

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOLUME XXVIII

1909

PART TWO

THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	J H ROPES	103
NOTES ON GOSPEL CHRONOLOGY	B W BACON	130
NOTE ON THE HEXAMETER IN JAS. 1:11	W H P HATCH	119
ABRAHAM AND ARCHEOLOGY	G A BARTON	152
THE EARLIEST HEBREW WRITINGS	J P PETERS	169
AZARIAH OF JUDAH AND TIGLATH PILESER III	H M HAYDN	182
NOTE ON AMOS 2:7	J A BEWER	200

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.		
1908		i
LIST OF NUMBERS		vii
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS		xvi

PUBLISHED FOR
THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS
BY
G. E. STECHERT & CO.
129-133 WEST TWENTIETH STREET, NEW YORK

\$3 00 A YEAR

SINGLE NUMBERS, \$1 50

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED TWICE A YEAR

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE FOR 1909

JULIUS AUGUST BEWER, Union Theological Seminary

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, Yale University

WILLIAM H. COBB, Congregational Library, Boston

Communications for the Editors should be addressed to the REV. WILLIAM H. COBB, 14 Beacon St., Boston, Massachusetts.

In ENGLAND copies of the Journal may be had of JAMES PARKER & Co., 27 Broad Street, Oxford, and 31 Bedford Street, Strand, London.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1909

President	HENRY P. SMITH, Meadville Theological Seminary
Vice-President	DAVID G. LYON, Harvard University
Recording Secretary	WILLIAM H. COBB, Congregational Library, Boston
Corresponding Secretary	JULIUS A. BEWER, Union Theological Seminary
Treasurer	J. DYNELEY PRINCE, Columbia University
Associates in Council	{ FRANK C. PORTER, Yale University IRVING F. WOOD, Smith College ALBERT T. CLAY, University of Pennsylvania.

3 1761 08154590 7



JOURNAL

OF

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXVIII

Part II

1909

The Text of the Epistle of James

JAMES HARDY ROPES

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE following investigation of the text of the Epistle of James is an experiment made in the belief that a thorough study of a strictly limited field in the great problem of the text of the New Testament might lead to valuable results, and that a body of observed facts could be assembled which would have permanent objective validity. The study is incomplete, but the results so far attained have proved interesting to the writer, and the present article is now published with the hope that others may be led to take up similar investigations in limited fields.

The elaborate investigations and statistics on the text of the New Testament published by Bernhard Weiss in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* are undoubtedly of much value, but the method is not always easy to understand, and the argument is not wholly convincing, while they are subject to the obvious, though only partly justified, criticism, that it is unsatisfactory to restrict the discussion arbitrarily to the uncial manuscripts. They represent, however, the only important systematic attempt to set forth the fundamental process of weighing the value of the several witnesses to the text. Such a process underlay the work of Westcott and Hort, and they ought to have given to the world the careful lists and statistics which they made, in addition to the com-

pact statements of results which are contained in Hort's *Introduction*. But any one who makes the attempt will discover at once why Dr. Hort was deterred from such an undertaking. Even in cases where the evidence is clear and indisputable, it is often impossible to make exact numerical statements that can be depended on. Unimportant complications in the state of the facts, the necessary subjectivity of the decision in some of the cases, and the difficulty of attaining absolute accuracy without an expenditure of time out of all proportion to any possible value which might accrue in a matter where only large differences of number can have any significance — all these things will inevitably unite to discourage the scholar from venturing upon anything beyond a summary statement, the weight of which will rest solely on the confidence which other students have in his personal power of judging evidence correctly. Yet, if the results are to be permanently convincing, some adequate statement of the evidence must be made.

In the following discussion perfect accuracy is not claimed for the statistics. The figures are presented as approximate only, and it has been sought to make only such use of them as their approximate character would justify. It has been attempted to use as evidence only those judgments about the nature of variants (for instance, in deciding whether a particular reading should be regarded as a deliberate emendation, or as an error, or as probably the true reading) which would seem likely to commend themselves to any scholar, and to treat doubtful matters as doubtful.

The textual problem of the New Testament has usually been approached through those books in which the facts are most complicated — and therefore most interesting. Would it not be well to begin with the simpler aspects of the problem and thence proceed to those which present greater difficulties? In the Epistle of James the problem is simplified by the absence of representatives of the "Western text." In the second century the book was so little known that the earliest clear references to it are those of Origen; it was not used by Cyprian, and no version is known to have been made

earlier than the fourth century. No witness presents the characteristic marks of the "Western text" in any recognizable degree. At the same time the amount of evidence for the text is large and varied. Further, the book is short enough for the material to be easily mastered and the facts kept in mind, while the number of variants is sufficient to provide an adequate body of facts for study. Tischendorf's apparatus registers variation at about 335 points; and even so it properly omits a large number of isolated and unimportant variants found in single minuscules and known from published collations.

It may be added that the epistle must have had in the third and fourth centuries a history somewhat distinct from that of the other books of its group (the Catholic Epistles and Acts), so that it is right in the first instance to study its text without reference to the textual problems of those books.

The practical results to which the investigation of the relative value of the witnesses to the text of James has thus far led, and which are given more fully below, may be here mentioned in brief. It will be observed that the study of the versions is not complete.

1. No Ms. or version gives an untouched, "neutral," text free from emendations. Therefore, "transcriptional probability," when it is clear, is a sufficient reason for rejecting the testimony even of the best Ms.

2. Codex B, though not perfect, presents a better text than any other Ms. or group of Mss. Hence, in cases where evidence from transcriptional probability is indecisive, the reading of Codex B is to be accepted, provided it can be shown from some ancient witness that the reading of B is not a mere individual eccentricity, peculiar to B alone.

3. The genealogical relations of the other older uncials and of the text underlying the Egyptian versions, and the question of the "Alexandrian Text," are still obscure.

4. The "Syrian Text" of K L P and most minuscules contributes nothing to the formation of a correct text.

5. The Old-Latin version was made from a text closely resembling that of B, but somewhat more emended.

These results tend, so far as they go, to confirm the main conclusions of the textual criticism of Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and B. Weiss. It is to be observed that they apply only to the Epistle of James, and that many of the questions now at issue in the text of other parts of the New Testament do not arise here.

I. AUTHORITIES

1. *Uncials*. The following uncials contain James :

B	}	cent. iv.
Ⲛ		
A	}	cent. v.
C		
043 (Ⲛ)		
0166		
Ⲛ ^c		cent. vii.
Ψ	}	cent. viii or ix.
049 (S)		
K ^{ac}	}	cent. ix.
L ^{ac}		
P ^{ac}		
056	}	cent. x.
0142		

Of the above no information is at hand concerning the text of Ψ, 049, 056, 0142.

2. *Minuscules*. Gregory's lists (*Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1908; *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, iii. 1909) include 478 minuscules ranging in date from cent. ix to cent. xviii, which contain, or may be presumed to contain, James. Of these no less than 139 are in the various libraries of Mt. Athos, 40 are in Paris, 39 in Rome, 31 in London. Minuscules are referred to by the numbers assigned in Gregory's latest list. The only minuscules known to be important are

33 (formerly 13^{ac}), cent. ix or x.

69 (formerly 31^{ac}), cent. xv (the Leicester codex).

Others than these two doubtless exist which contain interesting remains of ancient texts not wholly eliminated by conformation to the later standard. The present writer hopes to secure collations of all the minuscules of James, and would be grateful to any one who can furnish him with such collations.¹

3. *Versions.* The following ancient versions come in question :

- (1) Egyptian versions:
 - (a) Sahidic,
 - (b) Akhmimic,
 - (c) Middle Egyptian,
 - (d) Bohairic ;
- (2) Ethiopic version ;
- (3) Syriac versions :
 - (a) Peshitto,
 - (b) Harelean,
 - (c) Palestinian ;
- (4) Armenian version ;
- (5) Latin versions :
 - (a) Old-Latin :
 - ff. Cod. Corbeiensis,
 - s. Cod. Bobiensis,
 - m. Speculum ;
 - (b) Vulgate.

Not all of these versions are at present accessible in trustworthy editions. In the present study it has been possible to include only the Latin and Bohairic versions.

4. *Fathers.* Early patristic quotations from James are meagre, and do not contribute much to the establishment of the text. Later quotations have not yet been sufficiently studied to clear up the later history of the text.

¹ Since the above was written I have received from Mr. Martin Sprengling, of the University of Chicago, collations of all the Mss. of James at Jerusalem, Mt. Athos, Serres, and Kosinitza.

II. THE INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER OF THE CHIEF AUTHORITIES

NOTE.—In the following discussion the numbers are in nearly all cases only *approximate*, even when the word “about” has not been prefixed. They are, however, sufficiently accurate and complete to form a basis for the inferences here drawn.

1. *Codex B.*

Codex B, as will be shown below, has been adopted by all recent critical editors as the main basis of their text. It is probably the oldest Greek Ms. of James.² A thorough examination of the peculiarities of B by a competent philologist is perhaps the most pressing need of New Testament textual criticism at the present day.

B is written with many errors (*e.g.* Jas. 2 6 *καθισται*), and has many noteworthy spellings (*e.g.* 3 14 *επειθειαν*, 3 16 *επειθειαν*), in which a certain degree of consistency seems to have been observed, as if it represented a definite formal recension of the text.³

It is notoriously characterized throughout the New Testament by many omissions of single words or short phrases found in other types of text and even in other Mss. of the same type. Thus out of 88 cases in which **Σ** and B are at variance, 29 are cases of omission in B. On the other hand, the other older uncials very seldom omit words or phrases found in B.

The following are the only cases observed where other Mss. omit words found in B:

- 1 7 *om.* *τι* **Σ**C
 1 15 *om.* *η* [*επιθυμια*] C (*tantum*)
 3 7 *om.* *τε* A
 4 9 *om.* *και* **Σ**A

² Ezra Abbot, ‘On the Comparative Antiquity of the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts of the Greek Bible,’ in *Critical Essays*, 1888, pp. 140–154.

³ Bousset, ‘Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament’ (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi. 4), 1894, pp. 102–110.

- 4 12 *om.* ο [δυναμενος A (*tantum*)
 4 13 *om.* εκει A
 5 5 *om.* και A
 5 10 *om.* εν A 048 KL
 5 12 *om.* μου 048

If we disregard purely orthographic and unessential grammatical details, B is in James decidedly more free from deliberate emendation than any other known document. This is shown by the following evidence :

(a) When B stands alone among all uncials, it is in most instances wrong; but only the following four out of thirteen such readings seem fairly to be classed as due to emendation (other than orthographic or grammatical), and of these the first two may very possibly give the right reading after all:

- 1 22 ακροαται μονον *for* μονον ακροαται
 2 3 στηθι η καθου εκει *for* στηθι εκει η καθου
 2 26 *om.* γαρ
 4 14 επιστασθε της αυριον (*sine* το, τα)

The following is a complete list of the other cases of every kind where B stands alone among uncials. They are either the true reading, or due to accidental error, or cases in which no clear decision can be reached from the internal evidence of the readings.

- 1 9 *om.* ο [αδελφος
 1 11 *om.* αυτου [απωλετο
 1 26 χαλιων *for* χαλιναγωγων
 2 4 *om.* ου
 3 4 + τα [την καυτα
 3 6 καθισται *for* καθισταται
 3 14 ερειθιαν
 3 16 ερειθεια
 4 3 δαπανησετε
 4 14 *om.* η [ζωη
 5 11 *om.* ο [κυριος
 5 14 *om.* του κυριου
 5 20 + αυτου [και καλυψει

On the other hand, when the other older uncials stand alone among uncials, they show many demonstrable emendations; ⁴ thus :

⁴ The numbers are of course approximate, and mere orthography and grammar is not included.

Σ 21 emendations out of 28 such singular readings,
 A 23 emendations out of 43 such singular readings,
 C ($\frac{2}{3}$ of epistle) 5 emendations out of 12 such singular readings;
 while B has but 4 emendations out of 13 such singular readings.

(b) When the groups B**Σ**, B A depart from other uncials, there is no case where the group containing B offers a tolerably clear emendation. The group B C does show four small and somewhat doubtful emendations, viz.:

B C 1 26 καρδιαν] *εαυτου for αυτου*
 2 14 *om. το [οφελος*
 2 16 *om. το [οφελος*
 2 19 (ο) *θεος εστιν for εστιν ο θεος*

On the other hand groups not containing B, viz. : **Σ** A, A C, show a fair number of clear emendations, *e.g.*

Σ A 2 5 βασιλειας
 2 20 νεκρα
 2 22 συνεργει
 4 9 μεταστραφητω
 A C 3 4 οπου αν βουληται

The group **Σ** C appears only once against B A, and in that instance (1 τ *om. τι*) the reading of **Σ** C seems to be an accidental error.

A complete examination of all the readings of B and their relationships will show that the text of B, while not perfect (perfection would imply something like a miracle), is on the whole the best text of James. Where detectable emendations are present in the text of the older uncials, the variant readings found in B evince themselves as corrupt less often than those of any other witness or group. No group among the uncials, and no group including uncials and early versions, is superior to B, provided B is supported by any other credible witness.

The authority nearest in text to B is the Old-Latin ff,⁵

⁵ Substantially the same Greek text as that of ff is exhibited in the Latin excerpts of the *Speculum* (m). The Vulgate differs more from B. Whereas ff departs from B in but 21 out of 129 significant loci of variation, the Vulgate departs from B in 36 of these.

which is discussed below. It stands much closer to B than does **Σ**. It is, however, inferior to B, and in at least 14 instances the text of ff shows emendations which it shares with other uncials, but from which B is free. In no single case (omitting eccentricities where B has no Greek support whatever) has ff (with **Σ**^c A K L P, etc.) preserved a reading clearly preferable to that of B. The text of ff is thus next to B in value. The adhesion of ff strengthens the argument for any reading; but ff does not, in fact, unite with any other witness to form a group superior to B *al.*

The text of the ancient base of Codex P was also closely related to B.

The outcome of these facts is that we have in B a text whose ancestry was kept free from the influence of much of the emendation which was practiced in the third and fourth centuries. Further, those who determined its character seem for some reason regularly to have preferred the *shorter* readings. By this practice they were probably preserved from adopting some emendations (which habitually enlarge), while on the other hand they were led to perpetuate some errors. The resemblance of the text of ff to that of B is due to the fact that the ancestor of ff was translated from a text (of a date not later than about 300 A. D.) which likewise had received but little emendation, although it had been exposed to some influences which did not touch the ancestry of B.

2. *Other older uncials.*

NOTE.—In the following examination of **Σ** A C the absence of C in Jas. 4 *π-ῖν*, makes it necessary to divide the epistle into two parts and to treat the two divisions separately. In statistics relating to the second division (4 *π-ῖν*.) readings are not counted in which the variation is a peculiarity of one single uncial.

(1) Codex Sinaiticus. **Σ.**

Differs from B	88 times
of which:	
longer reading is in Σ	22 "
shorter " " " "	6 "

mere orthographic or grammatical difference 15 times

Ⲛ wholly alone	12	“
“ supported only by minuscules or versions	16	“
	<u>28</u>	

Of these 28 cases all appear to be wrong. About 7 are errors (all but one being unique readings of Ⲛ); the rest are emendations.

B Ⲛ alone among Greek Mss. 4 times

Two of these are the noteworthy readings

1 17 τροπης αποσκιασματος

5 4 αφυστηρημενος

in both of which B Ⲛ probably have the true reading.

B Ⲛ with only minuscule support	5	times
B Ⲛ against A C (1 1-4 2)	10	“
of which : B Ⲛ probably right	5	“
doubtful	5	“

Of the doubtful cases 3 are small changes of order, 2 are mere spelling.

B Ⲛ against A <i>al.</i> (4 3- <i>fn.</i>)	about 11	times
of which: B Ⲛ probably right	7	“
“ “ wrong	1	“
doubtful	3	“

Of the doubtful cases 2 are small changes of order.

It thus appears that Ⲛ shares with B some freedom from emendations which have influenced other uncials, but that B Ⲛ do not constitute a well-marked group among the older uncials. Ⲛ is more emended than B; and (whether in consequence of that, or partly through a different deliberate purpose on the part of those who controlled its ancestry) it is not so strongly affected by the preference for the shorter reading.

(2) Codex Alexandrinus. A.

Differs from B about	117	times
of which:		
longer reading in A	35	“
shorter “ “ “	9	“
A wholly alone	13	“
“ supported only by minuscules or versions	31	“

Of the 44 cases in which A has no uncial support, 35 seem by internal evidence to be probably wrong, 9 are doubtful; the great majority of the probably wrong readings are to be classed as emendations, but perhaps 8 are thoughtless errors.

The most striking fact about A is its connection with Codex 33 (formerly 13^{ac}; cent. ix or x). The mutilated condition of 33 makes complete statistics impossible, but out of about 155 readings of Cod. 33 given by Tregelles (*Greek Testament*, 1865) 92 show agreement of Cod. 33 with A. The relationship is still more clearly shown by the following instances in which the readings of A 33 stand with no uncial, and but little minuscule, support :

- 1 17 καταβαινων for -ον
- 1 19 και εστω for εστω δε
- 1 21 περισσευμα for περισειαν
- 2 3 + των ποδων
- 2 7 και for ουκ
- 2 11 εγενου for γεγονας
- 2 13 κατακαυχασθω for κατακαυχεται
- 2 16 και ειπη for ειπη δε
- 3 3 μεταγομεν αυτων for αυτων μεταγομεν
- 3 9 γεγενημενους for γεγονοτας
- 4 11 αδελφοι μου αλληλων for αλληλων αδελφοι
- 4 13 om. εκει
- 5 3 εν ημεραις εσχαιταις for εν εσχαιταις ημεραις
- 5 10 om. λαβετε
- 5 18 εδωκεν υετου for εδωκεν τον υετου οτ υετου εδωκεν

Such a set of readings as 2 10,

πληρωσας τηρησει	33
πληρωσει	A
τηρηση	B \aleph C ff vg
τηρησει	K L P,

where conflation is apparent, is also of much interest.

For statistics about 33 see below.

The peculiar common readings of A 33 are nearly all due to deliberate emendation, and would seem to belong to a definite recension. May not the concurrence of A 33 represent the text of Hesychius? 33 contains the LXX prophets

(Holmes and Parsons 198) in a text which may be Hesyehian (cf. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 80).

(3) Codex Ephraem. C. (Jas. 1 1-4 2, about two thirds of the epistle.)

Differs from B 48 times

In this proportion the number for the whole epistle would be 72. In Jas. 1 1-4 2 **Σ** differs from B 49 times, and in the whole epistle 88 times.

Of which:

longer reading in C 13 times

shorter " " " 4 "

C wholly alone 8 "

C supported only by minuscules or versions 9 "

Of these 17 cases where C has no uncial support, about 8 are probably emendations, 8 are thoughtless errors.

C thus shows characteristics almost exactly parallel to those of **Σ**.

(4) Codex Patriensis. **048** (**2**). Jas. 4 14-5 20, palimpsest.

In this portion of James occur 20 variant loci. In 10 of these **048** stands opposed to the unanimous testimony of **Σ** A B (C being deficient), but in 9 of the others it agrees with one or more of these older uncials. It shows no strong tendency to agree with K L P, or with any special type of text as yet distinguishable.

048 was formerly at Rossano in southern Italy, but bears no sign of having originated in the West. It probably represents a type of text current in the East, possibly at some locality other than Alexandria. Sanday correctly describes it as "*codd. Σ A C P non multo dissimilem.*"

(5) Corrector of Codex Sinaiticus. **Σ^c**.

Σ^c (cent. vii) has evidently made his laborious corrections in order to bring **Σ** into harmony with some current standard text. So far as James is concerned, nothing is known which would forbid the view that this standard was the Cæsarean text of Pamphilus, as is suggested by the well-known colophon introduced by **Σ^c** at the close of Esther. The corrector

used a standard which seems to have been much like C, although the number of available instances in James is too small for certainty. It was more like A than like B, and as much like P as like A. It had no special resemblance to the text of K L P, except as that agrees with older uncials. With **S** it is not easy to compare it, because it cannot be assumed that the standard always agreed with **S** in those cases where the corrector has left no mark. Of readings unsupported by an uncial the corrector has introduced practically none in James. The text used by **S**^e was one of many eclectic texts; whether it has special historical significance has not at present been determined.

3. *Later uncials*: K L P.

Of the text of Ψ and 049 (formerly **S**^{ae}), both being uncial Mss. of cent. viii or ix, nothing is known; for 056 and 0142 (both of cent. x) the accessible collations are inadequate.

The uncials K L P, all of cent. ix, offer the earliest attestation of the text which prevails among later Mss. From the readings attested by two of the three Mss. K L P, the Textus Receptus (ed. Stephen, 1550) departs in only 28 instances. Of these 9 are either of trifling importance or are obvious accidental errors on the part of K L, leaving only 19 readings to be considered in reconstructing from those four authorities the genuine text of the Antiochian recension. Such a reconstruction, however, it is not worth while to attempt until a complete apparatus of the readings of all the minuscules has been assembled. In the meantime a sufficiently close approximation to the true text of this recension can be reached, by assuming that the agreement of any two of the three ninth-century uncials gives the reading of the recension. The amount of error introduced by this assumption will not be sufficient to affect the general conclusion reached.

The readings of this later text fall into two groups, (1) those which are not attested by any older uncial or by the Old-Latin, Vulgate, or Syriac version, (2) those which are so attested. Of the first class there are in James only about 32 instances. Of these are

internally doubtful	10
errors	3
emendations	19
	<u>32</u>

The emendations were made for fullness, clearness, grammatical and orthographical improvement, etc. Among the most noteworthy are

2 1 2 9 3 1 omission of -μ- in *προσωπολημψια, λημψομεθα*.

In 1 7 1 12 KLP are supported in this reading by C.

2 18 *εκ for χωρις*

2 24 + *τοιunny*

3 12 *ουδεμια πηγη αλυκον και γλυκυ for ουτε (αλ. ουδε) αλυκον γλυκυ*.

4 14 *δε και for* **Σ** A B K *και*, **048** *δε*, perhaps a conflation of two readings.

No reading of this text without other uncial support has any strong internal probability of genuineness. But it is also evident that no considerable part of this text came into existence later than the fifth century.

The readings of the other class, in which the text of KLP is supported by older authorities, do not, when wrong, differ in essential character from those just discussed. Thus:

1 12 *ληψεται* C K L P

4 4 *μοιχοι και μοιχαλιδες* **Σ** K L P, *for μοιχαλιδες*

5 7 + *υετον* A K L P

KLP do not show any close affiliation with any one, or with any group of two, of the older uncials, but their ancestor appears to have had rather more readings in common with A than with any other older Ms. They agree least often with B.

Whether, as commonly supposed, the agreement of KLP with older uncials is due to contamination of the ancestry of these older Mss. (cent. iv and v) from the Antiochian recension of the beginning of the fourth century, cannot be determined from the study of the text of James. It is equally possible that the agreement is due to the fact that the texts

of the several older uncials and that of KLP drew alike from a common body of current variants. The fact that, when KLP agree with one older uncial against the others, the reading is in nearly every case wrong, would merely prove that the authors of this recension consistently followed wrong principles of judgment about the readings which they found in existence, and so accumulated false readings.⁶

With regard to the Mss. KLP taken individually, the investigations of Weiss seem to show that no reading attested by one of them alone (or with very little minuscule support) against all other uncials is probably genuine. There is reason for thinking that L is perhaps the truest of the three to the type of the recension.

P stands by itself. In many instances it departs from KL, and agrees with older uncials, and in such cases often has the right reading. It is evidently the descendant of a Ms. of the type of B^sAC into which had been introduced by correction a large part, but not the whole, of the readings of the Antiochian text. The result is a mixture, in which the two elements can be easily separated, and in which the readings not derived from the Antiochian recension are often correct.

⁶ Weiss, *Die katholischen Briefe*, pp. 56, 76 f., holds that many of the false readings of **SAC** come from the emended text seen in KLP, on the ground that these readings have a homogeneous character, but his argument is too subjective to be convincing. Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 151 f., conceives that whereas it may well be that **S** is not influenced by the "Syrian" recension, but only "analogous in composition" to it, **A** and **C** have a text containing a distinct "Syrian" element. But in James, at least, there is no means of proving that **A** and **C** differ in this respect from **S**. Unless certain readings can be shown to have originated with the Antiochian revisers, or unless the great number of Antiochian readings in any Ms. betrays its ancestry, there seems no positive reason for assuming direct influence in the case of early Mss. The result of direct but incomplete influence by the Antiochian recension on an older text can be instructively studied in P, 33, and 69. The sporadic nature of the agreement of **SAC** individually with KLP speaks against rather than for the view of Weiss and Hort. The case of **A** in the Gospels (Hort, p. 152) is different, and might serve as an argument for assuming some degree of direct Antiochian influence in other parts of that Ms.

The affinities of K L P are clearly shown by the following statistics :

P departs from K L	66 times
Of which :	
P agrees with B	41 “
“ “ “ no uncial	11 “
“ “ “ ⲛ	30 “
“ “ “ A	31 “
“ “ “ C	14 “
“ “ “ Ϛ	6 “
P B agree against all other uncials	11 “
P ⲛ “ “ “ “ “	3 “
P A “ “ “ “ “	2 “
P C “ “ “ “ “	3 “

The ancestor of P into which the Antiochian recension was corrected was thus a good Ms. which bore much closer resemblance to B than to any other extant uncial.

4. *Minuscules.*

The only minuscules which are thoroughly known are

33 (formerly 13^{ac}), cent. ix or x.

69 (formerly 31^{ac}), cent. xv, the Leicester codex.

The readings of both of these are accurately given by Tregelles, *Greek Testament*. The Mss. are both to be classed with P, as containing many readings which have survived from ancestors into which the Antiochian recension was incompletely introduced by correction.

The facts are as follows :

33 departs from K L P (or from two of them) 73 times

Of which :

33 agrees with no uncial	20 “
“ “ “ A	43 “
“ “ “ B	21 “
“ “ “ ⲛ	27 “
“ “ “ C	20 “
“ “ “ P	20 “

69 departs from K L P (or from two of them) 33 times

Of which :

69 agrees with no uncial	13	“
“ “ “ B	9	“
“ “ “ S	9	“
“ “ “ A	8	“
“ “ “ C	7	“
“ “ “ P	10	“

It thus appears that the ancient base of 33 was very closely related to A, but not specially akin to any other older uncial ; and that the base of 69 was an eclectic text about equally near to all the older uncials. Survivals of the ancient text are to be found in less degree in other minuscules.⁷ But it hardly seems likely that any genuine readings in James have been preserved in minuscules only, and such a reading, if it existed, would be recognizable only in a minuscule which was positively known to contain a considerable element of ancient readings not conformed to the Antiochian or any other late standard. The Textus Receptus was drawn from two or more Mss. (one being Codex 2) taken at random, not critically chosen for their text, but both Erasmus and the Complutensian editors present substantially the text of K L P.

5. *Latin versions.*

(1) Old-Latin.

ff. Codex Corbeiensis, cent. ix.

m. *Speculum Pseudo-Augustini.*

Excerpts from the Scriptures, perhaps made in cent. iv, and preserved in several Mss., of which the best is of cent. viii or ix. Includes 29 verses of James.

s. Codex Bobiensis, cent. v or vi.

(2) Vulgate.

In the following discussion Codex Amiatinus (c. 715 A.D.) is provisionally taken as representing the Vulgate.

The extraordinarily numerous variations found in the text of the Old-Latin Bible were due largely to differences of local Latin usage and to caprice, but probably also in some measure

⁷ Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 154 f., 156.

to learned revisions similar to that which produced the Vulgate, and were effected with the aid of Greek copies. In James, ff is substantially a pure Old-Latin text, not mixed with Vulgate readings,⁸ but its close kinship with the copy which was corrected in order to make the Vulgate is shown by the abundant agreement of ff and Vg, not only in vocabulary, but especially in the structure of sentences and the order of words.⁹ With these inferences corresponds the fact that Chromatius of Aquileia († c. 406), the friend of Jerome, uses the Latin version of James found in ff,¹⁰ and that the only probable allusion to James in the writings of Ambrose agrees with ff against Vg. The date of the version found in ff is thus not later than cent. iv.¹¹ Sanday (*Studia Biblica*, i. 1885, p. 258) thinks ff a local recension of North-Italian origin.¹²

The Latin version found in m (*Speculum Pseudo-Augustini*) is substantially that of Priscillian (Spain, † 385). It stands farther removed from both ff and Vg than they do from each other, but presents complicated relationships to these two. It is believed by Sanday to represent "a late African text," that is, "an African base . . . corrupted partly by internal development and partly by the admission of European readings."¹³ There is no sufficient evidence that m and ff rest upon two independent translations of James into Latin.¹⁴ On the con-

⁸ Wordsworth, *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 126 f.

⁹ Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 258 f.

¹⁰ Chromatius, *Tract. in ev. S. Matth.* ix. 1, xiv. 7; quoted in full by Wordsworth, *Studia Biblica*, i. p. 135.

¹¹ Heer, *Die versio latina des Barnabasbriefes*, 1908, pp. xlv f., thinks that the translation of Barnabas contained in the Codex Corbeiensis was made after Tertullian and before Cyprian and Novatian, and points out that in the version of James the use of *salvare*, together with other indications, suggests a somewhat late date.

¹² P. Thielmann, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*, viii. 1893, p. 502, holds that ff is probably of African origin.

¹³ Sanday, *Classical Review*, iv. 1890, pp. 414-417; *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 244 ff.

¹⁴ Sanday, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. II. 1887, p. cclv; cf. *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 250, 259. Wordsworth's view (*Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 133 f.) that ff, Vg, m, and the quotations in Jerome's writings represent four distinct translations is wholly untenable.

trary, the identity of the Greek text underlying the two, as exhibited below, points to a single original translation, which has been modified in the interest of Latin style and local usage, and not in order to conform it to current Greek Mss. Since sufficient allowance of time must be made for the divergence of *m* and *ff*, the patristic evidence from the latter part of the fourth century shows that the original translation of James into Latin was made certainly not later than 350 A.D.¹⁵

That James was translated into Latin separately from other books (and probably later) is indicated by the peculiarities of the version itself,¹⁶ by the unique phenomenon of its inclusion with patristic treatises in Cod. Corbeiensis (*ff*),¹⁷ and also by the complaint of Augustine¹⁸ at the unusual badness of the translation of James, as well as by the fact that Cassiodorus, who in other cases took the Old Latin as the basis of comment in his *Complexiones in epistolas et acta apostolorum et apocalypsin*, in James found it best to use the Vulgate form.¹⁹

The Latin version found in *s* is so close to *Vg* that it is a question whether it ought not to be classed as a Vulgate Ms. (so Hort, *Appendix*, p. 83). It differs from Codex Amiatinus of the *Vg* scarcely more than Codex Fuldensis does, but is nearer to *Am* than to *Fu*. On the ground of resemblances to the Latin version used by Fulgentius of Ruspe († 533) and Facundus of Ermione († c. 570) White surmises that the elements in *s* which are divergent from the Vulgate "represent a stream of late African text."²⁰

Jerome probably revised the Latin version of the Acts and

¹⁵ Hilary of Poitiers, *De trin.* iv. 8, writing in the Greek East in 356-358, seems to make his own translation of Jas. 1:7 (Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 68).

¹⁶ Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*,⁷ pp. 270 f. The case with 2 Peter is similar; cf. Westcott, *l.c.* pp. 269 f.

¹⁷ Zahn, *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, i. p. 324.

¹⁸ Augustine, *Retract.* ii. 32, *Adiuvant* (*sc.* Augustine's *adnotationes*, now lost) ergo aliquid, nisi quod ipsam epistolam, quam legebamus quando ista dictavi, non diligenter ex Graeco habebamus interpretatam.

¹⁹ Cf. Zahn, *ibid.*

²⁰ *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. IV. 1897, p. xxi.

epistles, in 384–385 A.D., as he had that of the gospels in 383 A.D., but his revision of the former books was superficial and imperfect; it “does not represent the critical opinion of Jerome, even in the restricted sense in which this is true of the text of the Gospels.”²¹ It is noteworthy that in Jerome’s own quotations from James he does not follow the Vulgate.²²

With regard to the Greek text underlying the several forms of the Latin version of James the following may be said.

(1) The text of ff is of the same type as that of the older Greek uncials, and resembles B in particular more closely than does any Greek Ms. In 129 loci where variation is attested by Greek uncial Mss., it is possible to determine the Greek text underlying ff. In only 21 of these does the text of ff differ from B.²³ From \aleph it differs at least twice as many times, and from A and C still more often. It shows no affinity to the text of K L P.

The 21 cases of divergence may be classified as follows:

Eccentricities of B	3
Emendations in ff	15
Error “ “	1
Doubtful	$\frac{2}{21}$

It thus appears that ff shows a text considerably more emended than that of B. These emendations are in agreement with readings of one or another of the uncials, but show no particular relation to any one of them.

The following readings of ff are of special interest:

1 17 *vel modicum obumbrationis*, cf. B \aleph η τροπης αποσκιασματος.

²¹ Westcott, ‘Vulgate,’ in Smith, *Dict. Bible*, p. 3479, cf. p. 3460; cf. J. Wordsworth, *Studia Biblica*, i. p. 128, H. J. White, ‘Vulgate,’ in Hastings, *Dict. Bible*, iv. pp. 874, 883.

²² Wordsworth, *l. c.*, p. 134.

²³ In addition to these I have noted 5 cases (4 being omissions) where the only Greek support of ff is one (or a very small number) of the minuscules. These cases may well be due to carelessness, or freedom, on the part of the translator. Similarly, certain cases where ff is only supported by versions are not included in the above count.

2 18 *tu operam habes ego fidem habeo*, an unfortunate, and unique, emendation.

5 20 *animam de morte sua*, cf. B (*tantum*) *ψυχην εκ θανατου αυτου*.

(2) The Greek text underlying m is substantially the same as that of ff. It agrees with ff in 34 cases where there are attested Greek variants, and differs from it in only 13. Of these 13, 7 (isolated, or nearly isolated, aberrations) are probably due to error in m, not to underlying Greek text, 1 probably is due to such error in ff. In the remaining 5 cases ff and Vg (Cod. Amiat.) agree against m; but these cases are not sufficient in number or character to justify any inference.

(3) The Greek text underlying Vg is largely the same as that of ff and m. The facts are as follows:

Cases noted where variation actually found among Greek uncials would show in the Latin translation ²⁴	about 130
--	-----------

Among these:

ff and Vg agree	about 102 times
“ “ “ differ	“ 28 “

In these 28 cases Vg is supported 8 times by B, always by one or more uncials, but only twice by the text of K L P against the older uncials.

The case is similar with m, which covers in its excerpts only a portion of the epistle.

Significant cases	about 40
m and Vg agree	27 times
“ “ “ differ	13 “

Among these 13 cases Vg is supported by C in 5 out of 6 possible instances; by B 8 in 7 cases; but only once by the text K L P against the older uncials.

²⁴ In this enumeration are omitted at least 2 cases where ff and Vg agree against all uncials with support only from a Greek minuscule or from versions; also 3 cases where ff has no uncial support, and 9 cases where Vg has no uncial support. Most of these are probably due to the Latin translator and revisers, not to any Greek variant. In any case they are too few to affect the bearing of the evidence.

The general inferences to be drawn from these facts are plain. (1) Since these three forms of the Latin version go back to substantially the same Greek text, it is highly unlikely that they represent two independent translations. As between ff and m later influences from current Greek texts have not been at work to any considerable extent to draw them apart, for even in their present late form they show an almost identical underlying Greek text. Their many mutual divergences are internal to the Latin version, and do not represent Greek variants.

(2) On the other hand, while the Vulgate is clearly a revision of a Latin text closely like ff, the Greek text which it represents differs somewhat from both ff and m; the greater part of these differences are doubtless due to the learned revision of Jerome.

(3) The third-century Greek source of this Latin translation may have contained original readings not preserved in any extant Greek Ms., but it would be unsafe to accept any readings on Latin evidence only, so long as there were a possibility of explaining them as idiosyncrasies of the translator or of a Latin reviser.

6. *Bohairic version.*

The Bohairic version, as found in the text of Horner's edition, clearly belongs with the text of B \aleph A C, and shows no kinship to that of K L P. But it betrays no special relation to any one, or to any group, of the older uncials. It is another eclectic text parallel to \aleph , A, and C.

III. HISTORY OF THE TEXT, AND USE OF THE AUTHORITIES

1. *History.*

Of the four types of text distinguished by Westcott and Hort the "Western text" drops out in James. The book was too little known in the second century to suffer the textual alteration which then befell other parts of the New Testament; and neither can any witness or group of witnesses be called "Western," nor does any series of readings clearly exhibit the special characteristics of that text. The other three types are easily distinguished. The "Syrian text" is represented by the ninth-century uncials K L (P) and by

the mass of minuscules ; the "Neutral text" by B and ff ; the "Alexandrian text" by **Σ** A C and the Bohairic version. A study of these groups leads, however, to a somewhat different statement of their relations from that made by W H. It is to be borne in mind that the following observations relate solely to the Epistle of James, taken by itself, without reference even to the other Catholic epistles.

The outlines of the history of the text of James can be made out as follows :

At the date when the Epistle of James first comes clearly to light, early in the third century, the explicit statements of Origen²⁵ show that the text of the New Testament had already fallen into much confusion, and that many variant readings were in circulation. In the text of James we have from the fourth century direct evidence (B **Σ**, ff m Vg) of a great number of variants, and from these the many other variants attested by fifth-century witnesses (A C **048**, Peshitto) do not differ in any essential character. These early variants, in existence before 500 A.D., but for which the precise date of origin cannot be determined, are mostly due to more or less deliberate emendation. Accidental errors, however, also occur. These latter are, indeed, more common in earlier than in later Mss., for in the later texts the process of careful copying naturally tended to eliminate obvious errors.

Of the authorities, no one is "neutral," in the strict sense of being wholly free from these emendations, although this is more nearly true of B than of any other document.²⁶ Nor is it possible to isolate any single and distinct "Alexandrian text," of the sort which Westcott and Hort believed to have proceeded from a learned and skillful hand at or before the beginning of the third century²⁷ What we have is rather a great mass of early emendations, most of them, it is true, found in Alexandrian documents (B **Σ** A C, Cyril, Bohairic), but equally present in **048** (which is not known to be connected with Alexandria), the Vulgate, and the Peshitto.

²⁵ *Comm. in Matth.* tom. xv. 14. *καὶ δὲ δηλοῦντι πολλὰ γέγονεν ἢ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ βιβλικῆς τινῶν γραφῶν, εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων.*

²⁶ Next to B in this respect stands the Old-Latin ff.

²⁷ See Hort's statement in Gregory, *Textkritik*, ii. p. 919.

From this store of readings, genuine, emended, and erroneous, the several documents evidently drew according to individual taste and preference, and thus produced a number of eclectic texts. The recension of Hesychius of Alexandria († 312) is historically attested,²⁸ but has not as yet been satisfactorily identified among the readings of our documents for James. The same is to be said of the recension of Pamphilus of Caesarea († 309), although this may perhaps be represented in part²⁹ by the corrections of **8**^c. The common readings of A 33 seem to point to the deliberate recension of some definite editor (Hesychius?).

The only influential recension of the text of James which can be traced with any confidence is that represented by the ninth-century uncials K L P, by the Textus Receptus, and probably by most minuscules. From the analogy of other parts of the New Testament where evidence from the Antiochian fathers is more abundant,³⁰ it may be assumed that in James also this text goes back to the fourth century and to Antioch, and the conjecture which associates it with the recension of Lucian of Antioch († 311) is very likely correct.³¹

This recension became the prevailing text of the Greek church, superseding all others, and many Mss. must have been corrected to conform to it. A good idea of what such a Ms. would be like may be gained from the present state of **8**, to which an analogous process of correction has been applied. The result, however, was that in many lines of textual transmission a part only of the Antiochian readings were introduced; and accordingly, when such Mss. as P and many minuscules (notably 33 and 69) were copied, a large

²⁸ Jerome, *Praef. in vers. paralip.*; *Apol. contra Rufinum*, ii. 26; *De viris ill.* 77; *Ad Damas. praef. in evv.*; Decretum Gelasianum, vi. 14, 15. See Bousset, 'Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament' (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi. 4), 1894.

²⁹ Bousset, 'Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament' (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi. 4), 1894, pp. 44-73; cf. esp. pp. 71-73.

³⁰ The quotations from James in Chrysostom yield no result for textual criticism.

³¹ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, p. 138.

number of non-antiochian readings, which had not been eliminated from their ancestors, were perpetuated in these mainly Antiochian descendants. Whether the uncials **Σ** **Α** **ϸ** betray influence from the Antiochian recension, or only show accidental agreement with it, is at present impossible to say. Of the later history of this text and its ramifications and local forms nothing is at present known, although the materials are abundant.³²

2. *Use of the authorities.*

Since most of the important variants were thus in existence as early as the fourth century,³³ it is evident that the value of the documents is not mainly to be determined by their date, or even by the date of the recension which they may represent. Ancient documents must be treated like modern editions; their worth depends on the materials available for them and on the soundness of the principles or tastes which guided their formation. The main task of textual criticism is to discover the character of these principles or tastes.

In the text of James genealogical relationship between Mss. (or even between types of text), which would serve as an external guide to the value of the evidence, is wholly lacking. In the investigation of the internal evidence but limited help is to be had from "groups"; the only groups that can at present be treated as distinct critical entities are B ff, A 33, K L P *al.* (the "Antiochian recension").

The practical outcome of the investigation is as follows.

As in the rest of the New Testament, the Antiochian text of K L P *al.* proves on examination to contain no distinctive readings which commend themselves as probably original. This is due not to its lateness, but to the systematic preference of its editor (or of a series of editors and copyists) for textual improvements which had been made at various

³² H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, i. 1902-7, has undertaken to trace this for the gospels.

³³ The isolated variants of the minuscules (variants many of which, even when known, are very properly left unmentioned in Tischendorf's apparatus) do not in most cases come seriously into question.

times in the interest of "lucidity and completeness."³⁴ We are therefore tolerably safe in refusing to accept its testimony in the comparatively few cases where its distinctive readings might in themselves have some degree of plausibility. The peculiar common element of A 33 is also due to emendation.

On the other hand, the text of B ff, while not absolutely free from obviously emended readings, proves to be much freer from them than is that of any other document. Moreover the text of B shows less trace of emendation than that of ff. Accordingly, if due precaution is taken against admitting unsupported errors due to the eccentricity of B, it is a sound rule, and indeed the only possible one, that in cases where "internal evidence of readings" is not decisive the reading of B should be followed. Since, however, B is by no means free from error and even emendation, positive evidence from "transcriptional" or other internal probability will outweigh the authority of B.

The use of the witnesses other than B is thus twofold. First, when they disagree with B, their readings may positively commend themselves by their internal character as superior. Secondly, when they agree with B, they serve as guarantee that the reading of B is not due to the idiosyncrasy of that Ms., and also, by affording evidence of the wider currency of the reading, they somewhat strengthen confidence in it.

The statement of Hort (*Introduction*, p. 171), which seems to mean that the authorities for the Catholic epistles stand in order of excellence B \times 33 C A P, is substantiated (at any rate for the uncials) in the Epistle of James.

The rule above stated cannot be presumed to yield a perfect text. The result will probably include some undetectable errors.³⁵ It will, however, certainly contain fewer

³⁴ Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 134 f., "Entirely blameless on either literary or religious grounds as regards vulgarized or unworthy diction, yet showing no marks of either critical or spiritual insight, it [the Antiochian recension] presents the New Testament in a form smooth and attractive, but appreciably impoverished in sense and force, more fitted for cursory perusal or recitation than for repeated and diligent study."

³⁵ Cf. Burkitt, 'The Rules of Tyconius' (*Texts and Studies*, iii), 1894, p. cxviii: "The general character of the 'Neutral' text, so often represented by B alone, stands on a sure basis, but B may here and there desert that text by an interpolation or by a substitution which may not necessarily be self-betraying."

"These, however, are but secondary considerations compared with the general result, that in the Old Testament as in the New the text of our oldest Mss. as a whole is proved by the evidence of the versions to be im-

emended readings than would be introduced by following the guidance of any other document or group of documents; and this is the chief requisite of a sound text, since in texts of the New Testament false readings, if supported by more than one document, are much more frequently due to emendation than to accident.

IV. CRITICAL EDITIONS

As the *Textus Receptus* of James is founded on Codex 2, so the critical text of the nineteenth-century editors (Tregelles, 1865; Tischendorf, eighth edition, 1872; Westcott and Hort, 1881; B. Weiss, 1892, ²1902) is founded, in varying proportions, on Codices B and **Σ**. Of readings found neither in B nor in **Σ**, only 6 (apart from mere divergences of spelling) seem to have been included in one or more of these editions:

- 1 17 ἀποσκίασμα Tr T WH Ws
 2 19 εἰς ὁ θεὸς ἐστίν Ws
 4 8 δαπανησῆτε Tr T WH
 4 13 ἐνα Ws²
 4 14 ποία γὰρ Tr T
 5 18 ἔδωκεν ὑετόν Tr T

Tregelles departs from B (omitting spelling) 33 times.

Tischendorf, eighth edition, departs from B 38 times, in 30 of which he agrees with Tregelles, by whom in general he appears to have been influenced. When Tregelles and Tischendorf depart from B, they adopt the reading of **Σ**, except in the 4 cases given above.³⁶

Westcott and Hort depart from B in only 12 readings (besides 3 cases of mere spelling), and in all except 2 of these they follow **Σ**. In 10 out of the 12 cases B stands alone among Greek Mss.

Weiss departs from B 19 times and adopts the reading of **Σ** in all but 3 of these.

mensely superior to the later eclectic texts commonly used in the Greek-speaking churches from the middle of the fourth century. These later revisions sometimes preserve valuable fragments of older texts which would otherwise have been lost altogether, but it is for such fragments alone that these recensions are valuable, and not for their continuous text."

³⁶ B and **Σ** differ in about 88 instances, of which at least 12 are mere spelling.

Notes on Gospel Chronology

BENJ. W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE New Testament has but one author who writes in the style and with the purpose of a historian, and but one date even in this author fully reckoned out according to prevailing methods by synchronisms. It is apparent, therefore, that the date so elaborately fixed in Lk. 3 1 is to the author the all-important date; and this it is, not of course because of the appearance of John the Baptist, a subordinate figure, but because it determines the baptism of Jesus and therewith the beginning of the drama of redemption. The Lucan reckoning becomes, therefore, the necessary starting point for modern discussion, as it would seem to have been for patristic chronography.

To its own detriment Gospel chronology has heretofore been made dependent on harmonization, a method now condemned on principles of historical criticism. The first postulate was: All the sources must rest upon the same substantial datings. In the present discussion the aim will be to ascertain and appraise independently all systems of dating presented or implied in the sources considered separately, to note the extent of agreement, and to draw conclusions upon comparison of their differences.

A. THE LUCAN SYSTEM

1. **The Baptism.** We have six synchronisms in Lk. 3 1, "the fifteenth year of Tiberius" and the administrations respectively of Pilate (deposed early in 36), Antipas (deposed in 38), Philip (*ob.* 33-34), Lysanias (unknown), and Annas and Caiaphas. Of these the last is incorrectly stated, only

Caiaphas having been high priest A.D. 18-35. All after the first are indeterminate. Tib. xv, if the practice of writers later than Nerva (A.D. 95) was followed, might mean the year beginning Jan. 1, A.D. 28. More probably the years were counted as beginning with the accession, Aug. 19, A.D. 14, in which case Tib. xv would mean the year *ending* Aug. 19, A.D. 29. More probably still Luke reckons, like Josephus, from Passover (*cf.* Ac. 27 9); *i.e.* Tib. xv = Apr. A.D. 28-Apr. A.D. 29. Reckonings from Tiberius' co-regency (*ca.* 11-12 A.D.) are scarcely admissible. The Baptism, accordingly, is dated by Luke in the twelvemonth beginning somewhere from Apr. A.D. 28 to Aug. A.D. 29. The crucifixion might be in either 29 or 30. Patristic chronographers date it accordingly sometimes as Tib. xv, sometimes Tib. xvi. In either case they probably mean the same, *viz.* the "year of the two Gemini," *i.e.* of the consuls L. Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius (*var.* Rufius, Rufus, Furius) Geminus = A.D. 29. For the year of the crucifixion was the starting point in all early reckonings, not that of the beginning of the ministry, still less that of the nativity. "The year of the two Gemini" as that of Jesus' death and resurrection was a constant of primitive Christian chronology which Turner gives good ground for regarding as having antedated even our third gospel itself.¹

2. **The Nativity.** Lk. 3 23 gives us a relative dating for Jesus' birth; for this is said to have taken place "about" 30 years before the baptism, *i.e.* B.C. 2-1. This is not seriously out of harmony with 1 5, where the opening scenes of the gospel story — not merely of the birth of the Baptist — are laid "in the days of Herod the king" (*ob.* B.C. 4; see

¹ *S.v.* "Chronology of the N. T." in Hastings' *BD*, i, pp. 403 ff. On p. 414 *b* Turner rightly emphasizes the fact that the primary chronological interest was in the date of the Passion and Resurrection, other dates all representing mere inferences from this: "Here was to every Christian eye from the first the turning point of the world's evolution"; and the Church's Confession had always put in the fore-front the historical setting "under Pontius Pilate" (1 Tim. 6 13). Turner might well have added a reference to the annual commemoration of the Redemption by Quartodecimans since apostolic times.

under 7 on the agreement of Luke's *sources* with Mt. 2 16); it conflicts seriously, however, with Lk. 2 2, where the census at the time of Jesus' birth is declared to be the famous one again referred to in Ac. 5 37, "the first census, the one made when Quirinius was governor of Syria" (Greek). All expedients for identifying this census with some statistical measure "in the days of Herod the king" are futile, since the census in question was for the Jewish world the epoch-making event of the century, when Judæa lost the last semblance of independence. This measure of incorporation into the empire was carried out according to Josephus by Quirinius,² after the deposition of Archelaus in A.D. 6-7. It was remembered not only for the desperate revolt it provoked (referred to in Ac. 5 37), but for the bone of perpetual contention it furnished thenceforth to Jewish casuistry. "Is it lawful to pay the *census* to Cæsar?"³ To suggest a possible employment of Quirinius in Syria in some other capacity than "governor," since his predecessors, M. Titius, C. Sestius Saturninus, and P. Quintilius Varus, cover by their tenures the whole period from before B.C. 9 till after the death of Herod, and thus to make room for another unknown census taken while Herod was king, is a mere subterfuge. On the other hand, Zahn and Spitta have recently shown⁴ that Josephus rather than Luke may be the author who is here principally in error. Revolts took place in B.C. 4-2 in all parts of Herod's dominions, that in Galilee being led by a certain Judas, whom Schürer declares to be "certainly identical" with the famous leader of the revolt "in the days of the Census." Quirinius is known to have been proconsul of Syria in B.C. 4-2, but *not* at the time alleged by Josephus. In fact, Josephus is particularly ill-informed as to the period of the census. Whether, then, Luke be right or wrong in

² *Ant.* XVII. xiii. 5 and XVIII. i. 1. See, however, the suggestion of Spitta below, as to a possible error of Josephus regarding the date of Quirinius' appointment.

³ Mk. 12 14.

⁴ Cf. Zahn, "Die Syrische Statthalterschaft u. d. Schätzung d. Quirinius" in *N. Kirchl. Zts.* 1893, and Spitta, "Die chronol. Notizen," etc., in *Zts. f. ntl. W.* 1906.

connecting the name of Quirinius with the census, and whether it be allowable or not to think of the census as occurring in B.C. 3-2, the mention of the proconsulship of Quirinius indicates B.C. 3-2 as the date really intended.⁵

If this explanation be found inadmissible, there is no insuperable difficulty in attributing to an author guilty of the glaring anachronisms of Ac. 5 36 f. the antedating by some ten years of the census of Quirinius. It certainly did not occur "in the days of Herod the king." The explanatory way in which Lk. 2 2 is interjected suggests that the whole effort to connect the story of the birth in Bethlehem with Quirinius and the famous census is only a somewhat blundering attempt to connect with outside history, similar to that of Ac. 11 28, where the local Palestinian famine of A.D. 46-47 is universalized.

3. **Duration of the Ministry.** The synchronisms of Lk. 3 1, so elaborately constructed, yet followed by no date for the Passion and Resurrection, nor any intimation that more than a year expired before this culmination of the drama of redemption, suggest that Luke in common with practically the entire body of the Christian church down to the time of Eusebius, understood literally the reference to "the acceptable year of the Lord" (Is. 61 2) placed in the mouth of Jesus in his programmatic address (Lk. 4 19). At least there is no indication in the third gospel of departure from the general synoptic type derived from Mark, in which events lead up to the final Passover, as if all fell within the limits of the single ecclesiastical year.

Attempts to determine the duration of the ministry from indirect indications of the evangelists should be distinguished from determinations of their own conception. It is possible and even probable that the evangelists' conceptions had in course of a generation or more become affected by the primitive practice of observing the 14th Nisan as the anniversary

⁵ Since the above was in type an article has appeared in the *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* x, 4, 1909, from the pen of Rev. Wm. Weber of Pittsburgh, Pa., supporting the view of Spitta, and offering the conjecture that the name "Sabinus" in *Ant.* xvii. 221 ff. represents a misreading by Josephus of his Aramaic source (Nicholas of Damascus), which had *Quirinius*.

of the Lord's death. This would tend to give to the gospel drama a cyclic character, condensing into the limits of a single ecclesiastical year events which really exceeded them. But the data commonly cited in favor of its longer duration fall far short of their object. They not only fail to remove the discrepancy between synoptic and Johannine tradition (see below, under 8), but even absolutely they do not require much extension of the synoptic single year. The cyclic conception would not be dominant at so early a period if the ministry had really extended over much more than a year, and 18 months are quite sufficient to account for known events. Mk. 2 23 (not in chronological order) and 6 39 may be taken to imply a Passover season spent in Galilee. The fact that Jesus has friends in Peræa and Judæa (Lk. 10 38 Mk. 11 2 14 3 15 43 (?)) has no bearing on the case unless all Jesus' friendships are to be dated after the opening of the ministry. Lk. 13 7 is wholly inapplicable, and equally the quotation Mt. 23 34-39 (*cf.* Lk. 11 49), where the personified "Wisdom of God" complains in a figure derived from Ps. 91 4 that *her* repeated appeals to Jerusalem through "prophets and 'wise men' and scribes" have been in vain. All this, accordingly, does not carry us beyond the fact that Jesus' public ministry extended probably over two Passover seasons. It does not warrant us in assuming that Luke or even Mark so understood.

4. **Patristic Dating.** The Lucan chronology, with which we are now dealing, starts from some point in the fifteenth year of Tiberius (April A.D. 28-Aug. A.D. 29), placing the Nativity 30 years before, and the Passion 12 months after. This chronology became dominant by the middle of the second century, especially among Gnostic exploiters of the symbolism of the numbers 30 and 12.⁶

Even in the particular of the one-year ministry it remained unaltered for a full century after the general acceptance of the fourth gospel with its three Passovers (2 13 ff. 6 4 11 55 ff.) made modification seemingly unavoidable. Against opponents of the fourth gospel, who pointed to this

⁶ Irenæus, *Her.* II. xxii.

contradiction, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and perhaps Melito of Sardis, had maintained a two-year ministry. Irenæus (A.D. 186) attempts to harmonize by the assumption of a ministry of 20 years' duration. Later harmonizers perhaps employed thus the traditional 12 years before the Dispersion of the Twelve (below, ii. B, 3). "Tradition" in Eusebius' time had settled down to the explanation, which he himself adopts, that "the three evangelists recorded only the deeds done by the Savior for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, . . . but John in his Gospel records the deeds of Christ which were performed before the Baptist was cast into prison. . . . One who understands this can no longer think that the Gospels are at variance with one another." (*HE*, III. xxiv.) The great Paschal Controversy, whose first outbreak (A.D. 154) coincides with efforts of the learned world to readjust the systems of dating, led to many attempts at absolute chronologies, of which the paschal cycle of Hippolytus at Rome (A.D. 224) was the ultimate outcome. These endeavor to carry back an exact reckoning of all gospel events to the very day and hour of the Nativity. One in particular, traceable to Alexander of Jerusalem (A.D. 218), and claiming to go back to "apostolic documents,"⁷ attempts not merely to fix by consulships the date of the great ecclesiastical anniversaries, but also to harmonize the Lucan chronology with the supposed requirements of John.⁸ Omitting the days of the month the datings are as follows: Nativity, A.D. 9; Baptism, A.D. 46; Crucifixion, A.D. 58 (!); Resurrection, Mar. 25,⁹ A.D. 58.

In all later attempts, and nearly all of the second century,

⁷ An early form of the *Acts of Pilate* is probably meant. The Cappadocians, from among whom Alexander came, kept the (Christian) Passover on the vernal equinox of the Julian calendar (Mar. 25; others Mar. 18, the date of the sun's entrance into Aries). This fixation of the anniversary of the feast of the Redemption on Mar. 25 is the main point of the Alexander fragment. But the Cappadocians adduced as their authority for the practice the *Acts of Pilate*.

⁸ Dobschütz, *T. u. U.* xi. 1, pp. 136 ff.

⁹ On the significance of this date see below, B 2. Mar. 25 fell on Saturday in A.D. 58, a discrepancy in the source.

the fixed point is the so-called "year of the two Gemini" for the year of the Passion. It is from this, reckoned as Tib. xvi, that in Turner's opinion the synchronisms of Lk. 3 1 are calculated. Manifestly the practice of observing the anniversary of Jesus' death and resurrection as a Christian feast of redemption coincidentally with the Jewish Passover, a practice amply attested as in vogue since the times of the apostles, if not alluded to by Paul himself (I Cor. 5 7 15 20), would make the determination of the year from which this so-called "Quartodeciman" practice originated a matter for precise determination at a *very* early period.

5. **Relation to John.** More important support for the Lucan chronology than the adhesion of the second century fathers may be found in Jn. 2 20. In spite of some ancient authorities¹⁰ who apply the reference to Solomon's or Zerubabel's temple, it seems more probable that the author has carefully reckoned out the synchronism of 46 years completed since the beginning of Herod's enterprise (B.C. 20-19, Turner), making the ministry begin with the Passover of 26 and end with that of 29. If with Irenæus we take the feast of Jn. 5 1 as a Passover, as well as 6 4, the duration of the ministry will be reckoned at three years and Jesus' age as 49. This author's divergence in other respects from synoptic tradition (below, *D*) cannot therefore affect his clear acceptance of the main factor in the Lucan chronology, the year 29 for the Crucifixion. Whether this acceptance is due to independent tradition, or merely ranks the writer of Jn. 2 20 with later chronographers who depend on Luke, must be decided by our judgment of the value of the date, and of the two systems respectively. It stands, at all events, as a confirmation of 29 as the traditional year of the Crucifixion and corroborates our interpretation of Lk. 3 1.

We must inquire later as to the duration of the ministry, and of Jesus' life, implied in Jn. 2 20, and in the fourth gospel as a whole.

¹⁰ *Gosp. of Nicod. and De Mont. Sina et Sion.*

B. CRITICISM OF THE LUCAN CHRONOLOGY

In spite of this array of second century support, very serious reason exists to question the accuracy of the date Tib. xvi (*i.e.* the year of the two Gemini) implied in Lk. 3 1, independent of the evidences of this author's superficiality elsewhere. The mere fact that ancient and modern chronographers have not ventured further from it than to extend the duration of the ministry in the interests of harmony, or to make some other reckoning of the years of Tiberius is not a guarantee; and if the pivotal date of Lk. 3 1 with the connected "year of the two Gemini" be invalidated, the whole chain of derived chronologies falls with it.

1. **The Calendar Argument.** It is a statement of all the Gospels, of practically universal acceptance,¹¹ that the Crucifixion occurred on a Friday. The Gospels differ, however, as to its having occurred before (John) or after (synoptics) the Passover supper, *i.e.* on the 14th or 15th of the lunation Nisan, which was invariably that of the first full moon after vernal equinox. Astronomical calculation can determine within limits of reasonable certainty on what years of Pilate's administration Nisan 14 fell on Thursday, which would make the year possible from the point of view of the synoptic writers; or on Friday, which would agree with John. No year in which Nisan 14 fell *neither* on Thursday or Friday can possibly have been that of the Crucifixion.

Naturally this method of determination by exclusion has been repeatedly applied, but with varying results, not from uncertainty in the astronomical calculations, which determine with exactness the day and hour of what should have been the Passover full moon, but from uncertainty as to the degree of approximation to this date with which the feast was appointed by the Jewish authorities. It admits, however, of positive demonstration¹² that the day of the month was fixed

¹¹ An exception must be made of E. Schwartz ("Osterbetrachtungen," *Z. nt. W.* vii. 1, 1906, pp. 37 ff.), who considers that the observance of "the Lord's day" as the resurrection day and of *Wednesday and Friday as fast days* ($\Delta\epsilon\delta$. viii. 1) arose independently of the events of Passion week.

¹² *Preaching of Peter ap. Clem. Al., Strom.* vi. 5; cf. Bacon, "Incidence of Passover," in *Expositor*, July, 1900.

by actual observation of the moon's *phasis* at the beginning of the lunation. The day preceding that night in which two credible witnesses had seen the slender crescent of the new moon was "sanctified" on the following day (second of the month), according to the requirements of the Talmudic treatise on "The Beginning of the Year," as the first of the month. The new moon of Nisan (first month of the year) was, of course, the most important. Several uncertainties remain, however, to limit our process of exclusion.

a. Whether a given lunation should be regarded as the first of the new year (Nisan) or added (by intercalation) to form the last of the old (Veadar), would admit of doubt only when full moon nearly coincided with spring equinox. Jewish astronomy was not equal to the task of determining the equinox more nearly than within one or two days, and the rules given for choice of the lunation Nisan are therefore quite crude and empirical. In such ambiguous years two possible lunations must be calculated, either of which may have been Nisan.

b. Cloudy weather might delay the "sanctification" of Nisan 1. The delay, however, *could not exceed 24 hours*, because of the rule limiting the months to 30 days.¹³ We must therefore include in our calculations both the 14th and 15th Nisan.

c. The Synoptic Gospels represent the Crucifixion as taking place on Nisan 15; John, with greater probability (below, *D*, 2), on Nisan 14. Two days must be admitted as possible in each Nisan on this score. Fortunately, the allowance largely cancels that of *b*; for a delayed Nisan 14 would coincide with Nisan 15.

With these allowances to cover all uncertainties it becomes possible to rule out certain years, in which, on no admissible supposition, either Nisan 14 or 15 could have fallen on a Friday.

¹³ Turner, *ibid.* p. 412, declares it as "one of the rules which may well go back to our Lord's time that Adar never consisted of more than 29 days." This would still further reduce the elements of uncertainty our tables are designed to cover, but the authority is not stated.

The subjoined table, taken substantially from Fotheringham (*Journ. of Philol.* 1903, p. 100 ff.), avoids the crudity of those previously constructed on the uniform average allowance of 36 hours between astronomical new moon and phasis.¹⁴ By determining the astronomical conditions of visibility in each lunation in terms of the moon's Mean Anomaly and Latitude of the Ascending Node, it fixes with practical certainty the evening before which the moon was *invisible*. By including the years 26 and 27 and calculating a second date for 26, 29 and 34, in which Nisan 14 would have fallen before Mar. 25, the equinox of the Julian calendar,¹⁵ two further sources of uncertainty are removed.

A.D.	ADAR		(VEADAR) NISAN		
	<i>Astr. New Moon</i>	<i>Phasis</i>	<i>Astr. New Moon</i>	<i>Phasis</i>	<i>Nisan 14</i>
26	6 Feb., 8 A.M.	8 Feb.	{ 7 Mar., 7 P.M.	9 Mar.	Sa. 23 Mar. }
			{ 6 Apr., 5 A.M.	7 Apr.	Su. 20 Apr. }
27	25 Feb., 5 A.M.	27 Feb.	26 Mar., 6 P.M.	28 Mar.	Fr. 11 Apr.
28	14 Feb., 9 A.M.	16 Feb.	15 Mar., 2 A.M.	17 Mar.	We. 31 Mar.
29	2 Feb., 8 A.M.	4 Feb.	{ 4 Mar., 3 A.M.	6 Mar.	Su. 20 Mar. }
			{ 2 Apr., 8 P.M.	5 Apr.	Tu. 19 Apr. }
30	21 Feb., 5 A.M.	23 Feb.	22 Mar., 8 P.M.	{ 24 Mar.	Fr. 7 Apr. }
				{ 25 Mar.	Sa. 8 Apr. }
31	11 Feb., 0 A.M.	12 Feb.	12 Mar., 1 A.M.	14 Mar.	We. 28 Mar.
32	29 Feb., 1 P.M.	2 Mar.	29 Mar., 11 P.M.	31 Mar.	Mo. 14 Apr.
33	18 Feb., 5 A.M.	19 Feb.	19 Mar., 1 P.M.	{ 20 Mar.	Fr. 3 Apr. }
				{ 21 Mar.	Sa. 4 Apr. }
34	7 Feb., 8 P.M.	9 Feb.	{ 9 Mar., 6 A.M.	10 Mar.	We. 24 Mar. }
			{ 7 Apr., 2 P.M.	8 Apr.	Th. 22 Apr. }
35	26 Feb., 8 P.M.	28 Feb.	28 Mar., 6 A.M.	29 Mar.	Tu. 12 Apr.

The only admissible years among the above, if synoptic tradition be right, are 34, in which, if the later lunation was proclaimed Nisan, the 15th fell normally on Friday; and 28 and 31, if bad weather delayed the phasis. But no amount of delay from this cause would produce any effect at the beginning of Nisan in 28 and 31, because Adar, the preceding month, had its full quota of 30 days. Only on the sup-

¹⁴ So Wurm, Anger, Wieseler, and Achelis.

¹⁵ Wurm's rule (*ap.* Wieseler, tr. Venables, *Syn. of Four Gospels*, p. 406), giving Mar. 23 for the equinox, is too exact. The Sanhedrin may have followed ordinary (Julian) usage.

position of delay *both* at the beginning of Adar and of Nisan do these years become admissible. They are not admissible at all unless synoptic tradition be right as against Johannine.

If Johannine tradition be right, 34 is again the most probable year; for while the conditions of visibility were such as to make Thursday, Apr. 22, A.D. 34, a possible 14 Nisan, thus confirming synoptic story, this is only just possible, and a single day's delay in observation from clouds or otherwise would make it Friday, Apr. 23, confirming the fourth gospel. Two days' delay (in this case quite supposable) would admit the date of the alternative Nisan. For in this year, A.D. 34, Friday, Mar. 26, would then have been Nisan 14, again confirming the fourth gospel.

But besides the year 34 (the most probable by either Johannine or synoptic tradition), the years 33 and 30 are both admissible, though by Johannine tradition only. Fotheringham adopts 33 as the true date, because "the date Saturday, Apr. 4, for Nisan 14 in this year is astronomically only slightly more probable" than Friday, Apr. 3. Of 30 he says: "In the case of 30 the conditions are so pronouncedly in favor of a late phasis that it would be difficult to adopt an earlier date" than Saturday, Apr. 8.¹⁶ This would of course exclude 30 A.D. from consideration. Nevertheless, Friday, Apr. 7, must be admitted to be possible, as cases are known of observation of the new moon under conditions more unfavorable. We therefore include this as a possible date, and 30 as an admissible year under Johannine tradition. Under synoptic it is entirely inadmissible.

As regards 29, the patristic "year of the two Gemini" corresponding to Lk. 31, Fotheringham's discussion is exhaustive and his conclusion decisive. "Whatever date therefore be astronomically possible, 29 appears to be impossible." Even Achelis, who reverts to the demonstrably false method of

¹⁶ In the table as given above, the columns giving Mean Anomaly and Longitude of the Ascending Node have been omitted. 200 marks the maximum of unfavorable conditions which become more favorable as the number advances toward 400 or recedes toward 0. At Nisan A.D. 30 they were 164 and 71 respectively.

dating by astronomic new and full moon,¹⁷ makes Nisan 14 in A.D. 29 fall on Sunday, Apr. 17, whether by this method or in calculating by phasis!¹⁸

2. **Source of the Lucan Date.** If then the patristic "year of the two Gemini" be really inadmissible, how account for the origin of the dating? In the view of Turner it does not rest upon Lk. 3 1, but antedates the third gospel itself. At all events, Luke has some source for it, because it cannot be connected with any other datum of his story. Whosoever the responsibility, the explanation of the adoption of this date is not far to seek. It is suggested by the course actually pursued by Hippolytus in dating the Crucifixion on Mar. 25, A.D. 29.

Epiphanius (*Hær.* I. 1, L. 1, 23) tells us of primitive Quartodeciman sects in Cappadocia who, in continuing their observance of Passover as the anniversary of the Crucifixion, had broken away from the Jewish lunar calendar and, instead of observing Nisan 14, observed the solar date, Mar. 25, just as we celebrate the Nativity at winter solstice, Dec. 25, observing the same day of the (solar) month each year. The certainty that the date, Mar. 25, was an arbitrary one is afforded by the practice of some of their number, who observed not Mar. 25, but Mar. 18; for *in both cases* we have simply spring equinox of the Julian Calendar, where Mar. 18 is the date for the entrance of the sun into Aries, Mar. 25 true equinox.¹⁹ Now in A.D. 29, Mar. 18 and Mar. 25 actually fell on Fridays. In all other conceivable years equinox fell on some other day of the week; so that it is quite supposable that A.D. 29 was made the basis of the synchronisms

¹⁷ Turner and Ramsay are certainly wrong in this assumption. Just because the Jews considered accuracy in the determination of their festal calendar vitally important, they clung with fanatical tenacity to their determinations by actual observation long after Gentile astronomy was competent to fix the dates by calculation. See the fragment of *Ker. Petri*, quoted above, note 12.

¹⁸ *Gött. gel. Nachr., phil. hist. Kl.*, 1902, pp. 707 ff. The obsolete method of allowing a uniform delay of 36 hours between astronomic new moon and phasis accounts for the discrepancy with Fotheringham's results.

¹⁹ See above on the fragment from Victorinus discussed by Dobschütz (*T. u. U.* xi. pp. 136 ff.), in which this dating for the Quartodeciman anniversary is attributed to Alexander, the *Cappadocian* bishop of Jerusalem, ca. 210 A.D.

of Lk. 3 1 for this reason, the dating of Jn. 2 21 and of the patristic chronographers simply resting upon the same. For Quartodecimans must very soon have discovered the remarkable coincidence that the Friday of Passover week in "the year of the two Gemini" coincided with the (Julian) vernal equinox, just as Jesus' birth was later understood to coincide with the (Julian) winter solstice. At all events, 29 A.D. as the year of the Crucifixion seems to be the one universal, unanimously attested date of all the earliest sources. Every dating takes its start from this—and yet it is astronomically impossible!

Per contra, since the year 30 is not altogether excluded under Johannine tradition, and second century interpretation of Lk. 3 1 may have been mistaken, the possibility must also be recognized that Lk. 3 1 may be based on independent historical tradition. Jn. 2 21 will then no doubt be adduced as supporting the same. In this case, however, the two passages must be understood as pointing to A.D. 30, and not 29. A decision as between the alternative possibilities must await further evidence.

C. PRE-LUCAN CHRONOLOGY

1. **Traces in Matthew and Luke.** On other points than the universally accepted starting point of 29 A.D. for the Crucifixion there is decided disagreement in the sources. They vary both as to the duration of the ministry and of Jesus' life. We have seen above (A, 2) that Luke's calculations of date do not always agree even with his own material. In particular the Nativity is placed "in the days of Herod the king," by Lk. 1 5, if indeed the original reference of Lk. 2 1 be not to some purely statistical census made under Saturninus in B.C. 9-7. The implications of Mt. 2 16 (note last clause) make 6 B.C. the *lowest* limit, but a date several years earlier may quite as well be implied.²⁰ Thus the 30 years of

²⁰ If the legend of the star Mt. 2 2 . be really an outgrowth of the remarkable conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces in May, October, and December of B.C. 7 in accordance with the statement of R. Abarbanel that the conjunction of these two planets in Pisces is to be a sign of Messiah's coming, we may be still more specific. A date in the neighborhood of B.C. 7 will have been assumed by the tradition.

Lk. 3 23 give in any case a lower estimate of Jesus' age "when he began" than the older tradition implied. We have evidence which is far from deserving the neglect it has received that his age was in reality more nearly 40.

2. **The Elders' Tradition of Jesus' Age.** Irenæus, in his attempts to defend the fourth gospel against the charge of unauthenticity,²¹ refers to an author, now generally acknowledged to be Papias (*ca.* A.D. 145), as reporting from "the Elders who were disciples of the Apostles," that Jesus when he began to teach had reached the age of 40 years, the age which "befits the teacher." We may infer from this latter expression that in its original form the tradition was a vindication of Jesus' right to the title and function of Rabbi under the legal requirement of 40 as the teaching age.²² Irenæus twists this into a defense of his interpretation of Jn. 8 57, as implying that Jesus continued his teaching until nearly the age of 50! Regarding this latter conception (that Jesus attained the age of 50 years) we shall have more to say presently. That of Papias with which we are now dealing (40 years) is not only reasonable in itself, and quite in harmony with Mt. 2 16 Lk. 1 5, but has positive confirmation in Ac. 7 23, where the statement is made that Moses when he visited his brethren in the rôle of peace-maker, "supposing that they would understand how that God by his hand was giving them salvation," had "fully completed his fortieth year."²³ This trait in Stephen's portrait of Moses the great prototype of Christ is introduced *without more than inferential warrant in the Old Testament*, which would hardly be the case if it were not intended to mark a correspondence.

3. **Jewish Polemic.** Conversely, Herford adduces evidence from the Jewish side of this polemic between Church and Synagogue which indicates Jewish interest to prove that Jesus did *not* attain the age of 40. Jesus is referred to (as

²¹ *Her.* II. xxii. 4, 5.

²² *Aboda Zara*, b. Talm. Frankfort ed. f. 19 b. Ad quodnam vero ætatis momentum expectandum est antequam vir doctus alios docere possit? *Resp.* Ad exactos annos quadraginta.

²³ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος.

Herford shows) in Bab. Talm., *Sanh.* 106 *b*, under the mask of "Balaam" (slain for seducing Israel, according to Num. 31 s. 16). A Christian opponent of Rabbi Ḥanina answers the question "How old was Balaam when he died?" as "33 or 34 years." This is justified thereupon by combination of Ps. 55 23 and Ps. 90 10. Because Jesus was a "bloody and deceitful man" he must have perished before attaining half a man's allotted days (*i.e.* 70 years). The (Palestinian) elders on the one side, rabbis on the other, corroborate the existence of a tradition independent of the Lucan, fixing the age of Jesus not at thirty, but at *forty*.

D. JOHANNINE CHRONOLOGY

We are thus brought again to the question so drastically treated by Irenæus. What is the relation of the Johannine chronological system to the Lucan?

1. **The Johannine Synchronism.** Jn. 2 13-22 transfers the scene of the temple-cleansing from the end of the ministry (Mk. 11 15-18 and parallels), its only possible historical position, to the beginning, thus making it occupy a position corresponding to that of Lk. 4 16 ff.; where Luke depicts the beginning of the ministry by describing how Jesus proclaimed "the acceptable year of the Lord" in his *πατρίς*. This transfer with the connected indirect synchronism (vv. 20. 21) and the emphasizing in 6 4 of a point only indirectly recognizable in Mk. 6 39, suggests that the fourth evangelist, while accepting the Lucan fixed point of A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion, has a deliberate, if tacit, intention to readjust the prevailing chronology (*a*) in respect to the age of Jesus, (*b*) in respect to the duration of the ministry, (*c*) in respect to the day of the Crucifixion.

a. Early errorists in Rome referred to by Augustine,²⁴ perhaps Caius and the Alogi, insisted on interpreting not only Jn. 8 57, but also 2 20, as implying that Jesus attained an age of nearly 50 years. Irenæus, as we have seen, the most determined opponent of the Alogi, admitted this interpretation of Jn. 8 57, and other Church writers, not long after, admitted it

²⁴ *de Doctr. Chr.* ii. 28.

as regards 2 20.²⁵ We still have, in fact, many traces of harmonistic chronologies of this period which reckon the duration of Jesus' life at 49 years.²⁶ As these interpretations did not disappear until their real irreconcilability with Luke became apparent, so it is probable that but for prepossessions of a similar kind we ourselves would recognize that at least Jn. 8 57 is not written from the standpoint of Lk. 3 23, but more nearly from that of the pre-Lucan chronology of Mt. 2 16, Lk. 1 5 21 (?) Ac. 7 23 and "the Elders" of Papias, if, indeed, John does not go still further in the direction of Irenæus' extravagant claims.

b. We have already recognized the probability that Jn. 2 13-22 is intended to rectify the Lucan thirty-year duration of Jesus' life; we must now recognize the further fact that this writer certainly extends the duration of the ministry, and the probability that he intends it to cover a period of three years, perhaps taking the suggestion from Lk. 13 7.

We may be sure from Jn. 8 57 that he reckoned the duration of Jesus' life as at that time (Tabernacles) approximating 50 years. But did he think of it as attaining just 50 at the ensuing Passover? If he reckoned after the manner of the later Greek chronographers, his starting point for the period of the incarnation would be not the birth of Jesus, but his conception (*σύλληψις*) in the womb of Mary. "Forty-six years" of age, therefore, would mark more nearly 47

²⁵ So among moderns Loisy and Jülicher.

²⁶ A number of medieval chronographers who seem to rest upon the *Defense of the Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse*, by Hippolytus (ca. A.D. 205), calculate by jubilees of years, reckoning 120 jubilees (6000 years) as the duration of the world, after which the millennium completes the period of 140 (2 × 70). Thus a fragment of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* quoted by Frick (*Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* 1908, 2, p. 172) forecasts "nine jubilees" (= 450 years) from the Ascension to the Second Coming. The Nativity is dated in chronologies of this class in A.M. 5500 (so, e.g., Annianus, ca. 412 A.D.), so that *Apoc. Thom.* probably reckoned one jubilee (50 years) as the period of the Incarnation. Chapman, however, has cogently argued (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, viii. 1906) for the dependence of this reckoning on Hippolytus, who employed the blundering calculations of Tertullian from the consular lists. Thus the extraordinary dates of Epiphanius and the Alexander fragment giving 12 years as the duration of the ministry and 49 as the duration of Jesus' life would be purely fortuitous in origin!

of the incarnation period. We may also assume that he regarded the unnamed "feast of the Jews" of Jn. 5 1 as a Passover, because such is the general understanding of the fathers.²⁷ If, then, a correspondence is intended between Herod's building and "the temple of his (Jesus') body," the Passover of the utterance will approximate the close of the forty-seventh year of the incarnation, that of 5 1 the forty-eighth, that of 6 4 the forty-ninth, and that of the Passion and Resurrection the fiftieth year.

On the other hand, the internal structure of the fourth gospel convinces us that Turner is right in his declaration that it contemplates originally and fundamentally no other chronology of the ministry than is reasonably and most naturally to be derived from Mark, viz. a period of one year for the Galilean ministry, ending with the Passover of Ch. 6, and a second, also of one year, for the ministry in Peræa and Judæa, ending with the Passover of Ch. 11.²⁸ In this case Jn. 2 13 π . will represent an extension of the original Johannine duration of Jesus' ministry, as well as an attempt at more exact dating of his birth.

c. The placing of the Crucifixion on Nisan 14 (Jn. 13 1. 29 18 28), instead of 15 as the synoptists declare, is an extraordinary instance of the combined boldness in matter with reserve in manner of the corrections of our fourth evangelist. His undeniable disposition to find mystical coincidences (*e.g.* 9 7 11 50) has indeed been regarded as sufficient to account for even such a tour de force as this, inasmuch as Jesus' death, the author's parallel to that of the Passover lamb (1 29. 36), is thus made to fall coincidentally with this sacrifice. But it is to be observed that the real author of this comparison is Paul (1 Cor. 5 7), and that Paul adds to it a further com-

²⁷ In our own judgment a misunderstanding. The dialogue of Jn. 5 is concerned with the authority of Jesus *vs.* the Law of Moses. *Pentecost* was the feast of the giving of the Law. But this only shows that Jn. 2 13 π . is a late addition, which can be made probable independently.

²⁸ Turner, *s.v.* "Chronology of N. T." in Hastings' *BD*, i. p. 409 *b*). "St. Mark's Gospel was shown (p. 406), if its order of events can be taken as chronological [the fourth evangelist would so take them], to imply, exactly like St. John's, a two-year ministry."

parison of the Resurrection to the waving of the Firstfruits (1 Cor. 15 20), which took place on Nisan 16. This he would scarcely do if the days of Crucifixion and Resurrection had fallen respectively on Nisan 15 and 17. Moreover, there is strong internal evidence of self-contradiction in the story of Mk. 14 ff. and parallels, indicating that the temptation to regard the last supper as the actual Passover with which it so nearly coincided, has availed to alter the original representation. Even now the account is bare of all the distinctive features of the Passover meal. In all probability, then, we must invert the supposed relation. Symbolism is unquestionably an exaggerated factor in John; but it grows out of the historic tradition, and not conversely. And what we thus find to be true respecting the day of the Crucifixion is at least partially true of the duration of the ministry, which, if not exactly two years, was almost certainly more than one; also of Jesus' age, which if not exactly 49, was very probably in the region of 40.

E. HARMONISTIC CHRONOLOGIES

Current harmonistic chronologies based on a 3-4 year ministry date from the period of Eusebius, who adopted 29 (Lk. 3 1) as the date of the Baptist's mission, 30 as that of the Baptism, and 33 for the Crucifixion, finding *four* Passovers in John. The heathen chronographer Phlegon, A.D. 117-138, furnished him with records of an earthquake which had occurred in 32-33 in Bithynia, and an eclipse of the sun (certainly that of Nov. 24, A.D. 29) visible in the same region. Unfortunately there is no good reason to suppose that any but Christian borrowers from Phlegon identified these events with the "eclipse" of Lk. 23 44 and the earthquake of Mt. 27 51. Still it is of interest to note Phlegon's date for the earthquake, if not for both events, in view of the fact that other Christian chronologists before Eusebius may have brought it into relation with gospel story. Phlegon's date was Ol. 202. 4 = A.D. 32-33.

CONCLUSION

The date A.D. 29 for the Passion seems to be older than any of our gospels, and yet on the showing of astronomy both incorrect and factitious. Luke would seem to have employed it for his dating of the beginning of the ministry "in the fifteenth year of Tiberius." The writer of Jn. 2 13 π . would seem also to have calculated from it; but whereas Luke — misled perhaps by the desire to connect the birth in Bethlehem with "the census" — placed the Nativity but 30 years before it, John, more loyal to the older tradition of Jesus' having "attained the age of the teacher," placed the Nativity more than 40, perhaps exactly 49 years before it. Astronomically the most probable dates for the Passion are A.D. 33 or 34. The most probable estimates of the duration of the ministry are those which come nearest the two-year period. The most probable estimates of the duration of Jesus' life are those which exceed rather than fall below the period of 40 years. The Nativity should be dated "in the days of Herod the king," most reasonably in about B.C. 8.

Note on the Hexameter in James 1 17

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

JAS. 1 17 contains, as every student of the Epistle knows, a defective hexameter verse. The defect consists in the fact that in the second foot instead of the regular dactyl or spondee we have a tribrach, and the manuscripts offer no variant readings to correct the irregularity. The hexameter is one form of dactylic rhythm, and hence the use of a tribrach anywhere in a hexameter verse is rhythmically illogical.

Sometimes in classical Greek poetry a short syllable having the ictus upon it occurs where a long syllable is expected, and it is commonly said that the short syllable is lengthened under the ictus. But in most cases of this sort some other cause can be discovered.¹ So in regard to Jas. 1 17 it is sometimes said that the short syllable *σις* in *δόςις* is lengthened under the ictus, so that the second foot is practically equivalent to a dactyl.² But, apart from the question as to the possibility of such lengthening under the ictus,³ it is difficult to believe that any poet, except some popular or non-literary maker of verses, would have allowed himself such metrical license when the difficulty could be avoided as easily as it can in the present case. Hence Blass, having this passage in mind, says that "the specimens of verse which have been found [in the New Testament] are for the most part of such a quality that they are better left unmentioned."⁴

¹ Seymour, *Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer*, p. 87; Jebb, *Homer*, pp. 193 f.

² Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*,² p. 54.

³ Seymour, *op. cit.*, p. 87, who characterizes the doctrine as "obsolete."

⁴ Blass, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*,² p. 304 (Eng. tr., p. 297).

From the point of view of classical and literary verse this judgment is certainly sound. But just as we are all familiar with modern specimens of verse-writing which could in no wise be called classical or literary in either form or sentiment, so also in antiquity there were composed many verses of a character no more meritorious. Many examples of such are preserved in inscriptions, and they are not infrequently as faulty in metre as they are barren in sentiment.⁵ But they are nevertheless interesting and instructive as representing the attempts of ordinary people to write verses. If an epitaph was needed, some friend or relative, or perhaps a local maker of grave-stones, would supply what was deemed an appropriate verse. Such productions may therefore be called the non-literary verses of plain people. Now with a few well-known exceptions the writers of the New Testament belonged to this class, and their language is akin to the speech of plain people engaged in the ordinary affairs of life. This has been amply demonstrated in our own day by the study of inscriptions, papyri, and inscribed potsherds. Allen has found in inscriptions several hexameter verses which show the same defect as that noted in the hexameter contained in Jas. 1 17.⁶ A short final syllable in the second foot having the ictus upon it occurs where a long syllable is expected. In three of these cases the second foot of the hexameter consists of a tribrach, as in Jas. 1 17.⁷ Hence it may be that the hexameter in James is another example of popular or non-literary verse-making.

It was said above that the difficulty in our verse could have been easily avoided, and we must believe that a skilful poet would have availed himself of the opportunity to do so. By inserting τ , which might easily have fallen out of the text, after $\delta\acute{o}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ the sense is not materially altered and the

⁵ For a careful and thorough study of the metrical structure of verses found in Greek inscriptions, see Allen in *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, iv. pp. 35 ff.

⁶ Allen, *op. cit.*, iv. p. 74.

⁷ There may be also a fourth instance, but Allen is uncertain as to the text.

metrical defect is removed.⁸ We then have a perfect hexameter verse: *πᾶσα δόσις τ' ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον.*

If with several modern interpreters we regard the verse as a quotation from some Greek poem of the classical or Hellenistic period,⁹ this slight correction of the text seems to be necessary. But on the other hand we may believe the verse to be a specimen of such non-literary versification as is sometimes found in inscriptions, or we may agree with other scholars that the occurrence of the hexameter in James is purely accidental.¹⁰ If we adopt either of the last-mentioned views, the text may stand unchanged.

⁸ For the position of *τε* cf., e.g., Thuc. 4. 26, 4: οὐς ᾤοντο ἡμερῶν ὀλίγων ἐκπολιορκήσειν ἐν νήσῳ τε ἐρήμῃ καὶ ὕδατι ἀλμυρῷ χρωμένους.

⁹ Ewald, *Das Sendschreiben an die Hebräer und Jakobus Rundschreiben*, p. 190; Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*,² p. 54; Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, ii. p. 40, n. 2; von Soden,³ in *Handcommentar zum N. T.*, p. 181.

¹⁰ Huther,³ in Meyer's *Kommentar*, p. 72, n. 1 (Eng. tr., p. 71, n. 1); Beyschlag,⁶ in Meyer's *Kommentar*, p. 71, n. 1.

Abraham and Archæology*

GEORGE A. BARTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THOSE scholars who have been seeking for years to condemn the higher criticism by the verdict of archæology have had much to say of Abraham and his age and of the confirmations which archæology has afforded to the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. For a long time they have been looking for a mention of Abraham on the monuments. Since an Egyptian occurrence of his name has been found, they have been strangely silent about it.

In 1905 Professor Breasted published in his *History of Egypt* a picture of a bit of the inscription on the walls of the temple of Karnak in which Shoshenq (the Biblical Shishak) recorded the names of the places which he had conquered in Palestine. This picture (fig. 180, opposite p. 536, cf. also p. 530) gives the name of a place as *The Field of Abram*, thus giving us what we have long been seeking, one of the names of Abram in an extra-Biblical source. True, it appears as a part of the name of a place (see also Breasted, *Ancient Records*, iv. pp. 352, 353), but it appears in such a way that it implies that the name was borne by a person, or god or eponymous hero.

Possibly there are two reasons why so little has been made of this long-desired discovery of the name of Abram. One

* The following abbreviations are used:

BE = *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, edited by H. V. Hilprecht.

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

CT = *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*.

*KAT*³ = Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3d ed.

IV R = Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. iv.

may be, that it is found in so late a document (Shosheng ruled 945-924 B.C.), and so far removed from the Abrahamic age, that it affords no proof of the historicity of Abraham. So far as this inscription is concerned, any of the critical theories of Abraham might be true. A second reason may be that in reality this discovery seems to confirm the critical conclusions. Brugsch and Steindorf had pointed out years ago that the Egyptian names which occur in Genesis, such as Potiphar and Zaphenathpaneah, are not found in Egyptian earlier than XXII dynasty, or the tenth century B.C. (cf. *Old Testament Student*, xi. pp. 180, 181, and Steindorf in *Zeitschr. f. ägyptische Sprache*, 1889, pp. 41 ff., 1892, p. 50 ff.). Professor W. Max Müller informs me that Egyptological research during the last twenty years confirms this statement. So far as this discovery of the name Abram goes, it falls in with other facts, which tend to show that the oldest Penta-teuchal documents reflect the vocabulary of the tenth to the eighth centuries.

Meantime a discovery of the name Abraham, of which probably much more notice will be taken, has been made in some Babylonian letters from Dilbad or Dilmu, the modern Dêlâm, a few miles southeast of Borsippa. These letters were written in the reign of Ammizaduga, one of the last kings of the dynasty to which Hammurabi belonged.¹ In five of these letters an Abraham is mentioned, who appears to have been a small farmer, and who rented a small tract of land from a certain well-to-do landowner named Sin-iddin. The Babylonian spelling of the name is not uniform; *A-ba-am-ra-am*, *A-ba-ra-ma*, and *A-ba-am-ra-ma* are the forms in which it appears.

The name is certainly the long-looked-for Abraham, but it is equally clear that its bearer does not correspond to the Biblical description of the Patriarch. The Abraham of these letters was the son of Amil-Ishtar (or Awil-Ishtar), and apparently had a brother Iddatum, while the Abraham of

¹ They are published by Ungnad in *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler*, Heft vii, and are discussed by him in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. vi. Heft 5. He discusses the name Abraham on pp. 60 ff.

the Bible was the son of Terah, and his brother's name was Nahor. The rôle, too, attributed to the Patriarch was impossible apparently for this small farmer, and the date of the farmer does not correspond to either of the Biblical dates for the Patriarch. The value of the discovery of this name consists of the fact that it shows that Abraham was a personal name in Babylonia at the time of the Hammurabi dynasty.

The evidence that Babylonia long dominated Palestine, and that there were close relations between the two, increases. Lugalzaggisi, about 3200 B.C., claims to have subdued the countries as far west as the Mediterranean Sea (*OBI*, No. 87, col. ii). A Babylonian Chronicle now adds details to the testimony of the business documents that Sargon² (cir. 3000 B.C.) subdued the Mediterranean coast, by stating that he overran the country and set up his images (King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, vol. ii. p. 4). Gudea brought cedar-wood from Mount Lebanon (see Statue *B*); Hammurabi and Ammizadugga, one of his successors, both claim to be kings of MARTU — the Babylonian name for Syria and Palestine (King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, Nos. 66 and 69). In the reign of Shamsuiluna, Hammurabi's successor, a man in Sippar leased a wagon or a cart for a year, and stipulated in the contract that it should not be driven to *Kittim*.³ *Kittim* is one of the Biblical names for the Mediterranean coastlands, and travel between this part of the world and Babylonia must have been abundant, when a man could not lease a cart for a year without taking into account the possibility that it might make this journey.

During the latter part of this period there was a considerable movement eastward from the Syrian coast into Babylonia (see Ranke in the Introduction to *BE*, vol. vi., and

² Meyer in the second edition of his *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1909, pp. 345 ff., has, I believe, placed these kings too late. He has apparently overlooked some important archæological data, to which the present writer called attention in the *Churchman*, vol. xcvii. pp. 53, 54.

³ The contract was published by Friedrich, in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. v. pp. 429 ff.

Clay, *JAOS*, xxviii. pp. 135 ff.). The migrations were accordingly reciprocal. They were not all in one direction.

Certain statements of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis are, it may be justly said, rendered more probable by some of these facts. Hammurabi, who is plausibly identified with Amraphel,⁴ claims to be king of the western countries. This does not prove that he invaded the Jordan valley and came into conflict with Abraham, but it makes it possible that he may have done so. Other statements of the same chapter are thought by many to receive confirmation from cuneiform sources also. A certain Kudurmabug, who was "Ad-da," or governor of Emutbal, a district of Elam, also calls himself in several inscriptions "Ad-da," or governor of MARTU (see, e.g., *CT*, xxi. 33). It has been sometimes inferred that Kudurmabug here asserted lordship over Palestine, but as Price points out (*Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, Series i, vol. v. pp. 167 ff.), the term probably designates the western part of Elam, or the westland of Elam. In that case Kudurmabug had no connection with Palestine. Kudurmabug did, however, place a son (and probably two sons in succession) on the throne of Larsa. It has been assumed that there was but one son, and that his name was written indifferently Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin, and that the former of these names was sometimes pronounced Eri-Agu, or Eri-Aku. An extensive literature has grown up since the days of George Smith upon this identification.⁵

Tiele (*Geschichte*, i. p. 124), while admitting that the identification was possible, regarded it as uncertain. Schrader (*Sitzungsberichte*, 1887, p. 602 note) held that the identification was made certain by a text published by Lenormant (*Choix*

⁴ See the discussion of Dhorme in the *Revue Biblique*, 1908, pp. 205-226, and of Ungnad in the *Zeitsch. f. Assyriologie*, xxii. pp. 7-13.

⁵ Cf., e.g., George Smith, *Early History of Babylonia*; *Records of the Past*, v. pp. 64 ff.; Delitzsch, *Sprache der Kossäer*, p. 69, note 1; Sayce, *Verdict of the Monuments*, pp. 192, 195, 533, 552; *Patriarchal Palestine*, pp. 63, 168; *Early History of the Hebrews*, pp. 11, 24, 26, 58, and 128; Schrader, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1887, p. 600 ff.; 1895, pp. 961 ff.; Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, i. pp. 391; Clay, *Light on the O. T. from Babel*, pp. 131 ff.; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 40 ff., 70, 148, 161, 168 ff., 185 ff., 190, 206.

de textes, pp. 164 ff.) in col. i. 1. 11 of which Rim-Sin's name occurs. An examination of the passage shows, however, that it proves only that Kudurmabug had a son Rim-Sin, who was king of Larsa—a fact which no one doubts. No evidence is found there to show that that son was called Eri-Aku. Winckler (*KAT*,³ p. 367) pronounced the identification of Eri-Aku and Rim-Sin to be extremely uncertain.

The facts, I believe, can be shown to be these: (1) Kudurmabug had two sons who were kings of Larsa, Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin. (2) It is possible, though by no means certain, that Arad-Sin may have been called in Sumerian Iri-Agu. (3) It was Rim-Sin only who, so far as our evidence reveals, came into contact with Hammurabi, and the recorded relations between them were hostile and afford no basis for supposing that the two monarchs made an expedition together into the Westland.

Each of these points should be considered separately.

1. The suggestion that Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were different sons of Kudurmabug is not new. I do not know who first made it, but it was considered by Hommel and rejected, in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 169. His reason for rejecting it is that *rim* (*iri, ri, irim*) is a Sumerian translation of the Semitic word *ardu*, servant, while *agu* (*aku*) is a frequent epithet of the moon-god, Sin. All this, however, only shows that the two names *might* refer to the same person. Even if these arguments were all probable, absolute identity is not established. The arguments are, however, not convincing. That *iri* is a dialectical variation of the Sumerian URU, "servant," is attested by Rawlinson's *Cun. Ins.* ii. p. 39, l. 70 *a*, but that the name of an Elamite should pass among Semitic peoples in its Sumerian form, while possible, strikes one as needing proof.

This supposition that Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were two sons of Kudurmabug was revived by Thureau-Dangin in 1905 (*Les inscriptions de Sumer et Akkad*, p. 300, note 3), and has since been reasserted by him (*Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königinschriften*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 210, note *k*). Mr. L. W. King (*Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*,

vol. i. p. 68) gives this view his unqualified approval, holding that Arad-Sin preceded Rim-Sin on the throne of Larsa. Dhorme, *Rev. Biblique*, 1908, p. 209, heartily concurs in both these points. Meyer also, in the second edition of his *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1909, pp. 550 ff., holds that the two kings were distinct from one another. There are several considerations which convince one of the correctness of this view. (1) In all the inscriptions of Rim-Sin except two, which were written before his father's death and in which he is associated with his father, his name is preceded by the determinative for deity, as though like Naram-Sin and Dungi he claimed to be a god. This determinative is never found before the name of Arad-Sin. (2) In the Chronicle published by King, Rim-Sin's name is spelled with two ideograms, that for "wild ox" (Sumerian AMA, Semitic *rimu*) and that for the moon-god. (See King, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 17, 18.) This shows that at least in the opinion of later Babylonian scribes the name was not regarded as equivalent to Arad-Sin, "servant of Sin," but to Rim-Sin, "the wild ox of Sin." It is possible, of course, that these scribes were mistaken, but in this matter they were quite as likely to be right as the modern scholar. (3) The titles of the two kings are not quite identical. Arad-Sin is called at the first "king of Larsa," then "king of Larsa, king of Sumir and Akkad," then "king of Larsa, king of Sumir and Akkad and *Ad-da* of Emutbal." Rim-Sin is called first "king of Larsa," then "king of Sumir and Akkad," but not "*Ad-da* of Emutbal." These facts seem to me to establish Thureau-Dangin's claim that Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were distinct persons, though both sons of Kudurmabug.

Inscriptions of Kudurmabug are extant in which at different times he associates now one of these sons, now the other with him, in each case designating the son mentioned as "king of Larsa." (See Thureau-Dangin, *opera citata*.) These facts when put together lead to the following reconstruction of the history. Kudurmabug was *Ad-da* or governor of Emutbal, a district of western Elam. He aided his son Arad-Sin to capture the throne of Larsa. Arad-Sin after-

ward made other conquests in Babylonia, so that he could assume the ancient title, "king of Sumir and Akkad." He then turned on his father and attempted to add Emutbal to his dominions, meeting at first with such success that he was enabled to add his father's title to his own. Kudurmabug succeeded finally in overthrowing him, and then aided a second son, Rim-Sin, to obtain the throne of Larsa. Rim-Sin, after his father's death, obtained control over most of Babylonia. Some such view of the history is necessary to account for all these facts, and agrees with the views of the scholars referred to above.

2. It is only possible that Arad-Sin may have been called Iri-Agu. The reasons why it is possible have been stated above. In IV R 35, No. 8, l. 1, Ri-im-ilu-A-gam-um occurs as a king's name. This has often been cited as proof that Eri-Aku was a real Babylonian king. It is not quite certain that it is proof of that, but even if it is, it does not prove that he was identical with Arad-Sin. Pinches, Schrader, and Hommel (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 179 ff.), all find Eri-Aku mentioned in the fragment of an epic dating from the Persian period, but there is nothing in the fragment to connect the name convincingly with Arad-Sin.

Another argument might be advanced. Among proper names from the period of the dynasty of Ur, which preceded a little that of Larsa, some Sumerian names apparently have a divine element written with the Semitic sign *Arad*, perhaps pronounced in Sumerian *Ura* or *Ira* or *Ara*. In these names, however, the sign *Arad* is not preceded by the determinative for deity; we only infer that it stood for a deity by the analogy of other names. For example, we have *Uru-ra-kal*,⁶ in which if the *ra* is a phonetic complement, the meaning might be "Ura is a guardian spirit" (*šedu*). Then there is *Uru-ra-ba-til*,⁷ "Ura gives life," "*Uru-ra-ga-se-ir*,"⁷ "Ura is strong," *Ura-ra-ba-ni-ru-ba-tum*,⁷ "Ura creates the great," *Uru-ra-ba-ni*,⁸ "Ura creates," *Uru-ra-kuš*,⁹ "Ura is protec-

⁶ Reisner, *Tempel Urkunden aus Telloh*, No. 200, l. 9.

⁷ *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, vol. xii. p. 343, ll. 11-13.

⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *Recueil de tablettes chaldéennes*, No. 389, 5, No. 392, rev. 2.

⁹ *Zeitsch. f. Assyriologie*, xviii. p. 252, l. 5.

tor," and two or three others in which the meaning is not so clear. It may now be argued that the *Arad* in the name Arad-Sin was to be read Ura and that it stood for a deity, Ura-Sin or Ura-Aga meaning "Ura is Sin." This is certainly possible. The existence of these names shows that it is; but after all, it is only *possible*. It is not proven, and, if it were proven, it does not associate this king with Hammurabi, or bring him into Palestine. Then, too, it must be borne in mind that even if the sign *Arad* stood for a deity, we do not know how it was vocalized. He may quite as likely have been called Girra or Mirra as Ura.¹⁰

3. All the references in our sources to relations between Hammurabi and a king of Larsa mention Rim-Sin as the king concerned, and picture the relations as hostile. (See, e.g., *KB*, III, p. 127, and King, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 17.) We have as yet no evidence from the inscriptions that Arad-Sin, even if he were called Iri-Agu, ever had anything to do with Hammurabi, either as a friend or an enemy. Of course it is possible that he may have had, as their reigns must have overlapped, but that remains to be proved. Rim-Sin, on the other hand, was not entirely subdued by Hammurabi, but lived to make war on Samsu-iluna, Hammurabi's successor (King, *op. cit.*, i. p. 69 and ii. p. 18).

No reference has yet been found in the monuments to Chedorlaomar, king of Elam, nor to Tidal, king of Goiim, unless Tidal be the Tudhal of the late fragment of an epic already referred to (cf. Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 184), an identification which Dhorme, *Rev. Biblique*, 1908, p. 211, declares to be pure hypothesis.

Archæology, so far from having as yet established the early composition and historical character of Gen. 14, seems, so far as I can see, to furnish a series of facts which are best explained by supposing that that chapter was composed by a late midrashic writer who had, it is true, access to some Babylonian data, partly late and partly early, but did not know how to use them. He lived so far from the times that he had lost in part the correct historical perspective. Archæ-

¹⁰ Cf. Huber, *Personennamen*, p. 58, note 2.

ology thus confirms the critical results reached by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cornill, Budde, Bacon, Briggs, Wildeboer, Ball, Carpenter, and Harford-Battersby.

In a discussion as to whether archæology has helped to establish the historical character of Abraham, a word ought to be devoted to the Hittites. The twenty-third chapter of Genesis, commonly ascribed by critics to P (cir. 450 B.C.), represents Abraham as buying the cave of Machpelah from Ephron, the Hittite. The chapter says that Ephron "dwelt in the midst of the children of Heth" (v. 10), implying that there was a Hittite colony of some size in Hebron, if the whole city was not in their possession.¹¹ Does archæological discovery confirm this impression?

For an answer we must pass in review the following facts. The discovery of cuneiform tablets at Boghaz-koi in Asia Minor has revealed that that was the center of Hittite power—the home-land of the Hittites.¹² The earliest mention of them which we have in history shows that their activity extended toward the Mesopotamian valley, for they helped to overthrow the first dynasty of Babylon¹³ some eighteen centuries or more before our era. They had apparently not yet gained possession of northern Syria, for when Thothmes III extended his campaigns through that country to the Euphrates, beginning about 1478 B.C., they did not impede his progress. After the triumphant progress of Thothmes to the Euphrates, in the year 1470 B.C., the great Hittite chief sent him presents, apparently from his native seat in Asia Minor.¹⁴ In the years that followed they took possession of a part of northern Syria, for in the El-Amarna letters, written during the reign of Amenophis IV (1375–1358), they are frequently mentioned in letters from Phœnicia and the Amorite country between the Lebanon

¹¹ The latter is the natural inference; see Sulzberger, *Am Ha-Aretz*, pp. 20 ff.

¹² See *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 35.

¹³ Cf. King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, vol. i. pp. 72 ff. and 148 ff., vol. ii. p. 22.

¹⁴ Cf. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 2d ed., p. 304, and *Ancient Records*, vol. ii. § 485.

and anti-Lebanon ranges.¹⁵ No mention of them occurs to show that they had pushed to the southern part of Palestine or were in the neighborhood of Hebron.¹⁶ In the time of the nineteenth dynasty Seti I (1313-1292) found his way into the valley between the Lebanon ranges blocked by them;¹⁷ and the great battle of Rameses II (1292-1225) with them at Kadesh, in which the Egyptian king narrowly escaped,¹⁷ is evidence of their presence in the north. Rameses afterward made a treaty with them in which each agreed to respect the territory of the other;¹⁸ and as Egyptian territory extended then to the Lebanon mountains, it is clear that the Hittites were not in southern Palestine. With the reign of Rameses III (1198-1167) the Philistines and other sea-peoples began to attack the coasts of Asia Minor, Palestine, and Egypt,¹⁹ so that by the time of Rameses XII (1118-1090), when Wenamon went to Phœnicia for cedar, on an expedition, the entertaining report of which survives,²⁰ Dor was in the possession of a tribe kindred to the Philistines, and it is probable that the same was true of the whole coast of Palestine.

In the *mêlée* which brought this about the Hittites did apparently push into Galilee as far as the plain of Esdraelon, where their king, Sisera, was overcome by Deborah and Barak (Ju. 5). Professor George F. Moore pointed this out some years ago,²¹ and although the discovery of cuneiform Hittite documents shows that his analogies of Hittite names on Egyptian monuments ending in *sira* were fallacious, the Egyptian *r* representing an original *l*, enough of his evidence is valid to prove the point. The coming of the

¹⁵ The reader can easily verify this statement by looking up the references to the Hittites in the geographical index to vol. v. of Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, and noting the localities from which the letters come.

¹⁶ Breasted, *History*, p. 412.

¹⁷ See Breasted's discussion of the battle in the *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, vol. v., also his *Ancient Records*, vol. iii, pp. 125-156, and *History*, pp. 427-430.

¹⁸ Breasted, *Records*, iii, pp. 163-174, and *History*, pp. 437-439.

¹⁹ Breasted, *Records*, iv, pp. 33-49, and *History*, pp. 480, 481.

²⁰ Breasted, *Records*, iv, pp. 271-287.

²¹ *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. xix, p. 160.

Hebrews and the sea-peoples apparently crippled the power of the Hittites, and although at places like Hamath and Carchemish their power lingered on, it is improbable that after this they ever conquered Hebron. While, therefore, archæology has much to tell us of the Hittites, it has nothing to tell which brings them into connection with Hebron.

There remains, however, one possibility: the Hyksos kings who invaded Egypt about 1700 B.C. and held that country for a hundred years *may* have been Hittites. The Hyksos formed an extensive empire which covered Palestine, reached, possibly, to Mesopotamia, and may have included Crete.²² They almost certainly ruled Hebron. Their invasion of Egypt occurred but a century or two later than the Hittite invasion of Babylonia, and contemporaneously with the settling of the Mittani, who are thought to be kindred to the Hittites, on the Euphrates. Possibly the Hyksos were Hittites also. Meyer²³ recognizes this possibility, though he declares it cannot be stated as a historical fact. There are, however, serious objections to an identification of the Hyksos with Hittites. The Egyptian traditions as preserved by Manetho and Josephus refer to the Hyksos as Arabians and Phœnicians.²⁴ A Semitic invasion of Egypt seems much more probable than an invasion by Hittites. The Egyptians under the empire became well acquainted with the Hittites and, as we have seen, mention them frequently. Had they been conscious that the Hyksos belonged to that race, it seems probable that they would have indicated it. The possibility that the Hyksos were Hittite impresses one therefore as improbable.

It must, however, be remembered that Manetho, although he had access to ancient records, lived at a later date than the author of the P document did, and some day, when the Hittite inscriptions are deciphered, archæology *may* prove that Gen. 23 has preserved a correct historical tradition,

²² See Breasted, *History of Egypt*, pp. 217 ff., and Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 2d ed., pp. 295 ff.

²³ *Geschichte*, 2d ed., p. 578.

²⁴ See Breasted, *History*, p. 219.

which the Egyptians themselves had lost. It has not done this yet, but we should, in the present state of our knowledge, be prepared for this possibility.

In one respect the recent progress of archæology affords some consolation to the Biblical apologist. If we are right in identifying the Amraphel of Gen. 14 with Hammurabi, the author of that chapter made Abram a contemporary of this Babylonian king. On the basis of the Babylonian dynastic tablets scholars had confidently dated Hammurabi in the twenty-third century B.C. It seemed, therefore, that the author of Gen. 14 placed Abram there. In Gen. 15 13 the E document (cf. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's *Hexateuch, ad loc.*) said that Abraham's descendants should be afflicted four hundred years. Whether the four hundred years was to be counted from the time of Abraham or from the beginning of the period of affliction was, however, left in doubt. In Ex. 12 40 P^s took it in the latter sense, making the Egyptian sojourn just four hundred and thirty years to a day. St. Paul (Gal. 3 17) took it in the former sense, making the time between the giving of the promise to Abraham and the giving of the law four hundred and thirty years. Most modern chronologists, from Archbishop Ussher to Professor Beecher (*Dated Events of the Old Testament*), have followed St. Paul. On the old view, that the Exodus occurred in 1491, this carried us back only to the twentieth century for Abraham, and when the Exodus was brought down to 1320, Abraham was brought down to the eighteenth century; when the Exodus was put a century later, still Abraham followed. Archæology thus seemed to divide the Bible against itself. Hommel felt this, and in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, ch. iv., he ceased to follow the Pauline interpretation. He thus was able to gain a hundred and thirty years for Abraham. As this did not carry him back to the time of Hammurabi by about three centuries, Hommel proposed to regard the second dynasty of Babylon, which at that time was known to us only through a chronological tablet, as apocryphal. The progress of science has relieved the situation in a less violent way. King and Poebel simultaneously discov-

ered that the first and second dynasties of Babylon overlapped by one hundred and twenty-five years or more (see King, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 70 ff. and ii. pp. 19-21; Poebel in *Zeitsch. f. Assyriologie*, xx. pp. 229 ff.). This fact reveals the possibility that other dynasties which we have been adding end to end may have overlapped; and it is possible, therefore, so far as archæology is concerned, that the author of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis may have had a chronology in mind not so far removed from that of E and P as we had supposed.

This chronology, if we date the Exodus about 1220, in accordance with present-day opinions, would not place Abraham earlier than the seventeenth or eighteenth century B.C. The traditions of E and P would therefore make the Abrahamic migration accord with that great movement of peoples which began when the Kassites pushed into southern Babylonia, the Mittanni into the upper Euphrates valley, and pushed westward a wave of people across Syria, driving the Hyksos into Egypt. It was probably this migration which brought the Canaanites into Palestine; for while we know from many cuneiform sources that the Amorites were in this region several centuries earlier, we have no mention of the Canaanites before this time. By the El-Amarna period, however, they had given their name to a section of the country (see *KB*, v. Nos. 11, 14, 50, 101, 151, 154, and 294). We may from the Biblical point of view, therefore, call this migration Canaanite (see Paton, *Early History of Palestine and Syria*, ch. v.).

The portion of this migration which entered Egypt established a reigning house there which probably covers dynasties XV and XVI of Manetho's chronological scheme. These rulers were powerful, though barbarous, and, as already noted, there is reason to believe that their empire extended far into Asia. This is the age to which all the Biblical references except Gen. 14 point as the age of Abraham. Gen. 14, we must still believe, placed Abram earlier, for the age of Hammurabi must have considerably preceded the Kassite migration. Archæology still is positively a stumbling block to the harmonizing of these chronological data.

If we follow the documents which point to the Hyksos period as the age of Abraham, interesting information as to the type of civilization of this time has recently been found in the great tunnel discovered by Mr. Macalister at Gezer (see *Quarterly Statement*, January, April, and July, 1908). This tunnel was 219 feet long, 12 feet 10 inches wide, and 23 feet high at the entrance, growing gradually smaller further on. It was entered by a staircase, which, like the tunnel itself, was cut out of the solid rock. It led to a spring of water, and was undoubtedly designed to enable the city to withstand a siege. From the nature of the débris with which its mouth was filled, it appears to have fallen into disuse about 1200 B.C. Judging from the wear of feet on the rock-cut stairs, it must have been constructed about 500 years before that. This brings us back to this Hyksos period—a time at which no known occupants of Palestine existed, unless the monarchs who ruled Egypt, who were powerful enough to accomplish such a work. It is true that in the nineteenth century B.C. Sesostris (Usertsen) III, of the XIIth Egyptian dynasty, had invaded Palestine (see Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. § 680). Had this monarch accomplished such a work, however, he would certainly have celebrated it in an inscription, as he did the cutting of the canal at the first cataract and the conquest of Nubia. Probably, then, the tunnel is Hyksos work. While this tunnel affords us a new basis for an estimate of the civilization of the Abrahamic age, it affords us no evidence for the historical character of the patriarch.

On the other hand, any fair estimate of the bearing of archæology upon the Abrahamic problem must take into account the facts brought to light by archæology which favor the theories of those who believe that Abraham was a moon-god. The name Abram, of which Abraham is but a variant form,²⁵ means, if it is of West-Semitic origin, "Exalted father."²⁵ Biblical traditions connect Abraham with

²⁵ See Briggs, Brown, and Driver's *Lexicon*, p. 4. If the name was imported into Palestine from Babylonia, this explanation will not hold. In the Babylonian form of the name "Father" is an accusative and the name seems to mean "He (i.e. some god) loves the father."

Harran and Ur, seats of the worship of the moon-god, Sin. In Babylonian mythology Sin was the father of Shamash, the sun-god, and of Ishtar. In Babylonian hymns one of the most frequent epithets of Sin is "Father,"²⁶ which in Semitic is "Ab." "The exalted Father," if Abraham's name, fits, it must be confessed, the moon-god theory. Sarah, or Sarai, the name of Abraham's wife, is the Hebrew equivalent of *šarratu*, "Queen," an epithet of the consort of the moon-god at Harran, and Milcah, Abraham's sister-in-law (Gen. 11 29), is the Hebrew equivalent of *Malkatu*, the name of the consort of the sun-god, and perhaps of the moon-god also.²⁷ These facts do not prove Abraham a moon-god; absolute proof that a character is mythical is even more difficult than to prove it historical. We cannot, however, wonder that, in the absence of proof from contemporary sources that Abraham was a person, such facts had great weight. The discovery from an extra-Biblical source that Abraham was in Babylonia the name of a person, even though that person cannot be identified with the Patriarch, breaks in a slight degree, though it by no means nullifies, the weight of these considerations.

The intense interest in the narratives of Abraham, which has led some earnest souls to inaugurate the so-called warfare between archæology and criticism,²⁸ springs, of course, from the part that the conception of Abraham has played in the development of the Jewish and Christian faiths. Abraham as an ideal is, however, a solid part of the history of the world's best religion, and the permanent value of the ideal is inde-

²⁶ See E. G. Perry's *Hymnen und Gebete an Sin in Leipziger semitische Studien*, ii. 4 (1907), pp. 17, 20, 34, 35; Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, 1909, p. 297, and Vanderburgh, *Sumerian Hymns*, 1908, pp. 11, 42, 43.

²⁷ See *KAT*³, pp. 364 ff., and *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, xi. pp. 296-299.

²⁸ One of the curious psychological phases of this artificial warfare is manifested in an article by Wiener on "Pentateuchal Criticism" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1909. This writer argues in substance that the critical analysis rests on an insecure basis, because our sources of knowledge for the text are so late and imperfect that no certain inferences can be drawn from its statements. This argument is apparently published as a defense of faith!

pendent of the results of criticism of the patriarchal narratives or the investigations of archæologists. The ideal was real, whether woven about a mythical, a half legendary, or an historical character. It represented for centuries Israel's conception of her own call and mission. It was not, however, a constant quantity, and the fact that it varied is true, whether Abraham were real or not. To J¹ Abraham was the ideal devout nomad, who was obedient to Yahweh's call (Gen. 12 1 ff.), who believed in Yahweh and it was accounted to him righteousness (Gen. 15 6); the type of a hospitable host, whom Yahweh deigns to visit (Gen. 18 1 ff.). To J² Abraham was the intercessor for the innocent, who would shield the Judge of the earth from the suspicion of having done wrong (Gen. 18 25). To E Abraham was an ideal prophet of God, whom God protected, whose intercession he heard (Gen. 20), and whose faith did not waver in the face of the hardest sacrifice (Gen. 22). To P Abraham was the great ancestor of the nation, with whom God confirmed a covenant by the sacred and perpetual rite of circumcision (Gen. 17). Later Jews seem to have regarded Abraham as a man so holy that all his physical descendants were necessarily saints or children of God (cf. Dan. 7 25, John 8 33, 39). Paul regarded Abraham as an ideal exponent of faith, to whom souls of similar faith were akin (Rom. 4 16); the great Johannine author regarded him as a moral ideal, to whom men of a similar moral stamp were related (John 8 39 b), and the idea very likely goes back to Jesus Himself. To the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews Abraham is the type of the ideal world-pilgrim, or Christian, never satisfied with the transitory, who "sought for a city that hath the foundations" (Heb. 11 16). A Jewish tradition embodied in *Yalqut*²⁹ represents Abraham as the redeeming father, who will one day go to Gehenna and rescue from hell his unfortunate children who have been cast in thither.

One would, of course, prefer to believe that Abraham was an historical character, but some of the sublimest ideals have been enshrined in story and parable, as well as in historic

²⁹ Quoted by Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 343.

men, and the ideal is as real and as useful for teaching in one case as in the other.

Abraham, as an ideal which represented the best thought of different periods, drew upward the saints of various ages and was a potent influence for good. This ideal is enshrined in the world's most immortal literature; it has become the fiber of the character of unnumbered saints. Neither the ideal nor the character can be touched by the verdict either of criticism or archæology. To Christians Abraham as the embodiment of the highest ideal ceased to be vital after the first century of our era. The separation from Judaism and the influx of Gentile Christians brought other personages to the fore. Christ became the One Leader; His divine character and work overshadowed all others.

In the face of these facts, one cannot but regard the excitement about Abraham and criticism and Abraham and archæology as unnecessary and ill advised. Whatever the truth may be, it will eventually prevail. No real scholar desires to substantiate a position simply because it is old, or to embrace an opinion simply because it is new and revolutionary. He desires the truth and the whole truth, and he welcomes any science which can help him to it. Such men refuse to convict criticism at the bar of archæology or archæology at the bar of criticism, but realize that both sciences are handmaids in the service of the truth.

The Earliest Hebrew Writings and their Religious Value

JOHN P. PETERS

NEW YORK CITY

HISTORICAL writing began in Judah at or shortly after the time of David, with the story of the life of that monarch. This was followed by the history of Saul, and this by the story of the period preceding, until at length the history was carried back to the creation. At the same time it was continued forward to cover the reigns of succeeding monarchs, but after Solomon in the form of brief, dry chronicles. Later a similar work was composed in Israel. When Amos and Hosea prophesied, at or before the middle of the eighth century, these two collections were in existence, and considerable portions of them, imbedded in the later historical works, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, have come down to us.¹ A study of these early compositions shows us the development in some circles of a higher, more spiritual life than that which was expressed either in the ritual or in that earlier prophetic movement of the *nebiim*. The latter movement, in fact, while it influenced the thought of the writers or compilers of these collections, was in general the medium through which certain of the doctrines or ideas of these higher thinkers were communicated to or made effective on the mass of the people, and the people prepared for that higher movement based on these ideas which commences with Amos and Hosea.

¹ They are known in the critical analysis as J and E, and earlier and later strata are often designated by further differentiations as J¹, J², etc. They may be read separately in such works as Addis' *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, Bacon's *Genesis, Exodus*, and the different volumes of the Polychrome Bible. The analysis will be found in Driver's or any good modern introduction, or in modern commentaries on the separate books.

For the story of creation, the development of civilization, agriculture, and the arts, the division of men into different nations with different languages, and the like, the original material of the Judean story is evidently the myths, legends, and traditions which the Israelites found among the Canaanites. These the Canaanites on their part had borrowed from the Babylonians, probably during the long period of Babylonian domination of the West Land, and the old Babylonian material is clearly recognizable in the Hebrew narratives. So it is eastward in Eden that man takes his origin; it is at Babel that the speech of man is confounded and different languages originate. The connection of the Hebrew flood story with the Babylonian is clear to the most casual observer, and it is plain that the Hebrew idea of the heavens and the water above and the water below the earth are identical with the Babylonian; the sacred tree and the tempting serpent appear in old Babylonian art, and the man who must consort with the beasts before a helpmeet is found for him recalls Eabani, the primitive man in the Gilgamesh epic, who satisfies his passion with the beasts until Ishtar sends him a woman from her devotees.² The comparison of this last-named story with the sweet, wholesome, and beautiful picture of the relation of man and woman in the Judean narrative brings out a characteristic feature of Hebrew religion as here represented, its freedom from the sexual idea. In Babylonia, Phœnicia, Syria, and Palestine great importance attached to Ishtar or Astarte, in whose cult prostitution played so prominent a part, the worship in kind of that great mysterious life-bearing power, to which is attributable so much of the joy and happiness, as well as the sorrow and pain of life, and without which the world must speedily come to an end. In the Hebrew there is no Ishtar; her life-giving functions have been assigned to Yahaweh, and the sex feature has been eliminated. In the story of the temptation we find a view of the carnal relation of man and woman which seems in

² Gen. 2 18 ff. Cf. Jastrow, *AJSL*, xv. 207 f.; Barton, *Sketch of Semitic Origins*, 43; Peters, *Early Hebrew Story*.

some regards almost monastic. It is through this relation that the eyes of man and woman are opened, the sense of decency in clothing is developed, innocence is lost. God is in some way offended, man estranged from Him, banished from His presence,³ and condemned to a life of toil and pain. It is true that we have passages, like the story of Judah and Tamar,⁴ in which the consecrated harlot or *kedesha* appears. This particular story belongs not to that part of the narrative derived from the ancient myths, but to the folklore history of the tribes, and narrates the mixture by intermarriage of Judah with the native Canaanites. It was in precisely such intermarriage, with its resultant combination of gods and cults, that the danger of Israel lay. The religion of Israel was affected by its contact with Canaan in this regard, and certain immoral practices were introduced in the cult of the temples and high places. This is testified to not only by such stories as that of Judah and Tamar, but also by categorical statements of both the Judean and Israelite⁵ narratives; but it is clear that this did not meet the approval of the better minds, and that such practices were never regarded by them as an integral part of their religion. It is presumably true that certain ideas and practices, not considered immoral at the outset but so considered later, were glossed and eliminated by succeeding writers; but, making all due allowance for this, it remains a fact of the greatest significance that the thinkers of Israel, having such myths as their material and surrounded by such licentious practices, sanctioned and required by religion, should have developed a product so spiritual and so void of immorality.

It is noteworthy also that these myths, which in their original form are grossly polytheistic, become in Hebrew monolatrous and almost monotheistic. It is Yahaweh who

³ Cf. with this the rule which forbade a man to partake of holy things within a certain period after cohabitation, 1 Sam. 21 4 r.

⁴ Gen. 38 21. Evidently certain usages, immoral in their nature and inconsistent with the general principles represented by J, were accepted as facts, after a manner familiar in the history of all religions.

⁵ Cf. Judges 2, 3 5 r.

creates earth and heaven, man and the beasts, who drives man out of Eden because of his transgression, and sends a flood to drown men because they were become corrupt. We find a few slight indications of the polytheistic sources from which the material was drawn, such as the remnant of a story about the offspring of the "sons of god" (or the gods) and the "daughters of men";⁶ but such remnants only make more clear the monotheistic character of the Hebrew version of those ancient myths and legends, and emphasize the fact that the Hebrews deliberately blotted out all other gods, recognizing no god besides Yahaweh.

There is also in general a strong moral element pervading the Hebrew tales. So in the flood story it is the wickedness of man which causes Yahaweh to send destruction upon him, not, as in the Babylonian tale, the mere caprice of the gods or a sort of fate which compels the gods themselves. There is a moral purpose in Yahaweh's government of the universe and His dealings with men. This is not, it is true, carried out consistently, and in some cases the motives ascribed to Yahaweh are those of caprice or favoritism or jealousy. It is the smell of the sweet fragrance of sacrifice, so long absent, which leads Yahaweh to say in His heart that He will not again curse the ground because of man.⁷ It is jealousy of man's power and independence which causes Yahaweh to drive him out of Eden⁸ and to confound his speech at Babel.⁹ But while we have such representations, similar in principle to the representations of the sources from which the compilers of these tales drew their material, yet in general Yahaweh is represented as acting on moral grounds, and as showing loving-kindness and mercy toward men.

The stories of the patriarchs, beginning with the twelfth chapter of Genesis, are of a different origin. One important element is local folklore, and especially the tales of the local sanctuaries which were adopted by the Hebrews. The story of Abraham in the Judæan narrative connects itself with Mamre or Hebron and with a tomb or *ziara* of Abraham at that place. It is evident from the story that the sanctity of

⁶ Gen. 6 2 ff.

⁷ Gen. 8 21.

⁸ Gen. 3 22.

⁹ Gen. 11 6 f.

this place antedated the Hebrew occupation. This sanctity was taken over by the Hebrews, with its local traditions. With these local traditions were combined by the Hebrews their own ethnic traditions, so that Abraham becomes in a sense the impersonation of the Hebrew people. Even the great historical event of the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt appears in the Judean narrative of Abraham. The Israelite or Elohistic narrative connects the name of Abraham with the region further southward about Beer-sheba, a favorite place of pilgrimage for Israelites. With this latter region, and especially with the shrine of Beer-sheba, were connected also the name and the traditions of Isaac.

The name of Jacob was associated with the ancient sanctuary of Bethel. This was conquered by the Israelites, who, according to the early and evidently historical narrative in Judges,¹⁰ destroyed the inhabitants. But clearly, also, they took over the ancient sanctuary, so that in the same narrative we read that "the messenger of Yahaweh went up from Gilgal to Bethel (so LXX); and they offered sacrifice there to Yahaweh."¹¹ With the sanctity of the place were taken over its cult and its traditions, the great *mazzabah* which Jacob set up, and the natural high place, rising like a *ziggurat* heavenward. With the local traditions of the ancient shrine were combined the folklore of Israel, and the native Jacob was identified with the conquering Israel. As in the case of Abraham, so here, also, the descent into and the return from Egypt were woven into the story, until the folklore connected primarily with the sanctuary of Bethel became a compendium of the national legends and traditions.

Somewhat similarly, with Shechem was associated Joseph, who becomes the parent of the great central tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim.

As these stories have come down to us, they have been brought into connection with one another and with the worship of Yahaweh. He has displaced the local divinities, and these are His shrines consecrated by those honored

¹⁰ 1 22 ff.

¹¹ Judges 2 1. 6.

fathers, the patriarchs, who, after a method common in other religions, have been brought into a genealogical relation.

Other shrines and cults were more local in their influence. In the story of Jephthah¹² an event of Israel's history has been brought into connection with a cult in Gilead in which the maidens lamented "four days in the year for the daughter of Jephthah." In the story of Samson¹³ we have, apparently, combined with historical events of a struggle with the Philistines, mythical elements connected with the neighboring Beth-Shemesh, the sanctuary of the sun-god Shamash. Here we have also a strange and primitive combination of the Nazarite and the consecrated harlot. Both of these stories, like that of Judah and Tamar, already noticed, bring us into connection with the obscene sexual worship evidently so common in Canaan. It is probable that other stories of a similar character existed in the earlier period, and that those tales which have come down to us contained gross elements which were later glossed over or eliminated. Considering their origin in the cult and myths of the native shrines, this is at least what we should expect. The remarkable fact is that those grosser elements should have been so effaced, and at such an early date that the earliest Judæan and Israelite collections contain only such feeble traces of them as are noted above.¹⁴

The lore of most of the sanctuaries perished, or was preserved in small fragments mingled with later history or with the great stream of popular story which connected itself with Bethel, Mamre, and Beersheba. So popular, on the other hand, did the tales connected with these sanctuaries become, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob assumed a national existence, dissociated to some extent from locality,

¹² Judges 11.

¹³ Judges 13-16.

¹⁴ It is worthy of note that the stories of Jephthah and Samson belong to the concubine tribes of Gad and Dan, which we have reason to suppose were of Canaanite origin. These stories may, therefore, be connected with their ancient worship. In the case of Dan, the myths or legends of Beth-Shemesh are mingled with the historical struggle against the Philistines. All the more remarkable becomes the monotheistic transformation which they underwent in the crucible of Israelite folklore.

and connected with the people as a whole. These stories, as their content shows, the historical references interwoven with the earlier myths and legends, had assumed form before the time of David, as a part of the lore of the nation. They were utilized later as history by the early historical writers of Judah and Israel, and underwent more or less modification, and probably also spiritualization, at the hands of those writers. But the gist and the bent of these tales were presumably settled long before the time of those writers or compilers.

As a whole, this patriarchal lore presents a pure and spiritual, if naïve and childlike, conception of mingled religion and morality. Especially is this the case with the story of Abraham, whose character is depicted as wonderfully grand and beautiful. He becomes a type of that unworldly goodness, rooted in faith, which the later prophets preach. At the divine command he leaves his home to seek a foreign land which God promises to give him. His wife is barren, and God promises that his seed shall inherit the land. At God's command he prepares to offer up his only son. He goes through life listening for the true teaching of God, which is not shut up in formal precepts.¹⁵ He is hospitable, merciful, compassionate.

The story of Jacob does not present so high a model, and that of Isaac is shadowy compared with the others, but all alike exhibit a clear conception of the difference between Israel and other peoples, more particularly the Canaanites, and Israel's racial and religious antagonism to the latter. Israel is the people of Yahaweh, whom He has chosen from among all peoples, and to whom He has given the land of Canaan. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are their ancestors, strangers to the Canaanites among whom they dwelt, to whom Yahaweh promised children and heirs, which they are. Their relation to Yahaweh is a moral one, or rather He is a moral God who abhors and punishes sensuality and crime. So he destroys Sodom and Gomorrah with fire and brimstone because of their unnatural lust, from which, as it would seem, Moab and

¹⁵ Cf. art. "Abraham," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

Ammon as well as Israel were free. How prevalent this unnatural lust was, and that it was sanctioned by religion, is made clear by the later history and legislation of Israel. How abhorrent it was to the better consciences in Israel, and yet how great a danger to the people, is shown not only by the story of Sodom and Gomorrah,¹⁶ but also by the ancient and gruesome story of the crime of Gibeah,¹⁷ which is evidently in its main features historical. Another of the abominations not only of Canaan, but also of the surrounding nations, was the sacrifice of first-born sons. This is condemned in the story of Abraham's would-be offering of Isaac, which recognizes the right of God to the first-born, for whom, by substitution, is to be sacrificed a ram.¹⁸

The deliverance from Egypt, the life in the wilderness, and the formation of the people of Israel under the law of Yahaweh, constitute a cycle of traditions of another character, entirely Israelite in origin, centering around the person of Moses. These traditions evidently originated among the people before the time of the Judæan and Israelite collectors, by whom they were gathered together and incorporated in their histories. In these traditions Moses is represented as the founder of the nation and religion of Israel, the interpreter and mediator to it of the will of Yahaweh, who gives it a law from Yahaweh. Accordingly the laws which existed at the time when these collections were made were ascribed to Moses, who was supposed to have obtained them from Yahaweh. This cycle of traditions also makes clear the fact that the god of Israel was one, and that Israel might have no god besides Him, for He was a jealous god, who would brook no rival. Israel was a peculiar people, separated from the nations, holy to Yahaweh. Yahaweh fought for them and gave them the lands of the Canaanites for an heritage.

Closely connected with this cycle are the traditions of the conquest of Canaan, which reveal the same conception of

¹⁶ Gen. 19.

¹⁷ Judges 19-21.

¹⁸ Gen. 22. This appears in the Israelite narrative (E) and seems to be a product of the period of reflection when these stories were collected rather than a part of the original Hebrew lore.

Israel's relation to Yahaweh and to the nations of Canaan. Connection and intermarriage with them is forbidden, since it involves acceptance of their gods. The worship of those gods was connected with immoral practices abhorrent to the religion of Yahaweh.¹⁹ Sometimes, however, we find that some foreign or even immoral practice has been condoned and has lingered on, its existence being accounted for and excused by some story like that of Rahab, the harlot, of Jericho, which may have an historical foundation.²⁰

Following this we have a cycle of local and tribal traditions of the vicissitudes of the occupation of the land, the struggles with Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites, Midianites, and Philistines, material contained in our present book of Judges, with part of Samuel. These traditions are diverse in character, and some of them have connections with local shrines and cults, as already pointed out.

With the story of Saul we begin to find ourselves on more strictly historical ground, the events narrated being closer to the time of their recording and the conditions favoring a more accurate preservation of the facts. The story of David was written almost, if not quite, by contemporaries, and from that time on we are dealing in general with history. But throughout all this mass of diverse material, Babylonian-Canaanite myths and legends, the legends of the sanctuaries, tribal and clan legends and traditions, the national traditions of Israel, the stories of its legendary and traditional heroes, its patriotic and folk songs, the records of court chroniclers and historiographers, and the stories of the prophets, runs the same monotheistic strain, the same pure, moral tone, distinct from and antagonistic to the surrounding polytheism and religious licentiousness.

The picture of Yahaweh's religion and of Israel's relation to Yahaweh which we obtain from these earliest writings, may be roughly described as follows: Yahaweh is a person like man, only wiser and stronger. He walks in the garden of Eden in the cool of the day, He comes down to see what man is doing at Babel, He visits Abraham in human form

¹⁹ Cf. Num. 25 1 ff.

²⁰ Josh. 2, 6 22 ff.

But in the later thought represented in these writings we find a movement away from this naïve anthropomorphism. He reveals Himself through His messenger, He shows Himself in the pillar of cloud and fire, man cannot see Him face to face, but only His hinder parts, and we even reach in the story of Elijah the thought of His manifestation, not in the cloud or the fire or the earthquake, but in the still, small voice which speaks in the heart of man. He is localized, having His abode in Horeb or Sinai, in the land of Canaan, which becomes His land, or more peculiarly in this or that sacred spot or object in which He manifests Himself. He dwells in the Ark, in the cherubim. He is worshiped in the stones or pillars at or on which one pours out the blood or the oil, which one touches or strokes. He is summoned by the smell of the sacrifice, and placated and satisfied by it; He consumes it by His fire. But withal He dwells unseen, in a region and a wise beyond the ken of man, in thick darkness. This is all very crude, unphilosophical, and inconsistent; and it is inconsistent partly because it represents different stages in the development of the thought of God, partly because it is unphilosophical. They knew Yahaweh only as they came in contact with Him; beyond that, not being speculative, they did not go.

Yahaweh is clearly marked off from the forces of nature, which He controls. He is a jealous God, not tolerating any God beside Himself, and therefore all supernatural agencies and effects in His land are centered in Him. He sends alike drought and rain, famine and plenty, sickness and health. Greatly to be feared is His wrath, which He displays especially towards Israel's foes, but at times also towards Israel itself when it violates His honor and sanctity. While in general Yahaweh has an ethical character and bestows His bounties or displays His wrath for moral causes, yet this is by no means always the case. The causes of His wrath are at times unethical, due to a transgression of His prerogative in some possibly unknown manner; and because His wrath is thus at times unethical, therefore also it must be satisfied by unethical and savage means, such as the sacrificial or semi-

sacrificial death of innocent offenders, or members of the family of the offender.²¹

But it was not in general the wrath of God which was in the mind of the Israelites in connection with God. In its outward expression, in its feasts and its friendly relations with its God, the religion of Israel was glad and joyful, and a similar conception of the relations of Israel to Yahaweh shows itself in these writings. The Israelite was proud of his God, and of His unique power and character. He delights to tell of the victories of his God over the gods of other peoples. In Egypt his God enables Moses to overmatch the sorcery of the Egyptians. But in Israel's relation to Him there is no sorcery nor magic art; in fact, there is a remarkable freedom from superstition. This and the thought that Yahaweh alone was lord in Canaan led to the condemnation of sorcery and witchcraft, which, nevertheless, continued to be practiced. Clearly the common people believed in the existence of malignant spirits, whom they sought to propitiate in order to avoid their curse and win their favor, and through whom, or the spirits of the dead, they sought to obtain guidance and knowledge of the future. The higher thinkers, although not prepared to dispute the existence of such agencies, nevertheless opposed their recognition and cult as an offense against the jealousy and exclusiveness of Yahaweh, who can and does in fact Himself fill this field, so that the propitiation or consultation of such spirits is really quite unnecessary.

The name Yahaweh, while it plays in these writings a larger part probably than it did in common practice, is not even there the exclusive use. Men might and did call God *baal*, or *melek*, or *adon*, or father, uncle, brother, etc., and in Israel there was more particularly an inclination to use the more general *el*, deity, or *elohim*, God. This renders it easier at the outset to identify the god of Israel with the gods of the various local shrines, the *baal*, or *god*, or *father* of Mamre or Bethel, or whatever else. But gradually more emphasis is

²¹ Cf. the death of Saul's descendants, 2 Sam. 21.

laid upon the special name, Yahaweh, of Israel's God. This development we can trace in these writings.

And now where and under what influences were these writings composed, and what relation did they bear to the actual religion of the people in the pre-prophetic period?

They bore the same relation to the actual religion of the people which the works of a few spiritual-minded thinkers, chiefly monks, bore to the actual religion of the masses of the people in Italy, or France, or Germany, or England in the dark ages. The name of Yahaweh, the tradition of His wonderful deliverances of His people, the belief that Israel was the people of Yahaweh—this the people held fast in the darkest part of the dark ages of Israel. This colored their folklore. There was a remembrance also of Moses, but, one would judge, very little of his teaching or religion, except as that and the rough morality of the nomad combined to protect them somewhat against the licentiousness of the religion of Canaan, or to keep alive a protest against it. A more formal expression of Moses' religious teaching was preserved in the cult connected with the Ark, and probably, also, borrowed from that, in a more or less modified form, in other shrines. A more ethical recollection and understanding of the religion of the great prophet and founder was preserved by a few thinkers. With the development of the national and literary sense this was applied to the folklore which had sprung up or been borrowed in the ways above indicated, with the result of selecting what was best in that, and modifying and spiritualizing it still further.²² The strengthening of the national sense aroused a desire to be informed of the past, and a pride in the nation's origin, achievements, and, as it were, peculiarities, which greatly reënforced the literary and religious motives. With the attempt to study their past comes inevitably a higher appreciation of the ethical aspect of the religion of Moses and a truer perception of the principles of that religion. We have here, in fact, the same sort of result which followed from the attempt among Christians to

²² The Judæan story is on the whole closer to the folklore than the Israelite, which shows more of the reflective and conscious element.

study the life and teachings of Jesus. This affected in its turn the folklore as embodied in the national stories which were being collected, and this in turn, as the culture and the national sense of the people increased, affected a constantly increasing number, but in its entirety always a relatively small minority. Religious practice did not change at all in pace with the changed conceptions of the thinking few who were most deeply affected by the spiritual and ethical literary development, until at last the latter came to be not only far in advance of, but also in opposition to the common expression of religion among the people, and the ideas connected with that expression. This was the condition reached in the prophetic period, but prepared by the school of writers and compilers whose work has come down to us in the fragments of the Judean and Israelite collections known to the critics in the Hexateuch as J and E, with the kindred material in Judges, Samuel, and Kings.²³

²³ For parallels to the growth of Hebrew chronicles and legislation in Anglo-Saxon chronicles and laws, cf. Carpenter-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, I. Chap. I.; Peters, *The Old Testament and the New Scholarship*, Chap. V.

Azariah of Judah and Tiglath-pileser III

HOWELL M. HAYDN

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

DID Azariah of Judah actually come into conflict with Tiglath-pileser III or not? This was formerly an open question, but it is so no longer, if one may judge by the expressions of the latest authorities. They subscribe, with practical unanimity, to the conclusions of Winckler,¹ who denies that the aforesaid monarchs ever had any dealings with each other, and explains the famous "Azrijâu" passages in Tiglath-pileser's "Annals," which seem to suggest that they did, as referring to an entirely different person from the king of Judah. Manifestly this newer theory of Winckler, as also the older one of Schrader, who identified "Azrijâu" with Azariah, must finally stand or fall by its harmony with the sanest interpretation of the Assyrian Inscriptions, and hence a fresh survey of the question from this standpoint seems permissible to the present writer.

I. *The Evidence of the Assyrian Inscriptions*

As is well known, Tiglath-pileser's "Annals" are in a fragmentary condition, and they are especially fragmentary where they speak of "Azrijâu," in the two inscriptions known as III R 9, No. 2, and III R 9, No. 3.² A duplicate of the latter has fortunately come to light, but none of the former. The transliteration of the two, as given by Schrader,³ is as follows:

(III R 9, No. 2)

1. 3. . . . ja-a-u mâ-t Ja-u-da-ai ki-ma . . .
1. 4. . . . šu(?)-ri-ja-u mâ-t Ja-u-di . . .
1. 10. . . . [j]a-a-u i-ki-mu u-dan-ni-nu-su-ma . . .

¹ First published in 1893.

² Rawlinson's Collection.

³ *KAT*,² 1883; Engl. transl., i. 209 ff.

(III R 9, No. 3)

- l. 23. . . . Az-ri-a-u . . . [u] šab-bit rab . . . [ka?]-ti-ja
 l. 31. (end) . . . Ša ina ħi-it-ṭi-sun za-rar-ti ana
 Az-ri-ja-a-u i-ki-i-mu.

Observe here that in the first inscription the name of the person concerned occurs three times, each time imperfectly, but that of his country twice, completely, while in the second, on the contrary, the name of the individual occurs twice in full, but there is no mention of his country. Observe also that in line 4 of the first inscription the name is given more fully than in line 3, another sign toward the beginning of the name being preserved, and so much of the one before that, as to suggest what it was. The same man is meant in both these lines, since the "mât Ja-u-da-ai" of the first is admittedly identical with the "mât Ja-u-di" of the second. That he is, further, the king of the country, is the natural inference from the uniform practice of the "Annals," to name in the records of campaigns the kings of the opposition with the lands or cities of their rule.

But is this king of "Ja-u-di," of the first inscription, whose name can only be conjectured as it stands, the same man as the land-less "Az-ri-ja-a-u" of the second? If so, the former would find his name, and the latter, his country, and the equation: Azrijâu of Jaudi = Azarjâhu of Jehudhah would certainly appear plausible.

This identity of the two names Schrader endeavored to prove, his best argument being based on the fact already noted that the *country* of the "Azrijâu" of the second inscription is not given. Inasmuch as the context in line 31 is unbroken, this would naturally suggest that he had been mentioned *with* his country a little earlier, and make his identification with "š(u?)-ri-ja-u mât Ja-u-di" of the first inscription very probable. Of course the close sequence of the two inscriptions, also, would be here involved.

Schrader failed to convince all, however, though convinced fully himself. Wellhausen,⁴ *e.g.*, maintained that the first

⁴ *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, xx. p. 633.

inscription had "no intelligible connection with" the second, and that the two names were entirely different. The difficulties attaching to the identification from the Old Testament side loomed large to him, and to others, and thus matters stood, with perhaps the majority holding Schrader's position, until 1893, when the appearance of Rost's work on the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III⁵ led to two remarkable but contradictory developments.

1. Rost himself accepted Schrader's identification.⁶ He had secured for his work clearer reproductions of the original inscriptions than had been available for Schrader, and from them he argued that the sign in the personal name of the first inscription, which Schrader thought either "šu" or "aš," was really "iz." Then there would be no need to prefix "A," as Schrader did, making "Ašurijâu," but the name would stand complete as "Iz-ri-jâu-u." As compared now, with the "Az-ri-jâu-u" of the second inscription, the difference would be only that between "az" and "iz," a difference paralleled by the writing of the name "Askelon" in the Assyrian inscriptions both "Askaluna" and "Iškaluna."

This demonstration of the identity of the names was accepted generally as conclusive. Schrader, so far at least, was right, and his main contention, that this Azrijâu of Jaudi was none other than Azariah of Judah, as a result of this unexpected clearing away of difficulties, and Rost's support, seemed, also, all but certainly established.

2. But now came the other and most unexpected development from Rost's work. In the same year that it appeared, Winckler⁷ made its text the documentary basis, on the Assyrian side, of an entirely different theory as to the personality and habitat of "Azrijâu" or, as he preferred to call him, "Izrijâu." This theory is to-day so well known, that it need be only briefly given here.

It rests upon two of the North-Semitic inscriptions found at Zenzirli in Northwest Syria about the year 1890, in which there occurs the name of a kingdom or principality of

⁵ *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-pileasers III.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, ii. p. xxiii.

⁷ *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 1893, pp. 1 ff.

that region, which, transliterated into the familiar square character, reads "𐤊𐤍". Winckler was struck by this form "𐤊𐤍", and its general resemblance to the "Ja-u-di" of the puzzling "Azrijâu" inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, which date from practically the same time. He saw that this resemblance would become identity if the 𐤍 of "𐤊𐤍" could be read as a consonant, and vowelled with "u"; both forms would then = "Ja-u-di," and "Azrijâu mâṭ Ja-u-di," need not any longer be taken as "Azariah of Judah," but could equally well be "Azrijâu," or "Izrijâu," of "Ja-u-di," this little state of Northern Syria. For many reasons, chiefly relating to Old Testament history and chronology, Winckler supported this latter identification in preference to the older view of Schrader, and he has had great success in winning recruits to his standard.

But, granting the attractiveness of his solution, is not the real question, as between his view and Schrader's, one of evidence, the evidence of all the *Assyrian* inscriptions of the period, and not simply of these two Aramaic inscriptions, with their somewhat doubtful "Ja-u-di"?⁸ The Assyrian inscriptions do not support Winckler's theory very well. In only one passage,⁹ aside from that under discussion, can he claim with any confidence that they mean by "mât Ja-u-di" his North Syrian country, while the cases in which they uncontestedly refer to Judah by that term are numerous, and cover the considerable period between Tiglath-pileser III and Esarhaddon.

But the evidence in favor of Judah goes further. A look back at the transliteration of III R 9, No. 2, will show that after the personal name in line 4 there occurs, "mât Ja-u-di," but after that name in line 3, "mât Ja-u-da-ai." Now since Winckler so cordially follows Rost and Schrader in declaring the same man to be referred to in both lines, being especially taken with the former's determination of his name as "Iz-ri-jâ-u," he must surely admit the consequence — that the

⁸ G. A. Cooke, e.g. in his "North Semitic Inscriptions," 1903, differs sharply from Winckler, taking 𐤍 as quiescent, and reading "Ya'di."

⁹ I.e. Sargon's Nimrûd Inscription, l. 8. Cf. *KB*, ii. p. 100.

“mât Ja-u-da-ai” has just as much right to be considered in determining “Izrijâu’s” or “Azrijâu’s” habitat as the “mât Ja-u-di.” But even a cursory glance at the inscriptions of the period will show that “mât Ja-u-da-ai” occurs therein, as a designation of Judah, fully as frequently as “mât Ja-u-di.”¹⁰ It is both curious and significant that these two designations of Judah, found separately so often, should occur in succeeding lines of this mere fragment, so that, with all its tantalizing imperfection, it nevertheless gives a *double* indication of the mysterious “Izrijâu’s” country :

mât Ja-u-da-ai = Judah,
mât Ja-u-di = Judah.

Consider the bearing of this double equation upon the question at issue a little further, since it is the main point upon which the present writer rests his case, and the one new factor he can claim to have brought forward. Here, then, is a country, named in a certain Assyrian inscription, whose identity cannot be conclusively established by the context. The passage which refers to it gives its name in two different, but closely related, forms. These two forms recur, separately, several times, in other Assyrian inscriptions of the same general period, where their respective contexts indisputably identify *each* with the *same* definitely known country. By the very law of probabilities, then, the argument for the identity of the two countries, the unknown and the known, must be admitted to be many times stronger than if only one name-form connected the two. And, this being so, the probability, also, that the better form of the personal name is “*Azrijâu*,” — in spite of Winckler’s preference for “Izrijâu,” — and that it corresponds to the Biblical “Azarjâhu” of Judah, is proportionately increased.

Such considerations might well give pause to too hasty an acceptance of Winckler’s theory. Indeed, one cannot help a feeling of surprise that one so keen for close distinctions as Winckler shows himself to be, *e.g.* in his careful treatment of the **𐎗** in “**𐎗𐎎**”, should have failed to note the form

¹⁰ *E.g.* Tigl.-pil. III, *Prunkinschrift*, II R 67, l. 61 ; Sennacherib’s Prism Inscription, col. ii. l. 72, and in other places.

“mât Ja-u-da-ai” as well as “mât Ja-u-di,” and to recognize its importance. The substantiation, through contemporary inscriptions, of its uniform reference to Judah elsewhere makes its value far greater, by the laws of evidence, for the determination of its reference as to Judah here also, than is the value of **𐤎𐤍** for fixing its reference as to another “mât Ja-u-di” in Northern Syria. And when it is remembered, further, that the **𐤍** in this word may not be used as a consonant, the greater strength of the older view, so far as its inscriptional basis is concerned, will have to be conceded. It might almost be said that it is “a condition, and not a theory,” which there obtains.

The strength of Winckler’s view, then, if the preceding argument is valid, must be rather negative than positive, and lie in the gravity of the objections to identifying “Azrijâu” with Azariah.

II. *The Objections to the Identification of “Azrijâu mât Jaudi” with Azariah of Judah*

As the objections concern both what “Azrijâu” is represented as doing, and when and where he did it, the statements of the Inscriptions on these points must first be examined. Here, owing to the broken condition of III R 9, No. 2, the sole dependence is III R 9, No. 3, and its duplicate, Layard 65. In this section of the “Annals” is described Tiglath-pileser’s subjugation to Assyria of a certain territory lying, apparently, in Northern Syria, between the mountains and the Mediterranean. A number of its localities are named, and then the account proceeds: ¹¹ “Nineteen districts of the town Hamath, together with the towns in their circuit, which are situated on the coast of the Western Sea, which in their sin and wickedness sided ¹² with Azrijâu I [*i.e.* Tiglath-pileser] turned into the territory of Assyria. My governor as administrator of the province I set over them, 30,300 of the inhabitants [I removed from] ¹³ their towns and let them

¹¹ See Schrader and Rost, *l.c.*

¹² Most probable reading.

¹³ Text broken, Rost’s proposed reading.

have the circuit of the city Ku . . . ; 1223 of the inhabitants I settled in the district of the land of Ulluba." That is practically all there is concerning "Azrijâu" in the whole inscription; a mere passing allusion. If it were not for III R 9, No. 2, there would be no definite clew to his identity, and he would be set down simply as some king or prince in the general region under discussion, who was the leader of a considerable revolt against Tiglath-pileser, in which the "Nineteen districts of the town Hamath" had joined. But III R 9, No. 2, *seems* to connect him with *Judah*, and to suggest the possibility that he was Azariah, and "there's the rub."

As to the date of his activity there are very clear and explicit data. The inscriptions known as Layard 50 *a* and *b* and 67 *a* have been shown to continue Layard 65 (= III R 9, No. 3), and within their compass is found one of the few surviving dates of the "Annals." Some twenty-five lines beyond the allusion to "Azrijâu," Tiglath-pileser says:¹⁴ "In the ninth year of my reign, Aššur my lord inspired me with confidence and I made an expedition against the lands," etc. His ninth year is 737 B.C., and since this line marks the beginning of his account of the campaigns of that year, what precedes is, in the absence of another date, most naturally taken as referring to his eighth year, or 738 B.C.

Again, the Assyrian "Eponym List with Addenda" has this note for the year 739 B.C.: "To the land Ulluba, the city Birtu, conquests." But the "Azrijâu" passage says that Tiglath-pileser settled 1223 of those concerned in his rebellion "in the district of the land of Ulluba," and, as it seems only reasonable to infer that the conquest of Ulluba preceded the transportation thither of the conquered of other regions, it results that the "Azrijâu" revolt must have taken place *after* 739 B.C., or, at the earliest, in that year. From these two mutually independent data comes the general agreement of scholars that 738 B.C. was the year of "Azrijâu's" revolt. In the following discussion that year is accepted.

¹⁴ Rost, *op. cit.* I. 157.

What, then, are the objections to the supposition that Azariah of Judah promoted a revolt against Assyria in the year 738 B.C., in which some Syrian districts, apparently dependencies of Hamath, were involved? They are both chronological and historical.

1. The chronological objections may be thus stated: Azariah of Judah was either not alive in 738 B.C., or, if living, was so incapacitated through age and disease, that it would have been utterly impossible for him to lead a revolt against Tiglath-pileser, far beyond the boundaries of his kingdom. The second alternative of this proposition presents objections as much historical as chronological, and may be set aside for the present, but the first sets forth the chronological objection in its extreme form, and inasmuch as, if sustained, it is manifestly in itself sufficient to render all others superfluous, it must be considered before them. If it is indeed true that Azariah had died before 738 B.C., then, of course, it is impossible that the references in Tiglath-pileser's accounts of that year should be to him, and, in this impossibility, Winckler's theory would be a possible way out, though it would still seem as if *some* king of *Judah* were demanded by the double equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mât Ja-u-di} &= \text{Judah,} \\ \text{mât Ja-u-da-ai} &= \text{Judah.} \end{aligned}$$

The two fixed data for computing the reigns of Judah's kings of this general period in years B.C. are, as is well known, supplied by the Assyrian Inscriptions in their mention of Jehu's presents to Shalmaneser II, 842 B.C., and of Ahaz's tribute to Tiglath-pileser, 734 B.C. It is generally assumed that these two propitiatory offerings to Assyria marked approximately the opening of the reigns of these kings, and hence it is substantially correct to take the number of years between the accessions of Athaliah (Jehu) and Ahaz as 842 - 734, or 108. Comparison, however, with the data supplied by the compiler of the book of Kings shows an excess therein for this same period of 35 years. In tracing this excess the accepted theory seems to be that it is to be assigned to the years given Amaziah, Azariah, and Jotham.

If 796 B.C., accordingly, be taken as a fair mean date for the accession of Amaziah, there are available 796 — 734, or 62 years, to contain the Biblical 97, *viz.* 29 of Amaziah, 52 of Azariah, and 16 of Jotham. Manifestly, no absolutely certain distribution of the excess, as between the three reigns, is possible. The Biblical data, when appealed to, seem to justify the following propositions, which are helpful in estimating probabilities:

(1) Jehoash, or Joash, of Judah came to the throne by counter-revolution when very young, and reigned about forty years.¹⁵ (This is generally admitted, since the error in the chronology of Kings, as stated above, is placed *after* Joash in the current reconstructions.)

(2) Amaziah, son of Joash, met with a violent death after a reign of uncertain length.¹⁶ (The Biblical twenty-nine years is universally held to be an error.)

(3) Azariah, son of Amaziah, at the death of his father, was taken by the people and made king of Judah when but sixteen years of age.¹⁷ (It is to be observed that these facts are given, not in the compiler's formula, but from the earlier historical source.)

(4) Azariah, in the latter part of his reign and until his death, was afflicted with leprosy, so that he lived in more or less complete seclusion, and his son Jotham "was over the household, judging the people of the land."¹⁸

From these statements, what are the natural deductions? Do they fairly forbid the supposition that Azariah was alive in 738 B.C.?

To solve the chronological difficulty by taking most of the thirty-five years' excess from the long reign of Azariah, rather than from the shorter reigns of Amaziah and Jotham, is, perhaps, a natural first thought, but the data just given seem to the present writer to be against doing this. Joash's long reign would argue for a much shorter reign for Amaziah, if, as is the natural supposition, the latter was the first-born son and already of a mature age when he came to the throne. More-

¹⁵ 2 K. 11 20-12 1.

¹⁶ 2 K. 14 19.

¹⁷ 2 K. 14 21.

¹⁸ 2 K. 15 6.

over, Amaziah's death was not a natural but a violent one, and this circumstance, taken with his mature age at accession, strengthens the probability that his reign was comparatively short. Similarly, the fact that Azariah came to the throne when he was but sixteen would argue that his reign, in the ordinary course of nature, would be a long one, and his son Jotham's correspondingly short. And this last deduction is rendered the more probable by the leprosy of Azariah's later years, which makes very plausible the theory, suggested, indeed, by the statements of Kings, of a co-reign of Jotham with Azariah. Of course, the exact duration of this co-reign would remain uncertain, but in any event it would cut short Jotham's independent reign by some years.

Suppose, then, that the compiler of Kings was right for once, when he assigned to Azariah a reign of fifty-two years. That would give for his accession year, on the hypothesis that he is "Azrijâu," as the earliest possible, 738 + 52, or 790 B.C. Amaziah's reign would then be from 796 to 790 B.C., and Jotham's independent reign from 738 to 734 B.C., the whole excess coming out of their two reigns, rather than out of Azariah's.

This is apparently held by most Old Testament scholars to-day to be an untenable interpretation of the data. For example, Whitehouse declares¹⁹ that the chronological argument "tells decisively against" Azariah's coming into conflict with Tiglath-pileser in 738 B.C. What ground is there for such a positive statement? Is the above interpretation to be rejected simply because it makes possible what the most natural translation of "Azrijâu mât Jaudi" suggests? All the difference between it and the commonly accepted view would be that it makes Amaziah's reign and Jotham's independent reign shorter than the current chronological theories can allow, consistently with their general schemes, though they, too, admittedly shorten these reigns somewhat from the Biblical assignments. The present writer does not see why, even on the current chronological assumptions, it is

¹⁹ Article "Uzziah," in *Hastings's Dictionary*, 1902.

not entirely possible for Azariah of Judah to have been living in 738 B.C.

But, more than this, the fact that the chronological data given in Kings must always be compared with the superior data of the Assyrian Inscriptions and controlled thereby is in itself a weighty protest and argument against refusing to this particular datum from these inscriptions its most natural interpretation for reasons of Old Testament chronology. The vital question here concerns the actual meaning of the inscriptions, and, in the determination of this, considerations of chronology, from the very nature of the aforesaid relations between the inscriptions and the Old Testament, should be most carefully excluded. The double equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mât Ja-u-da-ai} &= \text{Judah,} \\ \text{mât Ja-u-di} &= \text{Judah,} \end{aligned}$$

points so strongly to *some* king of Judah's coming into collision with Tiglath-pileser, that simple justice to it would suggest as the fair chronological question not, "Does Azariah's collision with Tiglath-pileser III in 738 B.C. conflict with the particular scheme of Old Testament chronology that happens to be most in favor for the moment?" but, "Can that scheme be reconciled to this fixed date supplied by the inscriptions?" In short, whether the chronological objection be considered as to particulars or in its general aspects, there appears to be no compelling reason to deny that Azariah of Judah was living in 738 B.C.

2. The historical objections to the identification of "Azri-jâu" with Azariah are, strictly speaking, not in order, according to the general chronological argument just advanced, for they would reverse the usual rule, and subject what is apparently a doubly attested reference upon the Assyrian inscriptions to *some* king of Judah — from the name form most probably Azariah — to verification or rejection by Old Testament data. Still, as they are currently regarded, by Winckler and those who accept his theory, as conclusive against the older view, fairness demands that they be taken up. They are conveniently divided into: (a) Objections

based upon the insignificance of Azariah's kingdom and its distance from the scene of action in the revolt of "Azrijâu," and (b) objections based upon Azariah's physical condition in 738 B.C. In order to treat the questions thus raised adequately it is desirable first to see just what the facts are regarding Azariah's life and activities, as far as they are set forth in the Old Testament.

The account of Azariah or Uzziah is, so far as the book of Kings is concerned, exceedingly meager and unsatisfactory.²⁰ Aside from the regular editorial formulæ for the beginning and end of a Judean king's reign, which cannot be regarded as of independent historical value, it yields but three facts, or groups of facts:

(1) Azariah was made king by the people of Judah, after his father Amaziah's murder, when but sixteen years of age.

(2) He restored to Judah the Red Sea port of Elath, and rebuilt it, presumably for commercial and military reasons.

(3) He was afflicted with leprosy from an indeterminate point in his reign until his death, so that he was obliged to relinquish some part of his official duties,—most probably, from the terms employed, those connected with the public administration of justice,—to his son Jotham, and lived in at least partial seclusion.²¹

The book of Chronicles²² most unexpectedly fills out this all too brief contribution of the book of Kings with some statements regarding Azariah which are of the utmost importance to a proper estimate of his achievements and influence. It is notorious that the Chronicler's additions to the data he derives from Kings have to be thoroughly sifted, but in the present instance, when this is done, there remains a short section of his narrative²³ so sober and inherently credible in its statements, that to deny its historic trustworthiness appears to be hypercriticism.

This section yields the following facts regarding Azariah (Uzziah): (1) He won notable victories over the Philistines and Arabians. (2) He organized, equipped, and directed

²⁰ See 2 K. 14 21-22; 15 1-7.

²¹ 2 K. 15 5. The Hebrew is obscure.

²² See 2 Chr. 26.

²³ V. 6-12, 14-15 a.

his standing army in a manner so efficient as to call for special remark. (3) He put Jerusalem into a more defensible condition than it had previously enjoyed by erecting towers at certain points in the city wall. (4) He built other towers in outlying regions, as a protection to his large and numerous herds of cattle. (5) He stimulated greatly the prosperity of his kingdom by his marked attention to farming and vine culture, as well as stock raising. (6) He was so powerful that the Ammonites thought it wise to send him "presents," and "his name spread abroad even to the entering in of Egypt."

The value of these data to a correct estimate of Azariah and his kingdom, must be apparent. They interpret admirably, *e.g.*, the bare hint given in the book of Kings as to his military successes. Where the latter simply mentions his conquest of Elath, they show that conquest to have been but one feature of a comprehensive campaign carried on to the east, south, and west of Judah, which undoubtedly issued in her becoming the dominant power in all the region to the south of Israel. Such successful campaigns abroad, taken with the statesman-like measures of internal policy also described, constitute Azariah a not unworthy compeer of David and Solomon in his military and commercial enterprises, and suggest the question whether the Chronicler has not here rescued a great name in Hebrew history from a position of undeserved mediocrity.

a. If now the historical objections to Azariah's coming into conflict with Tiglath-pileser in 738 B.C., which are based upon the insignificance of Judah and her distance from the scene of "Azrijâu's" revolt, are looked at in the light of these statements from the book of Chronicles, they do not seem insuperable.

It is, *e.g.*, no longer pertinent to inquire scornfully what possible interest "little" Judah could have in the distant conquests of Tiglath-pileser, which were no concern of hers. If Azariah was such a man as the Chronicler suggests, and Kings also in part, a conqueror and statesman who throughout his long reign had been developing the military strength

of Judah until she was confessedly a power to be reckoned with in Canaan, then why could not he, as well as his subject Amos, read the signs of the times, and realize what the advance of Assyria, if unchecked, must mean to all the little states of the West? Where Amos had seen in the coming of the Assyrian the inevitable judgment of Jahweh, Azariah would see in it rather the summons to use the forces he had been consolidating for so long, to oppose Assyria, for the honor of Jahweh, and the preservation of the *status quo*. And inasmuch as, in 738 B.C., the great Jeroboam II no longer ruled in Israel, but the craven Menahem, proved by the Inscriptions to have been at this very time a truckler to Assyria, who would more naturally lead the states of the West which wished to oppose the arrogant Assyrian in the coalition of their forces, than Azariah, the one man of commanding genius left in that part of the world? That such a coalition was unsuccessful is not surprising, when Tiglath-pileser was the opponent. Even to attempt it, however, would require courage and ability of no mean order, and would be a fitting climax to Azariah's long and powerful reign.

Nor, again, to take up the other historical objection, based upon the alleged "weakness" of Judah at this time, can the mere inference from 2 K. 14, that Judah was but a vassal state to Israel all through Azariah's reign, be fairly urged as prohibiting the view of the history just outlined, in the face of the explicit testimony of Chronicles to Azariah's independent greatness. That the book of Kings, in this chapter, does describe an encounter between Jehoash of Israel and Amaziah of Judah, provoked by the latter, which left Judah completely at the mercy of Israel, is undeniable. And inasmuch as this defeat very probably occasioned the conspiracy in Judah by which Amaziah met his death, it is not impossible, further, that the youthful Azariah began his reign as the vassal of Israel. But this is by no means the equivalent of saying that he continued to be the vassal of Israel after he reached the maturity of his powers. Indeed, to maintain this in the patently fragmentary condition of the

narrative in Kings for that whole period, and with such independent testimony to the contrary at hand, is to assume a position that hardly seems critically defensible.²²

²² Perhaps it is not out of place at this point to inquire, in order to insure an impartial treatment of both theories, whether there are no objections of an historical character which might be urged, but for the great unanimity of scholarship in its favor, against Winckler's identification. To some minds such an objection would be found in the vagueness and indefiniteness attaching to Winckler's "Azrijâu" upon the Inscriptions. The proverb has it, indeed, that "where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise," and that truth is perhaps brought home to Winckler in the present instance by the very troublesome facts that must be reckoned with in the life of Azariah, but that he nevertheless is dissatisfied to have his hero quite so minus a biography seems evident from the great pains he is at to deduce one for him. In doing this he is obliged to rely entirely upon the fragment from Tiglath-pileser's "Annals," already designated herein as III R 9, No. 2, since there is most unhappily no mention of "Azrijâu" in the Zenzirli Inscriptions. It is true that III R 9, No. 2, is unanimously regarded by Assyriologists as a very puzzling inscription, owing to its imperfect state of preservation, and even Rost's edition, for the most part so highly satisfactory to Winckler, does not render it everywhere intelligible; but Winckler does not lose courage in the face of these difficulties. Space will not permit the insertion here of all his reconstructions and notes, but one or two may be cited to show their highly original and suggestive character. Thus at ll. 106-107 Rost translates the broken text: (106) ". . . without number to heaven he raises," (107) ". . . with eyes like as from heaven." This is surely sufficiently enigmatic, but Winckler, without attempting to compete with Rost's translation, clears up the whole situation admirably by the simple note: "Several words seem to refer to the cities in which Izrijâu sought refuge." Again, in ll. 112-114, where Rost can only recover such bits as: (112) ". . . like vines," (113) ". . . was difficult," (114) ". . . was shut-in (?) and high," Winckler throws out the illuminating hint: "Broken words, probably belonging to the description of a place of refuge hard to storm." Thus it must be admitted that Winckler really assembles quite a biography of his "Azrijâu," though unfortunately it seems to be confined almost entirely to his last days, and even then leaves one in distressing uncertainty as to his fate. All that Winckler can say *apropos* of the break between III R 9, No. 2, and III R 9, No. 3, which comes at the very climax of events, is: "Missing, the ending of the siege." Did poor "Azrijâu" escape with his life, or was he captured and killed? It would be a great relief to know, but in any event his career, as set forth by Winckler, possesses a romantic interest, and makes that of Azariah seem prosaic, indeed, by comparison.

An historical objection which is of a more serious import, attaches itself to Winckler's handling of Tiglath-pileser's "Annals" at the point where the first "Azrijâu" inscription (III R 9, No. 2) comes in.

His whole theory, be it observed, as to the order of events in this

b. The second class of historical objections to the identification of "Azrijâu" with Azariah comprises those based upon the latter's physical condition in 738 B.C., which, it is said, would make it impossible for him to lead a revolt against Tiglath-pileser far beyond the boundaries of his kingdom. Three things are here implied: (1) Azariah was a very old man in 738 B.C.; (2) his leprosy did not permit of his taking any part in public affairs; (3) he took the field in person against Tiglath-pileser. As to (1) it would surely be permissible to urge, even against so great an authority as Wellhausen, whose opinion is epigrammatically expressed in his phrase, "Azariah vegetates, Jotham reigns," that 68 is not always decrepitude, nor does it necessarily mean mental decay or inertia, especially when a man has such varied interests as Azariah would seem to have had. Rather, so far as his age is concerned, Azariah would be in the very ripeness of his political sagacity and military experience in 738 B.C. As to (2), the exact statement of Kings regarding Azariah's leprosy is:²³ "And the Lord smote the king, so that he was a leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house. And

uprising, rests upon the supposition that the fragment of the "Annals" comprising lines 90-101 in Rost's text, and known as III R 9, No. 1, which describes Tutammû of Unki's refusal to pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser, and the consequent conquest of Unki, relates events of the same year as does the immediately following fragment, ll. 103-119, which is, of course, the first "Azrijâu" inscription (III R 9, No. 2), and has been seen to refer to the year 738 B.C. In fact, Winckler regards these two inscriptions as continuous, and is thus enabled to make Tiglath-pileser pass immediately from Unki to "Ja-u-di," which he has shown already by an elaborate argument to lie next to Unki. This line of march would be a natural one for Tiglath-pileser to follow, and thus Winckler builds up a very plausible theory of Tiglath-pileser's campaign of 738 B.C., and one entirely favorable to his own interpretation of "Azrijâu." But if Rost is right (*l.c.* II. *Introd.* pp. xxii ff.), there is a gap in the "Annals" at this point of at least two years, the fragment dealing with Tutammû being fixed by its reference to Arpad (l. 91) as relating to events not later than 740 B.C., when Arpad fell, while that dealing with "Azrijâu" is just as firmly tied up to 738 B.C. by its fellow-inscription III R 9, No. 3, as has been shown already. In view of the strong arguments Rost adduces in support of his position, it would seem as if Winckler must reconstruct his carefully built edifice of events, if it is to prove a safe habitation for his theory.

²³ 2 K. 15 6, *Engl. Rev.*, 1885.

Jotham the king's son was over the household, judging the people of the land." Some doubt attaches to the translation "several house," but the most satisfactory suggestion²⁴ upon the Hebrew phrase is that it points to a greater freedom being permitted Azariah than most in his condition. It is entirely within the rights of this passage to assert that it cannot fairly be made to mean that Azariah was totally incapacitated for rule by his disease. Its every legitimate requirement would seem to be satisfied by the supposition that Jotham simply took his father's place in those duties to the royal household and to the people at large which would require the king's personal presence, leaving to Azariah the direction of the foreign and domestic policies, and that more especially since it must be conceded that the exact nature and total progress of Azariah's "leprosy" cannot be certainly fixed. It is not said that he *died* of this disease, but, "he was a leper *unto* the day of his death," which may well mean something far less serious.

As to (3), if it is an inevitable conclusion, from impartial study of the "Azrijâu" Inscriptions, that "Azrijâu" took the field in person against Tiglath-pileser, then his identification with Azariah has received, beyond question, a body blow. It is true that the story of Naaman,²⁵ who was "captain of the host," though a "leper," shows that "leprosy" did not always keep men back from active warfare, but in Azariah's case the statements as to his seclusion seem fairly to preclude this.

But *is* such a personal, bodily share in the conflict a necessary inference from the accounts of "Azrijâu"? Of course it would appear so from Winckler's reconstruction of III R 9, No. 2, but it may well be doubted whether he is an altogether safe guide here, in view of the different position of Rost, as to both context and decipherable content. And in any event, to submit so strong an identification as is given in the double equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mât Ja-u-da-ai} &= \text{Judah,} \\ \text{mât Ja-u-di} &= \text{Judah,} \end{aligned}$$

²⁴ Cf. Klostermann, cited by Burney, *ad loc.*

²⁵ 2 K. 5 1 ff.

to the test of a purely conjectural restoration, is to show a rather startling devotion to a theory. The present writer would earnestly contend that, in view of this equation, it is just as legitimate, to say the least, to interpret "Azrijâu's" activities in the light of what the Old Testament says concerning Azariah, as it is to construct a theory for him which makes his identification with this king of Judah impossible.

Two possibilities as to the actual course of events suggest themselves, if Azariah's personal participation in the campaign against Tiglath-pileser be waived. If one be disposed to press the implications of Azariah's "leprosy" to the point of making him helpless both in mind and body at this time, then it is, of course, entirely compatible with the Biblical suggestion of a co-reign, that Jotham should have planned the great coalition against Tiglath-pileser, as well as taken the field in command of Judah's quota of troops. Azariah, as titular king, would still be given the credit of instigating the uprising in Tiglath-pileser's "Annals." There is no justification, as Schrader long ago pointed out, for disparaging Jotham, as to either character or ability. But, from the drift of the preceding discussion, it must be evident that the present writer inclines rather to a second possibility, — which commends itself to him as more consonant with the statements of the records in the case, whether Assyrian or Biblical, — which is, that it was Azariah himself, Judah's greatest king since David, in body leprous, but in mind alert and vigorous as ever, who in his last year planned the coalition of forces against Assyria mentioned by Tiglath-pileser in connection with "Azrijâu." His then, in fact as well as in record, would be the credit for the intrepid venture, even though he had to leave the actual command in the field to some one else.

Such a view of the course of events the present writer believes to be not a mere fancy, but an entirely possible interpretation of the Biblical and Assyrian data, and one which presents fully as strong a case as the theory of Winckler. He would, in all modesty, bespeak a reopening of the question.

Note on Amos 2 7a

JULIUS A. BEWER

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE difficulty in Am. 2 7a is now usually solved by omitting על-עפר-ארץ. Wellhausen¹ showed that they are the words that cause all the trouble, and therefore proposed to omit them. He appealed to the LXX for external support, and declared that it had apparently not read these words, because τὰ πατοῦντα ἐπὶ τὸν χοῦν τῆς γῆς was “an altogether unconstruable addition” and impossible with καὶ ἐκονδύλιζον εἰς κεφαλὰς πτωχῶν.

Professor Torrey² accepted this solution, and tried to explain how the double reading in the LXX arose. השאפים was wrongly connected with נעלים of the previous verse, “They sell . . . for a pair of shoes that trample.” “It was this trampling of shoes that was further described by the addition of the words על עפר ארץ.”

Now while the Greek translators might have made such a strange mistake as to connect השאפים with נעלים, it is not likely that a man who knew Hebrew well enough to annotate his Hebrew text, should have made this queer combination, especially after a proverbial phrase בעבור נעלים, whose meaning, if he did not know, the preceding words would have explained to him. That a Hebrew reader who translated השאפים by “trample upon” should have inserted, or have added in the margin, על עפר ארץ in order to explain to himself that one treads with sandals “on the dust of the earth” assumes in him, to say the least, a surprising simplicity. Or was he a poetic nature who expressed “old” sandals in this way? Assuming, for the sake of the argument,

¹ *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, vol. v. *ad loc.*

² In this *Journal*, vol. xv. (1896), pp. 151 f.

that this reader was so simple-minded or so poetic, how did he continue the sentence? What did he do with בראש דלים? The Greek translator saw this point, and he continued therefore quite ingenuously *καὶ ἐκονδύλιζον*. Are we to suppose that the Hebrew reader would leave without comment this phrase, which is really much more in need of it, standing so isolated as it does, than "the sandals that trample"?

The very fact that the LXX knew just as little as modern scholars what to do with *הַשָּׂפִים לְעַל עַבְרֵי אֶרֶץ* should put us on our guard. It speaks rather for than against the originality of the phrase.³ Driver⁴ has felt this, and is inclined to regard the reading of the Vulgate as probably original, "Who crush [הַשָּׂפִים] the heads of the poor upon the dust of the earth." But we should expect the accusative after הַשָּׂפִים, see especially Am. 8 4. And when we are not misled by the translation "crush," we expect לַעֲבֹר rather than עַל עַבְרֵי, "Who trample to the dust of the earth," etc., cf. *דָּבַא לְאֶרֶץ תְּהוּוּ*, Ps. 143 3. With these modifications this reading may indeed be the original text, and, if so, it contains an idiomatic phrase similar to "grind the faces of the poor," Isa. 3 15.

But after all this seems not entirely satisfying either, and the following emendation is proposed with all due reserve. Read for

הַשָּׂפִים לְעַבְרֵי אֶרֶץ בְּרֹאשׁ דָּלִים
הַשָּׂפִים אֶל-כַּפֵּר וְרִצּוֹ כִּשְׂעָר דָּלִים

Who long for bribes and oppress the poor in the gate.

אל שאף, cf. Eccl. 1 5. כפר as in Am. 5 12, 1 S. 12 3. Here the judges are pictured as eagerly longing for the price with which the criminals would buy their release, and oppressing the poor in court who cannot give them money, thus making it impossible for them to get redress for their wrongs. רצין, as in Am. 4 1.

³ That the LXX should have translated הַשָּׂפִים by *ἐκονδύλιζον* is most improbable. Why the Oxford Septuagint Concordance should put † after *τά πατούντα* in Am. 2 7 is difficult to see, since both *שאף* (Ps. 55 1, 2 56 3) and *שוקה* (Ps. 138 11) are translated by *καταπατείν*.

⁴ *The Books of Joel and Amos*, p. 149, in the "Cambridge Bible."

In a note in *AJSL*, xix. January, 1903, pp. 116 f., the present writer suggested that *καὶ ἐκονδύλιζον* of the LXX was probably a translation of **וַרְצִי**, which the Greek translator had in his Hebrew text. This would presuppose the reading **וַרְצִי וַרְקָא**. But it appears more likely that the LXX had the same consonantal Hebrew text as the Massorites, and that *καὶ ἐκονδύλιζον* was freely supplied by the translator, after he had mistakenly joined the previous clause to vs. 6. While thus the LXX has suggested the way out of the difficulty, it is probably not to be regarded as external authority for the proposed emendation, for the corruption of the text is older than the LXX.

PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER, 1908

THE forty-fourth meeting of the Society was held in Schermerhorn Hall, Columbia University, New York City, on Wednesday and Thursday, December 30th and 31st, 1908. The first session was held at 9.50 A.M., President Porter being in the Chair. Reading of the records of the last meeting was omitted, as they had been distributed in print.

Professor Bewer reported for the Publishing Committee, and read an official announcement from Pastor Schrader of the death of his father, Professor Eberhard Schrader, an honorary member of this Society. Professor Bewer also exhibited a copy of Professor Hilprecht's book, "The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy," presented to the Society by the author. Professors Lyon, F. Brown, and Gottheil were appointed a Committee to draw up a memorial on Professor Schrader in the name of the Society.

The Recording Secretary read his annual report, which was accepted and placed on file. The Chair appointed Professors Paton, W. A. Brown, and Peritz a Committee to nominate officers. Professor Gottheil reported from the Committee of Arrangements. The Chair appointed Professors Gottheil and Wood an Auditing Committee.

At 10 Professor Porter gave the President's address, on "The Bearing of Historical Studies on the Religious Use of the Bible."

Professor Prince read the Treasurer's report, and the Recording Secretary read his financial statement. These two papers were referred to the Auditing Committee.

From 11 A.M. to 1 P.M. papers were read and discussed as follows:

By Professor Ropes: "The Sociological Ideas of Paul."
 By Professor Peritz: "The Meaning of the Still, Small Voice in 1 Kings 19 12." By Professor Montgomery, "Some Gleanings from Pognon's ZKR Inscription." By Professor Wood: "Folk Tales in Old Testament Narrative."

It was voted to refer to the Council a resolution protesting against the tariff on scientific and technical books, and also a resolution requesting the Carnegie Institution of Washington to enlarge the scope of its grants in aid of research.

Adjourned for lunch and social hour.

Wednesday Afternoon. The Society met at 2.45. The Council reported that they had chosen Prof. J. A. Bewer as Corresponding Secretary, and Prof. B. W. Bacon and Rev. W. H. Cobb as additional members of the Publishing Committee. They announced that the next meeting would be held in Columbia University during the Christmas holidays of 1909, the particular time and place to be reported later, and the Committee of Arrangements to consist of Professors Jackson, Prince, and W. A. Brown. On nomination by the Council, the following active members were elected:

Prof. Edward Arthur Wieher, D.D., San Anselmo, Cal.
 Prof. Isaac Clark, D.D., Washington, D.C.
 Prof. Alexander R. Gordon, Litt.D., Montreal, Can.

From 3 to 5.20 papers were read and discussed as follows:

By Professor Paton: "The Usage of the Name Baal."
 By Dr. Guthrie: "Corinth as Destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews." By Professor Bewer: "Notes on Obadiah."
 By Professor Berry: "The Limited Efficacy of Sacrifice in the Old Testament." By Dr. Ward: "The Origin of the Yahweh Worship." Adjourned.

Wednesday Evening. The Society met at 8. The Council presented the following resolutions, which were adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis joins with other learned societies in representing to the Trustees of the Carnegie Institution of Washington the importance to the civilization of this country of emphasis upon the humanities equally with the natural sciences, and in requesting the Trustees to include more fully in their grants in aid of research the fields of philology, archæology, and ancient history.

Whereas, The present duty of twenty-five per cent, *ad valorem*, on books in the English language published abroad is, so far as scientific and technical works are concerned, of the nature of a tax on scholars, without compensating advantages of protection to authors or publishers, or of appreciable increase of revenue, and is to that extent contrary to public policy, and especially to that policy of fostering learning and education which has always characterized the administration of our government, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis petition the Committee on Ways and Means of the National Congress to take steps for the repeal of the duty on books of a scientific and technical character, in the English language, published abroad, putting these books on the same footing as books published in a foreign language.

At 8.10 President Francis Brown gave the Report of the Directors of the American School at Jerusalem, following it with illustrations by the stereopticon.

At 9.15 Professor Lyon addressed the Society on "The Harvard Excavations at Samaria," giving illustrations by the stereopticon.

Adjourned at 10.

Thursday Morning, December 31. — The Society met at 9.45. On nomination by the Council the following active members were elected :

Rev. John B. Kelso, Ph.D., Grove City, Pa.

Prof. Lilla F. Morse, S.T.M., So. Hadley, Mass.

Professor Paton, from the Committee on Nominations, reported the following list of officers, who were then unanimously elected :

H. P. Smith,	<i>President.</i>
D. G. Lyon,	<i>Vice-President.</i>
W. H. Cobb,	<i>Recording Secretary.</i>
J. D. Prince,	<i>Treasurer.</i>
F. C. Porter,	} <i>Additional members of Council.</i>
I. F. Wood,	
J. A. Montgomery,	
G. A. Barton,	} <i>To represent the Society on the Board of the Palestine School.</i>
N. Schmidt,	
A. T. Clay,	

Professor Gottheil reported from the Auditing Committee that the accounts of the Treasurer and the Recording Secretary were correct and the vouchers satisfactory.

The thanks of the Society were returned to Columbia University and to the Committee of Arrangements for the accommodations provided for this meeting.

Professor Lyon presented the following Minute, which was then adopted by vote of the Society :

The Society records with sorrow the death of Professor Eberhard Schrader of Berlin, an Honorary Member of this body since 1891. With a broad basis in classical, theological, and Semitic studies, he turned his especial attention nearly forty years ago to the young science of Assyriology, then struggling for recognition in Germany. By the thoroughness of his method and the energy of his championship, he did more than any other man to win respect for it at a critical time among the scholars of German universities. Its historical aspects and its bearings upon biblical scholarship were of particular interest to him, and students of the Old Testament, in particular, owe him a great debt.

He was a man of large heart as well as large mind, and those who had the privilege of his friendship were constantly impressed by his geniality, his heartiness, and his unflinching pleasure in good work by whomsoever it was done. His life was crowned by an exhibition of cheerful fortitude maintained during the years of a long and trying illness. The Society desires to express its appreciation, not only of his fruitful scholarship, but also of his noble character.

From 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. papers were read and discussed as follows :

By Professor Clay: "The Chief Deity of the Amorites."

By Professor Barton: "Abraham and Archæology." By Professor Haupt: "Does the Scripture say that the Christ cometh out of the Town of Bethlehem?" By Dr. Barrows: "Psychology and Exegesis." By Professor Bacon: "The Apocalyptic Chapter in the Synoptic Gospels."

Adjourned at 1 P.M.

WILLIAM H. COBB,
Recording Secretary.

REPORT
OF
FUNDS IN HANDS OF RECORDING SECRETARY

Receipts

Balance, Dec. 27, 1907	\$ 53 56
Sales of Journal for the year	220 45
Postage returned	1 15
	\$275 16
	\$275 16

Disbursements

1908.	
Jan. 23, Distributing Journal of 1907, part 2	\$13 00
Feb. 17, Berwick & Smith, press-work and binding Journal of 1907, part 2	65 35
July 7, Berwick & Smith, press-work Journal of 1908, part 1	48 82
July 29, Berwick & Smith, binding Journal of 1908, part 1	19 01
Mar. 9, Thomas Todd, programmes printed	5 75
Thomas Todd, blank receipts printed	2 25
Oct. 17, Insurance on vols. at Newton Centre	4 50
July 8, Distributing Journal of 1908, part 1	15 00
Dec. 22, " " " " " 2	15 00
Dec. 29, Postage, expressage, and exchange for the year	6 20
Balance, in Shawmut Bank, Boston	80 28
	\$275 16
	\$275 16

Audited, and found correct, Dec. 30, 1908.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL, }
IRVING F. WOOD, } *Auditors.*

ANNUAL REPORT
OF
THE TREASURER OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
AND EXEGESIS

December, 1907, to December, 1908

Receipts

1908.		
Jan.	1, Carried forward	\$ 94 89
	Dues	612 20
	Initiations	125 00
	Total	8832 09

Disbursements

1908.		
Jan.	2, Buskirk	\$ 15 52
Jan.	6, Bacon	4 51
Feb.	7, Cushing	175 55
Mar.	12, Exchange	1 20
Mar.	12, Cushing	223 13
	Cash in hand	412 08
	Total	8832 09

The above Report for 1908 is herewith respectfully submitted Dec. 30, 1908.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE, *Treasurer.*

Audited and found correct.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,)	} <i>Auditors.</i>
IRVING F. WOOD,)	

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY¹

HONORARY MEMBERS

- Prof. K. Budde, D.D., Marburg.
 Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oxford.
 Prof. S. R. Driver, D.D., Oxford.
 Prof. Adolf Harnack, D.D., Berlin.
 Prof. H. J. Holtzmann, D.D., Baden.
 Prof. A. Jülicher, D.D., Marburg.
 Prof. William Sanday, D.D., Oxford.
 Prof. A. H. Sayce, D.D., Oxford.
 Pres. S. Schechter, Litt.D., Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.
 Prof. G. A. Smith, D.D., United Free Church College, Glasgow.
 Prof. Bernhard Weiss, D.D., Berlin.
 Prof. F. C. Burkitt, M.A., Cambridge.
 Prof. Emil Schürer, D.D., Göttingen.

ACTIVE MEMBERS²

- (242) '92 Cyrus Adler, Ph.D., 2041 North Broad St., Phila., Pa.
 (415) '07 Prof. Frederick L. Anderson, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
 (425) '08 Prof. John B. Anderson, Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N.Y.
 (243) '92 Prof. A. W. Anthony, Lewiston, Me.
 (341) '00 Rev. William P. Armstrong, Jr., Library Place, Princeton, N.J.
 (305) '96 Prof. Wm. R. Arnold, Ph.D., Andover Theol. Sem., Cambridge,
 Mass.
 (184) '88 Prof. B. W. Bacon, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
 (373) '04 Prof. Wm. Frederic Badé, Ph.D., Pacific Theol. Sem., Berkeley, Cal.
 (210) '91 Prof. George A. Barton, Ph.D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
 (443) '09 Mordecai Bassan, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
 (211) '91 Rev. L. W. Batten, Ph.D., 232 E. 11th St., N.Y. City.
 (310) '97 Rev. R. H. Beattie, M.A., 5815 Ohio St., Austin Station, Chicago, Ill.
 (51) '81 Prof. I. T. Beckwith, Ph.D., Hartford, Conn.
 (18) '80 Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D., Auburn, N.Y.
 (326) '99 Prof. George R. Berry, D.D., Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N.Y.
 (343) '00 Prof. Walter R. Betteridge, Rochester Theol. Sem., Rochester, N.Y.

¹ This list has been corrected up to Dec. 11, 1909. Members are requested to notify the Recording Secretary of any change of address.

² The two numbers prefixed to the name of each member indicate the order and date of his accession to membership in the Society.

- (318) '98 Prof. Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (306) '96 Rev. Chas. L. Biggs, Henderson, Ky.
 (19) '80 Prof. John Binney, D.D., Middletown, Conn.
 (398) '07 Rev. Francis B. Blodgett, Gen. Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (380) '05 Prof. Edward I. Bosworth, D.D., Oberlin, Ohio.
 (423) '08 Prof. Clayton R. Bowen, Meadville Theol. School, Meadville, Pa.
 (370) '03 Rev. Lester Bradner, Jr., Ph.D., Providence, R.I.
 (130) '84 Prof. C. F. Bradley, D.D., 90 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
 (352) '02 Prof. Caroline M. Breyfogle, 304 E. 56th St., Chicago, Ill.
 (2) '80 Prof. C. A. Briggs, D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (311) '97 Miss Emilie Grace Briggs, Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (437) '08 Rev. B. W. Brotherston, No. Conway, N.H.
 (85) '83 Prof. C. R. Brown, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
 (20) '80 Pres. Francis Brown, D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (301) '96 Prof. Wm. A. Brown, D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (102) '84 Prof. M. D. Buell, D.D., 72 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
 (351) '02 Arthur Bumstead, Ph.D., Box 716, Kansas City, Mo.
 (120) '84 Prof. Sylvester Burnham, D.D., Hamilton, N.Y.
 (91) '83 Prof. E. D. Burton, D.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (22) '80 Pres. H. A. Buttz, D.D., Madison, N.J.
 (392) '06 Prof. Shirley J. Case, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (399) '07 Prof. George D. Castor, Pacific Theol. Sem., Berkeley, Cal.
 (420) '08 Rev. Edward M. Chapman, Old Lyme, Conn.
 (222) '91 Rev. James L. Cheney, Ph.D., Wheaton, Ill.
 (277) '95 Prof. Francis A. Christie, Theological School, Meadville, Pa.
 (400) '07 Raymond G. Clapp, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
 (369) '03 Prof. Calvin M. Clark, Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
 (446) '09 Prof. Isaac Clark, D.D., Howard Univ., Washington, D.C.
 (177) '87 Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D., Hamilton, N.Y.
 (414) '07 Prof. Albert T. Clay, Ph.D., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Phila., Pa.
 (68) '82 Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Congregational Library, Boston, Mass.
 (368) '03 Prof. Louis B. Crane, 448 Monroe Ave., Scranton, Pa.
 (390) '06 Rev. Wm. M. Crane, Ph.D., Richmond, Mass.
 (296) '96 Prof. Harlan Creelman, Ph.D., Theol. Sem., Auburn, N.Y.
 (62) '82 Prof. E. L. Curtis, D.D., 61 Trumbull St., New Haven, Conn.
 (401) '07 Miss M. Elizabeth Czarnowska, Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
 (426) '08 Prof. Frank L. Day, Randolph Macon Coll., Ashland, Va.
 (121) '84 Prof. F. B. Denio, D.D., Bangor, Me.
 (417) '07 Prof. Winfrid N. Donovan, Newton Centre, Mass.
 (382) '05 Miss E. Olive Dutcher, Mount Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.
 (402) '07 Prof. Burton S. Easton, Ph.D., Nashotah Sem., Nashotah, Wis.
 (364) '03 Prof. F. C. Eiselen, Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
 (278) '95 Rev. Frederick E. Emrich, D.D., Brighton, Mass.
 (403) '07 Rev. Henry Englander, Ph.D., 181 Reynolds Ave., Providence, R.I.
 (279) '95 Prof. David F. Estes, D.D., Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N.Y.
 (263) '94 Prof. Milton G. Evans, D.D., Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
 (239) '92 Prof. John L. Ewell, 325 College St., Washington, D.C.

- (280) '95 Prof. Charles P. Fagnani, D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (436) '08 Rev. Wm. R. Farmer, 440 Maple Ave., Edgewood Park, Pa.
 (388) '06 Prof. Wm. W. Fenn, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
 (26) '80 Rev. Henry Ferguson, LL.D., St. Paul's School, Concord, N.H.
 (431) '08 Prof. Geo. C. Foley, D.D., 1117 So. 46th St., Phila., Pa.
 (348) '00 Rev. T. C. Foote, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
 (441) '08 Prof. H. E. W. Fosbrooke, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.
 (298) '96 Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph.D., Brown Univ., Providence, R.I.
 (312) '97 Prof. James E. Frame, Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (418) '07 Prof. D. J. Fraser, Presbyterian College, Montreal, Can.
 (366) '03 Prof. Kemper Fullerton, Oberlin Theol. Sem., Oberlin, O.
 (325) '99 Rev. Owen H. Gates, Ph.D., Andover, Mass.
 (95) '83 Prof. J. F. Genung, Ph.D., Amherst, Mass.
 (198) '89 Prof. George W. Gilmore, 11 Waverly Place, N.Y. City.
 (340) '00 Rev. Edgar J. Goodspeed, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (162) '86 Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil, Ph.D., 63 W. 85th St., N.Y. City.
 (447) '09 Prof. Alex. R. Gordon, Litt. D., Presb. College, Montreal, Can.
 (432) '08 Prof. Carl E. Grammer, D.D., 1024 Spruce St., Phila., Pa.
 (384) '05 Prof. Elihu Grant, Ph.D., Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
 (433) '08 Rev. Julius H. Greenstone, Ph.D., 915 No. 8th St., Phila., Pa.
 (138) '85 Prof. C. R. Gregory, D.D., Leipzig, Germany.
 (381) '05 Rev. W. W. Guth, Ph.D., Univ. of the Pacific, San José, Cal.
 (442) '08 Kenneth S. Guthrie, Ph.D., 330 Schermerhorn St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
 (179) '88 Rev. A. D. Hail, M.D., D.D., 5659 Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 (209) '91 Prof. Thomas C. Hall, D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (404) '07 Prof. Robert F. Harper, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (119) '84 Prof. J. R. Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., Chetwynd House, Selly Oak
 (near Birmingham), England.
 (53) '81 Prof. Samuel Hart, D.D., Berkeley Divinity Sch., Middletown, Conn.
 (164) '87 Rev. E. C. Haskell, Burt, Ia.
 (385) '05 Rev. Wm. H. P. Hatch, Ph.D., Gen. Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (215) '91 Prof. Paul Haupt, Ph.D., 2511 Madison Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 (367) '03 Prof. Doremus A. Hayes, Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
 (322) '98 Rev. Henry Harrison Haynes, Ph.D., 6 Ellery St., Cambridge, Mass.
 (335) '00 Prof. A. D. Heffern, 4519 Kingsessing Ave., Phila., Pa.
 (124) '84 Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
 (429) '08 Edward A. Henry, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (444) '09 James M. Henry, 700 Park Ave., N.Y. City.
 (147) '86 Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, Ph.D., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Phila., Pa.
 (79) '83 Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover Theol. Sem., Cambridge, Mass.
 (434) '08 Prof. Wm. J. Hinke, Ph.D., 28 Court St., Auburn, N.Y.
 (363) '03 Prof. Charles T. Hock, Ph.D., Bloomfield, N.J.
 (354) '02 Rev. Richard M. Hodge, D.D., Teachers' College, Columbia
 Univ., N.Y. City.
 (427) '08 Ivan Lee Holt, 5747 Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 (304) '96 Rev. Hiram R. Hulse, 101 Lawrence St., N.Y. City.
 (439) '08 Miss Mary I. Hussey, Ph.D., Wellesley College, Mass.
 (313) '97 Prof. A. V. W. Jackson, LL.D., 16 Highland Place, Yonkers, N.Y.

- (49) '81 Prof. S. M. Jackson, D.D., 692 West End Ave., N.Y. City.
- (231) '91 Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Phila., Pa.
- (386) '05 Prof. James R. Jewett, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- (413) '07 Isya Joseph, Ph.D., 700 Park Ave., N.Y. City.
- (151) '86 Prof. M. L. Kellner, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
- (338) '00 Prof. James A. Kelso, Ph.D., Western Theol. Sem., Allegheny, Pa.
- (448) '09 Rev. John B. Kelso, Ph.D., Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.
- (438) '08 Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, Ph.D., Wellesley College, Mass.
- (405) '07 Prof. H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sci., Knox College, Toronto, Can.
- (287) '96 Prof. Charles F. Kent, Ph.D., New Haven, Conn.
- (406) '07 Prof. Albert C. Knudson, D.D., 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
- (393) '06 Nicholas A. Koenig, 80 W. 12th St., N.Y. City.
- (315) '97 Rev. Kaufmann Kohler, D.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.
- (395) '06 Robert Lau, Ph.D., 650 Leonard St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
- (350) '02 Rev. Frederick Lent, 195 Livingston St., New Haven, Conn.
- (371) '03 Prof. Adelaide I. Locke, Wellesley College, Mass.
- (372) '04 Rev. Lindsay B. Longacre, Ph.D., 239 E. 257th St., N.Y. City.
- (394) '06 Prof. Eugene W. Lyman, D.D., Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
- (71) '82 Prof. D. G. Lyon, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
- (244) '92 Prof. D. B. Macdonald, Hartford, Conn.
- (319) '98 Prof. John E. McFadyen, D.D., Knox College, Toronto, Can.
- (300) '06 Prof. Arthur C. McGiffert, D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
- (424) '08 John G. Machen, Ph.D., Princeton Theol. Sem., Princeton, N.J.
- (219) '91 Prof. W. R. Martin, Ph.D., 581 W. 161st St., N.Y. City.
- (327) '99 Prof. Shailer Mathews, D.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- (9) '80 Rev. C. M. Mead, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
- (174) '87 Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., 73 Bay State Road, Boston, Mass.
- (336) '00 Rev. Henry C. Meserve, Danbury, Conn.
- (407) '07 Prof. Lucius H. Miller, Princeton Univ., Princeton, N.J.
- (201) '90 Prof. E. K. Mitchell, D.D., 57 Gillette St., Hartford, Conn.
- (35) '80 Prof. H. G. Mitchell, D.D., 36 Pineknay St., Boston, Mass.
- (236) '92 Prof. J. A. Montgomery, Ph.D., 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Pa.
- (419) '09 Prof. Lilla F. Morse, S.T.M., Mt. Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.
- (331) '99 Prof. Warren J. Moulton, Ph.D., Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
- (170) '87 Rev. P. S. Moxom, D.D., 83 Dartmouth Terrace, Springfield, Mass.
- (419) '08 Mrs. Juliet E. O. Munsell, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
- (211) '92 Rev. C. S. Murkland, Middlebury, Vt.
- (214) '91 Prof. W. Muss-Arnolt, Ph.D., Public Library, Boston, Mass.
- (160) '86 Prof. H. S. Nash, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
- (346) '90 Rev. James B. Nies, Ph.D., London, England.
- (240) '92 Prof. L. B. Paton, Ph.D., 50 Forest St., Hartford, Conn.
- (154) '86 Prof. Wm. L. Pearson, Ph.D., Friends Univ., Wichita, Kan.
- (323) '98 Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph.D., Syracuse, N.Y.
- (87) '83 Rev. J. P. Peters, D.D., 225 W. 99th St., N.Y. City.
- (345) '90 Rev. Ernst Pfattheicher, Ph.D., 403 De Kalb St., Norristown, Pa.
- (46) '81 Rev. Bernhard Pick, D.D., 140 Court St., Newark, N.J.
- (378) '05 William Popper, Ph.D., Columbia Univ., N.Y. City.

- (254) '93 Prof. F. C. Porter, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
 (107) '84 Rev. Llewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Conn.
 (176) '87 Prof. Ira M. Price, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (245) '92 Prof. J. Dyneley Prince, Ph.D., Columbia Univ., N.Y. City.
 (316) '97 Prof. Herbert R. Purinton, Lewiston, Me.
 (266) '94 Rev. F. P. Ramsay, Ph.D., 435 Wash'n Bvd., Chicago, Ill.
 (361) '03 Prof. Harry L. Reed, Auburn Theol. Sem., Auburn, N.Y.
 (30) '80 Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D., 287 Ridge Ave., Allegheny, Pa.
 (83) '83 Rev. J. F. Riggs, D.D., 56 Halstead St., E. Orange, N.J.
 (105) '84 Prof. J. S. Riggs, D.D., Auburn, N.Y.
 (389) '06 Benj. W. Robinson, Ph. D., Chicago Theol. Sem., Chicago, Ill.
 (284) '95 Prof. Geo. L. Robinson, Ph.D., McCormick Theol. Sem., Chicago, Ill.
 (180) '88 Prof. R. W. Rogers, D.D., Drew Theol. Sem., Madison, N.J.
 (47) '81 Prof. C. J. H. Ropes, D.D., Bangor, Me.
 (285) '95 Prof. James H. Ropes, D.D., 13 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass.
 (387) '05 Prof. Elbert Russell, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
 (183) '88 Prof. W. H. Ryder, D.D., Andover Theol. Sem., Cambridge, Mass.
 (187) '88 Pres. F. K. Sanders, D.D., Topeka, Kan.
 (430) '08 Henry Schaefer, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (377) '05 Prof. Wm. C. Schaeffer, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.
 (190) '88 Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Ph.D., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.
 (255) '93 Rev. L. Henry Schwab, Sharon, Conn.
 (408) '07 Prof. Charles N. Shepard, Gen. Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
 (337) '00 Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, D.D., Drew Theol. Sem., Madison, N.J.
 (55) '81 Prof. H. P. Smith, D.D., Meadville Theol. School, Meadville, Pa.
 (409) '07 Prof. John M. P. Smith, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (360) '03 Prof. Wm. B. Smith, Tulane Univ., New Orleans, La.
 (328) '99 Prof. Wallace N. Stearns, Ph.D., Grand Forks, No. Dak.
 (58) '82 Prof. W. A. Stevens, D.D., Rochester, N.Y.
 (90) '83 Prof. Jacob Streibert, Gambier, O.
 (416) '07 Prof. John H. Strong, Rochester Theol. Sem., Rochester, N.Y.
 (422) '08 Rev. Harry Le Roy Taylor, Episc. Div. School, Cambridge, Mass.
 (74) '82 Prof. M. S. Terry, D.D., Evanston, Ill.
 (111) '84 Rev. Roderick Terry, D.D., Newport, R.I.
 (342) '00 Rev. Charles S. Thayer, Ph.D., 66 Forest St., Hartford, Conn.
 (293) '96 Rev. John R. Thurston, Whitinsville, Mass.
 (397) '06 Benjamin A. Tintner, 21 W. 115th St., N.Y. City.
 (440) '08 Prof. Olaf A. Toffteen, Ph.D., 1113 Wash'n Bvd., Chicago, Ill.
 (257) '93 Prof. C. C. Torrey, Ph.D., New Haven, Conn.
 (32) '80 Prof. C. H. Toy, LL.D., 7 Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.
 (411) '07 Rev. Ambrose W. Vernon, Brookline, Mass.
 (309) '96 Prof. C. W. Votaw, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 (33) '80 Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., *The Independent*, N.Y. City.
 (271) '94 Prof. Henry J. Weber, Ph.D., Bloomfield, N.J.
 (445) '09 Prof. Edward Arthur Wicher, D.D., San Francisco Theol. Sem.,
 San Anselmo, Cal.
 (275) '95 Rev. Leighton Williams, 305 W. 88th St., N.Y. City.
 (113) '84 Prof. R. D. Wilson, Ph.D., Princeton, N.J.

- (272) '94 Prof. Irving F. Wood, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
(320) '98 Pres. Mary E. Woolley, D.Litt., Mount Holyoke College,
So. Hadley, Mass.
(97) '84 Rev. Alfred A. Wright, D.D., 9 Clinton St., Cambridge, Mass.
(134) '85 Prof. G. F. Wright, D.D., Oberlin, O.
(412) '07 Prof. Royden K. Yerkes, Nashotah Theol. Sem., Nashotah, Wis.
(358) '02 Abraham Yohannan, Ph.D., Columbia Univ., N.Y. City.
(428) '08 Prof. Blanche Zehring, Wells College, Aurora, N.Y.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS

WHICH SUBSCRIBE FOR THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY

Andover Theological Seminary,	Andover, Mass.
Bangor Theological Seminary,	Bangor, Me.
Beloit College,	Beloit, Wis.
Berkeley Divinity School,	Middletown, Conn.
Bowdoin College,	Brunswick, Me.
British Museum,	London, Eng.
Brown University,	Providence, R.I.
Bryn Mawr College,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Bucknell Library,	Chester, Pa.
Cambridge University,	Cambridge, Eng.
Carnegie Library,	Allegheny, Pa.
Carnegie Library,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Chicago Theological Seminary,	Chicago, Ill.
City Library,	Springfield, Mass.
Colgate University,	Hamilton, N.Y.
Columbia University,	N.Y. City.
Congregational College,	Montreal, Can.
Congregational Library,	Boston, Mass.
Cornell University,	Ithaca, N.Y.
Crozer Theological Seminary,	Chester, Pa.
Drake University,	Des Moines, Ia.
Enoch Pratt Free Library,	Baltimore, Md.
Episcopal Theological School,	Cambridge, Mass.
Free Library,	Philadelphia, Pa.
General Theological Seminary,	N.Y. City.
Harvard University,	Cambridge, Mass.
Johns Hopkins University,	Baltimore, Md.
Library of Congress,	Washington, D.C.
Manchester College,	Oxford, Eng.
Meadville Theological School,	Meadville, Pa.
Mount Holyoke College,	South Hadley, Mass.
Newberry Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Newton Theological Institution,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Northwestern Univ.,	Evanston, Ill.
Oberlin Theological Seminary,	Oberlin, O.
Oxford University,	Oxford, Eng.
Pacific Theological Seminary,	Berkeley, Cal.

Pacific Unitarian School,	Berkeley, Cal.
Philadelphia Div. School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Public Library,	Boston, Mass.
Public Library,	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Public Library,	Buffalo, N.Y.
Public Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Public Library,	Cleveland, O.
Public Library,	Denver, Col.
Public Library,	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Public Library,	Indianapolis, Ind.
Public Library,	Jersey City, N.J.
Public Library,	Milwaukee, Wis.
Public Library,	N.Y. City.
Public Library,	St. Louis, Mo.
Public Library,	Seattle, Wash.
Public Library,	Worcester, Mass.
Queen's University,	Kingston, Ontario, Can.
Royal Library,	Berlin, Germany.
Sage Library,	New Brunswick, N.J.
St. Joseph's Seminary,	Youkers, N.Y.
San Francisco Theol. Seminary,	San Anselmo, Cal.
Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary,	Louisville, Ky.
State Library,	Albany, N.Y.
State Library,	Lausing, Mich.
State Library,	Sacramento, Cal.
Theol. and Rel. Branch, Public Library,	Cincinnati, O.
Trowbridge Reference Library,	New Haven, Conn.
Union Theological Seminary,	N.Y. City.
University Club Library,	Chicago, Ill.
University of Chicago,	Chicago, Ill.
University of Michigan,	Ann Arbor, Mich.
University of Munich,	Munich, Germany.
University of Wisconsin,	Madison, Wis.
University of Zurich,	Zurich, Switzerland.
Virginia Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Wellesley College,	Wellesley, Mass.
Wesleyan University,	Middletown, Conn.
Western Theological Seminary,	Allegheny, Pa.
Williams College,	Williamstown, Mass.
Yale University,	New Haven, Conn.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

OF THE

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

(As Amended Dec. 28, 1901)

CONSTITUTION

I

THIS association shall be called "The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis."

II

The object of the Society shall be to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on Biblical topics.

III

The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer, who, with five others, shall be united in a Council. These shall be elected annually by the Society, with the exception of the Corresponding Secretary, who shall be elected annually by the Council. Additional members of the Council shall be the Presidents of the Sections hereinafter provided for. There shall be also a Publishing Committee, consisting of the Corresponding Secretary and two others, who shall be annually chosen by the Council.

IV

Members shall be elected by the Society upon the recommendation of the Council. They may be of two classes, active and honorary. Honorary members shall belong to other nationalities than that of the United States of America, and shall be especially distinguished for their attainments as Biblical scholars. The number of honorary members chosen at the first election shall be not more than ten; in any succeeding year not more than two.

V

The Society shall meet at least once a year, at such time and place as the Council may determine. On the first day of the annual meeting the President, or some other member appointed by the Council for the purpose, shall deliver an address to the Society.

VI

Sections, consisting of all the members of the Society residing in a particular locality, may be organized, with the consent of the Council,

for the object stated in Article II, provided that the number of members composing any Section shall not be less than twelve. Each Section shall annually choose for itself a President, whose duty it shall be to preside over its meeting, and to take care that such papers and notes read before it as the Section may judge to be of sufficient value are transmitted promptly to the Corresponding Secretary of the Society. The Sections shall meet as often as they shall severally determine, provided that their meetings do not interfere with the meetings of the Society.

VII

This constitution may be amended by a vote of the Society, on recommendation of the Council, such amendment having been proposed at a previous meeting, and notice of the same having been sent to the members of the Society.

BY-LAWS

I

It shall be the duty of the President, or, in his absence, of the Vice-President, to preside at all the meetings of the Society; but, in the absence of both these officers, the Society may choose a presiding officer from the members present.

II

It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretary to notify the members, at least two weeks in advance, of each meeting, transmitting to them at the same time the list of papers to be presented at the meeting; to keep a record of the proceedings of such meetings; to preserve an accurate roll of the members; to make an annual report of the condition of the Society; to distribute its publications, and to do such other like things as the Council may request.

III

It shall be the duty of the Corresponding Secretary to conduct the correspondence of the Society, and in particular, to use his best efforts for the securing of suitable papers and notes to be presented to the Society at each meeting; to prepare a list of such papers, and to place it in the hands of the Recording Secretary for transmission to the members; to receive all papers and notes that shall have been presented, and lay them before the Publishing Committee.

IV

It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to take charge of all the funds of the Society, and to invest or disburse them under the direction of the Council, rendering an account of all his transactions to the Society at each annual meeting.

V

It shall be the duty of the Council to propose candidates for membership of the Society; to elect the Corresponding Secretary and the additional members of the Publishing Committee; to fix the times and places for meetings, and generally to supervise the interests of the Society.

VI

It shall be the duty of the Publishing Committee to publish the proceedings of the Society, and also to select, edit, and publish, as far as the funds of the Society will justify, such papers and notes from among those laid before them, as shall in their judgment be fitted to promote Biblical science.

VII

The fee for admission into the Society shall be five dollars, besides which each member shall annually pay a tax of three dollars; but libraries may become members without the fee for admission, from which, also, members permanently residing abroad shall be exempt. The donation at one time, by a single person, of fifty dollars shall exempt the donor from all further payments, and no payments shall be required of honorary members.

VIII

Each member shall be entitled to receive, without additional charge, one copy of each publication of the Society after his election; in addition to which, if he be a contributor to the *Journal*, he shall receive twenty-five copies of any article or articles he may have contributed.

IX

Five members of the Council, of whom not less than three shall have been elected directly by the Society, shall constitute a quorum thereof. Twelve members of the Society shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may continue in session for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

The following resolution, supplementary to the By-Laws, with reference to the price at which members may procure extra copies of the *Journal*, was adopted June 13th, 1884.

Resolved: That the Secretary be authorized to furnish to members, for the purpose of presentation, additional copies of any volume of the *Journal*, to the number of ten, at the rate of \$1 a copy, but that the price to persons not members be the amount of the annual assessment.

JOURNAL
OF
BIBLICAL
LITERATURE

EDITED BY
JULIUS A. BEWER
BENJAMIN WISNER BACON WILLIAM H. COBB

COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

VOLUME XXVIII

1909

PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY

BY

G. E. STECHERT & CO.

NEW YORK

1909

AMERICAN SCHOOL IN PALESTINE

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOR ORIENTAL STUDY AND RESEARCH IN PALESTINE was founded in 1909, and is affiliated with the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis and the Archaeological Institute of America. It is supported by a number of American Universities, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries, and by private subscriptions. The School is established in Jerusalem, and offers to properly qualified persons excellent opportunities for the study of the Semitic languages, and of the geography, archaeology, and history of Syria. The Thayer Memorial Fellowship, with a stipend of \$600, is awarded annually on examination. The Director of the School for 1909-1910 is Professor RICHARD GUTHRIE of Columbia University. The Chairman of the Committee on Fellowships is Professor CHARLES C. TORREY, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. A list of books recommended to candidates for the Fellowship and copies of recent examination papers will be found in the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY, vol. xi, 1907, Supplement.

For further information address the Chairman of the Managing Committee,

PROFESSOR CHARLES C. TORREY,

Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Special attention is called to the fact that back volumes of the JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE can now be applied to members of the Society at the following reduced rates:

Single volumes, \$1.00 each;

Complete sets, vols. I, XXVIII, 1882-1909, \$25.00.

Application for back volumes should be made to the Rev. W. H. COBB, Congregational Library, 11 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

