactly παρασκήνωσις) θεοῦ (v. 46).

These, the centres of interest of sacred history, are also the foci of dispute for this age of the universalizing of religion, because they embody the essence of Jewish particularism. Philo himself had rationalized the first in the treatise whose very title is *Quis heres rerum divinarum?* A similar title might well be applied to Galatians 3 to 5; for Paul also is here debating the question, Who are the true "seed of Abraham," the heirs of God? Both Philo and Paul, each in his own way, strive to put upon Scripture a broader sense than the literal interpretation of Jewish claims to be the "heirs of the world."

Equally fundamental to the age, and more diversely settled is the question of the *Law*, Who has the true revelation of

the trial scene of Jesus on his own authority, may be regarded for our present purpose as subordinate. The fact that the transpositions of Marcan material in Luke seem generally to have a basis in the tradition attested by Matthew, the closer resemblance of Acts 6 : 14 to Matt. 26 : 61 than to Mark, the extra-canonical parallels, and the remaining presence of apparently unintended duplicates (Acts 7 : 1, 55 f., 59 f. = Luke 22 : 66-69; 23 : 34, 46) are in favor of a second source. According to Spitta, the connection of this source was simply 6 : 12^b-7 : 1, 55 f. . . . 58^b-60, a close parallel to Matt. 26 : 59-66.

God's will? Has God vouchsafed *λόγια ζῶντα*, a *νόμος δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι* (Gal. 3 : 21), a *νόμος τῆς ζωῆς* (2 Esdr. 14 : 30)? And if so, where is it to be found? The Jews "search the Scriptures because they think that in them they have eternal life" (John 5 : 39). Are they right? Or are the Christians, who declare that the value of the Scriptures is only in their testimony to Christ the living Word, of whom Moses wrote, but to whom his professed followers "will not come that they might have life?" Paul admits (Rom. 3 : 2; 9 : 4) that primarily all three, *κληρονομία*, *λόγια*, and *σκήνωμα*, are prerogatives of Israel. In Rom. 3 : 2, the second, "That they were entrusted with the oracles of God" (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*) is even declared to be "first of all."

The third prerogative claimed by Israel, the *Tabernacling* (*יְשׁוּבָה*) of God with man is one whose literary history dates from the period of the Book of Jashar itself (1 Kings 8 : 53, LXX) through that of the Law (Deut. 33 : 12; Exod. 29 : 45 f.), the prophets (Is. 8 : 18, 57 : 15; Zech. 2 : 10 f., 8 : 3, 8), and psalmists (Ps. 68 : 16-18; 74 : 2; 135 : 21), down even to that of the Talmud in its favorite term the *Shekinah*. The question of this "dwelling (literally "tabernacling") of God" with his people is always whether it is local, inseparable from Zion, or spiritual (Is. 57 : 15).¹

Our author aims to present the Christian interpretation of these Scriptural prerogatives of the "people of God" in their historical order. He reviews accordingly the sacred history in its three great periods, (1) the Abrahamic, or patriarchal, with the covenant of circumcision, vv. 2-16; (2) the Mosaic, with the covenant of the Law, vv. 17-43; (3) the Davidic, with the covenant of the *Shekinah* (Ps. 89 : 7-37), vv. 44-50.

The speaker's object is twofold: (a) to prove that the institutions of the former dispensation were not ultimate but typical, foreshadowing those of the Messianic age; and (b) to

¹ The purely spiritual conception corresponding to Is. 57 : 15 appears in John 4 : 20-24; 14 : 23. In 1 : 12 and 2 : 21 Jesus' flesh is the *σκήνωμα* — *Shekina*. The two views are not identical; the former agrees best with the saying of Jesus, the latter finds support in Jewish usage (2 Cor. 5 : 1; 2 Pt. 1 : 13, 14).

prove that its theocratic leaders and prophets were analogously types of the Messiah himself in their efforts for redemption as well as in the rejection they suffered at the hands of the people.¹ Hence (4) the application, vv. 51-53, summing up the whole speech in the climactic denunciation: "Ye uncircumcised in heart and ears (i. e., outwardly people of the covenant, v. 8, but actually deaf and disobedient to its import), ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." The author thus brings to bear with cumulative force his gathered evidences of Israel's blindness; for he who places this splendid piece of rhetoric in the mouth of the proto-martyr looks forth himself upon a wider audience than Stephen's. It is the same which Justin, after his Apology to the heathen, confronts in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, the audience of Aristides and the apologists generally, the whole unbelieving world, which, if the folly of its heathenism be exposed, retorts: If, then, your Christ be the Messiah foretold to Israel, why is he repudiated by his own people? Why is their interpretation of their Scriptures, to which you also appeal, so different? The apologist's answer is, These Scriptures themselves bear witness of their spiritual intent. Moreover, they testify that stiff-necked Israel has always lacked the needful spiritual insight, has always grasped the external, unessential sense, turning blind eyes, a deaf ear, an unwilling heart to the true and higher sense. Israel's rejection of the Messiah of whom Moses and the prophets did write, as their fathers rejected and stoned the prophets, is but one proof the more of his Messiahship.² Such in outline is the argument of the speech. We must look about us for parallels in the contemporary literature, considering first the

¹ For demonstration in some detail of this twofold purpose, see the discussion of the argument of the speech below.

² Observe the predominance of this note in the *Oxyrhynchus logia*: III. [IV.], VI. [V.], and VIII. [VII.]. The fragment itself shows closest affinity with the Lucan gospel; its mystic, enigmatic form of expression well illustrates the characteristic Alexandrian-Christian fondness for contrasting the inner and outer sense.

application, vv. 51-53, the sense of which, fortunately, admits no dispute.

The first to deal in an apologetic sense with the phenomenon of the obduracy of Israel is the apostle Paul in Romans 9 to 11. It belongs therefore to the very beginnings of Christian literature, and is an item of no small importance in the dating of our gospels, all of which have more or less to say on this matter as a fulfilment of Isaiah 6 : 9 f.¹ (cf. Mark 4 : 11 f. and parallels; John 12 : 37-43), — more as time advances.

But there are differences. All our New Testament writers agree that Jesus has brought a new interpretation of Scripture. But, as Harnack has shown, there is one mode of dealing with the Scriptures and the conflicting interpretation thereof by Jews and Christians, especially affected by Alexandrian writers — continuous, in fact, with pre-Christian Alexandrianism — and another which derives from Paul, though even Paul is not free from occasional Alexandrianisms (1 Cor. 10 : 11; Col. 2 : 17).

Paul maintained that the old covenant had a real and direct application. It was "spiritual" and divine *for its own time*, though now superseded. Alexandrianism² followed the lead of Philo in maintaining that the literal sense had *always* been imperfect, if not evil. As time advances and the hostility between Jews and Christians becomes more bitter, the Alexandrian view tends more and more to supersede the Pauline. Even the title "Jew" is a lie when claimed by the Hebrew (Rev. 3 : 9), or a term of opprobrium (Gospel of John, *passim*), and their interpretation of their

¹ First employed by Paul, Rom. 11 : 8, and thence interpolated in Mark 4 : 12 after the logion *μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου*. See Resch, *Agrapha*, § 9, logion 17, p. 103.

² Including certain Palestinian sects of Essenic type, whose relation to Egyptian thought is not clear. The Ebionite-Christian *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions* are derived from these sectaries and are explicit in their teaching that the illuminati of even ancient Israel had constantly perceived the worthlessness of the external sense of Scripture and lived according to the inner and spiritual, *Recogn.*, i. 37.

Scriptures is wilfully perverse and accompanied with textual mutilation.¹ In the cruder representation of *Pseudo-Barnabas* the same use is made of the prophetic, spiritualized view of circumcision as in Acts 7 : 51. But here the typological interpretation of the Mosaic ordinances is prefaced by the explanation that Israel's adoption of the external sense was due to the teaching of an evil angel, whereas the Christian's ears are circumcised "that hearing the word we might believe." "He saith unto them: 'Thus saith the Lord your God (so I find the commandment): sow not upon thorns,² be ye circumcised to your Lord.' And what meaneth he? 'Be ye circumcised in the hardness of your heart; and then ye will not stiffen your neck.' Take this again: 'Behold, saith the Lord, all the Gentiles are uncircumcised in their foreskin, but this people is uncircumcised in their hearts.'" Then follows the allegorical interpretation of the ordinances of clean and unclean meats, winding up: "Ye see how wise a law-giver Moses was. But whence should they (the Jews) perceive or understand these things? Howbeit we (Christians) having justly perceived the commandments, tell them as the Lord willed. To this end he circumcised our ears and hearts, that we might understand these things."³ The whole epistle consists, in fact, of an exposition of the Old Testament (cc. i-xvii.), which the writer insists was meant to be understood allegorically, followed by "another lesson and teaching" (cc. xviii.-xxi.), consisting simply of the *Two Ways*, incorporated bodily, as "the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is free from the yoke of constraint," and which of course, as being "unveiled," requires no allegorical interpretation.

To the Alexandrian Christian, accordingly, the distinction

¹ So Justin, *Dial. with Trypho*, lxx. 11 ff., and the later writers.

² The interpolator of Mark 4 : 11 f. (see *Enc. Bibl. s. v. Gospels*, col. 1866) manifesting the same anti-Judaic spirit and employing the same prophecy (Is. 6 : 9 f.) as Acts 28 : 26 f.; John 12 : 37-41, connects the parable of the Sower with the same "commandment" as *Barnabas*, i. e., Jer. 4 : 3.

³ *Barn.* ix. 4 ff. and x. 11 ff., employing Deut. 10 : 16 ; Jer. 4 : 3, 4 and 9 : 26.

between the new and the old is not, as to the follower of Paul, temporal, the superseding of law by grace, obedience by filial trust; but qualitative, the inner for the outer. Faith tends to become insight, *gnosis*, vision of the spiritual realities through which even the Old Testament worthies were able to perceive the nullity of outward things, even the outward sense of the law, and apprehend the real and spiritual significance (Heb. 11 : 1 to 12 : 2).

As the universalism of the narrative in Acts 6 to 8 outdoes Paul, so the application of Stephen's speech is more anti-Judaic than Paul, tending toward the Alexandrianism of *Ps.-Barnabas* and the apologists. Paul finds no fault with the *pre-Christian* Jew for not taking the law spiritually. But our author takes him to task. Israel should have perceived the inner sense of the institutions which the speaker has reviewed in their true significance. But they were "stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, always resisting the Holy Ghost. As your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed them which shewed before of the coming of the Righteous One; of whom ye have now become betrayers and murderers, ye who received the law to stand as ordinances of angels (*εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*) and kept it not" (Acts 7 : 51-53).

But the question raised concerning the forensic setting of the speech may be inverted. It may be asked, Might not the Autor ad Theophilum be responsible for the other element, having embellished a simple narrative of forensic procedure with features derived from his own conception, in particular an *ἀπολογία* of his own composition? ¹

¹ So Baur, Zeller, and Overbeck. But see especially the important contribution of Harnack above referred to (*Das Magnificat*, 1900), in which the reasoning is really conclusive as to the composition of the poems of Luke 1-2 by a hand traceable throughout the Lucan narrative. The question we raise against Harnack is only this: Is it the last hand, the hand of the Autor ad Theophilum; or the hand of some writer whose work is largely incorporated by R? The relation of the narrative to the discourse material, as above set forth (p. 219), suggests the latter answer.

In one respect the facts are favorable to such a view. The speech in its general framework aims to meet the question, What is the relation of Christianity to Judaism? It meets it with the bold answer, Christianity is the true heir to all the Scriptural prerogatives of the people of God. It thus coincides in a general way with the answer of the *Autor ad Theophilum* to the familiar objection, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not," in a demonstration from Scripture that the rejection was foretold, and that "thus it behooved the Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory" (cf. Luke 24 : 19-21, 25-27, 44-47). In fact, had it failed to coincide to this extent with the purposes of R, it is manifest that it would never have been incorporated. It is also true that the Lucan appeals to the career of the *παῖς θεοῦ* of Deutero-Isaiah, are more characteristic of certain parts of the work. Distinctive features are more thickly sown in special chapters which there is independent reason for designating a "Special Source." Nevertheless, the outline and grouping of elements in the whole work remain, on which to base our judgment of R's special animus in the composition. From these it is apparent that his purpose was substantially the same as that attributed to the Special Source. How else account for his departure from the established tradition (Mark 1 : 14 ff.) of how Jesus began his career in Capernaum, to open it with the story of his rejection in Nazareth (Luke 4 : 16 ff.), whose nucleus is the well-known logion, "A prophet is of no repute in his own country," (*πατρίς*) and which ends with the significant citation of Elijah's mission to the Gentile widow of Zarephath, though "there were many widows in Israel," and Elisha's healing of the Syrian Naaman, though "there were many lepers in Israel"? How shall we account for the fact that he ends his *πρῶτος λόγος* with a reference by the risen Christ to his cruel rejection and death as that which, according to Law and Prophets and Psalms, "it behooved the Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory," coupled with a direction to preach him to the Gentiles; and that he concludes his

δεύτερος λόγος with the appeal of Paul in Rome to the classic passage from Isaiah 6:9 f. and the declaration "Be it known therefore unto you that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles: they will also hear"?

Surely none familiar with J. Weiss' admirable *Absicht und Character der Apostelgeschichte* can any longer be blind to the significance of our author's stereotyped method of relating the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. Once for all, that method is this:— first the offer of it to the Jews, with the warning "Beware lest that come upon you which is spoken in the prophets, 'Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish; For I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, if one declare it unto you;' then, when 'the Jews see the multitudes, and, filled with jealousy, contradict the things spoken and blaspheme,' the apostles are driven to address the Gentiles, declaring to the Jews: 'It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles, For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying,

I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles

That thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.' "

With a dominant purpose, and an attitude toward unbelieving Jewry, thus indicated, the author of Luke-Acts is certainly so nearly in accord with primitive Christian apologetics in general, and with that of Stephen's speech in particular, that we need not wonder at his adoption of it.

Per contra, we cannot agree with those who ascribe the composition of the speech, along with the rest of the discourses of Acts, to the author himself. Apart from the relation of the discourse to its narrative setting, the characteristics of both thought and language are distinguishable from those of the *Autor ad Theophilum*, and show a closer relation than Luke-Acts as a whole to the distinctively Alexandrian tradition, phraseology, and style. Besides this, the speech advances doctrinally as far beyond the standpoint

of Paul, as the Lucan narrative taken as a whole lags behind the actual course of Pauline missions, so that in both doctrine and historical application we have here a more radical point of view than that of our ecclesiastically minded compiler.

II

STYLE AND VOCABULARY

BUT let us first examine the formal affinities of the speech.

(1) The midrashic character of the tradition followed is notorious. A review of its features will show not only peculiarities which are only occasional in Luke-Acts (e. g., Acts 2 : 1 ff.), but can be traced more particularly in Alexandrian-Ebionite sources.

In v. 2 the tradition is followed which inferred from Genesis 15 : 7 that a theophany had already been vouchsafed to Abraham in Ur, "before he dwelt in Haran," as in Philo, *De Abr.*, 14 : 15 (II. p. 11, 16, ed. of Mangey), and Josephus (*Ant.*, I. 7, 1; cf. Neh. 9 : 7). In v. 4 Abraham is made to leave Haran after the death of Terah, against Genesis 11 : 26, 32; 12 : 4. This representation also recurs in Philo (*De Migr. Abr.*, p. 415). In v. 15 the number of Jacob's family is 75 (70 in Gen. 46 : 27; Deut. 10 : 22; Exod. 1 : 5; Hebrew 70, LXX, 75). Philo notes the difference. The Clementines have 72 (*Recog.*, I. 34), i. e., 6×12 , splitting the difference. In v. 16 there is a confusion of Hebron and Shechem, Genesis 23 : 3-20; 50 : 13 and Joshua 24 : 32, with the result that Abraham's only possession in Canaan is a tomb, even this, as the author is careful to note, not given by God, but "bought for a price in silver," and not at revered Hebron, but despised Shechem.¹ The curious change in the tradition which thus makes all the patriarchs share a common tomb, instead of Joseph only being buried

¹ Cf. the "humanitarianism of Luke" as evinced in his special plea for Samaritans, Luke 9 : 51-56; 10 : 30-37; 17 : 11-19; Acts 8 : 4-25, etc.

in Shechem (Josh. 24 : 32) and Jacob in Hebron (Gen. 50 : 13), is found in Josephus, *Ant.*, II. 8 : 2, but with the significant difference that in Josephus the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron is the common site. The description of Moses, vv. 20, 22, 24 embellishes the Old Testament account with midrashic traits reminding us of Philo (*Vita Mos.*, I. 3, 5; cf. *Jos.*, *Ant.*, II. 9 : 6, 7, 10), while the motive imputed in v. 25 is found in Philo (*Vita Mos.*, I. 8, 9) but not in Scripture. The same is true in some degree of the distinction of three periods of forty years in Moses' life (vv. 22, 30),¹ and the angelic character of the theophany at Horeb (v. 35) and Sinai (v. 38, 53).² The "Red" Sea as the scene of Pharaoh's overthrow is another innovation. As the "Red" Sea is nowhere mentioned in Scripture, but in Wisdom 10 : 18; 19 : 7; 1 Maccabees 4 : 2, and Hebrews 11 : 29, Hilgenfeld's comparison of v. 36 to *Assumpt. Mos.*, III. 10, "[Moses] who suffered many things in Egypt and in the Red Sea and in the wilderness forty years" is highly significant.³

Thus the variations of tradition, while not unexampled in Palestinian literature, have decided affinities with Alexandria, and an Ebionite animus.

(2) Such light as the vocabulary and diction afford is certainly not to be neglected. Kranichfeld, in an article entitled *Gedankengang der Rede des Stephanus*, in *St. u. Krit.*, 1900, IV., pp. 541-562, shows successfully enough how far short expositors have come in the attempt to trace the real course of thought, and perhaps advances somewhat beyond his predecessors in this direction. At least we must admit his principle that departures from the usual form of

¹ Found also in *Beresch. Rabba*, f. 115 : 3; *Schemoth Rabba*, f. 118 : 3.

² The Clementines have for the former instead of the angel "the true Prophet" i. e., Christ. For the Sinai theophany "an angel." They also agree in applying the 400 years of Gen. 15 : 13 to the oppression in Egypt, *Recog.*, I. 34, 35.

³ See Charles, *Assumption of Moses*, 1897, p. lxiii, f. : "The likeness is too close to be accidental. We must either assume that Acts 7 : 36 is derived from our text (*Ass. Mos.*), or that III, 11 b of our text is interpolated. The evidence of *Apoc. Bar.* lxxxiv. 3 is against the latter supposition : likewise also the word "suffered."

the tradition are not to be assumed to be accidental. His inferences from the peculiarities of diction and style are quite superficial and inadequate.¹ But even were they trustworthy, they certainly could not prove more than that the *Autor ad Theophilum* has here drawn from a written source. That this source was the actual address of the protomartyr, rather than one of the *διηγήσεις* employed by R, is far from being even indicated. Of the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* adduced by Kranichfeld (*μετώκισεν*, v. 4, *μετοικίω*, v. 43, *χορτάσματα*, v. 11, *σιτία*, v. 12, *κατασοφισάμενος*, v. 19, *ἀνείλετο*, v. 21, and *ἔμοσχοποίησαν*, v. 41), all save *μετώκισεν*, v. 4 and *χορτάσματα*, v. 11, are irrelevant, because belonging to quotations from the LXX. It is surprising that so recent a critic should pass over in silence many real *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* of much more telling significance. We set aside all words and phrases derived from LXX, according to Nestle's text (1898), which constitute nearly one half of the fifty-two verses under consideration. Even so there remain the following to be added to Kranichfeld's two: *ἀμύνεσθαι*, v. 24, *ὄφθη* (of ordinary sight), v. 26, *συναλλάσσειν* (in Paul *καταλλ.*), v. 26, *ἐφυγάδευσεν*, v. 29 (*β* text), *σύν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου*, v. 35, *λυτρωτής*, v. 35, *διαδέχεσθαι*, v. 45. If words derived from LXX were admitted on condition that no intention of quotation were apparent, still others might be enumerated.

As an argument for direct derivation of the speech from Stephen rather than from R, these data are manifestly worthless. Nor does it gain in strength even if we grant R (Luke?) to have been a Gentile, while Stephen was a Hellenist, from the occurrence of Hebraisms,² of which there is no lack. We instance only *ἐκάκωσεν τοῦ ποιεῖν*, v. 19, *διὰ χειρός*, v. 25, *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, v. 45, *εὔρεν χάριν ἐνώπιον*, v. 46, etc. Vogel (*Zur Charakteristik des Lukas*, p. 33) notes the exceptional absence from cc. 4, 6, 7, 10, and 24 of Acts

¹ For more thorough treatment of the matter of style, phraseology, and language, see Zeller, *Acts*, vol. II, p. 175. For evidence of composition by the *Autor ad Theophilum* (better the author of Luke's Special Source), Zeller compares 6 : 8 with 4 : 33 and 5 : 12; 6 : 7 with 12 : 24; 7 : 48 with 17 : 24 &c.

² More properly Semitisms. See Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 29.

of the classic *μέν*, rare in the New Testament, but used forty-four times in Acts. The same appears to be true in c. 7 (7 : 26 is doubtful) of *τέ*, employed elsewhere in Acts over one hundred times. But Hebraisms are notoriously most copious in the so-called Special Source of Luke, particularly Luke 1 : 5-2 : 52.¹ Per contra, *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*, v. 2, is a Lucan Graecism (Acts 2 : 29; 13 : 15; 15 : 7, 13; 22 : 1; 23 : 1, 6; 28 : 17). Acts 7, accordingly, is not more strongly Semitic in style than some other parts of Luke-Acts, nor is R's hand untraceable; yet as a whole its vocabulary sets it apart from the adjoining chapters.

Much more significant, to the present writer's mind are certain peculiar and rare expressions, not absolutely confined to Acts 7, but occurring elsewhere, principally in Luke's peculium. Paraphrases of the names of God and Christ are especially noteworthy.² We observe that *ὁ Ὑψιστός* of God, absolutely, occurs, aside from the speech (v. 48) *only* in Luke 1 : 32, 35, 76 and 6 : 35.³ Even *ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὑψιστός* does not occur outside of Mark 5 : 7 and parallels, except in Acts 16 : 17 and Hebrews 7 : 1.⁴ Such a title as "Redeemer" we surely might expect to find applied to Christ in the New Testament. Yet its *only* occurrence is in v. 35, where, however, its application to Moses is obviously intended to make him appear more plainly as the type of Christ.⁵ Is it not

¹ On the "Hebraisms" of Luke 1, 2, see Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 31 f.

² *Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης*, v. 2, is formally excluded by our rule limiting consideration to expressions of the author's own. In reality he is not consciously quoting Ps. 29 : 3, and the remarkable expression is clearly his own free choice from an indefinite number of possible titles. It is therefore appropriate to call attention to Hebr. 9 : 5 as the nearest approach to a N. T. parallel.

³ The occurrence of *ὁ Ὑψιστός* in 6 : 35 should be noted as one example of what may be instanced against the assertion of Soltau, *Eine Lücke*, &c., 1899, p. 41 : "Eine Verwandtschaft der Logiaabschnitte mit Acta besteht nicht." What Soltau has called "ein Missgriff Feine's" is rather an evidence of keen perception.

⁴ See Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 162, and Swete, *Comm.*, on Mark 5 : 7.

⁵ For the evidence of this intention see below. We believe that the addition *καὶ σοφίαν* in v. 10 to the LXX characterization of Joseph *ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν ἐναντίον Φαραῶ* and *σοφία Ἄγγ.* in v. 22 has a similar motive. It is worth noting in this connection that it is the Special Source of Luke which gives such prominence to Jesus' endowment with the "wisdom of God" (cf. the endowment of the Seven, Acts 6 : 3; *πλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας*).

significant, however, that *λύτρωσις* occurs only in Luke 1 : 68; 2 : 38 and Hebrews 9 : 12, while even *λυτρώσθαι*, aside from Luke 24 : 21 (of which more presently) and *λυτρώων* occur only once each (Tit. 2 : 14 and 1 Peter 1 : 18)? But perhaps we might expect different results with the title "Saviour," and the word "salvation" (v. 25). Is it not rather surprising that neither *Σωτήρ* nor *σωτηρία* occurs in the non-Lucan historical books of the New Testament, save once each in John 4 : 22, 42?¹ But *σωτήρ* appears in Luke 1 : 47; 2 : 11; Acts 5 : 31 (*ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα*, cf. Hebr. 2 : 10, *ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας*); 13 : 23; and *σωτηρία* in Luke 1 : 69, 71, 77; 19 : 9; Acts 4 : 12; 13 : 26, 47; 16 : 17; 27 : 34, and the synonymous *σωτήριον* in Luke 2 : 30; 3 : 6; Acts 28 : 28; but nowhere else save Eph. 6 : 17, and there in a LXX quotation. Can it be accidental that the conception of Jesus as Redeemer and Saviour is thus limited?

In v. 52 occurs a rare messianic title known to us as such from *Enoch*, xxxviii. 2, ὁ Δίκαιος. The only other instances in the New Testament are Acts 3 : 14 and 22 : 14, both of them passages which are otherwise connected with our own.

But pass from epithets of God and Christ to distinctive characterizations and other rare and peculiar expressions. Of the former we have an example in our author's habitual endowment of his theocratic heroes with *σοφία*, of which more hereafter (p. 245). Of the latter in the phrase *ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν*, v. 23, which occurs in Luke 24 : 38, elsewhere only in the fragment from the *Apocalypse of Elias*, 1 Cor. 2 : 9. But the phrase *ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις*, v. 22, paralleled only in Luke 24 : 19 (cf., however, Acts 18 : 24), is much more than a mere *façon de parler*. It is, to begin with, an addition to the Scriptural representation of

¹ As an appellative *σωτήρ* appears only in the latest of the N. T. writings, seeming to increase in frequency with the lateness of date. In the Pastoral Epistles it appears five times applied to God (1 Tim. and Titus), four times to Christ (2 Tim. and Titus), in Jude once (of God). The expression *σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου* occurs but twice, John 4 : 22 and 1 John 4 : 14. In 2 Peter ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν (five times) is the habitual appellative of Jesus Christ.

Moses, one which goes to the point of actual contradiction of Exodus 4 : 10. Moses is to be depicted as the antetype of Christ, and to this end must appear as both a teacher and a worker of miracles (cf. v. 36), more especially, however, as a "redeemer" (λυτρωτήν, v. 35). The reverse process appears in Luke 24 : 13-32, where Jesus is to be proved the "prophet" foretold "in Moses and all the prophets" as "like unto Moses" (Deut. 18 : 15). Accordingly Jesus is unconsciously described as such by the two disciples. He was "a prophet δυνατός ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ, and they had hoped that "this was he who should redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel." When we reflect on the rarity of the terms λυτρωτής, λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι, and that no New Testament writer before Luke makes any use of the doctrine of Christ as the *alter Moses*,¹ the occurrence of this descriptive phrase only in Luke 24 : 19 and Acts 7 : 22, shows its true significance.

After this we need only mention the remaining peculiarities. The only other occurrence of ποιεῖν ἐκδίκησιν, v. 24, is in Luke 18 : 7, 8; of ἐξώθειν, v. 45, in Acts 27 : 39; of πατριάρχης, Acts 2 : 29; Hebrews 7 : 4. Vogel (*Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, p. 63) finds συγγένεια only in Luke 1 : 61; Acts 7 : 3, 14, though employed in LXX (Exod., Wisd., 2 Macc.); βρέφος occurs in Luke 1 : 41, 44; 2 : 12, 16; 18 : 5; Acts 7 : 19; elsewhere only in 2 Timothy 3 : 15; 1 Peter 2 : 2; ἐξαποστέλλειν in Luke 1 : 5; 20 : 10, 11; Acts 7 : 12; 9 : 30; 11 : 22; 17 : 14; 22 : 21; elsewhere only in Galatians 4 : 4, 6; προδότης in Luke 6 : 16; Acts 7 : 52; elsewhere only 2 Timothy 3 : 4; ἐν βίβλῳ, with gen., only Luke 3 : 4; 20 : 42; Acts 1 : 20; 7 : 42, and Phil. 4 : 3. Finally Isaiah 66 : 12 is quoted in *Barn.* xvi. with the same variation from LXX as in Acts 7 : 49 (καὶ ποῖος for ἡ τίς), which leads Hilgenfeld (*loc. cit.*, p. 408) to infer dependence by Barnabæ, not, indeed, on Acts 7 : 49, but on the source employed for the speech.

¹ It is the stereotyped conception in the Clementine writings, where the standing designation of Christ is "the true Prophet" with explicit reference to Deut. 19 : 15, 18 f.

What inferences may we legitimately draw from this review of the style and vocabulary? Certainly not derivation direct from Stephen. The stylistic connection with other parts of Luke-Acts is too unmistakable. But neither can we infer composition by the Autor ad Theophilum. If we conceive him as the Gentile Luke, the Hebraistic thought and phraseology exclude the supposition. If we conceive him as some unknown Christian of Jewish birth, still the affinities are rather with special parts of the work, where a characteristic source appears to be employed, in particular at the beginning and end of the gospel¹ than with the work as a whole, and, as we have seen, the doctrinal standpoint of the speech, as well as of what survives of the narrative originally belonging to it concerning the work of the "Seven Evangelists," is more radical than that of R.

Let us not exaggerate the importance of evidence from language and style; but, such as it is, it confirms our previous results. The speech of Stephen is linguistically of a piece with the first and last chapters of Luke, and various other passages peculiar to Luke and Acts. It is the type of Hellenistic Greek framed on the model of the LXX.² Further, so far as we can trace affinity with other Christian writings, the resemblance is most marked to those of Alexandrian and Ebionite type and origin, *Ps.-Barnabas*, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Clementines.

¹ Soltan (op. cit., p. 38), though rejecting Feine's theory of a "precanonical Luke" combining a version of the *Logia* with a special type of the narrative, admits a special relation between chapters 1 f. and 24. "Andrerseits kann nicht verschwiegen werden dass die Grundanschauung von Lc. 24 : 19 f. derjenigen von Lc. 1-2 entspricht. Auch die Erzählungsweise ist derjenigen der Jugendgeschichte verwandt."

² For minuter characterization of this type of Greek and its "Hebraisms" which are in reality neither Aramaisms nor Hebraisms, but *Septuagintisms*, see Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, pp. 13-34.

III

DOCTRINAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE SPEECH AND THEIR
LITERARY AFFINITIES

IF now we were to pass to a review of cognate ideas — far more significant than mere vocabulary — we should find not only the conception, already noted for its distinctive phraseology, of Christ as the “prophet like unto Moses,” “mighty in deed and word,” “which should redeem Israel,” connecting the speech with the end of the third gospel and the Clementines, but other ideas, equally fundamental and equally distinctive, corroborating the indications of language which point to a connection with the beginning of this gospel. But space does not permit detailed consideration of each conception of the speech. A single illustration must suffice, before we proceed to review its treatment of the three prerogatives of the people of God which we have seen to be principally in debate.

Kranichfeld rightly points out that the interfusion of Genesis 15 : 13 f. and Exodus 3 : 12 (Acts 7 : 6 f.) is a departure from tradition which cannot be accidental. It is to be understood by reference to v. 42. In the author's mind the conception of the promise of God to the fathers as an assurance of relations with himself in *the true worship*,¹ has so completely displaced that of a special sacred *territory* to be owned by them, that he substitutes Exodus 3 : 12 for the promise of Genesis 15 : 13 f., neglecting the essence of the transaction in verses 7 f., 18, so as practically to substitute *λατρεία* for *κληρονομία*. Thus “the time of the fulfilment of the

¹ That prerogative of Israel which Paul significantly speaks of as “*the worship*” (*ὁν ἡ λατρεία*, Rom. 9 : 5).

promise" becomes that of the deliverance from Egypt and institution of the true worship at Sinai, to the complete eclipse of the giving of the land; correspondingly the stiff-neckedness and perversity of Israel bears fruit, not so much in temporary exclusion from Canaan as in the substitution of a *λατρεία τῆς στρατίας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* (v. 42), in *ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν*, for the promised worship of God. The motive for this becomes perfectly intelligible as soon as the polemic interest of the times, and of the speech as a whole, is considered. The fundamental questions are as to the *κληρονομία* and the *λόγια ζῶντα*. Israel points to circumcision as the sign and seal of the former (v. 8) and to the *λατρεία* instituted at Sinai as the sign of the latter. Our speaker (v. 51) denies that circumcision was anything more than a type and symbol, and is equally free in his attitude toward the Sinaitic ritual (v. 42 f.). But he does not stand alone in his treatment of the promise, Exodus 3 : 12. This overshadowing of the territorial conception of the covenant with Abraham, by one which cuts loose entirely from local relations and considers deliverance from the oppressor for the sake of *the true worship* to be the real content of the promise, is that of Luke 1 : 73-75, where "the oath which God sware to Abraham our father" (Gen. 15 : 7 ff.) is not the *κληρονομία*, but "that we, being delivered out of the hand of all our enemies should serve him (*λατρεύειν αὐτῷ*) in holiness and righteousness before him all our days." Now this peculiar tendency does not belong to all types of early Christian thought. The effort to spiritualize the promise to Abraham from *κληρονομία* to *λατρεία*, from a territorial to a religious sense, is characteristic of the Alexandrian writers, Hebrews, and *Barnabas*. The Pauline interpretation, as we shall see, takes a different direction.

With this single illustration of the relationship of individual ideas of the speech we turn to a consideration of its general course of thought, confining ourselves to incidental interpretation.

Section 1 of the speech deals in its first subdivision ([a]

= vv. 2-8) with the prophetic institution of the first or Abrahamic period, the *κληρονομία* or *inheritance of the holy land*; or as it is designated in v. 8, "the covenant of circumcision." But by circumcision, as appears from v. 51, the speaker, after the example and in the language of the prophets, understands a rite of value only for its symbolism, which is unveiling — preparedness of heart and ears for divine instruction. But beyond and above this the *content* of the covenant, the thing promised, is not the Pauline blessedness of the Gentiles (Gal. 3 : 8; Rom. 4 : 16 f., resting on Gen. 12 : 3), employed in Acts 3 : 25. Our author goes rather to Gen. 15 : 7-21; only, instead of finding there the territorial sense,¹ he combines Genesis 15 : 14, as we have seen, by a curious and significant anticipation, with Exodus 3 : 12, to read from it a promise of God to give *deliverance and the true λατρεία*. The oath of God is to execute judgment for the seed of Abraham against their oppressors, bring them forth from bondage, *and cause them to serve him*. Persistent and reiterated emphasis is placed upon the fact that the promise was *not* fulfilled in the external sense.² When God had removed Abraham into the land after his father's death, "he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on," but promised it to a certain "seed" to be given him, whose special "spiritual" character (cf. Rom. 9 : 7-9), as well as the "faith" of Abraham (cf. Rom. 4 : 19-22), is suggested in the reminder that "as yet he had no child." The conclusion of the section is (v. 16) that not an inch of soil in Canaan was given to any of the patriarchs save a burial-place, and even that in despised Samaria, which was not given, but "bought with

¹ Possibly the disappearance of the territorial sense was made easier for Hellenistic Jews by the LXX rendering *ἦν ἄν σοι δέλω*, "the land, wherever it be, that I shall show thee." The point that Abram "knew not whither he went" is emphasized in Hebr. 11 : 8. The fact that the patriarchs were "strangers and sojourners," and as such types of the Christian people of God, is emphasized both in Hebr. 11 : 9, 13-16, and here, vv. 6, 29.

² Meyer, *Comm.*, ad loc., "He gave not . . . and promised." So in Hebr. 11 : 13 the fact is emphasized that the inheritance was *not* received.

a price." The Abrahamic Inheritance, we are to infer, was not so much a particular land, but "freedom to worship God." This was first made clear to the patriarch himself. God withheld the land — and gave a larger promise.

Where then do we find the parallels to this characteristic interpretation of the κληρονομία, which the speaker opposes to that of the "uncircumcised in heart and ears"?

Paulinism does not by any means neglect to spiritualize the conception of the Abrahamic κληρονομία; but how? — Not by connecting the great story of God's act of cession of the land, Genesis 15 : 7–21, and its modification in the attached promise of deliverance from Egypt, forward with Exodus 3 : 1–12, but backward with Genesis 12 : 3 and Genesis 1 : 26–28. The κληρονομία ceases to be particularistic by becoming *cosmic*. Abraham becomes "heir of the world" (Rom. 4 : 13). His "seed," the "many nations" of Genesis 12 : 3, are all, Jews and Gentiles, who are "of faith," and as such are "blessed with faithful Abraham" (Gal. 3 : 7–9; Rom. 4 : 16–18). More particularly it is in the person of the "one new man" in whom the redeemed race is federated, as the lost race had been federated, or subsumed, in Adam, that this inheriting of the world is to be realized. "He saith not 'seeds' as of many, but as of one, 'and to thy seed,' which is Christ" (Gal. 3 : 16, 28, 29; cf. Eph. 2 : 15); so that one may say equally that God "made Abraham heir of the world" (Rom. 4 : 13), that he "appointed his Son heir of all things" (Heb. 1 : 2), and may promise the same inheritance "to him that overcometh" (Rev. 21 : 7). For we too are "heirs of God" only as being "joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8 : 17). God has created in him (in his spiritual second creation, 2 Cor. 4 : 6) of the twain, Jew and Gentile, "one new man" (Eph. 2 : 15). The heir is the Second Adam, "one new man," and yet not one, but Messiah and his people together. The Ἀγαπητός and ἀγαπητοί, Ἐκλεκτός and ἐκλεκτοί are heirs together, "even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world: having in love foreordained us in the Beloved . . .

according to his good pleasure which he purposed in him unto a dispensation of the fulness of the ages, to make Christ the head (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*) of all things, the things in the heavens, and the things on the earth, in whom we also were made heirs (*ἐκκληρώθημεν*) and were sealed with the promised Holy Spirit as an earnest of our inheritance" (*κληρονομία*) (Eph. 1 : 3-14, abridged). But if the life-giving Spirit is the *ἀρραβών* of our inheritance, it by no means follows that to Paul the inheritance itself was of an exclusively spiritual character. Quite the contrary. He proceeds at once to explain its character. It is "dominion" (*κατακυριεύσις*) over the entire creation of God, "things visible and invisible, things in heaven and on earth," personal, semi-personal, and impersonal (Eph. 1 : 10, 20-23; Col. 1 : 16-20). Messiah and his people — in Christian phrase, "Christ and the church" — not separately but in their united capacity, are to be in the fullest and completest sense "lords" over the entire creation of God. The *creation* is their inheritance, and is waiting for them, waiting impatiently under the dominion of "vanity" (*ματαιότητι*; cf. *און, יהוה* of false gods, *δαίμονες* made objects of worship, e. g., Jer. 14 : 22), till the sons who are the real heirs are made manifest (Rom. 8 : 19-23). When the time of tutelage is over and the day of adoption predetermined by the Father is come, these mere "stewards and governors," which, though worshipped among the heathen as deities, "are by nature no gods" (Gal. 4 : 8), will then be subjected under the dominion of the heir. This is "the mystery of the Creator's will, hid till now from the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1 : 9; 3 : 3-5; Rom. 16 : 25) even from angels (Eph. 3 : 9 f.; 1 Peter 1 : 12), who, according to *Slav. Enoch*, are ignorant of the mystery of their origin, but revealed in the manifestation of the Second Adam as Son and Heir of God. For the purposes of discipline it pleased God, in the pre-messianic dispensation of law, to put all, both Jews and Gentiles, under the mentorship of the angelic *στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου*.¹ But while for a time the *στοιχεία* have

¹ See Deissmann, s. v. "Elements," in *Encycl. Biblica*.

a delegated authority over the children for their conduct (*παιδαγῶγοι*) and even (as *ἐπιτρόποι* and *οἰκονόμοι*) control their property, once the Heir is come he is seen to be the true possessor of both the power and the riches. They are "weak" and "beggarly" (Gal. 3 : 24-26; 4 : 1-11); the universe is his, and he will judge their administration of his estate (1 Cor. 6 : 2, 3; cf. *Enoch* lxxxix. 59; 25, the judgment of the 70 shepherds, i. e., angelic guardians of Israel, by Messiah).¹

This conception of the *κληρονομία* is fundamental with Paul. It is the basis of his defence against the Judaistic stoicheiolatry and "worship of the angels" in the churches of the Lycus valley. It is the foundation stone of his cosmology and eschatology. In harmony with all the apocalyptic writers, the two are to him inseparable. A Christ who does not bring to fulfilment the declared purpose of God in creation, Genesis 1 : 28, *πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν, καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς, καὶ ἄρχετε τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάττης, καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν* would be to Paul no Messiah at all. He would not only disappoint the just expectations of Israel, based for centuries on the promise of God (Gen. 1 : 26-28; Ps. 8 : 6) and re-echoed in every apocalyptic writer;² but he would be unable to wrest the

¹ "And He called 70 shepherds and put away those sheep (Israel) that they might pasture them And he spake to that man who wrote before Him, who was one of the seven white ones, and said to him, 'Take those 70 shepherds to whom I delivered the sheep, and who, taking them on their own authority, slew more than I commanded them. And behold they were all bound, I saw, and they all stood before Him. And the judgment was held first over the stars (the angels who sinned in the days of Noah, Gen. 6 : 3), and they were judged and found guilty and went to the place of condemnation, and they were cast into an abyss, full of fire and flaming, and full of pillars of fire. And those 70 shepherds (the angelic guardians of Israel) were judged and found guilty and likewise cast into that fiery abyss.' Scholars are now agreed that the 70 shepherds are not human, but angelic. See the note of R. H. Charles' edition, ad loc.

² See, e. g., *Assumptio Mosis*, 1 : 12-14 (God created the world on behalf of his people and revealed this final cause to Moses); *Apoc. of Baruch*, xiv. 18 f.; xv. 7; xxi. 24. II Esdras 6 : 55, 59 is striking: "O Lord, thou hast said that for our sakes thou madest this world. . . . If the world now be made for our sakes, why do we not possess for an inheritance our world? How long shall this endure?" Cf. II

“dominion” from the stewards and governors, the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι, the δύνამεις καὶ κυριότητες, καὶ πάντα ὀνόματα ὀνομαζόμενα οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. Man was made to “have dominion over the works of God’s hands.” The end will come only when in the person of the second Adam he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. “For the Christ must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be put down is death.” The ground expressly cited for this unshakable confidence is Psalm 8 : 6 — “For ‘he hath put all things under his feet.’ But when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted who did put all things under him. And when all things are subdued under him then the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all” (1 Cor. 15 : 24–28).¹

Paul’s conception of the κληρονομία as inclusive of lordship over the creation and its angelic administrators does not differ a hair’s breadth from that of the messianic Pharisaism of his time, save that to him Jesus is that Second Adam or “Son of Man” of Psalm 8 : 4–8, to whom for his obedience God has given the name which is above every name — the name Κύριος παντοκράτωρ — that to him every knee should bow. Thus the essential, fundamentally distinctive feature of this Palestinian, apocalyptic idea of the κληρονομία, is that it is *cosmological*. The promise to Abraham is universalized by being carried back and brought into connection with the story of the creation and fall. It becomes the antidote to the curse by which evil and death came into the world (Gen. 2–3), restoring the primal creation as contem-

Esdras 7 : 11 ; 8 : 1, 44 ; 9 : 13. In Rabbinic literature the world is created on account of Abraham, *Yalk.* I. 766. In Christian apocalypse “he that overcometh” becomes “heir of all things,” Rev. 21 : 5–7. For the doctrine of the creation of the world “for the Church” in Hermas and later writers see below.

¹ For the importance attached in later times to this Pauline doctrine of the “lordship” (κυριότης) of Christ see the denunciations of Jude 4, 8, 25 and 2 Peter 2 : 10, against those who despise and rail at “lordship.”

plated in Genesis 1. In its Christian form it takes in Genesis 15 : 6 and 12 : 3 on the way, and includes as beneficiaries of the inheritance not only "Israel," or "the righteous in Israel," or the "People of God" (meaning Israel and proselytes), but "them that are of faith," "the Israel of God," "the Church," or "Christ and the Church," "the redemption of God's own possession."¹

But we have already seen that this was not the only early Christian manner of spiritualizing the hope of the *κληρονομία*. It is not that of the speech of Stephen. The Abrahamic inheritance here is connected, not backward with Genesis 1-3, but forward with the deliverance from Egypt. Genesis 15 : 7 ff. is amalgamated with Exodus 3 : 1 ff. Everything possible is done to detach the promise from its material content. In the fundamental passage (Gen. 15 : 7-21) the attention is concentrated on vv. 13-16 (a later interpolation in Gen. 15 : 7-21, according to critics), to the ignoring of 7-12, 17 ff., which constitute the heart of the story. Thus the conception of the prerogative of the *κληρονομία* tends to merge in, or actually becomes indistinguishable from that of the *λατρεία*. The place is nothing, the deliverance from oppression and bringing into relations of pure and unhindered "worship" is everything.

Now this conception of "God's holy covenant," as we have seen, does not stand alone in Acts 7 : 7, but is distinctively that of Luke 1 : 71-75. It stands in striking contrast to the Pauline, which develops exclusively in an opposite direction. In view of its spiritualizing character, no less than its affinities of phrasology and style, we are justified in applying to it the name Alexandrian. The essential difference of this mode of conception of the *κληρονομία* from the Pauline lies in its mode of escape from the particularism

¹ The pre-Christian apocalyptic writers meet the question of fitness for the *κληρονομία* by restricting it to the righteous remnant rather than all Israel. See *Apoc. of Baruch*, xvi. 18 f. ; xv. 7 ; xxi. 24, and cf. Charles' comment, *Assumption of Moses*, i. 12-14. In the early Christian writers the doctrine takes the form "God created the world on behalf of the Church" (Hermas, *Vis.*, ii, 4 : 1 ; cf. *Mand.* xii. 4 ; Justin, *Apol.* i. 10 ; ii. 4 : 5 ; *Dial.* xli. Irenaeus, *Her.*, v. 29 : 1, &c.).

of the Old Testament. The Pauline was *cosmological*; this is *idealistic*. The believer retreats from that outer world which the Palestinian apocalyptist would boldly subjugate, into the inner, spiritual realm. As Paulinism goes back to Pharisaic and Apocalyptic thought, this other reverts to pre-Christian Alexandrianism, whose essential and characteristic trait is *idealism*. The Alexandrian-Christian's answer to Philo's question, Who is the *κληρονόμος* of the things of God? in some forms is almost identical with Philo's, viz.: The wise man who controls his own faculties and desires;¹ in all it tends to lose terrestrial footing. It is in the Lucan form the same as the answer of Hebrews, whose author reasons along the same lines. The inheritance of Abraham cannot have been an earthly country (as the uncircumcised in heart and ears maintain), for even in the land of promise he dwelt in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise, as a stranger and sojourner; for he was looking for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God. He and his died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen and greeted them from afar. For they were indeed seeking a country of their own, but a better country, that is a heavenly; and for this reason God was not ashamed to be called the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, because there is no real particularism where the country sought is the heavenly, and in this case the city sought was one prepared of God.

The course of reasoning is similar when in Hebrews 3 : 7 to 4 : 11 the author (who here as elsewhere is followed by *Barnabas*) reasons from Psalm 95 : 7-11 that the "rest" (*κατάπαυσις*) set before Moses (Exod. 33 : 14) and Israel (Num. 14 : 21-23) in the wilderness was not that which Joshua gave in the land of Canaan, but that of Genesis 2 :

¹ Cf. *Clem. Recogn.*, i. 37. All this (Moses' appointment of "a place in which alone it should be lawful to them to sacrifice to God") was arranged with this view, that when the fitting time should come, and they should learn by means of the Prophet (Deut. 18 : 15 has just been referred to) that God desires mercy and not sacrifice, they might see Him who should teach them that the place chosen of God, in which it was suitable that victims should be offered to God, is his Wisdom."

2, the eternal sabbatic rest of God in the perfected creation. The promise was not realized in the literal sense, therefore the true sense was the inner or spiritual. It was discerned by the ancient worthies through "faith," i. e., the insight which "gives substance to these hoped-for things, and puts to the test of action the things not seen."¹

Both Alexandrian and Pauline ideas are carried out more emphatically, and similarly intermingled in *Ps.-Barnabas*. True, this Alexandrian writer flounders about among ideas much too large for him, borrowed partly from Hebrews, partly from a source at least connected with Acts 7. But his most salient characteristic is his marked effort to get away from the local sense of the *κληρονομία*. In his view both Genesis 1:26 to 2:3 and Exodus 3:14 look to the messianic Sabbath, which is the Inheritance. The land (*γη*) "flowing with milk and honey," when *gnosis* is applied — "for the Lord established among us wisdom and understanding of his secret things" — is seen to be not at all a reference to Canaan but to the redeemed creation. It is "a parable concerning the Lord." "In reference to the new creation of man in the likeness of Christ the prophet (Moses) preached, Enter into an earth (*εἰς γῆν*, omitting the article) flowing with milk and honey, and be lords over it (Exod. 3:14; Gen. 1:27).² We therefore are they whom he brought into the good earth. What, then, is the milk and honey? — The promise and the word by which we are nourished to live and be lords of the earth."³

These examples from Hebrews and *Barnabas* must suffice to illustrate the Alexandrian method of universalizing the conception of the *κληρονομία*. It is universalized, but not

¹ In 1:2; 2:5-9, where Ps. 8:4 is interpreted as applying to Christ's dominion over the world in fulfilment of Gen. 1:28, our author manifestly rests on a Pauline basis (cf. 1 Cor. 15; 27 f.), but the Alexandrianism of Hebrews is quite as marked as its Paulinism.

² Cf. this intermingling of Gen. 1:27 and Exod. 3:14 with that of Gen. 15:14 and Exod. 3:12 in Acts 7:7.

³ Compare with this the modern expression rationalizing the older view of the hereafter: "Heaven is not a place but a condition."

as having the *κόσμος* as its content, except where the influence of Paul is unmistakable. It escapes the bondage of Jewish particularism by spiritualizing the sense. The *κληρονομία* is essentially a condition of the soul in relation to God. Stephen, Hebrews, and *Barnabas* are all agreed that it must be understood *τυπικώς* of the Messianic Age, and they appeal to history in proof that no literal fulfilment was ever given. In Luke 1 : 73-75; Acts 7 : 2-7 we have even a substitution of the true *λατρεία* as its essential content.

[b] But it is also characteristic of the speech no less than of Hebrews, that it considers the theocratic characters of the Old Testament as types of Christ, though only in the case of Moses is this fully developed. In the patriarchal period it is of course the story of Joseph which foreshadows that of the Messianic Deliverer. Hence we have in the latter half of § 1 (vv. 9-16) a rehearsal of how Joseph was rejected by his jealous brethren and sold into Egypt, but was made by God the means of their deliverance. This mention of the patriarchs' treatment of Joseph, the one "with whom God was, delivering him out of all his afflictions and giving him favour and wisdom" (*χάριν καὶ σοφίαν*, cf. Luke 2 : 40, 52, *πληρούμενος σοφίας, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτον . . . προέκοπτεν τῇ σοφίᾳ . . . καὶ χάριτι*. Also Acts 6 : 3 *πλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας* and 10, *τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι*) is enough to suggest in connection with vv. 25-29, 39-43, 51-53, the author's idea of why the promise was deferred four hundred years. For the motive attributed to Joseph's brethren (cf. vv. 27 f.) is also characteristic. Like Jesus, Joseph was delivered up to the Gentiles by his brethren, to whom he came as prophet and king (*βασιλεύσεις*, Gen. 37 : 5-11, LXX.) Their motive was *ζῆλος* (Gen. 37 : 11, Acts 7 : 9), the characteristic fault of the unbelieving Jews in Acts (5 : 17; 13 : 45; 17 : 5) and Clement of Rome (cc. iv-vi.).¹

¹ The term appears also in James 3 : 14, 16; 4 : 2 as a fault. Elsewhere it appears in this sense only in the Pauline epistles. Even the "envy" of the chief priests who deliver up Jesus is described by another term (*φθόνος*, Matt. 27 : 18; Mark. 15 : 10).

But the divine endowment of Joseph with "wisdom and favor," and the presence of God with him as against the ζῆλος of his brethren is not all which suggests that the portrait is drawn τυπικῶς. Pains are taken to distinguish a first and second encounter of Joseph and his brethren. It was only "at the second time" that Joseph was made known unto his brethren, and became their deliverer (7 : 13). This might easily pass as mere accident, had we not immediately after a similar distinction in the portrayal of the career of Moses, where the first and second coming to "his brethren" is certainly to be understood τυπικῶς, and perhaps even the forty years, as corresponding to the forty years of Israel's obduracy between the first and second coming of Jesus (cf. Heb. 3 : 17). Our author sees in both a foreshadowing of his own age. Jesus has been rejected; presented now a first time to his brethren he is not recognized as "ruler and deliverer," but has been withdrawn into heaven. But from thence he must appear a "second time to them that wait for him unto salvation" (Heb. 9 : 28).¹

2. [a] In the review of the Mosaic dispensation the order of treatment is reversed. The typological significance of the redemptive personality occupies the author's attention before that of the institution. That our author is here approaching the heart of his argument is clearly indicated by the transition verse 7 : 17, "But proportionately as the time of the promise which God promised to Abraham was drawing nigh the people increased and multiplied in Egypt." Were it possible here to be blind to his conception of "the promise" and its content, verses 35-38, with their five-times-repeated emphatic οὐτος, make sure that none shall mistake the portrait of Christ in that of Moses. Every trait is made to suggest the great messianic passage quoted from the Law (Deut. 18 : 15, 18 f.), "A prophet shall the Lord God raise

¹ Cf. the rabbinic doctrine of the withdrawal of Messiah (*Pesikta* 49b). "Messiah, like Moses, will first appear, then be withdrawn 45 days (45 instead of 40, the number of years of Moses' withdrawal on account of Dan. 9 : 26). See below p. 251, note 4.

up unto you of your brethren *like unto me*. To him shall ye hearken in all things," a passage undoubtedly in our author's mind in Luke 24 : 27, 44, but nowhere employed in any earlier writing. The doctrine of Messiah as the alter Moses, "that prophet," is subsequently alluded to in John 1 : 21 (4 : 25?); 5 : 46; 6 : 14,¹ and fully developed in Acts 3 : 19-26, where the interpretation of the prophecy is that Messiah first appears as a prophet raised up by God from among his brethren of Israel, to turn them to repentance in preparation for the great and terrible Day of Jehovah (a function elsewhere assigned to Elias, or Moses and Elias). After he has thus been sent to Israel a first time, to bless them in turning away every one of them from their iniquities, and has afterwards been preached to the Gentiles, he will be sent a second time as the appointed Christ (3 : 20); for until this time of ἀποκατάστασις πάντων the heavens must receive him.² But the significant thing is that, aside from these passages and the possible exception soon to be discussed of Matthew 2 : 20, there is no trace in the New Testament of this treatment of Moses as a type of Christ save in Hebrews 3 : 1-6.³ It is in the Clementine literature, as already noted, that "the true Prophet," or "the Prophet," becomes the stereotyped

¹ The fourth gospel has consideration for the Alexandrian ideas apparent in our sources in other instances. See above, p. 222, note.

² A tracing of the relation of Acts 3 to Luke 1 f. and 24 has only indirect connection with our theme through the apparent relationship of Acts 3 to Acts 7; but one may be permitted to suggest a comparison of Acts 3 : 21 with Luke 1 : 70 and 3 : 18 with Luke 24 : 26 f.

³ The passage is exceedingly obscure, but may be elucidated with the help of *Barn.* viii. as follows : — The description (Num. 12 : 7) of Moses' dealing with Israel in the Exodus as faithfulness "in all God's house" is seized upon as a point of comparison for Jesus' faithfulness to God in *building* the house, viz., us, God's people in whom he dwells. Jesus thus appears not only as the new Redeemer, greater than Moses by as much as the builder is greater than the steward, but as the new Creator, for the new creation of God is not the universe, his "house" in the external sense, but his people in whom he dwells. Cf. Matt. 16 : 18 in the light of the rabbinic parable cited at end of Chase's art., "Peter, First Epistle of" in Cheyne's *Encycl. Bibl.* from *Yalkuth*, where the Creator, seeking a foundation on which to build his house, says, 'I have found Abraham, the rock on which to build.' See also *Barn.* viii.

designation of Christ, even in his pre-existent activity. In the same connection as Acts 7 : 37, viz., between the apostasy of Israel at Sinai with the consequent institution of the sacrificial system, and the institution of the "place in which alone it should be lawful for them to sacrifice," Moses' prediction is thus referred to (*Clem. Recogn.* I, 36): "He said himself, 'A prophet shall the Lord your God raise unto you, whom ye shall hear even as myself, according to all things which he shall say to you. Whosoever shall not hearken to that prophet shall be cut off from his people.'"¹

So with the speech of Stephen. The great figure of Moses is introduced with the remark that the time of the promise which God vouchsafed to Abraham had come nigh (v. 17). After the four hundred years of affliction in Egypt which followed upon the patriarchs' treatment of Joseph, God set out to redeem his promise. Then appeared the prototype of Messiah and was "fair unto God."² In his childhood the oppressor sought his life, and he is hardly rescued, but by the adoption of Pharaoh's daughter he becomes "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and "mighty in words and works."³ The former trait is borrowed from (Alexandrian?) midrash,⁴ the latter certainly not suggested by Exodus 4 : 11. Finally Moses like Abraham and the patriarchs (Acts 7 : 5 f., 29; Heb. 11 : 9, 13-16), like the people of God in the writer's time (1 Peter 1 : 1; 2 : 11, 17), spends the period of his manhood as a "stranger and sojourner."⁵

¹ Cf. Acts 3 : 22, 23, which has at the end the same variation from the O. T., Hebrew and LXX.

² Combining Exod. 3 : 2 with the description of Messiah in Ps. 45 : 2; cf. Hebrews 11 : 23, and Justin, *Trypho*, xxxviii. The same Psalm is quoted as messianic in Hebrews 1 : 8 f. The extraordinary beauty of Moses is a favorite theme of Talmudic writers. Hebrews 11 : 23 f. dwells on the beauty of the child, the rescue from the oppressor, the adoption by Pharaoh's daughter and return of Moses to his own people.

³ On the phrase *δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις* here (Acts 7 : 22) and in Luke 24 : 22, see above, p. 235.

⁴ Philo, *Vita Mos.*, I. 5, Jos., *Ant.*, II. 9, 10.

⁵ The only other occurrences of *παροικεῖν* and its derivatives in the New Testament besides those here referred to are as follows : Luke 24 : 18 (of Jesus the

But why dwell upon the story of Moses' infancy? Only in Matthew 2 have we a corresponding deliverance of the infant Redeemer from the wrath of the king,¹ and this incident is wholly excluded from the Lucan form of the story. On the other hand the legend of the hiding of the infant Messiah from the oppressor is older than any of our New Testament writings² and was doubtless connected with the story of Exodus 1 : 15-2 : 10 at least as soon as the doctrine of Messiah as the alter Moses began to be developed.³ Had we the gospel of the infancy known to our author and to the author of Hebrews 11 : 23, we might perhaps learn the nature of the correspondence he seems aiming to bring out. Meantime there is plenty to indicate affinity with Alexandrian and Ebionite teaching.

A more striking peculiarity of our author's sketch of the career of Moses is that he seizes upon the story of Exodus 2 : 11 ff., as if it were simply an abortive attempt to carry out the deliverance which is made Moses' mission in c. 3, certainly involving a strain upon the original. But in this also he agrees with Philo's *Vita Mos.* Moreover, this attempt is not frustrated by Moses' own violence or precipitancy; for Moses "supposed that Israel would understand how that God was granting them redemption by his hand." It was prevented by the callousness and obduracy of his people, and the ζῆλος of the evildoer, who thrust him away, saying, "Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?" Thus through Israel's incapacity to appreciate a divine deliverance symbolically offered, the Deliverer was withdrawn and the redemption deferred forty years.⁴ The redemption which then at

prophet like unto Moses); Acts 13 : 17 (the fathers delivered when "sojourners in the land of Egypt") and Eph. 2 : 19 (Gentile Christians are *not* strangers and sojourners with Israel, but fellow-citizens).

¹ Heb. 11 : 23 f. "By faith Moses was hid three months . . . because they feared not the king's commandment."

² Cf. Rev. 12 : 1-6.

³ Cf. Exod. 4 : 19 LXX, *τεθνήκασι γὰρ πάντες οἱ ζητοῦντές σου τὴν ψυχὴν*, with Matt. 2 : 20, *τεθνήκασι γὰρ οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου*.

⁴ Cf. *Pesikta*, 49 b, "Messiah like Moses will first appear, then be withdrawn

last followed is described simply by citation of Moses' mission (Exod. 3 : 2 ff.) to be the ruler and judge and *λυτρωτής* whom they had refused. The parallel to the career of Jesus is accentuated by a reference to the "wonders and signs"¹ (cf. Acts 2 : 22; Heb. 2 : 4), wrought "forty years long in Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness."² The section is rhetorically finished by a citation of the promise (v. 37): "This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel, A Prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me."

[b] The second part of this section on the Mosaic period, vv. 38-43, turns to its prophetic institution, the Law. And here we come upon an interpretation of Exodus 19-34 as unique in the New Testament as anything in the depiction of the career of Moses. The point that the speaker makes is indeed one for which the rabbinic writings furnish something of an analogy in their distinction of the oral law or *qabbalah*, delivered to Moses on Sinai, and by him orally transmitted to Joshua and the succession of prophets, from the written *torah*;³ but it is one which marks an attitude toward the law wholly different from the Pauline, one which is in fact the distinctive characteristic of the Alexandrian

45 days" (from Dan. 9 : 26). The doctrine of the withdrawal of Messiah (Web., *Altsyn. Theol.*, p. 348) is seen also in Apocalyptic literature; cf. Rev. 12 : 6, 13-16.

¹ Cf. *Clem. Recogn.*, I. 57, "Jesus was indeed he who according to the prophecy of Moses was to come; since indeed as Moses wrought signs and miracles, so also did Jesus."

² Hebrews, which stands alone among canonical writings in support of our author's reference to the "Red Sea as the scene of deliverance (Heb. 11 : 29; see above, p. 231, for the parallel to *Assumptio Mosis*), also emphasizes the period of 40 years of deferred redemption, seeming to suggest a parallel between the 40 years of Deut. 1 : 3, when God bore with disobedient Israel, and his own time (3 : 9 ff.). This has been taken as an indication of the date of Hebrews. But Acts 7 : 23, 30 inserts into the tradition two other 40-year periods, one in which Moses, like Christ, was "growing in wisdom," the other corresponding to that of God's long-suffering between the first and second mission of the Redeemer.

³ The midrashic saying, "Moses became rich from the chips struck off by his chisel" (Exod. 34 : 1) illustrates the later conception of the superior value of the oral communications on Sinai. Deuteronomy itself purports to give the content of this intercourse with God, Deut. 5 : 1-6 : 1.

type of Christianity. For, as both Baur and Harnack have made clear, our discrimination of the various types of early Christian thought must be based principally on their attitude toward the principal question of the age, and this is unmistakably the question of the validity of the Law. Now it is undeniable that both Paul and the Alexandrians are animated by a spirit of revolt against the particularism of Old Testament religion, and while the Alexandrian solution of the problem is, as we have seen, a qualitative distinction between the formal and the spiritual content of the law, Paul's being a temporal distinction, these two tend easily toward combination, so that even in Paul we have the beginnings of typology (1 Cor. 10 : 6; Col. 2 : 17), and in the apologists a well-defined theory of the imposition of the *σκιά τῶν μελλόντων* at a definite time and for a particular fault.¹ That which is distinctively, even surprisingly, wanting in Paul is the discrimination of the later writers between the moral and the ceremonial elements of the law. Paul is completely lacking, apparently, in that sense of revolt against sacerdotalism and the sacrificial system so strikingly evinced in the *agraphon* from the Ebionite gospel. "I came to put an end to sacrificing, and if ye cease not from sacrificing, wrath shall not cease from you."² Again and again we wonder why Paul does not draw the distinction so constantly drawn by Justin between the eternal moral law and the enactments of the Mosaic ceremonial. But he never does. The law is to him always synonymous with the perfect revelation of the divine will, and so long as one is "under law," all its parts go together and are equally indispensable. But the very essence of the redemption is to Paul that the redeemed (Jews and Gentiles) are "*no longer under law but under grace.*"

¹ Justin, *Trypho*, xxi, arguing from Ezek. 20 : 19-26, that the ceremonial was imposed, although "not good," on account of the sin of apostasy at Sinai, Exod. 32 : 6 ff. See below, p. 256.

² From Epiphanius, *Her.*, xxx. 16, p. 140 B : *ὡς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς* (sc., *τοῖς Ἐβιωναίοις*) *εὐαγγέλιον καλούμενον περιέχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ εἰάν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν, οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή.* See Resch, *Agrapha*, § 12; *Αποσγρηφον* 6, p. 373.

Hence the distinction of a spiritualized law brought by Messiah as second Moses and true Prophet (Weber, *Alt-synag. Theologie*, § 84) represented in the Gospel of Matthew (Sermon on the Mount, and 19 : 16-21; contrast Mark), James (2 : 8, 12 νόμος βασιλικός ἐλευθερίας), and Barnabas (ii. 6, ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ὁ ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης), the *nova lex* of the second century fathers, is to Paul un-Christian. It is from non-Pauline sources that the second century takes its interpretation of the law as twofold in character. That this non-Pauline attitude toward the law existed even in the primitive church should not be difficult to demonstrate. There is evidence that, directly or indirectly, it stands related to Alexandria in pre-Christian and post-Christian times, and of this evidence an important link is formed by Acts 6-8, taken in its connection with Hebrews, *Ps.-Barnabas*, the *Kerygma Petri*, and the Clementine writings.¹ Of the worth of this evidence the reader must judge. Alexandrian Christianity made no such violent rupture with its legalistic past as Paul with Pharisaism. Its system of allegorical interpretation, insight, or *gnosis*, as it is designated by Barnabas, enabled it to retain the Jewish Scriptures while repudiating Jewish particularism, specifically, as we have seen, in the case of the Abrahamic κληρονομία; and the σκήνωμα θεοῦ, but also, as we shall see, in the case even of the Mosaic ceremonial. More than one Jewish sect, some within the limits of Palestine itself, had revolted from the temple worship and scribal ceremonialism, carrying to a more or less radical extent the principle of spiritual interpreta-

¹ The dependence of the Clementines, in their present form, on our canonical sources is undisputed. Some may regard this as a sufficient explanation of their special connection with certain parts of Luke-Acts. What is here aimed at is a demonstration of the affinity as existing not only here, but in a whole group of writings, of which the Clementines and their sources form but a part, and which goes far back and extends widely. For not all the Alexandrianism of early Christianity comes from Alexandria. The term is used of a special type of non-Pauline universalizing of Old Testament religion, because its chief centre was Alexandria; but Palestinian thought, Essenic and Ebionite, was affected by it, even in pre-Christian times.

tion.¹ Messiah himself was to be ἀνὴρ ἀνακαινοποιῶν τὸν νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ἰψιστοῦ.² The Essenes, as is well known, had wholly broken away from the sacerdotal system; but the most systematic pre-Christian attempts at universalizing Judaism were in Alexandria, where Philo is only the last and greatest of a school whose effort was to read into Mosaism the theism of Plato by allegorical interpretation. Philo himself protests against more radical predecessors, iconoclasts, who rejected altogether the literal sense, which to him was only of lesser value,³ and regarded the spiritual only as obligatory. We have the evidence that Alexandrian Christian writers fell naturally in with this process in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, whose allegorical interpretation of the law of clean and unclean meats is taken bodily from *Ps.-Aristeas* (ca. 95 B. C.) and is in turn employed by Justin Martyr.⁴ Hebrews 9 : 5 even suggests that it is only the limitations of the occasion which prevent this author from developing the typological significance of the tabernacle furniture. But in one respect Christian Alexandrianism takes a step in advance of Judaism. It accepts indeed the doctrine of the inner sense of the Law of the more radical

¹ Cf. the sayings of Jesus on the law of clean and unclean in Mark 7 : 15 ff., and Luke 11 : 41 (almsgiving of the contents of the dish purifies the food. Washing of its surface, while the contents are the fruits of rapacity and oppression, does not). Even Pharisaism of the broader type had similar tendencies in the distinction of the greater and lesser commandments of the Law; cf. Luke. 10 : 26 f.; Mark 12 : 32, and the golden rule of Hillel with the remark, "This is the whole Law, the rest is commentary." Old Testament precedent will occur to every one; e. g., Mic. 6 : 6-8; Ps. 40 : 6-8; 50 : 7-15; 51 : 16 f. This was the decided tendency of the Wisdom literature, with which the Epistle of James is in nearest connection. It is noteworthy that here we meet, along with the warnings against ζῆλος (see above, p. 247) the conception of the New Law, as in *Barn.*, ii. 6 (cf. James 2 : 8, τελεῖτε τὸν νόμον βασιλικόν, 1 : 25, νόμος τέλειος, ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας), and of the θρησκεία (= λατρεία) as social morality.

² Test. of Levi, xvi.; the passage is of Christian origin.

³ See Gfrörer, *Philo*, I., p. 104.

⁴ Cf. *Barn.*, x. with *Ps.-Aristeas*, xxxix. 10 ff. (Merx., *Archiv*, I, 1869, p. 279; Swete, *Introd. to O. T. in Greek*, 1900, pp. 541-548). For some reason Harnack (*Litgesch.*) regards the utilization of Barnabas by Justin as "not strictly demonstrable!"

iconoclastic type, which Philo deplored,¹ but it has also an explanation to offer of the reason why the law was given in this enigmatic form, apparently teaching a worship substantially identical in its rites with heathen worship,² although its real meaning was spiritual and universal. This new departure is the application of *the doctrine of accommodation*, probably based on the saying of Jesus in explanation of the Mosaic statute of divorce. Jesus taught that the literal law was adapted to conditions of human imperfection. The true principle must be found in the description of man's ideal state "in the beginning of the creation" (Mark 10 : 2-9). In Christian Alexandrian teaching the application is more specific. The law is not human, nor even Mosaic law in general, but the Mosaic *ceremonial*. The "hardness of heart" is that of *Israel*, which compelled Jehovah to "give them statutes which were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live" (Ezek. 20 : 25; cf. Gal. 3 : 21). Moreover, even the occasion becomes specific; it was that of Exodus 32 : 6 ff., the making of the golden calf. Thus Justin Martyr explains the Christian non-observance of the Mosaic ceremonial as follows in the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew: "For we [Christians] too would observe the fleshly circumcision and the Sabbaths, and, in short, all the feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined you; namely, on account of your transgression and the hardness of your hearts . . . for the righteous until Moses, Adam, Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek, though uncircumcised and keeping no Sabbaths,³ were pleasing to God; and after them Abraham, with all his descendants until Moses, under whom

¹ Cf. the doctrine of *Barnabas* that Israel was misled by an evil angel to accepting the Law in a literal sense with the agraphon above cited, and *Clem. Recogn.* I: 64: "Nos enim, inquam pro certo comperimus, quod super sacrificiis, quæ offertis, multo magis exasperatur deus, sacrificiorum tempore duntaxat expleto. Et quia vos non vultis agnoscere emensum esse jam tempus hostias offerendi, ob hoc destructur et templum, et abominatio desolationis statuatur in loco sancto."

² *Barn.*, xvi. 2. "For, like the heathen almost, they consecrated God in the temple."

³ Hardly the conception of the Priestly Document.

your nation appeared unrighteous and ungrateful to God, making a calf in the wilderness; wherefore God, *accommodating himself to that nation*, enjoined them also to offer sacrifices *as if* to his name, in order that you might not serve idols, which precept, however, you have not observed. . . . Moreover, you were commanded to abstain from certain kinds of food, in order that you might keep God before your eyes while you ate and drank, seeing you were prone to depart from his knowledge, as Moses also affirms: 'The people ate and drank and rose up to play.' . . . Thus also God commanded you by the mouth of Moses to abstain from unclean, and indecent¹ and rapacious animals, when, though you were eating manna in the desert . . . you made and worshipped the golden calf. Hence he cries, and justly, 'They are foolish children in whom is no faith.'² Moreover that God enjoined you to keep the Sabbath and imposed other precepts upon you for a sign, as I have already said, on account of your unrighteousness, and that of your fathers . . . these words of his can prove to you. They are narrated by Ezekiel. . . . I gave them also statutes which were not good, and judgments whereby they shall not live. . . . And that you may learn that it was for the sins of your own nation, and for their idolatries, and not because there was any necessity for such sacrifices that they were enjoined, listen to the manner in which He speaks of these by Amos. . . . 'Have ye offered to me victims and sacrifices in the wilderness, O house of Israel? saith the Lord. And ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of your god Raphan the figures (τύπους) which ye made for yourselves, and I will carry you away beyond Damascus, saith the Lord.'³

¹ For the justification of this term compare *Barn.* x, 6-8, and *Ps.-Aristeas* xlii. 10 (Swete, p. 547, 15).

² Faith in the Alexandrian sense of *insight, gnosis*, penetration to the inner spiritual sense, as in Hebrews, *passim*. Cf. Justin, *Trypho*, xlv.

³ Abridged from *Trypho*, cc. xviii.-xxii. Cf. xxvii. "And although God commands you by all the prophets to do the same (ritual) things which he also commanded by Moses, it was on account of the hardness of your hearts . . . so that as in the beginning these things were enjoined you because of your wickedness,

This remarkable doctrine of Justin's regarding the Mosaic ceremonial worship as offered only "as if to God's name," enjoined "by accommodation," and as supplanting an original more spiritual type, in consequence of the sin of Aaron and the people at Sinai, if it stood alone, might perhaps be sufficiently explained as a mere interpretation of Acts 7 : 38-42, which is manifestly employed. Whether correct or not would still require to be ascertained. But it occurs as part of a larger connection reproduced in a whole series of writings of Alexandrian origin, the remotest link being even of pre-Christian date. Item by item Justin reproduces the arguments and even the language of *Barnabas*; and *Barnabas* not only builds on Hebrews and Acts, but on *Ps.-Aristeas*. In Justin we find the same ideas as in *Barnabas*, supported by the same passages, with new and more copious citations. Physical circumcision is a type only, since it is shared by Gentile nations; the real meaning being, Take away the veil from your hearts and ears, as says Jeremiah (4 : 3): "Sow not upon thorns, break up your fallow ground, circumcise the foreskin of your heart" (*Trypho* xvi., xxviii., *Barn.* ix., Heb. 6 : 7 f.; Acts 7 : 51). Sabbaths were ordained as a type of the messianic age, the "rest" of God in the "new creation" and the true "promised land" (in *Trypho* xii., xix., xxi., xxiii., Sabbaths were ordained for a type of the perpetual Sabbath of the regenerate life; cf. *Barn.* vi., resting on Heb. 2 : 5-4 : 13). The law of clean and unclean meats was symbolical of abstinence from the vices characteristic of the beasts in question, swine, birds of prey, hares and hyenas (*Trypho* xx., *Barn.* x., *Aristeas* xxxix. 10-xliii. 10 — Swete, pp. 544-548). "The temple, which is called the temple in Jerusalem, God admitted to be His house or court, not as though he needed it, but in order that you, in this view of it, giving yourselves to Him, might not worship in like manner because of your persistence in it, or rather your increased proneness to it, he calls you to a remembrance of it." Also c. xxx: "Impute it to your own wickedness that God can even be accused by those who have no understanding of not having always instructed all in the same righteous statutes." In later passages the doctrine is reiterated.

idols. And that this is so, Isaiah says: 'What house have ye built me, saith the Lord. Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool'" (*Trypho* xxii.; cf. *Barn.* xvi., Heb. 9, Acts 7 : 44-50).

Not only does Justin coincide with Barnabas in his general principle, and his application of it to the greater institutions of Mosaism as a whole, circumcision, Sabbaths, the law of clean and unclean meats, the sacrificial system, the temple; but in great detail he reproduces the particular types found by Barnabas, as the two goats as symbols of the two comings of Jesus, *Trypho* xl., cxl. (*Barn.* vii.), the outstretched hands of Moses (*Trypho* xci., cxii., *Barn.* xii.), Joshua's name (*Trypho* cxiii., *Barn.* xii., cf. Heb. 4 : 8), and the like.

The difference between the Alexandrianism of Justin and that of Barnabas is that whereas in Barnabas the literal sense is said to be of the Devil (*Barn.*, ix., x.), in Justin the typological theory is more fully adjusted to the Pauline by the doctrine that the external sense was temporarily intended.¹

Before returning to the doctrine of Stephen's speech on this fundamental question of the age, the occasion and validity of the Mosaic law and of the temple and its worship, we have still to cite one or two other early Christian documents which illustrate the more radical type of Alexandrianism represented by Barnabas, and which treat them as "statutes which were not good." The Essenic tendency already noted as apparent in the agraphon from the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* appears quite clearly in the *Clementine Recognitions*, whose parallels to Acts 7 : 38 ff. are thus abridged and paraphrased by Hilgenfeld.² Peter (*Recogn.* I. 32 f.) teaches Clement that the true Prophet (Adam-Christ) had revealed to Abraham that circumcision was instituted as a sign and seal of chastity. Afterward the twelve patriarchs, numbering 72 (sic, cf. Acts 7 : 14) with their families, abode four hundred

¹ *Trypho* xxvii., quoted above on p. 77 (note). In the *Clementines* Peter even admits to Clement that there are elements of Scripture which misrepresent the truth, and must be disregarded.

² *Wiss. Th.* 1895, p. 408 f.

years in Egypt (Acts 7 : 6). The true Prophet appeared to Moses in Egypt (Acts 7 : 30) for Israel's deliverance. But when Moses had climbed the Mount, the people showed their idolatrous inclination by worshipping the golden calf (1 : 35 cf. Acts 7 : 41), and Moses was then forced to concede to them the evil practice of sacrifice, but left the eradication of it to the true Prophet, who should be like him and come after him (i. 36, cf. Acts 7 : 37). He was also obliged to concede to the weakness of the people a special place in which alone it should be lawful for them to sacrifice. Only a few (Essenes and the like) had been able to raise themselves to an understanding of the worthlessness of sacrifice. Finally Peter explains that the building of a material temple on the spot which had been set apart as a place of prayer was the impious act of an ambitious tyrant¹ (*Recogn.*, I. 38).

An equally radical attitude of distinct hostility to the sacrificial system appears in an early Christian writing of unmistakably Egyptian origin, whose relation to the Clementine sources and the sources of Luke-Acts is a difficult problem.² The *Kerygma Petri*, the surviving fragments of which are principally found in Clement of Alexandria, dates from early in the second century, as the copious use made of it in the *Apology of Aristides* proves. Like Justin, like Aristides, its author aims to present Christianity in contrast first with heathenism, then with Judaism, dividing the world reli-

¹ Ubi vero tyrannos sibi magis quaesivere quam reges, tunc etiam in loco, qui eis orationis causa fuerat praedestinatus, templum pro ambitione regia construxere. *Recogn.*, I. 38.

² There is also conclusive evidence of literary dependence between the *Kerygma Petri* and the Clementines (see v. Döbschütz, *T. u. U.* xi. p. 33). *Recogn.* V. 20, and *Homil.*, X. 16 agree verbally in their description of Egyptian brute worship, both (and consequently their older common source) reproducing the *Ap. of Aristides*, c. xii., which in turn reproduces Frg. III of the *Kerygma*, this in turn showing connection with *Aristeas*, xxxviii. 10. To complete the chain of Alexandrian sources we need only add the relations which von Döbschütz has pointed out between Frg. II of the *Kerygma* and Philo, the *Prooemium* in *Theoph. ad Autol.*, II. 36, and the *Sibylline Oracles*, viii. 375 ff., and 390. Also between Frg. III and Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* iii. 19), with Origen's refutation.

giously into these three "genera." For his contrast between Jewish and heathen worship, in particular the description of heathen rites, wherein the Egyptian receive special attention, he resorts in part, as had Barnabas, to Aristeas.¹ The whole passage is also so close in form and substance to Acts 17 : 24-31 (cf. also Acts 14 : 15-17) as to compel the recognition of some more or less direct, but apparently literary connection.² But we are concerned now with the description of Jewish worship which in the *Kerygma* is placed in the mouth of Peter, and which appears to have followed upon that of the heathen: — "Neither worship ye as do the Jews, for these, fancying that they alone know God, know him not, but are worshippers of angels and archangels, the month and the moon. And unless the moon appear they do not observe the sabbath, which is called First,³ nor do they observe the new moon, nor Unleavened Bread, nor the Feast (Tabernacles), nor a great day."

We get the full significance of this arraignment of the Mosaic ceremonial, and its ritual calendar, as a "worship of angels and archangels," by comparing Paul's arraignment of the Judaizers in Galatia for returning in their newly adopted observance of (Sabbath) "days and months (new-moons), and seasons (מוֹעֲדִים) and (Sabbatic) years" to a worship of

¹ Cf. *Aristeas*, xxxviii. 15-39 : 5 Swete, 542, 10-544, 20, with *Kerygma Petri*, Frg. III, ed. Dobschütz (*Texte u. Unt.* xi.). See the preceding note.

² "Voraussetzung des in der Heidenkirche sich bildenden Dogmas ist ein nur in dürftigen Grundzügen feststehendes, sonst aber höchst bildsames Kerygma von dem *einen* Gott und von Christus" (quoted by v. Dobschütz, *ibid.* from Harnack, *D. G.*² I, 67). He adds: "Bei jenem herrscht der Gedanke der Weltschöpfung, bei diesem meist der des Endgerichtes vor," and cites II *Clem.* 1 : 1, and Harn., *Patr. Apost. Opera*, I, 2, p. 140. Cf. Acts 17 : 24-31, and *Kerygma Petri* Frags. *Wisdom of Solomon*, also attributed to Alexandria, gives one of the best and fullest examples of this Kerygma. Cf. *Wisd.* 13 : 6, 10, with Acts 17 : 23-27. Its comparison of Greek with Egyptian idolatry is specially noteworthy in connection with *Aristeas* and *Kerygma Petri* (cf. *Wisd.* 15 : 18-16 : 1, with *Aristeas* xxxviii. 1-15 (Merx. *Archiv.* i. p. 278).

³ For the elaborate ceremonies connected with the establishment of the annual religious calendar, beginning with the examination of "witnesses of the moon" for the "sanctification of the (Passover) new moon," see the Talmudic tractate *Rosh-hasshanah*.

the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, which, as compared with the direct "access in one Spirit unto the Father" (Eph. 2 : 18), obtained by Christ for both Jew and Gentile, is no better than their original heathenism. Everling¹ long ago proved that the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, both here in Galatians 4 : 3, 9 and Colossians 2 : 8, where the observance of "feast-days, new moons and sabbath days" is associated with "worshipping of angels" and the rites declared to be *σκιά τῶν μελλόντων* whose corporeal reality is "of Christ," are angelic beings in control of the four elements of nature and the heavenly bodies. Since then the *Apology of Aristides* has been brought to light; and this writer not only declares the Jews to be in their worship "like the heathen, even if in some sort they do appear to approach the truth," asserting that the Mosaic ceremonial is addressed "to angels and not to God, seeing they observe Sabbaths and new moons and the Passover and the great Fast, and fasts and circumcision and cleanness of meats,"² but employs *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* as his favorite term for the elemental spirits who are the real beings actually honored in the worship offered to angels, demons, spirits and divinities whether Jewish or heathen. The Judaizers of Colossae, accordingly, are but slightly different from those of Galatia. The common besetting sin of contemporary Judaism, a superstitious angelology and demonology,³ comes a little more into the foreground, Pharisaic nomism has retreated a little more into the background. In both epistles Paul is setting forth this contrast of Christianity with a more or less theosophic Judaism, and the point of superiority emphasized is that Christianity affords *direct* instead of merely *indirect*

¹ *Paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, 1888. See also E. Y. Hincks in Journ. of Bibl. Lit. 1896; and Woods, "Survivals in Christianity," 1893, p. 71, quoting Garnett, "Women of Turkey and their Folk-lore."

² *Ap. of Aristides*, c. xiv. (*Texts and Studies*, I, 1, 1891). See also Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kan.* II, 2 : 2, p. 823). In 2 *Clem.*, a writing affected by Egyptian sources, the Jews are called *οἱ δοκοῦντες ἔχειν τὸν θεόν*; cf. *Ep. to Diogn.* c. iii., *ἁμοιοτρόπως* (sc. *τοῖς ἔθνεσι*) *τὴν θρησκείαν προσάγουσιν, κτλ.*

³ Note the special character of early error in neighboring Ephesus. Acts 19: 13-19.

access to God (cf. Gal. 3 : 19 f. ; Eph. 2 : 18). The Mosaic ceremonial, as proved by its "days and months and seasons and years," and by the fact that it was "ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator" (Gal. 3 : 19) was adapted to the immaturity of the recipients. Its rules and ceremonies were addressed to "beings who by nature are not divine" (4 : 8) but were temporarily appointed by the Father as "stewards and guardians of the heir," having only a delegated authority (hence ἀσθενῆ) and no personal ownership (hence πτωχά) of the inheritance (the world) with which they had been entrusted until the coming of the "lord of all."¹ The nature of the Mosaic ceremonial (e. g., its lunar calendar), especially its extraordinary resemblance to heathen rites² and the beings through whom, historically, it was mediated, show it therefore to be *in form*³ a worship of angels, although the distinctions of meats (the Colossian Judaizers had in addition distinctions of "drinks;" cf. Rom. 14 : 17, 21) and the observances of new moons, sabbaths and feasts, are providentially adapted to foreshadow Christ (Col. 2 : 17) and might thus conceivably be utilized τυπικῶς, after the Alexandrian manner. That which proves, however, that these allusions to the law externally conceived as being a "worship of angels" or στοιχειά, do not belong to the substance of Paul's teaching, but are merely borrowed for the occasion, is the fact above noted, that there is no attempt to distinguish between the external and the spiritual, the divine and the human, the temporal and eternal in the law, and no attempt even to carry out the typology whose practicability is implied. It is therefore a mistake to attempt to account

¹ See above (p. 242) the citation from *Enoch*, lxxxix. f., as to the 70 angels to whose guardianship Israel was entrusted by God, and who are judged for unfaithfulness to their charge. In *Clem. Recogn.*, II. 42, each of the 72 nations has its "prince" or angelic guardian, that of Israel being Michael.

² In Gal. 5 : 12, Paul regards the mere outward rite of circumcision as comparable to the heathen religious castration.

³ Cf. Col. 2 : 11, where the Jewish fleshly circumcision is χειροποιήτος; with Acts 7 : 48, ἐν χειροποιήτοις, and 41, where those who εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, receive the ordinances of angels in place of the λατρεία.

for the doctrine of the *Kerygma*, *Barnabas*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus* (c. 1), which treats the Mosaic ceremonial as a "superstition" addressed to semi-divine beings, as based on Galatians 4 : 1-11. In Paul we find at most occasional *offshoots* of the doctrine. Its *roots* must be sought among Ebionite and Alexandrian writers, in the distinction between the *λόγια ζῶντα*, discovered by *gnosis* underneath the Mosaic ceremonial, and the system itself, which, if not actually evil and idolatrous, is at least heathenish, and tolerated by God only "by accommodation to that nation."

With this understanding of the distinctive elements of Pauline and Alexandrian thought, however occasionally intermingled, we return to the doctrine of Stephen's speech, which represents in Acts 7 : 42, that the Mosaic ceremonial was ordained as a punishment for the stiffneckedness (cf. Ex. 32 : 9; 33 : 1) and hard-heartedness of Israel, God being compelled continually by their grossness to put off the fulfilment of his promise to Abraham, and to hide the true *λατρεία* behind one adapted to a people which delighted in "the works of their hands" (externalities), "turned back in their hearts to Egypt," and had to be given over to a *λατρεία* of "the host of heaven."

For we have here as sharp a distinction as in *Barnabas* and *Justin*, between the *λόγια ζῶντα* originally delivered to Moses for the people in fulfilment of the promise whose time for fulfilment had now come (v. 17), that they should serve him in the appointed place (v. 7), and the ceremonial law. The "living oracles" proved all too ideal for an unworthy people, and were dashed to fragments at the foot of the mount. The sacrificial system actually ordained was suited to the people's demand of Aaron, "Make us gods which shall go before us." It was not a worship addressed directly to God, but to "the host of heaven," for the prophet declares (so argues our speaker) that the slain beasts and sacrifices of the forty years in the wilderness were not offered to God. On the contrary, to the prophet its tabernacle was a tabernacle of Moloch, and its implements mere *τύπους*, images of

Saturn the star-god,¹ ignorantly worshipped. It would be unreasonable to attempt to show that the Elohist account of the giving of the Decalogue, followed by the people's apostasy under the lead of Aaron, and the subsequent institution of the ceremonial worship was intended by its prophet author to suggest the superiority of the moral law as the true basis of divine favor (cf. Micah 6 : 6-8). Actual continuity between the ancient prophetic and the later Alexandrian and Ebionite antipathy to ceremonialism is more than we undertake to show. We observe only that this interpretation of Exodus 20 to 34 lay very near to hand, and is seized upon by our author and his followers. Because of the stiffneckedness of the people and their craving for external forms like the Egyptian, "God turned (from his purpose that they should serve *him*, v. 7) and gave them up to serve *the host of heaven*," i. e., angels, in particular those represented by the heavenly bodies. For proof he refers to Amos 5 : 25, assuming that the question "Did ye offer unto me slain beasts and sacrifices forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel?" is to be answered, No, but to beings who find delight in ceremonial worship, viz., the host of heaven, the *στοιχεῖα* of sun and stars. This he takes to be indicated in the words which follow, "And ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of the god Rephan, figures (*τύπους*) which ye made to worship them."²

Undoubtedly there are objections to this interpretation of Acts 7 : 39-44, in spite of the fact shown by the parallels

¹ For Moloch as sun-god, see Miller in Herzog's *Realencykl.*² Rephan is the Coptic name for $\text{ϩ}\text{N}\text{ϩ}$, *Chiun*, or Saturn, intelligible to the LXX, and apparently to the author of the speech of Stephen.

² The sense of the original: the wilderness period one *destitute* of sacrifices and offerings, although a time of special favor, was hopelessly lost after the Priestly Document came in to represent the sojourn in the wilderness as the sacerdotal period, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. Our author does not, of course, venture to deny the continual burnt offerings and sacrifice of the forty years in the wilderness, though such is really the meaning of Amos, neither does he assert that they were not *intended* for Yahwé; but he appeals to prophetic denunciation in proof that God *refused to regard them* as offered to himself, and turned over this unworthy *λατρεία* to "the host of heaven."

we adduce from the *Kerygma*, *Barnabas*, Justin, and the Clementines, showing that this was the understanding of the author's contemporaries and literary kindred. We are well aware that the worship of "the host of heaven" (Jer. 7 : 18, LXX) belongs specifically to the time of Manasseh. We are also aware that the question and answer quoted from Amos refer to two different periods separated by an interval of some six centuries. The inference is too easily drawn that the Christian speaker has the same idea; that he means, "Did you *continue* in the high and spiritual worship ordained for you in the wilderness, according to the promise, 'Ye shall worship me in this place,' O Israel? Nay, repeatedly you forsook it and worshipped strange gods." But what has the apostasy of Israel in the time of Manasseh and Jeremiah to do with the Stephen's argument? No one then denied these later idolatries of Israel. No one then would have ventured to assert that Israel's present *λατρεία* was not scrupulously conformed to the prescribed ceremonial, and sincerely intended for God. At the utmost this subsequent apostasy was an episode of Israel's past, which aggravated the general charge against them (v. 53, *καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε*); but it was the merest incident to the principle at stake. The question as between the speaker and his opponents concerns the *present λατρεία* of "slain beasts and sacrifices," as to whose ordination at Sinai both agree, the Jew claiming that this of itself is decisive as to its being "*the λατρεία*" (Rom. 9 : 5), the worship promised in Exodus 3 : 12, and actually instituted by God, perfect, absolute, ultimate. The question concerns *the worship of the forty years in the wilderness*, a period conceived by both parties, and proverbially by every Old Testament writer, as the typical period of Israel's faithful adherence to Yahwé. Unless the Christian can prove in some way that this is not *the λατρεία*, not ultimate but provisional (Paulinism); not direct, but indirect (Gal. 3 : 19 f., 24; 4 : 1-4, 8-11); not life-giving (*λόγια ζῶντα, νόμος δυνάμενος ζωοποιεῖσθαι*), but a matter of "dead works," "works of men's hands" (*ἔργα νεκρά*, Heb. 6 : 1; 9 : 14,

ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, Acts 7 : 41); not "worship in spirit and in truth," not the λογικὴ λατρεία and θυσία ζῶσα "acceptable to God" (Rom. 12 : 1), not the θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ (James 1 : 27); but falling far short of the divine intention (Acts 7 : 7, 38), he has wasted his words. All he has said proves nothing, the second Moses can do no more when he comes than improve, if that be possible, on the scrupulosity of the ritual ordained *after* the apostasy at Sinai.

Accordingly our speaker most indisputably conceives his quotation as referring to *the worship of the forty years in the wilderness*, that of the tabernacle, which "our fathers had in the wilderness" as a "tabernacle of μαρτυρία, even as he appointed who spake unto Moses, that he should make it according to the τύπος that he had seen." If additional proof were needed that the speaker conceives the prophet as referring not to subsequent idolatries in the answer he gives to his own question, but to the same wilderness worship, the worship of the tabernacle, it would be found in the illogical break advocates of the accepted view are obliged to discover not only after v. 42, but again after v. 43. Against this we have the interweaving from v. 42 to v. 46 of words and ideas which prove that in the speaker's mind all refer to the same. God gave Israel up after the apostasy at Sinai to serve (λατρεύειν) "the host of heaven" (στρατία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). This inference (of v. 42^a) is drawn from the (supposed) fact that Amos had designated the tabernacle "a tabernacle for the sun" ("Moloch," Amos 5 : 26, cf. Ps. 19 : 4), and its utensils as made for the worship of this sun-god, and the star-god Rephan. The back reference of v. 44 to the τύπος of v. 43 is equally clear, since the author draws from it his inference that this tabernacle and its utensils were in fact "types," though both here and in Hebrews 9 : 5 the less important "types" are passed over for the sake of the greater, the type of the tabernacle itself, a σκίνη τῆς μαρτυρίας, which testified of the "tabernacling presence" (σκήνωμα) sought by David.

Besides this break, wrongly assumed in the usual interpretation, there is the violence assumed to be done by Stephen to the sacred history. In the Old Testament as well as in a constant and unvarying tradition, the forty years of the wilderness were *the* period of all others of Israel's constancy.¹ It is most improbable that Stephen (or the author of the speech) should conceive them as the reverse.

On the other hand, *if* we are willing to look outside the New Testament to analogous statements in Ebionite and Alexandrian sources, the author's declaration that the tabernacle worship was in reality (though not of course in the estimation of the worshippers) a worship not of God directly, but of "the host of heaven," i. e., "angels and archangels, the moon and the month,"² and that the prophets manifest their knowledge of the fact in their repudiation of the ritual, will evince itself as by no means so startling as at first sight appears. In reality it is essential to the argument of the speech as a whole; for, be it noted, the conflict of early Christianity is not with the *temple* ceremonial, which offers but slight temptation to the people, none whatever after 70 A. D., but the *tabernacle* ceremonial of Exodus-Numbers conceived as having magical effect through mediation of angels. It is this "ceremonial on paper" of Rabbinic Judaism which is antagonized by Hebrews and by our author from a practically identical standpoint. Doubtless our author understands the prophet in the passage he cites as employing the names Moloch and Rephan hyperbolically, but it is the same tabernacle worship, that which now claims to be *the λατρεία*, that which Amos repudiated, to which he now would oppose *λόγια ζῶντα* and a *λογικὴ λατρεία εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ*. Israel still continues to delight in "the works of their hands," fondly imagining that such an outward *λατρεία* is acceptable to God. The prophet with clearer vision perceived it long ago

¹ Num. 25: 1 ff.; Deut. 32: 12, fall outside this period, and moreover could not be regarded as justifying the statement that God, after the Sinai apostasy, "turned, and gave them up to serve the host of heaven."

² *Kerygma Petri*.

to be not only unworthy to be addressed to him, but by the divine intention a service of sun and stars, properly to be classed with heathen rites¹ addressed to Moloch and Saturn, though "typical" of a higher worship.

Our author accordingly distinguished between the *λόγια ζῶντα* God was on the point of giving, — had in fact already given — through Moses, and the actual Mosaic law. Like Barnabas he would deny the claim of the Jews to possess even the covenant of the law. "Ours it is; but they lost it in this way forever, when Moses had just received it. For the Scripture saith, And Moses was in the mountain fasting forty days and forty nights, and he received the covenant from the Lord, even tables of stone written with the finger of the hand of the Lord. But they lost it by turning unto idols. For thus saith the Lord: Moses, Moses, come down quickly, for thy people whom thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt have done unlawfully. And Moses understood and threw the two tables from his hands; and their covenant was broken in pieces, that the covenant of the Beloved, Jesus, might be sealed unto our hearts in the hope which springeth from faith in him."²

Our author, like the author of the *Kerygma Petri*, denied that the Mosaic ceremonial was addressed directly to God, and declared it to be a "service of angels." How else shall we account for the contrast of v. 7 with v. 42 *λατρεύουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ . . . ἐπέστρεψε, καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν τῇ στρατίᾳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ?* Whether the conception came from Galatians 3 : 19; 4 : 1-8, or both are derived from some earlier Alexandrian writer, at all events we have in Acts 7 a more advanced and radical form than in

¹ Cf. *Barn.* xvi. 2. "For almost like the heathen they sanctified him in the temple." The very fact that it is here so hard to draw the line between actual heathen worship, and the Mosaic ritual as conceived by this writer, is the characteristic feature. The further we go from Paulinism in the direction of the later Christian Alexandrianism the more evanescent becomes the line of differentiation between the Jewish "superstition" (*Ep. to Diognetus*, c. 1) and actual heathen worship.

² *Barn.* iv. 6-8.

Galatians and Hebrews, where the *mediation* of the Law *through* angels is more prominent than its character as a worship of angels.

But our author's Alexandrianism finds typological significance even in this worship of angels. The tabernacle itself and the "star of Rephan"¹ were "types," v. 43, though naturally the speech does not stop as the author of the *λόγος παρακλήσεως* (Heb. 9) intimates that he might, to "speak severally" of the "candlestick and the table and the shewbread." It passes on rather in its final division, verses 44-50, to deal with the third prerogative claimed by Judaism, leading over through reference to the *Mishkan*-tabernacle, a "type," in the author's view, of the *Shekinah*-presence² of God, sought for by David, misconceived and lost by Solomon, but realized in the Messianic age.

3. In this section there is no development of the personal theocratic type of Messiah, although we are not left in doubt as to who it is, for v. 45 closes a period ("until the days of David") and in v. 46 David is expressly characterized as the man "who found favor in the sight of God." But the supreme significance of David, as here conceived, is not that he achieved the independence of the nation and thus became forerunner of the Messianic king (cf. 2 : 30 ff.), but that he again brought the divine promise (7 : 7 ; cf. Luke 1 : 69-75) to the verge of fulfilment in the form of the dwelling of God with his people. The speech rightly considers this *Shekinah*-presence to have been symbolized by the tabernacle, Exodus 25 : 8 ; 29 : 43-46. The temple, on the contrary, it conceives to have been a perversion of the promise

¹ What our author understood by "the star of Rephan" is a puzzle. That the *τύπος* symbolized to him the Star of Jacob (Num. 24 : 17) would seem credible ; but what utensil carried by Israel in the tabernacle or in heathen worship had the shape of a star ? Perhaps he would have been as much at a loss to answer as we.

² We should be obliged to coin some such term as *cotabernaculatio dei* to correspond in sense with the Hebrew. The Greek plays upon the terms *σκηνή* (vv. 43, 44) and *σκήνωμα* (v. 46) in a manner fairly equivalent to the Hebrew *mishkan* and *shekinah*, both formed from שׁכַן "to tabernacle."

in the same way as the ceremonial worship had been a perversion of the covenant: "they shall serve me." Was it not called the tabernacle of the testimony (τοῦ μαρτυρίου)? And had it not been made according to the figure (τύπος) appointed by God, who showed the pattern to Moses in the Mount?¹ Did not the story of Exodus 33 : 1-7 represent that the tabernacle was a substitute for the actual presence of God? It remained then during the period of the conquest under Joshua, "unto the days of David," and this is clearly conceived as a period of God's favor, when he "thrust out the nations from their possession before the face of our fathers." During these years it remained a "testimony" and "type;" but David, a theocratic forerunner of Messiah, assured of God's favorable regard, sought actual fulfilment. He asked of God — not to "build him an house," but — to "find a habitation (σκήνωμα) for the God of Jacob." The phraseology is borrowed from Psalm 132 : 2, 5, but both here and still more clearly in the fundamental passage, 2 Samuel 7 : 5-11, David appears as receiving from God something better than "a house of cedar" for the ark. Indeed there is already in the Elohist narrative of 2 Samuel 7 an unmistakable antipathy for ceremonialism in general, and particularly for the claims of the Judæan royal sanctuary in Jerusalem to be the exclusive "house of God," whatever we may say as to the anti-priestly, anti-Aaronic animus of the story of the golden calf and the institution of ceremonial worship in Exodus 32 f. In the original David receives, instead of what he asks, the assurance that God will build (i. e., establish) his, David's, house (i. e., his dynasty). In Stephen's speech we are carried further still, the thought of the divine σκήνωμα overshadows that of the Davidic throne; cf. Rev. 21 : 3.

But the speech leaves no manner of doubt regarding its conception of the Solomonic way of realizing what David had sought. Solomon's act was a supreme illustration of

¹ So Heb. 8 : 5, which also quotes Ex. 25 : 40, takes not the *temple* rites and utensils as types, but those of the *tabernacle*.

Israel's habitual "uncircumcision of heart and ears." There is indeed abundant historical ground for regarding the Solomonic temple on Mount Moriah as a monument of tyrannical oppression, which, politically, led to the disruption of the kingdom of David; religiously, to superstitious dependence on rites and ceremonies. Yet to find such treatment of it in a biblical writer is surprising enough, even when supported by the citation from Deutero-Isaiah: "The heaven is my throne, and the earth the footstool of my feet. What manner of house will ye build me, saith the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hand make all these things?" It is not strange even that Meyer and Wendt (Comm. *ad loc.*) should reject almost violently the interpretation of vv. 48-50 by Gfrörer, Baur, Zeller, Rauch, and Overbeck as meant to disparage the temple, the building of which is represented as a "corruption of the worship of God in its own nature free, bound to no fixed place and to no rigid, external rites" (Zeller), and even more, when Schneck-enburger (*St. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 528 ff.) concurs, ascribing to the speech a view akin to Essenism. The idea is strange to the New Testament. But so is that of the covenant of the law as a worship of angels, imposed "by accommodation," which, nevertheless, appears in Paul, in *Barnabas*, in Justin. If in a whole family of writings of the period *both* ideas are found associated, their strangeness in the New Testament only proves that the affinities of these particular chapters are largely outside it. Our author agrees with the Clementine writer that the temple-building of Solomon was "an act of tyrannous ambition, perverting a place of prayer into a display of royal magnificence." Herein he is followed, as we know, by *Barnabas*, who explains at length that the temple was a wretched misunderstanding of the promise of the indwelling of God in his people's hearts. This promise is now come to pass inasmuch as the outward temple was first "abolished" by Isaiah's word (as in Acts 7: 49 f.) and has now been destroyed in the war, whereas the true *habitatio dei* is being built up in the community of his people. "For God

dwelleth truly in our habitation within us. How? . . . He himself prophesying in us . . . dwelling in us, opening for us the door of the temple, which is the mouth . . . this is the spiritual temple built up to the Lord.”¹ Admit that conceivably both Barnabas and the Clementine writer might have taken the idea from Acts, even so, the fact that they so understand it is no slight evidence that it should be so understood. Add now that this interpretation is in line with the course of thought in the speech as a whole and that all its ideas are, so to speak, “constants” in a particular stream of Christian thought of marked individuality and firmly rooted in a well-known pre-Christian philosophy, and the strangeness (to us) of the interpretation tends not so much to disprove its correctness as to discover its source. We have already referred to the peroration of the speech, vv. 51-53. Take the anti-Jewish Alexandrian standpoint it occupies in common with so many writings of the period of the great apologists, and nothing can be more perfect than the unity of the discourse and the pertinence of each successive section to the fundamental idea. It has shown by a review of the Old Testament history that the true interpretation of each of Israel's fancied prerogatives, the Inheritance of Abraham, the Oracles of God, the Shekinah-presence, is the inner, that witnessed by the Holy Spirit; and that the reason for its rejection by Israel according to the flesh, is simply that they, like their fathers, are obdurate, gross, and stiffnecked. This they have shown not only in their rejection and persecution of the theocratic leaders who were types of Messiah, and the prophets who foretold the coming of the Just One, but ultimately by the betrayal and murder of the Messiah himself. Even the law which they had, with its “types” and “testimonies,” an ordinance of angels only, because for the hardness of their hearts they could not receive the “living oracles,” nor “serve God” himself, they did not keep, but wandered from it into absolute heathenism and idolatry.²

¹ Abridged from *Barn.* 16.

² Such in Justin Martyr, *Trypho* xix., is the sense manifestly given to this passage: “God accommodating himself to that nation, enjoined them also to

But turn now to 2 Esdras 14 : 30, where we have a similar denunciation, "Hear, O Israel. Our fathers at the beginning were strangers in Egypt, and they were delivered from thence, *and received the law of life, which they kept not, which ye also have transgressed after them.*" The difference between this and the Christian denunciation of Acts 7 : 38, 53 is just here, that the Christian denies that the law actually received by Israel at Sinai was a "law of life." "For if a law had been given such as were capable of giving life," says Paul (Gal. 3 : 21), "verily justification would have been of the law." The commandment was indeed in its ultimate intention "unto life," but was found in practical working to be "unto death" (*εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἣ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον*, Rom. 7 : 10). *Barnabas* xiv. 1-4¹ knows of such a "law of life" *presented* at Sinai, but not "received." "Yea, verily, but as regards the covenant which He sware to the fathers to give it to the people, let us see whether He hath actually given it. — He hath given it, but they on their part were not found worthy to receive it by reason of their sins. For the prophet saith: 'And Moses was fasting in Mount Sinai forty days and forty nights, that he might receive the covenant of the Lord to give to the people. And Moses received from the Lord the two tables which were written by the finger of the hand of the Lord in the spirit.' And Moses took them and brought them down to give them to the people. And the Lord said unto Moses: 'Moses, Moses, come down quickly; for thy people, whom thou leddest forth from the land of Egypt, hath done wickedly. And Moses perceived that they had made for themselves again molten images. And he cast them out of his hands, and the tables of the covenant of the Lord were broken in pieces.' Moses received them, but they on their part were not found worthy. But how did we receive them?

offer sacrifices as if to his name, in order that you might not serve idols. Which precept, however, you have not observed: nay, you sacrificed your children to demons."

¹ Repeating in substance what he had previously written in iv. 6-8.

Mark this. Moses received them being a servant but, the Lord himself gave them to us to be the people of his inheritance."

As Christian the speech of Stephen *must* deny with Paul and John (John 5 : 39) that the law in Israel's possession is *λόγια ζῶντα*, "living," or "unto life." When it comes to the question of "the covenant which he sware to the fathers to give it to the people," the covenant of the *λατρεία θεοῦ*, and what relation the actual Mosaic *λατρεία* bears to the law that *is* "unto life," the speech of Stephen takes the side of Barnabas. It makes a significant modification in the charge of 2 Esdras 14 : 30, "Your fathers received the law of life, which they kept not," guarding itself from the implication, that the written law was in any sense "unto life" or "the law of life," by declaring, "Ye received the law *unto ordinances of angels*, and kept it not," as in v. 38 it purposely discriminated the *λόγια ζῶντα* from the *λατρεία* actually instituted.

Our interpretation of Acts 7 : 53 thus removes it from the position of an exception to all other early Christian references to the angelic character of the Sinaitic legislation, which uniformly mark its *inferiority*. As in Galatians 3 : 19; 4 : 2, 3, 8-10 ; Hebr. 2: 2-5, *Barnabas* ix. 4, the *Kerygma Petri*, *Apology of Aristides*, Justin Martyr, this tradition is employed to prove the indirect, imperfect character of the Jewish worship. The speech, however, undoubtedly implies, as Justin expressly and repeatedly teaches,¹ that however inferior a substitute for the *λόγια ζῶντα* which they might have had, it was yet the duty of Israel to "keep" these "ordinances of angels," until the coming of the "Prophet like unto Moses," bringing the absolute spiritual law. It takes, in other words, the part of Philo as against those whom he blames for regarding their insight into the external character of the ordinances as an emancipation from the observance of them, and is less radical than *Barnabas*, the *Kerygma*, and the Clementines.

¹ *Dialogue with Trypho*, xxvii., xlv., xlvi.

The problem of the relation of the Clementine writings to the Ebionite Gospel on the one side and to the *Kerygma Petri* on the other, of the latter to the *Ἐυαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*, and of both the latter to the Lucan writings is too intricate for consideration here. That some relation exists between what has been called the Ebionite element of Luke and the Palestinian Ebionite writings is tolerably clear. That these so-called Ebionite sources are also in decided affinity with writings of such undeniably Alexandrian derivation as *Ps.-Barnabas*, and the *Kerygma Petri*, — perhaps we should add the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* — and that Hebrews and certain elements of the Lucan writings, including more especially Acts 6–8 and related sections of both “treatises,” display a similar affinity, it is hoped will be apparent from the present study of the speech of Stephen in its argument and literary relations.

THE MOHAMMEDAN CONQUEST OF
EGYPT AND NORTH AFRICA

CHARLES CUTLER TORREY, PH. D.
PROFESSOR OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES

THE MOHAMMEDAN CONQUEST OF EGYPT AND NORTH AFRICA IN THE YEARS 643 TO 705 A. D.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL ARABIC OF IBN 'ABD EL-HAKEM

THE HISTORY AND ITS AUTHOR

THE Arabic history from which the following extract is taken was written near the middle of the ninth century, A. D. Its author, Abu 'l-Qâsim 'Abd er-Rahmân, commonly known as Ibn 'Abd el-Hakem, was a native of Egypt, and died in el-Fustât in the year 871 A. D. His father, 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd el-Hakem, held the office of *qâdî* in Egypt, and was himself a learned man and much interested in the native traditions; his son frequently quotes him as one of his authorities. The history, entitled the *Futûh Misr*, or Conquest of Egypt, has not yet been published, but exists, in more or less complete form, in manuscripts found in the libraries of London, Paris, and Leyden. As the title indicates, the work is chiefly concerned with the Moslem invasion of the land in the seventh century; but it also contains a sketch of the history of Egypt from the earliest times, as well as important chapters dealing with the Mohammedan conquest of North Africa and Spain. Appended to the history proper is a collection of brief biographies of the *qâdîs* of Egypt, from the conquest down nearly to the author's own time; and this, again, is followed by a list of the Companions of the Prophet who came to Egypt, with the traditions commonly attributed to each of them.

The literary form of the composition is that which was common in the early days of Arabic historiography, while

the interval of time between the narrator and the events narrated was still comparatively short; the traditions relating to any given event or period are collected, and loosely strung together, great emphasis always being laid on the unbroken chain of authorities, or *isnâd*: "I had this from A, who heard it from B, on the authority of C," and so on, back to the time of the chief actors themselves, if possible. Some of the authorities quoted by our author, such as Ibn Lahf'a, had made extensive collections of the traditions relating to Egypt and Africa; but the *Conquest of Egypt* is the earliest work of the kind that has come down to us — it is, in fact, one of the oldest of all the Arabic histories, of any kind, that have been preserved.

Our author cannot be accorded high rank as a historian, however. Both in the choice of his material and in the use of it he shows again and again how lightly he took his task, and how little is to be expected from him in the way of critical judgment. Especially in his failure to distinguish the important from the trivial he falls far below his contemporary, Belâdhurî, whose history of the Moslem conquests bears a close formal resemblance to the *Futûh Misr*. Nevertheless, he has collected a great many interesting traditions, including some important material not to be found elsewhere, and his work deserves to be read and studied, especially by those who are interested in the development of early Moham-medan historiography.

Ibn 'Abd el-Hakem is very frequently cited, and often used extensively without express citation, by later writers, and thus a considerable part of his history has become common property. This is especially true of the portion of the work which has to do with the history of Egypt, the story of the invasion under 'Amr, the minute description of the Moslem occupation of Alexandria, and so on. The historian el-Maqrîzî, especially, has made a large part of this material familiar. Ibn 'Abd el-Hakem's account of the conquest of Spain has been made accessible to English readers by John Harris Jones, who published (Göttingen, 1858) the Arabic

text according to the two Paris manuscripts, with an English translation and commentary. A French translation of a part of the section dealing with the invasion of the province Africa was published by De Slane in the *Journal Asiatique* in 1844 (second half, pp. 354–364), and afterwards was included, with some additions, in an Appendix to his translation of Ibn Khaldûn's *History of the Berbers* (Paris, 1852; vol. i., pp. 301–312). A Latin version of a small portion of the book at the beginning, published by Karle (Göttingen, 1856), is of minor importance.

The section chosen for the present translation is that which is included between the account of the Moslem occupation of Alexandria and the neighboring country and the story of the conquest of Spain. In extent it constitutes about one-tenth of the whole work, and the part of the history which it includes is that dealing with the fortunes of the Mohammedans in Egypt and North Africa between the years 21 A. H. (642 A. D.), the year after that in which 'Amr took Alexandria, and 86 A. H. (705 A. D.), the year of the accession of the caliph Welîd ibn 'Abd el-Melik. This section contains some of the most interesting portions of the author's narrative, and is in all respects a characteristic specimen of the earliest Arabic historical composition.

The translation is based on a text obtained from the four manuscripts now known to exist. The best, and probably the oldest one of these is in the British Museum in London; two (one very old) are in the National Library in Paris; and a fourth, bearing another title and wrongly attributed to the later writer Suyûfî, has quite recently been discovered by Professor De Goeje, of Leyden, in the library of that city. In cases where the manuscripts disagree, the reading of the London codex is almost always to be preferred; the less usual proper names, moreover, are generally fully and correctly vocalized in this manuscript. The *isnâds*, or chains of attestation, made up of the names of those who transmitted each tradition, I have generally retained; though in cases where their presence in the text would be especially awkward, they

have been put in foot-notes. A few explanatory notes have been added. The number of these might have been considerably increased with profit, had the limits of the available space permitted. The original text of the section which is here translated begins in the London manuscript (Brit. Mus. *Stowe Or.* 6) on folio 65 b, and in the older Paris manuscript (No. 1686 in Slane's *Catalogue*) on folio 107 b.

THE STORY OF THE CONQUEST

I

EGYPT UNDER 'AMR IBN EL-'ÂŞÎ¹1. *The Conquest of El-Fayyûm*

AFTER² the Muslims had finished the conquest [of Alexandria], 'Amr³ sent the detachments of cavalry into the surrounding villages, and thus it happened that el-Fayyûm remained unknown to the army for the space of a year. At length, however, a man came and told them of it, so 'Amr sent with him Rabî'a ibn Hôbaish ibn 'Orfuṭa, of the tribe of Şadif, to reconnoitre. After they had made their way through el-Majâba without seeing anything, some were disposed to turn back, but others said: "Be not too hasty, let us press on, for unless we trust the man, he cannot bring us to that which we seek." When they had journeyed only a little further, the cultivated fields of el-Fayyûm burst on their view. So they fell upon them at once, and took possession without meeting any armed resistance.

Another tradition narrates, on the contrary, that Mâlik ibn Nâ'ima, of the tribe Şadif (he who was the owner of el-

¹ This superscription, which is not in the original, I have added for convenience. The narrative which follows falls into three well-marked divisions: (1) Egypt and the neighboring lands until the death of 'Amar; (2) The campaigns under 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd; (3) History of the conquest from 34 A. H. on. See the corresponding superscriptions below, pages 301 and 315. In the sequel, all the chapter-headings printed in italics are translated from the original text, unless the contrary is stated.

² This tradition, says our author, is derived mainly from Sa'id ibn 'Ofair.

³ I. e., 'Amr ibn el-'Âşî, the conqueror of Egypt.

Ashqar¹), rode forth on his horse to explore el-Majâba, not knowing what was beyond it; and that when he saw the cultivated land of el-Fayyûm, he returned to 'Amr with the tidings.

According to still a third tradition, 'Amr ibn el-'Âşî sent Qais ibn el-Hârith into Upper Egypt; so he journeyed until he came to what is now el-Qais, where he stayed; whence the place received its name. When 'Amr became impatient at hearing no tidings from him, Rabî'a ibn Hobaish said, "I will satisfy thee," and straightway went forth on his mare and rode her through the river; then, having accomplished his purpose, he returned to 'Amr with his report. The story has it that he rode through to el-Fayyûm from the eastern side, and that the name of his horse was el-A'mâ. God knows best which of these accounts is the true one.²

'Amr ibn el-'Âşî sent out also Nâfi' ibn 'Abd el-Qais el-Fihri (Nâfi' being the uterine brother of el-'Âşî ibn Wâ'il) with a company, and their horsemen entered Nubia in repeated summer incursions, like those which the Greeks³ were accustomed to make. This went on until the time when 'Amr was removed from the command over Egypt, and was succeeded by 'Abd Allah ibn Abî Sarḥ, who made terms with the natives, — as I shall narrate in the proper place, if God permits.⁴

2. *The Conquest of Barca*⁵

The Berbers, it is said, once lived in Palestine, and their king was Jâlût;⁶ but when David (blessed be his name)

¹ The name of a horse celebrated in the narratives of this conquest.

² Here follows, in all the manuscripts, the superscription *The Conquest of Barca*, which is, however, not in place until after the next paragraph. This is a good illustration of the fact, which appears also plainly in other places (see, e. g., page 315), that these chapter-headings were not in the history in its original form.

³ *Er-Rûm* denoting Byzantine subjects, as usual.

⁴ See below, page 308.

⁵ See the note above. In this case, the superscription (originally written either at the top of a sheet or in the margin) was accidentally inserted in the wrong place.

⁶ I. e., Goliath.

killed him, the Berbers emigrated, journeying westward until they came to Lûbiya and Murâqiya,¹ which are two districts belonging to the western part of Egypt; countries which drink the rain of heaven, and are not blessed² by the Nile. There they scattered: the tribes of Zenâta and Maghîla moved westward and dwelt in the mountains; Luwâta came and dwelt in the district of Anṭâbulus³ (that is, Barca), and thence were scattered over this part of North Africa, spreading in it as far as es-Sûs; Hawwâra settled in the city Lebda; and the territory occupied by Nefûsa included the city Sabra, the Greeks who were living in it being forced to emigrate. Thus the Divisions⁴ were made, and remained; and they became subject to the Greeks, paying tribute to those who conquered their land.

‘Amr ibn el-‘Âṣî advanced with his horsemen until he reached Barca, and there made a treaty with its people on condition of their paying him a poll-tax of thirteen thousand dînârs, with the stipulation that they might sell such of their children as they pleased, to make up the amount.⁵ In those days, no collector of the ground-tax entered Barca; the people merely sent their poll-tax when the time for it arrived. ‘Amr also sent ‘Oqba ibn Nâfi’ as far as Zawîla, so that all between Barca and Zawîla came into the hands of the Muslims.

3. *The Conquest of Iṭrâbulus*⁶

‘Amr then advanced until he halted at Iṭrâbulus, in the year 22.⁷ He encamped before the dome which rises above

¹ Thus pointed in the manuscripts.

² Here there is a play upon words, the verb *nâl* being used.

³ Derived from the Greek Pentapolis.

⁴ Arabic, *el-afâriq*; the Muslim writers deriving the name “Africa” (*Afriqiya*) from the root *faraq*, used twice in this context a few lines above, and translated “scatter.”

⁵ Here several brief traditions are added in support of the statements just made. I have omitted them as unimportant for the present translation.

⁶ Or, Ṭarâbulus; the Arabic form of the Greek Tripolis.

⁷ That is, the year 643 A. D. Ibn ‘Abd el-Ḥakem here mentions another tradition, according to which the conquest of Tripoli took place in the year 23.

the battlements on the eastern side, and besieged the city for a month without gaining any advantage. Then, one day, it happened that a man of the Banî Mudlij, in 'Amr's army, went out hunting with seven companions. They passed around the west side of the city until they were far away from the army. Then, as they were returning, the heat became oppressive, and in seeking shelter from it they followed along the shore. Now the sea came up close to the wall of the city, and on the side directly opposite the water there was no wall, but the vessels of the Greeks lay at their anchorages close to the houses. As the Mudlijî and his companions looked, they saw that the water had fallen here, and soon found a place where the city could be entered, the water having subsided from it. So they entered, passing through until they came to the neighborhood of the church, where they raised the *tekbîr*.¹ Now the Greeks had no means of escape excepting their boats; and as 'Amr, as soon as he saw this opening into the heart of the city, brought up his army and burst in upon them, only those got away who could embark at once in light craft. So 'Amr plundered the city.

Now the people of Sabra had been preparing to stand a siege (the name of the city was formerly Nibâra, Sabra being the old market, which was transferred to the city Nibâra by 'Abd er-Raḥmân ibn Ḥabîb in the year 31),² and when they heard how 'Amr had besieged Iṭrâbulus without making any impression on it, and that he could gain no advantage there, they were filled with confidence. So as soon as 'Amr had taken possession of Iṭrâbulus, he sent out a strong detachment of cavalry that same night with the order to ride at full speed. Arriving at Sabra in the morning, they found that the inhabitants were off their guard, and had opened the gates to drive out their cattle to pasture. So they entered, and not one of the enemy escaped, and all the spoil of the

¹ The Muslim battle-cry, "*Allah akbar!*"

² In the text of all the manuscripts, this gloss is in the wrong place, being inserted a line below, after the name Iṭrâbulus (!). As for the date, A. H. 31, it is evidently a mistake for 131.

city was secured. Then they returned to 'Amr with their plunder.

A tradition of Abû 'l-Aswad, Naḍr ibn 'Abd el-Jabbâr, derived from Ibn Lahî'a, from el-Hârith ibn Yezîd, reports Abû Temîm the Jaishânite as saying: We were with 'Amr ibn el-'Âşî when he made his expedition against Iṭrâbulus, and when the council was made up, one of our associates in it was Hobaib ibn Moghfil. We were speaking of the observance of the fast of Ramaḍân,¹ when Hobaib said, "There is to be no partition of the booty." But 'Amr answered him, "Never fear that there will be no division as soon as I have reckoned the amount."

4. 'Amr's Request for Permission to Invade Africa

Then 'Amr wished to move westward; so he wrote to [the caliph] 'Omar ibn el-Khaṭṭâb as follows:² "Now that God Almighty has conquered Iṭrâbulus for us, we are only nine days distant from Africa;³ so if the Commander of the Faithful desires that we should invade the land, and that God should deliver it into our hands, he has only to say the word." But 'Omar wrote in reply: "Nay, it is not 'Africa,' but 'Mafriqa,'⁴ betraying and betrayed. No one shall invade it, so long as I live!"⁵ Just then there came into 'Amr's hands the letter from the Moqauqis informing him that the Greeks were on the point of breaking their treaty and annulling the agreements they had made with him.⁶ 'Amr had made the Moqauqis promise not to keep from him anything that might happen; so when he received these tidings, he

¹ The connection between the close of Ramaḍân and the enjoyment of the booty is obvious.

² The tradition is that of 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, from Ibn Lahî'a, from Ibn Hubaira, from Abû Temîm of Jaishân.

³ By "Africa" the province of that name is intended, of course, throughout this history.

⁴ I. e., "place of scattering, dispersion." See above, page 285.

⁵ Two other brief traditions to the same effect are added here. I have omitted them as unimportant.

⁶ As narrated in an earlier part of this same history.

turned back in haste. He had, however, already sent out some companies of horse, which had brought back booty.

5. *The Removal of 'Amr from the Command in Egypt*

Then followed the death of 'Omar (God's mercy upon him); the date of its occurrence, according to Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, being the year 23. At that time, Egypt was under two Muslim governors; 'Amr ibn el-Âṣî himself in the lower part of the country, and 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd ibn Abî Sarḥ in the Şa'îd.¹ So when 'Othmân ibn 'Affân (God's mercy upon him) succeeded to the caliphate (as 'Abd Allah ibn Şâliḥ, or some one else, narrates on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd), 'Amr ibn el-Âṣî, thinking that he could rely on 'Othmân's favor, determined to get him to remove 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd from the command of Upper Egypt. So he waited on him, and made this request. But 'Othmân replied: "'Omar ibn el-Khaṭṭâb put him in command of the Şa'îd, although there was between them neither sacred obligation nor other special connection. Now thou knowest that he is my own brother from the breasts; how then should I remove him from that which another has already given him?" He said further than this, according to the tradition of Sa'îd ibn 'Ofair, "Thou mindest not what his mother was wont to do for me; how she hid for me in her sleeve the choice bits of meat, until I should come." But 'Amr was angry at this, and said: "I will not return unless my request is granted." So 'Othmân wrote to 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, making him the governor of all Egypt. The letter reached him in el-Fayyûm; according to Ibn 'Ofair, in a village there called Damûsha.² He at once offered to give

¹ Our historian records here another tradition, derived from Sa'îd ibn 'Ofair, according to which the caliph 'Omar had assigned to 'Abd Allah only el-Fayyûm of the Sa'îd.

² This last statement is corrected by Ibn Qodaid, the scholar who transmitted this history from Ibn 'Abd el-Ḥakem himself, the correction occurring in a note inserted at this point in the MSS. of London, Paris (the second), and Leyden. The

a sum of money to the people of Aṭwâb if they would bring him in his boat to el-Fuṣṭâṭ before daybreak. (What he offered them, according to the account current in his own family, was five dînârs.) So they went with him to el-Fuṣṭâṭ, arriving before dawn. Thereupon he sent for the muezzin, and opened the morning prayer at the first break of day. Now 'Abd Allah, 'Amr's son, was waiting for the muezzin to summon him to lead the morning prayer, for he was occupying his father's place; when he therefore had become impatient at the delay, some one told him that 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd was conducting the worship. (In the family of 'Abd Allah [ibn Sa'd] the story is current that the latter approached the mosque from the western side, with a candle borne before him, just as 'Abd Allah ibn 'Amr, also with a candle, approached from the direction of his house, and that the two candles met at the *qibla*.) So 'Abd Allah ibn 'Amr went and confronted 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, and said to him, "This is thy false dealing, and thine intriguing!" But the other replied: "What have I done? Thou and thy father have been coveting the Şa'îd from me; come now, let me put thee over the Şa'îd, and thy father over Lower Egypt, and see if I will envy you the possession of them!" So from that time on, 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd remained the *amîr* of Egypt, and his rule gave general satisfaction. He also made three important military expeditions, into Africa, against the blacks [of Nubia], and to Dhû 'ş-Şawârî; these I shall describe in the proper place, if God wills it.

The date of 'Amr's removal from Egypt, and the accession of 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, according to the tradition of Yaḥyâ ibn 'Abd Allah ibn Bukair on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, was the year 25.

name of the village was Shadmuwa, for which Damúsha was carelessly substituted through a scribal error.

6. *The Violation of the Treaty by the Alexandrians*

Now the people of Alexandria had broken their treaty, as has already been said.¹ The Greeks, with Manwil [Manuel] the Eunuch at their head, came in their ships and anchored off Alexandria, and all the Greeks who were in the city joined hands with them. The Moqauqis, however, gave them no encouragement and committed no breach of faith. In the meantime, as already narrated, the caliph 'Othmân had deposed 'Amr and given the command to 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd. But when the Greek army appeared before Alexandria, the people of Egypt besought 'Othmân to retain 'Amr in command until he should finish the conflict with the Greeks, inasmuch as he was skilled in warfare and dreaded by the enemy. So he granted their request. Alexandria was then surrounded by its wall; but 'Amr swore that if God would give him the victory over them, he would break down their wall, and make the city like the house of a harlot, accessible from all sides.² So he began operations against them, both by land and by sea.

Another (not el-Laith) narrates: Then those of the Copts who held with the Moqauqis took refuge with him; as for the Greeks, he had none of them in his following. Khârija ibn Hodhâfa said therefore to 'Amr: "Attack them, before they become strongly re-enforced, for there is no certainty that all Egypt may not join in the rebellion." But 'Amr said: "Nay, but I will challenge them to come out against me; for they will come into conflict with all whom they pass on the way, and thus God will discomfit the one part by means of the other." So they [the Greeks] came forth from Alexandria, and with them those of the people of the surrounding country who had joined the revolt; and they began encamping in

¹ See above, page 287. The present tradition is derived (our author says) from 'Abd Allah ibn Sâlih, on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, who had it from Yezid ibn Abi Habîb.

² This history contains many examples of the pungent sayings for which 'Amr was famous.

one village after another, drinking its wine and eating up its food, and carrying off as plunder whatever they came across; nor did 'Amr confront them until they reached Naqyûs. There the battle was joined, both on the land and on the water. The Greeks and Copts opened the fight by a sharp fire of arrows directed at the river, and an arrow soon struck 'Amr's horse in the throat (although he was on the land) and rolled him on the ground; 'Amr alighted safely, however. Then those [of the Muslims] who were fighting on the water came out and joined their fellows who were on the land; but the Greeks poured such a shower of arrows upon them that they gave ground a little, whereupon the enemy made an attack before which the Muslims retreated, and Sharîk ibn Sumai fled on his horse.

Now the Greeks were drawn up in successive ranks, one behind the other, and there came forth from them a certain officer¹ of their army — one of those who had come from the land of the Greeks on this expedition — mounted on his horse and armed with gilded weapons, and called for an opponent to meet him in single combat. There stood forth in answer to the challenge a man of the tribe Zubaid, named Ḥaumal, whose *kunya*² was Abû Madhḥaj. The two fought with spears, driving each other about, for some time; at last the *bitriq* threw away his spear and took his sword, and Ḥaumal, whose valor was well known in the army, did the same. Then 'Amr began shouting, "O Abû Madhḥaj!" and Ḥaumal shouted back, "At thy service!" while the two armies stood on the bank of the Nile looking on, drawn up in their ranks and rows. So the two circled about each other for a while, with their swords; then the Greek made a rush upon Ḥaumal and lifted him bodily (for he was a man of slender build), but the Muslim drew a dagger which was in his girdle or in his sleeve, and drove it with all his force into the neck of the barbarian, who fell dead, Ḥaumal falling upon him. He then stripped him of his spoil; but he himself died only a few days

¹ In the original, *bitriq*, a word derived from the Greek *patrikios*.

² The nickname used in familiar intercourse.

after (God's mercy upon him). 'Amr is said to have placed his own couch in front of the two posts of Ḥaumal's bier, keeping it there until he was carried out to be buried in the Moqatṭam.¹

Then the Muslims made a fierce attack, and the enemy were routed, the Muslims pursuing until they overtook them in Alexandria. So God gave his people the victory over the enemy; moreover, Manwîl the Eunuch fell in the fight.

According to the tradition of el-Haitham ibn Ziyâd, 'Amr continued the slaughter to the neglect of the spoil of the city; some one reminding him of this, he gave the order to raise the sword [i. e., cease from the fight]. A mosque was afterwards built on the spot where he raised the sword; it is the mosque in Alexandria which is now called the Mosque of er-Raḥma [i. e., of Mercy], so named because of this circumstance. As for the wall of the city, 'Amr razed the whole of it.

Then he collected the booty which had been taken; and when he had done so, there came to him some of the people of the villages which had not broken faith, saying: "We remained true to our compact; so when these robbers [the Greek army] passed by us, they took our household goods and our beasts of burden, and now these things are in your hands." So 'Amr returned to them all of the property which they recognized and of which they could prove their ownership. Then one of them said to him: "How was it right for thee to treat us as thou didst? We were entitled to thy protection from the enemy, for we are thine allies, and have remained faithful. As for those who have broken their compact, may God cast them away!" Then 'Amr regretted what he had done, and said: "I wish now that I had met the Greeks when they first came forth from the city."

A tradition of Ḥayât ibn Sharîk, from el-Ḥasan ibn Thûbân, from Hishâm ibn Abî Roqayya, asserts that this revolt of Alexandria was brought about in the following way: The chief man of Akhnâ came to 'Amr and said to him:

¹ The hill southeast of the modern city of Cairo, then el-Fuṣṭât.

“Tell us the amount of the poll-tax upon each one of us, so that we may be prepared for it.” But ‘Amr replied, pointing to the foundation of the church, “If thou should’st give me [a heap reaching] from the foundation to the roof, I could not tell thee. Ye are simply a store-house for us; when we need much, ye must give us much; when we need less, we exact less from you.” The man was angry at this, and went away to the Greeks, with whom he returned. When God routed them, this Nabataean¹ was taken captive and brought to ‘Amr. Those present advised putting him to death, but ‘Amr said: “By no means! Begone, and bring us another army!”

Sa‘îd ibn Sâbiq narrates that the name of this man was Ṭalmâ, and that ‘Amr, when he was brought into his presence, put a bracelet on his arm and a diadem on his head, and clothed him with a purple *burnus*, and said to him, “Bring us the like of these!” So he made no further trouble about the poll-tax. Some one asking him, “What if thou hadst been brought before the Greek emperor?” he replied, “I should have been a dead man; for he would have said, ‘Thou hast slain my people.’”

7. *The Destruction of Khirbet Werdân*

While ‘Amr was on his way to Alexandria,² he destroyed the village which is now called Khirbet Werdân. There are conflicting traditions (says Ibn ‘Abd el-Ḥakem) as to the reason for his destroying it. According to Sa‘îd ibn ‘Ofair: When ‘Amr was on his way to Naqyûs to join battle with the Greeks,³ Werdân turned aside at daybreak on business of his own, and the people of the place seized him and carried him off. When ‘Amr missed him, and made search for him, he followed the traces until he found him in one of their houses, whereupon he ordered the place to be laid waste and its people to remove from it.

¹ The name used merely as a term of contempt.

² I. e., during this expedition to put down the revolt of the city.

³ See above, page 291.

According to 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama: The people of the place were all monks; and they dealt treacherously with some of the men of 'Amr's rear guard, and killed them, after 'Amr had reached el-Keryûn. So he sent against them Werdân, who slew them and laid waste the village, which lies in ruins to the present day.

According to my father, 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd el-Hakem: The people of the place were brigands and villains; so 'Amr sent to their district and brought from it a sack containing some of the earth of their soil. Then he summoned them and made overtures to them, but they returned him no satisfactory answer. He ordered them to be led out of his presence for a moment, and calling for the sack of earth, he sprinkled some of it under his prayer-carpet, and sat upon it. Then he called them back and talked with them, and they complied with all his wishes. Then [after sending them out] he ordered the earth to be taken away, and again summoned them, but they gave him no satisfaction. This he did several times; and said, when he saw the result, "This is a village which needs to be trampled upon." So he gave orders to have it laid waste. God knows best which of these traditions is right.

8. *Further Traditions relating to this Campaign*¹

After God had thus discomfited the Greeks,² [the caliph] 'Othmân wished to have 'Amr take charge of the military operations in Egypt, while 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd took the taxes of the land. But 'Amr said, "Then I should be like one who holds a cow by the horns while another milks her." So he declined.

'Abd Allah ibn Yezîd el-Muqrî narrates, on the authority of Ḥarmala ibn 'Imrân, that Temîm ibn Fira' el-Mahrî said: I was present at the second conquest of Alexandria, but no

¹ There is in the original no superscription at this point, but one is evidently needed.

² Here (says our author) is resumed the main tradition, given by Ibn Lahî'a from Yezîd ibn Abi Ḥabîb.

portion of the spoil was given to me for some time, until it almost came to open conflict between my people and tribe of Qoraish. But somebody said: "Send to Abû Başra of the tribe of Ghifâr, and 'Oqba ibn 'Âmir of the tribe of Juhaina, who were both among the Companions of the Prophet, and ask them about the matter." So they sent and asked them, and they replied: "See whether he has attained to manhood, and if so, give him an allotment." So when some of them had observed me and seen that I was no longer a boy, but a man, they gave me my portion.

According to a tradition of 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, derived from Ibn Wahb, from Mûsâ ibn 'Olai, from his father, from 'Amr ibn el-'Âşî himself, the second conquest of Alexandria was made by force of arms,¹ in the caliphate of 'Othmân ibn 'Affân, after the death of 'Omar ibn el-Khaţţâb. 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama also states, on the authority of Ibn Lahî'a, that the first conquest of the city was in the year 21, and that the second was in the year 25, four years later. Yahyâ ibn 'Abd Allah ibn Bukair, relying on el-Laith ibn Sa'd, gives for the date of the former conquest the year 22, and for the latter the year 25.

A tradition not recorded by Ibn Lahî'a² states that the removal of 'Amr from Egypt by 'Othmân, and the appointment of 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, took place a month after the [second] conquest of Alexandria.

Another tradition, not given by Ibn Lahî'a, but recorded by Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb, narrates that the people of el-Khîs, belonging to el-Bîmâ, — a part of the swamps and thickets included in the conquest, — continued fighting the Muslims for seven years after Egypt had been conquered.

9. 'Amr's Visits to the Caliph 'Omar

A tradition of 'Othmân ibn Şâlih, obtained from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, states that 'Omar ibn el-Khaţţâb lived three years

¹ The question whether any given city or land was taken "by force" or "by treaty of peace" was of great importance in determining its future status in the Mohammedan domain, especially in regard to its tribute and taxes.

² Whose work our author is following in the main, in this part of his history.

after the conquest of Egypt,¹ and that during that time 'Amr paid him two visits. On one of these occasions, according to Ibn 'Ofair, he appointed in his place Zakarîyâ ibn el-Johm el-'Abdarî to take charge of the army, and Mujâhid ibn Jebr, a client of the Banî Naufal ibn 'Abd Menâf, to take charge of the land-tax. (Mujâhid was the grandfather of Mo'âdh ibn Mûsâ en-Neffât, who was the father of Ishâq ibn Mo'âdh, the poet.) When 'Omar asked him whom he had appointed in his place, and 'Amr named Mujâhid ibn Jebr, the caliph asked, "Dost thou mean the freedman of the daughter of Ghazwân?" "Yes," was the reply, "he is a scribe." Then said 'Omar, "Truly, the *qalam*² elevates [the station of] him who wields it." (This daughter of Ghazwân was the sister of 'Otba ibn Ghazwân, who was in the battle of Bedr. By the tradition of 'Abd el-Melik ibn Hishâm, from Ziyâd ibn 'Abd Allah, from Moḥammed ibn Ishâq, the line of descent was as follows: 'Otba ibn Ghazwân ibn Jâbir ibn Wahb ibn Nusaib ibn Mâlik ibn el-Ḥârith ibn Mâzin ibn Mos'ab ibn 'Ikrima ibn Khaṣafa³ ibn Qais ibn Ghailân, the covenant-associate of the Banî Naufal ibn 'Abd Menâf. The place where Mujâhid ibn Jebr settled [in Alexandria] was the house of Şâliḥ, the one from whom the street received its name.)

On the occasion of the second visit, 'Amr left in his place his son 'Abd Allah.⁴ The following story of this visit is told by 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama and 'Abd Allah ibn Şâliḥ, on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, on that of Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb: 'Amr ibn el-'Âṣî entered the presence of 'Omar when the latter was at his table, sitting cross-legged, with his companions about him in the same attitude, while in the dish before them there was hardly enough for one of the company.⁵ 'Amr greeted the caliph, and the latter returned the *salâm*,

¹ See also the statement above, page 295.

² The reed-pen used in writing.

³ Thus written and pointed in the London MS. In the older of the two Paris MSS. the name has been written over and is illegible; in the other it is written "Hafṣa."

⁴ This, as our author tells us, continues the tradition of Sa'id ibn 'Ofair.

⁵ The usual story of 'Omar's extreme simplicity of life.

exclaiming, "‘Amr ibn el-‘Âşî!" "Yes," was the reply. Then ‘Omar put his hand in the dish and filled it with *therîd*,¹ which he reached toward ‘Amr, saying, "Take this." So ‘Amr sat down and took the *therîd* in his left hand, eating it with his right, while the deputation which had accompanied him from Egypt looked on. As soon as they had come away, the members of the deputation said to ‘Amr, "What, pray, was that which thou didst?" ‘Amr replied: "He certainly knew well enough that I, coming from Egypt in the way that I did, could have done without the *therîd* which he offered me. But he wished to try me; and if I had not accepted it, I should have met with trouble from him."

Another incident is narrated by Abû ‘l-Aswad, Naḍr ibn ‘Abd el-Jabbâr, on the authority of Ibn Lahî’a, on that of Abû Qabil. ‘Amr had dyed his hair and beard black; so when he entered ‘Omar’s presence, the latter said, "Who art thou?" "I am ‘Amr ibn el-‘Âşî." ‘Omar replied: "The ‘Amr with whom I deal is an old man, but thou art a youth to-day! Now I am determined that thou shalt wash this off as soon as thou goest forth from my presence."

‘Abd Allah ibn Şâliḥ narrates, from el-Laith ibn Sa’d, from Yezîd ibn Abî Habîb: On one of the occasions when ‘Amr came from Egypt to visit the caliph ‘Omar, he found him in the pulpit on a Friday, and ‘Omar said: "Here comes ‘Amr ibn el-‘Âşî, a man who does not wish to walk the earth unless he can do so as an *amîr*."² And ‘Amr said, according to el-Laith: "Nothing else has been so truly my own trade as war."

10. *The Death of ‘Amr ibn el-‘Âşî*

The death of ‘Amr (God’s mercy upon him) took place in the year 43 [663 A.D.]. It was in that same year³ that ‘Otba

¹ Crumbled bread soaked in gravy.

² Another tradition is given here in support of this saying of ‘Omar’s, namely that of Sa’îd ibn ‘Ofair, derived from Ibn Lahî’a, from Mushriḥ ibn Hâ’an from Oqba ibn ‘Âmir.

³ This from Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, from el-Laith ibn Sa’d.

ibn Abî Sufyân was given the command in Egypt, and that Sharîk ibn Sumai made his expedition against Lebda in North Africa.¹ When the time of 'Amr's death was at hand, his eyes filled with tears.² His son, 'Abd Allah, said to him: "O Abû 'Abd Allah, can it be fear³ of death which thus affects thee?" "Not so," he replied, "but of what is to come after death." Then 'Abd Allah recalled to him all the places where he had been in the company of the Prophet, and the battles which he had helped to win in Syria. When he had finished, 'Amr said: "I have passed through three periods; and if I had died during either of the first two, I should have known what men would say of me. God sent Mohammed, and I was of all men the most bitterly opposed to what he brought, and wished that I might kill him. If I had died in those days, men would have said, 'Amr died an idolater, an enemy of God and his Prophet; he is in hell-fire.' Then God sent⁴ *islâm* into my heart; so I went to the Prophet, and he stretched out his hand to me to covenant with me; but I drew back my hand, and said: 'I will covenant with thee on condition that my past sins be forgiven' — thinking that in *islâm* I should commit no more sins. But the Prophet said: 'O 'Amr, *islâm* cancels whatever sin had preceded it, and the *hijra*⁵ cancels those which were committed between it and the receiving of *islâm*.' Now if I had died during this second stage, men would have said: 'Amr became a Muslim, and waged the holy war in company with the Prophet; we hope that God has a rich reward in store for him.' But then I came to hold military commands, and there were severe trials; and I have fears for this last period. But when ye carry me

¹ See below, page 317.

² This often repeated tradition is given here from Asad ibn Mûsâ and 'Abd Allah ibn Sâlih, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, from Yezîd ibn Abî Hâbib, from Ibn Shamâsa.

³ 'Abd Allah did not use the word *khauf* "fear," to be sure, but out of delicacy of feeling chose the word *jeza'*, "apprehension, uneasiness."

⁴ The verb is that ordinarily used of shooting an arrow, or hurling a dart.

⁵ The final renunciation, with the Prophet, of the old ties in Mekka, and the removal with him to el-Medîna.

forth, make haste with me; let no *mâdiḥa*¹ follow me, nor any torch; but gird my mantle tightly about me, for I am yet to see strife; and throw the soil well over me, for my right hand is not better entitled to it than my left; and do not bring into my grave any piece of wood or brick.² Then when ye have buried me, remain by me for as long a time as it would take to kill a camel and cut it up, that I may enjoy your presence."³

'Amr said also: "Although no one loved the Prophet more than I did, yet I did not often give myself the delight of his presence,⁴ nor did I keep going to him with my wants, until the time when he was taken up to God, because of my awe of him."

11. 'Amr's Last Commands⁵

Asad ibn Mûsâ has transmitted the following, from 'Abd er-Raḥmân ibn Moḥammed, from Moḥammed ibn Ṭalḥa, from Ismâ'îl: When 'Amr ibn el-Âṣî was nigh to death, he said, "Call 'Abd Allah," and then said to him: "My son, when I am dead, wash my body once, putting into the last of the water which ye use a little camphor. Then when ye have finished, carry me forth quickly; and when ye have laid me in my grave, throw the soil well over me, knowing that ye are leaving me alone and in fear. O God, I do not seek to excuse myself, I only ask for forgiveness. O God, thou hast commanded certain things, and we have neglected them; thou hast forbidden certain things, and we have done them. I have not been innocent enough to be justified, nor strong enough to conquer. But there is no God but thou, no God but thou!" This he said three times, and then was taken away.

¹ A professional mourner, a woman, whose business it was to sing the praises of the departed.

² I. e., he was to have no coffin, nor walled sepulchre.

³ Our author then adds another chain of authorities for the same tradition, viz. Asad ibn Mûsâ, Ibn Lahî'a, Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb, Suwaid ibn Qais, Qais ibn Sumai.

⁴ Literally, "fill my eye from him."

⁵ This chapter is merely a continuation — and to a considerable extent, also, a verbal repetition — of the traditions contained in the preceding one.

'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama narrates, from Ya'qûb ibn 'Abd er-Rahmân, from his father: When 'Amr was at the point of death, his eyes filled with tears and he wept. 'Abd Allah said to him, "Father, I had never been wont to fear lest a command of God should come upon thee which thou couldst not bear." But he replied: "My son, there have come upon thy father three grievous things: first, the loss of his command; second, the fear of what is now to come; and third, the separation from those whom he loves; and this last is the easiest to bear of the three. O God, thou hast commanded, and I have been remiss; thou hast forbidden, and I have disobeyed. But to thy nature belong forgiveness and forbearance."¹

When 'Abd Allah ibn 'Amr was going forth to conduct the prayer at his father's funeral, he said:² "I would not, indeed, that any man of all the Arabs were my father in place of this one; but I should not wish God to know that my eyes shed tears of apprehension for him, even though all the red camels³ of the herd were to be mine." Then he uttered the *tekbîr*.

'Amr was buried in the Moqattam, on the side toward the ravine. That was the way which travellers to the Hijâz took, in those days, and he wished that those who passed by might say a prayer for him. Hence the following lines, composed by 'Abd Allah ibn ez-Zubair:⁴—

"Hast thou not seen how changeful time has wrought its ruin
Upon the Sahmite, 'Amr, to whom all Egypt payed its tribute?
He is cast forth, unheeded, on the desert plain; his careful plans
Are come to naught, his great wealth has availed him not.
His troops could not protect him, nor his native cunning,
Nor all his planning, when the fated time was come."

¹ Here follow two more traditions, substantially identical with those which have already been given, but supported by different chains of witnesses. I have omitted them in the translation.

² This tradition is by 'Abd el-Ghaffâr ibn Dâ'ûd and 'Abd Allah ibn Şâlih, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, from Rabi'a ibn Loqaiç.

³ I. e., the best part.

⁴ 'Abd Allah's name appears often in the traditions relating to the conquest of North Africa, as will be seen in the sequel.

II

THE CAMPAIGNS OF 'ABD ALLAH IBN SA'D

1. *The Conquest of 'Africa'*

AFTER¹ 'Othmân had removed 'Amr ibn el-Âṣî from the command, and appointed 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd ibn Abî Sarḥ in his place, the latter continued to send out the troops of Muslim horse to raid the borders of Africa and bring in booty, as they had done under 'Amr's rule. At length 'Abd Allah wrote to 'Othmân, telling him how near these regions were to the Muslim domain, and asking permission to undertake a campaign thither. 'Othmân, after taking counsel in the matter, encouraged his people in the undertaking, and when a company of them had been collected, appointed over them el-Ḥârith ibn el-Ḥakem, with orders to proceed to Egypt and join 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, who was to command the whole. So 'Abd Allah set out for Africa.

Now the seat of rule in Africa at that time was a city called Qarṭâjenna,² where was reigning a king whose name was Jurjîr.³ He had originally been appointed vice-gerent there by [the Byzantine emperor] Heraclius, but had revolted and coined dînârs in his own name.⁴ His domain extended

¹ The following is chiefly from 'Othmân ibn Ṣâliḥ.

² The Arabic form of the name Carthage.

³ The prefect Gregory, who had undoubtedly assumed the purple, as here narrated, as he is styled *Turannos* by the Byzantine writers. The story of his daughter, who remained at his side to aid him during the battle with the Arabs, has been a favorite with historians, though probably without foundation in fact. 'Abd Allah is said to have offered her as a prize to that man of his army who should bring him Gregory's head.

⁴ Another brief tradition, repeating a part of the preceding, here follows in the original.

from Itrâbulus to Tanja.¹ So when 'Abd Allah approached, Jurjîr met him, and a battle was fought, in which the latter was killed and his army put to flight. It is often asserted that the one who killed Jurjîr was 'Abd Allah ibn ez-Zubair. Then 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd divided his troops into small bands and sent them in all directions, and they brought in abundant spoil. When the chieftains of the country saw this, they began to treat with 'Abd Allah, offering to give him a sum of money if he would go forth from their land. He agreed, and took the money and returned to Egypt, without appointing any Muslim governor over them or establishing any military station in their land.

When the booty taken at this time was divided,² the share of each Muslim, after the fifth³ had been deducted, was three thousand dînârs for a horseman and one thousand for a foot-soldier. [There are also traditions here relating to a certain foot-soldier who died after taking part in this expedition, to whose family the sum of one thousand dînârs was then paid, as his share.⁴] The number of 'Abd Allah's army was twenty thousand,⁵ and the one who had charge of the division of the booty was Sharîk ibn Sumai. It is said that Sharîk sold Ibn Zarâra of el-Medîna a quantity of gold ore, receiving in return a sum which proved to be greater than its value. El-Miqdâd ibn el-Aswad, meeting them and hearing of this, said, "This will never do." Thereupon Ibn Zarâra said [to Sharîk], "The extra amount is yours as a gift." But Sharîk answered, "I do not wish to keep what is yours, and I return it."

¹ I. e. Tangiers.

² A number of separate traditions are given here, but as they agree as to the main facts, I have given only the substance of them.

³ One-fifth of any booty of war was the property of the Caliph. According to the Koran (Sura 8, 42), a part of this fifth was to be devoted to charities.

⁴ Certain sheikhs of Egypt are here quoted as saying that each of these dinârs was worth a dinâr and a quarter.

⁵ A tradition of 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, derived from ibn Lahî'a, states that Mahra alone had 600 men in the army; Ghanth (belonging to Azd) 700; and Maida'an (also of Azd) 700.

In the division of the booty,¹ the daughter of Jurjîr came into the possession of a certain man of the Anşâr.² He put her on a camel and set out to return home, and as he did so, he recited these verses:—

“O daughter of Jurjîr, it will soon be thy turn to walk!
Thou shalt find in the Hijâz a mistress over thee;
All the way from Qobâ' thou shalt carry the water-skin!”

As she heard him, she asked, “What is this dog saying?” Some one told her, whereupon she threw herself down from the camel upon which she was riding, and was killed by the fall, her neck being broken.

It is said³ that one day while Abd Allah ibn Sa'd was in Africa there was placed before him a heap of coined silver. He said to the natives who brought it, “Where did you get this?” Thereupon one of them began looking about as though he were searching for something, until he found an olive, which he brought to 'Abd Allah, saying, “It is from this that we get the silver.” Being asked, “How so?” he answered: “The Greeks have no olives, so they come to us and buy our oil, and we receive in return for it this silver money.”⁴

Another tradition⁵ relating to this campaign is that on one occasion, when 'Abd Allah was conducting the sunset prayer, and had completed two *rek'as*, a confused noise was heard in

¹ The following tradition our author cites from his father, and from Sa'îd ibn 'Ofair.

² According to some traditions, this man was 'Abd Allah ibn ez-Zubair. Thus, for example, the interesting account in Ibn Khaldûn. That this is merely a later embellishment of the story, however, similar to those already mentioned above, is sufficiently proved by the account of this battle given (in what purport to be 'Abd Allah's own words) in the *Aghânî*, vi. 58 f.

³ Our author notes here that some authorities (whom he names) have called 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd the conqueror of Africa; but adds that others, improving this by a pun (*iftara* for *iftatah*) have called him the deflowerer of Africa.

⁴ Here follows a brief and unimportant tradition regarding the origin of the name “Africa.” See above, page 285.

⁵ From the author's father, from Bekr ibn Muḍar, from Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb, from Qais ibn Abî Yezîd, from el-Jellâs ibn 'Âmir, from 'Abd Allah ibn Abî Rabî'a.

the place where they were praying, and the men were seized with a panic, for they thought that the enemy were upon them. So he broke off the service; but when he saw nothing, he addressed the people, and then said: "This prayer of ours is as good as dead;" then he commanded the muezzin to proclaim the service anew, and began it again.

2. *How the Tidings were brought to Medîna*¹

According to the tradition of 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, derived from Ibn Lahî'a, 'Abd Allah sent 'Oqba ibn Nâfi' [to el-Medîna] with the tidings of the victory in Africa; but other authorities say rightly that it was 'Abd Allah ibn ez-Zubair who was sent. He rode from Africa to el-Medîna in twenty nights, and on his arrival,² entered the presence of 'Othmân and began narrating how they had met the enemy, and what things had happened during the campaign. The caliph was astonished, and said, "Canst thou tell the people these same things?" "Yes," he replied. So 'Othmân took him by the hand and led him to the *minbar*, saying, "Now narrate to them what thou hast narrated to me." At first 'Abd Allah hesitated, and his father, ez-Zubair, who was present, took up a handful of gravel and was on the point of throwing it at him, when he began speaking in words which filled them all with astonishment and admiration. So from that day on, ez-Zubair was wont to say: "When one of you wishes to marry a woman, let him look to her father, or to her brother, for he will be sure to see a colt from her tied at his door;"³ saying this because of the resemblance which he saw between 'Abd Allah and Abû Bekr.⁴

Another tradition narrates:⁵ When 'Abd Allah ibn ez-

¹ This superscription is lacking in the original.

² The tradition is from Sa'îd ibn 'Ofair, from el-Mundhir ibn 'Abd Allah el-Hizâmî, from Hishâm ibn 'Orwa.

³ I. e., he will see something to show him what sort of children may be expected from her. The metaphor is truly Arabian.

⁴ Ez-Zubair's wife, and 'Abd Allah's mother, was Asmâ, the daughter of Abû Bekr.

⁵ This is from 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd.

Zubair was sent from the army with the tidings of victory, he waited upon 'Othmân at once, before seeing his father, ez-Zubair. So 'Othmân went forth to the mosque, taking 'Abd Allah with him. After repeating the formulas of praise to God, he mentioned the things which God had permitted the Muslims to do under the leadership of 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, and then said: "Stand forth, 'Abd Allah, son of ez-Zubair, and tell the people what thou hast witnessed!" Ez-Zubair said afterwards: "I was angry with 'Othmân when I heard that, and said to myself, He is making a mere boy stand forth, who will not be able to speak in a way that is either equal to the occasion or creditable to himself." But Abd Allah stood up and spoke eloquently and suitably, so that before he had finished all were filled with wonder. Then 'Othmân came down from the *minbar*, and 'Abd Allah went to his father, who took him by the hand, saying: "When thou wouldst marry a woman, look first to her father and her brother;" seeming thus to compare him in eloquence with Abû Bekr eṣ-Ṣiddîq, his grandfather.

Others assert (says Ibn 'Abd el-Ḥakem) that 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd sent Merwân ibn el-Ḥakem¹ to 'Othmân from Africa; whether at the time of this conquest, or after it, I do not know, God knows best. There was sent with him² an Arab, either from the tribe of Lakhm or from that of Judhâm; on this point Ibn 'Abd el-Ḥakem was in doubt. [The story is then told in Merwân's own words:] While we were journeying, one day, night overtook us as we were passing over a certain road, and my companion said: "Wilt thou that we lodge with a friend of mine here?" "As thou wilt," I replied. So he led me aside from the road until we came to a monastery. Now my companion was a more learned man than I. A chain was hanging at the door; he took hold of this and shook it, whereupon a man appeared above us, who, when he saw us, opened the door and let us in. Before a

¹ Merwân became caliph in the year 64 (683 A. D.), but reigned less than a year.

² The following is given on the authority of 'Abd Allah ibn Ma'shar, of Aila.

word had been spoken, he spread a bed for each of us; then he approached my companion and began speaking to him in a foreign tongue, and continued this until I became uneasy. Then he came to me, and said, "In what way art thou related to your caliph?" I replied, "I am his cousin." "Is there any one nearer of kin to him than thou?" he asked. I answered, "No, unless a son should be born to him." Then he asked, "Art thou the governor of the Holy Land?"¹ "Not so." "Endeavor to be, then, if thou canst accomplish it." Then he said, "I would tell thee something, but I fear that thou canst not bear it." I answered, "Dost thou say this to me, knowing who I am?" But he returned to my companion, and again talked with him in the foreign tongue. At length he approached me once more, and asked of me questions like the former ones, while I returned similar answers. Then he said: "Thy sovereign is soon to be slain; and we² find [it foretold] that the governor of the Holy Land is to be caliph after him;³ so if thou canst attain to that position, do so." When I heard these words, profound emotion seized me; whereupon he said, "I told thee that I feared thou couldst not bear it." But I replied: "How should I not be overcome, seeing that thou hast foretold to me the death of the chief of the Muslims, and the commander of the Faithful!" So I went on to el-Medīna, and remained there for a month without saying anything to 'Othmān about this matter. Then I went to him, and found him in his house, reclining on a couch with a fan in his hand. I told him the story, and when I came to the prediction of the assassination I wept, and could proceed no further. But 'Othmān said, "Go on; thou hast not finished thy narrative." So I went on; and he began biting the edge of the fan (I think these were the words, says Ibn 'Abd el-Hakem) and seizing the end

¹ I. e., Palestine.

² I. e., the monks of the monastery, with their access to hidden sources of knowledge.

³ The "governor of the Holy Land" who was soon to succeed to the caliphate was Mo'āwiya, who gained control over all Syria and Palestine before the death of 'Othmān.

of his heel and rubbing it, as he lay on his back, until I repented of having told him the story. Then he said: "He told the truth, and I will tell thee how I know it. When the Prophet made his expedition to Tebûk, he gave to each of his companions his portion of the booty, but to me he gave two portions. I supposed that this was because of what I had expended on the expedition, and going to the Prophet, I said: 'Thou hast given me two portions, but to each of my companions a single portion; and I suppose that this is because of the expense I have incurred.' But he answered: 'No, but I wished the people to see the esteem in which I hold thee.' So I turned away, and just then 'Abd er-Raḥmân ibn 'Auf met me, and said: 'What hast thou been saying to the Prophet? His glance ceases not to follow thee.' Then I thought that I must have said something displeasing to the Prophet; so I waited until he came out for prayers, and then going to him I said: 'O Prophet, 'Abd er-Raḥmân ibn 'Auf has told me thus and thus, and I repent before God' (or words to that effect). But he answered: 'Not so; but thou art to be either slain or a slayer; be then the slain!'" God knows best how much of this story is true. The date of the conquest of Africa¹ was the year 27 [648 A.D.]; and in that same year Ḥafṣa, the wife of the Prophet, died.²

3. *The Conquest of Nubia*

'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd next undertook an expedition against the Blacks, that is, against Nubia. This took place in the year 31.³ The Nubians gave him a fierce battle, in which Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij, Abû Shamir ibn Abraha, and Ḥayûwil ibn Nâshira each lost an eye. It was on this occasion that the Nubians were given the name *Rumât el-Ḥadaq*.⁴ 'Abd

¹ This is from Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd.

² This latter statement is from 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, from Mâlik ibn Anas.

³ Two separate traditions in support of this statement are given here.

⁴ I. e., the archers who hit the pupils of the eyes.

Allah finally made a treaty of peace with them, not being able to subdue them. It was in regard to this battle that the poet said:

“My eyes ne'er saw another fight like Damqula,¹
With rushing horses loaded down with coats of mail.”

According to Ibn Abî Ḥabîb, the terms which 'Abd Allah made with them were these: The Muslims were not to attack them, nor they the Muslims; Nubia was to pay to the Muslims so and so many slaves every year, and the Muslims were to pay the Nubians yearly so and so much wheat and lentils. Ibn Abî Ḥabîb says, moreover, that they [the Nubians] had no compact of any kind with the Egyptians; but simply this agreement, for mutual protection, with the Muslims. Ibn Lahî'a adds, that their captive slaves might be purchased from them, as from others. Abû Ḥabîb (whose proper name was Suwaid), the father of Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb,² was himself one of these slaves. Ibn Lahî'a says: I heard Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb saying: “My father was one of the captive slaves of Damqula, and became the freedman of a man of the Banî 'Âmir, of the people of el-Medîna, whose name was Sherîk ibn Tofail.” The number of slaves which the Nubians were obliged to pay is given by some of the sheikhs of Egypt as three hundred and sixty yearly; others say four hundred, three hundred and sixty being for the Muslim booty and forty for the governor of the province. Some assert, moreover, that seventeen of them were women with children at the breast. After concluding this compact with the Nubians, 'Abd Allah retired from their land.

One of the most prominent of the sheikhs of Egypt narates that he once looked into one of the army registers in Fustât, and read it before it was torn up, and that the following words from it remained in his memory: “We hereby make a covenant and a compact with you, on condition that ye pay us yearly three hundred and sixty head, and that ye enter our territory only to pass through, not to remain; we

¹ I. e., Dongola.

² The transmitter of many of the traditions in this history.

promising the same with regard to your territory, with the understanding that if ye kill any Muslim, or harbor any of our runaway slaves, the compact is broken; and it shall be incumbent on you to return the fugitive slaves of the Muslims, as well as any belonging to the peoples under our protection who may take refuge with you." Others of the sheikhs assert that there was no formal obligation resting upon the Muslims and in favor of the Nubians, but say that in the first year of their sending what they had agreed to send, they brought to 'Amr ibn el-Âṣî a gift of forty slaves; but that he, being unwilling to receive it from them, returned it to one of the chief men of the Copts, named Nestaqûs, who was the officer in charge of their affairs. The latter then sold the slaves, and bought for his people such things as they needed. They [the sheikhs above mentioned] allege in regard to this that 'Amr sent to them wheat and horses, the reason for his doing so being that they had been ill supplied with these things, and having made known this lack at the beginning, they were furnished with them. This is what they relate.

As 'Abd Allah was returning, there were assembled before him on the bank of the Nile the people of el-Bujja. He inquired about them, and was told what they were, but thinking them too insignificant to be negotiated with, he passed on and left them. So they had at that time no compact or treaty with the Muslims. The first to treat with them was 'Obaid Allah ibn el-Ḥabḥâb.¹ One of the sheikhs asserts that he once read the written statement made by Ibn el-Ḥabḥâb, and that it contained these words: "[They shall furnish] three hundred young slaves every year, delivering them in er-Rîf;² passing through the land as traders, but not remaining. If they kill any Muslim or *protégé* of the Muslims, the compact is annulled. They may harbor no slave of the Muslims, but must return such fugitives as come to them. I also made with them at that time the following compact, to which they agreed: Any man of el-Bujja who steals a

¹ He was governor of the province Africa from 116 to 123 A. H.

² I. e., in Lower Egypt.

sheep shall be required to pay for it four dînârs; if he steals a cow, he shall pay ten dînârs. Their representative remained in er-Rîf, as a pledge of good faith in the hands of the Muslims."

4. *The Victory of Dhû 'ş-Şawârî*¹

The next expedition undertaken by 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd was that of Dhû 'ş-Şawârî, in the year 34.² One of the traditions relating to this campaign is the following: When 'Abd Allah halted at Dhû 'ş-Şawârî, he sent away half his men, under the command of Busr ibn Abî Arţâh, on a land expedition by night. After they were gone, a messenger came to 'Abd Allah, saying: "Whatever thou hast planned to do, should Heraclius come upon thee suddenly with a thousand boats, that do immediately!" (The other authorities, says our author, contradict el-Laith here, saying that it was not Heraclius, but his son,³ the former having died in the year 19, when the Muslims were besieging Alexandria.) Now the Muslim boats numbered at that time only a little more than two hundred. So 'Abd Allah went and stood among his men, and said: "I have been told that Heraclius is approaching with a thousand boats; now give me counsel!" As no one replied, he seated himself for a moment, waiting for them to collect themselves; then he arose again and addressed them, but again no one answered him. So he seated himself, and then after a moment stood up for the third time, saying: "We are at the last extremity; give me counsel!" Then there arose a man of el-Medîna, a volunteer in 'Abd Allah's

¹ Dhû (or Dhât) eş-Şawârî "The Place of the Masts," is said by the Arab writers to have been so named because of the great number of vessels which took part in this battle.

² This is from Yahyâ ibn Bukair, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd; the following narrative is from 'Abd Allah ibn Şâlih, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, from Yezîd ibn Abi Hâbib. According to other authorities, the date of this event was the year 31.

³ This was Constans II, who reigned from 642 to 668 A. D. (21-48 A. H.). His name is written *Qostantîn* by the Arab historians. It is true that he made this expedition in person, and was defeated by the Arabs.

army, and said: "O Commander! God Almighty says: 'How many a little band has conquered a multitude, with God's help! God is with those who stand fast.'" ¹ "Embark, then, in the name of God!" said 'Abd Allah. So they embarked; but each boat had only half its crew, the others having gone with Busr on his land expedition. They soon met the enemy, and the fight was begun with darts and arrows. The Emperor Heraclius ² remained in the rear, to be safe in case of defeat, and a succession of small boats brought him news of the battle. At first, when he asked, "What tidings?" the reply was, "They are fighting with darts and arrows." "The Greeks are conquering!" he cried. Again, as they returned, he asked, "What tidings?" "The darts and arrows are exhausted," was the answer, "and they are hurling stones." "The Greeks are conquering," he said again. Then they came once more, and said, in reply to his question, "The stones are all gone, and now they have lashed the boats together, two by two, and are fighting hand to hand with their swords." At this he cried, "The Greeks are conquered!"

The tradition ³ has it that the boats were lashed together with chains, as was then usual, and that the hostile boat which was fastened to the one containing the Muslim commander, 'Abd Allah, began to tow it over among the enemy, and would have succeeded had not 'Alqama ibn Yezîd el-Ghoṭaifi, who was fighting at the side of 'Abd Allah, struck the chain such a blow with his sword that he cut it through. Now 'Abd Allah's wife, Busaisa, the daughter of Ḥamza ibn Lîsharḥ, was with him in the boat; for the Muslims often carried their wives with them at such times. So after the battle 'Abd Allah asked her, "Whom didst thou think most valiant in the fight?" ⁴ "'Alqama of the chain!" was her answer. Now it had happened that at the time when 'Abd Allah was wooing

¹ Koran, Sura 2, 250.

² See the note above.

³ This tradition comes from 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, on the authority of Ibn Lahî'a, who had it from Yezid ibn Abî Ḥabîb.

⁴ Expecting, no doubt, to hear his own valor praised.

Busaisa, and went to ask her in marriage from her father, the latter said: "Alqama has already asked for her hand, and I have given him my promise, but if he is willing to release her, I will agree." So Abd Allah made request of 'Alqama, and the latter acquiesced. But after the death of 'Abd Allah,¹ Alqama married Busaisa. Then when he in turn died, she was married to Karîb ibn Abraha, and died as his wife in the year in which [the caliph] Merwân killed el-Akdar ibn Ḥomâm.² This is from Ibn Lahî'a; the other authorities narrate that el-Akdar was killed on the very day of Busaisa's death, and that when the tidings of the matter came to Karîb, he said, "Wait until I am through with this burial," and did not turn aside until after el-Akdar had been killed; and that the people blamed Karîb for this. As for el-Akdar and his death, there is a longer tradition than this one regarding it.

The following, also, is wanting in Ibn Lahî'a. In the year 35 [655 A.D.] the Greeks came to Constantine,³ the son of Heraclius, and said: "Wilt thou leave Alexandria in the hands of the Arabs, when it is our greatest city?" He replied: "What can I do with you? Can ye stand your ground for a moment, when ye meet the Arabs?" But they cried: "Go forth with us, upon our oath that we will do or die!" So they took this oath, and he set out for Alexandria with a thousand boats. They sailed at a time when tempests are frequent, and God sent a storm upon them and they were drowned. Constantine and his boat escaped shipwreck, but the storm drove him to the island of Sicily. When he told the people there his story, they said: "The Christian power has been tried and found wanting; its men are all gone. If the Arabs should descend upon us now, we could find

¹ The year of his death was 36, five years (according to Ibn 'Abd el-Ḥakem, two years) after this battle.

² This was in the year 64, the year in which Merwân invaded Egypt in his contest with the adherents of 'Abd Allah ibn ez-Zubair. El-Akdar was one of the noted warriors of Egypt, and the news of his death by the treacherous act of Merwân created no little excitement in the army.

³ See the note above.

none to help us keep them back." He answered: "We went forth with all promise of victory, but this disaster overtook us." Then they prepared a bath for him, and fell upon him when he had entered it.¹ "Woe to you!" he cried; "your men are gone, as ye say, and now ye will slay your emperor!" "Yes," they answered, "it will be as though he had been drowned with the rest." So they slew him, but spared those who had been in the boat with him.

5. *The Garrison of Alexandria*

After God had conquered Alexandria for the Muslims,² and the land was in quiet, 'Amr ibn el-Āṣî set apart one-quarter of his troops to garrison the city, provision being made that they should remain there for six months, at the end of which time they should be relieved by another division of equal size, which should remain for the same length of time: It was further provided that one-quarter of the troops should guard the coast, while the rest, one-half of the whole, remained with 'Amr himself.

According to a tradition from another source: The caliph 'Omar ibn el-Khaṭṭâb used to send every year a force recruited in el-Medîna for the garrisoning of Alexandria, for the governors [of Egypt] were always anxious about the city, and kept strengthening the garrison, not trusting the Greeks. Moreover, 'Othmân wrote as follows to 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd: "Thou knowest how the Commander of the Faithful is anxious for Alexandria, and how the Greeks have twice revolted. Now, therefore, keep a garrison constantly in the city, and see that they are fully provided for; see, too, that a new force replaces the old every six months."

Ṭalq ibn es-Samḥ narrates, from Dammâm ibn Ismâ'îl el-Moghâfirî, from Abû Qabîl, that 'Otba ibn Abî Sufyân gave

¹ In this part of the story, dealing with the murder of the emperor in Sicily, and the manner of it, our Arab narrator has found his way to actual facts.

² The tradition, received through 'Othmân ibn Šâliḥ and Ibn Lahî'a, is from Yezîd ibn Abî Ḥabîb and 'Abd Allah ibn Hubaira, whose accounts supplement each other.

to 'Alqama ibn Yezîd the command over the Muslim force in Alexandria, sending with him twelve thousand men. Then, when 'Otba left 'Alqama and his men in the lurch, the latter wrote to Mo'âwiya making complaint, and received the following reply: "I hereby send you, by way of reinforcement, ten thousand Syrians and five thousand of the men of el-Medîna." Thus the total number of the Muslim garrison in the city reached twenty-seven thousand.

'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama narrates, on the authority of Ibn Lahî'a: When 'Alqama ibn Yezîd was in command of Alexandria, with twelve thousand men, he wrote to Mo'âwiya: "Thou hast put me in charge of this city, but the force with me numbers only twelve thousand; each man is almost out of sight of his nearest comrade, the number is so small." Mo'âwiya replied: "I hereby send thee as reinforcement 'Abd Allah ibn Mutî' with four thousand men from el-Medîna; and I have ordered Mo'izz ibn Yezîd es-Sulamî to be in readiness at er-Ramla with four thousand men holding the bridles of their horses, so that whenever they hear from thee that there is danger, they may come to aid thee."

According to Ibn Lahî'a's tradition, 'Amr ibn el-'Âşî used to say: "The task of managing all Egypt is equal to holding the caliphate."

III

SUBSEQUENT COMMANDERS AND EXPEDITIONS IN
NORTH AFRICA¹1. *Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij*²

THE next to undertake an expedition into North Africa, after 'Abd Allah ibn Sa'd, was Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij, of the tribe Tajîb, in the year 34. Among those with him in his army, that year, was 'Abd el-Melik ibn Merwân.³ He (Mo'âwiya) captured numerous strongholds, and took great booty; he also established a military station at el-Qarn,⁴ which he continued to occupy until his return to Egypt. There were with him in this expedition a number of the Muhâjirûn and Anşâr.

Suleimân ibn Yassâr narrates:⁵ We made an expedition into North Africa under the command of Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij, and there were with us many of the Muhâjirûn and the Anşâr. Mo'âwiya gave us as our portion of the booty one half, after deducting the fifth,⁶ and I saw no one make objection to this excepting Jabala ibn 'Amr, one of the Anşâr.

Yûsuf ibn 'Adî also reports⁷ Khâlid ibn Abî 'Imrân as say-

¹ This superscription is found only in the London manuscript. Here begins (in all the MSS.) the fifth main division of the history.

² This chapter-heading, and those which follow, are not in the original.

³ Caliph, from 65 to 86 A. H. (684-705 A. D.).

⁴ The name of a mountain. See below.

⁵ This tradition comes from 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama and 'Abd Allah ibn el-Mubâarak (through Yûsuf ibn 'Adî), both having received it from Ibn Lahî'a, from Bukair ibn 'Abd Allah, from Suleimân himself.

⁶ See the note above, p. 302.

⁷ From Ibn el-Mubâarak, from Ibn Lahî'a.

ing: I asked Suleimân ibn Yassâr about the booty taken during these expeditions, and he said: "I knew of no other commander making such a division as did Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij, who gave us in Africa the half, after deducting the fifth. We had with us many of the companions of the Prophet, men of the Muhâjirûn; and Jabala ibn 'Amr, one of the Anşâr, refused to receive any of it."

Mo'âwiya¹ proceeded first to Qônia, a place [now] belonging to the city Qairawân, and thence went on to a mountain called el-Qarn, near which he made his camp. Then he sent 'Abd el-Melik ibn Merwân, with a thousand men, to a city named Jalûlâ. After besieging it for several days without success, he set out to return, but had proceeded only a short distance when he saw a great cloud of dust in the rear of the army. Supposing that it was the enemy in pursuit, he sent back part of his force to reconnoitre, while the rest remained standing in battle order. Those despatched for the purpose marched back rapidly, and found that the walls of Jalûlâ had fallen; so the Muslims entered the city and plundered it. Then 'Abd el-Melik returned to Mo'âwiya.

There was some strife over the booty taken at this time,² so the commander Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij wrote to the caliph Mo'âwiya regarding it. The latter replied, "The main army is the support of the raiding band," and divided the spoil accordingly. Each man received two hundred dinârs, and each horseman received four hundred for his horse in addition to his own portion. Thus 'Abd el-Melik [ibn Merwân] is reported to have said: "I received, for myself and my horse, six hundred dînârs, and used the money to buy myself a slave girl."

According to another tradition, Mo'âwiya himself led the raid on Jalûlâ. After besieging it without success, he abandoned all hope of getting possession of it, and started to

¹ The narrative now returns to the main tradition, derived chiefly from 'Othmân ibn Şâlih.

² Evidently the dispute was over the question whether the troops which remained in camp with Mo'âwiya should have a share of the spoil. Cf. 1 Sam. 30: 22-24.

return; moreover, some of his men had been killed and a large number wounded. But God conquered the city for him, after he had left it, without the aid of horsemen or foot-soldiers. So he returned with his men to the city, and took it, with all its inhabitants, no one opposing him. Then, after taking the spoil, he returned to Egypt.

'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama reports the tradition of Ibn Lahî'a, derived from Yezîd ibn Abî Habîb, that Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij made three expeditions into North Africa: the first in the year 34, before the death of 'Othmân (it was at this time that 'Othmân gave Merwân the fifth part),¹ an expedition which seems to be unknown to most writers; the second in the year 40; and the third in the year 50.

2. 'Oqba ibn Nâfi'

The next to make an excursion into North Africa, after Mo'âwiya, was 'Oqba ibn Nâfi', the Fihrite, who set out in the year 46, taking with him Busr ibn Abî Arţâh and Sharîk ibn Sumai of the tribe Murâd. He proceeded as far as Maghdâs,² a town belonging to Surt, where he encamped. (Busr had once before directed his march toward this place, in the year 26, starting out from Surt.)³ Here the winter rains overtook him (he himself was physically weak), and word was brought to him that the people of Weddân had revolted and renounced the conditions which Busr ibn Abî Arţâh had imposed upon them; for 'Amr ibn el-Âşî had sent Busr against Weddân some years before, at the time when he himself was besieging Ṭarâbulus,⁴ and Busr had taken the city. So 'Oqba left there the main body of his army, in charge of 'Omar ibn 'Alî of the tribe Qoraish, and Zuhair ibn Qais of the tribe Balî, while he himself went on with the most mobile of his troops, four hundred horsemen and four

¹ The part of the booty which was always at the disposal of the caliph. See p. 302, note.

² This is the reading of the best MSS.; the others have Maghmadâs.

³ This from Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd.

⁴ This, according to our historian, was the year 22 or 23 (see p. 285, above).

hundred mounted on camels, with eight hundred water-skins. Arriving at Weddân, he captured the city, and taking their king, cut off his ears. "Why hast thou done this to me," demanded the king, "seeing that I am thine ally?" "I did it to teach thee a lesson," 'Oqba replied. "Whenever thou shalt touch thine ears, thou wilt remember not to fight against the Arabs." He also compelled the people of the city to pay what Busr had formerly required of them, namely, three hundred and sixty slaves.

Then 'Oqba asked them whether there were any other cities beyond, and was told of Jarma, the principal city of Fezzân. So he proceeded thither, eight days' journey from Weddân, and when he drew near to the place he sent a messenger with a summons to Islâm, which the people obeyed. He halted at the distance of six miles from the city, and as their king came out to meet him, 'Oqba sent horsemen who separated him from his retinue and compelled him to proceed on foot. By the time he reached the Muslim camp, he was quite exhausted — for he was one accustomed to luxury — and began spitting blood. "Why," he demanded, "hast thou treated me thus, although I came to thee in submission?" "It was done in order to teach thee a lesson," 'Oqba replied. "Whenever thou shalt think upon it, it will remind thee not to contend with the Arabs."

Then, after imposing the tribute, three hundred and sixty slaves, upon them, and sending the men back eastward, he proceeded straight on at once against the fortresses of Fezzân, which he took, one by one, until he had gained possession of the last one. Here he asked the people of the place, "Is there any fortress beyond your district?" "Yes," was the answer; "there is Khâwâr, a great stronghold on the edge of the desert, in a rugged country, on the top of a mountain; it is the chief city of Kuwwâr." So he journeyed on for fifteen days until he reached the place, and as its inhabitants fortified themselves against him, he besieged them for a month, but without success. So he went on still further, against the remaining castles of Kuwwâr, and cap-

tured them all. In the last one was found the king of the region, and 'Oqba, taking him, cut off his fingers. "Why hast thou done this to me?" he asked. "For a lesson to thee," was the answer. "As often as thou beholdest thy fingers, thou wilt be reminded not to fight against the Arabs." Then, after requiring of them the tribute, three hundred and sixty slaves, he asked, "Are there any cities beyond you?" "I have no knowledge of any," the guide answered.

So 'Oqba returned, and when he came to the fortress Khâwâr he passed by it without attacking it or even making any halt, but journeyed on for three days, so that the people of the city felt themselves safe, and opened their gates. 'Oqba halted in a place which is now called Mâ' Faras, where there was no water, and he and his men suffered terribly from thirst, until they were nearly at the point of death. But at last, just after he had bowed himself twice in prayer and called upon God for help, his horse began pawing the ground with its hoofs, and soon uncovered a rock from under which oozed water, which it began to suck up eagerly. 'Oqba, seeing this, shouted to his men, "Dig here!" So they dug seventy small water holes in the sand, and drank until they were satisfied. Hence the place received the name Mâ' Faras.¹ Then 'Oqba returned to Khâwâr by another road, and the people there knew nothing of his approach until he came upon them by night, finding them at rest in their homes, in fancied security. So he and his army took possession of all that was in their city, their goods and their women and children, and put their fighting men to the sword.

Then he turned back again, and after making a short stay in the place where Zawîla now stands, he at length reached the main body of his army, after an absence of five months, and found that none were missing, either of the men or of the horses. Thence he proceeded westward, avoiding the main road, and came to the district Mazâta, all of whose

¹ I. e., the horse's watering-place.

fortresses he took; after this he went on to Şuff,¹ and took its castles and strongholds; then he sent a force of cavalry against Ghadâmis and captured it. When his horsemen returned to him, he proceeded against Qafşa, and then against Qaşîliya, in both cases with success.

Then he returned to el-Qairawân; but he was not satisfied with the military station which Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij had established, so he rode on with his men until he came to the place where el-Qairawân now stands. It was then a wady full of trees and thistles, the resort of wild beasts, lions, and venomous serpents. Here he cried at the top of his voice: "O ye inhabitants of the wady! Depart (God have mercy on you), for we are going to settle here!" This he repeated during three days, and at the end of that time all the lions and other wild beasts and the noxious reptiles had gone; not one remained. Then he ordered his men to clear the ground and occupy it, and those who had been settled in the other place by Mo'âwiya ibn Ḥodaij were transferred to this new place. Here he also planted his spear in the ground, saying, "This is your *qairawân*."²

El-Laith [ibn Sa'd] says: I have been told by Ziyâd ibn el-'Ajlân that this part of Africa was free from venomous reptiles for forty years afterward. If any one had offered a thousand dînârs for a serpent or a scorpion, it could not have been found.

3. *Abû 'l-Muhâjir*

After this, 'Oqba was deprived of his command, in the year 61, by Maslama ibn Mokhallad of the Anşâr, who had been appointed governor of the country by the caliph Mo'âwiya. Maslama was the first governor of both Egypt and North Africa, having been appointed in the year 47.³ He gave the

¹ This name is found in the manuscripts of Leyden and Paris (No. 2). The old Paris codex and that of London both leave a blank space here.

² I. e., military station. Another version of the story, differing very slightly from the above, here follows in the original.

³ This date is given by Yahyâ ibn Bukair, on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd.

command of the army to Abû'l-Muhâjir, Dînâr,¹ a freedman of the Anşâr, and instructed him to depose 'Oqba in the mildest manner possible. But Abû'l-Muhâjir disobeyed the order, and dealt most harshly with him, throwing him into prison and keeping him there, loaded with chains, until a letter came from the caliph setting him free, and appointing an interview with him. When 'Oqba came forth from the prison, he went as far as Qaşr el-Mâ', and there prayed and called upon God, saying, "O God, let me not die until after thou hast given Abû'l-Muhâjir, Dînâr the son of Umm Dînâr,² into my power!" This prayer was reported to Abû'l-Muhâjir, and from that time on he never ceased to fear for his life. When 'Oqba reached Egypt, Maslama came riding out to meet him, and swore a solemn oath that what Abû'l-Muhâjir had done was contrary to his express orders. Maslama had already been blamed for what he had done: "Thou shouldest have retained 'Oqba in his place," it was said, "for he is a man of sound judgment and superior ability." To this Maslama could only answer: "Abû'l-Muhâjir kept importuning us, having no command or other considerable emolument, and we wished to satisfy him."

As for Abû'l-Muhâjir, when he reached North Africa he was unwilling to stay in the place where 'Oqba had settled, so he went on two miles farther, and there built, and took up his abode. It had been the custom³ of those who made expeditions into Africa to return to el-Fusţât, and Abû'l-Muhâjir was the first to remain in the country and make it his permanent abode, winter and summer. Maslama had put him in command of the army which went out with him, and they remained there until the death of Ibn ez-Zubair, when they withdrew.

When 'Oqba presented himself before the caliph Mo'â-

¹ Dînâr was his true name, of course, and Abû'l-Muhâjir the *kunya*.

² I. e., he was a nobody; no one knew who his father was. (*Umm Dînâr* means "the mother of Dînâr.")

³ This statement is given as from 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, from Ibn Lahî'a (also from Aĥmed ibn 'Amr, from Ibn Wahb, from Ibn Lahî'a), from Yezîd ibn Abi Ĥabîb.

wiya,¹ he said: "It was I who conquered the lands, and planted the settlements, and built the mosque for the people, and the whole region was subject to me; and yet thou hast sent out this slave of the Anṣâr, who removed me, and treated me so shamefully!" Then Mo'âwiya asked his forgiveness, and said: "Thou knowest how highly our murdered chief² esteemed Maslama, and how he gave him the preferment; and how that Maslama, for his part, sought to avenge his death and offered his own heart's blood for him. And now I restore thee to thy command."

According to another tradition, it was not Mo'âwiya who thus restored 'Oqba to his command in Africa, but Yezîd ibn Mo'âwiya, who was reigning as his father's successor at the time when 'Oqba arrived. This is the correct tradition, for Mo'âwiya died in the year 60.³

4. 'Oqba's last Campaign

Then 'Oqba set out at once for Africa, making all speed because of his rage at Abû'l-Muhâjir, and on his arrival he treated him as he himself had been treated, and loaded him with chains. Then he took him, still in chains, on an expedition into es-Sûs (the people of es-Sûs are a branch of the Berbers, called Antana). After making a circuit through the land without meeting any opposition or fighting any battle, he turned back towards Africa. As he neared its border, he gave the order for his army to separate, and permitted himself to be left with only a small number. But as he approached a place called Tahûda, he was met by a large force of Greeks and Berbers under Kesîl⁴ ibn Lenzem, who had heard that he was now separated from the greater part of his army. A fierce battle was fought, in which 'Oqba

¹ In Damascus, which Mo'âwiya had made the seat of the caliphate.

² I. e., the caliph 'Othmân.

³ Other authorities for this date are here given in the original.

⁴ Thus written in all the manuscripts of the *Futûḥ Miṣr*. The correct form of the name is Kesîla. He was the head of the tribe Berânîs.

was killed and all the men with him were cut down. Abû'l-Muhâjir, still in his chains, was killed also. Then Kesîl and his army went and established themselves in the place where 'Oqba had made his settlement, and there they remained, and conquered those who were near them, Bâb Qâbis and the adjoining country. Kesîl also sent forth his men in every direction.

Another tradition tells the story differently, as follows: When 'Oqba set out for es-Sûs, he left Qairawân in charge of 'Omar ibn 'Alî, of Qoreish, and Zuhair ibn Qais, of Balî. In those days, Africa was called Muzâq. As 'Oqba was on his way, one of the enemy's leaders, with thirty thousand men, took advantage of his absence to attack 'Omar and Zuhair, who had only six thousand men; but God gave the Muslims the victory. While 'Oqba was journeying, the Berber chieftain Ibn el-Kâhina was following close behind him; as often as 'Oqba left a water-hole where he had halted, Ibn el-Kâhina came and filled it up. This continued until 'Oqba reached es-Sûs, not knowing what the Berber had been doing. When 'Oqba came to the sea, he drove his horse into it until the water reached its neck, and then cried: "O God, I call thee to witness that there is no bridge. Had I found a bridge, I would have passed over." Then he turned back by the way he had come, but found that the watering places were filled up. Then the Berbers with all their forces fell upon him, but he fought to the end. Now Abû'l-Muhâjir was with him, in chains, and when the fight became desperate, 'Oqba gave orders to free him from his fetters; but he refused to be freed, saying, "I will meet God in my chains." So both 'Oqba and Abû'l-Muhâjir and all those who were with them were killed.

'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama narrates as follows, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd: When 'Oqba ibn Nâfi', returning from his interview with the caliph Yezîd ibn Mo'âwiya, arrived in Eygpt with his army, on his way to North Africa, he met 'Abd Allah ibn 'Amr, who said to him: "O 'Oqba, perchance thou art one of that company who are to enter paradise

with their saddle-bags." Then he and his army passed on, and were all slain in battle with the Berbers, who were unbelievers.

A similar tradition is given by 'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama, from Ibn Lahî'a, from Bujair ibn Dhâkhir, of the tribe Moghâfir, who said: I was with 'Abd Allah ibn 'Amr when 'Oqba arrived, and 'Abd Allah said: "What has brought thee here, 'Oqba? For I know that thou art eager for military command." 'Oqba replied: "The Commander of the Faithful, Yezîd, has given me charge of an expedition into Africa." Then 'Abd Allah said: "Beware lest thou become the curse of the widows of Egypt; for I have long heard that a man of Qoreish would go forth on such an expedition, and would perish in it." So 'Oqba went on into Africa, and first searched out Abû'l-Muhâjir and put him in irons; then he marched on, taking Abû'l-Muhâjir with him, to the battle with the Berbers, whose army numbered five thousand men of Egypt. In the battle he and all his men and Abû'l-Muhâjir were killed. The date of this event, according to Yahyâ ibn Bukair, who had it from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, was the year 63.

Then ¹ Ibn el-Kâhina marched to Qairawân to attack 'Omar ibn 'Alî and Zuhair ibn Qais. They fought a fierce battle with him, in which he was put to flight and many of his companions were slain; then 'Amr and Zuhair proceeded toward Egypt with their army, to meet the Berber chieftains, leaving in Tarâbulus the disabled of their companions and those of the people of Africa who had joined them.

According to one tradition, when 'Abd el-'Azîz became governor of Egypt he wrote to Zuhair, who was then in Barca, directing him to make an incursion into Africa; and he accordingly went out with a large army. As he drew near to Qônia, where the army of Kesîl ibn Lemzem was, he set his troops in order; and when the enemy came out, a battle was fought in which Kesîl was killed and his army routed. Then Zuhair withdrew to Barca.

¹ The main line of the narrative, derived chiefly from 'Othmân ibn Şâlih, is resumed here.

According to another tradition, it was Ḥassân ibn en-No'mân who sent Zuhair on this expedition; God knows best which is right.

The death of Kesîl, according to el-Laith ibn Sa'd, quoted by Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, took place in the year 64.

5. *Ḥassân ibn en-No'mân*

Then Ḥassân ibn en-No'mân became governor of North Africa, having been appointed by 'Abd el-Melik ibn Merwân in the year 73. He proceeded with a large army to Ṭarâbulus, where he was joined by all those who had gone out from Africa and Ṭarâbulus; and putting Moḥammed ibn Abî Bukair, Hilâl ibn Tharwân, of the tribe Luwâta, and Zuhair ibn Qais in charge of the van of his army, he conquered the adjoining districts and took abundant booty. He also advanced upon the city Qartâjenna, in which the Greek troops were quartered, but was able to reach only a few of the weakest of them. Then he returned and attacked el-Kâhina,¹ who was at that time the queen of the Berbers and had conquered the greater part of Africa. They joined battle at a river which is now called Nahr el-Balâ, and after a fierce engagement she put his army to flight, killing many of them and taking eighty prisoners. Ḥassân himself escaped, and made his way to Anṭâbulus, where he took up his abode in certain castles belonging to the territory of Barca, which were afterwards called the Castles of Ḥassân. He gave the command of the province Africa to Abu Şâlih, while the territory under his own control included Anṭâbulus, Lûbiya, and Murâqiya as far as Ajdâbiya.

As for el-Kâhina, she treated her prisoners kindly, and set them all free except one, a man of 'Abs named Khâlid ibn Yezîd, whom she kept by her, treating him as one of her sons. At length Ḥassân sent a man to Khâlid with this message: "Ḥassân says, What hinders thee from sending

¹ The word *kâhina* means "priestess."

us a letter with information concerning el-Kâhina and her army?" So Khâlid wrote a letter to Ḥassân, and put it in a cake of bread baked in ashes, and then gave it to the messenger, thinking that it would thus be effectually concealed, since those who saw the bread would suppose that it was the man's provision for his journey. But el-Kâhina came out, and said, "O my children, I see that your death is in that which men eat." These words she repeated. Then the messenger went away and brought to Ḥassân the letter containing the information he wished. After this, Khâlid wrote another letter and concealed it in the messenger's saddle-bow, making a cavity for it, and then covering over and smoothing the place so as to hide it completely. But this time also el-Kâhina came out, saying, "O my children, your death is in something which was once a living plant in the ground;" and again she repeated her words. The messenger departed and came to Ḥassân, who called his men together and prepared to make the attack. As they drew near, el-Kâhina came forth with her loosened hair streaming, and cried, "Look, my children! What do ye see yonder above the horizon?" "We see," they said, "something like a reddish cloud." "Not so, by my God!" she answered; "It is the dust of the Arab horsemen!" Then she said to Khâlid: "It was in preparation for such a day as this that I made thee my son. My death is now at hand, and I charge thee to take good care of these two brothers of thine." Khâlid said: "I fear, if what thou sayest is true, that they will not be left alive." "They will survive," she answered, "and one of them will stand in a higher place among the Arabs than he occupies now. Go, therefore, and obtain protection for them both." So Khâlid went forth to meet Ḥassân, and told him of the two sons of el-Kâhina and obtained protection for them. Now Ḥassân had in his army a company of Berbers of the tribe Butr, and he appointed the elder of the two sons to be their commander, and showed him favor. Then he himself and his men went on and met el-Kâhina at the foot of a mountain, and there she was slain,

with the most of those who were about her. Hence the place was afterwards called Bîr el-Kâhina.¹

Then Ḥassân returned, and settled in the place where Qairawân of Africa now stands. He built there the public mosque, and prepared the official registers, and imposed the land-tax upon the natives of the country, as well as upon those of the Berbers who continued with them as adherents of the Christian faith. Nearly all of these were from the tribe Berânis, but there were a few from Butr. Ḥassân remained there until all the country was submissive and in order, then he repaired to 'Abd el-Melik² with his booty, in the second Jumâdâ of the year 76.³ As he passed by Barca, he appointed Ibrâhîm ibn en-Naşrânî over its tribute; then he came to Egypt, where 'Abd el-'Azîz ibn Merwân was governor; then he went on to present himself to the caliph 'Abd el-Melik, who was delighted with his report of conquests made and spoil taken.

Others assert that when he arrived in Egypt, 'Abd el-'Azîz took from him all the captives who were with him, for he brought such beautiful Berber slave girls as had never been seen before. The poet Nuşaiḃ⁴ used to say: "I myself saw the captives which 'Abd el-'Azîz took from Ḥassân, and there were among them two hundred girls worth a thousand dînârs each."

6. *The Death of Zuhair ibn Qais*

After the departure of Ḥassân, the Greeks attacked Anṭâbulus, and Ibrâhîm ibn en-Naşrânî fled, leaving the people of Anṭâbulus and their allies in the hands of the Greeks, who held possession for forty days and did great mischief in the land. When tidings of this reached 'Abd el-'Azîz ibn Merwân, he sent to Zuhair ibn Qais (who had gone out formerly

¹ I. e., the well of el-Kâhina.

² That is, to Damascus.

³ Another tradition, that of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, reported by Ibn Bukair, is noted here, according to which the date was the year 78.

⁴ Nuşaiḃ ibn Rebbâḥ, a freedman of 'Abd el-'Azîz ibn Merwân, well known among the early Arab poets of Egypt.

with Ḥassân, and then remained in Egypt after their return), ordering him to march at once against the Greeks. Zuhair obeyed, but only seventy of his men were already with him at that time. Now there was a certain recruiting officer of the tribe of Ṣadif, named Jandal ibn Ṣakhr, who was a coarse, churlish fellow; so Zuhair said to 'Abd el-'Azîz: "Now that thou hast given me the order to set out, pray do not send Jandal with me as my recruiting officer, for he would be sure to keep back the men from joining me by his violence and churlishness." Now 'Abd el-'Azîz bore a grudge against Zuhair, because he had opposed him when his father, Merwân ibn el-Ḥakem, had sent him by way of Aila before he [Merwân] himself entered Egypt;¹ so he answered: "I have never known thee, thyself, to be other than a boor and a rude fellow." Then said Zuhair: "I have not been wont to think, O thou son of Laila, that one who collected what God revealed to Mohammed before thy parents came together is a boor and a rude fellow; nor is he! Now I am going, and may God never bring me back to thee!" So he marched forth with his seventy men until he came to Darna, a place belonging to Ṭauqa in the district of Anṭâbulus, where he came upon the Greek army. As he paused to let his men close up, a certain young man who was with him said, "Art thou faint-hearted, Zuhair?" "Not I, O son of my brother!" he answered, "we have both of us courted this fate." Then he closed with the enemy, and he and all his men died the martyr's death. Their graves are pointed out there to this day. The time when this took place, according to el-Laith, quoted by Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, was the year 76.

Now there was at Amlas, in the desert of Anṭâbulus, a man of the tribe Madhḥaj whose name was 'Atîya ibn Yarbû', who had fled with his son from the pestilence. There were many other Muslims in that region, and these he aroused to help him in his attempt, riding forth with all

¹ At the time referred to above, in connection with the story of el-Akdar, page 312.

who would follow. Some seven hundred men having joined him, he advanced with them against the Greeks, whom he defeated, seizing their boats and putting the remnant of their army to flight. When 'Abd el-'Azîz ibn Merwân heard of this, he sent a young slave of his named Telîd to take charge of the district, and there came with him a number of the prominent men of Egypt.¹ The people were dissatisfied with the preferment of Telîd, because he was a slave; so when 'Abd el-'Azîz heard of this, he sent a message to him setting him free, and he remained in Anṭâbulus.

7. *Mûsâ ibn Noşair*

[Not long after this] Ḥassân ibn en-No'mân came back from his visit to the caliph 'Abd el-Melik, on his way to North Africa. Arriving in Egypt, he went to 'Abd el-'Azîz and said, "Write to that slave of thine to remove from Anṭâbulus." "Not I!" was the answer, "seeing that thou didst lose it and abandon it to the Greeks." "Then," said Ḥassân, "I will return at once to the Commander of the Faithful." "Return, by all means!" the other replied. So Ḥassân returned to 'Abd el-Melik, leaving behind in Egypt his baggage and all the cumbersome part of his train. Now 'Abd el-'Azîz had sent out Mûsâ ibn Noşair to North Africa, and when the caliph heard this from Ḥassân (who had been taken ill before his arrival), he bowed himself to the ground, crying out: "Praise to God, who has given me my opportunity with Mûsâ!" for he was his bitter enemy. (Mûsâ had been 'Abd el-Melik's governor over el-'Irâq together with Bishr ibn Merwân, and when the caliph quarrelled with him and wished to have him put to death, 'Abd el-'Azîz had ransomed him for a sum of money, having a high opinion of his intelligence and good judgment; and he had been with him in Egypt.) But very soon after this Ḥassân died;

¹ There is noted here also the tradition of Yaḥyâ ibn Bukair, from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, that the one who was appointed *amîr* of Anṭâbulus upon the death of Zuhair was Târiq.

so Mûsâ ibn Noşair was allowed to remain in North Africa, where he had arrived in the year 78.¹

Mûsâ removed Abû Şâlih,² and himself conducted a successful campaign through the greater part of North Africa, following one victory with another in close succession. He made report of his progress to 'Abd el-'Azîz, and sent him some of the booty. This 'Abd el-'Azîz sent on to 'Abd el-Melik, and it had the effect of quieting considerably the caliph's anger against Mûsâ.

'Abd el-Melik ibn Maslama narrates, on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, that when Mûsâ undertook this campaign into North Africa, he intrusted one division of the army to his son Merwân, who took a hundred thousand captives; and that he sent out another division in charge of his nephew, who also took a hundred thousand. (El-Laith ibn Sa'd, being asked of what race these captives were, replied that they were Berbers.) When Mûsâ sent in his report of these things, some of the people said: "This son of Noşair is certainly crazy; whence could he get twenty thousand captives to send to the caliph with the fifth of the spoil?" When Mûsâ heard of this, he said, "Let them send out some one else who can take twenty thousand for them."

Soon after this, Abd el-Melik ibn Merwân died; his death occurring, according to the tradition of Yahyâ ibn Buġair on the authority of el-Laith ibn Sa'd, on Thursday, the fourteenth of Shawwâl, in the year 86. His son el-Welîd succeeded to the caliphate; and after his accession the conquests of Mûsâ in North Africa continued to follow one another, so that el-Welîd held him in high esteem and regarded him with increasing admiration.

¹ According to another tradition cited here, that of Yahyâ ibn Bukair from el-Laith ibn Sa'd, the date was the year 79.

² Whom Hassân had left in charge of Africa, as narrated above.



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01234 6955

