

Canadian Society of Biblical Studies
BULLETIN

No. 3.

June, 1937.

THE
FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

PAPERS:

THE SPIRIT OF HEBREW LITERATURE

(Presidential Address).

By Professor W. R. Taylor, Ph.D.

University College, Toronto.

CHURCH CONSCIOUSNESS AMONG
NEW CONVERTS IN CORINTH

By Professor S. Maclean Gilmour, M.A.,

Queen's Theological College, Kingston.

THE FOUNDING OF HEBRON

By Professor F. V. Winnett, Ph.D.

University College, Toronto.

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

Executive Committee.

1937-38.

Honorary President

SIR ROBERT A. FALCONER, K.C.M.G., D.Litt., LL.D., D.D.,
81 Glengowan Road, Toronto.

President

PRINCIPAL THE REV. RICHARD DAVIDSON, Ph.D., D.D.
Emmanuel College, Toronto.

Vice-President

THE REV. F. H. COSGRAVE, D.C.L.,
Provost of Trinity College, Toronto.

Secretary-Treasurer

PROFESSOR THE REV. R. B. Y. SCOTT, Ph.D.,
Divinity Hall, 3520 University St., Montreal.

RABBI MAURICE EISENDRATH,
Holy Blossom Congregation, Bond St., Toronto.

THE REV. K. C. EVANS, Ph.D.
Trinity College, Toronto.

PROFESSOR G. P. GILMOUR, B.D.,
McMaster University, Hamilton.

The Fifth Annual Meeting

The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Society was held at Emmanuel College, Toronto, on May 4 and 5, 1937, Principal Davidson presiding in the absence through ill health of Professor W. R. Taylor.

The following were elected to membership in the Society:—

Miss Jessie R. Henderson, London, Ont.
President the Hon. and Rev. H. J. Cody, D.D., LL.D., Toronto.
The Rev. Beverley Oaten, M.A., M.R.E., Toronto.
The Rev. Philip Beattie, M.A., Toronto.
Prof. S. Maclean Gilmour, M.A., Kingston.
The Rev. David A. MacLennan, B.A., B.D., Toronto.
Prof. R. D. MacLennan, M.A., Montreal.
Mr. Charles F. Kraft, A.B., D.B., Chicago.
The Rev. C. E. J. Cragg, M.A., B.D., Brampton, Ont.
The Rev. R. B. Ferris, B.D., London, Ont.
The Rev. H. O. Hutcheson, M.A., B.D., Shelburne, Ont.
The Rev. G. D. Kendell, M.A., B.D., Bond Head, Ont.
The Rev. E. E. Long, B.D., Barrie, Ont.
The Rev. C. F. McIntosh, M.A., B.D., Orangeville, Ont.
The Rev. S. T. Martin, M.A., D.D., Hamilton, Ont.
The Rev. E. W. Young, M.A., B.D., London, Ont.
The Rev. M. T. Newby, M.A., Toronto.
The Rev. Prof. T. W. Isherwood, M.A., Toronto.
The Rev. P. M. MacDonald, D.D., Toronto.
The Rev. W. Harold Young, D.D., Toronto.
The Rev. James Smart, Ph.D., Galt, Ont.
The Rev. S. J. Mathers, M.A., Toronto.
The Rev. J. W. E. Newbery, B.A., Magnetawan, Ont.

Two losses from membership were recorded in the lamented death of Principal John McNeill, of McMaster University, and the removal from Canada of the Rev. C. Sauerbrei. The total membership is now eighty-eight.

The following program was presented at this meeting:—
Prof. W. R. Taylor: "*The Spirit of Hebrew Literature.*"

(Presidential Address)

The Rev. W. S. McCullough: "*Jeremiah and the Temple.*"
The Rev. C. C. Oke: "*The Plan of the First Epistle of John.*"
Rabbi A. A. Feldman: "*Was there a Davidic Dynasty?*"

- Prof. J. Hugh Michael: "*A Phenomenon in the Text of Romans.*"
 Prof. R. B. Y. Scott: "*Jachin and Boaz.*"
 Prof. S. Maclean Gilmour: "*Church Consciousness among New Converts in Corinth.*"
 The Rev. K. C. Evans: "*Cosmic Patterns in Ancient Oriental Biography.*"
 Prof. W. E. Staples: "*David and Mythology.*"
 Prof. F. V. Winnett: "*The Founding of Hebron.*"
 Prof. W. A. Irwin: "*The So-called Deuteronomic Tithes.*"
 Mr. Chas. F. Kraft: "*The Religion of Israel as reflected in the Book of Amos.*"

Three of the above papers are printed in this number of the Bulletin.

The Spirit of Hebrew Literature

When we speak of the spirit of a man, we mean those qualities of head and of heart which both mark him off from other men and give direction and significance to his life. So when we are asked to deal with the spirit of Hebrew Literature I assume that we are required to set forth those features of the Literature which somehow bind it into a unity and give it enduring significance among the literatures of the race. We need not waste much time at the outset debating whether the Hebrews at any time wrote anything that is worthy to be designated literature, and whether whatever treasure they gave to the world was held in earthen vessels. Mr. J. Middleton Murry in his "Problems of Style" makes the sweeping statement—"When we consider style in the larger sense, it seems to me scarcely an exaggeration to say that the style of one half of the (English) Bible is atrocious. A great part of the historical books of the Old Testament, the Gospels in the New, are examples of all that writing should not be: and nothing the translators might have done would have altered this. The "Life of Jesus" by Ernest Renan is, as a whole, infinitely superior in point of style to the narrative of the Authorized Version of the Gospels. . . ." With such a wave of the hand, Mr. Murry dismisses the bulk of the Bible as literature. His quarrel with what the Hebrews wrote is that they failed herein to present the facts which they recorded in their full setting, and vividly and with artistic unity. In other words that they did not write as a modern journalist would write. But somehow we feel that the literature of the Hebrews will be read long after the works of modern professional literary artists have been forgotten. And this power of survival is owed not only to the soul which it enshrines but to its own singular qualities. What these singular qualities are, we shall seek to define later. But for the moment it is sufficient to say that neither thought alone nor style alone creates literature and gives it immortality but that the two are for these ends as interdependent as the convex and concave sides of a circle. John Morley once said that "literature consists of all the books (—and they are not so many—) where moral truth and human passion are touched with a certain largeness, sanity and attraction of form." If this be our gauge then the Hebrews not only produced literature but great literature.

And yet, that the Hebrews produced a literature at all—even a mean literature—must be regarded as one of the most puzzling riddles of history. The country was small, one half the area of Nova Scotia, one tenth of that of England—; it was cut off from the sea by a harborless coast and ringed round by deserts on the landward side; it possessed no wealth in soil or in minerals—obliged to import even most of its salt; drought, blights and locust-plagues at frequent intervals reduced its normal poverty to starvation and desolation. It was little more than a highway over which rolled the armies of Asia and Africa; successive conquerors coveted it as a point of vantage in their

schemes for empire and robbed it of its independence even as they do now. All the conditions which we believe are necessary to the creation of an independent culture—resources, leisure, and freedom from molestation were wanting to these Hebrews. Off this great trunk-road between the two continents its hills and valleys were just back-bays and retreats in which a loose and fitful unity was maintained.

The literature itself exhibits the helplessness of the Hebrews to withstand the consequences of their history. On almost every page we see that the common denominator of their modes of life and thought was that which they shared in common with all the peoples of the Ancient Near East. The Ionian colonies of Asia Minor when robbed of their independence and civic freedom by the Persians, left with nothing on which to exercise their minds but themselves and the cosmos, proceeded to speculate on the nature of things, to construct theories as to their original substance and to explore the meaning of unity in a world of change or phenomena. Babylonian mythology, mediated through the Persians or others, very probably gave the initial impetus to this Ionian philosophy, since in its earliest forms it seems to be doing little more than to rationalize the Eastern myths. But the Hebrews in a political situation similar to that of the Ionians took over from their neighbors at least four creation myths, a Babylonian which we meet in Genesis I, a Syrian which is preserved in Genesis II, a third which is concealed behind the references to the dragon Rahab in various parts of the Old Testament, and a fourth preserved most completely in Psalm 74 in which the dragon mastered at creation by the god of order was the many headed monster Leviathan. The Hebrews accepted these contradictory views of the cosmos in respect to its origin and order with so little criticism that they did not even seek to harmonize them.

And if we pass from mythology to matters of form in literature, we meet the same conditions. For a long time men who were accustomed to the Greek modes of poetry were perplexed by the phenomena with which they were confronted in Hebrew poetry. Josephus out of a desire to magnify it tried to force anapaests and dactyls and other such measures on it. The apology of Josephus was unsuccessful. But as the poetry of the Old Testament seemed to be *sui generis*, later writers thought that it must be viewed as a creation of the Holy Ghost. John Donne, for example, says, "If we should take all those Figures and Tropes which are collected out of secular Poets and Orators we may give higher and livelier examples of every one of those Figures out of the Scriptures than out of all the Greek and Latin Poets and Orators: and they mistake it much who think that the Holy Ghost hath chosen a low and barbarous and homely style rather than an eloquent and powerful manner of expressing itself." It remained for later men to show that Hebrew poetry followed definite laws and forms.

Until quite a recent date, it was thought that this poetic art was an invention of the Hebrews, a product of their culture. But now it is known that it was employed in the hymns of Babylonians and Egyptians, and even of the Canaanites who preceded them in the land of

Palestine. To illustrate this we quote three examples of Synonymous Parallelism drawn from three different sources.
Hebrew (Ps. 36:6)—

"O Yahweh, thy mercy reaches to the heavens
And thy faithfulness to the clouds."

(Babylonian)—

"Be pleased that my prayers may be heard,
That the words of my cry may be heard."

(Egyptian)—

"The ever-moving stars sing aloud to thee
And the constellations that never set adore thee."

It is obvious that there is something common in the origin of the poetry of all these peoples. As the forms of rhythm in Greek poetry were determined for all its history in some dim past when words were matched to the pipe or the strings, so the measure of rhythm in the poetry of the Ancient East may have been early determined by the swing of the camel's stride as men sang to one another on long journeys through the desert steppes. But whatever the origin was, the Hebrews were not inventors of any form of metrical composition but heirs with all their neighbors to some common tradition.

These cultural defects of the Hebrews of which I have just spoken are still more impressively revealed in the results of Palestinian Archaeology. Within the last quarter of a century the excavations have brought to light a wealth of material which helps us to estimate from a new angle the economic, religious and artistic life of the people. And the evidences presented by the excavations are quite conclusive in respect to the ineptitude of the Hebrews for technical invention and artistic expression. In the six or eight centuries before the Hebrew invasion of Palestine, the pottery types which we meet in Middle Bronze Age and Late Bronze Age levels exhibit progress in technique, and increasing gracefulness in design and decoration. The potters of those ancient times loved their work and made many experiments to increase the beauty of the lip of the jar, the delicacy of the base and the curves of the shoulder and the sides, and crowning all this endeavor came the imported Cypriote bowls and the Philistine wares with their designs of plants, and birds and animals tastefully executed. But with the arrival of the Hebrews a change is met. The graceful shapes of the Middle Bronze Age and the splendid technique and decorative schemes of the Cypriote and Philistine pottery give place to a coarse undecorated reddish type of which the general mould of lip, shoulder and base is devoid of artistic merit. The fact that this type was produced without modification, century after century, for nine hundred years constitutes the most damning verdict ever pronounced in history on the artistry of a civilized people. The Hebrew artisan really did not love his work as Minoans, Cypriotes and Greeks did and so he never raised his craft to the dignity of an art. He invented no pattern or decorative scheme and made no improvements in technique. He was at best only a copyist with a short memory. When models failed him,

his skill languished, and models came and went without leaving any marks of abiding influence on his work. There is a curious confirmation of this in the levels of the second and third centuries B.C. For some reason Palestine at that time was importing wine from Rhodes. The excavator finds frequently the fragments of those beautiful and stately amphorae the handles of which bear in Greek letters the date and the name of the merchant. Everyone of these Rhodian jars must have challenged a true artisan to emulation. But in Palestine they came and they went, and the native-wines continued to be stored in jars as graceless as before their advent.

We have spoken at length of Hebrew pottery because it is illustrative of all Hebrew crafts. Like the pottery, the architecture of the houses is without form or beauty; the chapels or shrines are roughly constructed and on a small scale. The sacred stones are little better than boulders and beside them one finds small altars and diminutive incense-burners. Within the walls of the house, one may uncover a few beads, scarabs, loom weights of baked clay, ballistae, lamps, bits of agricultural implements, and a toy or a sacred image and things of that order. One is surprised at the lack of inscriptions and scripts of any kind and more generally at the amazing lack of all things. It is evident that the people must have been as poor as the fellahin of today and for hundreds of years it made little difference in their material fortunes whether a native born prince or a foreign-conqueror lorded it over them. So far as material culture is concerned, we can say there was none. It could not advance for reasons we have already given, and it did not recede because it could not be much simpler. Whether an excavation of Jerusalem would show some traces of luxury and refinement remains to be seen. The excavations at the rival capital of Samaria do not warrant us to believe that the results at Jerusalem would be much better. The history of the country makes it clear that a few kings like Solomon and Ahab did attempt to import foreign workmen and artisans and thereby to stimulate the culture of the country. But for every such departure from the narrow conditions which the natural poverty of the land imposed on kings and subjects alike there was regularly a bitter price to pay in the form of over-taxation, social unrest and revolt.

Such are the conditions out of which a great literature came and such are the people who produced it. It seems a paradox that the Hebrews presumed to believe and to say that

“Out of Zion shall come the teaching for the nations
And out of Jerusalem the word of the Eternal.”

No group of people seem at first sight to have been less equipped in resources, material and immaterial, to say a word that could survive the ages. It is, as I said a moment ago, one of the most puzzling riddles in the history of the race—the superlative example of the assertion that “God chooses the weak things of the world to confound the mighty and the nobodies to set at nought the somebodies”. And yet on second thought, one perceives that the Ancient World supplies us with more than one such riddle to resolve. We have been too long

accustomed to look at the people of ancient times according to certain modes that tradition dictates. For a long time we have been picturing “the Greeks as an Olympian humanity living in an ideal world whose very passions were tranquil and profound”. But how ideal in reality was the Greek world and how many of them rejoiced in passions that were tranquil and profound? The modern traveller observes that the masses of the common people of the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt live on about the same low cultural level. And for economic reasons this condition must have prevailed in ancient times. The excavations seem to confirm us in this belief, and the literature from Homer to Aristotle does not suggest that the slaves and hirelings and peasants were living in their lands a less drab and cramped life than their fellows in Syria and Palestine. Plato says that his citizens had “an insatiable love of money and that in their lawsuits half the people were perjured” (Laws 831, 948). And if I had not mentioned Plato’s name you might have attributed the statement to Hosea. And who among these Greeks created what we call Hellenism? Was it not the product of a Pindar from Thebes, a Thales from Asia Minor, an Aristotle from Stagira, a Homer from heaven-knows where, and a very small, select group from Athens. As they belong to quite an extent of time and a rather large area, the number of Greeks who lived Olympian lives in an ideal world were rather few per century, per city or per thousand of the population. How is it that out of those conditions there arose a literature of such timeless qualities? If we can solve this riddle, we can attack that of the Hebrew genius. In an age such as ours when men believe that organization, comfort and leisure are necessary for creative results, the springs of the culture of ancient times must always be a baffling mystery.

Hebrew literature, we must assume then, is the product of a very small fraction of the Hebrew people. It resembles Greek literature in this respect and in one other, it is bound together by one spirit. But here the resemblances cease because the spirit that binds together Hebrew literature is different from that of Greek. The great peoples that preceded the Hebrews, Assyrians, Babylonians and Egyptians, were held together like “waters behind a dam—and not like the fibrous matter of a tree.” “No inner loyalty to an ultimate truth made them one or fashioned their civilization.” But the Hebrews were the first people to be organized around a structural idea which penetrated through the life of the group and gave it a spiritual unity. They were therefore the first people to achieve a sense of selfhood and hence the first people to write history.

What this structural idea was is very easy to see if we compare the Hebrew historical writing with the parallel documents of their neighbors. The expedition of Amenophis II (1448-1420 B.C.) of Egypt into Syria-Palestine is described in part as follows:

“His Majesty crossed the ford of the Orontes on this day. His Majesty bent his arm in order to see the limits of the land. His Majesty caught sight of some Asiatics who sprang to horse. Behold, His

Majesty was armed with his weapons of war, his majesty gave them chase, mightily as the God Reseph, immediately. They betook themselves in flight at the sight of His Majesty and one tried to outstrip the other in flight. Then His Majesty brought their leader to the ground by means of his dagger. Behold, he brought the Asiatic back with him—and his chariot and horses and all his weapons. His Majesty turned with joy back to his (divine) father Amon—The list of what His Majesty took in the form of plunder on this day is a chief, two horses, a chariot, a suit of armor, two bows, a quiver filled with arrows."

Beside this Egyptian record, we can place one of the Assyrian king Shalmeneser III (860-825), concerning an expedition against Damascus.

"In the second year of my reign I set out from Niniveh. For the ninth time I crossed the Euphrates at high water. At Sangar I captured ninety-seven cities. One hundred cities of the Aramaeans I took, plundered, wasted and burned up. I moved along Mount Hamanu. I passed through the Yaraka mountains. I descended toward the cities of the region of Hamath. The city of Astamaku along with ninety-nine others I took. I made a massacre among them. I collected their booty. At that time Hadadidri of Damascus and Irhuleni of Hamath along with twelve kings of the coastal region relied on their mutual military forces. They proceeded against me to offer battle. I joined battle with them and defeated them. Their chariots, their horsemen and their implements of war I took away." And now for the purpose of comparison we can quote a selection from the historical books of the Hebrews. Almost any selection will serve our ends but because of its conciseness let us cite the incident described in II Kings 8:7-15.

"Now Elisha came to Damascus. And Benhadad, the king of Syria, was sick. And when it was told him,

"The man of God has come thither",
The king said to Hazael,

"Take with you a present and go to meet the man of God, and inquire of Jaweh through him whether I shall recover from this illness?"

So Hazael went to meet him and took a present with him, specimens of all the wares of Damascus as much as forty camels could carry. When he reached Elisha, he stood before him and said,

"Your son Benhadad, King of Syria, has sent me to ask you whether he will recover from his illness."

Elisha answered, "Go and tell him that he will certainly recover—though Jahweh has revealed to me that he will certainly die." As he spoke the face of the man of God became fixed with horror—utter horror. Then he burst into tears.

"Why does my lord weep?" said Hazael.

"Because," Elisha answered, "I know the cruelties you will practice on the Israelites, setting fortresses ablaze, murdering young men, dashing children to pieces, and ripping up pregnant women!"

"But your servant is but a dog," said Hazael; "how can he achieve all this?"

Elisha answered, "Jahweh has let me see you reigning over Syria!"

Then leaving Elisha, he went back to his master, who asked, "What did Elisha say to you?" Hazael replied, "He told me that you would certainly recover". Next day he took the bath-towel, soaked it, and spread it over the king's face till he was dead. Then Hazael reigned instead of him."

The difference between the last selection and the two preceding ones is immediately felt. Babylonians, Assyrians and Egyptians have left us records of events but nothing more. The words of the Egyptians are, as we see, bombastic accounts composed to flatter the vanity of the Pharaoh. The full story of a campaign is reduced to an empty account of his personal exploits. One is often left wondering why he needed an army at all. The Assyrian records are more impersonal but they give a very dry recitation of the successive movements in a campaign. Both Egyptians and Assyrians view campaigns as isolated incidents; we miss in their accounts any conception of a deeper causality, a development in events, something that links the matter of their records together or gives them meaning. We miss them because they never felt it and therefore they never attempted to produce out of their records a history. But the Hebrews did not believe that the life of men and of nations was just a flux of unrelated happenings; rather wars were waged, kingdoms rose and fell because Jahweh was ceaselessly at work in the affairs of men, in order to realize in the world a Divine purpose. This is the structural idea about which their thought is organized. Because of their possession of such an idea, they must write History.

We shall not spend time in discussing at length how they arrived at it. Enough is it to say that the Greeks made their gods; as Euhemerus said the gods were pale reflections of themselves, because, as they assumed, man is the measure of everything; but the Hebrews were the people of a God who said "You have not chosen me but I have chosen you". The Greek looked out on the world, dared to understand it and believed he could understand it. The Hebrew looked in himself and was awed by the moral urge that he discovered there as the voice of a supreme Moral Will without. As this moral order was both without and within, his God was both near and far—known as well as unknown. The sublimest Greek prayer was in the words of Euripides:

"Thou deep Base of the World, and thou high Throne,
Above the World, whoe'er thou art, unknown
And hard of surmise, Chain of Things that be
Or Reason of our Reason.
..... I lift to thee my praise." (Troades 884 ff. tr. Murray.)

But only one of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament contains such sentiments as these. The Hebrew creed is in the words of Psalm 139:

"O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me.
 Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising
 Thou understandest my thought afar off.
 Thou hast beset me behind and before
 and laid thine hand upon me.
 How precious also are they thoughts unto me, O God!
 How great is the sum of them.
 Search me, O God, and know my heart.
 And see if there be any wicked in me.
 And lead me in the way everlasting."

It is easy to understand therefore that Greek literature is preoccupied with the problems of the reason, and that it has given us the finest interpretation of the world from the approach by reason, and that Hebrew is obsessed with the problem of the Moral Will, as the Prophetic Literature witnesses. The Greek beatitudes are "Blessed is he who is sound in limb, free from disease, free from misfortune, happy in his children and himself good looking: and who ends his life well" (Solon—Herod. 1.32. cp. Aristotle Rhet. 1360 b. 14); the Hebrew Beatitudes you well know, "Blessed are the pure in heart, the peacemakers and those that hunger and thirst after righteousness".

This Hebrew confidence in the moral governance of things met its greatest test when they awoke to the problem of human pain. At first they believed that suffering and sin had a direct causal relation but the examples of suffering innocence became in the wake of the years too insistent in their appeal to be overpassed. The Psalms provide many instances of the baffled attempt of men to find concord between their view of the Divine Justice and their afflictions. The Book of Job comes passionately to grip with the problem. Its conclusions are in harmony with the Hebrew point of view. All the array of solutions of the problem of pain that the human mind has seriously or flippantly proposed are set out in order—that God is limited in power or knowledge, that He is short lived, that He is capricious, that He is a maniac, that He is a devil, that He possesses neither reason nor moral power. All these are stated only to be summarily dismissed as axiomatically untenable propositions. "The Judge of all the earth must do right". But man because of his humanity is so ignorant of all things, even those near at hand as well as those far off, that he cannot compass with his mind the plan of the Almighty. But if he could sit on the throne of the Universe for a day, decking himself with Divine majesty and thundering with a voice like God, and view all things *sub specie aeternitatis* then he would see that even in the suffering of the innocent there is a purpose that is not only just but kind. Such a conclusion is, if hardly won, nevertheless a natural deduction for a people whose life was penetrated by the structural idea of which I have spoken.

But how differently the Greeks deal with a problem fairly parallel to that of Job. Prometheus is impaled on the rocks for being a kind man, a lover of his fellows such as Job was. And his punishment is directed not by Satan but by Zeus Himself in his jealous rage. In the end, if we can read aright the concluding fragments of Aeschylus'

Prometheus, the Greek brings his God to the bar of reason and there gives him no clear acquittal. The Almighty and Prometheus are brought to a compromise such as the human lawcourts must often have witnessed. No Hebrew could have conceived such a plot, since "equity and justice are the feet of thy throne, O Jahweh, mercy and truth are thine attendants". Ps. 89:14.

It will now be evident why the Hebrews never wrote a tragedy. They did not lack passion or sympathy to enter into the experiences of others, as their love and marriage songs, their drinking songs, and also their dirges evidence, nor did they lack dramatic gifts since many of the prophetic addresses were highly dramatized, but tragedy can be produced only when life is viewed on a background of grim, dark mystery. The Hebrew was haunted with the mystery of things but the mystery was neither grim nor dark because within it was enfolded a Providence.

And in conclusion let me say that the Hebrew attitude to things of which we have been speaking is consistently reflected in their language and their literary style. You will have observed that in the standard translations of this literature there are few subordinate clauses introduced by conjunctions of cause, result, and purpose and so on. The Hebrew says everything immediately and directly, and he sees much, for the world is overflowing with suggestions to his sensitive mind, but he never stops to study the relations of these suggestions which stir his emotions and to construct them through a study of time and of cause and effect into a theory of life. If he had, the world would have had one more philosophy to discard. The Hebrew thinks intuitively, and senses vividly the truth which he finds *per saltum*. When the Greek sees a landscape he describes it as it is, but the Hebrew scarcely halts at the landscape because of what he senses beyond it.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers
 The moon and the stars thou hast ordained
 (I say to myself), What is man that thou art mindful of him".
 (Pss. 8:4; 19:1)
 "The heavens are singing the glory of God
 One day madly pours it forth to the next."

Because the Hebrews were the first great thinkers, and therefore were under no obligation to pay court to the sanctions of tradition in literature, their language has the freshness and the force of youth, telling human experiences through the words and concrete symbols by which man first translated them into speech. They never say—"Exact justice must be done" but "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth"—that life is transient or evanescent but "man is like the flower of the field" or "the days of man are like a weaver's shuttle". When they wish to sum up the virtues of a man, they assemble those experiences in which defence and shelter and comfort are most vividly sensed. "A man shall be as an hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a desert land". And so great thoughts wedded to simple words, striking imagery and strong emotion produced the gold of literature.

The Hebrews lived with their feet in two worlds, one foot in this world of hard, baffling and cruel events and the other in that realm to which our emotions, our finest instincts and our deepest feelings continually bear witness. But since their hearts were more simple than ours, or any that have succeeded them, the second world was to them the world of reality. Their words strike us as singularly sincere, and free from cant when they say:

“The Lord is the strength of my life
And my portion forever”.

In a long survey of the centuries we must ask ourselves whether Humanism or Hebrew mysticism has done most to keep pure the fountains of the life of the race.

W. R. TAYLOR.

Church Consciousness Among New Converts in Corinth

I.

More is known of the character and problems of the early Christian community in Corinth than of any other. This is due to the fact that much of Paul's extensive correspondence with Corinthian Christians has been preserved and that it deals with issues that had been raised in a peculiarly intimate and revealing manner. It is therefore pertinent to examine his letters to ascertain the nature of "Church" consciousness among recently converted Christians in a non-Jewish milieu.

A few of those who identified themselves with the Christian community in Corinth had formerly been Jews. The book of Acts (18:2, 8) specifies Aquila and his wife Prisca, who had been forced to migrate from Rome by a persecution directed against Jews sometime during the reign of Claudius (41-54), and Crispus who had been leader of the Corinthian synagogue. If the Sosthenes of I Cor. 1:1 is the same individual mentioned in Acts 18:17, he also became a Christian in Corinth and later moved to Ephesus with Prisca and Aquila (I Cor. 16:19; Ro. 16:3). Paul, by his general reference to those who had been circumcised before they were "called" (I Co. 7:18), indicates that there were still others whom we cannot identify by name. In the main, however, the new converts were drawn from the non-Jewish sections of the population. Paul in I Co. 12:2 expressly says so. Acts 18:7 mentions a proselyte, Titius Justus, in whose house Paul taught and who presumably became a Christian. He and others with Latin names such as Fortunatus, Achaicus, Lucius, Tertius, Gaius and Quartus (I Co. 6:16; Ro. 16:21ff) may have been descendents of the Corinthienses, the Roman veterans and freedmen with whom the new Colonia Julia Corinthus had been colonized. Others with Greek names such as Chloe (I Co. 1:11), Stephenus (I Co. 16:17), Jason and Sosipater (Ro. 16:21) bear witness to the cosmopolitan character both of the Corinthian population and the Christian ecclesia.

In Corinth as elsewhere early Christianity appealed chiefly to the poorer and relatively uncultured members of the community, many of them slaves or freedmen of the lower social strata. Paul frequently refers to this, occasionally to exult in it (I Co. 1:26-29). But there were also others of higher station, well-to-do who were not bound by specific hours of labor and were able to come early to the Lord's supper and consume abundant provisions that they had brought with them (I Co. 11:20f), and even civic officials such as Erastus, the city-treasurer (Ro. 16:23).

II.

Private or semi-private associations for various purposes were familiar phenomena in the Graeco-Roman world. Religious societies with some god of the pantheon as patron divinity and secular guilds of artisans, merchants, smiths, etc., flourished in Rome in the days of the Republic. The latter were regarded with suspicion in the early years of the Empire and some were suppressed, but collegia with religious purposes and those whose interests included providing deceased members with proper burial were legalized and even encouraged.¹ A singers' guild in Miletus has been traced back as early as the 6th century B.C.² 4th century Athenian inscriptions refer to clubs of citizens for purposes of worship and the celebration of various religious festivals.³ From the time of Alexander we hear of the existence in Europe, Asia Minor and Egypt of *thiasoi*. These were originally headed by priests but in the course of time developed lay leadership. They were societies organized around the worship of some cult divinity and not limited in membership to the citizens of any city state.⁴ Other similar clubs were called *eranoi*. They were also usually associated with the name of some divinity but served more pronounced economic and social ends.⁵

Religious devotees in general and worshippers of foreign (non-Graeco-Roman) divinities in particular usually went by the name of *therapeutai*. Those who had been initiated into the inner mysteries of one of the Oriental redeemer cults were called *mystai*. Therapeutai and *mystai* were often organized at *thiasoi* under the leadership of an officer known as an *archimystes*. Sometimes a collegium of *mystai* was known as a *speira*, a *koinan*, a *synodos* or other similar name⁶ Even the term *ekklesia* is found in a few inscriptions.⁷ We read of an unidentified mystical synod at Taurus⁸ a synod of *mystai* of the Great Mother at Smyrna,⁹ *mystai* of Dionysos in Philippi,¹⁰ *mystai* in Ephesus,¹¹ Thessalonica¹² and numerous other centres of the Mediterranean world.

The mystery religions which had spread most widely and had achieved most popularity were the Phrygian cult of Cybele (the Great Mother) and Attis, the Egyptian cult of Serapis and Isis, the Phoenician cult of Adonis and the Persian religion of Mithras.¹³ While they differed in detail and retained many characteristics of their national origin, all were syncretistic in character, tended to approximate to one another and offered similar solutions to the religious needs and longings of the age. All were built around the myth of a dying and rising god; all held out the promise of redemption to initiates: all had mysterious rites of initiation and celebrated sacred meals; and all were cosmopolitan in membership. All had the appeal of antiquity and the charm of imposing ceremony and impressive ritual.¹⁴

Two groups of adherents of these cults can be distinguished. One group visited the temple, participated in the public worship of the god and witnessed the public ceremonies as interested spectators. The other group, the *mystai*, had taken the oath of service (the sacramentum), had been initiated into the mysteries and had assumed all the

responsibilities of cult membership. The *mystai* did not simply watch what the god of the cult experienced but shared his experience of "death" and "rebirth" themselves and became identified with the god, whether he were Attis, Adonis, Isis or Mithras.¹⁵ It was members of this latter group who associated themselves in the various *thiasoi* and other *mystai* societies spoken of above.

III.

Baptism was the rite of admission to the Christian fellowship in Corinth as elsewhere (I Co. 6:11, 12:13), a rite in which Paul asserts that he himself took little part (1:14ff). At least some Corinthian Christians interpreted it not only as an act by which they were incorporated into the ecclesia but also as establishing a bond between themselves and whoever performed the sacrament (1:12f). Others allowed themselves to be baptized vicariously for those who had died (15:29), a custom which had analogies at least in Orphic circles.¹⁶

The rite of baptism as one condition of membership in the Christian ecclesia would remind the new convert of similar initiation rites in other Oriental cults with which he was familiar and to which he had perhaps belonged.¹⁷ In the pagan brotherhoods members met in a house that was owned or rented by the cult.¹⁸ In Ephesus and in Laodicea Christians met in a house provided by one of the group (I Co. 16:19, Col. 4:15; cf. Philemon vs. 2). Ro. 16:23 suggests that the same custom prevailed in Corinth. In the Christian fellowship the new convert participated in a sacred meal that must have impressed him as at least analogous to similar rites in other cults. He found in the Christian community, as far as religious standing was concerned, no distinctions of race or citizenship and few of sex. In the Christian ecclesia as in the pagan associations "entrance was not conditioned by nationality, citizenship, education, property or sex, and was not restricted to freedmen. Those who were excluded from civic or 'male' cults, especially foreigners, slaves and women, here as nowhere else could rejoice in an equal status with their fellows."¹⁹

In the Corinthian ecclesia as in the pagan cults and in diaspora Judaism interested spectators (*hoi apistoi*) frequented meetings and were welcomed to Christian worship and instruction in the hope that though they might sometimes scoff many might be induced to believe (14:22-25). A distinction was also drawn between full members and believers who had not yet been fully initiated. The usual name for the former was "the saints" (*hoi hagioi*),²⁰ probably borrowed from current Jewish or Septuagint usage. The latter were designated "novices" (*hoi idiotai*, I Co. 14:16, 23f), a title taken over from the Mysteries.²¹ Novices were assigned special seats at Corinthian assemblies (14:16). They were probably Christians who were yet unbaptized.

It is difficult and perhaps unwise to press any details of order and office that early Christianity may have taken over from its pagan environment. It may be that "the Church borrowed nothing from the

Pagan associations except the mechanism for mutual "helpfulness".²² Yet it is still more difficult to avoid the conclusion that Christians in Corinth thought of their new associations in the ecclesia in the light of membership in a new thiasos. Conditions of entrance into the Christian fellowship, rites that obtained within it and purposes it served were all comparable to those in the cultic societies. "If Greek Christians had not seen religious fellowships, thiasoi, in their new relationships it would constitute a problem that would demand explanation."²³

Corinthian Christians were distinctly conscious of a new relationship as a result of their membership in the ecclesia. They were "they that are within" in sharp contrast to "they that are without" (5:12). Yet some at any rate were not ready to allow their Church consciousness to interfere with ideas and practises established before conversion. Social and economic distinctions existing in civic life were not altogether ignored even in such intimate associations as that of the common fellowship meal (11:20-22). Some Christians felt free to continue to participate in pagan cultic feasts (8:10, 10:20f). The Jewish practice of settling disputes within the community did not at first commend itself to the Corinthian ecclesia. Quarrels among members led not infrequently to litigation before civic courts (6:1-6). Gross sexual immorality was not unknown (6:15) and even a man who had been guilty of incest was not immediately disciplined (5:1). It is apparent that membership in the Christian community did not at first demand a radical moral reorientation. Church consciousness among Gentile converts came only gradually to be identified with fixed social, ethical and religious standards.

IV.

Paul, to a much greater extent than his Gentile converts, was convinced of the radical break with current moral standards that was involved in entrance into the Christian fellowship. Much of his correspondence with Christians in Corinth and elsewhere was dedicated to the enforcement of ethical norms which he had taken over from Judaism, from primitive Christian teaching, from the best in pagan moral patterns, or which he believed himself to have received by direct revelation.

He also sought to impress on his converts that they were now neither Jew nor Greek but a "genus tertium", the Church of God (I Co. 10:32, Gal. 3:27f). All relationships within the community were to be the outcome of "brotherly love" (Ro. 12:10, I Thess. 4:9f., Col. 3:14, etc.). Cliques and factions were deplored (Phil. 2:2f., I Co. 1:10f., etc.). Disputes were deprecated and if they should arise were not to be taken before pagan courts (I Co. 6:1-8). Above all, Christians were to have no other religious loyalties. Paul may have been a debtor to both Greeks and barbarians but as a point of social control in the growing Church he insisted on an attitude of religious intolerance. Adherents of a pagan thiasos might possess a small, unpretentious temple (*hieron*) of their own or they might sacrifice to their cult divinity on a special altar erected within the public official temple

(*naos*).²⁴ In either case association with one god did not preclude appropriation of any benefits that might accrue from the worship of one or more other divinities. But Paul frowned on any such practice among Christians. A Christian could have only one God and one Lord (I Co. 8:6). In particular, he was not to participate in any cultic meal other than the Christian one. The fact that he thought himself to possess a gnosis which lifted him above superstitious belief in the reality of pagan gods or the efficacy of pagan cultic rites did not make participation a matter of no consequence. In the first place, it might lead a less enlightened brother to violate scruples of a more sensitive conscience (I Co. 8:10f). Secondly, it was opposing one sacrament to another, nullifying the one by the other, entering into fellowship with demons rather than with Christ. "I do not wish you to be partakers of demons. You cannot drink of the cup of the Lord and of the cup of demons. You cannot eat at the table of the Lord and at the table of demons" (I Co. 10:20f.).

Two marked characteristics of the culture of the Hellenistic period were its individualism and its syncretism. The former expressed itself in the ethics, the literature, the philosophy and even in the religion of the time.²⁵ A man entered into relationship with a divinity as an individual, not as a member of a corporate group. He became "divine" rather than the member of a "divine community". The latter also manifested itself in various areas of life. Its most typical expression was found in that eclectic ferment of thought known as gnosticism.²⁶ Within the Oriental cults which spread over the Mediterranean world it resulted in an interchange of rites, practices and beliefs and in the identification of the cult deity with the god or gods which had been worshipped in the particular locality.²⁷ So Isis could take over the honors of Aphrodite or Demeter and Adonis could be equated with Zeus, Apollo or Dionysos. As a result an individual who entered a thiasos looked for individual "salvation" and was not conscious of any ecumenical associations. His thiasos was a purely local phenomenon.

If early Gentile converts to Christianity may be presumed to have had no consciousness of anything other than the particular, local, ecclesia, the same cannot be said of Paul. To be sure he often things and speaks in terms of particular assemblies or groups. There is the Church that meets in the house of Prisca and Aquila, the Church that is in Philippi or the Churches of Asia. He took especial pride in those communities which he himself had founded (I Co. 3:6, 4:15, I Thess. 1:2-10). The prefaces and conclusions to all his letters witness to his continued and affectionate interest in the separate Churches as such. Yet the Christian community was more for him than a conglomerate of separate units. He thought in terms of the *oikoumene*, the inhabited world practically co-extensive with the Roman empire, bound together by a network of military and trade routes, a common speech and a common culture. He thought of the Christian message and the Christian Church against the background of the known world.

S. MACLEAN GILMOUR.

1. Samuel Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (1904), pp. 251-286.
2. Wilamowitz, *Sitzungs-Ber. d. preus. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1904, p. 619ff.
3. Orgeones. See F. Poland, *Gesch. d. griech. Vereinswesens* (1909), p. 8ff.
4. *Ibid.* p. 16ff., p. 353.
4. *Ibid.* p. 28ff.
6. *Ibid.* p. 36f., p. 154f.
7. See E. Hatch, *the Organ. of the early Christian Churches* (1880), p. 30, and Liebenam, *Rom. Vereinswesen* (1890), p. 272f.
8. Poland, *op. cit.* p. 557.
9. *Ibid.* p. 569.
10. *Ibid.* p. 555.
11. *Ibid.* p. 38.
12. *Ibid.* p. 37.
13. See Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (1911).
14. See Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (1910).
15. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 7ff.
16. See Lietzmann, *Korinther 1* (3rd ed. 1931) *ad loc.*
17. Cults dedicated to the worship of Isis and Serapis and to Aphrodite are known to have flourished in Corinth. See J. Weiss, *Der erste Korinther Brief* (1910), p. VIII.
18. Poland *op. cit.* pp. 459-465.
19. Weiss *op. cit.* p. XXII.
20. Also "the brethren". See Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (2nd ed. of the Eng. Trans. from the German 1908), vol I pp. 399-418 for the use of names as self-designations by early Christians. Cf. also E. Lohmeyer, *Vom Begriff der relig. Gemeinschaft* (1925) pp. 12ff.
21. Bauer, *Wörterbuch* (1928), *ad loc.*
22. E. F. Scott, *The Gospel and its Tributaries* (1928), p. 94. Contrast Heinrich, *Zeit. für wiss. Theol.*, 1876, pp. 465-562, where it is maintained that Christian order and organization in Corinth were modelled on forms taken from the Greek associations and not from the diaspora synagogues.
23. K. J. Neumann, *Der rom. Staat und d. Allg. Kirche* (1890), Vol I, p. 46f (quoted by Weiss, *op. cit.* p. XXII). Cf. also T. W. Wilson, *St. Paul and Paganism* (1927), p. 124: "The Gentile converts, having decided to become Christian, would naturally bring with them the experience of association with the guild system, and would seek, in keeping with distinctive Christian doctrine and practice, to frame their congregational life as far as possible along the lines of the guild life with which they had previously been familiar, and which they had in a measure found to be spiritually and morally helpful". Also Poland, *op. cit.* p. 534: "In the cultic meals, in the assemblies of members, in the patriarchal relationships of the 'house' congregations, . . . and in many other separate phenomena Christianity was influenced by the Greek associations".
24. Poland, *op. cit.* pp. 457, 471.
25. P. Wendland, *Die Hell.-rom. Kultur* (2nd ed. 1912) pp. 45-50.
26. *Ibid.* pp. 163-187.
27. See Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration* (1929) pp. 31ff.

The Founding of Hebron

"Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt."

(Num. xiii. 22b).

The above antiquarian gloss appears in the story of the spies sent out by Moses to explore the land of Canaan. "*So they went up and spied out the land from the desert of Zin as far as Rehob toward the approach to Hamath. They went up into the Negeb, and reached Hebron, where the 'Anakites, Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, lived. Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt.'*" It is a tantalizing gloss, as it seems to offer so much, and yet withholds so much. Every Old Testament student has eagerly seized upon it but, baffled in his attempt to convert it into a usable date, has ended by leaving it out of account. But the writer is convinced that archaeological research in Egypt has now reached a point where it is possible to convert this gloss into a date. The present paper is an attempt to demonstrate how this may be done, and then to point out that, having done it, we have obtained an extremely valuable clue to the reconstruction of early Hebrew history.

But let me first attempt to dispel any doubts that may still linger as to the trustworthiness of the passage. It has sometimes been cast under suspicion because it happens to be the only precise chronological reference of the kind in the Old Testament prior to the monarchy. But can we conceive of any possible motive for inventing such a statement? Why should a Hebrew writer affirm that Hebron, a comparatively unimportant Palestinian town, was seven years older than Zoan, the Egyptian capital? There is no suggestion in the context of the passage that the relative antiquity of the Hebrew and Egyptian peoples was a subject of current debate as, for instance, in the time of Josephus (cp. *Against Apion*); and even though it were, why should the writer pick Hebron to prove his point? There is no evidence that Hebron was the first site in Palestine to be occupied by the Hebrews. Moreover, if the statement were a fabrication, surely the fabricator would not have hesitated to make the difference in the antiquity of the two cities a matter of more than seven years. We seem forced to the conclusion that this gloss in Numbers is a simple record of known fact.

There is another consideration which influences us in its favour. The southern region of Judah, the so-called Negeb, in which Hebron lay, preserved an historical tradition which, if not exactly unique in Palestine, is at least striking. The 'Hebrew' invasion did not create a sharp break in the local tradition such as happened, for instance, when the Arabs conquered Persia in the seventh century A.D. The cities of the Negeb remembered who and what they were before the 'Hebrews' came in. Hebron remembered that its former name was Kirjath-arba, Debir remembered that it had once been called Kirjath-sepher, Hormah knew that its name had once been Arad. The very names of the conquerors

were preserved: it was Caleb that had taken Kirjath-arba (Josh. xv. 14, Ju. i. 10, 20); it was his brother Othniel ben Kenaz that had taken Kirjath-sepher (Josh. xv. 16f., Ju. i. 12f.). Hebron also preserved a memory of the fact that it had once been inhabited by 'Anakites',¹ led by three chiefs (?), Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai (Josh. xv. 14, Ju. i. 10). The Abraham and Isaac stories, which have their setting around Hebron and Beersheba, are a further witness to the unbroken historical tradition of this region. Thus we may feel added confidence in taking the tradition as to the date of the founding of Hebron at its face value.

Let us now turn to the interpretation of the passage. Zoan, as every Old Testament student knows, is the Hebrew form of the Egyptian city-name Dja'net, better known in its Greek dress *Tanis*. And Tanis at certain periods served as the capital of Egypt. Hebron, then, was built seven years before Tanis. But when was Tanis built? To this question three answers and three only may be given:

1. Since the city was first called Tanis under the XXIInd Egyptian dynasty, the so-called Tanite dynasty, its founding dates from the beginning of that dynasty, about 945 B. C.

2. Or its founding may date from the XIXth dynasty, from the time of Ramses II, when it was known as Pi-Ramses. The identification of Pi-Ramses with Tanis has been established beyond doubt by the recent excavations of Montet (see his article, "Tanis, Avaris et Pi-Ramsès" in the *Revue Biblique*, XXXIX, 1930).

3. Or its foundation may date from the Hyksos invasion about 1730 B.C. The Hyksos made their headquarters at a place in the Delta called Avaris, and the identification of Avaris with Pi-Ramses-Tanis is regarded as established by Montet and Gardiner.

Forced to choose between these three dates for the founding of Zoan or Tanis, we can at once discard the first one, 945 B.C. We know from the biblical record that Hebron was in existence long before 945; for did not David reign there for three and a half years before he transferred his residence to Jerusalem?

The choice between the remaining two dates has hitherto been made by selecting date No. 3, about 1730 B.C., or whenever the Hyksos entered Egypt. But the selection rests largely on the assumption that Tanis marks the site of Avaris, the Hyksos capital. As I have said, Montet, the excavator of Tanis, accepts this identification, as also does Gardiner (see *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XIX, 1933, pp. 122ff.). But in a recent number of the same journal (XXI, 1935, pp. 10-25) another Egyptologist, R. Weill, shows that the identification of Avaris with Tanis rests on very meagre grounds. The sole evidence is as follows: There was found at Tanis two twin-statues from the region of Merneptah on which appears an invocation addressed to "Seth, the Lord of Avaris". The same phrase occurs on an offering table of 'Aknenre Apopi which may have been found at Tanis, although this is not certain. These references to "the Lord of Avaris" on Tanite monuments have suggested to Montet that Tanis must mark the site of Avaris. But at another Delta site, Tell Moqdam, a monument was found similarly addressed to "Seth, the Lord of Avaris". Why not

identify Tell Moqdam with Avaris? It is only a case of one witness against two.

It is true that we have from Tanis a remarkable monument, the so-called Stela of the Year Four Hundred, which shows that there was in use at Tanis as late as about 1330 B.C. an era dating from the introduction of the cult of Seth to this spot about 1730 B.C. The date coincides with the beginnings of the Hyksos invasion and we know that the Hyksos cynically identified their god with the Egyptian Seth, who in Egyptian mythology was the arch-enemy of Osiris. So we seem justified in assuming that this era marked not only the introduction of the Hyksos Seth-cult but also the Hyksos foundation of the city, or rather its rebuilding, for both Gardiner and Weill say that there is no evidence that it began with the Hyksos. But all this is no proof that Tanis marks the site of Avaris. The worship of Seth was not peculiar to Tanis. Wherever the Hyksos settled they set up the worship of Seth. Many of the Delta cities must have had an era similar to, if not identical with, that used at Tanis, marking not only the introduction of the cult of Seth but also their refounding by the Hyksos.

As a matter of fact, the identification of Avaris with Tanis is removed from the realm of possibility by a reference to both of them in the same document, a list of Delta cities, a document noted by Weill but overlooked by both Montet and Gardiner.

If Tanis be not Avaris, then we are forced to conclude that by the building of Zoan the biblical writer is referring to its foundation as Pi-Ramses under Ramses II. And after all, *even though Tanis were Avaris*, is not the Hebrew writer more apt to be thinking of the foundation of the city as Pi-Ramses, the city which had played such a memorable role in their own history? Of what Egyptian city had they better reason to remember the foundation? Had not their own life-blood gone into its building? (Ex. i. 11). There was no reason why they should remember the date of the foundation of Hyksos Tanis, whatever its name may have been at that time, but how could they ever forget the foundation of the City-of-Ramses?

We have now to ask: Just when precisely was Pi-Ramses built? In a series of articles on "The Delta Residence of the Ramessides" published in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, V, 1919, pp. 137ff., Gardiner has gathered up all the information that we possess bearing on this question, and this suggests, it seems to me, that the foundations of the city were laid in the first year of the reign of Ramses II, i.e. in 1300 B.C. If so, we can now convert the gloss in Numbers xiii. 22b into a definite date: Hebron was built in 1307 B.C.

The next question is: Just what is meant by the "building" of Hebron? Must it not refer to its capture and "rebuilding" by Caleb? Just as Kirjath-sepher was renamed Debir following its capture by Othniel and Arad was renamed Hormah, so Kirjath-arba was renamed Hebron following its capture by Caleb. Hitherto scholars have interpreted the statement as referring to the original foundation of the city, perhaps as Kirjath-arba, although we are not sure that it may not have had another name before that. Most of these Oriental cities have had

a long history; they have had several foundations, each marking a new epoch in the life of the city. In the case of the city under discussion there is every reason to believe that the writer is thinking of its foundation as Hebron (as he says), not as Kirjath-arba.

We have now established not only the date of the founding of Hebron but, what is more important, the date of the Kenizzite movement up into the Negeb. This movement is referred to very briefly in Josh. xv. 13-19 and Ju. i. 10-15 where it is attributed to the tribe of Judah by making Caleb a Judaeon. But we have evidence in I Sam. xxx. 14 that as late as the time of David Caleb was still distinct from Judah. Furthermore, Caleb's brother, Othniel, is called a son of Kenaz and according to Gen. xxxvi 11 Kenaz was an Edomite tribe. So this invasion of the Negeb must be regarded as the work not of Judah but of a tribe or tribes having Edomite affiliations.

But this is not the only deduction which may be made from our text. It distinctly states that Hebron was built seven years before Zoan, i.e. Pi-Ramses. *The Israelites are still in Egypt*, soon to be pressed into service to aid in the building of Ramses' new capital. The Exodus under Moses has not yet taken place!

So far our reconstruction of Hebrew history has been based entirely on an interpretation of literary evidence. We must now test that interpretation by reference to the results of archaeological research. Unless it can be shown that it is in accord with the results obtained by this complementary line of investigation, we may be sure that we have turned a wrong corner somewhere and been led to a false conclusion. Documents may lie, archaeology never does. There is only one excavation which is pertinent to the point under discussion—Albright's excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim, which is almost certainly to be identified with Kirjath-sepher (Debir), the city captured by Othniel. Seller's excavation at Beth-zur may be left out of account since the interpretation of the finds there rests on Albright's interpretation of the materials from Tell Beit Mirsim. Starkey's work at Tell ed-Duweir (Lachish) may similarly be ignored for the present, since there is no evidence in our literary sources that Lachish was involved in the Kenizzite movement.

What then was Albright's conclusion from his work at Tell Beit Mirsim? It was that the city was taken by the Israelites about 1200 B.C., and this manifestly does not agree with our interpretation of Num. xiii. 22b. But it must be noted that this date depends entirely on an assumption as to the length of time to be assigned to the first phase of stratum B (B₁). Since the next phase of B is characterized by abundant remains of 'Philistine' pottery, whereas B₁ contains none whatever but only a degenerate local product (Albright calls it "the worst in the history of southern Palestine between 2000 B.C. and 1500 A.D.") we must date B₁ prior to the settlement of the Philistines in Canaan, i.e. before 1170 B.C. (Heurtley, however, denies that the 'Philistine' pottery originated with the Philistines, see *QDAP*, V.). Allowing twenty years for the Philistines to establish themselves and open up trade relations with their neighbours, Philistine pottery would make its

appearance in Tell Beit Mirsim about 1150 B.C., i.e. B₁ comes to an end and B₂ begins at that time. But how far back from 1150 does B₁ extend? To this no absolutely certain answer can be given. Albright wavers between fifty and a hundred years. In his final report (*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. XII, p. 61) he fixes on seventy-five years. This would carry the beginnings of B₁, marking the Kenizzite conquest and settlement, back to 1125 B.C. But I am sure he would admit that his dating is open to some revision. In fact, he says that Mackenzie dated a stratum at Beth-shemesh which is exactly similar to B₁ of Tell Beit Mirsim to "somewhere between 1300 and 1100 B.C." In view of all this it seems to me that there is nothing in the archaeological evidence from Tell Beit Mirsim which can be regarded as definitely invalidating our interpretation of Num. xiii. 22b. But the final word must rest with Professor Albright.

Quite a different suggestion as to the manner and date of the founding of Hebron has recently been put forward by Professor Forrer in an article on "The Hittites in Palestine" published in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* for Oct. 1936, and the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, April, 1937. He maintains that there is no evidence of a Hittite push into Palestine on a sufficient scale to account for the considerable Hittite settlement which is found at Hebron (Gen. xxiii), Beersheba (Gen. xxvi. 34), Jerusalem (Ezek. xvi. 3, 46), and Bethel (Ju. i. 22-26). In fact, he says that none of the peoples called 'Hittite' ever penetrated south of the Lebanons, and accounts for the so-called 'Hittite' settlement in southern Palestine by the theory that it originated with the Kurustamma-people from the Casga-territory in Asia Minor, who in 1353 B.C. took refuge in Egypt from a Hittite attack and were settled by the Pharaoh in his sparsely settled territories in southern Palestine, where they perhaps founded Hebron and Beersheba. It is a most improbable theory. There is no evidence that the Pharaoh settled them in Palestine. Furthermore, a date of 1353 for the founding of Hebron would presuppose, if Num. xiii. 22b be trustworthy, a foundation of Tanis seven years later, a foundation of which we otherwise know nothing.

And is it really true that no 'Hittite' peoples ever pushed south into Palestine? What about the Hyksos movement? In the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, XV, 1935, pp. 227ff. Albright points out that while the first Hyksos wave to strike Egypt was definitely Semitic, the next wave was just as definitely non-Semitic and seems to have come from southern Asia Minor. Have we not here the origin of the 'Hittite' settlement in southern Palestine? We know that after the Hyksos were driven from Egypt about 1580 B.C. they retreated into southern Palestine, whither the Pharaoh, Ahmose I, followed them and continued the conflict. But there is no reason for believing that they were driven away to the north. The discovery of many scarabs of Hyksos type in Palestine from a time subsequent to their expulsion from Egypt shows that many of them settled down here. May not the tradition related by Manetho and preserved to us by Josephus in his treatise *Against Apion*, I, 14, that they founded Jerusalem, after all be

correct? "Then, terrified by the might of the Assyrians, who at that time were masters of Asia, [they did not withdraw further north but] they built a city in the country now called Judaea, capable of accommodating their vast company, and gave it the name of Jerusalem" (Thackeray's translation). Perhaps our Hittite scholars can tell us if Jerusalem and Zion are of Hittite derivation. Ezekiel (xvi. 3, 46) says that the mother of Jerusalem was a Hittite, and the presence in Jerusalem at the time of the Tell el-Amarna letters of a governor with a name which is some variety of Hittite suggests that the city was still occupied by Hyksos Hittites. Forrer also draws attention to the significant fact that in the twenty-one biblical lists of the seven peoples who inhabited Palestine before the Israelites, the Hittites stand in the first place six times and nine times in second place. There may be good justification after all for Josephus so frequently calling the Hyksos "our ancestors" (cp. *Against Apion*, I, 16, 25, 26, etc.).

A further deduction may now be made. In Gen. xxiii we are told that Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah from a member of the Hittite settlement at Kirjath-arba (Hebron). Although the story comes from the P document and was manifestly told to justify the claims of the Hebrews to the sacred spot, it seems to preserve a genuine tradition and shows that the Hebrew claims were contested by an earlier group. Abraham must be dated after the settlement of the Hyksos Hittites in southern Palestine, i.e. after 1580 B.C. When Abraham appears on the scene the Hittites have evidently long been in occupation. He appears among them as a foreigner (*ger*) and settler (*tôshab*), whereas they are called the "people of the land" (*am ha-ares*), i.e. "natives." The most natural date for Abraham "the Hebrew" is, therefore, about 1400 B.C. when, as we know from the Tell el-Amarna letters, the Hebrews first came into Palestine (For this movement, see Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, p. 17ff.). On the basis of his interpretation of Gen. xiv Albright holds that Abraham must be dated to the early seventeenth century B.C. (see *AJSL*, XL, 125ff; *JPOS*, I and II). While I agree with his interpretation of the historical background of the first part of this chapter, I feel that it remains to be proven that the chapter is a unity. Verses 12-24 have all the earmarks of a late composition; their very claim that Abraham with 318 followers pursued and defeated an alliance of five powerful kings marks them as absurd and shows that the Hebrew writer did not grasp the true significance of the ancient document which vv. 1-11 undoubtedly constitute.

Continuing our investigation, we recall that the Hebrew genealogists recognize a distinction among the Hebrew tribes: some are sons of Leah, others are sons of Rachel, still others are sons of Zilpah or of Bilhah. There can be only one explanation of this: in early times these groups trod different paths but in Palestine their paths met. The Leah tribes (Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah) are represented as the eldest (Gen. xxix. 32-35). This helps us to understand why so much is told us of these tribes, not in Joshua and Judges, but in Genesis, the book dealing with the patriarchal period. There can scarcely be any doubt that the traditions about the attack of Simeon

and Levi on Shechem (Gen. xxxiv) and Judah's intermarriage with the Canaanites (Gen. xxxviii) represent memories of the *Habiru* movement of 1400 B.C., The patriarchal period is the *Habiru* period! Issachar and Zebulun are also reckoned as sons of Leah, an indication of their antiquity, but they seem to have entered Palestine before the *Habiru* movement (for early reference to Zebulun cp. Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, p. 31). Gad and Asher, the sons of Zilpah, are connected with the Leah tribes by making their mother a maid of Leah but whether this indicates that they were involved in the *Habiru* movement is uncertain. Probably they were, but because they settled farther north and for a time lost touch with their southern kinsmen they are granted only a secondary position in the genealogy.

If the Leah tribes settled in Canaan first (and does not Ju. i definitely say that Judah was the first to go up?), then we are forced to the conclusion that the Rachel tribes (Joseph and Benjamin) came in later. In fact, we may be pretty certain that it was they who were in Egypt, (or rather just Joseph since Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasseh represent later subdivisions of the tribe after it had settled in Palestine). And does not the whole Joseph story imply this very thing? The weak spot in the theory which would make the settlement of the Judaeans later in time than the settlement of the Josephites is its inability to account for the Joseph story. The Bilhah-tribes, Dan and Naphtali, which are connected by the genealogists with the Rachel-tribe by making Bilhah a maid of Rachel, may have been associated with the Josephite movement under Joshua (cp. Ju. i. 34-35, xviii).

After leaving Pi-Ramses (cp. Ex. xii, 37, Nu. xxxiii 3, Ps. xxviii 12, 43), the Josephites probably escaped along the narrow strip of sand which divides the Mediterranean from Lake Serbonis (Bardawil). They tried to enter Palestine from the south but were driven back by The king of Arad (Nu. xxi. 1-3, xiv. 39-45, Deut. i. 41-44). Unable to penetrate Edom, then at the height of her power, they were forced to go around that country. Then they pushed north, defeated Sihon, king of the Amorite kingdom centred at Heshbon, and Og, king of Bashan, another Amorite² kingdom. Having overrun Transjordan they crossed the Jordan at Adam (Josh. iii. 16-17), a spot about 16 miles above Jericho, and attacked Bethel, which fell into their hands (Ju. i. 22-26). They were then faced by an alliance of five southern cities ruled by Amorite kings, which succeeded in diverting the movement into the highlands of Ephraim. Josh. x. 1ff. claims that the alliance was defeated but this seems contrary to the real facts of the case. (The Jericho episode belongs to the traditions of the *Habiru* invasion).

The above reconstruction of the main outlines of early Hebrew history from an examination of the literary sources is confirmed by the results of archaeological investigation. The research of the last few years is making it more and more necessary to postulate two main movements into Palestine: one about 1400 B.C., the other about 1200 B.C. or slightly later. A more ready recognition of this fact would save the archaeologists themselves a lot of unnecessary hair-pulling. There is no need to suspect the conclusion of Garstang and Rowe that

Jericho fell "between 1400 B.C. and the accession of Akhenaton" in 1375 B.C. (the *Liverpool annals of Archaeology*, 1936, p. 75f.), nor Albright's conclusion that Bethel fell "somewhere in the thirteenth century B.C." (*Bulletin of the Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 56). That is just what a study of the literary sources teaches us to expect.

In conclusion, we turn once more to our inference from Nu. xiii. 22b that the Exodus from Egypt did not occur until after 1300 B.C. If we accept the evidence of Ex. ii. 23, iv. 19 we may fix date of this event more precisely as somewhere in the reign of Merneptah (1234-1214 B.C.). It is often urged against this date that a stela from the fifth year of Merneptah, 1229 B.C., mentions Israel as already settled in Palestine. If this be so, where are we to find room for the forty years (one generation) of wandering in the wilderness, which seems to be a perfectly reliable part of the tradition? It would seem as if our whole interpretation had struck an *impasse*. But are we sure that the name "Israel" at this stage refers to the Joseph tribe? The name is introduced into the Hebrew tradition in a peculiar sort of way: it is a *new* name given to Jacob after his wrestling with God at the Jabbok ford (Gen. ii. 28). Is it not probable that this new name was really an old one, the name of the district (around Shechem?) where the Joseph tribe settled? Having settled in the "land of Israel" they became known as "Israelites". Palestinian place-names of similar formation, Jacob-el and Levi-el, appear in Egyptian records. It is quite true that in the stela of Merneptah the name "Israel" is accompanied by the determinative for "men" whereas all the other places mentioned are accompanied by the determinative for "country". But these Israelites may well have derived their name from the district in which they lived and need have no necessary ethnological relation with the people who afterwards settled there and became known as "Israelites". There must surely be some reason for the frequent references to "the Land of Israel" and for the fact that this term is capable of extension to cover Judah as well, whereas the term "land of Judah" was incapable of such extension. In fact it is of very rare occurrence. This suggests that "Israel" is primarily a geographical term. If this be so, then there need no longer be any hesitation about placing the Exodus in the reign of Merneptah and the invasion of Palestine about 1175 B.C.

Our investigation thus forces us to the conclusion that the narratives of the conquest and settlement in their present form represent a fusion of traditions of all the movements into Palestine from about 1400 B.C. to approximately 1175 B.C.

F. V. WINNETT.

1. May not this name, meaning 'long-necked fellows', be merely a pun on 'Canaanite', 'k-n-' turned around? The difference in the *k*-sound of the words is immaterial, if it is a case of punning. The supposed reference to the Anakites on Egyptian pottery fragments from about 2000 B.C. (see Lods, *Israel*, pp. 44, 53) is shown by Albright (*JPOS*, 1928 p. 237) to be without foundation. Ju. iii. 7-11 may, however, suggest that the inhabitants of this region at the time of Othniel's conquest were of northern (Hittite) extraction.
2. A question arises as to the identity of these 'Amorites'. In Ju. xi. 26 we are told that Israel (Hebrews, at any rate) had lived in Heshbon and its neighbourhood for three hundred years before Jephthah's time, and he must be dated around 1100 B.C. But if the Hebrews were there for as long, where can we find room for this 'Amorite' kingdom? The question arises: Are not these 'Amorites' really the *Habiru* in another guise? We know that the Hebrews came from around Haran and this region in early times was known as Amurru. Certainly the Hebrews never called themselves "Hebrews" since this was a derogatory term (see Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 9). But in view of their place of origin there was every reason why they should be called "Amorites." The fact that the historical document produced by the Joseph tribe, the so-called E document, calls the inhabitants of Palestine "Amorites", whereas the J document of the southern tribes calls them "Canaanites", takes on new significance. The earliest settlers found the Canaanites in possession, the later group found the *Habiru*-Amorites (mixed with Canaanites of course). We can now understand why Joshua x. 5ff. calls the kings of Hebron, Jerusalem, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon "Amorites". That was the name the Israelites applied to all who were in Palestine before them. There is therefore no reason why Hoham of Hebron cannot have been a good Calebite. We can also understand why Ezekiel (xvi. 3, 46) says that the father of Jerusalem was an Amorite.