

CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY





Division

Series













**BY THE SAME AUTHOR**

**Nippur; or, Explorations and Adventures  
on the Euphrates**

The Narrative of the University of Pennsylvania Expedition to Babylonia, in the Years 1888-1890. With about 100 Illustrations and Plans, and with New Maps of the Euphrates Valley and the Ruin Sites of Babylonia. Two volumes, sold separately. 8°, gilt top, each . . . . . \$2.50

"The story is told with simplicity, directness, and precision. The book has a marked individuality and forms a fit companion for the classic works of Layard, Loftus, etc. It is of itself a credit to American learning and to literary skill—pleasant to read and well worth the reading."—*N. Y. Nation*.

"The University of Pennsylvania has accomplished a splendid work, which is to be classed among the most remarkable of modern archæological researches."—*N. Y. Times*.

**Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian**

Arranged and Edited, with Introductions and Explanatory Supplements, by Rev. Edward T. Bartlett, D.D., and Rev. John P. Peters, Ph.D.

**Part I.—The Hebrew Story from the Creation to the Exile.** 12° . . . . . \$1.50

**Part II.—Hebrew Poetry and Prophecy.** 12° 1.50

**Part III.—Covering the greater portion of the New Testament.** 12° . . . . . \$2.00

"I congratulate you on the issue of a work which I am sure will find a wide welcome, and the excellent features of which make it of permanent value."—Rt. Rev. HENRY C. POTTER, Bishop of New York.

"A valuable adjunct of biblical instruction."—Rt. Rev. W. E. STEVENS, Bishop of Pennsylvania.

***New York—G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS—London***

CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

VOL. VII.

PETERS' EARLY HEBREW STORY



# Early Hebrew Story

Its Historical Background

BY

JOHN P. PETERS, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH, NEW YORK

AUTHOR OF "NIPPUR, OR EXPLORATIONS AND ADVENTURES ON THE  
EUPHRATES"

---

New York :

G. P. Putnam's Sons

London : Williams and Norgate

1904

COPYRIGHT, 1904  
BY  
JOHN P. PETERS

---

Published, June, 1904

The Knickerbocker Press, New York



DEDICATED  
TO  
MY MOTHER

At whose knee I first  
learned to know and love  
the Bible



## MINUTE

*Passed by the Faculty of the Bangor  
Theological Seminary,  
December, 1903.*

*The Faculty of Bangor Theological Seminary wish to express their pleasure in the course of lectures delivered in November, 1903, by the Rev. John P. Peters, D.D., of New York City, upon the theme, "Early Hebrew Story, Its Historical Background." The broad and ripe scholarship, the fresh knowledge of details, the constructive temper and the reverent Christian spirit which were always manifest gave these lectures exceptional worth not only for the student body, but for the large company of thoughtful people who heard them. We earnestly hope that these lectures will be published, for, while opinions may differ about some of the conclusions arrived at, we believe that the course is adapted to promote biblical scholarship, and that their expert knowledge and positive constructive tone give them exceptional value at the present time. It will afford us especial satisfaction to have them associated in their publication with the Bond Foundation in this Seminary.*



## PREFACE

THE lectures in this volume were delivered before the Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine, on the Bond Foundation, in November, 1903.

The study of beginnings has always been one of especial interest to me, and my studies and archæological researches have been particularly devoted to the investigation of beginnings. It was, therefore, with peculiar pleasure that I received, some three years since, an invitation to treat the theme of Hebrew beginnings in a course of lectures. These lectures deal with matters which have been much under discussion of late, particularly through the publication of Delitzsch's "Babel and Bible,"—the origin of the stories of Creation, Eden, the Flood, the Tower of Babel, and the literary and religious dependence of the Hebrew version of these stories on foreign heathen, especially Babylonian, sources. Devout Christian men and women no longer accept these stories as the historical record of events, and not a few are coming to doubt the historical character of the patriarchs, or even of Moses. This uncertainty with regard to the historical character

of the contents of the early books of the Old Testament extends also to their religious character. If not valuable for historical purposes, what religious value, if any, do they possess?

These lectures deal, first, with the origin of the books in which these stories are contained. What is their date in their present form, how and when were they composed and from what source did the writers draw their material? Secondly: What is the nature of that material? How much of it is derived from foreign myths and legends, whether Babylonian or Canaanitic? How did the Hebrews come into possession of this material? Thirdly: What peculiarly Hebrew material, if any, exists in these stories? How much of that material is historical and in what sense? What evidence does it give, not only of the ancestry and political development, but still more of the religion and religious development of the Hebrews in the early period? Fourthly: What is the religious value to us of the present day of these stories and the books in which they are contained?

I have considered it preferable to publish these lectures substantially as they were delivered, retaining the lecture form and style. If this results in a certain discursive and repetitious quality, I nevertheless hope that the directness of address may

more than atone for those faults with the average reader. It is my hope in this volume to speak rather to the intelligent men and women who are interested in the Bible, in the early history of the world and the development of religion, than to scholars or theological students. At the same time I shall be disappointed if I do not bring to the latter also some things worthy of their careful consideration. The book is in a sense a study in the comparative history of religion.

Inasmuch as this volume is addressed primarily to the general public, I have thought it best to burden the pages as little as possible with notes or references.

JOHN P. PETERS.

St. Michael's Church,

May 3, 1904.





## CONTENTS

---

LECTURE	PAGE
I. Introductory : Literary and Archæological	3
II. The Formation of Israel : The Origin of the Twelve Tribes . . . . .	45
III. The Patriarchs and the Shrines of Israel.	81
IV. Survivals—Legendary and Mythical . . . . .	128
V. Cosmogony and Primeval History . . . . .	196
VI. The Moral Value of Early Hebrew Story	268



# Early Hebrew Story



# Early Hebrew Story

---

## LECTURE I

### INTRODUCTORY

#### *Literary and Archaeological*

**B**EFORE we proceed to consider the history which lies behind the quaint and fascinating stories of the early books of the Old Testament, especially the Book of Genesis, we must agree upon a point of departure. My first lecture, therefore, will be of an introductory character, dealing with (1) the date and origin of the literature in which these stories are contained, and (2) the historical setting which we are able, from other sources, to give to those early times, chiefly from discoveries in Babylonia and Egypt; to a small extent from discoveries in Palestine itself.

I. Hebrew literature commences in the days of David and Solomon, with a narrative of the founding of the kingdom of David,\* practically contemporaneous with the events narrated. This is the vivid

---

\* This is contained in the second book of Samuel, chapters I—V, IX—XX, and in the first book of Kings, chapters I and II.

narrative of a story-teller ; there is in it none of that tendency to moralize and teach, to present history according to a theory of its causes and of God's purpose in His dealings with men, which becomes increasingly dominant in later Hebrew writings.

When we say that this was the beginning of Hebrew literature, we do not mean, however, that there were not before this period songs and stories, the latter sometimes of considerable length, constituting something like a series ; but that these still passed about by word of mouth, or that even if some laws, songs and the like had been committed to writing, they had not been reduced to a true literary shape.

The commencement of historical writing, which, as I have already indicated, is the commencement of Hebrew literature, is contemporary also with the commencement of historical records. Under David and Solomon we first meet with official annals, containing names, revenue lists, and, on the religious side, temple reports and ceremonial or ritual directions. The people was becoming conscious of its unity and also of its heredity. It was interested to record its own doings, and, at the same time, becoming interested to learn what had been done in the past and to tell the deeds of its ancestors. Consequently, about this period, collections of old songs

began to be made, since songs commemorated the great deeds of the olden time. The best known of these is the collection entitled the Book of Yashar, or Jasher.\* And here let me note, first, that the more familiar Yeshurun or Jeshurun † is Yashar or Jasher, with the meaningless noun ending, *un*, affixed for poetical effect; and, secondly, that Yashar, in the longer form Yeshurun, is nothing more nor less than Israel (*Yishra-el*) with the final *el* omitted, so that the (Song) "Book of Yashar" is the (Song) "Book of Israel," and the "God of Jeshurun" is the "God of Israel." We shall note later a similar omission of the divine element, *el*, in the Hebrew Jacob and Joseph in contrast with the Babylonian and Egyptian Jacob-el and Joseph-el; and it may be said in passing that in later historical times we find a similar omission of the divine element, Yahu or Jehu, in the name of King Ahaz, who appears in Assyrian as Jehoahaz. Instances can also be adduced of the interchange of the divine element in names, a name appearing in one case with Yahu, and in another with *el*, *adoni*, etc., an evidence of the flexibility of that element. Instances may also be adduced from Babylonian-Assyrian use of a similar omission of the divine element in names.

---

\* 2 Sam., I, 8.

† Cf. for instance Deut. XXXIII, 26.

I need not mention other collections of songs, like the "Wars of Yahaweh"\* , but may add that there are a number of songs in the early books of the Old Testament, now embodied in the historical narrative, which, in their origin at least, are older than the time of David. All of these, presumably, were contained in some of the various collections made in the times of David and Solomon, or embodied in some stories current at that time and thus preserved for future use. Besides these songs there were also in existence, at and before David's time, old stories, traditions and laws, many of which had already assumed a definite form and some of which may have been committed to writing. These formed the material for that story of the past, which soon began to be created, for, the history of King David and the dramatic and important events of the immediate past having been compiled, an effort was shortly made to go further back and compile a history of Israel from the beginning.

And here let me remind you of the process of history building employed by our own English ancestors. With Alfred the Great, English historical writing may be said to commence in the form of the Saxon Chronicle. This utilized the meagre

---

\* Num. XXI, 14.



Latin Bishop's Roll, of Winchester, drawing additional material from Bede and other unknown sources and carrying the story down to date. Then an effort was made to include the story of a still earlier period, and the Saxon Chronicle was carried back to the Incarnation. After Alfred's time the Chronicle was continued by various hands in various monasteries. One or more of these forms of the Chronicle, together with another history, that of Irish Marian, which started with Creation, was finally utilized by Florence of Worcester, who composed a new history, in which it is almost if not quite impossible to say what is from one source, what from another and what from the ultimate author or composer. Almost precisely similar was the growth of Hebrew history. I might compare further the anonymous and gradual growth and changes of monastic literature in Europe at large during the Dark and early Middle Ages, to illustrate the similar gradual growth and change, and the similar anonymity and composite character and authorship of Hebrew historical literature. With perhaps even greater effect I might cite examples from other oriental literature, for instances of similar growth. But time will not allow me to make such an excursus as would be necessary for this purpose. Suffice it to say that the growth of Hebrew literature was

in these regards not phenomenal and strange, but distinctly normal and natural.

It seems that the story of King David and his kingdom was shortly followed by a story of his early life, containing some of those fascinating episodes in the first Book of Samuel. And now we begin to find competing narratives, as it were, that is, a double narration of single events. We have, in the first Book of Samuel, as it stands to-day, not one, but two narratives of David's early life combined. These narratives, like the history of King David and his kingdom, consist of picturesque and interesting episodes; and, as in the story of the kingdom, there is little or nothing of the supernatural. The generation which witnessed these things had not passed away, there had not been time for the growth about these very human happenings of legend and myth and mystical interpretation. And this is a reason why we mark this period of the latter days of David and the commencement of Solomon's reign as the period of the beginnings of Hebrew literature. You have, in the history of David's life, all the evidences of the narrative of eye-witnesses, of a generation close to the events which are described; while, in proportion as you go backward from that period, legendary and mythical features appear in ever increasing quantity, because

those are far away, remote events, shrouded with a glamor of mystery, and conceived of as caused by the workings of marvelous and supernatural agencies. The story of Saul is human, like the story of David, and so are parts of the story of Samuel. But by the side of this living, breathing Samuel you find also another Samuel of a quite different character. In the stories of the Judges, historical tradition is strongly mixed with myth and legend. In the story of Samson, as I shall try to show in detail somewhat later, it is extremely hard to pick out the actual historical elements and, to some extent, the same is true of Jephthah. In the story of Gideon you have two narratives combined, and in the analysis and comparison of those two stories you will find an admirable example of the growth of myth and legend about the heroes of the past.

Back of this group of stories, which is still not so far removed from the days of David and Solomon, and, therefore, contains still much vivid and picturesque material of manifest and direct historic value, you come to a period for which, at the time when history began to be written, tradition was already meagre, namely, the invasion and settlement of Canaan. If you will read your Bible carefully, you will find that the greater part of that period appears to be a blank. It is true that here and

there we have longer traditions of special events, such as the capture of Jericho, the league with the Gibeonites and the war with Ai; but generally the traditions are very indistinct and what has come down to us gives evidence of having been written or rewritten under the influence of reflection and study. I hope to show you that we have also some of the story of this period handed down in what on their face claim to be the stories of a still older period — the stories of the Book of Genesis.

For the period preceding the conquest we have a great abundance of material, but the history of this age is of an entirely different nature from the narratives which we have, for instance, from the time of David. It is full of the miraculous. God walks and talks with men; angels appear; all things are done directly by the agency of God or His messengers.

One naturally asks: Why, if we have such a scarcity of material for the period which lay just beyond the ken of those writers of history who began their work in the time of David and Solomon, we have such an abundance of material, even though it be of a different character, for this more remote period? There occurred precisely at this point a great creative movement in the life of Israel, which affected it

so profoundly that the memory of it echoes through the whole of Israel's history and through the whole range of its literature,—the deliverance from Egypt.

In these lectures I hope to be able to show you how this event influenced that thought and that literature in the earlier times. As the War of the Revolution has left an indelible impress on this country, so the deliverance from Egypt stamped and influenced the thought of Israel forever. Anyone can tell you to-day of Bunker Hill and Lexington and Saratoga, of Valley Forge and the Crossing of the Delaware and the surrender of Cornwallis. Anyone can tell you of George Washington and what he meant and what he did ; but who can tell you of the men and the events which followed, important as they were, the disintegration of the Federation, the ultimate creation of the United States of America, and the life and struggles of the succeeding generations? Even in an age like this, which writes history, and even with events so close at hand, you will find that, while the common people of this country know the Revolution and its story, the history of the Federation and the ultimate creation of the nation of the United States of America is almost unknown. Consequently the story of the former is vivid, and its events seem close at hand, while the history of the latter is very remote and

## Early Hebrew Story

vague. This is small and insignificant ; the former period assumes gigantic shape and heroic proportions. In another age it would have been colored through and through with the supernatural. It was the vastness and the strangeness of the events which brought the ancestors of Israel out of Egypt and created Israel into a people which preserved that memory so abundantly in stories and legends, and at the same time supernaturalized it. At or about the time of Solomon, when the effort was made to write the history of Israel's past, these stories and legends were brought into consecutive shape to form the history of this period.

For the still earlier period, the period which preceded the deliverance from Egypt and the creation of the nation, the compilers of the history found another sort of material—legends with myth intermixed, connected, as I shall endeavor to show you in another lecture, to a considerable extent with the famous sanctuaries of the country, and, therefore, Canaanite in origin, with which, however, had been mingled true Israelitish material, recollections or imaginations of Israel's past, early lore, such as all nations have told about their ancestors. These stories of the heroes of the time past had been so told and told again by story-tellers, that they had already assumed a fixed form. Some of them are

among the most exquisite gems of the narrator's art to be found in any language.

As in England, history grew back and back from the narration of events contemporary with the writers, until at last it was prefaced with a story that went back first to the Incarnation and then to the Creation, so, likewise, these collectors of the history of Israel first carried their story back to the beginning of the nation with Moses, and then back further still, by means of this legendary lore of the remote past, to what one might call the incarnation of the nation in Abraham. But even this was not the beginning ; and finally there was prefixed a narrative which told of the creation of the world, of the long-lived men of the primeval world, of the great flood that destroyed mankind, of the division of the nations by the growth of different languages, of the development of civilization, the origin of musicians, iron-workers, city dwellers and the like. These stories contain the natural speculations of a simple people with regard to the beginnings of all things. But these stories did not originate with the compilers of the history. They found them already in existence. They were a part of the knowledge of the Canaanites, the wisdom of their higher culture, which the Hebrews found and borrowed ; and so it is that we find similar cosmogonies

## Early Hebrew Story

and culture myths among the neighboring and kindred Phoenicians. Of the relation of these to the Babylonian cosmogonies and primeval myths, more anon.

Such was the origin of this first history, compiled after Israel had become a settled people, with a capital city, a king and a court. But this history was never completed. It was added to as time went on and carried forward to include new reigns and new events. It was changed by the writer or the generation which inherited it from the past, for a written work was the property of him who possessed it, in a sense which you and I no longer know. The owner made it his own by changing and adapting it; a practice not peculiar to the history of Israel nor even to the literature of the Orient in the remote past, for this again we find even in the monkish chronicles of our own ancestors in England. These monkish chronicles were the possession and the creation of a monastery or a locality, not of an individual; and so, likewise, the story of Israel, which I have attempted to describe, was the possession and creation of a region and a lineally descended group of workers, that is, a school, not an individual.

This history, or so much of it as has come down to us, designated as J by the modern critics in their



analysis of Genesis and the following books of the Old Testament, because it uses the name Yahaweh (German Jahveh) for Israel's God, and because it was Judæan in origin, now constitutes a part of our Pentateuch and the succeeding historical books, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. Modern critics further use the designations J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, etc., which means that in this narrative they can trace, as they believe, different hands and different dates, although the whole belongs to one school. With this subtlety of analysis, which tends at present to be, I think, somewhat too subtle, we need have nothing to do, except to recognize the fact, which I have already endeavored to express, of continued growth and change in the narrative. This narrative began to be compiled, as I have stated, in Jerusalem in the time of David or Solomon, and, so far at least as the earlier periods are concerned, was completed, if that can be called completion which continued to grow in the method I have endeavored to explain, not later than the 9th century B. C.

After Solomon's death the kingdom of Israel was divided into two parts. The northern and larger part, under Jeroboam as king, continued to be known as Israel, the smaller southern part, which adhered to the dynasty of David and retained the capital, Jerusalem, was called Judah. While in-

ferior in extent of country and natural resources to Israel, Judah was superior in accumulated wealth, and in its possession of the capital and the Temple. Such learning and such literature as existed at the time of the division, and through the greater part of the first century following that event, were Judæan. In Israel the first century was a period of turbulence and instability. Dynasty followed dynasty in rapid succession. There was no fixed and stable capital. It was not a time favorable for literary activity. But in the 9th century a strong man, Omri, usurped the throne, established a dynasty which lasted for over forty years, and built a city, Samaria, which became the permanent capital of the northern kingdom. From this time on, the greater natural wealth and strength of Israel began to tell, and Israel achieved in all respects superiority over the smaller kingdom of Judah. With Omri and his son Ahab conditions were created favorable to literary development in Israel, just as had been the case in Judah in the time of David and Solomon, and with this period begins an Israelite history similar in general content to the Judæan history already described. The advance in civilization, in the humanities, and, above all, in religious thought which had taken place in the century intervening since the composition of the latter, is

mirrored in this new history. It is less anthropomorphic than the Judæan history, and more moral; so that, on the one hand, the descriptions of God's dealing with men are less personal, less *naïve* and less primitive, and on the other hand things which were narrated without prejudice in the Judæan narrative are here condemned. The historian is beginning to look at things from what we commonly call the prophetic standpoint, that point of view which exhibits itself more fully in the works of the writing prophets of Israel. This Israelite narrative is commonly designated as E by the critics, because of the characteristic use for the pre-Mosaic period of Elohim instead of Yahaweh as the name of God. As in the case of the Judæan narrative, so here, also, the critics differentiate E<sup>1</sup>, E<sup>2</sup>, E<sup>3</sup>, etc., to indicate, as I have already explained, certain differences, which seem to indicate a difference of hands and dates. In general this narrative of history was parallel with the Judæan narrative, except only that it seems to have begun with Abraham, while the other commenced with creation. It grew in the same manner and its completion—understanding completion in the same sense—may be ascribed to a period about a century later than that of the Judæan narrative, in the 8th century B. C., just before the writing prophets begin their work.

These prophets, who began their activity somewhat before the middle of the 8th century B. C., in the persons of Amos and Hosea, themselves successors of a line of speaking prophets, of whom Elijah is the most famous example, dominated, by the latter half of that century, the whole thought of Israel, or perhaps I should rather say the thought of that part of the nation which has come down to us, the thought which ultimately prevailed. This thought is characterized by a highly monotheistic conception of God as the creator and lord of all, from whom come both good and ill, and who is identified with increasing emphasis as Yahaweh, the special God of Israel. That he, the God of Israel, brought good or evil, gave victory or defeat, welfare or misfortune, was due to the deeds or misdeeds of his people, and those deeds or misdeeds were viewed from a moral, not a ritual or religious standpoint.

The predominance of this prophetic conception involved a re-examination of history. The stories of the heroes of the past, their victories and defeats, became something more than mere episodes. They were expressions of God's pleasure or God's wrath; victory or defeat found their explanation in the good or the evil done by the nation.

In 722-1 Samaria was finally conquered, and the

flower of its population deported by the Assyrians. This conquest had precisely the same effect upon Jerusalem and Judah which the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 A.D. had upon Rome and the West. Thinking men and literature alike were driven from the one center to the other, the result being a renaissance of culture and literature, followed by a religious reformation in the other kingdom and capital. Israelite literature—that Israelite historical narrative which I have just described, the tales of the prophets, from which are drawn the stories of Elijah, Elisha, Micaiah, etc., in our Books of Kings, Songs, Psalms, Prophecies and other productions of the period of Israel's golden age—now became the property of Judah and were interpreted to it with force and fervor by the more cultured refugees and immigrants who found their way thither from Samaria.

So it is that in the time of Hezekiah a new period of literary activity began in Jerusalem, a period in which the new literature and the new thought of Israel became, to a large extent, dominant. A new history of the past was formed by the combination of the Judæan and Israelite narratives in one whole (known by the critics as J E), the component parts of which and the hand of the compiler are not always distinguishable. This new history was in its

turn colored and modified by that prophetic spirit derived by Judah from Israel, which, during the 7th century, dominated the entire religious thought of the nation, as it has come down to us, and which has found such notable expression in the Book of Deuteronomy that the critics call this recension of the history of the past Deuteronomic. That recension you will observe in its most characteristic form in the settings of the stories of the Book of Judges. You will remember their general form: The children of Israel sinned, therefore God delivered them into the hand of so and so, who oppressed Israel so many years (usually a generation or a half a generation). Then, when they cried unto Yaha-weh, he raised up a deliverer in the person of so and so. Then comes the narrative and then the Deuteronomic closing section: So and so judged Israel, or the land had rest such and such a length of time. The stories themselves are sometimes more and sometimes less retouched by the hand of this Deuteronomic reviser, who has brought the Judæan and Israelite histories into one whole and is now regarding them from the point of view of the philosophy of history, as he understands it, and interpreting the meaning of this history to the people, to the end that by the contemplation of God's dealings in the past they shall be guided in the future. This work.

from its similarity in thought and phraseology to the main body of our Book of Deuteronomy, the critics indicate by the letter D, while the letter R, with various signs attached to it, indicates in critical phraseology different reviews or recensions. But it is not my object to examine in detail these critical processes; rather my purpose is to lay before you a general presentation of the origin, growth and present condition of the literary material with which we have to deal; since a fair understanding of the literary problem is essential to a comprehension of the means by which we must attempt to reach the history lying behind the story.

The writing of history did not stop with the period of the Deuteronomists. The destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile forced on the minds of the Jewish leaders a further reconsideration of religious problems. The political destruction of the nation brought a new class, new interests and new thoughts to the front. The priests had always played an important part in the life and story of the people, a part which, I think, modern criticism has tended unduly to minimize, so far as the pre-exilic period is concerned. To the priests we are indebted primarily for those codes of laws—oracles, statutes and decisions—which we find embodied in both the Judæan and Israelite histo-

rics. In Judah, thanks to the Temple, the priests played a far more important part in molding the thought and life of the nation than in Israel. Here also priest and prophet showed a tendency to unite. This union finds expression in Deuteronomy. The priests were the depositories of tradition, the expounders of God's oracles, and hence the interpreters into the conditions of the present of the customs and rules of the past. They were, accordingly, both custodians and makers of law, and that law was ceremonial and moral, religious and secular, to make distinctions unknown to those days. Deuteronomy was a didactic promulgation of this law for popular use, in content legal and priestly, in spirit and expression moral and prophetic. The stories of the greater prophets of Judah display a similar connection between priest and prophet. Isaiah's visions show a tendency to connect themselves with the Temple, its forms and its worship. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel were of priestly family. The former shows a decided Low Church, iconoclastic tendency; the latter is a High-Churchman, to whom the Temple, with its traditions, its laws, its ritual and ceremonial, are matters of importance. And in this Ezekiel represents the prevailing tendency of his time, the ecclesiastical, legal and ceremonial tendency. With the destruction of the politi-



cal life, the relative preponderance of the religious-ecclesiastical life was increased. Just as in the Turkish Empire the Greek, Armenian and other nations, politically annihilated by the conquest, yet survive through and by their churches and ecclesiastical organizations, with a resultant strengthening of the hierarchy and emphasis on the legal-ceremonial aspect of religion, so in and after the exile the Jews survived as a religion only, with consequent emphasis on the legal-ceremonial side of that religion. In connection with this new development came a new study of the past, and a new study of the philosophy of history. The destruction of the Temple and the impossibility of continuing the sacrifices and ceremonial of its worship led to a loving and careful collection of sacrificial and ceremonial laws, and in part to their development, free from the influence of practice, on logical, theoretical lines. The minutiae of laws and ceremonies began to take on a new importance and to play a part in the interpretation of the meaning of the punishment which had befallen Israel. It was clear that these calamities could be the result only of wrong-doing. Was this wrong-doing connected with the neglect in the past of ritual and ceremonial requirements? Had Israel failed to live up to the law of God in these particulars? The exilic and

early post-exilic period seems to have been a time of great mental and moral agitation and you will find writers of that period who represent a very broad, as well as a very narrow view. But it was the school which emphasized the minutiae, which codified the ritual and ceremonial law, which interpreted the entire past in relation to the law thus codified and looked forward to the rehabilitation of Israel by the observance of that law which ultimately became dominant, and whose hand we recognize in a new treatment of the ancient history dating from this period. This is distinctly a legal and priestly treatment; it is contained in what is called by the critics the Priest Code, indicated in their analysis by the letter P. Here laws are brought together in a *cadre* of history, and that history, going back to the creation, aims to show that the great principles of the Law were laid down at the beginning or were even pre-existent. We find the law of the Sabbath set forth in the account of creation, and in the same spirit the laws of sacrifice, clean and unclean, circumcision and the like are taught and expounded through the stories of the antediluvians, the flood and the patriarchs.

But the Priest Code has not come down to us by itself. In the period after the exile, toward the end, perhaps, of the 5th century, in the effort which

was made at that time to utilize and combine all the literature of the past, that part of the Deuteronomic histories, whose growth I have described, covering the period to the conquest and settlement of Canaan, and this priestly history were wrought together into our Hexateuch, that is, the five books of the Law, with Joshua. (The latter book was in a way separated from the rest as less sacred, the peculiarly sacred part being that which dealt with the Law and which ended with the death of Moses, our Pentateuch). In the later historical books, Judges, Samuel and Kings, we can detect, also, though to a less extent, a touch of the revising hand of this same priestly school. The full development of the thought of this school for this period is represented, however, in a separate and later work which runs parallel with the other but was never combined with it, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

To sum up, we have, in those books which contain the early story of Israel, first a simple and very uncritical narrative, delighting in episodes and personal adventures, the Judæan story, called by the critics J. A little more advanced in its moral and religious standpoint, a little less *naïve* is the Israelitic narrative, covering in general the same ground, called by the critics E. Out of these two, united

into one, and treated with a religious presupposition based on the teaching of the prophets, was formed the Deuteronomic history. This Deuteronomic history was later combined in its early part with another history written from the priestly standpoint, laying emphasis on form and ceremony, sacrifice and ritual, judging events from the standpoint of the Law, and interpreting history from the creation onward from a legal and priestly standpoint. This priestly work, combined with the Deuteronomic, gives us our present Hexateuch, the first six books of our Bible.

II. And now, having explained to you the literary critical standpoint according to which I analyze and interpret these old stories of the early books of the Bible, let me try to state what we know from other sources than the Bible about the early history of the world of Israel's thought and action, which may throw light upon the history that lies behind those stories.

From present indications it would seem that as early as about 7000 B. C. both Babylonia and Egypt were occupied by civilized men, who had so far advanced in civilization as to build cities, manufacture pottery, etc. The art of writing, also, was independently developed in both these countries at a very early time. The earliest specimens of writ-

ing which we have, which may possibly date from 4000 B. C. or thereabouts in both lands, show a long period of antecedent development. At that early date both the Babylonian cuneiform and the Egyptian hieroglyphic systems were already so far conventionalized that, it may be safely said, the difference between the original picture writing from which each was derived and the earliest specimens of writing yet found in Egypt and Babylonia respectively are greater than the difference between those early specimens of writing and the later developed script of both regions. It is clear, from other evidence, also, that both these countries had, as early as the fifth millennium B. C., a very long period of the development of the arts of civilization behind them.

Babylonia, at the earliest period to which our information now extends, was occupied by a non-Semitic race, which we commonly call Sumerian, by whom, apparently, the cuneiform system of writing was developed, and from whom, at all events, it was borrowed by the Semitic Babylonians. These Sumerians were the parents not only of the later Babylonian writing, but also to a large degree of Babylonian religious ideas and practices.

At the earliest period to which our information now extends there existed in Palestine also, as exca-

vations at Gezer and elsewhere would seem to indicate, a non-Semitic population, at a low stage of civilization, whose places of worship and perhaps even their more permanent habitations appear to have been caves cut out of the rock. These people did not bury, but burned their dead.

Somewhere, perhaps, about 3000 B. C., a change occurred in the racial affinities of the population of Palestine. A people whose skull and body measurements show them to have been Semitic, and practically identical with the peasant population now in possession of the country took the place of the former pre-Semitic population. Burial of the dead took the place of burning. The troglodytic shrines and dwellings were exchanged for houses built of stone above the ground. In many cases the ancient sacred caves continued to be regarded with reverence and became sanctuaries of the new religion. Often, however, the caves of the earlier inhabitants were turned into store-houses, cisterns, and the like. Sacred stones were set up and worshipped, either singly or in lines or circles. We find evidences also of that sacrifice of children and that phallic and lascivious worship which the prophets of Israel describe as practised among the Canaanites and taken over by the Israelites from them.

At about the same period occurred a change of

population or of the dominant population in Babylonia. There, also, burial of the dead took the place of burning. Apparently this was due to a Semitic invasion from the south, for Arabia seems to have been the original home of the Semites, which, moving northward in wave after wave, overran the countries both east and west, as other similar invaders from the same region were destined to do so often in the succeeding ages. With the time of Sargon of Akkad, whose reign I would place perhaps in the neighborhood of 2800 B. C., Semitic domination was securely established in Babylonia. The old Sumerian script had by that time been adapted to the Semitic tongue and Sumerian religious ideas appropriated and adopted by the Semites. The Semitic invaders of Canaan did not, like their comrades to the east, find a high civilization in the country which they overran. Hence the striking difference in civilization between the earliest Semitic inhabitants of Babylonia and Canaan, respectively, in spite of their very close kinship.

The inscriptions of Sargon and his successors show us that at his time there was fairly close contact between Babylonia and Palestine. Sargon, and, for that matter, some of his predecessors and many of his successors, claimed dominion over Palestine and made expeditions thither. From this period, roughly

3000 B. C., onward, until the 16th century B. C., a fairly close political connection was maintained between Babylonia and Palestine, and Babylonian civilization, culture and religion gradually extended westward to the Mediterranean. To the east of Babylonia lay another country, Elam, which also derived from Babylonia at a very early period its civilization, including the cuneiform system of writing. Between the Elamites and the Babylonians ensued in the third millennium a long struggle for supremacy, which resulted in the temporary establishment of Elamite dominion in Babylonia, about 2300 B. C., with Larsa, the Ellasar of the Bible, as its capital.

A little before this, while Ur in southern Babylonia was the chief city of Babylonia, perhaps about 2500 B. C., a new wave of Semitic invaders moved northward out of Arabia. They were unable to conquer that part of Babylonia nearest Arabia, of which Ur was the capital, but succeeded in establishing a new kingdom in the north with Babylon as its capital. It was to this supposed second Arabian wave of immigration that the famous Babylonian dynasty belonged, generally known by the name of Hammurabi, although Hammurabi was not in reality the first king of the dynasty, and his ancestors had ruled over Babylon for a century and a



half or more before his time. It is in the inscriptions of the time of this Hammurabi dynasty that we find names of the same type as Abram or Abiram, Father is exalted, Ahiram, Brother is exalted, etc.,—names which indicate a relation of the god as father, brother, uncle, *ab*, *ah*, *am*, which we find in the earliest Hebrew names. In these inscriptions also we find the names Yagub-ilu and Yasup-ilu, which are identical, except that the Babylonian has the god-name, *ilu*, at the end, with the Jacob and Joseph so familiar to us in the older Hebrew narratives. This identity of names of the Israelite patriarchal traditions with names of the Hammurabi period in Babylon suggests also a kinship between the peoples who used those names. It is accordingly now supposed that this second wave of Semitic invasion, which established itself in Babylon about 2500 B. C., was the eastern half of the same Semitic movement, which, overrunning Palestine, produced there the characteristic Canaanite population and civilization. It is suggested, also, that this same northward movement out of Arabia made itself felt in Egypt. Attention is called to Semitic names of the same type (for instance, Yagub-her, the equivalent of Yagub-el, since Egyptian *r* = Semitic *l*), which occur in the fragmentary Egyptian monuments of the dark period succeeding the old

Kingdom. Certain it is that at this time Egyptian contact with Palestine became closer than before.

Babylonian inscriptions show us, as already stated, that Babylonian domination in Palestine continued through the whole of the third millennium. The Elamite conquest did not change these conditions, and we find that after Babylon, by the expulsion of the Elamites, had become the capital of Babylonia, under Hammurabi, the cities of the West Land became its tributaries, as they had been tributaries of the kings of Ur before the Elamite conquest. These conditions, as already stated, continued to prevail until the 16th century B. C.

How profound and far-reaching was the influence exerted upon Palestine by Babylonia during this period becomes more apparent the more precise our knowledge becomes. Numerous place names in Palestine make it clear that Babylonian deities were worshipped there. We have, for instance, Ashtarti, Ashteroth and Ashteroth Karnaim, Anathoth, Beth Shemesh, Bit Ninib, Uru-salim or Jerusalem, Mt. Sinai, Mt. Nebo, evidence of the worship of the Babylonian deities, Ishtar, Anath, Shamash, Ninib, Salman, Sin and Nebo, not to recount places named from Dagon, Rimmon and others. The appearance of places with such and similar names as Levitical cities, sacred mountains, sanctuaries of refuge and

the like in the Hebrew scriptures, shows us that the Hebrews on their part adopted from the Canaanites what the Canaanites had originally adopted from the Babylonians. The same is true with regard to magical practices. The story of the marriage of the sons of the gods with the daughters of men (Gen. VI) is paralleled in the conceptions of Sumerian demonology which were taken over by the Babylonians, and which are preserved in the bilingual incantation tablets. Specific names, like the Lilith, famous especially later in rabbinic lore as the demon wife of Adam, the *shedim*, the satyrs so often mentioned in the Hebrew Prophets, are, as we now know, actually Sumerian words which passed from Sumerian to Babylonian, from Babylonian to Canaanite and from Canaanite to Hebrew. So, also, the Hebrew word for temple, *hekal*, was borrowed ultimately from the *egal* of the ancient pre-Semitic inhabitants of Babylonia. But I need not at this point multiply proofs of the dependence of Canaan upon Babylonia. Suffice it to call attention here to the fact, brought out by the famous discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets in 1888, that, so completely did Babylonian influence dominate Canaan 150 years after Babylonian rule had given way to Egyptian, that the language and script of official intercourse between Canaan and Egypt still contin-

ued to be the Babylonian cuneiform. The letters found at Tel el-Amarna from the governors and dependent princes in Palestine to their Egyptian over-lord were written in the cuneiform script and the Babylonian language. A few specimens of similar correspondence have been found in Palestine, one in Lachish and four in Ta-anach on the plain of Esdraelon. Similar in race, as it would seem, to the Babylonians, closely akin in speech, the Semitic Canaanite inhabitants of Palestine readily adopted the culture and the religion of their Babylonian over-lords during the long period of the supremacy of the latter, with such modifications as were natural in view of the different conditions of their country, their different grade of culture and their somewhat different surroundings.

It was in the 16th century that the Egyptians became aggressive in their relations to Asia, and, from being the invaded, turned invaders. They overran Palestine and Syria, and for a while the Egyptian empire included all hither Asia west of the Euphrates and south of the Taurus mountains. The Tel el-Amarna letters reveal the condition of Palestine at the end of this Egyptian period, when the Egyptian empire was tottering to its fall.

From the Egyptian inscriptions of this period of conquest we learn that the land east of the Jor-

dan was called in early times Ruten, which, transliterated into Semitic, is Lotan. But this was, in Bible times, the territory of the Ammonites and Moabites, who are described as descendants of Lot, which is the same as Lotan. It would seem as though the Ammonites and Moabites, peoples kindred to the Hebrews and belonging apparently to the Khabiri, whom we find mentioned in the Tel-el-Amarna letters, entered and occupied, in the 14th or following century, the territory which had formerly been occupied by the people of Ruten or Lotan. The traditions and ancestry of the former population these Khabiri took over with their land, which is represented in the Bible by the statement that they were children of Lot, the former people of that country. This, as I shall endeavor to show you later, is of a piece with some of the other genealogies which we shall find in Palestine. It is the statement of an historical fact in the form of a family history and genealogy. The Egyptian inscriptions show us also that in the 16th century, B. C., long before the Hebrew conquest, most of the important cities of after times were already in existence, and bearing the same names which they bore in later times,—names which prove them to have been, already before that period, the site of the cult of some Babylonian deity. It was precisely the

cities sacred in these earlier periods which became later centers of worship or sacred places among the Hebrews, as already pointed out.

Toward the end of the 15th century, under Amenophis III. and Amenophis IV., commences a period of confusion and turmoil. The Hittites were pressing downward from Asia Minor into Northern Syria. An Aramæan wave of invasion was beginning to come out of Arabia, Suti and Khabiri were pressing in from the east and southeast on the cities of Palestine, while Amorites, dislodged from their former habitations in the north by the invasion of the Hittites, were descending into the same regions from another direction. The Tel el-Amarna letters have thrown much light on this period, when the Egyptian Asiatic empire was beginning to decay. They reveal the existence in Syria and Palestine of numerous small states subject to Egypt. In the latter region these were threatened by invasions of the Suti and Khabiri, Aramæan peoples who were pressing in from the east. In the former, as already stated, they were being overwhelmed by the invasion of Hittites from the north. These letters show us also that the language spoken at that time through all these regions was Canaanite—that Semitic dialect or language which we find later in use among Phœnicians, Moabites and Hebrews. According to their own

tradition, as we find it in the tales of the Book of Genesis and later in the ritual of the Book of Deuteronomy, the Hebrews were Aramæans by origin. The word Hebrew appears to be identical with Khabiri, the name of the people who, in the Tel el-Amarna letters, are mentioned as invading Canaan at the end of the 15th century. Not that the people whom we now call Hebrews had come into existence at that period: the name seems to designate that general group of peoples out of which grew the kindred nations, Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites and Israelites. Those disturbances, which overthrew the Egyptian power in Syria and Palestine, and ultimately brought about to a large extent a change of population or at least of the dominant population, began to show themselves in the movements of the Hittites, Amorites, Suti and Khabiri about the close of the 15th century B. C.

At this period the ancient world had reached a high stage of culture and civilization. There was a belt extending, roughly speaking, from China on the east to Spain on the west, and from the mouth of the Danube on the north to Nubia on the south, which may be said to have been included in the sphere of civilization at that time. Space will not permit me to go into details regarding the character and extent of this civilization or of these civili-

zations, for this civilized belt represented not so much one civilization as a number of independent civilizations. These civilizations were independent even in the matter of writing, so that we find one system of writing in China, another in Babylonia, Assyria, Elam, etc., another in Egypt, another among the Hittites, another in Crete, and possibly still another, less fully developed, on the shores of Asia Minor, in Cyprus and elsewhere along the Mediterranean. This civilization, or these civilizations, fell, precisely as did the Roman civilization in the first centuries of our era. It was in both cases invasions from the outside barbarian belt which caused the catastrophe and brought about for a time a period of chaos and disorder.

It is when these civilizations seemed to be at their very height, at the close of the 15th or beginning of the 14th century, that we first observe the results of an upheaval among and pressure from nations outside of the belt of civilization. It was apparently pressure from behind which caused the descent of the Hittites on Syria from the north, overturning and disturbing the Amorite populations as far south as Palestine. The settlement of a Mycenæan community at Ialysos in Rhodes about this time, as shown by excavations conducted there, suggests that some pressure from behind was begin-



ning to be exerted at the same period on the peoples of the Ægæan region—the peoples of that Mycenæan or Ægæan civilization which has left us such splendid monuments as evidence of the high stage of culture then reached, but whose language and racial affinities are as yet unknown to us. Indo-European peoples were beginning to press down through and from the Balkan peninsula into Greece, the Ægæan Islands, and the coast-lands of Asia Minor, unsettling and to some extent driving out the populations formerly occupying these territories. It was probably, as already stated, this pressure of Indo-European peoples into Asia Minor which forced the overflow of the Hittites into Syria, thus bringing the latter people into conflict with the Egyptians. This advance of the Indo-European peoples southward was a slow movement, extending over a considerable period of time and ultimately involving a vast extent of territory. In the west, Italy felt its effects in a movement of northern peoples crowding southward. In the 13th century we find Sardinians and Etruscans with Achæans and other European peoples descending on the shores of northern Africa and the coast-lands of Palestine. At first the invaders came by sea, in boats, and attacked the coast-lands only. About the close of the 13th century, however, the movement assumed

greater proportions. A large part of Asia Minor seems to have been affected by this time by the pressure from behind, and we have the great land migration of the time of Ramses III., which broke in pieces the Hittite kingdom, driving downward into Palestine both Amorite and Hittite fragments, and deposited the Philistines in Palestine. We have, perhaps, a reference to these movements of the Amorites in the Book of Numbers,\* in the account of the Amorite kingdoms established in Bashan and between Ammon and Moab, by which the latter people were practically dispossessed. These Amorites, the Hebrews, kinsfolk of the Moabites, in their turn assailed and conquered.

The height of this period of confusion in the Ægæan world was reached in what is known in Greek tradition as the time of the Dorian invasion, about 1200 B. C. Farther eastward we find similar conditions, but precisely as in the fourth and following centuries A. D. the civilization of the West went down before the inroads of the barbarians, giving place, after the period of the dark ages, to a new and higher culture, while the East managed, with great struggle and after much loss, to maintain itself still for a long time, and by doing so was able to aid in mediating the best results of the old

---

\* Chap. XXI, XXII.

civilization to the new born West before it sank down at last in decrepitude and decay, so it was at this time. The Ægæan civilization was overwhelmed. Egypt fell into a state of decay, the result of her struggles with the invaders whom she succeeded in repelling, but with such a weakening and disintegration of her own power as to subject her to invasion and conquest by the Ethiopians of the south. Babylonia and Assyria passed into a condition of eclipse, from which they issued later to assume still for a long period the position of leaders in civilization.

It was not only the north which poured forth its barbarous hordes at this period. Precisely as in the post-Christian ages the civilized world found itself invaded by Arabian hordes from the south, even while still struggling with the Teutons from the north, so it was now. Aramæan hordes were pressing northward from Arabia at the same time that the northern peoples were moving south. The two streams met in Syria, which completely changed its character and its population at this period in consequence.

I shall not endeavor to note in detail the similar conditions existing further northward and eastward, which resulted in the growth of new states in Armenia and adjacent regions, in the elimination of

the kingdom of Mitanni in Mesopotamia and the conquest and settlement of that region by Aramæans, and in the temporary decay of both Assyria and Babylonia as the result of their struggle with invading hordes from north and south and east.

Out of this period of confusion, these dark ages, there sprang up, in the extreme western part of Asia, the new civilization and the great sea power of the Phœnicians. At the same period, inland and a little further south, another nation, Israel, was more slowly coming into being, small in extent of territory, but destined to exert a vastly greater influence on the civilization and religion of the world. Out of this period of darkness also the alphabet was born, a new system of writing, unlike the picture scripts and syllabaries which had prevailed thus far. The Phœnicians, according to the testimony of antiquity, were its inventors. Whence they derived the ideas for their invention is uncertain. From the evidence thus far at hand, it would seem that the alphabet was invented somewhere, probably, about or after 1200 B. C. In 1400 B. C. all Syria and Palestine used the cumbrous Babylonian cuneiform script. About the 10th century B. C. we find the Phœnician alphabet, full-fledged, in use through all Syria, as well as in Greece and

southern Arabia. Out of those dark ages, between 1400 and 1000 B. C., came, therefore, one of the great epoch-making discoveries or inventions in the history of mankind.

Another event of importance in the history of civilization connected with these dark ages is the introduction of iron. In the brilliant civilization of the 15th century copper and bronze were the metals used for weapons and tools. Iron was rare and used only for purposes of ornament. But somewhere during these dark ages iron took the place of bronze, so that by about 1000 B. C. we find it in general use as far west as Greece. I may compare the connection with the dark ages of antiquity of these two great events in the history of civilization with the relation of the introduction of printing and gunpowder to the close of the dark ages of European history.

But to turn back to what more precisely and directly concerns our theme. The nation of Israel came into being in the struggles and confusion of these same dark ages, one of the world's great periods of travail, between 1300 and 1000 B. C. David's reign, which we may place about 1000 B. C., represents the recommencement of a period of enlightenment. It was during his prosperous reign and the more peaceful and cultivated, if less

aggressive rule of his successor, Solomon, that Israelitic literature had its beginning.

I have endeavored to establish a point of departure, both by an analysis of the literature with which we have to deal, and also by a sketch, drawn largely from archæological sources, of the primitive history of the people and the region to whom the stories contained in that literature belong. You will find, I think, that these stories themselves illustrate and illuminate, when properly understood, that ancient pre-historic period of Israel's history.

## LECTURE II

### THE FORMATION OF ISRAEL

#### *The Origin of the Twelve Tribes*

**M**OST closely connected with the historical theme discussed in the last lecture is the formation of Israel. Its own conception of its origin is expressed in the legends in Genesis, and especially the legends of the twelve tribes out of which Israel was formed.

It has been already pointed out that Israel was a birth of the dark ages of antiquity, that period of turmoil and confusion which resulted in the overthrow of the previously existing civilization and institutions of Palestine and the surrounding countries. Israel was alien to Canaan and the Canaanites. The consciousness of this fact breathes through all its legends and traditions. Its fathers came from the land of the Aramæans. It was not of the same stock as Canaan. Canaan was a son of Ham, but Israel was descended from Shem. When Abraham would find a wife for his son Isaac, he marries him, not to a daughter of the Canaanites, nor does he choose an Egyptian as Ishmael had done, but he sends to take a wife for him from Aram-naharaim,

the land of the Aramæans in Mesopotamia. So, also, Isaac's favorite son, Jacob, goes to Paddan-Aram and finds there a wife of his own stock, unlike Edom, who intermarries with the daughters of Heth and of Ishmael. As these stories show, Israel was conscious not merely of its non-Canaanite origin, but that its origin was Aramæan, a consciousness which expressed itself further in a ritual preserved to us in the 7th century Book of Deuteronomy, in which the Israelites, in presenting their offering of the first-fruits, are instructed to say: "An Aramæan ready to perish was my father" (Deut. XXVI, 5).

As we shall see later, much in the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is Canaanite and belongs to the old Canaanite sanctuaries; but mingled with this is a national Israelite element which represents a true racial tradition. I have already pointed out that, at the close of the 15th century B. C., an Aramæan wave of invasion was pressing northward from Arabia, just as an Amorite wave had done before and as an Arabian wave was destined to do later. It may be of interest to note that the last ripple of this Aramæan wave of invasion, which began in the fifteenth century, was the Nabatæans, whom we meet in northern Arabia coming northward in the later Assyrian inscriptions of the



7th century B. C., who were settled in ancient Edom in the fourth century, and who occupied the whole region eastward from the Jordan to the Euphrates at the commencement of our era. Probably Arabs in race, the language of the Nabatæans was Aramæan, but so strongly tinged with Arabic as to form a connecting link between Aramæan and Arabic, at one end joining one, at the other, the other. These Nabatæans were the rear-guard of the Aramæans and the vanguard of the Arabs, and their language is almost transitional between Aramæan and Arabic. Similarly there are indications that those Aramæan invaders of whom the Hebrews were part, who began to come out of Arabia in the 15th century B. C., were transitional between Canaanites and Aramæans, belonging to the latter in race, akin in language to the former.

But while the Israelites were thus conscious of their differentiation from the Canaanites, the Amorites, Jebusites, Hivites and all the other inhabitants of Canaan who belonged to the older occupation, they show in their traditions consciousness of a close connection with Moab, Ammon, Edom and some of the Bedawin peoples of the neighboring regions. Edom was the closest of kin—Israel's own brother, and indeed, Israel's elder brother.

Edom was Esau, the elder son of Isaac ; Israel was Jacob, his younger son. The meaning of this family narrative, as expressing the relationship of the two nations, is perfectly plain, and it is clear, also, that we have here an historical fact ; that these two peoples were so close of kin that they were in fact twin brothers ; that the one who first reached the condition of settled nationality was Edom, to be outdone later by the younger Israel, who won the blessing of the better land and hence the higher culture and the greater strength. Next most closely related to Israel, from our knowledge of later conditions, we should expect to find Moab and Ammon, and in point of fact they are represented as the children of Lot, Abraham's nephew, who was to him like his own younger brother, so that Israel may be said to be almost a first cousin to those two nations.

But closer of kin in reality were the semi-Bedawin tribes in the region in which, according to its traditions, Israel wandered for so many years, the children of Ishmael, Abraham's elder son. These Ishmaelite tribes were Israel's own kinsfolk, the continuing occupants of the land once common to both ; consequently to Ishmael the legend ascribes the seniority, at the same time that it recognizes his inferiority, counting these tribes as sons of Hagar, the

concubine, and not of Sarah, the true wife.\* These genealogies agree with those stories of Genesis which picture the original nomadic condition of Israel's ancestors, and both preserve in this regard a true tradition. It may be said in passing that the way in which the ancestors of the Israelites are represented as tenting here and there, wandering in and out among the settled peoples of Canaan, dwelling in the midst of them and yet not of them, is a singularly faithful picture of conditions which one may find in places to-day and which have always existed at times in Palestine. In later Israelite and Jewish times we find such conditions prevailing; and the Tel el-Amarna letters make it clear that such conditions prevailed in Palestine in the days when the Egyptian power was tottering to its fall. There is a verisimilitude about the descriptions of the lives of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis which convinces the thoughtful reader that the same conditions prevailed at the time when these legends took form, 1200 or thereabout B. C. There is a similar

---

\* In the Priest-Code, Gen. XXV, 12-17, Ishmael is made to include northern Arabia. In a race legend included in the Yahawist, Gen. XXV, 1-4, Abraham is represented as father, by a concubine named Keturah, of various Arabian peoples, extending well into southern Arabia. These genealogies testify to Israel's consciousness of a connection with Arabia, and in-so-far confirm the statement that the ancestors of Israel at some period came from that country.

verisimilitude in the picture which we have, particularly in the story of Joseph, of the way in which nomadic or semi-nomadic inhabitants of Palestine and the neighboring parts wandered into Egypt and out of it again. While we have no Egyptian inscription which mentions the Israelites in this connection, there is an inscription of King Merenptah, supposed to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus, about the middle of the 13th century B. C., which shows that nomadic tribes were in his day doing precisely what the Israelite stories say that the ancestors of Israel did. The Shasu or Bedawi tribes mentioned in this inscription belong to Aduma, which seems to be Edom; and if so, this is the earliest mention of Edom which has been found anywhere up to this time. These tribes are permitted to "pass the fortress of King Merenptah in Thuku (Succoth) to the pools of King Merenptah, which are in Thuku, that they may obtain food for themselves and for their cattle in the field of the Pharaoh, who is the gracious sun in every land."

Another inscription of the same king, discovered at Thebes in 1896, contains the first known mention of the name Israel. This inscription reads as follows: "No one among the Nine Bows [the foreign nations] raises his head. Tekhony [the Libyans] are destroyed; Khate [the Hittites] are at

peace ; Pa-kan-ana [Canaan] is captive in every evil (?). Ashkelon is carried into captivity ; Gezer is taken ; Yenoam is annihilated ; Israel is destroyed, its crops are no more ; Kharu [Southern Palestine] has become like the widows of Egypt. All the lands are in peace together. Every robber has been conquered by King Merenptah, who like the sun gives life each day.”

It must be confessed that this inscription is very perplexing and hard to bring into line with our supposed knowledge from other sources with regard to Israel. Israel is here mentioned along with peoples and nations of southern Palestine, as though already settled in that country. From all other indications, it would appear that Israel was as yet in an unorganized, nomadic condition. We may, perhaps, infer that some of the separate elements which we know later in their combined form as Israel were already at this time known by that name, and possibly, also, that these Israelites did not go down into Egypt with their kinsmen. It may be that the story of the sojourn at Kadesh (Num. XX) should be connected with this inscription, and interpreted as indicating a longer residence in that region of Israel, or some of its elements, than has been hitherto supposed.

Jacob would seem, from the inscriptions of Tho-

thmes or Thutmosis III., to have been in existence at a still earlier period. Thutmosis's reign commences in the beginning of the 15th century B. C. He was the greatest warrior and the most successful conqueror Egypt ever knew. At the beginning of his reign the kings of northern Palestine and Syria formed a federation, under the king of Kadesh, a city on the Orontes, to throw off the Egyptian yoke. The decisive battle was fought at Megiddo on the plain of Esdraelon, where three or four centuries later the Israelites fought a decisive battle with the Canaanite kings for the possession of northern Palestine. The list of peoples in Thutmosis's inscription recording that victory contains the names of many towns familiar in later Israelite history:—Merom, Laish, Shumem, Ta'anach, Ibleam, Joppa, Gath, Ekron, Gezer, Bethel, Beth Anoth,—and indeed, as pointed out in the last lecture, we now know, from various Egyptian inscriptions, that most of the cities which later play a part in the Bible narrative, including Jerusalem itself, were in existence long before the time when the Hebrews occupied the land and were, therefore, evidently taken over by the Hebrews, names and all, from the earlier Canaanite inhabitants.

Among these names in the lists of Thutmosis appear two, familiar to us in Hebrew tradition as

names of persons, Joseph-el and Jacob-el. I have already pointed out in the former lecture that Joseph-el and Jacob-el are the same as our Joseph and Jacob, except that in the latter the divine affix, *el*, is omitted, and also that we find precisely these same names as personal names in Babylonia as early as 2250 B. C. From the analogy of other names in Hebrew we have every reason to suppose that Jacob and Joseph were abbreviated; that originally they had the divine affix, *el*, itself a regular component part of names of this description. We know, also, from later history, that in actual use such divine prefixes or suffixes were sometimes omitted, although parts of the full name. We may regard it, I think, as fairly established that Jacob and Joseph represent an original Jacob-el and Joseph-el, and the discovery of these names in Palestine indicating a certain territory and collectively the inhabitants of that territory, suggests to us a connection of the names Joseph and Jacob in the Bible story with these names found in the Egyptian inscriptions at a period considerably antedating the Hebrew invasion. It would seem from the connection that in the Egyptian inscriptions these names apply to that section of territory later occupied by the Israelites more narrowly so called, and by those tribes known as the sons of Joseph. We have here, presumably, the

same phenomenon which we have in the case of Moab and Ammon, the children of Lot. Moab and Ammon, coming into the territory theretofore known as Lotan, and taking possession of the same, adopted the traditions of that country and, after, a process familiar the world over, became the children of the land, that is, children of Lot. So we may suggest that the Israelites, occupying at a later date the land of Jacob, became, by virtue of that fact, the children of Jacob, who in their legends becomes their progenitor and is finally identified with Israel. Similarly the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh became the children of Joseph.

Another curious fact with regard to the names and early inhabitants of Palestine and the later connection of these same names with the Israelites, we learn also from the Egyptian inscriptions. The Hittites are first mentioned in the Egyptian monuments about 1470 B. C., as paying tribute to the Egyptian king, Thutmosis III. Their land is there described as "the greater Hittite land," and lay, evidently, to the north of Syria. From other sources it would appear that their home was Asia Minor, and perhaps that the center of their dominion was Cappadocia. Under succeeding Egyptian reigns they pressed further southward, and ultimately, in the days of the 18th dynasty, in



the times of Seti I. and the Ramses, appear as a great power, struggling with Egypt for the possession of Syria and Palestine. In the records of Seti I. and Ramses II. of their expeditions into Palestine and Syria and their contests with the Hittites, we find mention of a once somewhat important state called Aseru, or Asaru, occupying apparently the western part of Galilee, precisely the region occupied later by the Israelite tribe of Asher, a name which is linguistically identical with the Aseru or Asaru of the Egyptian inscriptions. Had this Aseru or Asaru anything to do with Asher, which was one of the twelve tribes of Israel? I think that it was identical with it, and that the fact is thus brought out that Asher was originally a Canaanite people, occupying the land before the time of the incoming of Israel. We have in that event an explanation of the fact that the mother of Asher was called in Hebrew story a concubine, the hand-maid or slave of Leah, and not the wife of Jacob.

Israel was, like the Edomites, the Ishmaelites, and other kindred peoples, theoretically divided into twelve tribes. It is sometimes supposed that this twelve-fold division, a number corresponding to the number of the months of the year, was connected with a primal lunar worship. I would suggest the possibility of another, perhaps more simple

explanation. In Hebrew laws we have a tendency toward a tenfold division. The early laws are, as a rule, cast in the form of decalogues, which again divide into pentads. That is, normally the early laws are cast in double sections of five laws in each half section. This is a method of division not peculiar to the Hebrew. It depends upon the simple and natural system of counting, based upon the constitution of the body, which has influenced numeral systems the world over, and in fact given us our decimal system. People counted on the fingers—five fingers on the one hand and five fingers on the other hand, the two together, ten. This is of a piece with the whole primitive method of measuring nature. Similarly for length-measures men used fingers and ells and feet. For its numerical convenience this finger-counting was very commonly adopted in the arrangement and codification of early legislation.

But we find also a second primitive numerical system which, I fancy, is based in the same way, although not quite so obviously, on the arrangement of the parts of the human body,—the duodecimal system, which has come down to us through our Anglo-Saxon ancestors and was in primitive times a rival of the decimal system. This system does not owe its origin to the twelve lunar months,

but simply to another method of counting the fingers, which was an advance on the decimal system in that it gave a higher count, the method, namely, of counting the closed hand or fist in addition to counting the fingers of the hand. This system is singularly combined with the decimal system in the Assyrian-Babylonian numeration, where the units are 6, 60, 600, etc., the basal unit reckoned on the duodecimal system, the secondary units obtained by multiplication of this basal unit, not by six or twelve, but by ten. It would seem from this that both systems of counting, the decimal and the duodecimal, were, to some extent, in use and known in Babylonia, possibly, also, among the Hebrews and their kinsfolk. If so, the tendency to reckon the component parts of the nation by twelve, not by ten, which we find among these peoples, may be due, not to the influence of lunar worship, but merely to a method of numerical calculation.

But whatever the origin of this twelve-fold division, we find the tendency among these kindred peoples to count twelve parts or tribes. The complete people was made up of twelve parts. So far as Israel was concerned, and probably, also, so far as some, if not all of the neighboring peoples who used the same system were concerned, this twelve-

fold division was, at least in the historical period, theory rather than practice. You can make twelve tribes in Israel at any known period only by artificial calculation. Either, for instance, you must make a tribe of Joseph, as is done in the account of the conquest in the Yahawistic narrative (Josh. XVI, 1), which was never a tribe in the historical period from David onward; or, if you count as two Ephraim and Manasseh, who were actually tribes, you must drop Levi, the priestly tribe, from the reckoning. The song of Deborah (Judges V), which was practically contemporary with the events narrated in it, and is to be dated, therefore, not later certainly, than the 11th century B. C., mentions only ten tribes. In that document Ephraim, as the leading tribe, is named first, followed by the other Rachelite tribes, Benjamin and Machir, which is, properly speaking, Manasseh east of the Jordan, although here it may be used poetically of Manasseh in general. Then follow Zebulun, Issachar and Reuben, Leah tribes, and then Gilead, which may be Gad, Dan, Asher and Naphtali. Three of the Leah tribes, Judah, Simeon and Levi, are omitted altogether, and in fact at that time Simeon and Levi were already extinct as tribes, or practically so. But while at any given period of Israel's history there were not twelve tribes in existence, nevertheless the

theory of the twelve-fold division, derived, perhaps, from prehistoric conditions, was constantly maintained and preserved in the memory and belief of the people by the story of the twelve brothers, children of Israel, who is Jacob.

That such genealogical relations, those of the twelve brethren to Jacob, of Israel and Edom to Isaac, of Isaac, Ishmael, Dedan, Teima, Saba and the rest to Abraham, and the other numerous genealogies which we find in Israelite tradition, are not to be taken in any literal sense as indicating personal relations will be clear, I think, to any student of the Bible who will observe the method in which the Bible narrative over and over again counts the individuals mentioned in these various genealogies as nations, sometimes in so many words saying this is such and such a people, sometimes mentioning facts which by no possible stretch of the imagination can be parts of personal history, but are descriptions of the conditions of a tribe or nation. The same use is found almost everywhere in the compilation of early traditions of the history and derivation of nations and tribes. Most strikingly parallel to the Hebrew in this regard is the Arabic use. In Arabia we find precisely the same combination of the history of the tribe or people, told in the shape of genealogy, and personal stories about the tribal

ancestors, who, nevertheless, are not persons, which we have in the Israelite narrative. Given this conception of the relation of tribes and peoples to one another expressed in terms of family relationship, which shows itself in its driest and plainest form in the geographical table of the tenth chapter of Genesis and in the genealogies of the Priest-Code in the early chapters of the same book, it was inevitable that local and national story-tellers should weave stories about these tribal names in which would be intermingled actual historical reminiscences and personal and individual traits. This has actually occurred in Hebrew story, and legend has thus given a personal character to ancestors who, after all, are nothing but tribal personifications or characterizations. In this genealogical system the relationships of peoples and places are expressed naturally in terms of the relationships between individuals. Nations are fathers and grandfathers, sons and grand-sons, brothers, sisters and wives of one another, or stand in the same relation to the territories which they invade or possess. I have suggested applications of this latter principle in the relationship of Moab and Ammon to Lot and Ephraim and Manasseh to Joseph. Occasionally we have identifications—the incoming people identifying itself with the parentage and tradition of the

people it has dispossessed, and thus claiming for itself two names as the names of its ancestors. Of this we have an example in Israel and Jacob and perhaps, also, in the double name Esau and Edom for the same people.

In Hebrew story Jacob is described as the father of twelve sons by two wives and two concubines, a distinction which suggests at once a difference between the eight children of the wives and the four children of the concubines. What was the difference between the tribes in their origin which suggested this distinction? How was it that four were recognized as less legitimately the children of Jacob than the other eight? Of the eight children by his two wives the six elder are the children of one wife, Leah, the one whom he loved less; the two younger, only, are children of the wife of his heart. It will be noticed, further, that his two wives were both of them of Aramæan origin, children of Laban, emphasizing what I have already called attention to—the consciousness on the part of the Hebrews of their kinship with and in fact descent from the Aramæans, from whom, in historical times, as we know them, they were differentiated by language, whereas they spoke the same tongue as the Canaanites, to whom they yet counted themselves alien. Again the kinship indicated in these

traditions does not correspond with the geographical distribution of the tribes of Israel as we know it historically, an evidence that it comes down to us from a pre-historic period. So, also, it is not the oldest son, Reuben, to whom the leadership and hegemony belongs in the earliest historical times of which we have knowledge, as we should expect genealogically, but one of the youngest sons, Joseph. Clearly, at the time when these genealogies took shape, Israel was conscious of a period when Reuben had been the leading tribe, a period which, even in the time of the Judges, had already long since passed away. Traces of this former leadership are found in the Elohist form of the Joseph story, where Reuben takes the lead, and in the story of Reuben's rebellion in Numbers XVI. But in the time of the Judges Joseph was the dominant element, which is accounted for in tradition by the story, according to which, although a younger son, he was yet the son of the favored wife. Of all the sons of Jacob, it is Joseph about whom we have the fullest story, including a peculiar connection with Egypt. Clearly these legends took shape after Reuben had ceased to be the leader and before the time of the hegemony of Judah under David and Solomon, at a period when the tribe of Joseph was predominant.



I might mention other details which give us similar glimpses into the history of the past in the form of genealogies. Manasseh was older than Ephraim, but it was Ephraim, not Manasseh, who received the blessing of his father, which gave him the rights of brimogeniture. It is, in another form, the same story which is told in regard to the relationship of Esau and Jacob. The legend indicates an earlier priority of some sort, obtained by Manasseh, which, in fact, seems to have been achieved by the location of Manasseh east of the Jordan, before either of the Joseph tribes found a foothold in the west.

And now let us take up these tribes somewhat more systematically: We have, as sons of Leah, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar and Zebulun, six in all, together with a daughter, Dinah. Connected with these, as sons of Leah's handmaid, Zilpah, are Gad and Asher. Rachel, the second wife of Jacob, had at first no children. She, therefore, gave to Jacob her handmaid, Bilhah, by whom he had two sons, Dan and Naphtali. Later Rachel gave birth to Joseph and finally, in Palestine, she was delivered of a son, Benjamin, at whose birth she died; and from an early time the tomb of Rachel has been, as it is to-day, a sacred place of pilgrimage between Jerusalem and Bethlehem.

The first four of the sons of Leah, Reuben, Simeon,

Levi and Judah, constitute, according to the story in Genesis XXIX and XXX, a group within a group. After these were born Leah ceased bearing. Then were born the two children of Rachel's handmaid, Bilhah, Dan and Naphtali, then the two children of Leah's handmaid, Zilpah, Gad and Asher. It was only after the birth of these intervening four children of the concubines that the two remaining children of Leah, Issachar and Zebulun, were born. In historical times, Reuben, Simeon and Judah are settled in the extreme south, while Issachar and Zebulun are in the north. Was it this geographical distribution which gave rise to the division of the children of Leah into two groups, an older one of four, a younger one of two children? You will observe that the oldest children are in the south, the region from which Israel came into the land, the youngest in the north. Reuben, the first-born, the oldest of all, occupies that territory which, according to Hebrew story, was first subdued and occupied by the tribes of Israel in their migration into Canaan. Reuben represents, therefore, the oldest settlement of Israel on its way into Canaan. Judah, as we know it historically, is a very mixed tribe, containing Calebite\* and other non-Israelitic elements. In

---

\* Caleb, the dog or dog tribe, to whom belonged Hebron, was a Kenizzite (Josh. XIV, 13, 14), as was his brother Othniel to whom

the Song of Deborah, as already noticed, the name of Judah does not appear, and it has accordingly been suggested that Judah did not in fact exist at that time as a part of Israel, and that it was not considered a part of the twelve tribes until the time of David. I do not think that the facts warrant such a conclusion, nor even the conclusion that Judah represents altogether a migration of Israel from the Amalekite region southward up through the Negeb. At the time of Deborah, Judah was separated from the tribes northward by the Canaanite enclave in which lay Jerusalem, which would account for the fact that after the conquest Judah played no part in the history of Israel at large until the time of David. On the other hand the story, in the Book of Samuel, of Saul and David would seem to show that before that period, in Saul's time and earlier, Judah recognized its relationship with Israel, and also that this relationship was equally recognized by Israel. I see no reason why the account in the first chapter of Judges of the conquest of the land of Canaan, which, in other re-

---

belonged Kiriath-Sepher (Josh. XV, 17), a name which we find also among the tribes of Edom (Gen. XXVI, 42). As late as David's time Caleb seems to be regarded as distinct from Judah (1 Sam. XXV, 3; XXX, 4). In the later Priest-Code and Chronicler he becomes a clan of Judah, descended from the patriarch of that name.

spects, seems historically reliable, should not be followed in this particular also, and why we should not suppose that the original tribe of Judah actually came in from the east of the Jordan but was afterwards very much enlarged by, and, indeed, received its importance from the addition of other elements connected with the region southward, like the Calebites.

In historical times Simeon is closely connected with Judah, and, so far as it has an independent existence, seems to constitute a fringe on the edge of Judah toward the Bedawin desert population (Judges I, 17). When we turn to the so-called Blessings of Jacob, in Genesis XLIX, which are a characterization of the conditions of Israel, making use of older tribal verses or couplets, in the period shortly after the division of the kingdom, if my conclusions are correct, Simeon and Levi are classed together as brethren, distinguished for their cruelty, who have been guilty of some outrage so indefensible that they are divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel. Here Levi is treated as a tribe, like the other tribes, but apparently both it and Simeon had been blotted out of existence, or almost blotted out of existence.

In the somewhat similar but later characterization of the tribes called the Blessing of Moses, to

be found in the thirty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, Simeon has evidently passed out of existence for all intents and purposes, but Levi appears as the priest tribe.\* Now there is a story in the Book of Genesis (XXXIV), in which both Simeon and Levi play a part, as also their sister, Dinah, who elsewhere plays no part whatsoever in the story of Israel. According to this story, Dinah was violated by Prince Shechem, the son of Hamor. In revenge for this her brothers, Simeon and Levi, by stratagem, succeeded in murdering Hamor and Shechem, his son, and spoiling their city, whereupon Jacob, their father, says to Simeon and Levi :

---

\* These tribal blessings or characterizations are evidently an old and favorite type in Israelite folklore. We have at least three distinct collections of tribal sayings or couplets preserved: Gen. XXIX and XXX, Gen. XLIX, Deut. XXXIII. In Gen. XLIX, and Deut. XXXIII, old couplets are utilized, adapted and changed to make longer poems and songs. Each of these poems is in a way an epitome, idealized, of course, and colored to some extent according to the subjectivity of the poet, of the nation, on the scheme of its twelve-fold tribal division, and has, therefore, considerable historical value. The Blessings of Jacob, Gen. XLIX, dates, I presume, from the 9th century, the Blessings of Moses from about the middle of the 8th century B. C. In the first part of the latter there seems to be some confusion of text, which affects the Blessings of Judah, Simeon and Levi. As the play on words shows, Simeon should be substituted for Judah in verse 7. The last half of that verse, with verse 11, belongs to Judah, and verses 8—10 to Levi.

“Ye have troubled me to make me stink among the inhabitants of the land: and I being few in number, they shall gather themselves together against me, and slay me; and I shall be destroyed, I and my house” (Gen. XXXIV, 30). Of course, the prince Shechem here mentioned is the city of Shechem, and what we are dealing with is primarily a narrative of tribes and peoples. It has often been suggested that this narrative recounts the same thing which is referred to in the passage of the Blessings of Jacob, Gen. XLIX, 4-7, cited above, and that we have here in fact, told in the form of a story, reminiscences of an actual historical occurrence—the attempt of Simeon and Levi to secure a settlement in the land of Canaan, which attempt was so conducted as to result in catastrophe to those tribes, which were in consequence scattered in Israel and practically blotted out of existence. Geographically, we should have supposed that an entrance into Canaan would have been made at just this point by any peoples advancing from the east of the Jordan. As one sits on top of Mt. Osha in Gilead to-day and looks down upon all Palestine, for all Palestine is visible from this point, and from this point only, the Samaritan hills lie directly opposite, across the Jordan, and through the shoulder of the mountains in which Shechem

(shoulder) lies, one sees as far as to the Mediterranean Sea beyond. A road is visible descending from Shechem in the Samarian hills to the Jordan valley, which, crossing the Jordan, leads up to es-Salt in Gilead. This road is clearly a much easier way of entering the hill country across the Jordan than anything further southward; indeed, it seems to the observer on the opposite hills of Gilead the natural way to enter that country. This natural connection between these two parts of the country, Gilead on the east of the Jordan, Samaria on the west, is rendered evident, moreover, in the Turkish administrative division of modern times, where the central territory east of the Jordan is governed from Nablus, ancient Shechem, not from Jerusalem. It will be remembered, also, that in the historic times of Israel, after the division of the kingdom, the land east of the Jordan, including the territory of Moab to the southward, belonged or was tributary to Samaria, and not to Jerusalem. It is really easier for a person east of the Jordan to cross over and go up to Shechem than to Jerusalem, or at least it would be if the roads in both cases were equally well attended to. At the present moment the presence of a good carriage road from Jerusalem to Jericho and a bridge across the Jordan at that point, makes some difference in this particu-

lar. At the same time anyone traveling along the mountains to the west of the Jordan becomes conscious of the fact that there are by nature many more and easier roads leading up from the Jordan valley to the country afterwards occupied by Samaria, than to Jerusalem and Judæa.

In historical times we find two sons of Leah, those which were represented as younger sons, born after the others, occupying the edge of the plain of Esdraelon and the central section of Galilee, and these Leah tribes in the north are separated from the Leah tribes in the south by the whole mass of the later born Rachel tribes. If we understand the story of the thirty-fourth chapter of Genesis, in connection with the allusion in the Blessings of Jacob already referred to, as retaining the tradition of an attempted settlement by Simeon and Levi in the center of the land, which attempted settlement failed, we shall have at once an explanation of this division. The Leah tribes would then, first of all, moving up from the south, have occupied the territory east of the Jordan. That was their oldest settlement, as represented in the story which made Reuben, the most southerly tribe east of Jordan, the oldest son. Moving across the Jordan, they entered Canaan proper at three points—first at a central point opposite Shechem, where the two next eld-



est sons, Simeon and Levi, attempted to make a settlement; secondly at a lower point, just at the head of the Dead Sea, which brought them into the country south of Jerusalem, where Judah, the youngest son of the first set, made his settlement. The latest and youngest invasion was that from the more northern part of the east Jordan land, through the great and fertile Esdraelon plain, by the tribes of Issachar and Zebulun, which resulted in the occupation of central Galilee. At the outset, as is stated in the early Yahawistic account of the conquest in the first chapter of Judges, and in Joshua XVII, 14-18, the Israelites were unable to take the rich and strong Canaanite cities on the plains, or to cope with the Canaanites in the well-settled, city-studded lowlands. So the Canaanites maintained themselves to a late date, both in the important cities of the plain of Esdraelon, Beth-shean, Ta'anach, Megiddo and Ibleam, and also in the rich country about Shechem, that central part of the land which, both in the Blessings of Jacob and the Blessings of Moses, is represented as the most fertile and beautiful part of the land of Israel. If you will turn to those blessings you will find with what sympathetic appreciation the poet dwells on the natural wealth of this delightful region, and even to-day the traveler cannot but be impressed with its charm, in con-

trast with almost any other section of Palestine. This is the country which Simeon and Levi failed to conquer, but which was occupied later by the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh.

These tribes, Joseph, are, according to the old folklore stories of Genesis, younger than the sons of Leah, the tribes of Israel who first settled in Canaan ; moreover Joseph was Israel's favorite son. In fact Joseph, in the shape of Ephraim and Manasseh, was the most favored of all the sons in the land he occupied, and in consequent wealth and prosperity. In fact, also, the sons of Rachel did enter Canaan later than the sons of Leah. They represent a second wave of invasion, which crossed the Jordan at Jericho, took that city, moved up by a natural road to Ai and Bethel, and, having established themselves in that region, pressed gradually northward as far as the edge of the plain of Esdraelon. That their conquest of the richer country about Shechem, Dothan, and the like, was slow is plain from the passage from Joshua cited above. The story of Abimelech, son of Gideon-Jerubbaal, in the Book of Judges, seems to show that even at that comparatively late date Shechem was still in the hands of the Canaanites.

Of the two tribes which occupied the land of Joseph and thus became his sons, the more powerful

one and the one which in the story received the blessing of his father, with the rights of the first born, was Ephraim, but actually the older of the two was Manasseh. The reason of this is clear when we read the account of the division of the territory among the tribes, in the Book of Joshua. There it is said that Manasseh had two sections—one section east of the Jordan, where Machir, the first born of Manasseh dwelt, the other west of the Jordan. It was the original settlement east of the Jordan in northern Gilead which made Manasseh the elder son. After Ephraim had entered Canaan by way of Jericho, and settled himself in the central highlands from Bethel to Shiloh, Manasseh began to push across the Jordan into the west Jordan region opposite northern Gilead, until, Manasseh pressing downward and Ephraim upward, the whole rich central region, the later Samaria, was occupied. Manasseh, as the tribe which had earlier reached the settled state in Gilead, is called the older son, but it was to Ephraim that the larger and better share of the heritage of Joseph fell.

According to the story in Genesis, Rachel, Israel's favorite wife, had two children, of whom the younger, Benjamin, "son of the south," was born in Palestine itself. Now the territory of that tribe was in fact south of the territory of Joseph, that is,

Ephraim and Manasseh, and the tribe itself in the earlier story appears as a sort of dependent on Ephraim. Benjamin seems indeed to have been an out-put or off-growth of the latter in the Palestinian period, and the name Benjamin, "son of the south," supports this supposition. There is a strange and gruesome story in the 19th and following chapters of Judges, the historical background of which has never been satisfactorily ascertained. I suspect that this story, which is intended to account for the smallness of Benjamin in relation to the neighboring tribes, is in some way connected with the origin of Benjamin and its separation from the kindred Rachelite tribes of Joseph.

There are four tribes which are called sons of concubines:—two, Asher and Gad, the children of Leah's handmaid, and having, apparently, therefore, some special connection with the Leah tribes; and two, Dan and Naphtali, the children of Rachel's handmaid, and having, therefore, presumably some special connection with the Rachel tribes.

Of the two dependents or inferiors of the Leah tribes, Asher and Gad, I have already called attention to the fact that Asher was in the land, as it would appear from Egyptian inscriptions, before Israel entered. The tribe plays no part in the history of the country, and in the description of the

conquest it is stated that the territory of Asher was imperfectly conquered and the children of Asher dwelt among the Canaanites. Putting together all the information that we have, it would seem that Asher was in fact a Canaanite tribe or clan, which the children of Israel found in the country and subjected or annexed, so that it became a component part of the children of Israel. The tradition of its different origin and its Canaanite connection survived in the story which said that it was the son not of a true wife but of the handmaid of one of the wives. The reason for the connection with the Leah tribes is apparent from the geographical position of Asher, which borders on the land of the younger Leah children, Zebulun and Issachar, lying between them and the Phœnician coastlands.

Gad was an inhabitant of the mountainous territory in the central section of the east Jordan region. The name Gad is the name of a god of good fortune worshipped by Aramæans and Phœnicians, and the natural suggestion is that the children of Gad were in some pre-historic period worshippers of that god. There is, however, in the notices which we have of the tribe in the historical period, nothing to support this view, suggested by the name, however probable it may seem in itself. Gad was one of two or three

tribes, sections of which inhabited Gilead, and the region is quite as frequently, or more frequently designated as Gilead than by the names of the tribes occupying it. In the time of the first kings Gilead had become a sort of home-land of Israel, a last support in time of distress. When the country west of the Jordan was overrun by the Philistines, it was in Gilead that the sons of Saul found loyal support. When Absalom raised the standard of revolt against David, David took refuge in Gilead and was supported by its inhabitants with similar loyalty. But while the Israelites west of the Jordan advanced in civilization, the inhabitants of Gilead appear to have remained more nearly in their primitive condition. It was from this region that Elijah, that Titanic prophet of primitive type, came. Gilead is a country of very considerable extent, and is to-day one of the best wooded and best watered sections, not only of Palestine but of all Syria—a land capable of supporting hardy mountaineers and herdsmen. But it is also a land bordering on the desert, which, by its very position, is almost certain to remain in a more primitive state than the country to the west of the Jordan, or even than the regions north and south of it, Moab and Bashan. The name Gad appears in the inscription of Mesha, king of Moab. The people of Gad are said in that

inscription to have occupied Ataroth and other cities in the region north of the Arnon from time immemorial. The passage may mean that they were known as the primitive occupants of the territory. That, in any case, they seem to have been. Apparently, also, they were united at an early time to Israel. I would suggest that a clan, whose special and eponymous god was Gad, was found by the Israelites settled in Gilead at the time of their inroad, and annexed to Israel, whose god, Yahaweh, thus became its god. The suggestion of the genealogical connection which attaches Gad to the sons of Leah, not to the sons of Rachel, would indicate that such connection was made at an early date, when the Leah tribes occupied this territory, before Ephraim and Manasseh came to the front, or Manasseh secured a settlement in Gilead. It was the possession of Gilead which rendered possible the invasion of northern Canaan by Issachar and Zebulun.

If, in the case of Asher and Gad, the genealogical story has the meaning which I have ascribed to it, then we shall expect to find a similar connection in the case of Dan and Naphthali. Now Dan, at the outset, occupied the territory between Benjamin, and perhaps the extreme northern part of Judah, and the coast-land. It is the region through which

one passes to-day on the railroad from Jaffa to Jerusalem. The name of the tribe, Dan, which may be a shortened form of Daniel, like Jacob and Joseph for Jacob-el and Joseph-el, does not help us to discriminate the origin or connection of the tribe. The name of its hero, Samson, the man of Shamash or Shemesh, the sun-god, suggests at once some connection with the ancient sanctuary of Shemesh, or Beth-Shemesh, whose remains exist to-day in the old land of Dan in the *tel* or ruin mound known as Ain-Shems. This connection with Shamash suggests, as in the case of Gad, and possibly, also, of Asher, an original connection of this tribe with another god than Yahaweh, the god of Israel, which connection in itself indicates non-Israelitic origin, and supports the theory suggested by the genealogical tradition, that it was of Canaanite, that is, non-Israelite origin, and was attached or annexed by the Rachel tribes, Ephraim and Benjamin, at the time of the conquest. I therefore venture to suggest that, whatever the ultimate origin of this tribe may have been, it was settled in the land before the arrival of Israel, and that its principal and most highly venerated shrine was Beth-Shemesh, some of the myths and legends of which it has incorporated in its history. The pressure of the incoming Philistines crowded it out of its original situation, and it ulti-



mately sought new habitations at the extreme north of Israel. After this it plays no part except as the site of one of the two great temples of the Israelite kingdom, the Temple of Dan. It is possible that the name Dan was the secondary name of the tribe, assumed after this removal.

Of course if this method of treating the story of the birth of the tribes be correct, it follows that Naphthali had a similar origin, namely, that it was a Canaanite tribe or clan, which was subdued or attached by the Rachel tribes. But for this we have no other evidence than the analogy of the preceding. The most important place within the borders of Naphthali was Kedesh, or sanctuary, a place of much sanctity, apparently, in the pre-Israelitic period. If we knew the history of this region more fully it may be that we should find a relation between Naphthali and Kedesh similar to that between Dan and Beth-Shemesh. Naphthali occupied the eastern part of Galilee (it must be said that the exact boundaries of Naphthali, Zebulun, Issachar and Asher are not clear from the Bible account). All this territory was half Canaanitic, even in the historical period, so that the whole region bore the name of Galilee, the mark, the borderland in which Canaanite and Israelite were mixed. Naphthali's location, as we know it, would suggest a connection with Leah,

that is, with Zebulun and Issachar, as in the case of Asher, rather than with Rachel. What was the reason for its connection with the Rachel tribes is not clear.

So much for the historical tradition which lies behind these family stories of the birth of the twelve tribes. It is in the main Israelite tradition, in contrast with those traditions and legends, with which I shall deal in the next chapter, of still earlier origin, whose heroes are the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph.

## LECTURE III

### THE PATRIARCHS AND THE SHRINES OF ISRAEL

**I**N this country we have practically no inheritance of shrines, rites, myths and legends of an earlier religion. Great Britain, also, is comparatively void of such relics, although the records of an earlier time show that before the Reformation not a few existed. The further eastward and southward one goes the more such remains of the religion of previous inhabitants are found. Whoever has visited Naples at the time of the festival of St. Januarius and witnessed the liquefaction of his blood and the ceremonies connected with the same, including the remarkable procession of what look to us like heathen gods, represented by huge silver figures mounted on litters, through the streets of the city, will realize that he is witnessing, under the guise of Christianity, a heathen festival, which has undergone relatively little change. Everywhere in Italy, Spain and the Levant, one finds the old gods and goddesses revered under the names of Christian saints, their festivals preserved as festivals of the

Christian Church and the rites and ceremonies of their ancient cult still lingering on.

In Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine, where two religions converge, namely, Islam and Christianity, and sometimes three, Islam, Christianity and Judaism, or even more, it is not unusual to find all worshipping together or at different times at the same shrine, and according to a cult which, on investigation, prove to be the shrine and the cult of a still earlier religion. At Kal'at el-Hosn, near Homs, all sects worship at the shrine of St. George (el-Khuddr), the richest and most important in Northern Syria. At Smyrna, Christian and Moslem reverence the grave of Polycarp, and at Baghdad, Jew and Moslem worship at the tomb of Joshua, son of Jehozadak, the high priest. Elijah on Mt. Carmel is honored by all, as also the Temple at Jerusalem.

One of the most curious and striking examples of the persistence of the ancient religion which can be traced anywhere is that of the cult now practised by the Moslems at the so-called Tomb of Joshua, the son of Nun, on Giant Mountain, opposite Therapia, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. Here is a great tumulus, fifty odd feet in length, by which is a *tekke*, or Moslem monastery, inhabited by dervishes. One finds shreds of clothing and the like attached to the trees, shrubs and stones about

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 83

this tumulus, to which pious Moslems make pilgrimage. On inquiry the stranger is told that it is the Tomb of Joshua, or of his toe, for the saint is represented as of gigantic size. Before the Moslem conquest this tumulus was a Christian sanctuary, said to be the Tomb of Pantaleon. Here prayers were offered and miracles wrought for Christians by Pantaleon just as now by Joshua for Moslems. But we are able to trace the worship at this point still further back. In Greek days it was the "bed of Heracles," and held in reverence evidently in much the same manner as in the Christian and Moslem periods. Examination of the spot and comparison with other tumuli in the Bosphorus region make it clear that we have here a burial tumulus of the population which antedated the Greek colonization and civilization of this region. As the place of burial of their tribesmen and forefathers, this place was doubtless sacred to these people, and that sanctity was passed on with the added charm of antiquity, mystery and vastness to the heathen Greeks, from them to the Christian Greeks, and from them to the Moslems.

Many more examples, perhaps less striking and yet in some ways more curious, of the inheritance of sacred sites and sacred customs, I might adduce from my own experience. Elijah, under the name

of el-Khuddr, the evergreen, has inherited various sacred places and sacred customs, one of the most curious being a sacred grove on the Euphrates, a *daphne*, to use the Greek term, where all life is sacred. Under the same name, el-Khuddr, St. George, who, by the way, on the Greek Islands is always the heir of Apollo, has inherited the sanctuaries of I scarcely know what gods in Palestine, and is honored by Christian and Moslem alike. One of his shrines, as already stated, is the greatest in northern Syria. It is, of course, clear that the famous story of St. George and the dragon is itself an inheritance from earlier heathen myths. Jonah has been made, in Babylonia, Mesopotamia, and Syria, heir of the fish-god, Dagon. The Virgin has become the successor of the sacred places and sacred beliefs which attached themselves to Ishtar and various heathen goddesses. Speaking roughly she may be said to be sole heir to all the feminine deities of antiquity in those eastern regions, and to a considerable extent this is true also of southern Europe. It is this breadth of inheritance which gives us such curious discrepancies in the worship of the Virgin. Similarly in antiquity we find divergencies in the worship of various gods and goddesses, which show that they were the heirs of several predecessors. This is noticeable in Roman and

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>85</sup>

Greek mythology, and in the Egyptian Pantheon. We meet it likewise in the Babylonian and Assyrian Pantheon, as, for instance, in the diametrically opposed characteristics of the Ishtar worshipped at different places, like the Ishtar of Arbela and the Ishtar of Nineveh, both of them warrior goddesses, and the Ishtar of Erech, a goddess of love and lust.

The transference of sacred places from one religion to another involves a general transference of rites and customs, as well as names and characteristics. Any educated Christian of to-day, who observes the best known feasts of Christianity, knows that the dates of those feasts, and much, at least, in the early celebration of them, is derived, not from Christian, but from heathen sources. The month and day of the birth of Jesus are not known, and apparently at the beginning no attempt was made by the Christian Church to celebrate the birth of Christ. When such a celebration found its way into the Christian Church, we find it connecting itself not with our present Christmas but with what we now celebrate as the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, or Epiphany. The great heathen solstitial feast, which connected itself with the change of the sun's course from south to north, and the commencement of the new year, was known to and almost of necessity in

some way observed by early Christians, with the Roman world in which they dwelt, as the feast of the new year, the time of good wishes and of gifts, the time of riot and merry-making and joy therefor. Following a practice which was natural, and I think we should say, in general, commendable, the Christians gradually introduced a Christian element into their observance of this feast. The turn of the year, the new birth of the year, might well be connected with the turn in the world's life, with the new birth of the world through the birth of Christ; and little by little the heathen festival was converted into a Christian festival celebrating the birth of Christ. Heathen customs connected with the old festival were carried over to the new, and indeed, threatened, in the middle ages, to swamp the Christian idea of the festival altogether. It was these heathen rites and practices which so outraged our Puritan forefathers that they abandoned Christmas, forbade the observance of the festival, and even prohibited the eating of mince pie as one of the characteristics of the profane Christmas merry-making.

In the name Easter we retain the name of an old Teutonic goddess, whose festival was celebrated in the spring of the year, in connection with the rebirth or resurrection of nature. If we did not know



## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>87</sup>

positively the historical origin of the Christian festival of Easter, we might suppose that Teutonic Christians had taken this festival over bodily, name and all, from their forbears. It is one of the most interesting examples of the method in which a heathen name and a Christian conception may be united in one. But not only the great annual festivals, even the very days of the week preserve the names of heathen gods and the memory of their worship by our forefathers,—Tiw and Woden and Thor and Frigg or Fria, with whom are oddly combined the sun and moon and Saturn. All over the world there has been a midsummer festival. In the west this feast is now associated with St. John's Day. In connection with this festival, as in the All-Halloween merry-making, heathen rites and superstitions were taken over by the earlier Christians, and still linger, partly as jests, partly as superstitious survivals in the popular celebration of the festival. In fact it is often the case that the beliefs and practices of an earlier religion linger on in later times in the form of merry sports and games. Similarly songs full of a mystical and mythical meaning in primitive times become the nonsense rhymes of Mother Goose stories to amuse the children of a later age.

Ancient rites and ceremonies of a religious char-

acter often linger on in family and local customs, the origin and meaning of which are no longer known or understood by those who practise them. A few years since a Jewish gentleman, traveling incognito in Spain, was entertained in a Spanish home. At sundown on Friday evening the head of the family lighted ceremonial candles, after a well-known Jewish usage. The Jewish guest at first supposed himself to be in the home of co-religionists, but on inquiry found that his host was not only a Christian, but was even unaware of the Jewish nature of the ceremonial he had performed. He only knew that it was an ancient custom which had been handed down in his family from father to son. Apparently his ancestors had been Jews who had accepted baptism in the time of Philip II. in preference to exile. Secretly they had retained their Jewish customs and for a time their Jewish faith. The Jewish faith had ultimately been lost, but the Jewish customs had persisted, after their significance had been forgotten, in the form of family traditions.

The Armenians have a curious custom connected with the feast of the Transfiguration, unknown in the west, and indeed their date of the Transfiguration is different from ours. In the old Persian midsummer festival of Abrizan, taken over by the

Armenians from the Persian religion, it was the custom to ascend high mountains, a part of that high-place worship which is common over a large extent of country, but more particularly in hither Asia. It was a day of frolic and practical jest; part of the ritual of the festival consisting in pouring water, each seeking an opportunity to douse the others. Early Christian missionaries (Gregory the Illuminator himself, it is said) seized on the custom of ascending mountains in this festival and connected with it the Transfiguration, in which our Lord's divine being was revealed on the mount to three chosen apostles. So this old Persian feast of Abrizan became in Armenia the feast of the Transfiguration; and to-day that feast is observed with merry-making and practical jests; but the characteristic jest of this carnival, if one may so call it, is the throwing of water by one person upon another in sport, a remnant of the essential element of the ancient heathen festival.

I have called attention, in the case of St. George and the dragon, to the transference of heathen stories to Christian saints. This example might be multiplied many fold. In the Arthurian legends and in the chivalric tales which connect themselves with the figure of Charlemagne and his paladins, you find ancient myths repeated as sober history.

Similarly magic tales from a most remote antiquity are repeated in a new guise in connection with historical events and personages. So the black magician who, owing to the struggles of Egypt with Ethiopia, plays so important and characteristic a part in Egyptian stories from the 10th century B.C. onward, and with whom all are familiar in those famous oriental stories known to us as the Arabian Nights, reappears side by side with actual historical characters almost 2000 years his juniors in the cycle of Charlemagne romances.

Mingled with the story of Switzerland's struggle with Austria, you find mythical elements. When I was a boy William Tell was supposed to be an historical figure, the hero who led in the struggle for freedom, and we were taught to believe as an historical fact the tale of his shooting the apple from the head of his son. To-day every boy learns that William Tell is a mythical figure, and that the shooting of the apple is an episode of the "shooting myth," which seems to have its original home in Scandinavia. Similarly, in Burgundian history, as late as the 14th century A. D., we find mythical characters of the Nibelungenlied mingled among and walking, as it were, arm in arm with true historical characters. Or perhaps rather I should say that the events of myth and legend and the actual facts of history

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 91

are, in a certain Burgundian version of the Nibelungenlied, curiously intertwined. But even 2,000 years before Christ we find precisely this same combination in the version of the Gilgamesh Epic which has come down to us, a version which the scribes of Ashurbanipal derived from the library of the Temple of Ishtar at Erech, in which events of the struggle for freedom of Erech against the Elamites are mingled with the zodiacal myth of Gilgamesh.

The old inhabitants of Prussia and of some parts of Saxony were not Teutonic, but Slavonic. There are a few enclaves of this population still existing, maintaining their old costumes and customs, and, to some extent, the old Wendish language. A visit to the Wends of the Spreewald twenty odd years ago interested me in a special study of the history and folklore of that people, so far as it had been collected. I found, over and over again, fairy tales, identical in principle, and, to a large extent, in detail, with familiar tales in Grimm's famous German collection, brought down almost to date, with the doings of Frederick the Great, and one or two of the most striking characters among his generals mixed in. It was a good illustration of the conception of times past which a primitive people possesses. To the unlettered Wends the fairy tales of their re-

remote ancestors and the stories of the exploits of the great Fritz were one and the same in character. To be sure, those fairy tales had in their essential principle come down from a period so remote that we call it pre-historic, and the events of the great Fritz's reign were removed by only a couple of generations from the present time. But there is no perspective in folklore. The near past and the remote past are one, and so the great Fritz became contemporary with the figures which had enlivened the tales of their forefathers a thousand, or it may be two thousand, years or more before.

On my last visit to Palestine I heard, from the mouth of Jewish narrators, a story of the so-called Tomb of the Judges, near Jerusalem, which combined the present and the middle ages and the period preceding the fall of Jerusalem in one picture, and this whole story of the origin and history of that interesting tomb was evidently developed out of an effort to find in the history and traditions of the people some explanation for the shape and number of the chambers and graves which it contained. The Talmud is full of tales which, in a similar manner, mingle past and present, and combine heathen names, heathen magic and even heathen mythology with Jewish persons and Jewish doctrines. Something of the same sort, also, we find

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 93

in the later books of the Bible itself. Esther and Mordecai are clearly the goddess Ishtar and the god Marduk. Traditions and practices connected with these two deities and their worship, such as the Babylonian New Year's feast, have mingled themselves with Jewish customs and traditions and given rise to this narrowest and fiercest of all the books of the Hebrew canon. The fact that in Jewish history this book is especially connected with the mysterious feast of Purim, suggests to us that this feast had a heathen origin connected with the festivals of Ishtar and Marduk.

The stories in the Book of Daniel are curious instances of the way in which ancient, race-old names, later heathen names, modern religious doctrines and distorted recollections of actual historical events are mingled together in folklore and a certain class of religious literature based upon that folklore. I fancy that Daniel himself, who, in the time of Ezekiel, was a remote figure of the past, mentioned along with the legendary Noah and Job as a great hero of remote antiquity, may have been in some way connected with the same tradition or the same conception which shows itself in the name of the tribe Dan; for Dan is merely Daniel, with the omission of the divine part, *el*, instances of which omission have been given in the previous lecture.

If, in the Talmudic period and the later Bible times, foreign myths and even the names of foreign gods could so mingle themselves with Jewish story, it is to be expected that in primitive Hebrew folklore much more of the same sort will be found. Indeed, the primitive folklore of Israel would be unlike the primitive folklore of any other people in the world if we did not find such combinations. In the fourth lecture I shall endeavor to show some instances of the survival of heathen myths and legends in the names and stories which meet us in the book of Genesis. In this lecture I am concerned with the adoption by the Israelites of the legends of certain ancient sanctuaries, which, woven together with actual Israelite traditions of the past and with historical events of a later period, became to Israel the story of its forefathers and were fitted into that same genealogical system which was the method in that folklore of relating the events of history.

The stories of the patriarchs—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—are, to a considerable extent, the ancient pre-Israelitic legends and possibly even myths of ancient sanctuaries adopted and adapted by the Israelites after their occupation of the country, combined with their own historical traditions and cast in the personal and genealogical mould. All through



the Old Testament we have the evidence—and I have given you some of it in this and the preceding lectures—of the adoption by the Israelites of the shrines of the preceding inhabitants. The religion of Israel, as we meet it in the historical period, is composed, one may say, of three parts. First, there is the old religion of the nomadic period, common to the Israelite with all the nomadic peoples among whom he dwelt. The religious ideas of this period we can discriminate best by a comparison with the religion of the Arabs before the time of Mohammed, inasmuch as until the time of the Prophet the Arabs remained largely untouched by civilization and in the same primitive condition in which the ancestors of the Hebrews were 1300 years B. C. Secondly, there are those religious rites and ceremonies, feasts, sacrifices and the like, which the Hebrews borrowed from the Canaanites at, or after, the conquest and occupation of Palestine; and thirdly there is that element which was peculiar to Israel itself, and especially that element derived from the revelation of God through Moses.

If I may digress so far, I would say that the tendency of recent critical treatment has been unduly to minimize in the study of Israel's religion the last named and most essential element. The progress of the world has been achieved chiefly through

great men, more than mere products of their times and of previous conditions, who often stand out from all that has gone before or that surrounds them, in such a way that they seem to be rather a contradiction than a result of their antecedents, and their surroundings. It is such men as Gautama in India, Zoroaster in Persia, Mohammed in Islam, Moses in Israel, and many other and lesser figures in all lands and ages, whom we cannot fully account for by their surroundings, who have not only lifted their people up but have foreseen something so much higher and better than their compeers could grasp, that for generations their successors were still being inspired and carried forward by them to reach the goal which they had attained at once. Of all these great men whom I have mentioned, Moses is, in my judgment, the greatest, and certainly he is the most important for us. In fact the succeeding history of Israel in its relation to him is strikingly similar to the history of Christianity in relation to Jesus. To this day we find ourselves ever perceiving and appropriating new and higher meaning in Jesus' life and teaching. On the other hand that life and teaching are constantly being encrusted with the interpretations and explanations of generations who believe that they have found all that there is in them, and who would preserve the sacred

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 97

person from the irreverent contact of a new age and a new thought. Similarly the Christian sacred books are guarded by believers from the careless and irreverent touch which they think will injure or destroy them. Over and over again this crust, with which some age or generation has surrounded the sacred person and the sacred books of Christianity, has been shattered by those who wish to see the reality and who, seeing it, find that it is different from and greater than what had been represented. So far from being injured or destroyed, the books and the life continue to exist and to impart to each succeeding age a better understanding of the meaning of Jesus Christ, and an ever higher conception of the revelation of God in Him. So in all ages of Israel's history the name of Moses plays an important part. Traditions and doctrines grow up about his name, and each new reformation seeks to be and claims that it is a return to the true and unadulterated teaching of Moses.

But to return: Israel adopted the old shrines which it found in Canaan and the worship connected with those shrines, precisely as the Christians adopted the heathen shrines and much of the worship connected with them when Christianity conquered heathenism, or as Islam has done in its conquest of both Christian and heathen lands.

Now the old shrines of Canaan consisted, primarily, of caves, fountains, wells, trees, heights and stones, precisely as is the case today among the plain folk of the land, Moslem and Christian alike. The caves were, to a considerable extent, an inheritance derived by the Canaanites themselves from earlier inhabitants. Excavations conducted for the Palestine Exploration Fund at Gezer by Mr. Macalister have shown us how those pre-Semitic inhabitants, who burned their dead instead of burying them as their Semitic successors did, hollowed caves in the soft limestone rock, the so-called clunch, which is almost as easily worked as chalk, probably for their habitations, certainly for the burning of their dead and for their temples, if one may call such shrines by such a name. By a very natural process the later Semitic inhabitants recognized the sanctity of these caves. The caves which had been used for the burning of the dead they continued in some cases to use for burial. Caves which had been shrines retained their sanctity often-times as the oracle places of new shrines.

Beneath the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem, which seems to represent the site of the altar of the Temple of Yahaweh from Solomon's time onward, there is a cave which appears to have been connected with the sanctity of that spot, although we

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 99

have no actual evidence of any relation of this cave to the worship there conducted in Jewish times. In the case of other temples, as, for example, that of Hierapolis in northern Syria, we have evidence that the cave or hole in the ground did play a part and was an essential feature of the sanctity of the place. The most famous of the ancient cave shrines of Palestine which appears in Hebrew history is Machpelah. This cave was connected with the burial of the dead and with that reverence for ancestors which, while in the Hebrew usage it never became pronounced ancestor worship, was, nevertheless, in some of its manifestations, closely connected with the cult of the ancestors. In Machpelah Abraham buried Sarah, his wife; there Isaac was buried with Rebekah, his wife, and there Jacob buried Leah and was himself buried. To this day this cave is sacred, and we have an almost continuous tradition that, from the pre-Israelitic time, represented by Abraham, onward, it was a holy place. Today no Christian or Jew is allowed to enter the *haram*, within which is the opening of the ancient sacred cave. Only as a special recognition of royalty was permission to enter the enclosure, not the cave, granted to the present English King and the present German Emperor. The ordinary Christian is liable to insult, if not some-

thing worse, when he even goes to the door of the enclosure or seeks to examine the stones of the outer wall to determine whether in fact the enclosure of the *haram*, within which the opening of the sacred cave lies, is of Herodian structure, or earlier or later. And here in passing I may add that this reverence of caves is by no means peculiar to Palestine or Syria. We find the same practices in Greece and Crete, in India and in many other regions.

Somewhat less sacred, but attested as always connected with worship at Hebron, was a sacred tree. The present tree, which is in the Russian enclosure and is supposed to be Abraham's oak, is now almost dead. It is, presumably, the successor of a series of such trees, or there may have been at times more than one tree. Today trees are sacred to the Moslem, and at places, to the Christian population of Palestine. You will find everywhere solitary trees, like the oak at Seilun, supposed to be the ancient Shiloh, decorated with the shreds of the garments of devotees who have sought to come in contact with the divine being or agency which exists in or is expressed through that tree, by placing parts of themselves, or, as surrogates for themselves, their clothing upon the tree. All through the Old Testament we have evidence of this sacredness of trees, and indeed the prophets never tire of denouncing the

immoral practices connected with this tree worship and the lust which found satisfaction in the name of religion under every green tree. Hebron, Kiriath-Arba or Arbaim, is, from time immemorial, represented as the place of a sacred tree or, as the translation of our Old Testament so often has it, "a grove." Of course it is not necessary that tree or grove and cave should stand in any opposition to one another. They may be parts of the same sanctuary, indications of the presence or theophany of the god or gods at that point.

Another natural place of worship, not only in Palestine but throughout the east, was the high place. The great mountain of Hermon was sacred. The very name Hermon is an indication of the sanctity of the spot. It was an *haram*, a set-apart place. Sinai, literally the place of the god Sin, was another of the famous sacred heights of the Palestinian region. Mt. Nebo indicates in its name that the worship of the god Nebo was connected with that mountain, which, at a later date, was brought by the Israelites into connection with their own great religious leader and revealer, Moses. The temple at Jerusalem was erected on a height, though here, as already pointed out, an additional cause for sanctity may be surmised in the ancient cave which existed there. High places are mentioned over and over

again in the Bible, and the Deuteronomic writers and compilers protest against them as strongly as the earlier prophets protested against the worship under green trees.

The philosophy of the cult of the high places is, I think, apparent without further discussion. I might add that the *siggurat*, characteristic of the great temples of Babylonia, both by its name *siggurat*, peak, and by its form, shows this same high place worship in Babylonia. The Temple of Bel-Enlil, the god of the spirit-world, the lord of all creation, at Ekur, mountain house, in Nippur, the most ancient sacred city of Babylonia, is a good indication of the ideas connected with such a cult. From the beginning, certainly, of the Semitic period, say 3000 B. C., or thereabouts onward, there stood, in connection with this temple, a square pyramid in three terraces. At the foot was the altar. On the top was, if we may judge from Herodotus' account of the worship in the later Babylonian *siggurats*, where seven terraces were substituted for three, a shrine, a simple room, which was meant to be the habitation of the divinity when he came down, where there may have been some shew bread or the like, and where, Herodotus says, in Babylon a priestess spent the night, ever ready for her lord and master. This whole representa-



tion is clearly figurative of the god of the storm, who comes down in the thunder clouds, which cut off from sight the summit of the mountain. These dark clouds about the summit of the height show that he is there, present in his abode, and all men know his presence by the voice, the thunder, which he utters (note, by the way, that the Hebrews called thunder the "voice of Yahaweh"); while the brightness and awfulness of his presence is revealed by the lightning flash, the "hail stones and coals of fire," to use the familiar expressions taken from our English translation of the 18th Psalm, that grand picture of God revealing Himself in the thunder storm. So in the Babylonian temple, and one may say that the Hebrew temple was the lineal descendant of the same conception, the god mysteriously dwelt in the dark chamber on the summit of the artificial mountain, at the foot of which sacrifice was offered to him. But this is precisely the picture which we have in Exodus of the theophany of the God of Israel at Sinai. The Israelites offered their sacrifices at the foot of the mountain, from the summit of which God spoke to them in thunder and lightning. Moses, only, might venture within the Holy of Holies, the high priest and interpreter of the oracles of God.

It was the same idea which gave sanctity to

places like Mizpah, in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, and still gives sanctity, for Moslem and Christian alike, to many of the high mountains in Syria and Palestine, like Jebel Osha, of which I have already spoken, on top of which, near the very highest summit, and in a place which itself has a marvelous view of the Jordan valley beneath and the greater part of western Palestine beyond, stands a sacred oak, a well and a *kubbe* or shrine of the prophet Hosea, at which worship and sacrifices are offered to this day. Here we have a survival of sanctity, precisely as in the case of Machpelah and the trees of Hebron; and here again we have two sacred things united, the tree and the height, just as at Hebron we had the tree and the cave.

Wells in that land, and still more, fountains were and still are held sacred. Man sought the source of life. Man realized the marvel and wonder of the divine presence in life—the life which showed itself in the tree, and still more the life which showed itself in the fertilizing water which came down from heaven or, pouring out from the ground, gave life to the earth. In that parched and half waterless region, wells and fountains are more remarkable than elsewhere, and the abounding life about them, in startling contrast with the arid or semi-arid environment, forces itself upon the thought and imagination of

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 105

every beholder and brings home almost involuntarily the consciousness of a mighty life-giving power, hidden somewhere, but in touch with that water source. Famous in all Israelite history are especially two water sources, one at the extreme south, one at the extreme north of the country. According to Israelite tradition, Beersheba, interpreted by the Jews as seven wells, was the creation of their ancestors. Today there are at the ancient site, surrounded by a great tract of wilderness, some four or five wells in actual operation, and evidences of the existence of still more, apparently seven in all. It is a wonderful thing, after a long day's journey over a waterless route, with no settled habitations visible anywhere, to find this center of activity and movement in the waste. Where the people come from, it is hard to tell, but from every side they are pouring in and pouring out, drawing and carrying away the precious water which means life to them and their flocks and herds. It has been a center and a gathering place for the nomadic populations of that region from time beyond ken, and will, I presume, continue to be so; and to the primitive men of that region today there is a sacredness connected with the site, certainly akin to that sacredness which attached itself to it in the remote period.

With this site, to some extent, Abraham is con-

nected in the old Israelite tradition, as we find it in the Book of Genesis, but more particularly it was the site of the tradition of Isaac. It was a spot especially sacred to the Israelites of the northern kingdom. It is to be observed that in the 9th and 8th centuries B. C., Beersheba was a favorite place of pilgrimage for them, so that men went from Gilead and Samaria to seek God and worship there, as we learn from references in the prophets. The peculiar connection which Israel, in distinction from Judah, claimed with this sanctuary suggests at once how and why Isaac was the father of Jacob, the land from which these pilgrimages were made.

Of an entirely different character is the other great sacred source of the north. At the foot of Hermon the River Jordan takes its rise. There are three principal sources, and at two of these the water bubbles out of the ground with that roaring noise so aptly described in the 42nd Psalm: "One deep calleth another, because of the noise of thy water-pipes: all thy waves and storms are gone over me." At Banias, which was the ancient Paneas, the place of the worship of the god Pan, the water rushes out with a great noise from beneath the foot of a cliff on the lowest slopes of Hermon. Above this great spring is a cave, and by it rock cuttings and inscriptions of the Greek heathen period. At that time,

and probably much earlier, worship was offered at this source of life to the divine source of life, which poured out wealth and blessing for man. Still more striking is the effect of the stream which wells out from the mound of Tel el-Kadhi, on the plain beneath, a mile or more away. Tel el-Kadhi is a little hill, largely if not altogether artificial, rising out of the plain, covered for the most part with a thick growth of trees and vegetation. Here, away from the homes of men, in the loneliness of the uninhabited plain, one is more impressed even than at Banias with the roaring, rushing sound of the waters, which pour out of the ground in so great a volume as to form at once a river. This, presumably, was the site of the ancient temple of Dan, and the worship at this temple, I fancy, was always of a primitive sort, such as was befitting the worship of the god who exhibited himself in such nature forces. The Psalm which I have quoted above was, I think, in its original form, a liturgical hymn sung at the great autumnal festival by worshippers at this shrine, where served, according to tradition, the descendants of Moses.

Besides the worship which connected itself with such manifestations of divine power and divine life, with the mysteries of the wide heaven above or the dark interior of the earth beneath, we find, also,

constant reference in the early books of the Bible, and indeed until after the time of Isaiah, to stone worship. One of the familiar names for God was Rock, as in the thirty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, in various Psalms, and in such names as Ebenezer, "Rock is strength" (parallel with Eliezer, God is strength). When Isaiah would depict the coming spread of the religion of Israel's god, so that Yahaweh shall be worshipped in Egypt, he expresses his meaning by saying that a *mazzabah*, or stone pillar shall be set up there (Is. XIX, 19). That is to say, he cannot think of the worship of Yahaweh dissociated from the sacred stone. This sacredness of stones, it may be added, lingers on in Syria and Palestine today.

The reason for this worship of stones is not so clear as the reason for the other sorts of worship already described, but the fact is well established. The heathen Arabs worshipped stones, believing that the divinity was or manifested himself in those stones. A single prominent stone, a meteoric stone, a stone of some peculiar form, particularly if there was any phallic suggestion in its shape, or a striking group of stones, attracted such worship. The sacrifice offered consisted in pouring blood upon the stone or stones, that the divinity therein contained might receive the life, which was the blood

of the victim offered. They also set up stones, which were revered in a similar way, by pouring blood upon them, touching them with the hand and kissing them as surrogates of the divinity with whom they sought to come in contact. The same thing was done in Canaan from a very early period onward, as is evident from references in the Bible, and also from the discoveries which have been made by explorers. One of the most striking discoveries of sacred stones yet made is that of the megalithic temple at Gezer, where a number of stones were set up, not in a circular form, the *gilgal*, as is common east of the Jordan and in the Jordan valley, a form resembling that so well known at Stone Henge in Salisbury, but in an alignment. The original object of worship, as is evident from the surroundings and the way in which the stone itself is smoothed and polished, was a stone, somewhat smaller than those about it, of natural phallic shape. The other stones, some of them having an artificial and still more evident phallic shape, and some of them mere rude blocks, support and strengthen this original object of worship.

There are in the Bible traditions, like that of Lot's wife who was turned to salt, which show, in a very simple way, the natural superstitions which connect themselves with stones of peculiar form. Modern

## Early Hebrew Story

Arabs have pointed out to me, in other places and outside of Palestine, stone formations with which they connected some myth or legend, the origin of which was manifest the instant one saw the stone; but this is common everywhere. The curious freaks of nature by which mountain-sides, stone heaps and individual stones assume weird shapes, suggesting resemblances to human constructions, or animal and human forms, lead to legends, according to which these natural manifestations are accounted for as actual creations of divine, or semi-divine or sometimes of human beings, nor can you persuade the people among whom these traditions are extant that these things are mere freaks of nature and not formed and shaped for the purpose which the tradition ascribes to them.

One of the most singular stone formations west of the Jordan in Palestine is to be seen in the great stone field a little to the north of the modern town of Beitin, the ancient Bethel. One is here, if I may borrow an expression, "on the roof of the world." A few hundred feet to the north of this stone field you come to a divide, from which you can look north and south. You are far above Jerusalem, which is visible away to the south. You look over a succession of hills and then across the huge, deep cleft of the Jordan valley to Gilcad and Moab beyond.



## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>111</sup>

The situation is imposing. One feels a sense of awe as one stands at this point; and just here, on the slope of this roof, near its summit, occurs a freak of nature so singular that it is difficult to convince one's self that nature and not man is the author. Huge stones seem to be piled one upon another to make columns nine or ten feet or more in height. In reality these columns are produced by erosion, and the different density of the strata has led to greater erosion in one part than another, so that they taper and bulge in manifold and various shapes. So strong is the resemblance to constructions made by men's hands that I myself have gone to this spot, not once but several times, and examined every stone, to make sure that there could be no mistake in my impression, and I have found that others have done the same thing. It is only after such a careful examination of the site that one convinces one's self that in reality these stone pillars are the work of nature, not of man. They look exactly like the "pillars of testimony" which are to be seen all over the country, only of gigantic size. These "pillars of testimony" occur today in groups at many places, especially where the traveler first catches sight of some sacred spot. Thereupon he sets stones one upon the other in the shape of a column, and says, "Oh, so and so (mentioning the name of

the saint whose *weli* he sees), as I by this bear testimony to thee, so do thou bear testimony to me in the day of judgment." The custom in some form is clearly a very ancient one, and references to similar heaps of testimony occur in the Hebrew scriptures (Cf. Gen. XXXI, 47 f.).

Whoever stands on the hillside above Bethel, especially toward evening, if he have any sympathy with nature and the mysticism of nature's children in his soul, understands with a new understanding the fascinating story of Jacob's flight when night overtook him near Bethel, and there on the height, which was so much nearer to heaven than all the country round about him, he saw the "ladder," or better, the stage-tower that reached up to heaven and the angels of God ascending and descending (Gen. XXVIII). Surely it is a point at which heaven and earth meet. And there stand the pillars which the mighty heroes of antiquity erected; for those stones are not stones which the pigmies of the present day could pick up and set one upon another. It was only the giant men of olden times who could set up as memorials of communion with God these mighty stones at this point where heaven and earth are so clearly united.

Here you have another natural sanctuary, which became ultimately one of the two great temples of

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>113</sup>

Israel of the north. But the worship at this point, I fancy, was never conducted, as at Jerusalem, in a great temple built with hands. It was a more primitive, simple out-of-door worship, but none the less the place was a place of the greatest sanctity from pre-historic times onward. It was not only the ancestors of Israel, but Israel itself which worshipped here. Bethel and Dan, two natural holy places, were made royal chapels of the kingdom of Israel, just because they were natural, primitive, holy places, at the time when Israel, in revolt against the oriental despotism of Solomon's son, was harking back to things primitive, political and religious. These natural high places of the most primitive period, with their simple ancestral worship, were the protest of Israel against the new, hand-made temple of Phœnician type at Jerusalem.

Bethel is in Jacob's land and its traditions belong to Jacob. Later the land became the very homeland and center of Israel, and Israel was identified with Jacob. It was natural, therefore, that the legends connected with Bethel and Jacob should have come to play, as they have, so important a part in Israel's history.

I have said that Abraham is connected more especially with Hebron. In the genealogies of the patriarchs the greater antiquity of Hebron,

or rather of the relation of the Hebrews to Hebron, seems to be recognized in the ancestral relation of Abraham to Jacob. But why, then, was Isaac, who was connected with the still more southern Beersheba, the son instead of the father of Abraham? You will note that in the patriarchal stories Abraham and Jacob are much more real and vivid than the more shadowy Isaac, and much more is told about them than about him. The situation of Hebron and Bethel, in the center of the life and history of Israel, accounts for this more active and fuller part which Abraham and Jacob play in Hebrew story, as over against the less vivid and the less personal character of the narrative of Isaac, the hero of the more remote Beersheba. The peculiar relation of Beersheba to Israel, as it appears in historic times, has been already noted. This relation is reflected in the genealogy in which Isaac is represented as Jacob's father. But if Isaac were Jacob's father, then, when the genealogy was completed by bringing all the patriarchs into a family relation, it was impossible to assign to Abraham that position, as he was clearly older than Jacob. He must, therefore, become the father of Isaac, and so we have the genealogy of the patriarchs or heroes of those three great primeval sanctuaries, in the order Abraham, Isaac, Jacob.

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 115

I have already called attention in a previous lecture to the fact that the land in which Bethel stood was called in prehistoric times, as we learn from the Egyptian inscriptions, Jacob-el. It was the land of Jacob. But in the story of the Book of Genesis, Jacob is identified with Israel, and the two are declared to be one and the same. I do not know any very much better evidence for the combination which I have already suggested of the traditions of Israel with the traditions native to the country than this combination of these two names—Israel, the proper name of the people, and Jacob, the name of the country into which Israel comes. This identification having taken place, you find, combined with the old pre-Israelite legends of Jacob-el and Bethel, the whole story of Israel, as it existed in the traditions of the people down to the time when these traditions and legends assumed comparatively fixed shape in the folklore of the Israelites, told as the personal story of Jacob-Israel. I have already called attention to the fact that, from archæological sources, especially from the tablets of Tel el-Amarna, we have evidence of the invasion of Canaan toward the close of the 15th and the beginning of the 14th century B. C. by Aramæan tribes, the first-comers of that long Aramæan invasion which did not end until toward

the time of Christ. The connection of Israel with these Aramæans appears in the stories, woven into the Jacob-Israel cycle, of the marriage with Laban's daughter and the long sojourn in Pad-dan-Aram.

I have also said that one event in its history made such an impression upon Israel that it was told over and over again in folklore as a part of the story of each of the various ancestors; that it was told in song, and that in fact it is reflected through all the literature of Israel,—namely the deliverance from Egypt. In the story of Jacob-Israel you have a part, but only a part of the tale of the Egyptian sojourn and the Egyptian bondage, the descent into Egypt by Jacob. Note, however, that Jacob was not buried in Egypt; his burial-place was in Canaan.

More of the story of the Egyptian bondage is told in the story of Joseph. I have already called attention to the fact that the country about Shechem was known in the 16th century, as evidenced by the Egyptian inscriptions, as Joseph-el, precisely as the territory somewhat further south was identified as Jacob-el. The tomb of Joseph was shown in Israelite times in the neighborhood of Shechem (Josh. XXIV, 32). This was the region which belonged to the sons of Joseph, Manasseh and Ephraim. Joseph appears as a patriarch in the stories of Gen-

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>117</sup>

esis, and, as in the case of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, so in his case also we have to do, I presume, primarily with the ancient pre-Israelite hero of a region, whose special shrine, perhaps, was at Shechem. But this story has been quite differently treated, in many respects, from those of the older patriarchs, and consequently stands in a somewhat different relation to Israelite history from their stories. In the first place Israel's relation to this region and its stories was later than its relation to the regions and stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Even the Joseph tribes did not at first occupy the neighborhood of Shechem. They made their first settlement in the neighborhood of Bethel and Ai; and at the period when the Ark was located at Shiloh, it would appear that Shechem was still strongly Canaanitic. It seems that the process of Hebraization (if one may be pardoned such a word) of the richer northern part of the country, later known as Samaria, the regions about Shechem, Samaria and Dothan, was slow. The occupation of this region of Joseph occurring thus at a later date Joseph failed to take rank with the ancestors of the whole people, and became instead the father only of the two tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, which occupied the Joseph territory.

As the father of Ephraim and Manasseh, Joseph

became the son of Israel and the brother of the other tribal eponyms (it is perhaps noteworthy that it is precisely in this part of the Jacob-Israel story that the name Israel takes the place of Jacob). A certain relation of unfriendliness and envy on the part of the older tribes towards the newcomers, who, entering after them, occupied the best part of the country, seems to be indicated in the story of Joseph and his brethren. Certainly there is an element of pride and boastfulness on the part of the Josephites toward their less prosperous and powerful brother tribes. More characteristic is the peculiar relation of the Josephite tribes to the Egyptian sojourn and the deliverance from Egyptian bondage suggested by the story of Joseph, which has led not a few modern scholars to conjecture that the deliverance from Egypt in fact affected only these tribes. Certainly the story of that bondage and deliverance is told in unmistakable fashion in the legend of Joseph.

In its details, also, the story of Joseph has received a different treatment from those of the other patriarchs. It has been spun out and developed at greater length and with a much greater wealth of personal detail. We have in it seemingly actual contact with events of Egyptian history, Egyptian social and political life, and Egyptian literature. The



## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>119</sup>

story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife sounds strangely like the tales of that romantic literature in which the Egyptians delighted, and the main incident of this tale has often been compared with an incident in the Egyptian tale of the Two Brothers, which can be traced back certainly to the 18th dynasty. The conditions of the semi-Asiatic rule of Amenhotep IV., and his apparently Semitic vizier, Janhamu, seem to be reflected in the story of Joseph's promotion to favor and his government of Egypt. The historian (or might we venture rather to say the *storian*?) of Joseph was familiar, also, with the peculiar agrarian conditions of Egypt, dating from a still earlier period, but connected by him with the hero of his story. The Egyptian names used in the narrative, on the other hand, appear to belong to a much later period, not earlier, certainly, than 1000 B. C. Altogether we have in Joseph's story a most interesting combination of elements from various sources and periods, woven together with such art as to give a vivid, personal narrative.

But while the Egyptian element is strongest in this narrative, it must not be forgotten that a migration into Egypt, an affliction there, and a deliverance through the might of Yahaweh are described also in the story of Abraham, although in

## Early Hebrew Story

a quite different form (Gen. XII). Abraham, or Abram, as he is there called (some writers have made much of this distinction between Abraham and Abram, and suggested that there is a combination of two persons and therefore two traditions here also, just as in the case of Jacob and Israel. I fancy that the two forms of the name are rather due to local and dialectical differences of utterance), went down into Egypt with his wife, Sarah, called in these earlier stories Sarai (here again the difference of names seems to be due to dialectical differences of utterance, and the differentiation and combination of Sarai and Sarah in the story in Genesis show merely that we have the same story passing through the mouths of people speaking different dialects and hence pronouncing in a different way the same word). Fearful of the Egyptian, Abram declares that Sarah is his sister, not his wife. So Pharaoh took her for his harem — the bondage of Israel in a new form, but a bondage which resulted also in the prosperity of Israel, precisely as in the stories of Jacob and Joseph. In comparison with the barren lands from which they came the Israelites were wealthy in Egypt, and so Abraham had there abundance of sheep and oxen, he-asses and men and maid servants, and she-asses and camels. The deliverance from Egypt,

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>121</sup>

with which we are so familiar in a more directly historical form in the story of Moses in the Book of Exodus, is also pictured in Abraham's story. Yahweh plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues, and so Pharaoh commanded his men concerning Abraham, and he sent him away and his wife and all that he had.

A confirmation of the meaning suggested for this story — that it is a picture of historic conditions in Israel in the form of a personal narrative of Abraham — you will find in the account of the relation of Abraham with the Philistines, in the twentieth chapter of Genesis. Historically, any relation between the Philistines and Abraham would seem to be an anachronism. If we connect Abraham with the period represented in the 14th chapter of Genesis, he must have lived in the 23rd century B. C. But the Philistines came into Palestine at about the same time that Israel did. As I have pointed out in a previous lecture, the Philistine invasion was part of that great movement of nations which resulted from pressure downward by the barbarian hordes of the north, owing to some disturbances in the mysterious uncivilized belt which lay beyond the verge of the civilized world of that day. We do not know anything about the Philistines earlier than approximately the 13th century B. C., when

they descended from Crete or Asia Minor or both. Here we have Abraham who, according to the 14th chapter of Genesis, should have lived about the 23rd century B. C., in contact with the Philistines, who appear in Palestine a thousand years later, about the 13th century B. C.

The instant you understand that you are dealing with the history of a race and its vicissitudes under the name of a man, the anachronism disappears. Abraham, according to this 20th chapter, being in contact with the Philistines (here, by the way, you have Abraham, not Abram, and Sarah, not Sarai), does precisely what he is reported to have done in the case of the Egyptians. He tells Abimelech, king of Gerar, that Sarah is his sister, not his wife, and so Abimelech, king of Gerar, sent and took Sarah. Then Yahaweh afflicted Abimelech and all his house, producing barrenness throughout the land, which was healed only when Abimelech took sheep and oxen and men servants and women servants and gave them to Abraham, and restored to him Sarah, his wife.

Next to the oppression in Egypt, the historic event which made the greatest impression on Israel was the oppression of the Philistines in the struggle for the possession of the land between the two peoples. Coming in about the same time, the one

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>123</sup>

from the east, the other from the west, the Philistines, who were already a civilized and organized people, were at first victorious. The Israelites were conquered. Temporary victories and temporary deliverances there were in the time of Saul and, before his time, in the time of the Judges, but they were only temporary victories. The Philistines pressed on and on and Israel was oppressed by them until the great deliverer, David, arose. You have the stories of the oppression by the Egyptians and by the Philistines told under precisely the same picture, and the last named story brings us to that limit beyond which little or nothing in this early folklore of Israel descends, the time of David.

This latter story, the story of Abraham's contact with the Philistines in the 20th chapter, is told in a double form. We have two narratives combined in one. There is a Yahawistic narrative, that is, a narrative in which the name Yahaweh is used for the divinity and which, as I have said in a previous lecture, represents more particularly the folklore and legends of the south, and there is a similar story of Philistine oppression and deliverance from the Philistine yoke told in an Elohist narrative, that narrative which uses Elohim as the name of the divinity and which belongs rather to the north. But further, in the Elohist narrative, in

the 26th chapter of Genesis, you have this same story precisely told about Isaac. In other words, these cycles of legends which gathered around Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were originally independent one of another, and each one was made the vehicle of the whole story of Israel.

It is from this fact, that each of these stories was originally independent of the other, that there resulted both the narration of the same episode about two patriarchs, as in the instance just quoted, and also the connection of a patriarch with more than one place and region. It is for this reason that Abraham, regularly connected with the region about Hebron, appears also in the Yahawistic narrative in some connection with "the oak of Moreh," at Shechem (Gen. XII, 6), as building an altar by Bethel (Gen. XII, 8), or as making a covenant at Beersheba (XXI, 32). We find the same thing to-day. The same story is told of different saints; or a saint local in one place is transferred by his worshippers to other localities, sacred according to other traditions to some other saint. Especially great saints, like St. George, tend to dominate whole regions, often appropriating the shrines and traditions of other saints in addition to their own. Further, especially where a saint has assumed such a controlling and dominant influence, people of another

## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel 125

race and religion coming into his sphere of influence, if, at least, approximately in the same grade of culture, will adopt this saint in addition to or in place of their own cult. This is the reason why the Moslems of Syria have adopted the cult of the Christian, or rather pre-Christian St. George.

Similarly the Israelite, taking over the Canaanite shrines with their heroes or divinities, who were the ancestors of the people of those regions, from whom they named themselves and from whom, in the case of Jacob, the land itself was named, became in their turn not merely worshippers at those shrines, but also descendants of those ancestors. The Israelites of a given locality connected themselves with the shrine of that locality, but in doing this they did not lose consciousness of the heroes and heroic events of their own past. Their traditions were mingled with the traditions and legends of the shrine which they had now adopted as their own, and so long as those traditions and legends were passed down by word of mouth and not by writing, these legends were constantly growing and changing, representing new heroic events and in their coloring the conditions of a new time, so that from the events narrated and the coloring given to the narrative we are often able to say, "at such and such a date this ceased to be a living story in the mouth of the people and assumed written form."

Before that final change came, the substitution of the written story for the oral tradition, there was developed in Israel a consciousness of its oneness. Lost for a time in the period following Moses and Joshua and the disintegration of the conquest, this was revived and strengthened by the Philistine struggles. This unification of the people led to the unification of these legends. Abraham and Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, were connected with one another in a genealogical scheme. This is parallel with the joint political and mythological unification which took place under somewhat similar conditions in Egypt and Babylonia, or even, to some extent, in Greece, determining the relationships ascribed to the different gods and even to the different cities one with another. We know that in Babylonia and in Egypt the gods which appear in later times connected one with another in a system of kinship were originally the independent and separate gods of various localities, and that contact or combination between the localities with which these gods were originally connected brought about the relationship of the gods which is set forth in the later mythologies. And this relationship of the gods to one another expresses oftentimes the relation in antiquity or in importance of the cities one to another. For instance, the statement that Sin, the god of Ur, was



## Patriarchs and Shrines of Israel <sup>127</sup>

the son of Enlil, the god of Nippur, corresponds with what we know as to the relation of those cities and shrines in the earliest antiquity. Nippur was the great ancient shrine ; the importance of Ur was later. In the same way Ea, the god of Eridu, has as his son Marduk, who became the great god of Babylon.

Again, in Babylonia the gods of the earlier Sumerian inhabitants became the ancestors and parents of the gods of the later Semitic Babylonians. Similar conditions we find in Egypt. Everyone is familiar with the same phenomena in Greek mythology. We need not be surprised to find somewhat the same conditions existing in Palestine. That, in adopting as their own ancestors the mythical eponymous forms worshipped by the previous inhabitants and regarded by them as their ancestors, the Israelites did not also adopt their divine character and build not merely a scheme of the genealogy of the race, but also a mythological system in which these eponymous ancestors were gods and not men, was due to influences which I shall discuss in a future lecture.

## LECTURE IV

### SURVIVALS — LEGENDARY AND MYTHICAL

**I**N the last lecture I endeavored to show that the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and, to some extent Joseph, as they have come down to us, had their origin in the sanctuary myths, legends and traditions of Hebron, Beersheba, Bethel and Shechem, and that into these old pre-Israelitic myths and legends were woven threads of Hebrew story, so that the ancestral heroes, gods or demigods of the country of which Israel took possession were adopted by Israel, and ultimately became its ancestors, the patriarchs, whose forms were clothed with the traditions of Israel's history, Israel's religious struggles, Israel's thoughts and convictions. Their stories became the vehicle, not only through which Israel's history was narrated, but also by which a real religious teaching was conveyed; and so you find, surviving under the form of stories told about this patriarch or that, recollections of religious struggles, of the growth or abolition of ritual practices, and the like.

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 129

In the very nature of the case, while here and there a consciousness of the original religious, racial or tribal nature of the heroes of these stories is manifest in general they have been generously clothed with personal traits by successive generations of narrators, striking episodes have been introduced into their stories and even romances which have no inherent connection with the original legends. Of all the stories, that of Isaac is most shadowy and impersonal, but there is connected, partly with his story and partly with that of Abraham, a very beautiful episode of a personal form, told with consummate art, — the wooing and winning of Rebekah. There is in Abraham's story less of the episodical and romantic and more of the racial and legendary element than in the narratives of Jacob and Joseph, but there are, nevertheless, features of a purely romantic character, for which we are to seek no other meaning than the fancy of the story-teller, his desire to clothe his theme with wonder and with charm, or to display his skill and his knowledge. In this the story of Abraham differs in no essential degree from the tribal stories of Arab eponyms, the epic tales and folklore legends of Greece and Egypt, or our own Germanic and Celtic kinsfolk and ancestors.

Eponymous and mythical figures attract to them-

selves stories of actual episodes and events, they assume the character and form of real persons, or become ideal expressions of the customs, thoughts, and aspirations of the people among whom they are told, or of some gifted narrator or narrators, who express in them their own stronger personality or loftier conceptions. The legends of Christian saints show the same characteristics, and the same saint in two different localities may even possess entirely different characters, different attributes and different histories. The difference is due to the different history and environment of the people of the localities in which the saint is worshipped, or to the different character and genius of the makers of the stories. Two saints among the same people and in the same locality may differ greatly in character, owing to the sources from which their stories are derived, each being, nevertheless, a characteristic expression of the people among whom they both originated. Similarly in the stories of Abraham and Jacob, even as they were finally brought together in the early Judæan and Israelite histories, there is evidence of the combination of material originally from different sources, and representing different ideas. Between the characters of the heroes of the two cycles of legends there is a striking difference. Abraham is of a singularly exalted

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 131

and beautiful character, Jacob, on the other hand, is a wily Ulysses, shrewd, pious, cunning. Each is a type of the Hebrew, as we actually find him in history, and may be said to be his portraiture of himself, his thoughts and hopes. Neither is complete. Each represents a stratum of thought. How it happened that this thought attached itself to this name, that to the other, we cannot say; but the process once begun tended to continue and complete itself.

The story of Jacob has less of the racial and legendary element than that of Abraham, and more of the episodic and personal. Particularly it is characterized by its wit and its humorous enjoyment of Jacob's tricks. Clearly the original narrators and their auditors enjoyed hugely the fun at Esau's expense. It is the wit of the more sophisticated, tamer people, at the expense of the barbarous neighbor of whom at the same time he is half afraid; the relation, for example, of the lowland Scot to the Highlander in the days which Sir Walter Scott has clothed with such glamor. The Israelite laughs at the shaggy, hairy, uncouth Edomites, as rough and ragged as the goats of their own wild land. Esau must have borrowed the color of his skin from the rocks of his country, and his country is called Edom because it is red. In

these witticisms one sees before him just the type of wild Edomite which Israel held up to laughter as Esau. The open shirt displays a breast so hairy that it looks like a goat's beard hanging down. The hairy legs below the short shirt might pass for a satyr's limbs. The hair of the head is unkempt and matted and hangs down about the face, which itself is tanned and burned to a dry redness by the sun. It is a type which one finds today in that region, and which the town Arab — for that was what Israel had become — naturally laughs at and compares with a goat. One can almost see a group of Israelites sitting about the fire in a hut on a winter night, or out in front of it on a summer evening, listening with shouts of laughter to the narrator who tells the tale of the way in which Israel, by the advice of his cunning mother, Rebekah, deceives the old, decrepit, blear-eyed Isaac by covering himself with goat skins so as to represent the hairy Esau.

There is the same sort of wit and apt characterization of personal appearance and tribal characteristics in the description of the way in which Esau, overreached by Jacob, sells his birthright for a mess of pottage. It is a picture of that same childish improvidence of savage nature of which as displayed by the red Indians our ancestors told equally merry

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 133

tales. The Indian savage was ready to sell his birthright for some foolish gewgaw, some useless weapon or a bottle of rum. So Esau sells his birthright for the satisfaction of his immediate desire. Hungry, to fill his belly, he sells the whole future. One might fancy, as he reads the story of the dealings of Jacob with Esau, that he is reading in mystical form the story of the dealing of the town Jew in Russia with the stupid, blundering, brutal Russian *Moujik*. It is a wonderful picture of the unchanging Israel dealing with his stronger but less cunning brethren in all times and all lands.

The same element of humor shows itself in the story of the dealings of Jacob and Laban, and as in the story of the dealings of Jacob and Esau we have a reflection of the race rivalry and race contests of the Israelite and the Edomite, so in the story of Jacob and Laban we have a reflection of the rivalries, bickerings and conflicts of neighboring Israelites and Aramæans. Here again Jacob overreaches his rival by cunning tricks, as of the ring-streaked wands, which caused the ewes to give birth to mottled sheep, or the theft of the gods of the Aramæans and their concealment by Rachel. There is the same glorification of cunning as over against strength and power, and the same touch of humor. At places the story has come down to us in a trun-

cated form, so that the jest is not quite clear, but enough remains to show us that it must once have been a very merry tale;—the story of the way in which Israel overreached Aram. It is this element of wit and cunning which is so peculiarly characteristic of the story of Jacob in contrast with that of Abraham or Joseph, and which gives Jacob a distinctive personal character so different from that of the other patriarchs. At the end of the story of Jacob and Laban the race element in the legend makes itself felt in another way, in the mention of the dividing line that was drawn in Gilead between Israelite and Aramæan—a boundary line which had ceased to be a boundary line in the time of King Ahab, when the Aramæans were threatening to overrun the whole of the land of Israel.

The story of Joseph contains more than any of the others of the romantic element. That there is a sanctuary legend or a sanctuary element behind the story, the identification of the country or the people formerly inhabiting the country about Shechem as Joseph or Joseph-el in the pre-Israelite period, and the existence in that neighborhood in the Israelite period of a tomb, known as the tomb of Joseph, make plain; but this element plays a much smaller part in the story of Joseph than it does in that of any of the other patriarchs. In the story



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 135

as we have it, there is evidence of composition and growth. It has come down to us in a composite narrative, derived from the Yahawistic and Elohist narrators. We cannot at all points separate the story completely into its component parts, but only enough to show that there are such component parts. In the Elohist story it was Reuben, the eldest brother, who played the part of protector and friend to Joseph, and who vouched to his father for Benjamin when, for the second time, the brethren went down into Egypt. In the Judæan story it is Judah who plays the same part.

We have, in the story of Joseph, pictures of a new part of the land, almost unknown to the stories of Jacob, Isaac and Abraham. It is in Dothan that the brethren feed their flocks and thither Joseph goes to find them. There he is cast into the pit and sold to the Ishmaelites. Evidently when this story took shape Israel was spreading northward, assimilating the country in the neighborhood of Shechem and beyond. This part of the story is later in principle than the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, which deal with the country southward, and if the representation of the conquest of the land which I gave in the second lecture be correct, this is precisely what we should expect. The Joseph land was occupied at a later period than the land about

Bethel or the land about Hebron, and of necessity the Israelite traditions of the Shechem region are later than those of the territories of Bethel and Hebron. Possibly, too, there is a later element in the long-sleeved tunic, so infelicitously translated in our King James' version "the coat of many colors," which Jacob gives to his favorite son. In contrast with his less favored brethren, Joseph is represented to be the townsman of higher degree. They are the herdsmen, the peasants. One seems to find in this an echo of the wealth, the prosperity and the culture of the Joseph tribes in contrast with the simpler condition of their brethren, whose lot had fallen in a less favored region.

I have already, in the preceding lecture, called attention to the meaning of the Egyptian element in the story of Joseph, and the historic background of that element.

In connecting the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph with Hebron, Beersheba, Bethel and Shechem respectively, I do not mean to say that the patriarchs were originally localized only or absolutely at those shrines, but rather that those were the headquarters, as it were, of the region which connected itself with or worshipped these respective patriarchs; but, as I have endeavored to show, the patriarchs might and did stretch out

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 137

beyond their own regions, precisely as today a great saint may be revered over a large territory, and as the territories of different saints may overlap. So to recur to a former illustration, while the most famous shrine of St. George in Syria is at Kal'at el-Hosn, yet St. George can not be said to be localized at that sanctuary. He is worshipped all over Palestine and Syria. There are, however, certain conditions which lead the explorer to give to Kal'at el-Hosn a special pre-eminence in connection with his worship. So there are appearances which lead us to give the pre-eminence in connection with Isaac to Beersheba, of Abraham to Hebron, of Jacob to Bethel and of Joseph to Shechem; but that does not mean that these great saints of antiquity, if one may use such a phrase, were limited to those places only.

It is my special object to show in this lecture the traces, not only in the stories of these patriarchs, but also in some of the other stories which have come down to us, of the survivals of the legendary and mythical lore of the pre-Israelitic period. Why these survivals in some cases attached themselves to one name and in some cases to another is not altogether clear.

One of the religious practices which Israel found in the land of Canaan at the time of the occupation

was child sacrifice. Of the prevalence of child sacrifice among the Canaanites at a later period we have abundant evidence in the Prophets and the Books of the Kings. So prevalent and well established was the practice that Israel was in constant danger, according to these sources, of adopting into its own religion this, to us, peculiarly horrible and offensive practice. We are told that at various times the practice was common at Jerusalem, and the valley of Gehenna was particularly connected with the immolation of infants to Molech. The idea of the sacrifice of the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul is one of the wide-spread, almost fundamental ideas of fairly primitive man, continuing often in a more refined shape in a higher grade of civilization. So side by side with high and lofty cults in India there lingered on, even after the English conquest of the country, those barbarous and cruel cults which called for sacrifice of children or even of adults. But it was especially in the Canaanite and Syrian regions that this thought of appeasing an angry deity by the sacrifice of human beings seems to have become a prevailing doctrine.

This doctrine has left its impress upon Hebrew law in all its stages. So, underlying the laws regulating animal sacrifice there is the conception of the consecration of the first born to God. All that openeth the

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 139

womb is the property of God. In the Hebrew use, however, it was not actually the first-born child or animal which was of necessity offered to God, but where that was not the case a surrogate must be offered in its stead. So the first-born of man was to be redeemed with a sheep or a goat, and in the case of the first born of the ass, there might be redemption, but if there were no redemption then its neck must be broken. This latter practice represents a form of offering to God by simple killing, which we see also in the *haram* sacrifice, met with particularly in connection with war. A city, a town or even a people was declared *haram*, devoted to God: that is to say, if conquered in battle all living things contained in it must be put to death, and even the inanimate objects might not become the personal spoils of the victors. This slaughter was a sacrifice, a consecration or devotion to God, and of the same nature was the killing of the first-born of the ass which was not redeemed. The first-born belonged to God; it was His right.

Recent archaeological discoveries have given us, apparently, the material evidence of the existence of this practice of child sacrifice in Canaan. At Ta'anach, in the neighborhood of a rock-cut altar, the Austrian explorer, Sellin, found jars containing the bones of children, and only of children. In the

enclosure of the megalithic temple at Gezer, Macalister found similar jars containing, as at Ta'anach, the bones only of children. These jar burials of the bones of infants in connection with an altar or temple can be accounted for, in the belief of these explorers, only on the supposition that they were sacrificial victims.

One of the most striking evidences of the widespread conviction among the Israelites of the efficacy of the sacrifice of the first-born son, whether infant or grown, is afforded by the story of the sacrifice of the son of the king of Moab, in the third chapter of the second book of Kings. Each town or nation believed in the existence of its own special god, to whom it stood in a peculiar relation. At times it became necessary to strengthen the hands of that god, as it were, against the gods of hostile nations, who seemed to be too strong for him, or to arouse his interest, which seemed in some way to have been alienated or diverted. It was the wrath of the divine powers which brought disaster in battle, plague, pestilence and, in general, any misfortune, upon men. Such calamities might be due to the wrath of the god of the town or nation itself. He might be offended, because he had not received that which was his due. Or it might be that the god of that town or people was not able to

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 141

withstand the power of other gods, his adversaries. In the first case it was necessary to appease an offended deity ; in the second to find some means of giving new strength and energy to the national god. In the days of Jehoram, son of Ahab, when the king of Judah was a subject ally of Israel, and Edom in its turn a subject ally of Judah, Moab, under its king, Mesha, revolted and cast off the yoke of Israel. The king of Israel, with his allies, the kings of Judah and Edom, marched into Moab to take vengeance, by the way of Judah and Edom, around the southern end of the Dead Sea. The allies devastated the country and shut up the king of Moab in his stronghold, Kirhareseth, the modern Kerak. The king of Moab was sore pressed. As a last resort, whether to appease his deity, Chemosh, or to strengthen Chemosh's hands against the gods of his adversaries, the kings of Israel, Judah and Edom, Mesha sacrificed on the wall of the city, in sight of the allied hosts, his son and the heir to the throne. The Israelites, Jews and Edomites who beheld the sacrifice were filled with terror, knowing the meaning and the power of this sacrifice and believing that it would so arouse and strengthen the god of Moab that he would become almost, if not quite, irresistible. Accordingly the allied kings were compelled to abandon the siege and withdraw with their purpose unaccomplished.

## Early Hebrew Story

The meaning of the sacrifice of the first-born is, of course, clear, and it is a meaning which appeals, in its principle, even to this day. God demands the best which man has; that which is most precious to him—if possible even more precious to him than himself. Man must appease God by giving Him the very best he has and the very best is the fruit of his body, and chief and highest of that fruit is the first-born son.

Considering the evidence which we have in the Bible of the profound impression produced upon the Israelites in the historic period by the sacrifice of the first-born, and the evidence from the Bible and from archæological sources of the prevalence of that sacrifice among the Canaanites, it would be strange if we should find in the stories of the patriarchs, considering the way in which such stories picture the early life and practices of the people that tells them, no traces of child sacrifice and also of its abandonment. The very argument for the abandonment of such a practice is presented in folklore, not in the form of syllogisms and discussions, but of a story which relates the fact. Such a story is woven into the legends of Abraham and may be regarded as the protest against that sacrifice on the part of precisely that highest prophetic or pre-prophetic element in Israel which is represented



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 143

in the story of Abraham in general. The story itself, contained in the twenty-second chapter of Genesis, is familiar to all. God bids Abraham to take his only son, Isaac, to a certain spot which He indicates and offer him there as a burnt offering. The story assumes that it was a natural thing to do. Abraham accepts it as a command which might be expected from the deity, and travels three days to offer up Isaac at the place indicated. After he has bound him and placed him upon the altar and is about to sacrifice him, an angel voice calls to him, telling him that God will absolve him from the obligation to sacrifice his only begotten son, and he is shown a ram which is to take the place of Isaac as a sacrifice.

This is clearly an etiological story and answers the question: why is it that we sacrifice a ram instead of the first-born? The story, according to the critics, is a part of the Israelite, not the Judæan, narrative. With what locality it was originally connected is not altogether clear. Later interpretation connected it with Jerusalem. The name of the place given in the text as it now stands is Yahaweh-Yireh (or Jireh, to substitute for the Y the J which is so frequently used). A number of critics have made out of this Jeruel, substituting for Yahaweh *el*, and reversing the order of the parts of the compound word, and

suppose it to be some mountain, possibly in the neighborhood of Tekoah. But Jeruel is singularly like Jerusalem. It is, in fact, Jerusalem with the god-name *el* substituted for the god-name *salem*, and the location of Jerusalem would correspond in general with the length of the journey which Abraham is supposed to take from Beersheba, at which place he was then staying. Whatever the locality with which it was originally connected, whether Jerusalem or some spot further southward, it may be regarded as an instance of what has been already explained — the tendency of local legends to connect themselves with the great hero of legend and by that connection to become part of his legend, and so the expression of the people's thought and life in that legend.

The moral character of this story is a very high one and it may be said in passing that the moral character of Israelitic folklore in general presents a most favorable contrast to the folklore of other peoples. It is not my intention in this lecture to deal with the moral value of the stories of Genesis or the inspiration of the Book of Genesis and the early literature of Israel which has come down to us; but even when dealing with the merely historical side, the origin of the legend, its ritual meaning or the survivals in it of heathenism and heathen mythology,

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 145

one cannot altogether avoid the moral element. For whatever their source, the whole point of view of these Israelitic stories is, from our standpoint, moral in contrast with the similar Greek, or Babylonian or Egyptian lore. What we should have found in such lore ascribed to the caprice of the gods, to a blind fate, or to some fantastic and whimsical cause, is in Israelitic law imbued with moral purpose. So in this story the moral purpose of the sacrifice of the first-born is achieved, so far as that sacrifice represents the complete surrender of man to the will of God. Abraham is represented as perfectly obedient. On the other hand, that horror of human sacrifice which we of today feel and which seems to us to be a part of our better natures and of necessity, therefore, an evidence of the evil of the sacrifice itself, is without words recognized. God will not have human sacrifice, but substitutes for the first-born son the ram.

Another of the famous and beautiful stories connected with the name of Abraham represents, primarily, the attempt to explain certain striking, natural phenomena. Very primitive people tend to find a mythological or supernatural explanation of peculiar natural phenomena. To the north of Damascus, on the road to Palmyra, is a salt marsh, the rocks to the east of which are fantastic in their shapes. When I traveled through that country the Arabs

pointed out to me these rocks as men or women turned into salt by God, as punishment for their folly or misdeeds. In fact the story of Lot's wife was told to me with regard to these rocks, precisely as in the Bible it is told of the strange, salty formations to the south of the Dead Sea. More than once, under the guidance of the Arabs of the country, I went to visit strangely shaped rocks in Canaan and in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, which the Arabs assured me were ancient castles or cities, and about some of which they told strange and fantastic tales, but all of which proved, on examination, to be freaks of nature in her fantastic moods. All over the world one finds strange stories and tales told with regard to precisely such formations — stories of ruined cities, stories of men and animals turned to stone. A familiar Greek legend, in some respects not unlike the Hebrew legend of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, is the tale of Philemon and Baucis, and the city which, for its inhospitality, was overwhelmed by the gods and buried beneath the surface of the lake.

One of the most remarkable natural phenomena in the world is the great depression of the Jordan Valley, ending in the Dead Sea. To the dweller on the hills of Palestine, from Bethel southward, this is constantly in the eye and in the mind. One cannot as-

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 147

cent to any height without looking down into the wonderful chasm which cuts the mountains in two and separates the country west of the Jordan from that to the east by a great and almost impassable gulf. It was inevitable, with this great gulf before the eye, that the people of the Judæan highlands should build up stories explanatory of this phenomenon, and that those stories should in some way be brought into connection with the great heroes of the legends of the land. There is no part of the world's surface which is so far depressed beneath the sea level as the Dead Sea, and there is no such chasm as that of the Jordan and Dead Sea anywhere else in the world. Weird, unearthly, it divides the east from the west. As you descend from the plateau of Moab or the mountains of Judæa into that strange gulf, you feel a physical oppression caused by the added weight of atmosphere. A strange effect is produced upon the imagination, also, by the peculiar physical phenomena of the plain of the lower Jordan Valley, of the desolate lake beyond, of the mountains rising barren and almost sheer four thousand feet on either side, an uncanny effect, suggestive of weird events and existences. And consequent, apparently, on this physical and mental depression, there is a moral enervation. Arab tribes which have wandered from the uplands into the lower plain, have, it is said,

without exception, lost both their physical and moral stamina.

All people who have attempted to inhabit the lower Jordan Valley have become utterly corrupt. Hebrew story echoes this fact in the account of the moral corruption of the Moabites, whom Israel found in the Jordan Valley; and there was even danger that Israel would be corrupted by contact with them, as they on their part had been corrupted by the descent from the highlands of the east into the Jordan Valley, through the effect of its climate and contact with its populations. The soil of the valley itself, like all alluvial soils, is rich. Vegetation is abundant wherever there is water. In the neighborhood of Jericho that is to be found in plenty, and in Herod's day Jericho was a garden famous for its richness and fertility. The land is equally rich today, but the people of Jericho and the neighborhood are physically and morally degraded. Inhabiting a rich territory, they are too lazy or too enervated, according to all accounts, to do the simplest work necessary to gather in their harvests. If all reports may be believed, they live for little more than the gratification of their lusts.

The contrast between the fertility of Jericho and the region about it and opposite it on the other side of Jordan, and the utter barrenness of the coun-

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 149

try a few miles further southward, on the shore of the Dead Sea, is one of the striking features of the situation which, to the simple, primitive man, could find explanation only in some action of God or the gods, by which the one portion was rendered absolutely barren, while the other was left fertile. Here in the neighborhood of Jericho all is so luxuriously rich, so aboundingly fertile, while a few miles further south, on the shore of the Dead Sea, there is a scene of utter desolation and death:—no fish in the water, no bird in the air, no tree or shrub about the shore, the mountain sides to east and west absolutely barren. Skeleton trees that have floated down the Jordan are to be seen here and there resting on the surface of the sea, to be tossed up later like petrified fragments on its shore, adding to the general impression of death and destruction. Now and then pieces of a pitch-like substance are observed floating on the surface, or are found on the beach, where the waves have cast them up. Moreover, the water has the strange property, unlike any other water in the country, of bearing even a human being on its surface. It is so impregnated with salts that one cannot drink it, and after bathing in it the skin pricks and burns from its effects. The sea itself is most inhospitable to navigation, not only because there are scant places along its wild

and dreary shores at which a boat can by any possibility land, but also because of the strange storms and currents which render navigation peculiarly dangerous. At the southern end strange shapes of white saline rock suggest, even to the unimaginative, the destruction of houses or cities, and men or animals turned to salt. It would have been a strange thing if no traditions had come down to us endeavoring to explain these peculiar phenomena, recognizing both the physical and the moral facts to which I have called attention in connection with the Dead Sea and the lower Jordan Valley.

The story, as it has come down to us, is connected with Abraham, in whose immediate locality the Dead Sea lay. It is connected, also, with racial traditions of the Moabites and Ammonites—the neighbors who occupied the other shore of the Dead Sea and the Jordan, and with whom Israel came into contact, often hostile, at the fords of the Jordan. The story is contained in the nineteenth and following chapters of Genesis. It is illuminated and adorned by personal and romantic elements, which have no historical or distinctly religious or ritual significance. Of such a character is the fascinating oriental picture of Abraham's attempt to haggle with God, to buy from him the safety of



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 151

Sodom and Gomorrah in the same method in which one buys goods from his neighbor, commencing with one price and cheapening and cheapening until they come to an ultimate agreement. But this is so beautifully told as to be relieved of any gross or coarse element, and to be ethically and morally not only inoffensive, but edifying to the modern reader.

The cause of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is two-fold: the lack of hospitality, a deadly sin in the Orient,—the same sin which in the Greek legend of Philemon and Baucis brought about the destruction of the city — and the immorality of the country. I have already called attention to the fact that from time immemorial immorality seems to have been characteristic of the conditions of the Jordan Valley. The particular form of immorality here mentioned is described again under other circumstances in connection with the destruction of the Benjaminites for the sin of Gibeah, in the nineteenth and following chapters of the Book of Judges. It is a wickedness which is horribly prevalent to this day in the East and in Palestine, and the abhorrence with which it is treated in the Hebrew narrative is one of the best evidences of the essentially elevated and pure character of Hebrew religious thought.

The contrast between the desolate Dead Sea and its environments and the fertile region of Jericho, is explained by the destruction of the cities of the plain by God for their wickedness, and the particular method of the destruction is itself suggested by the phenomena which are to be observed from time to time in that region, the outbreak of inflammable gases, and oil and naphtha eruptions. The connection of Moab and Ammon with the region is expressed in the further story of the escape of Lot, which is bound up with the legend as it has come down to us. Here, again, the purer moral attitude of the Israelite finds offense in what was evidently, in its origin, a story not of shame but of honor.

It must be understood that, in the case of such a story as that of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the deliverance of Lot and his daughters, we can do little more than suggest a foundation for the legend. For the method in which the story grows and for its present details we can give analogies and show how elsewhere, in similar manner, stories very realistic in character have grown out of some strange physical feature which had to be accounted for to the satisfaction of the people. I have suggested the reason why this story, which pertains properly not to Abraham, but to Lot, should be connected with the Abraham

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 153

legend. There are incidental features in the story, like the deliverance of the region of Zoar, which are probably to be explained in connection with the physical phenomena of the region itself. Why was there this little oasis of Zoar, where all else was devastation? It was the place preserved for the refuge of Lot. Again, the story of Lot's dwelling in a cave is apparently to be connected with a legend of the period. It is to be presumed that an individual cave of that region was pointed out as the cave of Lot. It is, of course, possible that historical events and incidents are woven in with this story, as in the case of similar legendary material elsewhere. Scientists have called attention to the gas explosions, the naphtha eruptions and the consequent conflagrations of a minor character which might be expected in a region of such a physical conformation as the Dead Sea country, and precisely as in the case of the Babylonian flood legend the color and possibly largely the conception of the story are due to the actual fact of local floods, so the coloring of this story and even the suggestion of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah may be due to the fact of actual explosions and conflagrations of a volcanic character in the lower Jordanic and Dead Sea region.

This was not the only story which connected itself

with the Dead Sea region and the destruction of cities in that neighborhood, apparently for their wickedness. About the middle of the eighth century B.C. we find Hosea referring to the destruction of Admah and Zeboim (XI, 8). Indeed it was to be supposed that such conditions as those existing in the Dead Sea region would give rise to various legends. We shall see that the story of Eden appeared in more than one form in Jewish tradition, and that besides the cosmogonies which we have in the Book of Genesis there were current among the Jews other cosmogonies and cosmogonic legends. The material in our Book of Genesis represents only a part of the great mass of early tradition and story current among the Hebrews.

Attention has already been called in a previous lecture to the relation of Moab and Ammon to Lot. They are descendants of Lot, in the sense that they occupied the country of Lot or Lotan, the primitive name of the region east of the Dead Sea, as we learn from the Egyptian inscriptions. Very close relation to Israel is recognized in this story, which makes Lot a kinsman of Abraham, and still more, perhaps, in the fact that the local legend of the birth of those two nations has been woven into the Hebrew story of Abraham. In the primitive form of the legend of the origin of Moab and Ammon, it would

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 155

seem as though the story of the destruction which befell the cities of the plain must have been, like the story of the Flood, understood as a universal destruction. Lot and his two daughters, of all living things, escaped. Now, there was no greater shame or disgrace that could befall man or woman than to die childless. To avert such a calamity any means of any sort might be taken. This same conception shows itself here and there in stories of other primitive peoples, as, for example, in the Germanic *Wölsungenlied*. What would be shameful under other circumstances is heroic under such conditions. There is also a further conception which shows itself perhaps most characteristically in the Egyptian royal marriages, the idea of purity of blood. In Egyptian royal use purity of blood was essential, and was reckoned especially on the woman's side. A brother might marry his sister, and, in fact, must do so in order to transmit the blood of the race pure and undefiled. It was a common boast of ancient races or nations that their blood was pure, and to preserve that purity intermarriage with other peoples was forbidden.

Both these facts find expression in the story of the birth of Moab and Ammon from Lot as father and his two daughters as mothers of the two nations respectively, and the names of the nations themselves are

here explained by those curious etymologies which represented so much reality to the ancient mind and which are so constantly cited in the Old Testament as evidence of the facts of the legend narrated. The eldest daughter called her son Moab, born "from the father" (Me-ab), and the younger daughter called her son Ben-Ammi, "son of my kinsman," which, in sound certainly, comes close to the familiar Bene-Ammon. This story was not originally a story of any shameful deed, nor was the descent of Moab and Ammon from such an ancestry a dishonorable descent, but quite the contrary. It was a claim that they were pure-blooded, above all the people about them, unmixed with foreign elements, and the deeds of their ancestresses, which gave them birth, were deeds of tragic heroism. The later Israelite and Jewish thought, with its newer and higher moral conceptions, came to regard the deed and the story which related it as shameful. Something of this later feeling shows itself in the form of the legend as it has come down to us in Genesis. A fuller expression of that sentiment of abhorrence we find in the occasional references to this story elsewhere in Hebrew literature.

In the matter of racial relations, the legend of Abraham was much richer than that of Isaac or Jacob. There is one story, or perhaps better gene-

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 157

alogy (Gen. XI, 28, ff., XV, 7) connecting Abraham with Terah, and his city Haran, and ultimately with Ur of the Chaldees. This represents a historical fact, of a connection with Haran and Ur, but that connection is rather a connection of religion and civilization than a real connection of race. Attention has already been called to the fact that Babylonian civilization dominated Palestine from a very early period onward until the close of the 15th century B. C., and even beyond. It left its traces in the names and worship of various gods. It gave the Canaanites their mythology and their cosmogony, which became in turn the foundation of the Hebrew cosmogony. As a comparison of the recently discovered Laws of Hammurabi with Hebrew laws shows, Babylonia influenced the legislation of Palestine from that early period onward. It might in fact well be said that Palestine was a descendant of Babylonia, not in the literal sense of descent of blood, but in the equally real sense of descent of thought, religion and civilization, and this is precisely what is represented in this story of the descent of Abraham from Haran, who came out of Ur of the Chaldees. Haran was the city of Mesopotamia famous for its worship of the god Sin, and through its cult of that divinity standing in peculiarly close relations to Ur in Babylonia. Babylo-

nian and Assyrian inscriptions recognize repeatedly this relationship. Ur and Haran were the two great cities of the worship of the moon-god, Sin. Ur was the primitive home of that worship, Haran its later rival in the same cult.

It is the Judæan tradition which has preserved to us this connection of Abraham through Haran with Ur, the seat of the worship of Sin. It is the Judæan tradition which represents Sinai, that is, the place of the God Sin, as the sacred mountain of the Israelites, in which God revealed Himself and from which He gave the law. It is particularly with this region of the south that Abram is connected in the stories of Genesis, and in the Judæan narrative he is represented as the parent of the tribes which inhabit the territory about Sinai. His genealogy, as given here, establishes a peculiar connection with the two great shrines of the moon-god in Mesopotamia and Babylonia; and in the Judæan narrative he stands in a similar relation to what was evidently in primitive times a famous seat of the same worship south of Palestine.

There are further indications of a primitive connection with the worship of the moon in the names which occur in this genealogy. The sons of Terah are Abraham, Nahor and Haran. Haran, as stated, is the famous city of that name in Mesopotamia,



the seat of the worship of the god Sin. Nahor and Abram are brought into connection with that same worship in the names of their wives, Milkah and Sarah, which are titles of the goddess who was associated with Sin at Haran, and presumably, also, at Ur. We have here a survival of a mythological connection, the fact of which is preserved in this genealogy and these names, but the meaning of which had been altogether lost at a very early period, so that the story was told among the Hebrews without offense, precisely as, at a later date, the story of Mordecai and Esther became, without offense to Jewish monotheism, a part of the religious legend and belief of Judaism. Sinai ceased to be the place where Sin was worshipped; it became the dwelling place of Yahaweh. The tradition of the connection of the worship at Sinai with that of Haran and Ur survived as the tradition of a lineal descent of Abraham from ancestors who had migrated from Ur to Haran, whence he himself migrated to Palestine; and the goddess with whom he was associated in the old heathen legend, an indication of his relation to the Sin cult, became a person, his wife, and the ancestress of the Hebrew nation.

There is another story in Genesis (XIV) which brings Abraham into connection with Babylonia, so

different from the surrounding material in its main element that critics assign it to none of the documents traceable in the Book of Genesis, such as the Yahawist, the Elohist and the Priest Code, but set it apart by itself. This episode is cast in the time of Amraphel, king of Shinar. Amraphel has been identified with Hammurabi, the famous king of Babylonia who drove out the Elamites and secured the hegemony, or rather the dominion of all Babylonia for Babylon, raising that city to a position of political and religious predominance, which it continued to hold for many centuries. He was the author or compiler of a code of laws which profoundly affected all future legislation in Babylonia and Assyria, and even in the civilized Semitic world to the west of those regions, Syria and Palestine. He was, in short, one of the great characters of history, an epoch-making man. The Babylonian name, Hammurabi, does not at first sight seem to be the same as Amraphel, principally because it lacks the divine suffix, *el*, or *ilu*, which has been added to the Hebrew form of the name. The Babylonian form corresponding to Amraphel would be Hammurabi-elu. The omission of the divine suffix is a phenomenon we have already encountered too many times to make more comment necessary. With that exception the names are, according to

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 161

phonetic laws, the same. The Shinar, of which Amraphel was king, is identical with Sumer, of which and Akkad Hammurabi of Babylon was king.

With Amraphel are mentioned three other kings. Of these the first, Arioch, king of Ellasar, seems to be identical with Eriaku, king of Larsa, a contemporary of Hammurabi, and the special representative in Babylonia of Elamite dominion. The name itself appears to be Elamite. Chedorlaomer represents clearly the cuneiform Kudurlagamar, a name of good Elamite formation. Tidal, king of nations (in the Hebrew, *Goiim*), is apparently Tidhulu, king of Gutium. The corruption in the Hebrew text is a natural one. The representation that at that period the Elamites were the dominant power in Babylonia, and that these various kings were subject kings of the Elamite over-lord, is entirely in accordance with the facts of history. A raid by these kings into the west land to punish recalcitrant vassals, collect tribute, etc., would have been a natural event, quite in accordance with what we know from historical records to have taken place at that period. The period of these events would have been the 23d century B. C., just before that revolt against Elamitic supremacy, at the head of which stood Hammurabi, which resulted in driving out the Elamites and making him lord of all Babylonia.

These four kings are represented as having met and defeated five kings of the Jordan Valley and the neighboring country, sacked the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, and carried off as a prisoner Lot, Abraham's nephew. Then Abram, the Hebrew, gathered together his trained men, three hundred and eighteen in all, pursued them, fell upon them by night, smote them, rescued his brother Lot, recaptured the stolen goods and returned. On his way back he met Melchizedek, king of Salem, or Jerusalem, and paid him tribute from the booty, returning the remainder, less the immediate expenses of his followers, to the plundered kings.

Now the names of the four kings in this narrative are either names actually known from the Babylonian inscriptions as the names of kings of the regions represented, or, if not actually occurring as names of kings of that period, they are at least perfectly natural and proper as such names. The general conditions of Babylonia as here represented are historically and politically accurate, and such a raid into the westland as that here described is quite in accordance with the conditions which we know to have prevailed in the 23d century B. C. On the other hand, the representation of the defeat of the four kings by Abraham is quite out of keeping with the account given elsewhere of

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 163

Abraham as a wandering herdman, with headquarters in the neighborhood of Hebron, journeying back and forth through the country. It has been suggested that some later writer, having before him in a Babylonian text the account of the raid of Chedorlaomer, made out of it a sort of novelette, combining unrelated, historical events drawn from the Babylonian texts with the Hebrew heroic legends of Abraham. As there are elements of local color in the narrative, which point to a close connection of the narrator with the region, it would seem that if anything of this sort were done, it must have been done at an early period.

It seems to me more probable that we have here a reminiscence of actual events rather than a romance compounded out of cuneiform texts and Canaanite legends. The difficulty which critics have found with the narrative as history has been the impossibility of Abraham, a herdman, attacking and defeating these four kings. If it be remembered that Abraham was the great hero, around whom all sorts of national events affecting both the pre-Israelitic and also the Israelite inhabitants of southern Palestine clustered, this difficulty will be removed, and we may fairly argue that we have in this chapter the remembrance of an actual

historical event: the defeat, under the lead of the people of southern Palestine, of the Elamite Babylonian invaders, by a night attack, after the latter had overrun Lotan and the cities of the plain, carrying off much plunder, including the kindred of the men of Hebron and the surrounding region. What I have already said must be remembered: that, as these stories have come down to us in the form of a personal narrative, there is much of detail mixed in which is not itself historical or pertinent to the historical narrative. All that we can, as a rule, hope to understand from stories of this description, is certain main incidents. So in this story the origin and bearing of the episode of Melchizedek is not altogether clear. The name of the king and his city fit in a way with what we know of the early history of Jerusalem from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, but the incident seems to have been so colored with later religio-mystical ideas about Jerusalem, that the historical element is veiled beyond recognition.

It has been noted that when we come to the consideration of racial conditions the stories of Abraham are much fuller and richer than those of Isaac and Jacob. We have in Abraham a connection with all those southern tribes, with whom, in point of fact, Hebron and the territory of Judah

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 165

stood in closest contact and relationship. It will be remembered that the account of the settlement of Judah, in Judges I, represents that tribe as containing non-Judæan elements which came in from the south, and especially that Hebron and the region about and to the south of it was settled by the Calebites and other kindred peoples. This connection with the tribes to the south is recognized in Abraham's tradition and confirms the suggestion already made that in its origin that tradition connected itself first and foremost with the neighborhood and shrine of Hebron. But when the Hebrews had adopted the people and the traditions of that region and found in Abraham a forefather, it was natural that the traditions which belonged properly to other shrines or other sections of the country occupied by them, should also be told in connection with Abraham. As ancestor of all, he is to be connected with all, and the Judæan narrative legitimizes, so to speak, the worship at the sacred oak of Moreh at Shechem, and the sacred stones at Bethel by stories connecting them with Abraham. This it is, I think, which accounts for the appearance of Abraham in connection with Beersheba, with Bethel and with Shechem.

Next in importance to the tradition of Abraham is that of Jacob, and he, also, for the same reason,

is connected not only with Bethel, but also, though to a less extent, with other sacred places. He has his origin in Beersheba (Gen. XXVIII, 10), the relation of which to historical fact and the religious practice of a later date has been already commented on. He is also connected with Shechem, where, according to the Elohist (Gen. XXXIII, 30), he set up an altar and called it El-Elohe-Israel. In the Book of Judges we find various mentions of a sacred place and apparently a temple at Shechem, ascribed indiscriminately to El-Berith and Baal-Berith. The statement of the Elohist appears to bring Jacob into connection with the foundation of the worship at that site. In another passage, also in the Elohist narrative, Jacob is described as hiding the strange gods and the earrings, which were always devotional objects, under the sacred oak at Shechem. While the story clearly connects him in some way with this sacred tree, it is not altogether clear what its real meaning is or its relation to the religious life of the people. It may represent some historical occurrence. Jacob is also brought into connection with two sacred places east of the Jordan, namely, Mahanaim and Peniel (Gen. XXXII, 1 f. and 24 ff.). How and why these two places were originally sacred, with what names they were originally connected, and what was the character of the worship



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 167

there conducted, we do not know. Whatever that sanctity, and whatever the early tradition, both holy places were, at an early date, brought into connection with the story of Jacob, precisely in the same way in which various shrines in Syria of diverse origin have been brought into connection with St. George. The meaning of the name Mahanaim is explained, after the manner of etymological myths, as evidence that the hosts of God, the angels, met Jacob at this place. With the exception of this brief fragment, the legend, whatever it was, about Mahanaim, has been lost.

Penuel or Peniel is similarly explained by an etymological myth as meaning the face or presence of God. It is the place where Jacob met God face to face, and the origin of a sacrificial usage of the Israelites is also brought into connection with the same event. It was because God touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh when he met and wrestled with Him at Penuel that the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the hip, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, to this day.

Jacob is also brought into connection with the heap of witness at Gilead and Mizpah. From the story (Gen. XXXI, 44 ff.) it would appear that this was one of those ancient stone monuments, a circle or alignment or a mere formless heap or heaps of

stones, which were regarded as sacred and which, by tradition or agreement, had come to be regarded as the boundary line between Aramæans and Israelites. The authorship of this monument, which possessed, of course, a sacred character and was, like all monuments of that sort, a place of vows certainly, and probably of sacrifice, is ascribed to Jacob, who, with his brethren, gathered stones and made a heap and sacrificed there at the heap, and made with Laban, the mythical, semi-divine hero of Aram, a covenant that this should be the boundary line between Aram and Israel. Historically this would point to an early period, for in the time of Ahab, in the 9th century B. C., this had long ceased to be the boundary line. The Aramæans had occupied a considerable portion of Gilead, and even crossed the Jordan and invaded western Palestine. This story looks back, therefore, to a traditional, geographical relation between Aram and Israel, long antedating the 9th century B. C. This and the story of the relations of Israel and Edom, told under the names of Jacob and Esau, seem to represent the traditions of an early time and the conditions of the Israelites in the period before they occupied the country west of the Jordan, when they were brought into rivalry and unfriendly contact with Edomites and Aramæans, in the struggle of all for place and

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 169

land. The struggle with Edom and the characterization of the heroes of the two peoples in Esau and Jacob, as related in this narrative, is a fine expression of what one might call the opposing, unconscious views which were to be developed in the national histories of the two peoples.

Indirectly, in the narrative of the Elohist, Jacob is connected with two famous *wells*, — to apply a modern term to things ancient — of the Israelite period, namely, the Tomb of Rachel and the Tomb of Deborah. To the former (Gen. XXXV, 19 f.), which has possibly maintained its sanctity to the present day, reference has already been made. The second, the tomb or *wely* of Deborah, has a different history (Gen. XXXV, 8). Deborah was according to this story the nurse of Rebekah, Jacob's mother, and her name was connected with an oak below Bethel which was called Allon-Bacuth. In the story of Deborah, in the Book of Judges (Judges IV, 5), this same place is brought into connection with that heroine. She dwelt, we are told, under the palm tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Bethel, on Mt. Ephraim. Here we have a phenomenon which is common enough everywhere, where the same place belongs to different persons or saints of the same name. To the popular mind these are one, but the stories told show frequently

that we have two or more characters combined under one name.

I have already suggested the probable original connection of Milkah and Sarah, the wives of Abraham and his brother Nahor, with the goddesses associated with the god Sin at Haran. Laban, Jacob's father-in-law, is apparently connected with the same moon worship, the word Laban itself, which is kindred to Lebanon, the name of the famous mountains, meaning moon. This is one of those survivals which proves the original existence in these tales of a mythological element, of which in their present form, however, we see but vague and dim traces. That they were told first among a polytheistic people, that gods and goddesses played a part in them, would in itself seem probable, and these traces serve to show that such was actually the case. But so thoroughly were they cleansed in their reproduction and growth under the Israelites of everything of this sort, so thoroughly have they been remoulded into the monotheistic thought of Israel, that we find no more than traces or suggestions of the original polytheistic element, the mere shadows of myths. Similarly, while we have in some of the names which have come down to us in these early stories, like Leah, the wild cow, Rachel, the ewe, perhaps Ephraim, the bull, and others, sug-

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 171

gestions of a primitive totemistic conception, yet that totemism is a thing of the very remote past, only discernible, if at all, in a few names and possibly a couple of ritual practices.

The stories of the patriarchs, as they have come down to us, are singular for their freedom from these coarser and more material elements, which continued to exist and play a great rôle in the much more highly developed and, in some respects, more philosophic, religious doctrines and practices of Egypt and Babylonia. These stories as they have come down to us are peculiar, also, for their moral elevation, their purity of thought and their freedom from any of the abominations of the Canaanite religion which we know exercised at this period and much later a great influence on the religious practice and belief of the Israelites themselves. While we have from the books of the Kings and the Prophets testimony that, even to a late period, polytheism, child worship and sexual immorality, as a religious rite, were commonly practised among the worshippers of Yahaweh, pervading the very precincts of the sanctuary at Jerusalem, we find these old stories so free from the profanation of such religious rites and practices that what traces of them are discernible are due almost, one may say, to microscopic dissection. It has already been said that these

stories, as they have come down to us in the Yahawistic and Elohist narratives, represent folklore, not the conceptions of individual moralists, philosophers, prophets and reformers standing apart from the people, but the thought of the people itself. They are, therefore, a peculiarly valuable testimony to us of the existence among the Israelites from a very early period of a mass of people imbued with a popular, not philosophical, monotheistic idea, with a lofty moral conception of God, and with an ethical code enormously in advance of that of the peoples about them.

These patriarchal stories were connected especially, as has been pointed out, with the great shrines of Hebron, Beersheba and Bethel. The later religion, the religion of the Prophets, from Isaiah's time onward, connected itself with Jerusalem. Whether in the original stories of the patriarchs we have any trace of Jerusalem is not altogether clear. Two passages in the legend of Abraham connect themselves in their present form with this place,—the story of Abraham and Melchizedek, king of Salem, that is, Jerusalem, in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, and the story of the sacrifice of Isaac in the twenty-second chapter. It may be that the latter, and perhaps both, were worked in in the latest handling, after Jerusalem had become

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 173

the center of worship. My own inclination is to suppose that the references are original and are evidence that Jerusalem was recognized as a sacred place at an early period and brought into connection with the story of Abraham on the principle which I have already explained. However this may be, Jerusalem certainly played no great part in the early period. It gave no heroic name, no mass of myth and legend to the Hebrews. When the Israelites conquered Jerusalem it was for them a place at least relatively indifferent—the city of the Jebusites. When the Israelite palladium, the ark, about which Israelite tradition and worship from Moses' time onward centered, was placed at Jerusalem, it was brought into connection with no great name which had already assumed a legendary connection with Israel, like that of Abraham or Isaac or Jacob. The ground was practically free for the establishment of a worship which should center itself about the ark, free from local traditions, a place where the Israelite could make his religion, as it were, anew, not building upon local foundations. This local dissociation of the political and religious center established by David from the sites of the great traditions of the past helped those traditions to assume the form which they have assumed of a story of the past life of Israel common to all, not

partisan in final shape, as it were, to one place or another, freed largely in this final form even from definite association with the places and shrines with which the stories were first connected. But before this stage was reached these stories themselves, partly through the original importance of the shrines which they represented, partly through the greater skill or effectiveness of the narrators who told the stories of these particular sanctuaries, had become so popular that the stories and traditions of other shrines were absorbed in them, as I have already endeavored to explain.

This is a practice familiar in the religious development of other countries. In India, in Egypt, in Babylonia, in Greece, in Italy, a god dominating, through the political supremacy of the place which he represents, or for some other cause, a larger region or the whole country, absorbs the names, the attributes and the cults of various gods in other places. Sometimes traces of the original divergence of cult continue to exist in peculiar traditions or stories connected with the god at one place, which do not appear at another. Often we can observe religious strata, some of them the result of political events, others of the activities of great religious reformers. In Babylonia and Egypt we have first the cult by dif-



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 175

ferent towns or nomes of different gods, the patrons of those places. An association of these towns or nomes led next to an association of the gods, so that in each town more than one god was worshipped. Then the god of the chief town or nome tended to become the chief god of the whole association, to absorb into himself the other gods and their attributes. There was a still further development which led men to speak of one god as though he possessed all power and all attributes, as though he were the god of all; but in the same or the next breath a number of different gods are recognized or the same powers and attributes are ascribed to some other god of the pantheon. In Babylonia, with the development of the power of Babylon, the name, the attributes and the legends of En-Lil, the Bel of Nippur, were transferred to Marduk, or Merodach, the Bel of Babylon. It was originally Bel En-lil of Nippur who contended with the dragon and slew him, as the champion of the gods, who brought order out of chaos and the like. In the later period, from about 2200 B. C. onward, it was Marduk of Babylon who did all this.

The same phenomena we find in the development and transfer of the worship of Christian saints in Syria, Asia Minor and Europe. I have already called attention to the peculiar dominance of St.

George in the worship of Syria. In actual practice there exists today among the Moslems, Christians and Jews of Palestine and Syria, that is, the common people, a nominal monotheism, combined with a practical polytheism, and one can often best understand the peculiar phenomena which we meet in the early pages of the Bible by a study of the present day religious phenomena in Palestine and Syria. One shrine assumes a peculiar importance. The saint of that shrine, for some reason not always clear, dominates the region and absorbs the attributes, the stories and the cults of other saints and other shrines. In part the tales of those other shrines pass altogether out of existence, leaving behind no trace or only a faint trace in names or curious and unexplained practices and the like. In part these tales continue on, embodied in the tales of the dominant saints or heroes.

Traces, survivals of the same conditions, we have found in the tales of the heroes of Hebron, Beer-sheba, Bethel and Shechem — the altar which Abraham sets up here, the *massabah* erected there, the statement that here God appeared, there such and such a patriarch annointed a stone, here was the tomb of his wife, and there, under yonder oak, he buried the gods and the divine symbols which he had brought with him from a foreign land. Such

## Survivals — Legendary, Mythical 177

fragmentary notices as the appearance of the angels at Mahanaim, or longer tales, like the story of the wrestling with God at Penuel, are the survivals of older local legends and traditions which have been absorbed in the great legend cycles of those who have become the patron saints, if one may so express it, of Israel, the patriarchs of Bible story.

There are, however, a few survivals of the traditions of ancient sanctuaries which were not absorbed in the stories of these patriarchs, but which are retained in another form, generally woven into historical narratives. Such, for instance, is the story of Jephthah's daughter. For her the women go and mourn upon the mountains at a certain season, precisely as women elsewhere mourned for Tammuz. We have here one of those mourning rites connected with the death of a demi-god or goddess, or hero or heroine, which appear at many places, and which here, as is so often the case, was ultimately brought into connection with historical events ; for I presume that the bulk of Jephthah's history, at least that part surrounding the hero, Jephthah, who led the Israelites east of the Jordan against their foes, whether those were Ammonites or Moabites, may be unquestionably accepted as fact. The fact of the sacrifice of a maiden might in itself be true, but it is suspiciously like a class of stories with which we are all familiar,

such as the Greek story of Agamemnon and Iphigenia, or, in principle, the fairy tale of "Beauty and the Beast," where the father vows that he will sacrifice the first thing that meets him on his return home, which first thing turns out to be his daughter. There are certain characteristics which appear over and over again in folklore, and which often make a tale, supposed to be historical, suspicious, because they are characteristic of folklore. Characteristic of folklore, for example, as we know it in Germanic story, as well as in the East, is the exaltation of the youngest son. The father has various sons and the youngest son, whom all put upon and despise, turns out to be the one to do great things, just as in the story of Jacob and his children. So, also, the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, while in itself quite possible, is strikingly like an episode which appears in the folklore of many peoples. Moreover, the mourning of the women on the mountains for Jephthah's daughter is clearly a survival and reminiscence of some early pre-Israelite cult.

I have already suggested that the story of Samson contains legendary and mythical elements. The very name Samson, "man of Shamash," the sun-god, is in itself *prima facie* evidence of some connection with the cult of Shamash (Shemesh in our Old Testament). The country in which Samson

played his part was the country about Beth Shemesh, a name still preserved in the ruin mound of Ain-Shems, the shrine of the sun god. It has been suggested that the story of the shearing of the locks of Samson, by which he was deprived of his strength, is mythical, connected with a sun myth, but if it had any such connection that connection must have been early lost. The story as we now have it is one which has as its motive the emphasis and exaltation of the Nazarite vow and the Nazarite ritual. The Nazarite vow was clearly an old ritual custom that existed in Canaan before the time of Israel. It played a not unimportant part in later Israelite ritual and law, but its origin is much older than the Israelite period. With the mythical elements contained in this story of Samson there are mingled also recollections of historical events, the struggle with the invading Philistines, so that we have here myth, legend and history combined.

The Samson story, or legend, or, better, perhaps, cycle of legends, has a distinct character of its own, different from that of any of the other legends familiar among the Hebrews. From the point of view of folklore it is one of the most fascinating tales in the Bible, full of glimpses into the customs and practices of the people, and quite

equal to the story of Jacob in its wit and merriment.

We have here some excellent specimens of the folk-riddles which were so prominent a feature in the life and thought of early times and are still a familiar element of modern oriental life. In connection with one of these riddles we have a rude, strong couplet which affords a characteristic specimen of the early folk-poetry :

“ If ye had not ploughed with my cow  
Ye had not found my riddle now.”

Another similar couplet is woven into a characteristic etymological legend, the explanation of the name of the place Lehi, which seems to be the word jaw-bone, by a story which describes the heroic strength of Samson, who overcomes the superior forces of the hostile Philistines with no other weapon than the jaw-bone of an ass :

“ With the jaw-bone of an ass, mass upon mass,  
With the jaw-bone of an ass I have killed ten thousand men.”

The student of early customs also finds in Samson's story much that is interesting. Samson's marriage to the Philistine wife, whom he visits only from time to time, with a present of a kid, is a survival of that ancient custom of marriage in which a woman remained with her tribe or clan, the children also belonging to her clan. In such marriage the

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 181

husband often came to his wife secretly, so that the identity of the husband was almost, if not quite, unknown to the other members of her clan, and regularly with a present.

In the episode of Delilah and Samson one cannot help but be suspicious of a mythical element. But an element of another nature also enters in. Attention has been called to the immoral worship, the sexual cult, so pronounced a characteristic of Canaanite religion, and, for that matter, of Babylonian also. The newly discovered Babylonian code of Hammurabi contains laws about women devoted to what we should consider a life of shame, as a constituent part of the religious system connected with certain shrines. They were half held in honor for the life they led as servants of the god or goddess, half regarded as creatures of dishonor. The same conditions of sexual cult prevailed in Palestine, as is clear, among other things, from the statements of the Hebrew prophets. That the Israelites, to a large extent, adopted in this regard the customs and ideas of the people among whom they were settled is clear, not only from the frequent denunciations of this worship in the Prophets, but also from the historical statements of the Books of the Kings. Such worship crept into the very Temple of Yahaweh at Jeru-

salem, so that we find mention in the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah of both male and female prostitutes consecrated to the service of a goddess, evidently Ishtar or Ashtaroth, having their shrine and apparently also their abode within the Temple limits. In view of these facts, it would be strange if we should find no traces of such conditions in early folklore. The stern and exalted morality characteristic of these stories has left us, however, little more than traces, and those faint. One of the survivals of tales connected with this sex worship we have, I presume, in the story of Samson and Delilah; with which one is tempted to compare such stories as that of Gilgamesh and Ishtar in the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic. Another survival there may be in what seems to us a very offensive and strange episode in Genesis (XXXVIII, 3 ff.)—how Tamar played the harlot with Judah. Possibly, also, the same thing lies behind the story of Rahab, the harlot of Jericho, in the book of Joshua.

There is a survival of this sexual cult in another form in the oath which Abraham exacted of his servant, with his hand upon his genitals (Gen. XXIV, 2). The thought behind this is, after all, the same in principle as the thought which originally connected itself with those pillars (*massabah*)



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 183

which are so frequently mentioned in Genesis, and which formed an integral part of the Yahaweh cult itself, in the conception of the best minds in Israel, as late as the time of Isaiah. Both the pillars and the oath suggest the meaning which originally attached to such a cult, expressing itself by worship offered to a stone of phallic shape, the use of phallic symbols as oblations, the oath by the organs of reproduction, and finally in prostitution itself as a ritual act. It was in the reproduction of life that men found the most wonderful exhibition of divine activity, and so the function of reproducing life became a sort of sacrament, a divine mystery, and the organs of reproduction symbols and, in a sense, representations of the divine power in primitive times the world over. Primarily there was nothing obscene or immoral in this; in practice it tended to become a vile debauchery. Similarly the sacrifice of a woman's virtue in the name of religion and the cult of a goddess, was not primarily a service of lust. It was of the same nature as the sacrifice of the first-born, the offering to the deity of one's best and most precious possession. In practice it was a lewd and debasing cult, and as such condemned in Israel from a very early period, in striking contrast with its exaltation or condonation in the religions of kindred and neighboring peoples,

otherwise in a far more advanced stage of civilization, thought and social development.

I have suggested a possible explanation of the story of Rahab in the book of Joshua, which brings it into connection with the practices of the sexual cult. The name itself suggests the cosmogonic myth. The name appears in Isaiah, Psalms and Job (as, for example, Isaiah LI, 9; Psalms LXXXIX, 10; Job XXVI, 12), as the name of a great monster which inhabits the deep and represents the powers of darkness and chaos. With this monster the divine power is continually in strife. He smites it and makes out of it heaven and earth. He slays it, and whether as Egypt or as Babylon, gives it as food to His people. It is the enemy of good and as such is identified with the enemies of Israel. It is anything that represents the power of darkness or evil; for this Rahab is evidently also identical with the leviathan, the behemoth, and the dragon which are mentioned in other Biblical passages (as, for instance, Psalms LXXIV, 12; CIV, 26; Job XL; Isaiah XXVII, 1; Job VII, 12; Ezekiel XXIX, 3). The same monster under various names, generally as a dragon, appears also in apocryphal and ultimately Christian literature. This is the dragon of the book of Revelation, the great enemy who is cast out of heaven by Michael,

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 185

the representative of the powers of light. Presumably it is the same dragon which plays a part in what we may call Christian mythology as the antagonist of St. George.

This monster is of Babylonian origin, where it plays an important part in cosmogonic myths. It is chaos and the powers of darkness. It is by the victory over this monster that Bel-Marduk makes the world and brings order out of confusion, light out of darkness. He splits the dragon in two, of half of him he forms the heavens and of the other half the earth. But this monster appears not only in the creation myth. The fight between light and darkness is continual. One of the most famous representations which have come down to us from the Babylonian religious art is a *bas relief* representing the battle between Bel and the dragon. That contest in one form or another was celebrated in numerous myths and tales. These passed over to the Canaanites during the long period of Babylonian supremacy and became a part of their literary property and religious concept. Through them later the Israelites made acquaintance with these conceptions of mythical monsters, through whom eclipses, earthquakes and the like were brought to pass, who represented the powers of darkness, confusion and

chaos with which the divine power was in constant conflict. But in place of the mythological element of the Canaanite and Babylonian tales, the Hebrew substituted the conception of the power of God only.

Nevertheless, there is evidence in the part which the angels and saints play in this conflict in the later Hebrew and Christian literature and legends, that in the mind of the great mass of the people the story never lost its mythological character, just as in the minds of the great mass of people the pure monotheism of the Hebrew or Christian religion was diluted with distinctly polytheistic ideas and cults. The references in the Prophets, Psalms, Hagiographa and Apocrypha show the survival of these ancient myths as a part certainly of the popular religion. Many other instances of the survival of older heathen and mythological conceptions, and even of fetishistic and polytheistic practices, could be given from the ritual laws in Leviticus and Numbers, and from the allusions in prophetic and other later books. But the object of these lectures is not to deal with those elements in the later literature, but to study the early stories of Israel, as contained in the folklore particularly of Genesis and Judges, with a view to establishing the meaning of those stories and their historical and religious bearing.

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 187

I have referred to the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah. The revelation made in the Book of Kings, in the narrative of those reforms (2 Kings, XVIII, 4; XXIII, 6 ff.), of the objects worshipped and the character of worship in the temple is rather startling to one who has not read the earlier history between the lines. We find depicted a condition of polytheism. Surrounding and connected with the shrine of the great god, the special god of Israel, Yahaweh, were the shrines of other gods and goddesses, precisely as in the Babylonian temples. There were horses consecrated to the service of the sun god, a shrine of Ashtoreth, devoted to the foul worship to which I referred a moment since, and, among other things, a brazen serpent called Nehushtan. Whether the worship of this serpent was at all connected with the mythological ideas regarding Rahab, the great monster of the deep, I do not know; but one thing stands out — the connection of this worship of the serpent in the temple with the story of the brazen serpent, which we find in the Book of Numbers (Numbers XXI, 7 ff.).

This serpent worship was accounted for by a story which connected itself, it will be observed, not with Abraham or Jacob or Isaac, but with Moses, the great religious leader, through whose influence Israel was ultimately brought to be

a monotheistic people. To him was ascribed the symbol of the serpent, which, it was said, he set up in the wilderness, at a time when the people were in danger from a plague of fiery serpents which had attacked the camp. This is at least testimony to the fact that the origin of the worship was lost in antiquity, and that the symbol of that worship in the Temple of Yahaweh was older than the recollection of man. It belonged to a primitive and almost fetishistic form of worship. With this survival of primitive fetishism in connection with the monotheistic and lofty Yahaweh cult in the temple at Jerusalem as late as the time of Hezekiah one may compare the survival of serpent worship in Egypt at the present day under the guise of Islam. This cult in Egypt evidently originated in that rudest stage of religion, which expressed itself in the deification of all sorts of creatures, and it has maintained its place in all succeeding religious systems. One may also compare the occurrence of similar worship of a fetish description in modern India in connection with really profound and exalted philosophic systems. The story which accounted for this serpent worship in Jerusalem and brought it into connection with Moses, lingered on after the symbol of the worship had been destroyed. It was interwoven, without objection,

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 189

in a singularly beautiful manner with the high and noble story of Moses and his religion, and the brazen serpent has even become, by that religious mysticism which enables us with catholic instinct to connect the religion of today with the upward strivings of the most primitive times, a symbol of Jesus Christ exalted on the cross, by whom all mankind, poisoned by the bite of sin, may be redeemed and saved.

There are, in the story of Moses, other elements of an unhistorical character, if we understand by "historical" literal statements of fact. There are also elements of a purely fantastical character, the invention of the narrator, who loved to decorate the story of the past and provide it with a suitable setting. Of such a nature is the magical element which is introduced in connection with the plagues of Egypt, Moses' magic wand and the like. This was done by writers who were familiar, to some extent at least, with the claim to magical pre-eminence of Egypt and the nature of the magic that was supposed to be wrought there. Late writings in the Demotic script have revealed to us the fact that, from an early period, there existed in Egypt a large literature which dealt with magic and magical achievements. The story of Moses, as told in Exodus, would seem to show that the fame of these

magic tales and some of their contents early spread to neighboring regions. Stories of this description possess a peculiar power of dissemination by the hold they take on the popular imagination. Attention has already been called to the reappearance of some of the *motifs* of these Egyptian magical tales, notably the black, Ethiopian magician, in the legends of Charlemagne's paladins. To the Egyptians the Ethiopians were the masters of magic for the same reason that the English ascribed peculiar magical powers to the Cornishmen, the Scandinavians to the Laps, the Germans to the Huns,—because of the mystery of their barbarism. It is the same principle which leads primitive men to ascribe peculiar supernatural powers to the lower animals. Such elements, derived from Egyptian sources, connected themselves with the history of Moses for the same reason that stories derived from Egyptian originals gathered about the legend of Joseph. Moses and Joseph were connected with Egypt; therefore the narrators sought to adorn their tales with Egyptian material, real or supposed. It may be remembered, by the way, that Joseph is also credited with magical power, both as an interpreter of dreams and as a diviner.

Besides this magical element derived from Egyptian sources, we find in the story of Moses other



## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 191

elements of an unhistorical character similar to some of those of which we have already met examples in the study of the tales of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. So, in a very ancient passage, so old that it was not understood by the compilers of Moses' narrative (Exodus IV, 24 ff.), we read how Zipporah, Moses' wife, averted the wrath of Yahaweh by the circumcision of her son. Here we have, apparently, a story to account for the fact that the Israelite was circumcised in infancy, not as an initiation to manhood, as is the practice among the Moslems of the present day, and was, perhaps, the earlier practice among the ancestors of the Hebrews.

But while the story of Moses contains such ritual and legendary elements, it differs entirely in its character from the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. We are dealing here, not with race traditions, nor sanctuary legends. The story is not collective but individual, and in this we find evidence of the historical character of the main features of Moses' history. Time will not suffice me to show at length that Moses is an historical person and that the great religious movement introduced by him was an historical fact. There is, as already pointed out, too much of a tendency, resulting from the recognition of the facts of evolution, to ascribe everything to heredity and environment; to inter-

pret all phenomena and all actions in social life and history as the result of conditions prevailing and events occurring previously. After all allowance is made for this dependence upon the past and the present, it must be realized that the great forward steps, the great achievements of history, of social and religious progress, have been the result of the life, the thought and the actions of individuals who seemed to step out of their environments, who cannot be explained by their surroundings, who overtop the men about them. It is these men, the Mohammeds, the Zoroasters, the Buddhas, and their like who have in other regions and in other times achieved the great movements affecting and influencing millions of men through generation after generation.

As a rule the events of the lives of these men are mingled with legend and fiction. Moses was a man of this type. The story of his birth and exposure on the Nile is strikingly similar to that old Semitic story of the exposure on the Euphrates of King Sargon, the great man of antiquity, a man whose legend was probably known in Palestine as a result of the early Babylonian domination. The story of Moses' exposure on the Nile may well have been derived from this earlier legend of the exposure of Sargon. We may profitably note the characteristic difference between the legend in the Hebrew and

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 193

the legend in the Babylonian form. In the Babylonian form it is a goddess through whom Sargon is rescued, and his story enters into mythology somewhat as does that of Paris of Troy. In the Hebrew story Moses is rescued through divine intervention, but that intervention occurs not through the personal act of a god or goddess, but through the spiritual agency by which God causes men to do this or that, governing events and putting thoughts into the hearts of men. It is well to note this difference, because it is characteristic of the difference between Hebrew legends and Canaanite, Babylonian and Egyptian legends from beginning to end. Although these legends were derived by the Hebrews from the Babylonians and must have come to them through the Canaanites in a mythological shape, the Hebrews have removed the mythological element, substituting for it the spiritual agency in God's action and a lofty, monotheistic conception of the relation of the divinity to the universe.

The fact that such a legendary element exists in Moses' story, identical with or related to a similar element in the legend of Sargon, does not prove that Moses' story is in its origin unhistorical. The legendary and mythical elements combined with Sargon's story in Babylonian literature formerly led some scholars to argue that Sargon himself was not

an historical personage, but merely a creation of legend. It is rather amusing to note that a distinguished German scholar presented full proof, theoretically, of the mythical character of Sargon in a book that was published at about the time when I was excavating monuments containing the inscriptions of Sargon himself, unearthing a temple which he had built, and furnishing, from the archæological side, conclusive proof of his existence and activity. It was his great importance in antiquity which led to the connection of legendary and mythical elements with his name. The same thing was true of Cyrus; the same was true of Moses, and, to some extent, of David, and is true of any great man even today, much more in the remote and early periods.

The scope of these lectures will not permit me to discuss the question of what Moses did. I wish only to warn the reader not to conclude that a character is unhistorical because birth stories, magical tales, and other elements of a manifestly unhistorical character are woven into the narratives about that person which have come down to us. The distinction between the stories of Moses, Samuel and David and the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is that in the former the legendary elements are adornments of the tale due to the fancy of the story-teller, his desire to display his knowledge of the times and

## Survivals—Legendary, Mythical 195

conditions in which his heroes lived and acted, and his effort to make vivid and real the tale which he tells; in the latter the legend is the essence, the kernel of the story; the character itself is legend. It seems to me that a comparison of the stories of Moses and Abraham, for instance, should of itself convince the careful and intelligent reader of the essential difference between the two — a difference which I have endeavored to indicate in the discussion of some of the most important elements of those stories.

## LECTURE V

### COSMOGONY AND PRIMEVAL HISTORY

THE first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis are different in character and origin from those which succeed them. As was pointed out in the first lecture, these chapters, although placed at the commencement, constitute, nevertheless, the latest addition to Hebrew story. After the narratives of the Yahawist and Elohist had been carried back through the times of the patriarchs to the beginning of the history of the Hebrews in Abraham, a further section was prefixed either to the Yahawist or to the combined Yahawist-Elohist narrative, as a preface to it, which undertook to carry the story back to the creation of the world.

When we seek the history which lies behind the stories in these earliest chapters of Genesis, we find that it is of a different nature and has a different value from that in the succeeding chapters. Here there is little or no historical tradition. We have rather answers to the questions which exercise the mind of primitive man (and in most cases the mind of the modern scientific man as well, although the

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 197

latter's point of view and method of handling such things are different). What is the cause of various phenomena which force themselves on his observation? How did the world come into existence? Where did man himself come from? Why does man have a sex consciousness and a sex shame which the beasts do not have? How did men acquire civilization? What is the reason of the differences of language among men? Why should flesh sacrifice be acceptable to God rather or more than vegetable sacrifice? Why do men speak different languages? These and other questions are asked and answered in a very *naïve* and primitive fashion in the cosmogonies, genealogies and stories of these early chapters.

Historically these chapters are valuable as a study in religious and moral development. Incidentally they show us the thought connection of Palestine and the Hebrews with other peoples and other regions. Here and there we catch glimpses, in race names and genealogies, of facts which possess a value of another sort. Sometimes in these chapters we have the material presented in story shape, sometimes the flesh of the story has wasted away and left us nothing but a skeleton of names and genealogies. Here and there we encounter curious little fragments of longer stories or mere

allusions to legends evidently well known to the original hearers or readers, but unknown to us. The condition of these fragments and allusions and the occasional strange breaks or inconcinnities in the stories which have come down to us suggest a considerable recension of narratives once much more extensive, resulting, among other things, in the elimination of mythological and other material which was objectionable to the monotheistic and moral Hebrew thought.

We have in the present shape of this portion of the book two narratives combined, a later narrative from the Priest Code and an earlier narrative from the Yahawist. But even the earlier of these narratives, the Yahawistic narrative, as it has come down to us, gives evidence that behind it again there were still earlier and diverse legends and tales. Probably we have, in our present cosmogonies and primitive legends, but a very small survival of the mass of material of this description which once existed.

Characteristic of these cosmogonies and primitive legends is their connection with Babylonian originals. We observe this even when we take up the philosophical cosmogony of the Priest Code, contained in the first chapter and the first three verses of the second chapter of Genesis. This is not



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 199

popular folklore, but the work of the scholar and thinker. The phraseology is the legal phraseology, with its repetitious accuracy. The religious concept is exalted, spiritual and thoroughly monotheistic. There is little in common in the conception of this writer with the Babylonian cosmogony, in which we hear of gods many, male and female, the births of gods in succeeding æons, the births of hideous monsters, dragons and the like, themselves divine, the vain struggle of the gods above with Tiamtu, the monster of chaos, the contest between the god Marduk, as champion of the other gods, and this monstrous Tiamtu, whom having slain he divides into two parts, out of one of which he makes the heaven above, and out of the other the earth beneath.

And yet in the cosmogony of the Jewish Priest Code, in the second verse of Chapter I, we have this same Tiamtu, in the Hebrew *Tehom* (translated "the deep"), used like a proper name, without the article, to designate the chaos out of which the world was created. The Hebrew words *thohu* and *bohu* (translated "waste and void") in the same verse, are, also, evidently echoes of names and a concept which had come down to the writer, which he did not invent. They were ancient words, consecrated, as it were, to this use, one of which had

become obsolete for all else beside. Moreover, the picture of the conditions out of which the world was created, the formless mass of land half hidden by water, so foreign to Canaan, suggests the conditions of Babylonia. In Babylonia, year after year, in the annual floods, men saw in the small these conditions of chaos, land and water mingled in confusion, followed by the restoration of order, the emergence of land from the waste, with plants and creeping things and beasts and men dwelling in safety thereon; and this annual experience, so unlike the conditions of Palestine, colored the Babylonian conception of the original creation of the world.

The Babylonian cosmogony, as it has come down to us, partly in Greek authors, partly in cuneiform tablets, is evidently a nature myth, which tells, under the picture of the victory over chaos, and its kindred and mixed forms, the story of the battle of light against darkness, order against confusion. Bel is the hero, who overcomes chaos, divides light from darkness and heaven from earth, creates sun and moon and stars, and out of his own blood mixed with earth makes men in his image and with his life in their veins. One story of the creation, preserved to us in cuneiform texts, was told in seven tablets, known as the *Enum Eliš* series. Of these the first

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 201

four deal with the origin of chaos and its monsters, the birth of the gods and finally the victory of Bel over Chaos, the emergence of order out of confusion, light out of darkness, and the creation of heaven and earth. The fifth tablet appears to contain, among other things, the creation of the beasts; the sixth, the creation of man; and the seventh, a hymn of praise to Bel, the creator, with a summing up of all his work of creation. The creator in this cosmogony is Bel-Marduk, of Babylon; but clearly there lay behind this another and older cosmogony which ascribed the creation of the world to Bel-Enlil of Nippur; and behind this again, or side by side with it, apparently, still a third cosmogony, of Eridu, in which Ea was the creator. One trace of this threefold origin can be found, perhaps, in the fact that chaos appears under three names, Tiamtu, Apsu and Mummu, which, while here designating separate individuals, yet represent one and the same concept.

The form of the Babylonian creation myth, which affected the cosmogony of the Priest Code, was not the earlier or earliest form from Nippur or Eridu, whatever those forms may have been, but the version of Babylon, in which Bel-Marduk was the creator. Corresponding to the seven tablets of this Babylonian myth are the seven

days of the Hebrew scheme ; to its threefold chaos correspond the triple names of the primeval waste in the second verse of our narrative, *Tchom*, *Thohu* and *Bohu*. Out of this waste, dark and watery, were brought light and order, the firmament of heaven was spread out above and the earth beneath, with its growth of grass and herbs and trees, and the sun and moon and stars were made and set in the heavens. All this corresponds in a way with the first four tablets of the Babylonian series, which also tell of the victory over chaos, its reduction to order, its division into heaven and earth, made out of the two halves of Tiamtu, the formation of sun and stars, etc. The purely mythological part of the Babylonian cosmogony, of which we have found reflections elsewhere in Hebrew literature in the struggle of Yahaweh with the monster of the abyss and her horrible comrades, whom he destroys and smites through, tramples upon and divides in pieces, precisely as in the Babylonian myth, is eliminated, but the cosmogonic idea is retained. So likewise in the fifth day, according to the Hebrew cosmogony, God creates the beasts, and in the sixth, man, these two days thus corresponding in their content to the fifth and sixth tablets of the Babylonian series. The seventh day of the Hebrew scheme reminds one faintly of the summing up of the creative acts

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 203

in the hymn to Bel the creator, which constitutes the seventh tablet of the Babylonian series. But in the Hebrew we have, also, another element introduced, the Sabbath, which, while itself of Babylonian origin, has nevertheless, so far as our present knowledge goes, no connection with creation in Babylonian thought and mythology.

The Sabbath was in Babylonian use a *dies nefastus*, on which nothing should be undertaken, a day of abstention and, in so far, a day of rest, occurring on the first, seventh, fourteenth and twenty-first of each month. There were also, apparently, occasional additional sabbaths (as, in one month of which we possess the calendar, on the 19th), something like the saints days or occasional holy days of our calendars. Out of this original *dies nefastus* the Hebrew Sabbath developed into a true day of rest, which was a holy day in our sense of the term, occurring on each seventh day. The cosmogony of the Priest Code marks that stage of religious development when the Sabbath had become an essential feature of the Hebrew religious system, so important that it was conceived of as part of the scheme of creation; a conception which combined readily and naturally with the sevenfold scheme derived from the old Babylonian cosmogonic myth.

As already pointed out, the differences between

the Babylonian myth of creation (or myths, for from Greek and cuneiform fragments we know, as already stated, of the existence of more than one such myth, albeit there was a close family resemblance among them) and the cosmogony of the Priest Code are far greater than the resemblance. There is a lofty spirituality and a wholesome, sane reasonableness in the latter which lift it altogether out of the atmosphere of that Babylonian mythology from which it had its birth. Nevertheless the marks of its origin are sufficiently clear to leave no doubt as to its descent.

It seems probable that the ancient Babylonian cosmogony, reflected in the highly advanced and philosophical presentment of the author of the Priest Code, had at an early period, before the advent of Israel, found its home in Canaan, and that it was out of forms of this myth, modified and changed in the thought of Israel, and especially of its higher and more spiritual thinkers through many generations, that a later writer constructed ultimately his majestic presentation of the creation of the world, so singularly unlike, in respect of its monotheism, its spirituality and its sanity, to any cosmogony with which we are acquainted in any country. This view of the origin of our cosmogony finds confirmation in the fragments of Phœnician

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 205

cosmogonies which have been handed down through Greek sources. Here again we find reflections of the Babylonian myth, with local variations and developments. Here Tiamtu reappears as Tauthe, and by the side of this representation of chaos we have another, called Baau, which is manifestly identical with the *Bohu* of the second verse of Genesis.

The fact, furthermore, that there are traces in the Prophets, Psalms and other later literature of the existence among the Israelites of myths and legends similar to those which are represented in the Babylonian cosmogonies, showing us, as it does, the manifold contact of Israelite thought with the thought of Babylonia, gives additional evidence of the relation of the cosmogony of the Priest Code to that contained in the Babylonian cosmogony of the *Enuma Eliš* tablets. I have already, in a previous chapter, called attention to the not infrequent references to the great monster of the deep, Rahab, who, if not in name, at least in thought, reminds one strikingly of the Babylonian mythology, and the contest represented in Babylonian-Assyrian art between Marduk-Bel and the dragon. In Isaiah LI, 9, we have Rahab and the dragon and Tehom, all made use of in a passage which reminds us of the contest of Marduk against Tiamtu and her

comrades. It was Yahaweh who, in days of yore, in the ages of the most remote antiquity, shattered Rahab, put to shame the dragon and dried up the waters of Tehom. In Psalm LXXXIX, 10, and following verses, Yahaweh not only defeats Rahab but puts him to shame, treating him like carrion; which reminds one of the wanton insult that Marduk heaps on his defeated foe, Tiamtu, on whose body he leaps. In Psalm LXXIV, 12, Yahaweh, after having split the deep into two parts, precisely as Marduk split Tiamtu, crushes the heads of darkness, shatters the heads of Leviathan and gives them as meat to the jackals. Here again we have the threefold representation of chaos, with the contumelious treatment of the vanquished foes, whose heads are cast to the jackals; a peculiarly Palestinian touch.

In Job XXVI, 11-13, we find possibly still another of those elements which occur in the Babylonian cosmogonies. In the Babylonian myth the half of Tiamtu which is used as the heavens is fastened by bolts. Here these fastenings appear as the pillars of heaven. Here the three-fold chaos is represented by the sea, Rahab and the fleeing serpent. In Isaiah XXVII, 1, this same three-fold chaotic foe whom, in the Babylonian cosmogony Marduk, in the Hebrew Yahaweh, smites and



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 207

destroys, is called Leviathan the fleeing serpent, Leviathan the coiled serpent and the dragon in the sea. There are other passages which show how firmly fixed this conception of the monster of the abyss was in Hebrew thought, and how clearly the thought of that monster was derived from the similar Babylonian monster. But my object in these lectures is not to deal with Hebrew literature at large, but with the early Hebrew stories or the stories contained in the early books of the Bible, and especially Genesis.

Besides the cosmogony contained in the first chapter of Genesis, which represents, as stated, an advanced scientific thought, we have in the second and third chapters another cosmogony of a very different type, a *naïve* folklore tale of creation and the story of the first man, handed down to us in that early Judæan narrative which we know as J. Here we have no chaos of land, half water, out of which, by the spirit of God breathing upon it, the world is created. The simple thought of this folklore cosmogony goes back no further than the existence of the land itself. No explanation of that is vouchsafed. The land was there and this land is the land of Palestine — a dry, barren land, in which water is not an enemy, but a friend, which must depend for its fertility, not upon streams and floods, but upon

the rain which God gives and which cannot produce without the hard toil of man. In its entire outlook this cosmogony is very different from that of the first chapter. Unphilosophical it certainly is, and *naïve*, but fascinating. If the thought is altogether childlike, we yet find, if I may so express it, the pure and spiritual child discussing the great problems of the world and life with an innocent simplicity which cannot fail to be instructive to the grown man. But if the coloring of this cosmogony is characteristically Palestinian, in the barrenness of the land, which requires rain and the toil of man that it may produce, there is, nevertheless, evidence of the foreign origin of parts at least of the story which has come down to us so completely Hebraized. It does not, of course, follow that because a thought or fancy is found in Egypt, Babylonia, India or Greece it may not also be native to Canaan. There are certain primeval ideas which we find in the folklore of many countries and which, so far as the ideas themselves are concerned, might as well have originated in Canaan as have been borrowed from any other source. The mere resemblance of ideas is not in itself an evidence of borrowing. So the idea, expressed in our story of Eden, that the first man lived in a state of happiness and in intimate relation with God, or the gods, is not an uncommon concep-

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 209

tion. We find similar ideas in many places. The Egyptians even placed their paradise to the east, as did the Hebrews, a thought in itself natural, inasmuch as the east is the point of the rising of the sun. It is the treatment of this theme in other respects, so different from the treatment of the same theme in Egypt, which proves that the Hebrews did not derive their ideas with regard to Eden from Egypt.

Now, while much in this story may be classed as universal primitive thought, we have also certain ear-marks which indicate unmistakably a Babylonian connection for some certainly of the fundamental thoughts of our tale. The park or garden which God plants and in which he sets the man whom he creates, is far away in some remote land off to the east, out of which and about which flow the great streams of the earth. This garden-park, or the region in which it stands, is named Eden. But Eden is a Babylonian word — the name of a part or perhaps parts of that rich plain of Babylonia famous for its fertility, which God seemed to have planted like a garden on the earth and which was the model surely of the perfect garden where man first dwelt: or rather, perhaps, the name Eden, which is a Babylonian word, is used for that whole region in which God planted a garden, for in the text it is

not "the garden of Eden," but "a garden in Eden" which is mentioned. Furthermore, out of Eden went a river to water the ground, and thence it was divided and became four heads of water. Two of these have names which have not been identified; two are the well-known names of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates. In Eden, Tigris and Euphrates, we have local features which connect the story unmistakably with Babylonia.

It does not necessarily follow from this that the Hebrews thought of the garden of Eden as lying in the plain of Babylon. The whole geographical conception of these chapters is crude and primitive in the extreme. So, for instance, all the great rivers come from the same source. It makes no difference where one sees them now; they all started from the same place. The description of the countries which are connected with these rivers is simple and unlettered. There is the land of Havilah, that mysterious territory about which all that the narrator knows is that thence come gold and the onyx stone. There is the land of Kush, which is encompassed by the river Gihon. Apparently seas and rivers are confused with one another, after the manner of simple, rude men ignorant of geography. The descriptions are as vague as many of those of the far away lands to the east, which one meets in the Arabian

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 211

Nights. This being the case, one is inclined to ask whether, after all, the name Eden and the idea of the perfect and fertile garden having been derived from Babylonia, the locality of the garden was not pushed up, in the vague geography of the narrator, into those mysterious mountains of the north, among which later the Ark of Noah rested, and where the Tigris and Euphrates took their rise. We shall see, presently, that the idea of an abode of God far away in the north was common in Hebrew thought.

With regard to the rivers of paradise it has been suggested that the number four is connected with a representation which we sometimes find in early Babylonian art of a four-divided stream. One is reminded, likewise, of the four corners of the heavens and the four sections of the earth which are characteristic of Babylonian thought. But without this there is enough in these chapters to show us that the fundamental and characteristic traditions at the bottom of this cosmogony are Babylonian. Doubtless these traditions wandered into Palestine from the east, in that period of Babylonian dominion of which I have had occasion to speak so often, as having made such a profound and many-sided impression on the religion and thought of the Palestinian westland.

In several particulars this story bears marks of a very early origin. Possibly one of these evidences of early origin is found in the reference to the position of Ashur in the fourteenth verse of the second chapter. Hiddekel, that is, the Tigris, is here represented as flowing to the east of Ashur. Now this is true of the old capital city of Assyria, from which the whole country was named Ashur, but it is not true of the country itself, nor of the cities of Calah and Nineveh, which were the centers and representatives of Assyrian power from about 1300 B. C. onward. It is possible of course that the narrator may have made a geographical error in this statement, or that he was thinking of the Assyrian possessions which lay between him and the Tigris, and therefore in a rough, general way spoke of the Tigris as eastward of Assyria, while in reality it lies to the west. In view of the fact, however, that Ashur, the old Assyria, actually lay on the west bank of the Tigris, and therefore had the Tigris on its east, it is not unnatural to suppose that the Ashur here meant is the city Ashur and that this story took shape at a time when Ashur was Assyria, before the seat of empire was removed to Calah, and Assyria became a country on the east bank of the Tigris. At least it shows a time when Ashur stood for Assyria with the outside world.

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 213

The story of Eden was evidently popular among the Hebrews, and we have several references to it in later literature. In the Book of Ezekiel, in the 6th century B. C., the story is told with a different application, or a different coloring (Ezekiel XXVIII, 11, ff). Here Tyre, or the land of Tyre, is Eden. Ezekiel is directed to take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyre and say to him: "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God." The beauties of paradise are represented as the civilized commercial products of the famous and luxurious city of Tyre, — gems, treasures and costly stuffs. The expulsion from Eden is the overthrow of the king of Tyre, the representative of his people, by the Babylonian power as a punishment for the sins of luxury and wantonness. This passage may be evidence of the existence among the Jews of a form of the Eden story influenced by Phœnician thought. The imagery and the purely figurative treatment of the story in this passage are, of course, Ezekiel's own fancy. The Eden story seems to have appealed to him with peculiar force, and the last chapters of his prophecy, from XL onward, in which he outlines the new Utopian Jewish state, are influenced by the thought of the primitive paradise in Eden. Other writers of the same or later periods also show the influence of the Eden story in occasional imagery,

and especially in their references to the garden of God. Evidently the story was a popular one among the Hebrews, for which reason the Prophets freely made use of the thought and of imagery drawn from it. The connection of Eden with Tyre in the passage of Ezekiel quoted above suggests, what we shall find to have been true in some other matters of cosmogony and primitive history, that the Phœnicians also possessed an Eden story drawn originally from Babylonia. Probably in this case, as in the case of other of the early stories in Genesis, our story of Eden in the second and third chapters is only one of several forms of the story which were current in Canaan and the neighboring countries in the early days.

Up to the present time no story corresponding to the cosmogony in the second chapter of Genesis and no story of Eden has been found in Babylonia. On the other hand, as pointed out, this Hebrew story of the creation of man, his home in Eden, his fall and his expulsion, is full of thoughts, words and imagery which were evidently drawn from Babylonian sources, and we have here also episodes which are unmistakably identical with episodes in Babylonian myths which have come down to us. The question arises: Was there any one myth or legend in Babylonia which corresponded in general



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 215

to our Hebrew story of Eden, or have we in this cosmogony and in the story of Eden a Canaanite-Hebrew development, into which are woven recollections and suggestions from various Babylonian myths?

Before we attempt to answer this question let us analyze the Hebrew story more fully. The story of the creation of man himself, so *naïvely* told in the second chapter, in such striking contrast with the high spiritual thought of the first chapter, is, one may say, a world thought and need not be referred particularly to Babylonia or Palestine. It is the out-thinking of primitive man when he asks himself the question: Of what is man created? Dead, he returns to earth. Therefore, out of the earth he came; and, as one makes vessels out of the potter's clay, earth mixed with water, so God made man. Now there are two things on which manifestly the life of man depends: one of these is blood. If the blood be poured out of a man's veins, the man is dead. It is clear therefore that blood is life. That is a thought which finds repeated expression in the Old Testament in Hebrew sacrificial use, in Hebrew legislation, in Hebrew thought and customs. In one of the Babylonian stories of creation which has come down to us, man is represented as being made of clay in the image of God. That clay Marduk

mixed with his own blood, and so gave life to man. Man is therefore a blood-kinsman of God. The same conception is found in some of the South Sea islands. The other something, the presence of which in the body constitutes life, is the breath or spirit. If the breath goes out of a man, his life has gone out of him. It is the latter idea which finds expression in our cosmogony. The same dependence of man's life on God, the same relation of man to God which is expressed in the Babylonian story under the representation of the blood of God mixed with clay to make man, appears in this story under the form of the breath of God breathed into the clay which He had made. The life of man was the breath of God himself. This is a very simple and very natural out-thinking from man's observation of his own constitution. It may very well be native in Palestine and there is no ground for saying that it was derived from some other people.

The relation of man and God, as represented throughout this whole story, is very simple. That man was made in the image of God is understood in the most naturalistic manner, and the picture of the Almighty is extremely anthropomorphic. Almighty and all-wise He is not in the philosophical sense; but almighty and all-wise in the conception of the simple man merely means greatly mightier

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 217

and greatly wiser than man himself. That is the highest that primitive man can think when he is thinking out the being and nature of God, and that is the representation of God which is given here. He does not at first succeed in finding the right mate for man. He must come and look to see what man is doing. He walks in the garden in the cool of the evening. There is also something capricious about His decrees, and His word is not an absolute word. He tells man that if he eats of the tree of life he shall surely die. But this, it proves, is not the case. God has told man this to prevent him from becoming altogether like Himself. This conception of God can be paralleled throughout in Palestine today. The plain people, Moslems and Christians alike, think of God in precisely this way; nor is such thought peculiar to Palestine, it is the thought of the simple man everywhere

Any one who has visited Oberammergau will remember the paintings of God the Father which are so common above the doors of the houses, or used to be, at least, twenty-five years ago. They were painted by a rude genius, who paid in kind for lodging, food and drink, principally the latter. Now, to say that such representations are merely figurative, and endeavor to express pictorially the

idea of the fatherhood of God is to misstate the case. These pictures of God the Father represent really the real and literal idea which the common people possess of God. In Palestine today the conception of God among the common people is yet more realistic and grosser, and you will even hear the people speak in the most naturalistic manner of the members of God and swear by the parts of His physical body in a way which makes it very plain that they think of God as constituted physically as we are constituted; that man in the literal sense is made in God's image.

A primitive conception of the relation of name to fact, characteristic of all oriental thought, is brought out in Adam's naming of the beasts, which indicates and establishes, also, the dominion of man over the beasts about him. God creates the animals and brings them one by one to man, who names them. Now name and thing are one. To know the name is to know the essence of the thing. In ancient Babylonian magic, for instance, to name the creature or the demon which caused the sickness was to show one's power over that creature or demon, and thus to be able to master it and overcome the sickness. To know the mysterious name of God was to possess a power over the universe itself. To know the name of a demon was to put

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 219

that demon under your power. So for man to name the beasts was to put them under his power. The expression by Adam of the names of the beasts put those beasts in subjection under him who had spoken their names to Yahaweh. The name of the first man, Adam, is itself a common noun meaning man or mankind, a fact which shows us that we are dealing with speculations about the creation of man not a man. It is not a name that ever appears, to my knowledge, as a personal name in Old Testament times, and to the end Hebrew writers were conscious of the fact that Adam was not a true name, such as it became with the change of language in later Christian times, but merely the word "mankind." This is made very plain in the later Priest Code, in the beginning of the fifth chapter. The heading of this section reads as follows: "The book of the generations of Adam." Then follows the statement: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him. Male and female created he them and blessed them and called them Adam." We meet with this same phenomenon in various national cosmogonic legends. The story of the origin of man or of the particular race is told as the story of a man who bears the name *man*, sometimes in an archaic or slightly differentiated form. Frequently the name of a

nation is itself the name for *man*. Possibly we find this latter phenomenon in the case of Edom. At least the words Adam and Edom have the same root letters.

One universal assumption we find in this story, namely, that the language of the people telling the story was the primeval language, spoken by God Himself. This assumption appears in the account of the naming of the animals by Adam. It appears in Adam's own name, given him by God, the Hebrew word for man. Here we have also one of those plays on names, those etymological puns which are so numerous in the Old Testament. Adam, man, we are told, was made out of *adamah*, earth. The derivation of woman from man is the theme of another etymological episode. A common Hebrew word for man is *ish*. The Hebrew word for woman is *ishah*. Etymologically this appears to be a different root from the similar sounding *ish*, man, but primitive etymology depends only on resemblances of sound, and so we find *ishah* made a derivative of *ish*, and a story founded on this etymology of the creation of woman from a rib of man. This story, which is a man's story, homo-sexual, is an interesting example of the methods of early thought. Man measures the universe by himself. He explains the relations of all

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 221

about him by what he knows of himself. Woman depends upon man and woman was made for man. Out of man himself she was made, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone. Very *naïve* is this literalism by which she is actually built out of a bone of Adam. The rib seems to be chosen as the material for her construction, because ribs are relatively numerous, and, therefore, superfluous in man's composition. No other bone could well be spared, but of the ribs more than one might be taken without sensible loss; and so from man's rib was woman made, who was to be part of man. All this is primitive folklore, and in it we find no evidences of a special connection with Babylonia or any other country.

In the account of the relation of man to the beasts, before woman was created, there is a suggestion at least of resemblance to the story of the wild, primitive man, Eabani, in the Babylonian Gilgamesh legend. Eabani was made out of clay by the goddess, who, in that story, is the creative force, because in her rather than in the god is the womb of life. At the outset Eabani consorted with the beasts of the field. "He ate grass with the gazelles, he drank water with the cattle of the field, he amused himself with the animals of the water." Out of this condition he was raised into true manhood by entering

## Early Hebrew Story

into relation with a woman, a priestess of Ishtar, who came to entice him. It was by finding a mate in her that he developed out of a being like the beasts, and, leaving them behind, went with her to the place of Gilgamesh to become his friend and fight and strive with him. Evidently, in the thought of the Hebrew story, Adam was at first like Eabani. No true mate was found for him, however, among the beasts of the field. His manhood required a helpmeet of his own kind, bone of his bone, flesh of his flesh. The resemblance in this case is sufficient to suggest a connection with Babylonian story, but not sufficient to prove that connection with certainty.

There is, in the Hebrew story, an openness and freedom in the discussion of the part which man and woman are meant to play toward one another and the union which makes the two one, so foreign to our modern manner of thinking that the reader of today scarcely takes in its full meaning. The physical union indicated escapes his notice. The text suggests to him a union of another sort, a union of a more spiritual nature. Indeed so readily does the language here used lend itself to the thought of a spiritual union, that it has become a proof-text in the argument for monogamy, and we of today are almost amazed that, with the words



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 223

of this chapter before him, the Hebrew could ever have been a polygamist. We have, in fact, read into the words more than was really originally contained in them. We have seen not the literal sense and the original thought, but a spiritual development from the possibilities which lay in that original thought.

In the relation which man is here represented as holding toward woman, we have, apparently, another of those incidental evidences of the great antiquity of this story. It is not the woman who leaves father and mother and cleaves to the man, but the man who leaves father and mother and cleaves to his wife. It would seem as though we had a survival of the old matriarchate, that relation of marriage of which we have an example in the Samson story, where the woman remains with her tribe or clan or family and is visited by the man. The offspring in such a case belongs to the woman's family, not the man's. The picture of the relation of the primitive man and woman which follows is drawn from the study of the relation of the sexes in childhood. What the narrator sees that children are in their relations to one another, that he conceives the first man and woman to have been, except only that they were grown up. So they are described as going unclothed without sense of shame. The sense

of shame is developed in connection with temptation and knowledge. The whole is pictured in a manner appropriate to such a method of thinking. What in actual men and women is developed through slow processes, comes to the first man and woman at once, through the eating of the fruit of the tree.

Mingled with this story of temptation and knowledge is the story of the hostility of the serpent. Here we have two elements introduced which do not seem to be a part of the simple primitive folklore thought, but rather elements derived from some myth or other. There were, according to the story, two trees in the garden of Eden, possessed of strange power. The fruit of the one gave to him who ate it the knowledge of good and evil, the fruit of the other endowed man with immortality. There is a series of Babylonian magic tablets having their origin in Eridu, the city of the god Ea, in which we find mention of magic trees and magic plants connected mystically with the abode of Ea in Eridu and possessing strange properties. To be sure somewhat kindred notions connected with trees exist in other parts of the world, but the Babylonian affinities already suggested in this cosmogony make one suspect that we have here a survival of that same conception of the magical power

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 225

of certain trees growing in some particular place which is exhibited in the exorcism tablets from Eridu. This suggestion is greatly strengthened by a consideration of the fragments of the Babylonian Adapa myth which have come down to us. Our main knowledge of the contents of this myth is derived from clay tablets discovered at Tel el-Amarna in Egypt. These had been used for purposes of study by Egyptian scribes. From the presence of these fragments among the letters and archives at Tel el-Amarna, it was evident that this myth was one well known in the west, throughout Syria and Canaan, in the 15th century B. C.

The general content of the myth is as follows: Adapa, son of the god Ea (it will be observed that the locality of this myth also is Eridu), has received wisdom from his father, but not immortality. Adapa is the guardian of the shrine of Ea in Eridu, the anointed one. It is his duty to care for the needs of the sanctuary. Fishing in the sea by Eridu, the south wind strikes him suddenly and overturns his boat. In revenge he breaks the wings of the south wind. When Anu, god of heaven, hears of this, he sends his messenger to bring Adapa before him. Ea advises Adapa what to do to avoid punishment. He bids him put on a mourning garment and secure the compassion of

the two gods, Tammuz and Gishzida, whom he will meet in heaven at the entrance to Anu's palace. By arousing their pity he will secure their mediation with Anu. When he comes into the presence of Anu he will be offered food to eat. It is the food of death and he must not eat it. He will be offered water to drink. It is the water of death and he must not drink it. Adapa does as he is bidden, wins the pity and mediation of Tammuz and Gishzida and secures mercy from Anu, who, perceiving that Ea has made him, a mortal, acquainted with knowledge and good to look upon, resolves to give him also immortality, and offers him the bread and water of life. Following the direction of his father, Ea, Adapa refuses to take what is given him, believing that if he eat or drink it he shall surely die; and so it is that while man has knowledge, he has yet failed to secure immortality.

This is, of course, very different from the story which we have in the third chapter of Genesis. We are, however, struggling with the same problem: Why does man, who possesses knowledge like the gods and is made in their image, yet differ from them so materially? After a brief life of toil he must perish, while they live on forever. To some extent Ea plays in the Babylonian story the same

## Cosmogony, Primeval History <sup>227</sup>

part which both Yahaweh and the serpent play in the Eden story. The connection of life and immortality with the fruit of the trees does not appear in the Adapa myth, but may be derived, as already suggested, from other stories which we have from the same source, namely, from Eridu.

It should be added that in the early period of history as represented in the Bible the Hebrew was not conscious of any true immortality. God lived forever; man was made physically in the image of God and, like God, he possessed a knowledge which set him apart from the beasts. Only in this was he unlike God: that his life was limited in its duration. It was at a very late period that the conception was developed of another sort of relation to divinity, of another respect in which man was made in the image of God, namely immortality. It is characteristic of the earlier stage of thought that man did not pick of the tree of life and live forever.

The second extraneous element which we notice in this story is the serpent. There is a Babylonian seal cylinder representing two human figures sitting one on either side of a tree, each with a hand stretched out toward the fruit of that tree. Behind one of them stands erect what appears to be the figure of a serpent. This seal has been frequently used as an evidence that the Babylonians also had

the story of the temptation by the serpent, which temptation consisted in the plucking of the fruit of a tree, precisely as in the third chapter of Genesis. I doubt very much whether there is any connection whatsoever between the representation on this seal and our story in Genesis. No allusion to any such story has been found in Babylonian literature up to the present time, and no other representation in the slightest degree resembling this in that respect has been discovered. I am inclined to think that it is rather another form of the same idea which is represented by the genius or the man and the genius standing by the tree bearing fruit, a common representation in Babylonian and Assyrian art.

The serpent played an important part in the later religious life of Israel, as I have pointed out already, and in this regard, also, Israel was one with the nations about it. As we meet the serpent in mythology, if I may use that word in its broadest and most general sense, he is sometimes the friend, sometimes the enemy, of man. In Israelite story he seems to be conceived of as the enemy of man. To be sure, the brazen serpent to which the worshipper looked healed him from evil, but the evil from which he was healed was supposed itself to have been an evil brought upon him by the serpent. The serpent is one of the names used to de-

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 229

scribe the great monster of chaos, the monster of the abyss or deep, with whom Yahaweh contended and whom He dashed in pieces. The serpent is, accordingly, identified with the dragon. Apparently the same general conception prevailed in Babylonia, and serpent and dragon were more or less regarded as identical, if one can judge from the representations which appear on seal cylinders and the like, and the serpent was, therefore, regarded as a creature inimical to man. Whether there is any relation to Babylonian thought in the part which the serpent plays in the Eden story, is not clear. It is clear, however, that whatever foreign connection the story of the serpent may have had in its origins we have in its development a natural expression of primitive folklore, the attempt to explain that instinctive hostility which exists between man and the serpent. Every one is conscious of this antagonism toward the serpent on the part of man. Our narrator, who expresses the folklore and thought of his people, attempts to explain this instinctive hostility, and this story is an answer to the question: Why is there such hostility between man and serpent?

We have in this story, also, a further thought regarding the serpent, of the same simple character, such as primitive men might have developed any-

where. It is a wide-spread and natural conception that the serpent is peculiarly wise. In all countries and among all peoples men in a low state of civilization admire the cunning which certain animals possess as the consequence of instincts and powers which man does not possess. The way in which the animal ascertains the presence of danger and avoids it is mysterious to man, and is therefore ascribed by him to some supernatural wisdom, about which he tells stories. In our own ancestral folklore the fox is the creature peculiarly endowed with wisdom. Among the colored people, of our own country at least, we find the rabbit playing a similar part. Everywhere there has been an inclination to ascribe to the serpent in a peculiar degree the possession of this wisdom, which represents a certain supernatural and uncanny power. This is doubtless due to the mysterious life and being of the serpent, so different from that of man, or even of the birds and quadrupeds, to the strange transformations which the serpent undergoes, his mysterious hiding-places, his silent gliding, and the like. In these things primitive man sees an evidence of a wisdom which surpasses his own. It is the serpent, therefore, who knows the plan and counsel of God.

But why does the serpent go upon his belly and eat dust, while man walks upright and the other



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 231

beasts move on four legs? Why should woman so cleave to man, suffering at his hand abuse, and yet more than his willing slave, so that "her desire is unto him?" Why is it that, with pain and agony, she should bring children into the world and yet more than willingly do so? Why is the toil of man so hard? The beasts find their food ready prepared, but man must earn his living by the sweat of his brow. And then one sees a touch characteristic of Palestine: Why does the land which man sows with good grain bring forth thorns and thistles, as the land of Palestine does in a way which seems to be characteristic peculiarly of itself? These various questions also find their answer in this story. Clearly the story itself, as we now have it, was one of slow growth, and in its elements it is of composite character. In its final shape it answers not one question, but many: the reason of the hatred between serpent and man, of the degraded condition of the serpent, who must creep on his belly and eat the dust of the earth, of the painfulness of child-bearing on the woman's part, and this almost fruitless toil to procure his living from the ground on the man's part. All these things result from the primeval transgression, by which man sinned against God and brought the curse of God upon him. So the story stands in its completed form; but it would

seem that behind this lie many individual thoughts and suggestions representing different episodes, different stories, which have at last been united into one whole. This was the way in which, doubtless, these larger stories were developed. We have them now as one whole. Sometimes we can in part separate the strands which have been woven together; at other times they are inextricably intertwined, and it is impossible to separate the parts.

By the serpent's advice woman first and then man took from the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and their eyes were opened, they were no longer children, but at once men and women, knowing good and evil, and this knowledge brought upon them a curse. In this story the narrator shows himself conscious of that which each one of us feels: of the superior power of the man over the child, and at the same time of the existence of another something, very good, which every man loses in his growth from childhood into manhood. That superior power and wisdom was a possession which man had clearly attained. God became jealous therefore lest man should become like Himself; the same fear which expresses itself in the story of the tower of Babel. This same fear shows itself, also, in the Babylonian myth of Adapa, and as Ea, by fraud, prevents man from partaking of

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 233

the food of life, so that he may become like God and live forever, so here Yahaweh decides for the same reason to drive man out of the garden of Eden.

The story closes with an episode entirely and characteristically Babylonian. God placed eastward of the garden of Eden the cherubim. Now we have in the first chapter of Ezekiel a description of cherubim, from which we know that the Hebrews designated by this title those composite, winged monster forms which stood before the Babylonian temples. It is not clear that we have this name applied to them in Babylonia, but it would seem probable that both name and idea were derived from the same source. These cherubim, winged bulls, lions or the like, stood in front, that is, to the eastward or southward, of the temple, at the gate of the dwelling of God, and were indications that God dwelt at that spot, of which they also were guardians. Eden is here conceived of as being, like these temples, a dwelling-place of God. Once man dwelt within in close communication with God. God is still there, and the cherubim are the indication of His presence and the guardians of the sanctity of His abode from which man has been driven forth. In the chapter of Ezekiel referred to God comes from His abode in the north mounted upon the cherubim. One may

well ask whether in the thought of the prophet that mysterious garden of God, where man had once dwelt with God but which was now closed against the entrance of man by the cherubim, was not the dwelling of Yahaweh on the mountain of God in the far distant north, where the streams of the Tigris and Euphrates had their source.

And now we are, perhaps, in a position to attempt some sort of answer to the question whether this second cosmogony and the story of Eden contained therein were derived from a Babylonian source. Yes and no. It would seem, if our analysis be correct, that various Babylonian myths have yielded material which has been utilized in our story and that, besides the elements drawn from these myths, we have also material derived from Babylonian sources in another way—the name Eden, the suggestion of a garden located by the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates but in a region fertile, like Babylonia, the picture, drawn primarily from Babylonian temple use, of the cherubim. On the other hand, we have abundant material which is native, and, so far as our present information goes, it would seem to me probable that this cosmogony and this story grew upon Canaanite soil, utilizing in its composition Babylonian material of various descriptions.

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 235

In the Eden story we have seen examples of the attempt which the primitive Hebrews and presumably, also, their Canaanite predecessors, made to answer those questions about the world which every man must ask himself. The tale of Cain and Abel, in the fourth chapter of Genesis, contains further examples of this same sort of story-building. Some of the proper names which we meet with in these early chapters are full of meaning and are evidently themselves Hebrew, like Adam. The name of the first woman, Eve, was at the time of the reduction of these stories to a Hebrew form, no longer a good Hebrew word. There is, however, a suggestion in the word of some connection with the Hebrew root which means life. I venture to suggest that the Hebrews took over the name, which was a real word in a kindred Semitic language, from the people preceding them in the occupation of the country. It was close enough in sound to Hebrew to suggest connection with the root meaning life. At the same time it was not a known Hebrew word. The general perception of the meaning of the root is indicated by the interpretation of the word given in Genesis III, 20: "Adam called his wife's name Eve (*chavvah*), because she was the mother of all life (*chay*)."

When we come to deal with the names in some of the other stories,

it becomes still more clear, from the unintelligibility of those names in Hebrew, that we have primitive pre-Israelite material, just as such names as Corinth, Olympus, Hymettus, and many more in Greece are inexplicable in Greek, because they go back to the pre-Hellenic period. But every nation undertakes to explain the proper names which it uses, and some of the quaintest and most curious little touches which we have in Genesis are those etymological stories intended to account for the use of this or that name. In most cases the etymologies are themselves false, and in all cases the stories are clearly invented to account for the word.

In Cain and Abel we have two names which are unintelligible. Cain is very *naïvely* explained in the text as connected with the Hebrew root *kanah*, "to get," so that Eve is made to say at his birth: "I have gotten a man with the Lord." The name in its Hebrew form reminds one strikingly of the Kenites, who in early times wandered back and forth among the Hebrews, not occupying settled habitations, and it seems possible that the story, in some of its features, may have been affected by the resemblance of the name of Cain to that of these Kenites, whose poverty-stricken and miserable life was always before the eyes of the peasants of

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 237

Palestine. For the name Abel no attempt is made to find an explanation in our story. The name is in fact strikingly like the Babylonian *Ablu*, son, and one is tempted to suppose that originally, in pre-Hebrew times, it had that signification, but if so our narrators have lost all sense of its original meaning.

The origin and the original meaning of the narrative itself are not clear. Are we dealing, in Cain and Abel, with two peoples and their feuds? In the wild, half savage Cain, wandering in the east-land, afflicted, it would seem, by the curse of God, so that he may not even till the ground, we have in fact a picture always before the mind of the Palestinian peasant and herdman. These wandering neighbors of theirs to the eastward are precisely like this Cain. They are murderers, and surely the curse of God is upon them; and yet they are fearful to deal with, so that, whatever befall, one should be careful not to murder one of them, as his death will surely be revenged sevenfold. Moreover, they have a mark upon them, put there by God, to distinguish them from the settled peasantry. Precisely what mark or characteristic the narrative has reference to as distinguishing Cain, is not altogether clear. In Leviticus and elsewhere we have indications that at least some of these neighbors with whom Israel

came in contact were distinguished by the cutting of the corners of their hair, tattoos, and other tribal signs. It was, of course, an old idea to distinguish tribes, races and families by some particular sign, just as the Hebrew was distinguished by circumcision. This was the sign given by God to distinguish His people, and we may well suppose that by the mark put upon Cain by Yahaweh, of which the narrator speaks, we are to understand some peculiar tribal sign. But it seems curious that it should have been precisely this Cain, who is a wanderer on the face of the earth, before whom the very ground is cursed so that it may produce nothing for him and who lives in the outer desert, who is at the beginning of the narrative described as the tiller of the ground as over against Abel. Abel was the peasant herdman, Cain the husbandman. But Cain is the husbandman no longer, and the reason why he is not and why he is now cursed and driven out into the outer wilderness is because, once prosperous and well-to-do and a tiller of the ground, he slew Abel, the herdman. I suspect that this is a touch of imagination which points the moral. It may be that in general we have in this story an explanation of the condition of some wild folk whose name, so like that of the Kenites, came to be connected in the thought of Israel with the Kenites.



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 239

One is tempted to think that one element in this story, however, is an answer to the question: Why does God prefer flesh sacrifice to vegetable? In actual practice, in the oldest Hebrew codes, flesh sacrifice is the sacrifice desired of God, the meal or vegetable offering (the "meat offering" of the King James Version) being used never independently, but only in connection with flesh offering, to constitute a full meal. We have, also, in this story an explanation of God's relation to murder, connected with the meaning of blood. Blood is life, and life must be given for life. It is the duty of a man to take vengeance for the blood of his kinsman which is shed; but let it not be supposed that where there is no kinsman to avenge that blood, therefore blood will not be avenged; for the blood which is unrevenged by the avenger of blood yet has the power to call to God himself for vengeance. While in the details of its expression peculiar, this is in its essentials a thought sufficiently common. Let one remember, for example, the murder tests in mediæval Europe and the superstition according to which, on the approach of the murderer, the corpse of the murdered man would begin to bleed.

As the story of Cain and Abel has come down to us, various motives and possibly various tales have been welded into one most effective whole — a

moral story, the condemnation of the murderer, on whom rests forever the mark of God. Murder is the one thing which God will not and can not overlook. The Cain of this story, it should be added, seems to have nothing in common, or at least nothing which we can trace in common, with the Cain whom we meet in the genealogies of the fifth chapter. Very likely it was the resemblance of the name of the former to that of the latter which caused the latter to be made a son of Adam and Eve. Outside of the name Abel, also, there is nothing in this story which suggests a connection with any known Babylonian source. It appears to be throughout of Canaanitic origin.

It is different when we come to deal with the genealogies which undertake to account for the primitive ages of mankind.

We have two of these, one, the Yahawistic, contained in the fourth chapter of Genesis, the other, the genealogy of the Priest Code, contained in the fifth chapter. The former is commonly called the Cainite, and the latter the Sethite, genealogy. Behind both of them there were doubtless legends connected with the various individuals. Traces of some of these legends exist in the Cainite genealogy. The Sethite genealogy has been reduced to its lowest form, a mere skeleton of names, ages and

## Cosmogony, Primeval History <sup>241</sup>

the like. It is the second or Sethite family tree, however, which is the more complete in the matter of names. This has the characteristic marks of the priestly document in its repetitious language, the effort at legal precision, the schematic form in which the whole is thrown, and, finally, the fact that precise figures are given. So-and-so lived so long and begat a son; and his days after he had begotten this son were so-and-so many, and all the days that he lived altogether were such and such a number. In this Priest Code genealogy, which professes to give the descendants of Adam through Seth, we have ten generations, including Adam at one end and Noah at the other. In the Yahawistic genealogy, in the fourth chapter, which gives the descent from Adam through Cain, we have seven generations, including Adam at one end and Lamech at the other. Now in the Priest Code, Lamech is the father of Noah, and in the Yahawistic narrative, inasmuch as Noah plays precisely the same part as in the Priest Code, it may be assumed that the same relationship existed. If, then, we add to the Yahawistic genealogy Noah, we should have in this list eight names in all. Comparing the two lists, we shall find that the two genealogies are identical at both ends, and practically identical in the middle also. They evidently came from the

same source and were once the same. The two names which are missing in the Yahawistic genealogy are Seth and Enos, who, in the Priest Code, are the son and grandson of Adam respectively. The Yahawistic genealogy knows no son of Adam named Seth, but only Cain. This Cain is etymologically the same as Cainan, which appears as the fourth name in the Priest Code. The next three names in the Priest Code and the Yahawist are identical, but in reverse order. In the Priest Code the order is Mahalaleel, Jared and Enoch. In the Yahawist it is Enoch, Irad, which is really the same name as Jared, and Mehujael. In the Greek Septuagint translation, the Mahalaleel of the Priest Code appears as Maleleel, and the Mehujael of the Yahawist as Maiel. Then follows Methuselah in the Priest Code, and Methusa-el in the Hebrew text of the Yahawist, but in the Septuagint Methuselah, as in the Priest Code. Finally we have in both genealogies Lamech and Noah.

It would seem to be clear from this comparison that the two genealogies depend upon the same original; but where did this original come from? According to the history of Berossus, there were in Babylonia, before the beginning of history, ten primeval kings whose reigns were of enormous extent. Up to the present time no Babylonian

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 243

tablets have been found which give this tradition or the names of these kings. With two exceptions these names have come down to us only in a Greek form. Of some of these names no one has yet been able to offer any explanation. There are others whose Babylonian form can be restored with a fair degree of certainty. The third name in the list of Berossus is Amelon. This is clearly a Greek corruption of the Babylonian word for man, *amelu*. Turning to the Hebrew genealogical list, according to the Priest Code, we find that the third name is Enos, which is a Hebrew word for man, apparently a translation of the Babylonian *amelu*. The fourth name in the Berossus list is Ammenon. This seems to be the Babylonian Ummanu, artificer. The word Cainan, which corresponds to this in the Hebrew, cannot be said, properly speaking, to be a noun with a significance in Hebrew. As stated above it is the name Cain, with the nominal suffix *an* added. There is a word in the kindred Aramaic language, strikingly similar in root and sound, which would correspond substantially in meaning with the Babylonian Amelu, namely, *Cainai*, smith. One is tempted to suppose that we have here a translation of the Babylonian Ummanu which has preserved a form no longer existing in classical Hebrew.

The seventh name in the list of Berossus is Edo-

ranchus, or Enedorachos. This is evidently the Babylonian En-me-dur-an-ki, about whom we know something from Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions. He was a famous hero of the primeval time, king of Sippara, the city of the Sun God, and at the same time a soothsayer priest, initiated into the divine mysteries, the secrets of heaven and earth. To him was carried back the origin of the guild of soothsayers, the interpreters of oracles and signs, and his name, which is Sumerian, means, apparently, "interpreter of heaven and earth." The corresponding name in the Hebrew genealogy is Enoch. In the Priest Code he and he alone of all the primeval kings is described as standing in a peculiar relation to God. "He walked with God and he was not; for God took him." (Gen. V, 24). In the story of the Yahawist he is the son of Cain, and his name is also the name of a city which Cain built. The name Enoch may be connected with the last member of the Babylonian name En-me-dur-an-ki, *anki*. It has been suggested also that the 365 years assigned in the Priest Code as the period of Enoch's life are connected with the sun year, and correspond in a way with the relation of the Babylonian En-me-dur-an-ki to the Sun God of Sippara. While Enoch seems to be identical with the latter part of the Babylonian name, En-me-dur-

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 245

an-ki, and the peculiar piety and intimate relation with God represented in the Hebrew story may correspond to the relation to the divine secrets expressed in the Babylonian story of En-me-duran-ki, I doubt whether the last-named element of connection — that which suggests a relation in the number of years of his life to the sun period — should be pressed.

The eighth name in the Berossus list is Amemp-sinos, which seems to be intended to represent the Babylonian Amel-Sin, man of the moon-god, Sin. In the eighth place in the Hebrew list, comparing the two lists with one another, we find the name Methusa-el (better, Methusha-el) or Methuselah. Methusha-el is also a good Babylonian name, Mutusha-ili, and means in Hebrew and Babylonian alike "male, or man of God." What the second part of Methuselah or Methusha-el is, is not so clear. It seems probable that we have in the Hebrew the Babylonian name Amel-Sin, translated as to its first part and adapted as to its second. In the tenth place in the list stands, in the Berossus narrative, Xisuthros, the Hasis-Adra or Nuh-napishtim of the cuneiform tablets, the hero of the Babylonian flood myth, and in the tenth place in the Hebrew list, Noah, the hero of the Flood story. Evidently these two are identical and the Hebrew name Noah

is the first part of the name Nuh-napishtim of the Babylonian legend.

These points of similarity are sufficient, as it seems to me, to establish the connection of the Hebrew legend of the ten forefathers who lived before the Flood, and whose years were incredibly long, with the Babylonian legend of the ten primeval kings who lived before the Flood and whose ages were numbered by cycles.

It is interesting to note that the ages of the Hebrew forefathers have come down to us in three different systems, in the Hebrew Masoretic text, which is represented in our English Bible, in the Greek Septuagint translation, and in the Samaritan Hebrew. Each of these seems to represent a different system, from which it would appear that it was not, in the estimate of the early ages, the literal number of years which was important, but something for which those numbers stood. The system represented in our English Bibles, that of the Masoretic Hebrew, appears to have been based on the conception that the world would last four thousand years. Half of that period passed between creation and the birth of Abraham. From the birth of Abraham to the foundation of the Temple there was another thousand years. According to this system, the year of the birth of our



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 247

Lord would have coincided approximately with the end of the world. The Septuagint adds to this scheme almost 600 years before the Flood, while the Samaritan subtracts 350 years. Enormous as the ages of the primeval ancestors are represented to be in any of these schemes, they are modest in comparison with the Babylonian chronology, which reckons the ages of the antediluvian kings in cycles of sars, each sar equaling 3,600 years. The first king reigned ten sars, the next thirteen, and so on, making an average of twelve sars for each king, 120 sars or 432,000 years in all before the Flood.

The genealogy of the Priest Code is closer to the Babylonian original in that we have in it all the ten names. The simpler folklore which we have in the Yahawist was not so much interested in the precise number ten of the original system as it was in the tales or legends which connected themselves with the individual kings or forefathers. It was the scribes and priests who preserved carefully the scheme. It is the folklore tales which have handed down to us some stories about these antediluvian heroes which seem to represent fragments of a more extensive lore of the same description. Some of these fragments of stories appear to represent original civilization legends — the commencement of city

building, the division of men into those that occupy settled residences and herdmen who wander hither and thither, the origin of musicians and musical instruments, the origin of metal workers. In some of these fragments we have specimens, also, of that etymological myth-making of which I have already spoken, where the interpretation of the name has given rise to a story. In at least one of these fragments, the notice of Jubal, the father of musicians, we have the reverse practice, where the name is invented to account for the fact. Similar myths and legends of the creation of the world and the primeval ancestors existed among the Phœnicians. In those legends, as they have been handed down to us from Sanchoniathon through Philo of Byblos and Eusebius, we find an undoubted connection with the Babylonian myths, in some points closer than in the Hebrew story, and yet striking differences. The Phœnician legends are located in Phœnicia itself and we even have an Egyptian element added in the name of the patriarch Taautos, who first invented writing and letters and who is identified, and apparently correctly, with the Egyptian Thoth.

In the Phœnician cosmogony and primeval history we can also identify some of the names which appear in the Babylonian cosmogony, translated as

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 249

in the Hebrew. The Phœnician legends resemble the folklore of the Yahawist rather more than they do the genealogies of the Priest Code in this: that they contain civilization tales. In one Phœnician scheme we have thirteen ages, showing the progress upward of civilization. Man was first a mere beast, living without family relations, his food the fruits that grew of themselves. Then he enters into a family relation, which may be said to correspond to the story of the creation of Eve in Genesis as the helpmeet of Adam. Next is an age in which he produces and employs fire. Then comes the age in which men associate themselves into organizations, with chiefs at their head. Then the time when men began to occupy settled abodes, to build huts of reeds, to clothe themselves with skins and to venture upon the water, floating on logs. Next the age when man learned how to hunt and catch the beasts and fishes. Then the age when he began to make himself metal tools, with which the better to build rafts of logs and fashion hooks and weapons to catch the fishes and kill the beasts. In the eighth age, having learned to make bricks of clay, he commences to build substantial houses; in the ninth age to cut down the forests and plant fruit trees, to till the ground and domesticate animals. The tenth age is the age of town-building. The eleventh, fol-

lowing this period of association of men in towns, is the time of the development of righteousness and justice to regulate the dealings of man with his fellow men. In the twelfth age he invented the alphabet and committed his thoughts to writing. One of the characteristics of the thirteenth age is the discovery of medicine to heal his ills. It is uncertain how much of this scheme is due to the influence of Greek thought or the imagination of Greek authors; but from the Phœnician stories which have come down to us through Greek authors this much seems clear: that there existed cosmogonies and primeval tales kindred to those which we find among the Hebrews in Canaan and unmistakably kindred also to the Babylonian cosmogonic and primeval myths.

The existence of such stories among the Phœnicians, similar to those which the Hebrews possessed, appears to be evidence that the originals of these legends came into the whole west-land in the early period of Babylonian domination, long before the time of the Hebrew conquest. They were adopted by the Phœnicians, Canaanites and other kindred peoples and locally adapted. Sometimes further material was added. The names were some of them translated, some of them merely borrowed, and corrupted in the borrowing, being afterwards explained etymologically by etymologies which

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 251

created what we may call etymological myths. The Yahawistic folklore story represents not an earlier stage of borrowing, but a cruder, more primitive, more native treatment of the material which had been derived from Babylonia. The Priest Code represents a more philosophical treatment of the same material and a more exact transmission. Neither one represents a direct borrowing. There was a tendency at one time to suppose that the Priest Code borrowed much material directly from the Babylonians at the time of the exile and later. That there was no such direct borrowing in this case is clear, among other things, from the complete change of names and from the general agreement of the names which appear in the Priest Code with those which appear in the earlier Yahawist narrative.

At the beginning of the sixth chapter of Genesis we have a curious fragment, evidently from a larger whole which was mythological in character. The sons of the gods saw the daughters of men that they were good to look upon, and took them wives from all whom they chose. Out of this union seem to have been born the mysterious *nephilim*, translated "giants" in our English version (VI, 4). The compiler of the history of Genesis is putting legends and fragments of legends together, with a

view to giving us a history of the world. This fragment is introduced to prepare the way for the account of the wickedness of the world, which resulted in its destruction by the Flood. It would appear that the compiler had before him a legend which was offensive to his religious belief, because of its distinctly polytheistic character. At the same time it was a well-known story and one which fitted into the account of the corruption of the world. He adopted it with the elimination of the offensive polytheistic elements, which resulted in leaving little more than a torso of the original.

Babylonian magic, which plays a very large part in the Babylonian literature which has come down to us, was derived by the Semitic Babylonians from the pre-Semitic inhabitants of that country, whom we generally call Sumerian. To the last the exorcisms which were used by the Babylonians and Assyrians continued to be written in Sumerian, often with an interlinear translation, evidence that the demons were Sumerians, for the language which they understood and in which incantations must be spoken was the old Sumerian tongue. Moreover, the names of those demons are Sumerian. The whole system of Babylonian magic and the whole Babylonian scheme of the spirit and demon world seem to have been derived from the Sumerians.

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 253

But some, certainly, of the words for the spirit and demon world familiar to us in the Hebrew Bible and in later Hebrew tradition are also Sumerian, as has already been pointed out. Further, the details of Hebrew magic, so far as we can ascertain them from the Bible, seem to have been identical with the details of magical rites in the Sumerian incantations. The conception of the demon world and the magic power which shows itself in Hebrew ritual, and more distinctly in an occasional Hebrew story and prophetic allusion, was in its elements essentially of Babylonian, and hence primarily of Sumerian, origin. Of course all primitive peoples have magical ideas. They know of demons and spirit powers which must be appeased and the like. What is meant is not that there was nothing of that sort among the Hebrews or their direct ancestors which they brought with them into Canaan, or nothing of that sort among the ancestors of the Canaanites, whose civilization and whose ideas the Hebrews borrowed so freely, but that the more elaborate and complete system of the Sumerians affected at an early period all this region, taking up into itself such existing native elements. This is the reason why we find Sumerian names and Sumerian practices reproduced in Hebrew demonology and magic. I fancy that the underlying matter of

that section of the sixth chapter of Genesis which describes the union of men with beings of the spirit world, from which resulted these mysterious *nephilim*, is at least akin to the Sumerian teaching of the possibility of the union of man with demons and spirits. Out of such a union came strange, weird creatures, the same conception which we have in the later Jewish story of the union of Adam and Lilith, or in those rabbinic tales, according to which men secretly took demon wives and had children by them, and at their death-beds were claimed by those half demon, spirit children, who then, and then only, made themselves manifest. But while in general Hebrew mythology and demonology are dependent upon Babylonian and early Sumerian demonology, and for that reason one is inclined to suspect a general connection in the case of all such tales, it must be said that there is no evidence in the peculiar form of this present fragment or in the words used in it of such connection.

It is interesting to observe that in Palestine and Syria the common people believe to this day in the possibility of intercourse with spirit or demon beings, and a recent traveller mentions at least one case from his own experience where a child was claimed by the mother and supposed by her neigh-



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 255

bors to be her offspring by a *jinn*, or spirit.\* This is a not unusual belief among primitive people, with their anthropomorphic conception of God and the spirit world, but such a practical expression of the belief is, I believe, rare. More usually such unions are attributed to people of an earlier time or of a foreign race, and are connected, as here (Gen. VI), with stories of men of unusual size and peculiar or diabolical properties.

So much has been written in recent years about the story of the Flood and the relation of the Hebrew Flood story in the sixth and following chapters of Genesis to the Babylonian Flood myth in the eleventh book of the epic of Gilgamesh that I may pass over this section with comparatively brief mention. Here, as elsewhere in this early part of Genesis, we have, in our present compilation, two forms of the Flood story woven together, the one the more simple folklore tale, the other the more precise, schematic account of the Priest Code. According to the simpler folklore tale, man was corrupt, whereupon Yahaweh decided to destroy him; but Noah found grace in His sight. So He bade him and all his household, with seven of each sort of clean beasts and two of unclean beasts, to come into the ark. So Noah went into the ark and

---

\* S. I. Curtiss, in "Primitive Semitic Religion Today."

Yahaweh shut him in, and after seven days He sent a rain which lasted forty days and forty nights, flooding the earth and lifting up the ark above it. All living things on the dry land died, and only Noah and those with him in the ark were left alive. Then the rain was restrained and the waters subsided, and after forty days Noah opened a window of the ark and sent out a raven, which did not come back, then a dove, which returned because it found no resting place. After seven days he sent out the dove again, which returned to him at eventide with an olive leaf, so that he knew that the waters were abated. After seven days he sent the dove out again. As it did not return he removed the covering of the ark and looked out and, behold, the face of the ground was dry. So he built an altar to Yahaweh and offered burnt offerings to appease Him. When Yahaweh smelled the sweet savor He was pleased and said that He would not curse the ground any more for man's sake.

The longer and more elaborate Priest Code narrative ascribes the Flood, as does the Yahawistic story, to the wrath of God, on account of the wickedness of the earth. It gives in detail the instructions under which Noah built the ark, into which he was to take two of each sort of creature

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 257

on the earth, male and female. The precise date of the commencement of the Flood is given. The Flood is here the result not merely of rain, but also of the opening of the fountains of the great deep below and of the windows of heaven above. The precise depth attained by the water of the Flood is given. For 150 days the waters prevailed upon the earth; then God caused a wind to pass over the earth to dry up the waters, and the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven were closed. After 150 days the waters decreased, and the precise date on which the ark came to rest on the mountains of Armenia is given. It was a considerable time after that, however, before the waters had so far decreased that the tops of the mountains were seen, and a still much longer time before the waters were finally dried up. The precise dates for all these events are given. When the earth was at last dry, God bade Noah and his family, with all the living creatures, to go out. As the sign of the covenant which God established with men that he would not destroy them again by a flood, He placed the rainbow in the heavens; a view of the meaning of that phenomenon curiously similar to that which we find in Homer.

In the Babylonian story also the Flood appears to be the result of the wickedness of man. The

world was full of violence, and so the heart of the mighty gods urged them to make a flood. A counsel was held. Ea reveals the plan of the gods to Nuh-napishtim, or Hasisadra. He bids him build a ship and bring "the seed of life of every sort into the ship." The construction of the ship and its measurements are given in some detail. Nuh-napishtim was divinely told when to enter in. After he had entered, at eventide of the same day, the rain began. (It is interesting, by the way, to notice that in the Babylonian account we have a ship which is steered by a rudder; in the Hebrew we have a box in which everything is shut up—the difference between a people used to navigation and one living inland, in a land without so much as a navigable stream.) The flood was accompanied with terrible phenomena, which filled the very gods with dismay, so that they sought refuge in highest heaven and covered there greatly frightened. Ish-tar screamed like a woman in travail, full of anguish at the destruction of the people to whom she had given birth. Six days and nights wind, flood and storm overwhelmed the land. When the seventh day came the storm ceased, the sea lulled, the blast fell, the flood ceased. All mankind were dead. The tilled land was become a waste. Nuh-napishtim steered his vessel to the mountains of the coun-

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 259

try of Nizer, which were visible above the water, and on one of the mountain tops the vessel was caught and made fast for seven days. Then he sent out a dove. It went to and fro, found no resting place and returned. He sent out a swallow. It did the same. A raven which he sent out, finding the dead bodies on the water, returned not, wading hither and thither, croaking and feeding on what it found. Then he brought everything out of the ship and offered sacrifice to the gods. The gods smelled the sweet savor and swarmed about the sacrifice like flies. Then Bel first discovers that the counsel of the gods had been revealed and that all men were not destroyed. He is very wroth, but Ea appeases him and persuades him in future not to cause a flood, but to reduce the number of mankind by wild beasts, by famines, and by plagues. Then Bel makes Nuh-napishtim and his wife immortal, and takes them away to dwell at the mouth of the rivers.

The connection between both the Hebrew stories and the Babylonian myth is unmistakable. The differences between these two Hebrew forms of the story, taken in connection with their similarity to the Babylonian original, indicate, as in other cases, not a direct borrowing, but the same sort of derivation which I have already suggested for other tales.

The Flood myth wandered from Babylonia to Canaan. At the time of Babylonian supremacy it was part of the lore of Canaan. When the Hebrews entered the land they absorbed and assimilated this lore, reproducing the old myths and legends in characteristic Hebraic forms.

The story of the Tower of Babel, in the eleventh chapter of Genesis, bears on its very face the evidence of Babylonian suggestion; but, on the other hand, so far as we know, there is no similar Babylonian myth. We have in this story, in the interpretation of the word Babel, an example of that curious etymologizing which I have so often referred to. Properly Babel, or Bab-ilu, to give the ordinary Babylonian form, means "the gate of God." It is here interpreted as meaning "confusion."

Two different questions are answered in this Babel legend, as we now have it, which suggests that we have two stories combined in one. One of these stories undertook to answer the question: Why do men speak different languages? If all people are derived from the same man, what is the reason that men now speak not one language, but many? The second question which engages the attention of the narrator is the origin and purpose of one of those mighty tower pyramids which

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 261

existed in connection with many of the old Babylonian temples.

I fancy that the story connects itself directly with an enormous, half-ruined, unfinished *ziggurat*, which stood, in the period preceding Nebuchadrezzar, one does not know for how many centuries before, in the immediate neighborhood of Babylon, at Borsippa. In one of his inscriptions Nebuchadrezzar says of this *ziggurat* that a former king, whose name he does not mention, had built it and carried it up to the height of forty-two ells, but had never completed it. It had long since fallen into decay. Its water conduits had become useless, rain-storms and tempests had penetrated its unbaked brick work, the baked brick with which its terraces were covered had bulged out and the unbaked bricks of the core been converted into rubbish heaps. Any traveler in Babylonia must have observed this striking ruin in the immediate neighborhood of the capital, and as he pondered over the meaning of these strange structures in general he must have asked himself in particular why this tower of such enormous size was never finished. Whether the people of the country gave him the tradition, or whether he drew the answer out of his own imagination, we do not know; but the answer is found in a story, in some of its ele-

ments not unlike those stories which we find in Greek and other mythologies, of the attempt of insolent man to make himself equal to the gods, to contend with them and take possession of high heaven itself. Man sought to achieve this by building a tower up to heaven in steps one above the other, and God interfered by confusing the language of the men so that they could not speak one to another, and thus scattering them into different nations.

This last part of the story, perhaps a part originally of a separate story, connects itself, as I have said, with a false etymology of the word Babel—an etymology of a type not uncommon, where an effort is made to read out of a word an explanation of existing conditions. In that wonderful city of Babel or Babylon men from all nations of the earth met together. One could see all costumes and hear all languages. It was in our sense a “babel,” a place of confusion of tongues. There were in it quarters occupied by different peoples, where you would hear only the languages of those peoples. It was from this city or this region that all nations of men had gone out, as the traditions of the forefathers told. Surely their dispersion was a part of that same confusion of tongues of which one had an evidence in Babylon itself. As men were



## Cosmogony, Primeval History 263

divided and kept weak and disunited in the different quarters of the city by the fact that they could not communicate with one another, so were men in the world at large kept from uniting into one irresistible mass by their differences in language. This confusion of tongues was the work of God, or rather, probably, in the original story, of the gods, to separate men one from another, so that they might not be able to achieve a work which would invade heaven and overthrow the gods themselves. As I have said, no parallel myth or legend has yet been found in the Babylonian records; and indeed this story sounds rather like travellers' tales, told by simple but pious Israelites, who had visited the distant land of Babylon and brought home tales of its wonders and their explanation of the same, partly as they heard them there, partly as they themselves expounded them.

The names of the nations and the Hebrew view of their affinity one to another, are presented to us in the tenth chapter, the famous table of the nations, in the common form of genealogies. Here again we have a combination of two elements — the later Priest Code and the earlier Yahawistic narrative. Both have been reduced almost to their lowest elements, the mere skeleton form of names; but in the

Yahawist there survives one fragment of what was apparently a larger story, a little fragment full of fascinating suggestions about Nimrod the mighty hunter. Evidently the story was Babylonian in origin. Nimrod has not yet, however, been identified with any certainty in the Babylonian cuneiform tablets.

Both the Priest Code and the Yahawistic list in this chapter agree in a three-fold division of the nations. The more simple, less learned Yahawistic list knows only the conditions close at hand. Three elements met together in the Palestinian region: First, the Canaanites, who were there before the Israelites came into the country, and who became their slaves; secondly, the Israelites, who, with all the children of Eber, their Hebrew kinsfolk, were descendants of Shem; and thirdly, the Philistines and their kinsfolk, who had come down from Asia Minor or from the islands of the west, the people of Japheth. To both of these latter, the Israelites and the Philistines, the Canaanites were slaves. The Canaanites were the despised, subject people. The cause of this condition is explained in a story in the ninth chapter, which tells of the shamelessness and immorality of Canaan, who, seeing the nakedness of his father, mocked it and told his brethren about it, while Shem and Japheth took a

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 265

garment and laid it on their shoulders and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father. When Noah knew what his youngest son had done, he said: "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." Here the Yahawistic narrator characterizes the Canaanites as a shameless and immoral people, in agreement with those constant denunciations which are found in the writings of the Prophets. It is a testimony to the immoral condition of the city-dwelling Canaanites whom Israel found in the country and whose religion and immorality alike were so dangerous to him. His sterner, better moral sense leads him to dissociate himself from these, and in their subject condition he recognizes the punishment of God for their shamelessness. According to our story, therefore, the Canaanites are subjected by both the invading races, the Israelites and the Philistines, as a punishment for their immorality and shamelessness.

The more educated Priest Code, recognizing the same threefold division, takes a broader view of the world. It tries to account for the whole world of its day. To the Semites or Shemites in its scheme belonged not only Hebrews and Aramæans, but also Babylonians, Assyrians, and the kindred peoples of Arabia. With Canaan — and whoever has

visited the coastlands of Canaan or studied the results of the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Fund in the cities of the Shephelah will realize the meaning and the truth of this — is associated Egypt. The Egyptians, and Lybians, and their kindred are brethren of Canaan, sons of Ham. Notable is the greater outlook northward of the scheme of the Priest Code. The sons of Japheth include here not only the Philistines and the people of the isles, but the people of the far west and of the north, the Moschi and other nations in Asia Minor, of whom we read in the Assyrian records, who played a prominent part in the ninth and eighth centuries B. C. Historically and geographically these tables are very valuable. They are also, perhaps, one of the best evidences of the meaning, not only of genealogical lists in general, but also of the stories told in the early chapters of Genesis about tribes as individuals. In that sense they serve us as a clue to unravel the later tales of the ancestors of Israel.

In the eleventh chapter the Priest Code furnishes us with a second genealogical table of nations, which deals more closely with the direct ancestry of the Israelites and their connection with that group of nations for which the author recognized a linguistic and race kinship under the name

## Cosmogony, Primeval History 267

Shem. It is this name Shem, ascribed to the ancestor of this group of nations, from which we have derived the word Semitic or Shemitic, which we apply to Hebrews, Babylonians, Aramæans, Arabs and Ethiopians alike, because they all speak languages of the same stock. What was the source of the material used by the author of the Priest Code in this table is not at all clear. The scheme is in general the same as that of the genealogy of the antediluvian patriarchs in the fifth chapter. So-and-so lived so-and-so many years, and begat so-and-so, and so-and-so lived after he begat so-and-so so many years. But, unlike the former genealogy, this scheme gives us a sliding scale of ages, by which we are brought down from the excessive length of days of the mythical ancestors to the still very abnormal but relatively natural age of Abram. As before so here also we have ten names in the list, commencing with Shem and ending with Abram, the direct ancestor of the Hebrews, with whose history, which we have already discussed in a former chapter, the second section of the Book of Genesis commences.

## LECTURE VI

### THE MORAL VALUE OF EARLY HEBREW STORY

**I**N these lectures I have treated early Hebrew story precisely as I should treat the early story of any people, Romans or Greeks, Egyptians, Babylonians or Chinese, and I believe that this is not merely the only honest but the only truly faithful and religious manner in which to treat this story. Doubtless, to some accustomed to another point of view, such a method of handling Bible tales and Bible histories seems profane and shocking. There is, in the treatment of any religious book, a tendency to set that book apart from worldly things and to surround it with a halo of mystery and awe which obscures its real character and meaning, its true origin, and its proper relation to the present.

The traveler who visits Oberammergau to see the Passion Play finds, or used to find, in the old convent near the top of the hill, as one approaches the village, a chapel, one of the sacred spots visited as a religious rite, a sort of pilgrimage, by the peasant folk who come to take part in the Passion

Play. The point of adoration in this chapel is a small marble figure placed on or above the altar and securely fastened by a metal band, that no one may carry off a treasure so precious. This little figure has been kissed black by countless thousands of worshippers. The reason for this veneration is that it fell from heaven. In this case, however, as in the case of all the figures that fell from heaven with which I am acquainted, whether in heathen antiquity or the Christian Middle Ages, the heavenly artists showed themselves far less skilful than the better grade of human artists. To this fact ignorant worshippers may remain blind; the intelligent and spiritually minded are repelled by what appears to them to be a misrepresentation of God and a gross fraud on men practised in the name of religion.

Some of the sacred writings which are revered by peoples in India and elsewhere are like this figure in the convent by Oberammergau. They are declared by the priests to be sacrosanct. The very language in which they are written is unintelligible to their worshippers. Their contents are known, so far as they are known, only in adaptations and paraphrases, cast in the language of a later period and combined with the thoughts and doctrines of that period. Some of the hymns

of the Rig Veda sound to us of today like an incentive to and a glorification of lust; much in this Veda and in other later Indian sacred books is worse than foolish. But this no one sees. The crude, gross image is declared to be divine, and the faithful worship, unseeing, unwitting what they worship. Generally such sacred books are in part fine, but the fine metal of which they are composed is sadly mixed at places with baser material. If their bodies are of brass their feet are of clay; but this the worshippers are not allowed to perceive, because they are covered with a veil of authority or interpretation.

In general the older such books are, and the more ignorant of their actual contents the worshippers, the more sacred they are declared to be, figures let down from heaven. So the Indian, ignorant of the very ancient language in which his Veda is written, with no knowledge of its contents, declares that it is not only divine, but self creative. The Moslem forbids him who is not a believer to so much as touch his holy book, the Koran. Written in Arabic unintelligible to the Arab of today, so that even he cannot understand its meaning, much less the Turks and the millions of Persian, Indian, Malayan and other Moslems of a race alien to that of the founder of Islam, the Koran may



not be translated even for the faithful, and the unlearned believer can know it only through its interpretation. All that most know is the sound of unintelligible words, which they recite by rote, worshipping the letter and the sound as a sort of fetish.

There have been times when Jews and Christians did much the same thing with the Bible; and there are countless Jews and Christians today to whom the Bible is known not for itself and by itself, but through the garb of the doctrine in which it has been dressed, the Talmud, or the Fathers. To one who, like myself, believes profoundly in the value of tradition in a Church of tradition and authority, this garb of doctrine is interesting and has its value, but precisely in so far as it is used to hide the book itself or prevent the study of that book as other books are studied, with an appeal to the reason and intelligence of the individual and the age, I protest against that tradition and that authority.

To him who honestly believes in the divine inspiration of the Bible the only method of treatment logically possible is that pursued by the vast body of Protestants in their missionary propaganda, where they take the Bible simply as it stands, translated freely and frankly into the languages of the nations to whom they go, and bid them read that

## Early Hebrew Story

Bible without any interpretation whatsoever. That course is the true course to pursue with regard to a book which we claim to be sacred. Its sanctity must shine forth from itself. It must prove itself to each succeeding generation, with its increased knowledge and its different ideas, to each nation, with its different language and its different customs, as something through which God speaks to man. We count it different from any other book, and therefore we dare to lay it down thus, open before the world, and challenge men to study it for itself; and we who do this must study it and handle it with the same frankness.

The interpretation based upon the scientific knowledge and methods of one age will not be the interpretation which is sufficient for another age; but if the Bible is what we believe it to be, we need have no fear of applying to it the test of the scientific examination and criticism of any age whatsoever. Our faith in the truth which we profess to believe is at stake in this question of our dealing with the Bible. If we fear to submit it to these tests, we fear to do so because we fear that it is not what we claim that it is. The profoundest faith in Christ and the Christian religion is that which challenges the criticism and examination of the age, which believes that every scientific test

will but bring out more fully the fact that God has revealed himself to mankind, especially in and through that nation from which the Lord was born, whose history was one long preparing, one pregnancy for that birth.

And one thing more: If we believe that Jesus, the true and full revelation of God to man, was both human and divine, then it must be clear, it seems to me, that such was the nature of any lower revelation made by God to man, as through the men who prepared the way for His coming, or the men that wrote the story of His life. We must believe that the human and divine were combined in the revelation made through them, and it is no more profane to speak of Jesus as having human flesh, as having hands and feet and nose and eyes and ears, as we men have, as having grown from childhood to youth as we grow, as having been in all respects what men about Him are, save in the completeness of His victory over sin and the fullness of His one-ness with God, than it is profane to speak of the Book which we count, above all books, as the inspired book, as having human characteristics; or to speak of that nation whose story, whose growth and whose highest thought are revealed to us in that book, as having the experiences and characteristics which we know in other nations. If we

would know really what is spiritual and what is inspired in the thought and life of Israel, we must learn to know also what is human and what is natural. There is no profanation, then, in finding in the early story of the Hebrews, as in the early story of any people, myths and legends, fables and traditions. There is nothing profane in observing the growth of Israel out of the simple, sweet yet foolish thoughts of childhood into the fuller growth of the man.

And now to sum up conclusions. What I have treated in these lectures is but part of a whole. My object has not been to take up each individual tradition or legend and explain it fully. I have rather sought to suggest methods of treatment, giving examples of the way in which here, as in any primitive history, we must search for the historical truth that lies behind the early story. I have warned you that all stories are not the same stories; that in folklore, such as we have in the earlier books of the Bible, we cannot always trace the origin of details, and yet that often some little detail contains a most valuable historical suggestion. I have dealt only with the earlier stories and legends, before the documentary period.

We may divide the early story, as we find it in the Bible, into, first, that portion ending in the

eleventh chapter of Genesis, which deals with the creation of the world, the origin of man, the origin of civilization, of the arts and sciences, language and those things which are back of any race or national tradition.

I have tried to show you that this material, as we have it in the Bible, has its closest connection with Babylonian sources. The cosmogonies and the genealogies of those earlier chapters find not alone their parallels but also their origins in Babylonia; not, as I have stated more than once, that they were directly borrowed from Babylonia, but that Babylonia is the source from which indirectly and at a very early period they came to Israel.

The remainder of the Book of Genesis deals with the story of Israel's forefathers before Israel became a nation, and is in its main features Canaanite, precisely as the first part is Babylonian. It is the Canaanite holy places, the Canaanite traditions and legends which were taken over and made a part of Israel's history.

It is with Moses first, with his creation of a nation and a religion, that a new form of tradition begins, which we may call more distinctively Israelitic, the basis of which is not that which was taken from others and woven into Hebrew thought and life, but that which was itself Israelitic.

This is only a rough, general grouping. I have pointed out that in the earliest stories we have Canaanitic elements; and that these stories themselves have been so worked over in an Israelitic sense and so permeated by Israelitic thought that they are now more different from than like their early Babylonian originals. So, in the material of the second stratum, the Canaanite stratum, if I may so designate it, I have shown that there are not a few Babylonian elements; and, further, that this whole material has been woven into the web of the Israelitic racial traditions and been made part of the Israelitic national self-consciousness, so that, in the form in which it comes down to us, it is in very truth a history of the forefathers and the race of Israel. And in the third, the highest stratum, I have tried to show you that there are also incorporated more primitive elements, Babylonian and Canaanite material. I might add that even after documentary history begins we still have in Israel, just as in Rome in the story of Livy, an abundance of folklore, primitive speculations, curious religious legends, which are not history in our modern sense of the term history, and which, if we wish to reduce them to what we call historical form, must first be sifted and recomposed.

Folklore remained a living force in Israel to the

last, and the out-pourings of folklore characterize some of the most interesting periods of Israelitic history, an evidence that Israel was still keenly alive in all its members. What part of the book of Kings is more interesting to the general and more profitable to the religious reader than precisely that part which is drawn from the folklore that gathered around the early prophets — those “Tales of the Prophets,” which have given us the gigantic figure of Elijah, and the tamer and more human, but at the same time more magical and less ethical, picture of Elisha? What more full of the teaching of the meaning and action of a perverted conscience than the story of Balaam, in which, in primitive fashion, the ass speaks, as is so often the case with beasts in folk story, and proves to be able to see the divine and spiritual powers invisible to man? Again, in that great revival of national life which was connected with the revolt under the Maccabees against Antiochian oppression and persecution, we have another out-pouring of popular thought and folklore, from which have come the fascinating tales of our Book of Daniel. Here, at this late period in Israel’s history, and still later in the Book of Esther, and in some of the apocryphal books, like Tobit, we have material drawn from heathen sources, heathen myths and heathen

religious practices, remade into Israel's life and Israel's religious and historic consciousness.

What we have in our Bible is only a fragment of a greater whole. The Old Testament is a survival of the literature of Israel. The stories which have been woven together in legend cycles, in genealogies, and, finally, in histories, in the books which have come down to us, are the survivals of a greater mass of stories told in the early days of Israel, first by raconteurs as individual tales, then built into cycles, and finally written down in the literary period of Israel, many of them to be ultimately lost; some leaving a trace here and there in the literature which has come down to us, others doubtless perishing altogether. The references of prophets and psalmists to the traditions and legends of Israel show us the existence of such material which we have lost, and little snatches of poems here and there, whose references are now blind, or allusions contained in our present story, which are dark to us but were evidently familiar to those who first read them, are all the evidence that we now possess of the existence of this further mass of material; but they are enough to prove its existence.

Hosea knew a legend of Sodom and Gomorrah of which we know nothing. Isaiah and Ezekiel



knew a story of Eden of which we have no other trace. The psalmists and Job knew myths of creation and of the contest between God and the monster of the deep which are not contained in the present books of the Bible. This, by the way, should be borne in mind when we study the prophetic or poetic literature of Israel and ask what was the relation in thought and date between our written prophets, and our psalmists, and the so-called historical literature of Israel represented in our Bible from Genesis on through Kings. There has been too much of an inclination, in modern critical writings, to argue that because a prophet does not refer to or quote from the stories which we now find, or because he quotes from or refers to stories which are clearly other than those which we now possess, therefore our stories were not known to, or are later than the writings of, that prophet. The point of view of these critics has been too narrow; they have failed to realize the existence and the bearing of that greater mass of literature out of which our present Bible has been sifted.

And now, to consider more definitely the historical value of these early Hebrew stories. There was a time, within my own recollection, when at least the conservatives treated the history of Livy and the songs of Homer as historical material, and

there was again a period, also within my recollection, for the development in historical and literary criticism has been a very rapid one in the last half century, when critics regarded these things as worthless, and, casting them away entirely, undertook to begin the writing of history only at a later period, in Greece with the Persian War, in Rome not until long after the beginning of the Republic. We of today venture to write the history of Greece not only up to but before the time of Homer. We find in the Homeric poems material for the writing of that history; and yet not at all the same material which those earlier scholars found, who counted the epic of the expedition against Troy as literal fact. We write the story of Rome today, not only from the time of Romulus and Remus, but from a period still earlier, and yet Romulus and Remus are no longer the historical figures they seemed to the earlier generation which accepted Livy as a text-book of history. Similarly we of today believe that we find history in the early Hebrew story, unlike those men of a few years since, who spoke of everything before the time of David and Solomon as a period of which we knew nothing whatever, but only idle tales, and who made the history of Israel commence with the kingdom of David. But, on the other

hand, we do not use this material as those earlier theologians and earlier historians of Israel did, who treated, for instance, the story of the garden of Eden or the legends of Abraham as prose history, such as you might expect from the pen of a Macaulay or a Fiske.

First of all, these old stories, treated in the way which I have endeavored to suggest to you, carry us back into a great antiquity. We see that the material is very ancient, and even the form of that material in the latest of the Hebrew narratives, that of the Priest Code, is itself of no small antiquity. That point of view which regards the writers of the Priest Code as manufacturing these stories in the Babylonian captivity has been shown to be radically false, and by implication it would seem that the similar conception of the manufacture of laws in Babylonia must be treated in the same way. What has been done to far too great an extent by a certain school of critics is to determine the date of a writing by the last hand that worked over the material, the last idea which was woven in. It is as though a man were to restore today an old cathedral which had fallen into ruins. He scrapes off here the plaster that had been smeared over an ancient painting. There, where a fragment of carving has fallen out, he puts in a

new piece, according to his best judgment as near as may be a replica of that which had been there before. Some distinctly modern things he introduces, the use of iron supports and the like, which were unknown in the older time. And when he has restored this cathedral, the body of which and the design of which is truly ancient, albeit built upon by many hands, until it has been at last repaired by this modern architect, some critics say : "See, there is iron here ; that was not known in the old times ; and here is a stone which evidently came from this recent quarry which has but now been opened, and it bears the tool marks of our age. This cathedral is a modern cathedral." They have overlooked the great essential features and dwelt only upon the minor matters of the latest reconstruction. Fundamentally these stories in the early books of Genesis are of great antiquity. Their final handling is late. But that which is essential, the core of this material, the conception and the design, belongs to a remote antiquity.

The archæological and other discoveries which have been made in Palestine itself, in Syria, in Egypt, and, above all, in Assyria and Babylonia, have been in their way a corrective to modern critical tendencies. They have shown us that we

are in these stories in touch with a remote antiquity, and that even the authors of the Priest Code had their material largely cut out and prepared by a tradition, the roots of which go down three thousand years before the time of Christ.

I have endeavored to show that these stories are valuable historically in the revelation of early racial connections; that they contain true traditions of the origin and formation and kinship of the Hebrew people and some of their neighbors, of the conquest of Canaan and the relation of the Hebrews to the Canaanites, of tribal origins and developments in Israel itself. Now and then there is an account of some great historical event, showing, for example, the political relations of Canaan to Babylonia, like that of which we get a glimpse in the story of Abraham's victory over Chedorlamer. But, above all, we have in these legends, as they have come down to us, the strongest confirmation of the truth of the story of the deliverance from Egypt, of which so much is made in later Hebrew history. Indelibly it fixed its imprint upon these early legends, woven into each because it was an event which impressed itself upon the life of all Israel.

Historically these early stories are valuable also in that unconscious picture which they give us of

the life and thought of the people. Folklore is more illuminating in its pictures of social and industrial conditions, of domestic life, of the ideas, customs and habits of a people than formal history; and he who wants to know how the Israelites of early times lived must turn not to the formal history of the Book of Kings, but to Genesis and Judges. But here we must remember that folklore, passed down from mouth to mouth, changes in its description of environment, not quite, but almost *pari passu* with the change of that environment itself, so that the pictures of life which we obtain in the stories of Genesis, Exodus and Judges, are not pictures of the life 2000 or 1500 years B. C., but more nearly 1000 years B. C., at a period just before they were reduced to written form.

Above all, early Hebrew story is valuable as a history of the development of civilization, morality and religion among the Hebrews, and in this lies part also of the moral value to us of today of these early stories.

I have tried to show you the likeness between Babylonian cosmogonies, legends, mythology and magic and those of the Hebrews, the identity of Israelitic with Canaanitic practices, ritual, ceremonial and sacred places, the intimate relation between the popular religion of Israel and that of

Babylonia and Canaan, and I have done so because my object was to prove to you the connection with and dependence on Babylonia and Canaan of the Hebrews in primitive times.

More characteristic than these likenesses, however, are the divergencies which exist. Take the Babylonian myth of creation. Read of the strange figures of monsters and gods who succeeded one another in æon after æon; of the struggle of god with god, of the weakness and the immoralities of those gods. Read of the caprices of the gods which bring about the Flood. Behold the picture of the gods huddled together, shuddering in terror because of the destruction which is wrought. See the powerlessness of the gods in the presence of nature and of fate. Hear how the gods sensuously and greedily clustered around the sacrifice like flies about sweetmeats. Then read the Hebrew story, even in the anthropomorphic representation of the earliest Hebrew narrative, where Yahaweh walks among men and counsels with them as a man. He and He only is the author of all things. His judgments are not the judgments of caprice, but moral judgments based on a conception of justice and right. Man's relations with Him are not merely those relations of terror which man must have with any being whose nature and character is alien to

him and unfathomable by him. God made man in His image. Man can understand, man can come to God; and God's dealings with man are reasonable and intelligible to man.

Go on upward from this into the higher and more spiritual, if less poetic and picturesque cosmogony of the Priest Code, with its picture of the all-power of God alone, who need not put forth His hand, whose breath, whose word create, from whom alone are all things. He transcends the universe, and transcends so far the thought of man himself that he can form no picture of His likeness.

Or take the Hebrew story of the Flood, whose cause is the wickedness of man, which God would punish, with its moral lesson of the relation of God to man and man to God, and that for all sin and evil that is wrought God will bring calamity and destruction, who is yet not unwilling to remember the good that is done, if it be but by one individual, whom He will surely recompense for his righteousness.

I have called your attention to the fact that reminiscences of Canaanite polytheism, of Canaanite child-worship, of the immoral Canaanitic sex worship, shine through the later stories here and there, but the fact that we get such glimpses, confirming the continual references of the Prophets to the



abominations of the land, does but bring out in clearer relief the wonderful exaltation and purity of the Hebrew narrative and carry conviction of the inspiration of the men and the people through whom these tales have come down to us. That they, seeing the spiritual reality behind and beneath the gross and crude expression, did out of such material build a story so sweet and beautiful and uplifting, is an evidence of the inspiring Spirit which dwelt in Israel, of God working in this people to lift it out of polytheism into monotheism. That out of what seems to us a foul nature worship they should gain that inward, underlying thought which was worth having of the worship of a life-giving God, and incorporate it in their religious life; that out of the abhorrent child-sacrifice they should take that exalted spiritual thought of the true human sacrifice, the offering of one's self, one's thoughts, one's deeds, one's possessions, a living sacrifice unto God;—that is their glory, and the evidence of their peculiar relation to God, which we call inspiration.

The difference between the Hebrew stories contained in Genesis and their Babylonian and Canaanite prototypes is striking evidence of the historical fact of the mission of Moses. Precisely as Christianity took over and reformed the myths and

legends of the countries which it conquered or occupied, so the religion of Moses took over and reformed the myths and legends which it found in Canaan. The legend of Perceval or Parsifal may serve as an illustration of the way in which Christianity dealt with the early heathen myths which it absorbed. Parsifal was a heathen hero; the original story of Parsifal, a heathen myth. In Christian legend he becomes a man. The gods and demigods of the heathen legend vanish; but the divine element remains transformed into another shape. The legend is brought into connection with Jesus through the ritual of the Christian Church, and there is a sort of mystic combination of Parsifal with Jesus through the Holy Grail. In such ways a heathen myth and heathen demigods or heroes became the most effective means of conveying Christianity and Christian truth. The same thing precisely occurred in the transformation of the old mythic material by the Hebrew forefathers. The monotheistic and moral elements which were introduced into those stories, and which are personified in the heroes of those stories, are due to Moses, in the same sense that the transformation of the Parsifal and similar legends are attributable to Jesus Christ.

That the heathen polytheistic myths and sensual

and cruel rites which the Hebrews took over from Canaanites and Babylonians have been transformed into the sweet, sane and charming stories of Genesis, that Hebrew monotheism and Hebrew morality have been breathed into them, so that they have become instinct with the life of Israel, an expression of its better spiritual being, is due to Moses, and is itself a proof of the nature and reality of his mission. Why did these tales become, in the mouths of the men of Israel, so pure and exalted at a period long antecedent to the time of the first writing prophets, Amos and Hosea? It was not Amos and Hosea who inspired them with their stern morality, their lofty monotheism, their charming idealism. It was they who prepared the way for the teaching of those prophets. The advance made upon their teaching by the more formal pronouncements of those great teachers of righteousness is relatively small. The great work of creation and inspiration had been achieved long before their day. Who or what was it then that gave inspiration to the men who at such an early date transmuted the dross of heathen myths and legends into this pure gold of ethical story? The selfsame myths and legends remained gross, sensual and polytheistic in the lore of the more highly civilized peoples among whom the Israelites lived

and with whom they were in constant intercourse, as we see by a comparison with the myths and legends—and their would-be scientific expansions and explanations—of the Phœnicians. The phenomenon of this extraordinary transformation of gross and sensual heathen legends into the sweet, pure stories of Israel's heroes is convincing evidence of some profound and inspired influence which at the outset differentiated Israel from the peoples among whom it dwelt. It is, in other words, a proof of the substantial truth of Israel's claim of a revelation of God through Moses.

More in detail I might endeavor to point out to you the historical value of early Hebrew story on the side of moral history. That story is an evidence to us of the moral growth, the moral evolution of the people of Israel, which, in a sense, is parallel with the moral growth and the moral evolution of the individual from childhood up; that growth and evolution which ultimately made the religion of Israel ripen into the religion of Christ Jesus. But this early Hebrew story has a moral value not merely as the study of the development of a people. If this were all, then Genesis and Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges, would be valuable chiefly to the student of religion, to the scholar who looks

back to see out of what a later and truer religion has grown, and smiles to himself, sympathetically, it may be, but still smiles as he reads the crude thoughts of the childhood of that religion. This early story has a present-day moral value, a moral value not only for the student, but also for the modern practitioner of religion. It has a right to be called inspired, not only by comparison with other sacred literature of early date, but also because of its actual value in moral teaching today.

Let us take that book of which we especially think when we speak of early Hebrew story — the Book of Genesis. It is one part of a larger whole. Time will not allow me to analyze the whole. Let me analyze this part and endeavor to show you in it what I mean. In the first place, look at it from the point of view of its outward form. I sometimes think that I should like to publish the Book of Genesis divided into its own proper sections and chapters, the whole of it, just as it was meant to be seen and read by the final artist, the last hand that put it into shape. We have it today divided into a number of chapters — fifty of them — according to a relatively modern scheme, and each chapter divided into a number of verses for convenience of reference ; and the chapters are headed with statements as to their contents. Now while the Book

of Genesis is a fragment of a larger whole, the Pentateuch, or the Hexateuch, or the great history of Israel, according to the relation in which you consider it, there is also a unity of design in the book itself, which makes it a true book. There are two great divisions of the Book—the first dealing with the pre-Hebrew world, the world before Abraham; and the second and much larger division dealing with the ancestors of the Hebrews before Moses, from Abraham onward.

In the first main division there are seven chapters, the mystical and complete number which God himself observed in the creation of the world. In the second part there are five chapters, and the whole put together adds up another mystical number, twelve, the number of the tribes of Israel. It is a quaint method, this division into sections, according to a mystical numerical scheme, giving even the outward form a religious significance; but it is a method which was familiar also to authors of our own race not so many centuries ago.

The first chapter of each of these two great sections has no heading. Each succeeding chapter is conveniently indicated by a recurrent formula. You must remember that such divisions for the eye as you and I make today by the separation of words and sentences from one another by spaces,

the headings of chapters, parentheses, punctuation, all those devices for facilitating the reading and understanding of the written text, were unknown in that early period, unknown even to Greek and Latin antiquity. Where we use chapter headings, the compiler of Genesis used these recurrent formulæ.

The first chapter, of course, needed no heading. The second chapter is indicated by this heading (Gen. II, 4): "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Then we read the story of the creation of man upon the earth, of the beasts, of the making of woman as man's helpmeet, of the garden in which God placed this man and woman, the serpent, the temptation, the fall and the curse. The second chapter is designated (V, 1): "The Book of the Generations of Man (Adam)." It contains the story of antediluvian mankind, with his genealogies. The fourth chapter, VI, 9 - IX, 29, is headed: "The Generations of Noah," and contains the story of Noah and the Flood. The fifth chapter, X, 1 - XI, 9, is called: "The Generations of the sons of Noah." It carries you down to the branching off of that particular race out of which Israel was to come. The sixth chapter, Genesis

XI, 10–XI, 26, is headed: “The Generations of Shem,” and gives you, in the form of genealogy, the history of those kindred nations, known as Semites, of relationship with whom, through a common ancestor, the Hebrews were conscious linguistically and ethnologically. The seventh chapter, Genesis XI, 27–32, is headed: “The Generations of Terah.” This recounts the separation from the eastern Semites of that west Semitic element out of which Israel was conscious of being derived, and the genealogy of this west Semitic stem.

This ends Part I of Book I of Genesis. As in the first part, so in the second part, also, the first chapter, which is the story of the great forefather of the Hebrews, Abraham (Gen. XII, 1–XXV, 11), is without a heading. The second chapter is headed: “The Generations of Ishmael” (Gen. XXV, 12–18); the third chapter: “The Generations of Isaac” (XXV, 19–XXXV, 29); the fourth chapter: “The Generations of Esau” (XXXVI,–XXXVII, 1); the fifth chapter: “The Generations of Jacob” (XXXVII, 2 to the close of the book).

Note the way in which the writer takes first the eldest son of Abraham, Ishmael, and follows his history until it ends in nothing, as much as to say:



“See, God would have chosen him, but it was in vain. That is the end. We must go back and look for and find another clue.” In the same way he follows the history of Esau, only to return and take up the story of the younger son, Jacob, like one who has followed a wrong road and found it a *cul-de-sac*, and must come back to the last crossing and start afresh. Such is the outward scheme.

Now notice the conception which the book presents and which I think is grand, not only in comparison with any other primitive history that was ever written, but grand in itself and full of meaning to us of today. According to the conception of the man who cast the book in this form, the history of the beginnings of Israel must commence with the creation of the universe, because that was the beginning of God's plan about Israel. Then observe the writer's conception of sin as the cause of trouble in the world and the picture which he gives you of the misery that follows sin: the sin of the disobedience to God's law, arbitrary though it seem, the sin that somehow comes with sex, and the misery entailed on the human race in the hard life of toil for the man and child-bearing for the woman, and perpetual conflict with the serpent.

The horrible results of envy, hatred and malice are vividly pictured in the story of Cain and Abel.

Then follows, in a couple of episodes, the story of the corruption of the earth, God's wrath, and the horrible punishment of the Flood by which all the families of the earth were destroyed, save only that of Noah. It is like a picture of our own thoughts and our own ways, especially in the zeal and uncharitableness of our youth. So we would root out sin by a root and branch destruction ; but a root and branch destruction will not destroy sin. A new and different course must be tried. Accordingly a new commencement is made, and you have the story of the guiding love of God, which responds to the faith of man.

Most beautifully this is set forth in the story of Abraham. Abraham lets Lot choose the land that he will occupy, and Lot chooses the better land, to which are given the good things of the earth. But the very luxury and wanton exuberance of life which caused him to choose this land are indirectly the cause also of its destruction. To Abraham falls the poorer land, which exacts the hardy toil of man ; but the choice is of God, and with that land goes God's blessing. Because of the complete faith of Abraham in God, his ever readiness to obey, to forsake what seemed to be the door of fortune at the behest of God, to surrender the dearest that he had, even his own son, if God

should so command, God loved Abraham and promised him a blessing. Because of the faith which believed in the face of disappointment, which believed in the impossible, even that impossible itself was achieved, and to Abraham and Sarah, aged, in the course of nature barren, was born Isaac, and from him Jacob and the twelve tribes, through whom the promised blessing was fulfilled.

I shall not ask you to follow further with me this line of thought. The same plan, the same thought runs through the book. It is a picture of a relation of man to God, which lifts the man out of sin and weakness and infirmity, which out of his faults even, through faith, brings him a blessing. I would ask you, rather, to consider more in detail two or three individual stories or episodes on their moral side. I venture to say that if you will read the story of what we commonly know as the fall of man in Eden intelligently, comprehending the thought of the writer, you will find that the problems which are there presented and discussed in this mystical story form are the same problems which you and I encounter in our daily life, and that the story, just as it is there told, is immensely profitable to you and to me in the moral consideration of those problems. We are perfectly con-

scious of the truth which lies behind our Lord's saying, that if we would enter into the kingdom of God we must be as little children; we are perfectly conscious that in some way, somehow, every one of us, in passing out of our childhood, has lost something. The race itself, in the development of civilization, loses a similar something. And yet we are equally conscious that out of that loss in some way may be achieved a greater gain. Out of the toil, out of the pain, out of the very thorns and thistles and the never ceasing struggle with temptation comes a new manhood, a new power, and ultimately a new and wonderful relation to God. Who that studies his own nature, who that seeks to guide and help those who are struggling with their consciousness of sin and fall and failure, but finds, and has found through all the Christian ages, inspiration and assistance in this chapter? Read all the philosophical treatises that you will and profit by them; I venture to think that if you will read this chapter, simply and *naïvely*, as it is written, it will after them all still enlighten and guide you.

Is there anywhere in all literature a more effective setting forth of the horrible results of envy, malice and hatred than the story of Cain and Abel? of the abhorrence which God and man alike have

for murder and the murderer, so that the very name of Cain has become in this connection a part of our own literary goods, a symbol and a by-word to indicate and stigmatize the malicious and envious thought that leads to murder?

Is there any more beautiful picture which has ever been drawn of the man who walks with God than Abraham, the friend of God? So touching is the tale that it has sifted in strange forms through all sorts of oriental traditions. So beautiful and so inspiring is the story that all Islam today admires and reveres that friend of God, and wherever you go in Moslem lands you find shrines dedicated to *Halil*, the Arab's name for Abraham, because he was the friend of God.

Artistically, perhaps, the most perfect specimen of the *raconteur's* art in the Book of Genesis is the tale of the wooing of Rebecca; and so sweet and wholesome is the story that the love of Isaac and Rebecca for one another has become a type of true marital affection, and to this day, in the marriage service of the Church of England and its sister Church in America, prayer is offered that the newly married couple may "live together as faithfully as Isaac and Rebecca."

While in many of its features the story of Jacob is less exalted than that of Abraham, yet no one

can read it without recognizing the beauty and force of the spiritual touches, which are introduced over and over again; and the very weaknesses of the hero, furnishing a point of sympathy and contact for the average man, have always made the story one of peculiar interest and value. The overshrewdness, the touch of rascality in Jacob's nature is brought out with an appreciative sense of humor; but one feels also the moral element in the retribution that comes upon him, combined with a sense of the loving kindness of God, which makes of his very faults a blessing. But I need not attempt to describe in detail those traits which all recognize.

Of a different type from the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, more elaborate in its literary form, is the story of Joseph, which, likewise, is narrated with great power, and is a beautiful piece of work from the artistic standpoint.

The stories of Genesis are stories of humanity. They appeal to men. They are and will be worth reading forever. These heroes of Genesis are eternal. Men, from a generation brought up with the old, literal ideas, may for a time be shocked, as it were, out of the use of the book by this newer way of looking at it. Unable to hold the old view any longer, they yet cannot at first reconcile them-

selves to this new point of view. They see that these stories are not literal history, as they once thought; that God did not walk back and forth upon the earth or talk with men in the literal way there narrated. They had felt that the essential value of the book lay in the literal truthfulness of these things. They had looked at it only from a peculiar religious and theological standpoint. They are unable longer to regard it in this light and have no further use for the book. There will always be persons, also, of that prosaic type of mind which cannot understand the mystical, the poetical, the story-telling way of conveying truth. To these people I presume that Genesis will never be a source of mental enjoyment and spiritual uplift. But however much, for a time, the ordinary serious-minded man, or generation of religious men, may turn away from the use of this book, on account of the overturning of his previous theological misunderstanding of the nature of its contents, he must ultimately return to it, I believe, with renewed enjoyment and profit; and young and old, scholars and simple folk alike will continue to read and study it forever.

To the child Genesis is the most charming book in the Bible, and it is a misfortune when the man has lost so much of the child that should be in him

that he can no longer appreciate that charm. To the child, also, Genesis is full of spiritual instruction. You do not need to take these stories and attach a theological interpretation to them for his benefit. Give them to the child in their simple form, or better still translate them still more fully, present them more clearly as stories, rid them of those curious Hebrew words which sometimes puzzle and bother the child and give him false impressions, translating them precisely as the Hebrews translated the names in the myths and legends which they took over. The child will find, I care not how pure and lofty the religious thought by which he is surrounded, uplift and help in these stories of Genesis. And the man who, in the development of his manhood, has kept, as he ought to keep, in touch with his childhood, and in touch as that childhood is or should have been with nature and with spirit, will find, even more possibly than the child himself, spiritual help and spiritual meaning in these tales. What he imbibed as a child will grow within him, and develop new meaning as he grows.

The man who has altogether lost the spirit of the child, the man who has lost touch with his own childhood and his childish thoughts, the man who has lost touch with that sweet view of nature and



of spirit which is part of the child-likeness which made Jesus say that we must become like little children in order to inherit the kingdom of God, has lost certainly one of the best elements of his human nature. So surely as man keeps close to the best that was in his childhood, which, I take it, is of the best that is in his nature altogether, so surely will he from time to time, turning back from other studies and other reading, find new inspiration and new meaning in this wonderful old book of Genesis. It is for this reason that it continues to stand today in the Bible, that book which Jewish and Christian generations of religious, thoughtful men have venerated and passed on for the veneration of their successors.

FINIS



## INDEX

- Abel, 235ff., 295, 298.  
 Abimelech, 72, 122.  
 Abraham, 46ff., 49, 59, 80, 94, 100, 105, 113f., 117, 120ff., 128ff., 142ff., 154, 156ff., 170, 172f., 176, 182, 187, 191, 194f., 196, 246, 267, 283, 292, 294, 296, 299.  
 Abram, see Abraham.  
 Abrizan, festival of, 88.  
 Adam, 33, 218ff., 235, 241f., 249, 254, 293.  
 Adapa, 225f., 232.  
 Ægæan, civilization, 39ff.  
 Alphabet, invention of, 42.  
 Amarna Tablets, 33, 36, 37, 49, 115, 164, 225.  
 Ammon, 35, 37, 47, 54, 60, 152, 154ff., 177.  
 Amorite, 37, 40, 46, 47.  
 Amraphel, see Hammurabi.  
 Anu, 226.  
 Arabia, home of Semites, 29ff., 41, 46f., 49; tribal stories, 58; religion, 95, 108; origins, 265, 267.  
 Aramæan, 36, 41, 45, 46, 47, 61, 75, 115f., 133f., 168, 265, 267.  
 Asher, 58, 63f., 74f., 77f.  
 Asheroth, 32, 182, 187.
- Babel, tower of, 232, 260ff.  
 Babylon, 30.  
 Babylonia, civilization of, 26f; Semitic domination, 29; struggle with Elam, 30; domination of Palestine, 31ff; numeral system, 55; temples, 102; mythology, 126f; influence of, 157;
- Babylonia, religious development, 174f; sexual cult, 181; cosmogonic myths, 185; legends, 192f; cosmogonies, 198ff; Eden, 209ff; creation, 215, 221; magic, 218, 224, 252; serpent, 228f; cherubim, 233; primeval king, 242ff; flood myth, 255f; Babel, 260ff.
- Balaam, 277.  
 Banias, 106.  
 Beersheba, 105, 114, 124, 128, 136, 144, 166, 172, 176.  
 Behemoth, 184.  
 Bel, 200f., 205, 259.  
 Benjamin, 58, 63, 73f., 77, 155.  
 Berossus, 242ff.  
 Bethel, 52, 72f., 110ff., 124, 128, 136, 165, 169, 172, 176.  
 Beth-Shemesh, 78f., 179.  
 Bilhah, 63f.  
 Blessings of Jacob, 66ff., 71.  
 " " Moses, 66f., 71.  
 Blood, 239.  
 Burial, 28f.  
 Burning, 28f.
- Cain, 235ff., 241, 245f., 295, 298.  
 Caleb, 64f., 165.  
 Canaan, early conditions, 29f., 33, 37; alien to Israel, 45ff., 61; occupation of, 64, 68, 70ff., 95; religion, 97f., 125, 137f., 181, 185; cosmogonies, 204; Eden story, 214;

- Canaan, legends of, 250, 260;  
     origin of, 264;  
     immorality, 265f., 286;  
     myths and legends, 288.  
 Caves, 28, 98ff.  
 Chedorlaomer, 161, 163, 283.  
 Cherubim, 233f.  
 Child Sacrifice, 138ff.  
 Christmas, 85.  
 Circumcision, 191, 238.  
 Creation, myth of, 200ff., 215ff.,  
     279, 285.  
 Dagon, 32, 84.  
 Dan, 58, 63f., 77ff., 107, 113.  
 Daniel, 78, 93, 277.  
 David, narrative of founding of  
     kingdom, 3;  
     official annals, 4;  
     narrative of early life, 8;  
     commencement of era, 43, 65,  
     76, 123, 173, 194, 280.  
 Dead Sea, legend of, 145ff.  
 Deborah, 58, 65, 169.  
 Delilah, 181f.  
 Deuteronomist, 20.  
 Dinah, 63, 67.  
 Dragon, 184f., 205ff., 229.  
 Ea, 127, 201, 224ff., 232, 258f.  
 Eabani, 221f.  
 Easter, 86.  
 Eden, 208ff., 235.  
 Edom, 37, 46ff., 50, 59, 61, 63, 65,  
     131ff., 141, 168f., 220, 279,  
     294f., 297.  
 Egypt, civilization, 26f;  
     influence in Canaan, 34, 50ff.,  
     62;  
     magic, 90, 189ff;  
     bondage, 118ff;  
     mythology, 126, 174;  
     serpent worship, 188;  
     paradise, 209.  
 Elam, 30, 161.  
 Elijah, 76, 83, 277.  
 Elisha, 277.  
 Ellasar, see Larsa.  
 Elohist, 17, 62, 123, 135, 166, 169,  
     172, 196.  
 Enlil, 127, 175, 201.  
 Enoch, 242, 245.  
 Enos, 242f.  
 Ephraim, 54, 58, 60, 63, 72ff., 77,  
     116f., 170.  
 Eridu, 201, 224f.  
 Esau, see Edom.  
 Esther, 93, 159, 277.  
 Eve, 235f., 249.  
 Ezekiel, 22, 213, 233, 278.  
 Flood, 245ff., 255ff., 285f., 293,  
     296.  
 Gad, 58, 63f., 74ff.  
 Galilee, 79.  
 Genealogies, 240ff., 263, 266, 275.  
 Gezer, excavations at, 28, 98;  
     capture of, 51, 52;  
     temple at, 109;  
     child sacrifice, 140.  
 Giants, 251.  
 Gideon, 9.  
 Gilead, 58, 69, 73, 76f., 106, 134,  
     167f.  
 Gilgamesh, 91, 182, 221f., 255.  
 Gomorrah, see Sodom.  
 Hagar, 48.  
 Hammurabi, 30;  
     laws of, 157;  
     expedition of, 160ff;  
     code of, 181.  
 Haran, 150ff.  
 Hebron, 64, 100f., 104, 113f., 128,  
     136f., 163ff., 172, 176.  
 Hermon, 101, 106.  
 Hexateuch, 25, 26.  
 High Place, 101ff.  
 Hittites, 36ff., 50, 54.  
 Hosea, tomb of, 104.  
 Iron, introduction of, 43.  
 Isaac, 46, 59, 80, 94, 106, 114, 126,  
     128f., 132, 136, 164, 172f.,  
     187, 191, 194, 294, 297, 299f.  
 Issachar, 58, 63, 71, 75, 79.  
 Ishmael, 45, 48, 59, 294.  
 Ishtar, 32, 84f., 91, 93, 182, 222.

- Jacob, 5, 31, 46, 51, 53f., 58, 59, 61ff., 78, 80, 94, 113ff., 125f., 128ff., 164ff., 169, 173, 178, 187, 191, 194, 294f., 297, 299f.  
 Jacob-el, see Jacob.  
 Jasher, see Yashar.  
 Jephthah, 9, 177f.  
 Jeremiah, 22.  
 Jerusalem, 32, 52, 65, 69, 98, 101, 143f., 162, 164, 171, 182, 188.  
 Jeshurun, see Yeshurun.  
 Joseph, 5, 31, 53f., 60, 62f., 72, 74, 78, 80, 116ff., 126, 134ff., 190.  
 Joseph-el, see Joseph.  
 Joshua, tomb of, 82.  
 Judah, 58, 62ff., 71, 77, 135.  
 Judges, tomb of, 92.
- Kedesh, 79.  
 Kenites, 236, 238.  
 Khabiri, 35ff.
- Laban, 61, 116, 133, 168, 170.  
 Larsa, 30, 161.  
 Leah, 58, 61, 63f., 70ff., 170.  
 Levi, 58, 63, 66f., 70.  
 Leviathan, 184, 206f.  
 Levitical cities, 32.  
 Lilith, 33, 254.  
 Lot, 35, 48, 54, 152ff., 164, 296.  
 Lotan, see Lot.
- Machir, 58, 73.  
 Machpelah, 99, 104.  
 Magic, 189f., 218, 252.  
 Mahanaim, 166 f., 177.  
 Manasseh, 54, 58, 60, 72f., 77, 116f.  
 Marduk, 93, 127, 175, 185, 199, 201, 205f., 215.  
 Mazzebah, 108, 176, 182.  
 Melchizedek, 162, 164, 172.  
 Merenptah, 50.  
 Mesha, 76, 141.  
 Methuselah, 242, 245.  
 Milkah, 159, 170.  
 Moab, 35, 37, 47, 54, 60, 76, 141, 152, 154ff., 177.  
 Mordecai, 93, 159.
- Moses, 95ff., 101, 121, 126, 187, 189ff., 275, 287f.  
 Mycenæan, civilization, 39ff.
- Nabataeans, 46f.  
 Nahor, 159, 170.  
 Naphtali, 58, 63f., 74, 79.  
 Nazarite, vow, 179.  
 Nebo, 32, 101.  
 Nehushtan, 187.  
 Ninib, 32.  
 Nippur, 102, 127, 175, 201.  
 Noah, 241f., 245, 255ff., 265, 293, 296.
- Penuel, 166f., 177.  
 Phallic, 28, 108f., 183.  
 Philistines, origin, 40, 264ff.; conquest by, 76, 78, 121ff., 180.  
 Phœnicia, 36 ; civilization and alphabet, 42 ; worship of Gad, 75 ; cosmogony 204f.
- Priest Code, 24, 60, 65, 198f., 203ff., 219, 240ff., 256, 265ff., 281, 283.
- Rachel, 58, 63, 70ff., 169f.  
 Rahab, 182, 184, 187, 205f.  
 Rebekah, 129, 132, 299.  
 Reuben, 62ff., 70.  
 Ruten, 35.
- Sabbath, 24, 203.  
 Sacrifice, child, 138ff ; flesh, 239.  
 Salman, 32.  
 Samson, 78, 178ff., 223.  
 Sarah, 49, 120, 122, 170, 297.  
 Sarai, see Sarah.  
 Sargon I., 29, 192ff.  
 Semitic, 27ff., 31, 36, 98, 102, 192, 265ff., 294.  
 Serpent Worship, 187ff., 206f., 224, 228ff., 231f.  
 Sexual Cult, 181ff.  
 Shamash, 32, 78, 178.

- Shechem, 66ff., 116f., 134ff., 165,  
     176.  
 Shedim, 33.  
 Shiloh, 100, 117.  
 Shooting, myth, 90.  
 Simeon, 58, 63f., 66ff., 70.  
 Sin, 32, 101, 126, 157ff., 170, 245.  
 Sinai, 102.  
 Sodom, legend of, 151ff., 162, 278.  
 Solomon, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16,  
     62, 98, 280.  
 St. George, 82, 84, 89, 125, 137,  
     167, 176, 185.  
 St. Januarius, 81.  
 Stone Worship, 28, 108ff.  
 Sumerian, 27f;  
     demonology, 33, 252.  
  
 Tamar, 182.  
 Tehom, 199, 202, 205f.  
 Thutmosis, inscription of, 52, 54.  
 Tiamtu, 199, 202f., 205f.
- Tobit, 277.  
 Totemism, 171.  
 Tree Worship, 100, 224f.  
  
 Ur, 30, 126, 157ff.  
 Uru-salim, see Jerusalem.  
  
 Woman, creation, 222f., 231f.  
 Wells, 104ff.  
 Writing, 27, 38, 42.  
  
 Yagub-ilu, see Jacob.  
 Yahawist, 15, 58, 71, 123, 135,  
     172, 196, 198, 240ff., 256, 263,  
     265.  
 Yashar, book of, 5.  
 Yasup-ilu, see Joseph.  
 Yeshurun, 5.  
  
 Zebulun, 58, 71, 75, 79.  
 Zilpah, 63f.

# The Crown Theological Library

## I.—BABEL AND BIBLE

By Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, of the University of Berlin. Authorized translation. 12°. With 77 illustrations. Net, \$1.50.

“It is unnecessary to say, perhaps, that every student of the Bible and every clergyman who intends to keep up with the progress in Bible research should be familiar with the contents of this book.”—*Springfield Republican*.

## II.—THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST

A Christological Study. By Paul Lobstein, of the University of Strassburg. Authorized translation. 12°. Net, \$1.25.

At the present moment, when the subject of this work is exercising men's minds throughout the country, this contribution by the well-known Strassburg professor—critical, yet perfectly reverent in treatment—should be welcomed by all.

## III.—MY STRUGGLE FOR LIGHT

Confessions of a Preacher. By R. Wimmer. 12°. Net, \$1.25.

Originally educated in a conservative school of theology, the author gradually progressed to more liberal ideas. In this book he describes the struggle through which he passed when endeavoring to reconcile faith with reason, and sets forth the conclusions at which he arrived.

New York — G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS — London

# The Crown Theological Library

## IV.—LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY:

### ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND MISSION

By Jean Reville, Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris. Translated and Edited by Victor Leuliette. 12°. Net, \$1.25.

The lectures included in this volume were delivered by M. Reville in Geneva in 1892. The translator says in his preface that they are now offered to the English public, at this time of growing unsettlement and anxiety, to show how a leading French Protestant endeavors to meet the needs and solve some of the difficulties of those who, in the face of an ever-widening horizon of knowledge and consequent broadening of thought, are casting about for a reverent reconsideration and clear restatement of Christian doctrine in the light of philosophic and scientific conceptions of our time.

## VI.—FAITH AND MORALS

By Wilhelm Herrmann, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Marburg. Translated from the German by Donald Matheson, M.A., and Robert W. Stewart, M.A., B.Sc. 12°. Net, \$1.25.

In Professor Herrman's view Faith begins with a guess after a power behind Nature.—a guess resting on various grounds but always involving some moral results. But these moral results lead to little that is satisfactory, till in Jesus Christ's life and teaching we find that the moral requirements after which we have striven have been recognized and fulfilled; and so we know that the power we guessed at is beneficent and has been at work here into Christ's life coming into touch with us. Through Christ accordingly we become sure of God.

## VII.—EARLY HEBREW STORY

A Study of the Origin, the Value, and the Historical Background of the Legends of Israel. By John P. Peters, D.D., Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York; author of "Nippur; or, Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates." 12°. Net.

The six lectures which constitute this book were originally delivered as Bond Lectures before the Bangor Theological Seminary in Bangor, Me.

New York — G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS — London









BS1171 P482  
Early Hebrew story: its historical

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00011 8291