



---

#### Volume Information

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898)

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268786>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

JOURNAL  
OF  
BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOLUME XVII

*(The Authors alone are responsible for the Contents of their  
Papers.)*

PUBLISHED BY THE  
SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

1898

---

PRINTED BY J. S. CUSHING & Co., NORWOOD, MASS.

## CONTENTS.

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| The Prophecy of 'Malachi.' <i>C. C. Torrey</i> . . . . .                   | I    |
| The Edomites in Southern Judah. <i>C. C. Torrey</i> . . . . .              | 16   |
| The Confession of Nathanael, John i. 45-49. <i>Rush Rhees</i> . . . . .    | 21   |
| Peter: The Man and the Epistle. <i>G. M. Harmon</i> . . . . .              | 31   |
| Isaiah xxi. 1-10 reëxamined. <i>William Henry Cobb</i> . . . . .           | 40   |
| The Composition of the Book of Daniel. <i>George A. Barton</i> . . . . .   | 62   |
| A "Striking Monotony" in the Synoptic Gospels. <i>Rush Rhees</i> . . . . . | 87   |
| Influence of Assyrian in Unexpected Places. <i>T. K. Cheyne</i> . . . . .  | 103  |
| הַפְּטָפִים, 1 Kings xviii. 21. <i>Morris Fastrow, Jr.</i> . . . . .       | 108  |
| Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult. <i>Ismar J. Peritz</i> . . . . .         | 111  |
| The Original Form of Leviticus xxi., xxii. <i>L. B. Paton</i> . . . . .    | 149  |
| An Emendation of the Papias Fragment. <i>B. W. Bacon</i> . . . . .         | 176  |
| The Authorship of Romans xv., xvi. <i>W. H. Ryder</i> . . . . .            | 184  |
| On קִישִׁי and קִישִׁדוֹ. <i>R. J. H. Gottheil</i> . . . . .               | 199  |
| On Daniel viii. 11, 12. <i>J. Dyneley Prince</i> . . . . .                 | 203  |
| Note on Psalm cxxi. 1. <i>Dean A. Walker</i> . . . . .                     | 205  |
| Dr. Torrey on the Edomites. <i>T. K. Cheyne</i> . . . . .                  | 207  |
| Proceedings of the Society, December, 1897 . . . . .                       | i    |
| Officers and Members of the Society . . . . .                              | iv   |
| Constitution and By-Laws . . . . .   | xiii |



---

Front Matter

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898)

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268787>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# JOURNAL

OF

# BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOL. XVII. 1898 PART II.

## CONTENTS.

|  | PAGE  |
|--|-------|
| 1. WOMAN IN THE ANCIENT HEBREW CULT. <i>Ismar J. Peritz</i> . . . . .      | 111   |
| 2. THE ORIGINAL FORM OF LEVITICUS XXI., XXII. <i>L. B. Paton</i> . . . . . | 149   |
| 3. AN EMENDATION OF THE PAPIAS FRAGMENT. <i>B. W. Bacon</i> . . . . .      | 176   |
| 4. THE AUTHORSHIP OF ROMANS XV., XVI. <i>W. H. Ryder</i> . . . . .         | 184   |
| 5. ON קִישִׁדּוֹ AND קִישִׁ. <i>R. J. H. Gottheil</i> . . . . .            | 199   |
| 6. ON DANIEL VIII. 11, 12. <i>J. Dyneley Prince</i> . . . . .              | 203   |
| 7. NOTE ON PSALM CXXI. I. <i>Dean A. Walker</i> . . . . .                  | 205   |
| 8. DR. TORREY ON THE EDMITES. <i>T. K. Cheyne</i> . . . . .                | 207   |
| <br>PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY, DECEMBER, 1897 . . . . .                   | <br>i |
| OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY . . . . .                              | iv    |
| CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS . . . . .   | xiii  |

PUBLISHED BY THE

Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

1898.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00.

SINGLE NUMBERS, \$1.50.

To be had of the Secretary, W. H. COBB, Congregational Library, Boston, Mass.



---

Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult

Author(s): Ismar J. Peritz

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 111-148

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268788>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

SEVENTEENTH YEAR—1898—PART II.

---

## Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult.

PROF. ISMAR J. PERITZ.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

### 1. Introduction. Current View of Woman's Relation to the Cult.

THE opinion has found considerable currency that woman, on account of her sex, was disqualified to perform the duties of the religious cult among the Hebrews; that in the absence of males in the family, the cult of the deceased could not be perpetuated. The chief representatives of this view are Stade, Schwally, Benzinger, and Nowack. Benzinger (*Hebräische Archäologie*, p. 140) has given it amplest expression; and, in order to have it clearly before us, I quote his words in full: "Noch an einem anderen Punkt zeigt sich die Inferiorität der Frau deutlich: die Frau war nicht fähig zur Ausübung des Kultus. Die Sitte der Schwagerehe setzt die Anschauung voraus, dass Frau und Töchter nicht im Stande sind, den Kultus des Toten zu pflegen. Aus demselben Grund kam ihnen nur ein sehr beschränktes Erbrecht zu, ebensowenig wurden der Frau nach dem Tod kultische Ehren zu teil. Nur als Ehefrau war ihr eine gewisse Teilnahme am Kulte des Mannes gestattet. Bis auf den heutigen Tag hat sich bei den Juden diese Vorstellung erhalten: die Frauen dürfen dem Gottesdienst in der Synagoge anwohnen, die Mädchen sind davon ausgeschlossen. Nicht minder wird im Islâm die Frau als unfähig zur Kultusübung betrachtet. Dass schon frühe einzelne Frauen als Prophetinnen auftreten, ist eine Ausnahme, welche die Regel bestätigt."

Nowack (*Hebräische Archäologie* i. 344 f., 348) is less sweeping in his statements, but also affirms that the levirate law had for its main object to provide male descent for the dead, because woman was unqualified to participate in the cult; that this disqualification also lay at the basis of the Hebrew laws of inheritance; and that

only the son, or the nearest male, and not the female, was qualified to transmit the cult of the testator.

The expression of this view reaches, it seems to me, the strangest height, when Schwally (*ZATW.* xi. 176 ff.) endeavors to explain the word **זָכָר**, 'male,' as connected with **קָוִי בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים**, 'to call in cult upon God,' and meaning therefore first 'a cultic person,' then, on the assumption, according to the view in question, that this cultic person can be in all Israelitish and Semitic antiquity only a man, meaning, secondly, 'a male.' This sexual meaning was then, thirdly, transferred from men to animals, and reached the highest point of development in the Arabic and Aramaic in the meaning, fourthly, "das männliche Glied." Leaving out of consideration the assumption as to cult, such a view of an etymological development from a distinct spiritual meaning to the lowest physical will never commend itself as an improvement on the older view represented by Gesenius, *s.v.*

None of the three authorities mentioned seems to speak from independent investigation of the subject of woman's relation to the Hebrew or Semitic cult. All three are evidently dependent upon Stade, and simply follow him.

Stade reaches his conclusion in a peculiar manner. He is dealing with the Hebrew family in pre-prophetic time, and he finds in the customs of mourning evidences of a cult of the dead and indications of ancestor-worship. He concludes from these indications that ancestor-worship was a prime factor in the formation of the ancient Israelitish family. Here he begins to call attention to similarities in the organization of the ancient Greek, Roman, and Indian families, and to draw parallels between them and the Semitic. The ancient Indo-Germanic family was a "Cultgenossenschaft," held together by the common bond of worship of the ancestors of the family, whose altar is the family altar, and whose priest is the father and the lord of the house. This cult explains the most ancient laws of the people. Can similar ancient Hebrew laws find a similar explanation? In answering this question affirmatively Stade proceeds to instance the law of inheritance. This law among the ancient Hebrews, as among the ancient Greeks and Romans, was originally that of agnates. In ancient Israel the son only is the heir, not the daughter. Stade asserts that wherever this law of inheritance is found, the ground for it is that only the son, or the nearest male relative, taking his place as the heir, can perpetuate the cult of the testator (*Geschichte* i. 388-391).

It is important to observe that Stade's conclusion, denying woman her share in the ancient Hebrew cult, is not based upon any direct evidence derived from the Old Testament itself, but upon a remote and supposed analogy which connects a question of cult with that of the law of inheritance, and upon an utter disregard of all phenomena in the Old Testament that may point the other way.

The connection of the law of inheritance with the admission to the cult, and the explanation of the former from this source, are entirely forced and unsatisfactory. That the inheritance in old Israel was restricted to agnates is true enough (Nowack, *Arch.* i. 348 f.); but we may well ask whether there is not a simpler explanation of the fact. The weakness of Stade's position becomes very apparent when, in his attempt to support his view of the dependence of the right to inherit upon admission to the cult, he refers to Gen. 15<sup>2f.</sup> as the solitary evidence. Now, the ancient custom that in default of a son the slave of the master becomes heir may prove that Abraham had no son, but how it can prove that Eliezer was the last representative of the family cult, save on the assumption of that which Stade endeavors to prove, I cannot see.

But the fact of woman's exclusion from the Hebrew laws of inheritance does not need explanation from her relation to the cult. There is a better way. W. Robertson Smith mentions a similar law among the Arabs. Smith shows that antique Arab society had its basis not in the patriarchal authority, the family, but in the stock or kinship tribe, an organization that has for its object offence and defence, and that the whole law of the old Arabs resolves itself into a law of war, in which blood-feud, blood-wite, and booty are the points on which everything turns. The law of inheritance there follows the law of booty. The tribe owned the property of which the individual had only a usufruct, and which fell to be divided after his death like the spoils of war. The right of inheritance belonged to the active members of the tribe. This explains the relation of woman to the law of inheritance, and is in accordance with the old law of Medina, quoted by Smith, in which women were excluded from inheritance on the principle that "none can be heirs who do not take part in battle, drive booty, and protect property." See W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, pp. 33-58, and his note on "Law of Inheritance," p. 263.

Now, it is a well-recognized fact that the affinity in social organization and ancient law is far greater between the Arabs and the Hebrews than between the Semites and the Greeks and Romans. And so woman's exclusion from inheritance finds here, it seems to

me, a natural, reasonable, and more direct explanation, and does not need the assumption that woman was excluded from the ancient Hebrew cult. It thus appears that the current opinion on woman's relation to the Hebrew cult is by no means based upon a special and direct investigation of the subject. This phase of Hebrew antiquity has so far received no critical treatment.<sup>1</sup> Because in later Levitical legislation man is made prominent in the cult, and later Judaism has in Herod's Temple a "Court of Women," and the Mishna exempts woman from reading the Shema' and the ritual of the phylacteries (*Berakoth* 3<sup>3</sup>), and in the Middle Ages woman was relegated to the galleries of the synagogues,<sup>2</sup> and Jewish men now pray: "Blessed art thou, Lord, our God, King of the world, that thou hast not made me a woman" (*Hebrew Prayer Book*: part of the daily morning prayer), and because Islam excludes woman from the cult, it has been taken for granted that this exclusion was from the beginning a distinctive feature of Semitic cult. The facts on the subject, as contained in the Old Testament, and supplied by other Semitic religions, have not been collected and squarely looked in the face. To supply this evident lack is the object of this essay. My method of treatment is to collect, arrange, and explain some of the more prominent facts in regard to woman's position in other Semitic cults in general, but more especially, *all* the facts bearing upon woman's position in the ancient and later Hebrew cult as contained in the Old Testament. The conclusion to which the facts thus treated have led me, if I may here anticipate, is that the Semites in general, and the Hebrews in particular, and the latter especially in the earlier periods of their history, exhibit no tendency to discriminate between man and woman so far as regards participation in religious practices, but that woman participates in all the essentials of the cult, both as worshipper and official; and that only in later time, with the progress in the development of the cult itself, a tendency appears, not so much, however, to exclude woman from the cult, as rather to make man prominent in it.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Schechter, in his *Studies in Judaism*, under the caption, "Woman in Temple and Synagogue," touches lightly, and in a popular way, upon some of the surface facts of the subject. His essay cannot be regarded as a critical contribution to the subject, and in fact he does not lay claim to such a contribution. See p. 313.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Israel Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, p. 25 f.

<sup>3</sup> I hope, at some future time, as a second part of the subject, to treat fully of the causes of woman's later inferior position in the cult, and her final, apparently entire, exclusion from it.

## 2. Woman in Other Semitic Cults.

That we have reason to look to other Semitic cults for light has been fully demonstrated by the researches of W. R. Smith, embodied in his *Religion of the Semites*. The fundamental institutions of the Israelites had a common origin with those of the other Semitic peoples. The relation of woman to the other Semitic cults has therefore a vital bearing on our question, and must all the more receive some attention, since Schwally (*ZATW.* xi. 178) claims that "im israelitischen, überhaupt im ganzen semitischen Altertum," man only possessed the qualification to perform independently the duties of the religious cult.

### 1. *Woman in the Arabic Cult.*

Islam is no such ancient nor unadulterated source as to supply much that is helpful in the investigation of the early Hebrew cult. It is far different with pre-Islamic, Arabic heathenism. Here we may well go with confidence for analogies and explanations. We are not, therefore, like Benzinger, so much concerned with the relation of woman to the cult of Islam as with her relation to the cult of Arabic heathenism. Fortunately, meagre as the source in general is, it yields material enough to leave beyond any question woman's relation to Arabic cult. The facts, as collected mainly from Wellhausen's *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, lead to the conclusion that this relation is one of almost perfect parity with that of man, there being not the slightest indication that the question of sex from a religious point of view ever comes into consideration.

(1) *Female Divinities.*—Female divinities are numerous, and play a very important rôle in Arabic heathenism. The Jinns even were mostly feminine (Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 135). Local divinities of Mecca were Isâf and Nâila, man and wife (p. 73). In the Ka'ba at Mecca stood a dove of aloe wood, a fact pointing to the great Semitic goddess (p. 70). Suvâ', one of the five "idols of the people of Noah," was worshipped by the Beni Hamdân, and in the form of a woman; so a late tradition says, which, however, according to Wellhausen, is not reliable (p. 16). According to Epiphanius the worship of Dhu lShara was associated with that of his virgin mother (p. 46). Shams was a goddess (p. 56). But chief of all are "the three daughters of Allah," the goddesses Al Lât, Manât, and Al 'Uzza, whose worship possessed more vitality and importance than that of all the male divinities, Allah only excepted. All Arabia was most zealously

devoted to them, the polemic against them in the Koran being but a small part of the evidence of this fact (p. 21 ff., p. 71). A religion that pays such homage to female divinities is not likely to discriminate against woman in matters of cult; at any rate only the most positive testimony can carry any weight in the matter.

(2) *Women as Devotees.* — Women frequented the places of worship. At the annual Ḥajj at Mecca married and unmarried women were present (p. 85). The reference in Yaqut to the backs of the women jostling at Dhu l-Khalaṣa is an indication in what throngs the women attended the sanctuaries (Wellh., p. 43; Smith, *Kinship*, p. 295).

But the women's devotion was not confined to simple attendance; they brought their votive offerings. There is ancient testimony to the fact that the women worshipped Al Uzza "daily with sacrifices and gifts" (Wellh., p. 37; cf. also pp. 112, 101).

The two principal acts of Arabic worship, the 'stroking' (*ta-massuh*), and (most important of all) the *ṭawāf*, or act of encircling the sacred stone, were participated in by the women as well as by the men (Wellh., pp. 52, 105 f., 118).

In the cult of the dead the women had even more than their share. It was theirs to chant the rhythmical dirge; the institution of the professional mourning men is later than that of the mourning women (p. 160).<sup>4</sup> The regulation that woman during the period of her purification must not approach the sanctuary (pp. 52 and 118) is but the evidence of the single exception that proves her inclusion in the cult. For an interesting story of the conversion of a Dausite and his wife, illustrating many points of the intimate association of man with woman in religion, see Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 45.

(3) *Woman as Cultic Official.* — Arabic heathenism had two chief cultic officials: *sādin* (temple watchman), or *ḥājib* (doorkeeper), the temple servant or priest, and *kāhin*, seer, prophet. In the latter class women are numerous (Wellh., p. 130); but of the woman *sādin* there is not a single instance that I can find. But this fact finds a simple explanation as soon as the nature of the office is examined. The *sādin* was not a priest whose specific prerogative it was to officiate at the altar. Such an official the Arabs never had. He was not needed for sacrificing, and, though the sacred lot was in his keeping, and he, in general, officiated at the casting of the sacred

<sup>4</sup> Circumcision was practised, among some tribes, upon girls (p. 154 f., 168). But this custom, found also among certain uncivilized tribes in Africa, was merely one feature in the consecration of all the members of the tribe to the deity.

lots, even that could be done without him (Wellh., p. 129). The *sâdin* or *hâjib*, as the names indicate, was the watchman, the door-keeper of the sanctuary. Arabic nomadic life had given a peculiar form of duty to this office. In general the sanctuaries did not wander with the tribes, but remained stationary; but there are cases where the idol did share in the nomadic life, and was carried into battle like the ark of Jahveh (Wellh., pp. 18 and 129). Cases of theft of idols, even, are not unheard of (p. 18). The *sâdin* became in this manner the resident, the defender, and, in time, the actual possessor of the sanctuary. By a natural law of selection, the office of watcher, protector, and possessor would fall to man and not to woman. The absence of woman from this office cannot therefore be taken as implying a discrimination against woman in reference to the cult.

This view is confirmed by the fact that woman was not excluded from the office of *kâhin*, which carried with it far greater cultic significance. This significance becomes all the more apparent when the original position of the *kâhin* is recognized. There is every reason for accepting the conclusion of W. R. Smith, Wellhausen, and most moderns, that the office of the *sâdin* was originally included in that of the *kâhin*, which corresponded very nearly to that of the early Hebrew *kôhen*. In course of development the *kâhins* branched off from the general priestly body, carrying with them the principal part of its duty and the ancient title of honor, and leaving behind them a class of officials who sank into mere *âditui* (Wellh., p. 134; W. R. Smith, *Journal of Philology* xiii. 278). The *kâhin* therefore was originally the great official of the cult, and women, as stated, are frequently found holding this office.

It thus appears that the testimony of Arabic heathenism on woman's relation to the cult is comprehensive, clear, and uniform. Whether as divinity, devotee, or cultic official, woman shares cultic duties with man, and in matters of religion there is no sign of any discrimination against her on account of her sex.

## 2. *Woman in Assyro-Babylonian, Phœnician, and other Semitic Cults.*

Babylonian and Assyrian cults do not furnish altogether as safe a basis for comparison with the Hebrew cult as that of Arabic heathenism. Babylonian and Assyrian religions, as is generally held, are syncretistic, mixed with non-Semitic elements, and developed under physical and moral conditions different from those which determined

the Hebrew development. This is in great measure true also of the Phœnician cult—a result due, no doubt, to its close relation to the Assyro-Babylonian. One feels the need, therefore, of caution in the use of material from these sources. Yet there are certain general features which recur with striking uniformity in all parts of the Semitic field, as W. R. Smith has said (*Rel. of Sem.*, p. 14 ff.). The relation of woman to the cult, it may be safely asserted, is one of these. As my purpose is simply to allow a side light from this direction to fall upon the main question, it will not require an exhaustive treatment.

(1) *Female Divinities.*—It will not be necessary to name all of the numerous female divinities of the Assyro-Babylonian pantheon. As the representative of them all, we may call to mind the Babylonian Ishtar, who was venerated as the mother goddess, the queen, head and firstborn of all gods. (Cf. W. R. Smith, *Rel.*, p. 56 ff.) Among the other female divinities may be named Damkina, Nana, Nin-gal, Gula, Anunit, and Zarpanit. In pairs often occur the divinities: as, Bel and Belit; Ea and Damkina.

The Phœnicians have by the side of בעל a בעלת, both distinguished by many additional names, expressing either attributes or names of cities devoted to their worship. Besides, they worshipped עשתרת, Astarte, the great Semitic goddess, and תנית, Tanith. Cf. Baethgen, *Beiträge*, pp. 29, 31, 26 ff.; Baudissin, *PRE<sup>3</sup>*. s.v. Astarte, Baal; Pietschmann, *Geschichte d. Phœnizier*, p. 182 ff.

The Moabites worshipped by the side of כמשי an עשתר כמשי who was most probably a female divinity. (Cf. Baudissin, *PRE<sup>3</sup>*. ii. 150, 156, and Baethgen, pp. 14, 256.) To her Mesha, according to his inscription, devoted the Israelitish captives. Cf. the inscription of King Mesha on the Moabite stone, l. 17.

The Aramæans worshipped by the side of Hadad the female divinity Atargatis, who was the great Syrian goddess, even outranking Hadad. Cf. Baethgen, 68, 74.

(2) *Women as Devotees.*—It would be safe to let this question rest on a *priori* grounds: that cults which pay such homage to female divinities cannot discriminate in matters of cult against the female sex. But there is all the direct testimony that is needed. Woman's intimate relation to the divinity finds expression in some of the female names, viz. אמתמלקרת and מתמלקרת, "Handmaid of Melkart"; חתמלקרת, "Sister of Melkart"; חנמלקרת, "Grace of Melkart"; cf. Euting, *Sammlung Karthag. Inschriften*, 153, 320, 213, 165, quoted by Baethgen, p. 21; so also אמתעשתרת (*CIS.* 46), חתמלכת (*CIS.* 231), נעמלכת (*CIS.* 41).

But the most abundant evidence we find in the Old Testament itself in the numerous allusions to woman's participation in foreign cults, of which I treat further on. See p. 120.

(3) *Woman as Cultic Official*. — Meissner, in his *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht* (pp. 8 and 111, § 12), speaks of financial functions of priests and priestesses, the latter's official position in the temple being indicated by *SAL* (or *UD*) *Šamaš*; cf. also Peiser, *Babylonische Verträge d. Berl. Mus.*, pp. xvii–xxix.

There were priestesses of Ishtar at Uruk (cf. Jeremias, *Izdubar-Nimrod*, p. 59 f.).

Prophetesses, who tell the messages of the gods, are mentioned in connection with the 'seers' in the text of Gudea. Cf. Amiaud, "The Inscription of Telloh," *Records of the Past*, New Series, i. 42, ii. 78.

To the same class of officials belong, most probably, also the priestesses or prophetesses whose names are attached to the oracular responses of Istar of Arbela. Cf. Pinches, "The Oracle of Istar of Arbela," *Records of the Past*, New Series, v. 129 ff.; Tiele, *Gesch. d. Rel.*, p. 195.

These scattered references have led me to go carefully through Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* in quest of designations of these female officials. To give this subject the thorough treatment it needs would require too long a digression, and I therefore present these designations in a simple alphabetical order: —

- (1) *uḫātu*, eine weibliche Hierodule, näher Dienerin der Göttin Istar von Erech. They appear also as "Klagefrauen beim Tammuz-Fest" (Del., p. 41).
- (2) *ēpištu*, fem. of part. *ēpišu*, Hexe (p. 119).
- (3) *āsiptu*, fem. of *āsiptu*, Beschwörer (p. 247).
- (4) *zirmaštu*, ein Epitheton, bez. Name der Zauberin oder Hexe (p. 264).
- (5) *ḫarimtu* auch *ḫarmatu*, eine weibliche Hierodule, näher Dienerin der Göttin Istar zu Erech (p. 290).
- (6) *kaššaptu*, fem. of *kaššapu*, Zauberin, Hexe (p. 360).
- (7) *mahḫutu*, fem. of *mahḫu*, der von Ekstase befallene, von Sinnen seiende (vgl. מַשְׁפָּטִים), Prophet, Wahrsager, *μάντις*, bez. Prophetin (p. 397).
- (8) *ḫadištu* (*gadištu*), Hierodule, eine dem Dienste der Göttin Istar geweihte und dadurch entweihte Jungfrau (vgl. קַדְוָה). The term is also used of the Zauberin und Hexe (p. 581).
- (9) *šabrātu*, fem. of *šabrū*, eine best. Berufsart, viell. Magier, Seher (p. 639).

On woman's position as official in Phoenician cult, the Eshmun-azar inscription furnishes a word that is of the highest import. The Sidonian king, naming his mother, calls her not only אִמְעִשְׁתָּרַת, but he designates her also כַּהֲנַת עִשְׁתָּרַת, the feminine form of כַּהֵן, found here for the first time. Cf. *CIS.* 3, l. 14 f.

### 3. *Old Testament References to Woman's Relation to other Semitic Cults.*

As furnishing us with a view of the relation of woman to other and especially Semitic cults, the allusions in the Old Testament must not be overlooked. These allusions cover two points: (1) The worship of strange gods by devotees who were either Canaanites or immigrants on Israelitish soil, and (2) the worship of strange gods by the Hebrew women themselves. The chief means by which the first could establish itself alongside of the Hebrew cult was intermarriage. As Professor Moore says: "The connubium in itself involved the recognition of one another's religion, and was naturally followed by participation in the cultus" (*Judges*, p. 83). Hence, the result of such unions is uniformly stated to have been the establishment of the foreign cult (cf. Ju. 3<sup>5f.</sup> 1 Ki. 11<sup>1-8</sup>). But our chief interest here lies in the intense zeal which the strange wives of the Hebrews manifested in the observance and propagation of their native cults. Here, of course, Jezebel will first come to mind.<sup>5</sup> But that she was by no means the only instance can be easily gathered from such notices as that which speaks of Solomon's readiness to provide the means for the worship of his "strange wives which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods" (1 Ki. 11<sup>8</sup>), and more still from the numerous Deuteronomic passages which ascribe the spread of idolatry to these intermarriages, and strictly forbid them on that ground (Ex. 34<sup>15f.</sup> Dt. 7<sup>3f.</sup> Jos. 23<sup>12f.</sup>). It will be seen that these facts gathered from the Old Testament confirm the view arrived at from the more direct sources, that woman's part in the other Semitic cults was intensely active.

But this activity was not confined to non-Hebrew women. Even before Jezebel, Maacah, the mother of Asa (1 Ki. 15<sup>13</sup>), had manifested her zeal for the Canaanitish cult of Astarte (cf. Stade, *Gesch.* i. 355; Baethgen, *Beiträge*, p. 218; Baudissin, *PRE<sup>3</sup>*. s.v. Astarte, Aschera) by erecting to her worship a **מַבְלַצֵּת**, which was probably nothing else than an **אֲשֵׁרָה**, which Asa in the progress of a religious reformation hews down, and burns in the valley of the Kidron, and at the same time punishes his mother's idolatrous tendencies by depriving her of the rank of the queen-mother. As the Jezebel of the southern kingdom appears Athaliah, probably Jezebel's daughter (cf. Stade, *Gesch.* i. 524, note 2). That her zealous endeavor to establish the Phœnician cult on Judæan soil was not void of suc-

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 1 Ki. 16<sup>31</sup> ff. 18<sup>4</sup>. 13. 19 19<sup>2</sup> 2 Ki. 3<sup>13</sup> 9<sup>22b</sup>.

cess is evident from the bitterness with which she is mentioned (cf. 2 Ki. 8<sup>18, 26 f.</sup> 2 Chr. 21<sup>6</sup> 22<sup>2 f.</sup> 24<sup>7</sup>).

In the time of the prophet Jeremiah (7<sup>13</sup> 44<sup>15 ff.</sup>) the Hebrew women vied with one another in their devotion to the Assyrian cult of Ishtar, whom they worshipped under the name of מַלְכַת הַשָּׁמַיִם (cf. Baudissin, *PRE*<sup>3</sup>. s.v. Astarte), claiming it to be a well-established cult, the practice of which had always been a source of prosperity, and its neglect the cause of adversity (44<sup>17 f.</sup>). One feature of the cult is characteristically feminine: while the children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, the women knead the dough, and bake the cakes in the moon-shaped form to portray the goddess (cf. v. Orelli, *Jeremia*, on 44<sup>19</sup>; Wellhausen, *Heid.*, p. 38 f.).

To this cult most probably belongs the reference 2 Ki. 23<sup>7b</sup>, where the Massoretic כְּתִיִם might well be corrected (on the basis of Cod. Alex. χερτικιμ = כְּתִיִם probably for כְּתָנִים) to כְּתָנִים, χιτων (Lucian *στολάς*), *tunica* (cf. Klostermann *in loc.*), pointing to an activity on the part of some of the women (perhaps the קְדֻשֹׁת) in providing garments probably used in the act of the worship of Astarte; for the custom of changing garments in preparation for the approach of the divinity, and of priests supplying such garments, finds illustration in other cults (cf. Wellh., *Heid.*, pp. 52, 106; Gen. 35<sup>2</sup> 2 Ki. 10<sup>22</sup>). This explanation of the passage, it seems to me, will furnish the best answer to Stade's rather too ready expedient that the second half of the verse is a "naïve Glosse eines Späteren" (*Gesch.* i. 653, note 4).

To Ezekiel (8<sup>14</sup>) we are indebted for the bare mention of the Hebrew women's devotion to the worship of Tammuz.<sup>6</sup> The phraseology with which he describes the worship, "there sat the women weeping for Tammuz," leaves its identity with that of Adonis under his Babylonian name, the characteristic of which was lamentation, without a doubt (cf. Baudissin, *Studien* i. 35, 300 ff.).

Woman's part as devotee in the worship of Melek, the sacrificing of children in the Valley of Hinnom, which dates back as far as Ahaz, and reached frightful dimensions in the dark days of the seventh century,<sup>7</sup> is not directly stated in the Old Testament. Professor Moore, in his article, "The Image of Moloch" (in this *JOURNAL*, xvi. 163), cites a passage from Plutarch (*De Superstitione*, c. 13),

<sup>6</sup> That Zechariah's "mourning for Hadadrimmon" (*Zech.* 12<sup>11</sup>) has no connection with Tammuz or Adonis worship has been shown by Baudissin (*Studien* i. 295 ff.).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. W. R. Smith, *Encycl. Brit*<sup>9</sup>. xvi. 696; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 609 f.; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 222 f.

according to which the Carthaginians used to sacrifice their own children, and those who had no offspring of their own used to buy children from the poor, and slaughter them, as if they were lambs or birds. At these sacrifices the mother stood by, unmoved, without a groan. That there was also no distinction of sex in that cult as far as the victim itself was concerned is evident from the recurring phrase "to make one's son or daughter to pass through the fire to Moloch" (2 Ki. 23<sup>10</sup> Jer. 32<sup>35</sup>, etc.). There is sufficient reason to suppose, then, that the general terms "children of Judah" (Jer. 7<sup>30</sup>), "inhabitants of Jerusalem" (19<sup>3</sup>), "this city" (19<sup>8</sup>), used by the prophets condemning the practice include both men and women. (Cf. Jer. 32<sup>32</sup> Ez. 16<sup>2ff.</sup>, and compare Jer. 19<sup>13</sup> with 44<sup>15</sup>.)<sup>8</sup>

It appears then that the facts thus collected from the Old Testament on woman's relation to the foreign cults give very clear testimony, and that it is throughout to the effect that woman, whether native or Hebrew, shared in all the religious activities, and often excelled in manifesting religious zeal. Well might the Deuteronomic lawgiver, aware of woman's religious interest and zeal, provide the most drastic measures for its destruction (cf. Dt. 13<sup>7-12</sup> (6-11) 17<sup>2-5</sup>).

### 3. Woman as Devotee in the Jahveh Cult.

#### 1. *The Presence of Women at the Sanctuary and Religious Gatherings.*

Hannah and Peninnah, as also the daughters of Elkanah, were accustomed to go up to the yearly religious gathering before Jahveh in Shiloh (1 S. 1<sup>1ff.</sup> 2<sup>19</sup>). How general this custom was among women is indicated in the question which the husband of the Shunamite woman asks: "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? it is neither new moon, nor sabbath" (2 Ki. 4<sup>23</sup>). The rape of the Shilonite maidens is planned in expectation, and carried into effect in the realization, of the fact of the presence of the daughters of Shiloh at the annual feast of Jahveh (Ju. 21<sup>6-25</sup>). At the feast that David makes in honor of the removing of the ark of Jahveh, the religious character of which is confirmed by the offering of sacrifices, women are present (2 S. 6<sup>19</sup>). The legislation of Deuteronomy definitely

<sup>8</sup> As the Philistine religion seems to have been strongly influenced by Semitic religions (cf. Baethgen, *Rel.*, p. 65), it is not altogether irrelevant to call attention to the fact that, little as is known of the Philistine Dagon cult (cf. Baudissin, *PRE<sup>3</sup>. s.v. Dagon*), it is nevertheless evident from Ju. 16<sup>23ff.</sup> that men and women alike mingled in the temple precincts and participated in the festive occasions.

provides for woman's presence at the sanctuary at festal seasons (Dt. 12<sup>12, 18</sup> 14<sup>26</sup> 15<sup>20</sup> 16<sup>11, 14</sup>).<sup>9</sup> In like manner, at that great religious gathering, the reading of the law, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, woman appears side by side with man in all the solemnity and joy of the occasion (Neh. 8<sup>2, 3</sup> 12<sup>43</sup>).

## 2. *Woman's Participation in the Sacrificial Meals.*

There is full evidence that women were by no means mere idle spectators at these religious gatherings, but that, on the contrary, they shared in every important cultic act. Chief among these were the sacrificial meals. When Elkanah sacrifices he gives to his wives and daughters "portions" (1 S. 1<sup>4</sup>).<sup>10</sup> If it were certain that אֶשְׁפֶּר in 2 S. 6<sup>19</sup> and its parallel 1 Chr. 16<sup>3</sup> means "a good piece of flesh," A.V., or "a portion of flesh," R.V., as some ancient versions render it, and as may well be expected here to complete the triad of such festal occasions, bread, flesh, and wine,<sup>11</sup> it might furnish another instance in earlier times of woman's participation in the sacrificial meal. But the text is altogether too uncertain.<sup>12</sup> But we have by no means need to depend upon uncertain data. The Deuteronomic legislation is as full as it is explicit upon woman's participation in the sacrificial meals and leaves it beyond any question. Regulating what was no doubt an antique custom, it specifies in a number of distinct passages that at the great sacrificial feast at the central sanctuary woman is to have her share (Dt. 12<sup>12</sup> 14<sup>22-29</sup> 15<sup>19-23</sup> 16<sup>9-12, 13-15</sup>). An important illustration on a large scale, that this custom existed not simply in law but in actual practice, even in post-exilic times, is furnished by the sacrificial meal at the publication of the law in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. 12<sup>43</sup>).

Additional evidence of a similar character comes to us from a somewhat different source. The Levitical legislation is much concerned with the disposition of that part of the sacrifice which fell to the priest. The material is divided into קֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשׁים and קֹדֶשׁ.

<sup>9</sup> In view of this definite provision, the regulation "Three times a year shall all thy males appear in the presence of Jahveh" (Ex. 23<sup>17</sup> 34<sup>23</sup> Dt. 16<sup>16</sup>), can not possibly imply the exclusion of woman. But more on that subject below.

<sup>10</sup> The word מִנְחָה is a technical term almost exclusively used of the portion of sacrifice that falls to the priest, or of the sacrificial meal that falls to the worshipper (Ex. 29<sup>26</sup> Lev. 7<sup>33</sup> 8<sup>29</sup> 2 Chr. 31<sup>19</sup> 1 S. 9<sup>23</sup>). When in later usage the term is widened to cover portions of other meals, the festal character of the meal is still apparent (Neh. 8<sup>10, 12</sup> Esth. 2<sup>9</sup> 9<sup>19, 22</sup>).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Klostermann, *Samuelis*, in loc.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Driver, *Text of Samuel*, p. 207 f.

The first class may be eaten by the male members of the Aaronic family only; the second class may be eaten by the female members as well (Lev. 10<sup>12-15</sup> 22<sup>1-16</sup> Nu. 18<sup>8-19</sup>). The question, why in the later legislation the women of priestly families were excluded from sharing in the most holy things, need not detain us at this point. The fact that they were permitted to share in the holy things, which was strictly forbidden to outsiders,<sup>13</sup> is in line with the fact of their sharing in the sacrificial meals in general.

Woman's participation in the festal meals has, of course, always been recognized; but its relation to her position in cult has so far not been deemed worthy of notice. The tendency has been to speak of these sacrificial meals, either in a general way, as of a 'family' feast, without recognizing specially, or else ignoring, the female element, or else as of 'feasts' without any particular religious significance (Keil, *Deut.*, 359 f.; Oehler, *O. T. Theology*, Engl. Transl., p. 291; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 143; Benz., *Arch.*, 438; Nowack, *Arch.* ii. 213). Woman's share in them clearly defined, it is yet necessary to call attention to and emphasize the cultic significance of these sacrificial meals.

Eating as an act of worship in connection with sacrifice is a familiar fact in Semitic as well as in other religions. W. R. Smith has made it probable<sup>14</sup> that Semitic religion, as it appears in historical times, is founded on the conception of kinship between the god and the worshipper,<sup>15</sup> and the leading idea in the animal sacrifices of the Semites is that of an act of communion in which the god and his worshipper unite by partaking of the flesh and blood of a sacred victim.<sup>16</sup> This idea finds its fullest expression in the Hebrew ritual. As is known, a distinction is made there between sacrifices which are wholly made over to the god and sacrifices which the god and the worshipper share. To the latter class, with which we are mostly concerned, belonged the זבחים and שלמים, that is, all the ordinary festal sacrifices, vows, and free-will offerings, of which the deity received the blood and the fat of the intestines, while the rest was left to the worshipper for a social feast.

The participation in these sacrificial meals, it is to be noticed, is hedged about with severe restrictions, and invested with the utmost

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Lev. 22. This stands out all the more clearly when the exceptions are taken into account; viz., when the priest's daughter had married a stranger, or was a widow, or divorced and had a child, and so had retired outside of the priestly circle. Cf. Lev. 22<sup>12f.</sup>

<sup>14</sup> *Rel. of Sem.*, Lectures vi.-viii.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

solemnity. Levitical legislation emphatically provides that the food must be eaten within a specified time, that is, before there was any danger of putrefaction;<sup>17</sup> otherwise it is to be burned; nothing ceremonially unclean must touch it; the person, ceremonially unclean, who eats of it "shall be cut off" (Lev. 7<sup>15-21</sup> 19<sup>6-8</sup> 22<sup>30</sup>). Similar precautions surround the eating of the priest's portion. That the eating of the priest's portion of every sacrifice constituted a sacrificial meal like that of the worshipper may well be questioned (cf. Benz., *Archäol.*, p. 456 f.), but is of no essential importance in our inquiry. Apart from that, there is every evidence of the sanctity of the food. It is called קֹדֶשׁ, it must be eaten in a holy place, the ceremonially unclean are forbidden to eat it, and members of the Aaronic family and household only are allowed to partake of it.

The reason for all these precautions is obvious: sacrifice and the sacrificial meal were acts of communion between the god and the worshipper, and approach to it, or partaking of it, was surrounded by all the possible safeguards that surrounded the approach to the god. Yet woman, as has been shown, had free access to it. It is obvious that the participation in an act of such cultic importance finds a far better explanation in woman's inclusion in the cult than any ignoring or belittling of such inclusion can possibly furnish.

### 3. *Woman's Participation in the Sacrificial Act.*

In approaching this phase of the question it is necessary to call to mind what is now well recognized, that the act of sacrifice in the Hebrew cult had its own history of development.<sup>18</sup> At first all slaughter was sacrifice; no priest was needed to perform the sacrificial act, the worshipper was in this respect his own priest. Later, with the growth of the ritual and a priestly caste, sacrificing becomes the business of the priest, the worshipper recedes from the altar, and his share in the sacrificial act is confined to the laying of the hand upon the victim,<sup>19</sup> which, if we may judge from the analogy of Lev.

<sup>17</sup> The reason that W. R. Smith assigns for this requirement, viz., that the old sacrificial feasts occupied but a single day, or at most two days, and as the act of eating is part of the service it is to be completed before men break up from the sanctuary (*Rel. of Sem.*, p. 221), does not seem to me to be altogether plausible, and I prefer to follow his view on the same point as expressed in another connection. See p. 203, note 8.

<sup>18</sup> Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 199 f.; Nowack, *Arch.* ii. 87, 211, 218 f.; Benz., *Arch.*, 405 f.

<sup>19</sup> Lev. 3<sup>2</sup>, etc. On the meaning of the custom cf. Smith, *Rel.*, pp. 335 and 401 f.; Benz., p. 453.

16<sup>21</sup>, was accompanied by a confession of sins. But, whether in its earlier simplicity or in its later limitation, the share of the worshipper in the act of sacrificing cannot but be regarded as an act of the highest cultic significance.

That women brought sacrifices in old Israel and also in later time is so evident that an attempt to prove it seems an act of supererogation. But it is with this point as with many others connected with the whole question: facts otherwise well known have been either forgotten or ignored.

An illustration from old Israel is the sacrifice of Manoah and his wife (Ju. 13<sup>15-23</sup>), the latter's share in which is expressed in her words [ומנחה]<sup>20</sup> לא־לֶקַח מִיַּדְנִי עֹלָה (vs.<sup>23</sup>). Of like import perhaps are the words about Hannah (1 S. 2<sup>19</sup>) בְּעֹלֹתֶיהָ אֶת־אִישָׁהּ לֹבַח (1 S. 2<sup>19</sup>) אֶת־זֶבַח הַיָּמִים. A valuable testimony to the prevalence of the custom is furnished by the prophet Jeremiah, who speaks of the women of his time as performing the various acts pertaining to sacrifice: they bake cakes, pour out drink offerings, and burn incense (Jer. 7<sup>18</sup> 44<sup>15-17 ff.</sup>). It is true they do not do this in the service of Jahveh; but it will be observed that they are censured by the prophet, not because they as women overstep their prerogative, but rather because they do it "unto other gods."<sup>22</sup>

For later times we have the clearest testimony to the custom in the Levitical legislation which provides, as is well known, for sacrifices of purification for women (Lev. 12 and 15<sup>19-33</sup>).

In the absence of definite information on the point, it is not easy to say precisely with what action on the part of the worshipper in bringing a sacrifice according to the Levitical ritual the strictly cultic act began. Oehler, with good reason, as it seems to me, maintains that the sacrificial act began with the presentation of the victim.<sup>23</sup> Benzinger considers it to begin with the laying on of the hand. But in view of the fact that in the sacrifice when the victims are birds the "pressing on of the hand" סַמֵּךְ יָדוֹ (Maimonides, *בְּכַל־בֶּהֱ*) was omitted, as Benzinger rightly supposes, and as the priest in that case also did the slaughtering (Lev. 1<sup>15</sup>), and there would so be left nothing of cultic significance for the offerer, it seems better to regard

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Moore, *Judg.*, in loc.

<sup>21</sup> The construction of the sentence, it seems to me, makes Hannah the subject of *קִיְבַח*.

<sup>22</sup> That the emphasis is on this is evident from the terms of 44<sup>3</sup> and the numerous repetitions of the phrase "unto other gods" (44<sup>5</sup>, 8, 15, 25, 7<sup>18</sup>).

<sup>23</sup> Oehler, *O. T. Theology*, p. 274.

the presentation itself as a part of the sacrificial act.<sup>24</sup> But whether the presentation itself was a cultic act or not, it is agreed by all that the laying on of the hand was. If there were any need of evidence on this point, it might be furnished by the fact that the Mishna<sup>25</sup> explicitly denies woman the right to perform this act. This is characteristic of the Mishna's treatment of woman's position in the cult, on which more will have to be said in another connection. Here it is sufficient to say that however valuable the Mishna is as a witness to the views of the tradition, it is not a safe guide in the exegesis of any particular passage of Scripture. There is no basis in the text for such a discrimination against woman. The laying on of the hand is the regular feature of the *עלה* (Lev. 4<sup>24</sup>), and woman's offering is an *עלה* which, judging from the words *תביא* and *לקחה*, she herself was to present *אל פתח אהל מועד* (Lev. 12<sup>6, 8</sup>). The absence of the specific mention of the laying on of hands cannot be urged against it here any more than it can where the offerer is a man (Lev. 14<sup>19, 20</sup>). From a source of greater value on this particular point than the Mishna it would seem that we have direct testimony that women did touch their sacrifices. In the complaint over the idolatry and sinfulness of the women (Baruch 6<sup>29</sup>, the Epistle of Jeremy), the statement occurs: "The menstruous woman and the woman in childbed *touch their sacrifices*." The reference here is evidently<sup>26</sup> to what is prohibited in Lev. 12<sup>4</sup>, and may point to the custom that the women like the men laid hands on the sacrifices which they offered. It is possible, however, that the term "touch," as Professor Toy suggests to me, may have reference to the *eating* of the sacrifices by the women of priestly families. But neither the context, which deals with such a variety of cultic acts, nor the term itself, *ἄπτομαι* (in LXX generally for *נגע*, *הניע*), necessarily requires that meaning. We find, therefore, in ancient Israel and in the time to which the Levitical legislation bears witness that in the act of sacrifice women enjoyed equal rights with men.

#### 4. *Woman's Participation in the Vow, Nazirism, and the Function of the Kedesha.*

The intimate relation which the terms *התקדש* and the Arabic

<sup>24</sup> The difficulty raised by Köhler (quoted by Professor Day in Oehler's *O. T. Theol.*, p. 275), that the fitness of the animal was not decided until after the presentation, is easily overcome by the simple supposition that such examination preceded the more formal presentation. <sup>25</sup> *Menachoth* 9<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Zöckler, *Kurzf. Kom.*, on Baruch 6<sup>29</sup>.

*nadhara* (Heb. נָדַר, נָזַר, נָזֵר), sustain to each other, as Wellhausen has pointed out,<sup>27</sup> makes it best to consider them together.<sup>28</sup>

The cultic significance of the vow, Naziritism, and the Kedesha are too well acknowledged by all to require restatement; we simply confine ourselves to woman's relation to them.

I begin with the Nazirite vow as furnishing the fullest and clearest illustration of woman's participation in the cult. The Levitical legislation contained in Nu. 6 aims evidently to regulate a custom that is very ancient (cf. Dillmann, *in loc.*). Now it is a remarkable instance of the truth of my contention that no discrimination is made against woman in her relation to the cult that the whole elaborate ritual with its solemn requirements, its abstinence from all products of the vine, the consecration of the hair, the separation from all defilement, the appearing before the door of the tabernacle with offerings, עֲלָה לַחֲטָאת, שְׁלָמִים, and מִנְחָה, and more especially the hair offering (vs.<sup>18</sup>), all this is introduced with אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה (vs.<sup>2</sup>). The same fact meets us in the regulation of the estimation<sup>29</sup> by which a vowed male or female may be redeemed. The female is there, indeed, valued less than the male, but that this has no bearing on the question of cult is very evident.

In view of this clear evidence of woman's participation in the Nazirite vow, we have reason to suppose that woman is included in

<sup>27</sup> *Heid*, p. 118.

<sup>28</sup> In doing this, and doing it here, I deviate, in the interest of what seems to me correcter method, from Stade, followed by Benzinger and Nowack, who treat of vows under the head of cultic actions, and of Nazirites and Kedesha under the head of holy persons. This is evidently due to a tacit following of the opinion that the Nazirite and the Kedesha were officials. Oehler, who favors such a view (*O. T. Theol.*, p. 295), asserts clearly that Naziritism involved no priestly service, but urges Philo's and Maimonides' inference that there is an intimate relation between the Nazirite vow and the commands of abstinence imposed upon the priesthood. But this similarity appears to me slight ground on which to base the official character of Naziritism. These restrictions are evidently of the nature of taboos incident to a state of consecration, and similar to others, viz., the abstinence from women. (Cf. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, p. 462 ff.) They are of too general a character, covering the cases of worshipper and priest alike, to allow such an inference. On the other hand, the evident absence of any priestly service in Naziritism, the tenor of the laws, and the historical illustrations, point to the Nazirite as a devotee rather than an official. The single instance of Samuel, where the Nazirite vow is found in combination with prophetic and priestly functions is counterbalanced by the case of Samson and the Rechabites. The case is somewhat different with the Kedesha. Yet on foreign soil the Kedesha was mainly a devotee, and only in some cases became an official, of which there is no illustration in Hebrew cult.

<sup>29</sup> Lev. 27<sup>2</sup> ff.

the legislation of the ordinary vow (Nu. 15<sup>11</sup>), although we find it in a general way addressed to man without specific mention of woman. In fact, this must be the case of the legislation in general, unless we should suppose that the decalogue which is addressed to man has no application to woman. That woman made the ordinary vow is not only seen in the case of Hannah (1 S. 1<sup>11</sup>), but is taken for granted and regulated in Nu. 30. The restriction this legislation places upon woman's power to vow is of interest in that it affords a glimpse of a contrast between her relations to society and to the cult. If woman is independent, that is, a widow or divorced, her vow is as binding as that of man; if she is still unmarried in her father's house and her father hears her vow without opposing it, or if she be married and her husband hears her vow without opposing it, it is equally binding, but if her father or husband "disallow her in the day that he heareth; none of her vows, or of her bonds wherewith she hath bound her soul, shall stand; and Jahveh shall forgive her, because her father (or husband) disallowed her" (vs.<sup>6</sup>). The meaning of all this is clear: the *cult* knows here no distinction between man and woman; it is the position of woman in society that introduces the difference.

While it is very evident that the institution of the Kedeschim owes its existence in the Jahveh cult to adoption, its prevalence is well attested.<sup>30</sup> It is not necessary to our purpose to do more at this point than to call attention to the fact that in this lowest and most unnatural form of devotion, as we have found it already in some of the higher, woman appears side by side of man, the קדשות by the side of the קדשים.

##### 5. *Woman's Participation in Prayer.*

If, as Stade does (*Gesch.* i. 487 ff.), we regard prayer equally ancient with sacrifice, usually accompanying the latter, and while permitted and practised elsewhere, properly offered at the sanctuary, it is another important cultic act in which women participated. And I gladly follow Stade in referring to Hannah (1 S. 1<sup>10</sup> ff. 2<sup>1</sup>) as an example illustrating a number of important points connected with the ancient custom of prayer.

And if again we may follow Stade in associating with prayer as

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Stade, i. 479 f.; Benz., p. 428; Nowack, ii. 132; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 264; Dillmann, *Deut.*, p. 349; W. R. Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 133; Baudissin, *REP*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Aschera*, etc.

cultic acts fasting, the blessing, the curse, and the oath,<sup>31</sup> we find woman again participating in them.<sup>32</sup>

#### 6. *Woman's Participation in Consultation of the Oracle and in Theophanies.*

That the oracle and its consultation occupied a very important place in the ancient Hebrew cult is a matter of course.<sup>33</sup> The intimate relation in which the oracle stood to the priesthood speaks for the act of consultation as a cultic rite. That women were accustomed to go to inquire of the oracle is shown by the story of Rebekah (Gen. 25<sup>22f.</sup>), which furnishes us not only with the statement וַתֵּלֶךְ לְדָרֵשׁ אֶת יְהוָה, but also with the quotation of a very ancient oracular response that could have been addressed to a woman only. Even if Stade's view,<sup>34</sup> that the oracular response represents simply the legend of the origin of the oracle at Beersheba, could be established, which is rather doubtful,<sup>35</sup> the legend itself would remain equally forceful as an evidence of the custom of women's participation in the consultation of the oracle.

In this connection, and as pointing to the same fact, that in the conception of the writers of the period no hindrance existed to the free approach of woman to the divinity, may be mentioned the theophanies to women, of which we have not a few illustrations (cf. Gen. 3<sup>13ff.</sup> 16<sup>3ff.</sup> 18<sup>9f. 15</sup> 21<sup>17ff.</sup> Ju. 13<sup>3ff.</sup>).

#### 7. *Other Indications.*

There are some other facts in the Old Testament which, while not dealing directly with woman's relation to the cult, yet furnish indirectly an evidence that is very valuable. They are the evidences of a religious consciousness and influence of woman that are difficult to account for on the supposition of woman's exclusion from the cult, and, on the other hand, best accounted for by the fact that she shared in the general religious life.

(1) *The Women's Naming of their Children.* — It seems to have been a somewhat general practice in Old Testament times for women to give the names to their children.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Stade, *Gesch.* i. 489 ff.; Nowack, *Arch.* ii. 259-263, 270 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Jer. 36<sup>6</sup> Lev. 16<sup>29</sup> 23<sup>26-32</sup> Est. 4<sup>16</sup> Gen. 24<sup>60</sup> 1 S. 11<sup>7</sup> 2<sup>20</sup> Ruth 1<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Stade, i. 471 ff.; Nowack, ii. 272; Benz., 407 ff.

<sup>34</sup> *Gesch.* i. 474, note 2.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Dillmann, *Genesis*, in loco.

<sup>36</sup> The following statistics on the point may not be without some interest.

The reason for this custom we need not here discuss. For we are interested at this point not so much in the fact of the naming itself as in the contents of the names given. A number of the names given by the mothers contain a decided religious element: **שמואל**, **שמואל**, **שמואל**.<sup>37</sup> But the most striking illustration is the naming of **איכבוד** (1 S. 4<sup>21</sup>). A very early tradition represents the wife of Phineas as being crushed by the news of the capture of the ark, and the death of her father-in-law and her husband. And when, in the moment of her death, she gives birth to a son, she names him with her dying breath **איכבוד**, "Inglorious,"<sup>38</sup> saying **גלה כבוד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל**. Three times in the short passage is the emphasis laid upon the loss of the ark. There is no good reason to doubt this feature of the tradition. But, to say the least, we have here clear evidence that in the thought of the narrator of this early tradition it was quite natural for a woman so to feel the loss of the ark as to hand down to posterity her pain in the very name of her son. Can such deep religious feeling be associated with an exclusion from the cult?

(2) *The Influence ascribed to Hebrew Women in Matters of Religion.*—The Deuteronomic sentiment against women's prose-

Out of 44 cases in which the naming of the children is mentioned in the Old Testament, in 26 it is ascribed to women, in 14 to men, and in 4 to God.

*Women name in:* Gen. 4<sup>25</sup> 16<sup>11</sup> 19<sup>37</sup> 38 29<sup>22</sup>f. 35 (all J) 30<sup>6</sup> 8 (E) 11.13 (J) 18.20 (E) 21.24 (J) 35<sup>18a</sup> (JE) 38<sup>3</sup>.4.5 (J) Ju. 13<sup>24</sup> 1 S. 1<sup>29</sup> 4<sup>21</sup> 1 Chr. 4<sup>9</sup> 7<sup>16</sup> Is. 7<sup>14</sup> Ruth 4<sup>17</sup> (יִתְּרֵי אִיִּתֵּי).

*Men name:* Gen. 4<sup>26</sup> 5<sup>29</sup> (J) 5<sup>3</sup> 16<sup>15</sup> 17<sup>19</sup> 21<sup>3</sup> (P) 35<sup>18b</sup> (JE) 41<sup>51</sup>.52 (E) Ex. 2<sup>22</sup> (J) 2 S. 12<sup>24</sup> 1 Chr. 7<sup>23</sup> Job 42<sup>14</sup> Gen. 25<sup>25</sup> (יִקְרָא) (J).

*God names:* Is. 8<sup>3</sup> Hos. 1<sup>4</sup>.6.9.

From the fact that P in the only three cases uniformly ascribes the naming to the father, and does so in the case of Seth (Gen. 5<sup>3</sup>) in contradiction to J, who ascribes it to the mother (Gen. 4<sup>25</sup>), it might be supposed that P represents a later custom or tendency. But J and E, and the other early sources, are by no means uniform in ascribing the naming to the mother, as may be seen from the enumeration above. All that can be justly claimed is that in the majority of cases the naming was done by the mother.

<sup>37</sup> Since writing this my attention has been called to Mr. Gray's valuable *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*. I find my view on the value of the Hebrew names as expressive of religious thoughts, and as throwing "light on the Hebrew religion, and more especially on the popular religion," fully corroborated by him. Cf. p. 10 ff.

<sup>38</sup> It seems to me far better to take the **אֵן** as the negative than with Klostermann (*in loc.*) as the exclamation **אֵן**. Cf. Driver, *Text of Samuel*, *in loco*. Gray, *Studies*, expresses it as his opinion that it is not quite clear what **אֵן**, as an element in a proper name, means. Cf. p. 246, note 1.

lytism (spoken of more fully elsewhere) is here in point. While, of course, this proselytism is in behalf of foreign cults, it yet indicates an intense religious interest and influence, scarcely conceivable apart from her share in the cultic life.

Neither may we pass over lightly such expressions as Ruth's וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶל־הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶּן. It was hardly an empty phrase. If it may be taken, as well it ought to be, and as is so generally done, as an evidence of the early conception of the close union of the god with his land, the personal pronouns are an equally strong indication of woman's share in the religious life.

#### 4. Woman's Relation to the Jahveh Cult as affected by Some Ritualistic Legislation.

##### 1. *The Female in Sacrificial Victims.*

According to the researches of W. R. Smith, a very vital principle underlies the selection of the sacrificial animal, which determines not only the species of the animal but also its sex.<sup>39</sup> It is therefore not without meaning to our inquiry to note whether the sacrificial animal in the Hebrew cult was limited to the male.<sup>40</sup> We should expect that a cult that proscribes woman on account of her sex would also not permit the use of a female victim in sacrifice. But that the latter is not the case in the Hebrew cult is very evident. In earlier practice the female victim predominates (Gen. 15<sup>9</sup>[E] 1 S 6<sup>14</sup> 16<sup>2</sup>). In the Levitical legislation a discrimination is made in favor of the male in that it is preferred in the more solemn sacrifices, but even there the female victim is by no means excluded. A male is required as a passover-lamb (Ex. 12<sup>5</sup>), for the עֵלֶה (Lev. 1<sup>3.10</sup> 22<sup>19</sup>); in the קֹדֶשׁ אֲדָמָה a male is required from an "anointed priest" (Lev. 4<sup>3</sup>), from the whole people (vs.<sup>14</sup>), from the ruler (vs.<sup>23</sup>), while in the case of an ordinary Israelite a female is accepted (vs.<sup>28.32</sup> and 5<sup>6</sup>); in the שְׂלֵמִים the victim may be either male or female (Lev. 3<sup>1.6</sup>; cf. Mal. 1<sup>14</sup>). I defer the discussion of the reason for this discrimination; for the present, let it suffice to mention this as simply another fact pointing to the conclusion that the Hebrew cult is not pervaded by any principle that excludes the female sex.

##### 2. *Woman as ceremonially "defiling."*

Both the sexual approach to woman and her condition in childbed or during her courses are regarded in Hebrew custom and legislation,

<sup>39</sup> *Rel. of Sem.*, Lecture viii.

<sup>40</sup> As was the case among the Harranians, quoted by W. R. Smith, p. 280, note 2.

as among many other nations, as ceremonially defiling (1 S. 21<sup>5f</sup>. Ex. 19<sup>15</sup> Lev. 12 15<sup>19ff</sup>. Ez. 36<sup>17</sup> Is. 64<sup>6</sup> Baruch 6<sup>29</sup>). The original ground for this legislation lies most probably, as is suggested by Stade,<sup>41</sup> in animism, which regards as unclean and defiling all such persons who are under the influence, that is, possessed by spirits, viz., those that suffer from certain diseases or have done certain acts that stand under the protection of certain spirits. It is, however, perfectly evident that this condition of ceremonial unfitness is only temporary: its removal can be effected. And the very exception of woman's fitness for the cult under those conditions proves the rule of her ordinary inclusion.

### 3. *Woman not excluded from the Three Yearly Feasts.*

"Three times in the year shall all thy males see<sup>42</sup> the face of the Lord Jahveh" (Ex. 23<sup>17</sup> 34<sup>23</sup> Deut. 16<sup>16</sup>). That this is an old law, and has reference to the three yearly feasts, is evident from the connection in which it is found. But it may well be remembered that its origin, like the origin of all the earliest legislation, was not theoretic but consuetudinary, the result of actual cases presented to the priest for decision. And it may well have had its occasion in the fact that such a law could not be put in effect in the case of woman as easily as in the case of man, and not without contravening the other custom and legislation that excluded her from the approach of holy things at certain periods, just considered. To infer, therefore, from this law woman's exclusion from all cult would be more than it can bear, and is contradicted by all the facts so far adduced. Neither is it a parallel case, as it seems to me, to be cited in connection with the custom that certain holy parts of an ox must not be eaten by women. Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 281, note 3.

### 4. *The Law of the Firstlings.*

The law of the firstlings with its emphasis upon the firstborn male might at first sight appear as a very formidable objection to woman's inclusion in cult; but upon careful examination the facts here will be found in harmony with those already adduced.

That the later legislation counts the males only as firstlings cannot be questioned (Nu. 3<sup>40ff</sup>. [P]). But it seems to me altogether doubt-

<sup>41</sup> *Gesch.* i. 483 f.; cf. also Smith's "Notes on Holiness, Uncleanness, and Taboo," in *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 426 ff., and "Taboos and the Intercourse of the Sexes," *ibid.*, p. 435 ff.; Wellhausen, *Heid.*, p. 116.

<sup>42</sup> Not "appear before"; cf. Driver on *Deut.* 16<sup>16</sup>.

ful whether this was also the case in the earlier legislation. But as this has been assumed, without a dissenting voice, to have always been so, one feels the need of much courage to call it in question. Yet there are weighty considerations against this assumption that have a right to a hearing.

The origin of the consecration of the firstlings is found, as W. R. Smith has pointed out (*Rel. of Sem.*, p. 444), in something of the nature of taboo of the first produce, having its proper parallel in the vegetable kingdom in the law of Lev. 19<sup>23ff.</sup>, which ordains that for three years the fruit of a new orchard shall be treated as 'uncircumcised' and not eaten. This being the case, and as we have found no discrimination against female victims in offerings in general, we might argue on general grounds against the probability of an original discrimination here. There is, however, far more direct evidence that no such discrimination existed in earliest times. I mention :

(a) The term פֶּטֶר רְחֵם, or פֶּטֶר שֵׁנֶר. It is repeated so often that we can scarcely go amiss in seeing in it the central idea of the custom and the law. But if this be so, its limitation to a זָכָר practically annuls it by introducing an entirely different element which takes its emphasis. If there be any meaning or force in the פֶּטֶר, the זָכָר dissipates it. It does, therefore, seem improbable that they both belonged to the original idea, and far more probable that that was contained in the פֶּטֶר, irrespective whether it was male or female, in agreement with the idea of the taboo of the first produce. Cf. also the כָּל פֶּטֶר רַחֵם in כָּל (Ex. 13<sup>12</sup> Ez. 20<sup>26</sup>).

(b) W. R. Smith has also called attention to the fact that "in the period immediately before the exile, when sacrifice of firstborn children became common, these grisly offerings were supposed to fall under the law of firstlings (Jer. 7<sup>31</sup> 19<sup>5</sup> Ez. 20<sup>26</sup>)."<sup>43</sup> But, this being so, the passage in Jeremiah, stating that that which was done to בְּנֵיהֶם was also done to בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, shows that still at that time the female was included in the law of the firstling.

(c) A careful examination of the wording of the texts of the law reveals the fact that the word זָכָר has only a very doubtful place in them. To facilitate such examination, I present the following tabulated form of the law :

1. — JE. Ex. 13<sup>2</sup>:

קֹדֶשׁ לִי כָל בְּכֹר פֶּטֶר כָּל רַחֵם בְּבֵנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֶרֶם וּבְבַהֲמָה לִי הוּא :

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 445.

2. — JE. Ex. 13<sup>12, 13</sup> :  
 והעברת כל פטר רחם ליהוה וכל פטר שגר בהמה אשר יהיה לך [הזכרים] ליהוה :  
 וכל פטר חמר תפדה בשה ואם לא תפדה וערפתו וכל בכור אדם בבניך תפדה :
3. — E. Ex. 22<sup>28</sup> : בכור בניך תתן לי :
4. — JE. Ex. 34<sup>19, 20</sup> : כל פטר רחם לי וכל מקנך [תזכר] פטר שור ושה :  
 ופטר חמר תפדה בשה ואם לא תפדה וערפתו כל בכור בניך תפדה :
5. — D. Dt. 15<sup>19</sup> : כל הבכור אשר יולד בבקרך ובצאנך [תזכר] תקדש ליהוה אלהיך :
6. — P. Nu. 3<sup>40 ff.</sup> : ויאמר יהוה אל משה פקד כל בכור זכר לבני ישראל וגו' :

It is to be noticed, in the first place, that in passages 3 and 1, evidently the oldest form of the law, no specification is made that the consecrated firstborn must be a male. For I take it that **בניך** may stand for "thy children" as well as for "thy sons," and, as the term **בכר** has a feminine as well as a masculine plural, it may be either masculine or feminine. Cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, ed. 26, § 87, 3; and the feminines in **והכל הביא גם הוא מבכרות צאנו ומחלבהן וגו'** in Gen. 4<sup>4</sup>.

We note, secondly: If the syntactical position of **הזכרים** in 2 and the corrupt **תזכר** in 4 be examined, and compared with the position of **זכר** in 6, it will be seen that in the first two passages, as well as in 5, the word has all the appearance of not being an original part of the sentence but of being an afterthought, a gloss.

And, thirdly, the term **זכר** is peculiar to P. JE, it is well known, uses **איש ואשתו** in the place of P's **זכר ונקבה** (comp. Gen. 7<sup>2 and 9</sup>), and the term nowhere else occurs in JE (cf. Brown and Driver's *Gesenius's Lex.*, s.v. **זכר**).<sup>44</sup> The three facts together, as it seems to me, can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that the term **זכר** in Ex. 13<sup>12</sup> 34<sup>19</sup>, and probably also in Dt. 15<sup>19</sup>, is due to a later glossing by a source related to P, and that its object was to bring into harmony the earlier with the later custom.

And altogether our examination of the law of the firstlings, far from pointing to an exclusion of the female from cult, is but another indication that in early times no discrimination was made against the female, but that perfect parity existed between the sexes in matters of the cult.

<sup>44</sup> This does not apply to the peculiar form **זכור** found in Ex. 23<sup>17</sup> 34<sup>28</sup>.

### 5. *Circumcision in its Relation to Woman's Position in Cult.*

The prominence given to the rite of circumcision in the Old Testament will scarcely permit us to pass it without an inquiry as to such a relation. Von Orelli is probably right in his contention that circumcision was practised among the Hebrews in the pre-Mosaic times (cf. *PRE*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. "Beschneidung," against Nowack, *Arch.* i. 168). But, as Smend says (*Alttest. Rel.*, p. 37), it was not in ancient Israel a sign of a servant of Jahveh, nor did Moses make it such. Its meaning and application in Arabic heathenism is of service to us here.<sup>45</sup>

The Arabs circumcised the girls also, and made a feast as at a boy's circumcision (Wellh., *ibid.*). Wellhausen's supposition, that the circumcision of girls was not as generally practised as that of boys, seems very likely. But why it may not be regarded in the same light, and why it "hat eher eine natürliche Veranlassung und einen medicinischen Nutzen gehabt," is not apparent. In the absence of definite evidence on this point, the most reasonable supposition is that whatever cultic significance the act had in the case of man it also had in the case of woman. All the evidence we have to form our judgment on the question whether circumcision was practised on girls in early Israel or not is the analogy of the Arabic custom; and the analogy, it seems to me, is stronger than the silence. At any rate, there is no ground to construe that silence into exclusion from the cult. Circumcision, with its religious significance as the sign of Jahveh's covenant with Israel, is a late, exilic view,<sup>46</sup> and is no more a criterion, than the preceding case of the law of the firstborn, for the condition of ancient Israel. And in the same light we must regard all such exclusive prominence given to "males" in the priestly genealogies<sup>47</sup> and laws of temple service.<sup>48</sup>

### 5. The Hebrew Woman's Relation to the Cult of the Dead and the Worship of Ancestors.

Attention has long since been called to the traces of an extensive cult of the dead in the ancient Hebrew religion, originating most

<sup>45</sup> According to Wellhausen (*Heidenth.*, p. 154 f.; cf. also W. R. Smith, *Rel.*, p. 319), the etymology of  $\text{כְּרִית}$  and its Arabic equivalent points to a connection of circumcision with bridegroom. But perhaps the practice is, like the hair-offering, a representative sacrifice, by which recognition is made of the divine ownership of human life (cf. T. K. Cheyne, *Encycl. Britannica*, s.v. "Circumcision"). In either case we may suppose it to be of cultic significance.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Smend, *Rel.*, p. 38 f.; Nowack, i. 169 f.

<sup>47</sup> Jos. 17<sup>2</sup> Ezra 8<sup>3 ff.</sup> 2 Chr. 31<sup>16, 19</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Lev. 6<sup>18, 29</sup> 7<sup>6</sup> Nu. 3<sup>15, 22</sup> 1 Macc. 2<sup>18 ff.</sup>, etc.

probably in ancestor worship (Stade, *Gesch.* i. 387 ff.; Nowack, *Arch.* ii. 300 f.; Benzinger, *Arch.*, p. 165 ff.; Smend, *Alltest. Rel.*, p. 112 f.), and finding its analogies in other religions, and particularly in Arabic heathenism (Wellh., *Heidenth.*, pp. 159-164; Goldziher, "Ueber Todtenverehrung im Heidenthum und im Islam," *Muhammedanische Studien* i. 229 ff.).<sup>49</sup>

### 1. *Woman's Participation in the Various Mourning Rites.*

Apart from such actions as were the natural expressions of grief over the dead, there are certain features in the prevalent mourning customs that had evidently cultic significance, in which women prominently participated.

Jer. 16<sup>5-8</sup> gives us a pretty complete list of the numerous mourning customs in vogue in Israel. Taking them up in that order we find:

(a) The Lamentation. The variety of terms used for the act of lamentation over the dead, **אנה**, **אבל**, **כפד**, **נהה**, **המה**, points to its general practice, but the specific technical meaning of **קנינה**, with its peculiar rhythm and exclamatory beginning **איך**, **איכה**, which has furnished the technical term **מקוננות** (Jer. 9<sup>16</sup>) for the professional "mourning women,"<sup>50</sup> met with both in ancient and modern Arabia (cf. Goldziher, p. 251; Trumbull, *Studies in Oriental Life*, p. 153 ff.; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 388), and in ancient Babylonia in the female *kalû* (*Records of the Past*, Second Series, ii. 78; Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 684), points particularly to woman's principal share in the act.

(b) Laceration, **התגנדר** (Dt. 14<sup>1</sup> 1 Ki. 18<sup>28</sup> Jer. 16<sup>6</sup> 41<sup>5</sup> 47<sup>5</sup> Mic. 4<sup>14</sup>), finding its parallel in the custom of Arabic heathenism, where the women beat or scratched their faces till the blood flowed.<sup>51</sup>

(c) The Hair-offering, **קרחה** (Am. 8<sup>10</sup> Mic. 1<sup>16</sup> Dt. 14<sup>1</sup> and others), especially of women (Is. 3<sup>24</sup>). See Goldziher, p. 247 ff.; Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 161; Smith, *Rel.*, p. 306 ff.

(d) The Sacrifices to or for the dead, and the sacrificial meal connected with it (Jer. 16<sup>7-8</sup>). See Stade, *Gesch.* i. 388 f., 425; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 291 f.; Benz., *Arch.*, 165 ff.; Nowack, *Arch.* i. 196 f.

That these cultic rites were performed *by* men and women alike, and *for* men and women alike, is already clear from the references adduced. It will, however, not be altogether superfluous to empha-

<sup>49</sup> Add W. R. Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 304 ff.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. also the term **קנינת** (2 Chr. 35<sup>25</sup>), and **יודעי נה** (Am. 5<sup>16</sup>).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Goldziher, p. 246 f., 253; Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 160; W. R. Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 304 ff.; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 156; Smith, *Kinship*, 214 ff.

size the force of Jeremiah's words on this point. The calamity of unceremonial burial of which the prophet speaks is one "concerning the *sons* and concerning the *daughters* that are born in this place, and concerning their *mothers* that bare them and concerning their *fathers* that begat them" (vs.<sup>3</sup>), and for their *fathers* or for their *mothers* (vs.<sup>7</sup>).

If, while at this point, I may also call attention to the care and interest ascribed by tradition to the patriarchs in the burial of their wives (Gen. 23<sup>2</sup> 25<sup>10</sup> 35<sup>8, 19 f.</sup> 48<sup>7</sup> 49<sup>31 f.</sup>), and to Barzillai's words to David: "Let thy servant, I pray thee, turn back again, that I may die in mine own city, by the grave of my *father* and my *mother*" (2 S. 19<sup>38</sup>), it will appear how utterly unfounded and erroneous Benzinger's statement is that "ebensowenig wurden der Frau nach dem Tod kultische Ehren zu teil" (*Arch.*, p. 140). It will appear also that the phrases like "to be buried with one's fathers" (1 Ki. 14<sup>31</sup> 2 Ki. 12<sup>22 (21)</sup>, etc.) may be too narrowly interpreted.

The mourning customs just considered, on account of their being cultic rites, have been taken as the evidences of early ancestor worship among the Hebrews. See the references cited on p. 137. It is not at all of moment to our inquiry to come to a decision on this question one way or the other. But as Stade, followed by Nowack and Benzinger, invariably and specifically asserts woman's exclusion from the cult of the ancestors,<sup>52</sup> I shall endeavor to show that every fact taken by him as pointing to ancestor worship at all points with equal force to woman's inclusion in it. To woman's participation in the various cultic mourning rites, I add now:

### 2. *The Sanctity of the Tombs of Female Ancestors.*

The grave, as is well known, became in some cases a religious shrine in ancient Israel; that it even became an asylum, and its precincts a *τέμενος* (*hima*) as in Arabic heathenism (Goldz., p. 235 f.), we do not know. As this sanctity of the grave is taken as pointing strongly to ancestor worship, it is important to call attention to the fact that prominently by the side of the accounts of the sacred burial places of the patriarchs, of Joseph, of Moses and Aaron, we read of the grave of Rachel with its *מַצְבֵּה* (Gen. 35<sup>20</sup>), of Miriam in Kadesh (Nu. 20<sup>1</sup>), and of Deborah under the sacred tree near Bethel, the Allon-bacuth being most probably identical with the Deborah-Palm in Ju. 4<sup>5</sup>. See Dillmann, *Genesis*, in loco, and Moore, *Judges*, in

<sup>52</sup> Stade, *Gesch.* i. 390 f.; Nowack, *Arch.* i. 154, 344, 348; Benz., *Arch.*, p. 140.

loco. In fact, there are more graves of female ancestors mentioned of pre-Mosaic times than of male, including besides those already mentioned those of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah at Machpelah (Gen. 49<sup>21</sup>). It is evident, therefore, that whatever religious significance there is in the sanctity of the graves of the ancestors, woman shares in it. This appears also in another fact that may be mentioned here. If we may, with Nowack (i. 177), consider that the ceremony of boring the ear with an awl to the doorpost (Dt. 15<sup>12ff.</sup> Ex. 21<sup>2ff.</sup>), whereby a slave becomes a permanent member of the family, is best explained as a remnant of ancestor worship, the אֱלֹהִים in these passages referring to the ancestors of the family, we have but another instance of woman's share in the cult, for Dt. 15<sup>17b</sup> prescribes: "And also unto thy bondwoman shalt thou do likewise."

### 3. *Woman's Access to and Possession of the Teraphim.*

While it may be true that the evidence that the teraphim were the images of the ancestors of the family, and their consultation a species of manes oracle (Stade, *Gesch.* i. 467; Nowack, ii. 23; Baudissin, *Studien* i. 57), is not altogether full enough to be conclusive, yet it seems to be going too far to the other extreme to say (Moore, *Judges*, p. 380) that there is no evidence. The inference from Gen. 31<sup>19. 30. 34</sup> 1 S. 19<sup>13</sup> Ju. 17<sup>5</sup> that the teraphim were household gods seems to me not much weakened by the reference to Ez. 21<sup>21</sup>. At any rate, that they were images legitimately used in divination in ancient Israel (1 S. 19<sup>13</sup> Ho. 3<sup>4</sup> Zech. 10<sup>2</sup> Ez. 21<sup>21</sup>) is generally admitted. It is in this, after all, that the significance of the teraphim in our inquiry lies.

Twice women are mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with the teraphim. Of course, Michal's use of the teraphim (1 S. 19<sup>13</sup>) contains nothing of cultic significance; all that we may legitimately gather in this direction is that she evidently had free access to the image. But it is entirely different with the case of Rachel (Gen. 31<sup>19. 30. 34</sup>). Why did Rachel steal the teraphim, the god (it was probably only *one* image, cf. Dillmann, *in loc.*) of her father (אֱלֹהֵי, vs.<sup>30</sup>)? We may hardly ascribe it to any other than a religious motive, finding its most plausible explanation in the similar case of the Danites (Ju. 18), whose spies had consulted the oracle of Micah and had received a favorable reply (vs.<sup>5. 6</sup>), and then had given the hint to the rest of the tribe to carry it away with them (vs.<sup>14</sup>). The teraphim was employed as an oracle<sup>53</sup>: this explains Rachel's interest

<sup>53</sup> Zech. 10<sup>2</sup> Ez. 21<sup>21</sup>.

in it, and so we meet here the Hebrew woman for the first time in our investigation not only as a worshipper but in the possession of the sacred objects employed in oracular inquiry.

This leads us to consider next the intimately related question,

4. *Woman's Relation to the Oracle of the Dead, Necromancy, and the other Cognate Forms of Divination.*

As performing oracular functions (קָבַם, cf. Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 126 f.; Stade, i. 505; but especially W. R. Smith, *Journal of Philology* xiii. 276 ff.) of the oracle of the dead (described in Is. 8<sup>10</sup> Dt. 18<sup>11</sup> as דָּרַשׁ אֶל הַמֵּתִים) woman appears officially, as the בעֲלַת אוֹב, one who has a familiar spirit, in the woman of Endor (1 S. 28). This official character of woman is worthy of special notice. That necromancy was a religious cult is clear from the terms which are used in connection with it. The woman of Endor describes her vision as seeing אֱלֹהִים (vs.<sup>13</sup>), דָּרַשׁ and קָבַם are the terms used in speaking of the consultation; the opposition to the cult brands it as a הוֹעֲבָה (Dt. 18<sup>12</sup>) and its approach with the technical terms הִלָּל (Ez. 13<sup>19</sup>) and טָמֵא (Lev. 19<sup>31</sup>) as ceremonially defiling.<sup>54</sup> The opposition it met with and its frequent mention show how widely and how deeply the cult had entrenched and retained itself in the popular faith. Whether its origin lies in ancestor worship, as Stade supposes, need not be here discussed. This is certain, that we find woman acting in a widespread popular cult in an official capacity, and, judging from the fact that Saul's order is בִּקְשׁוּ לִי אִשֶׁת בְּעִלַת אוֹב, occupying the leading position. The latter is confirmed also by the fact that in the often recurring phrase הָאוֹבוֹת וְהַיִּדְעָנִים (Lev. 19<sup>31</sup> 20<sup>6</sup> Is. 8<sup>19</sup> 19<sup>3</sup> etc.) the feminine הָאוֹבוֹת invariably comes first.<sup>55</sup>

The 'wise woman,' אִשֶׁת הַכִּמְהָה, and the use made of her (2 S. 14<sup>2</sup> 20<sup>16</sup>, also Ju. 5<sup>23</sup> Ex. 35<sup>25</sup>), contains nothing of cultic significance (cf. Smend, *Alttest. Rel.*, p. 91).

But here unquestionably belongs the practice of divination by

<sup>54</sup> For these reasons I cannot follow Driver (*Deut.*, p. 226) when he says that the opposition to the cult was not due to its being considered idolatry but a superstition. It was a rival cult that the opposition fought, and one that was not altogether of foreign origin. Cf. Stade, *Gesch.* i. 425; W. R. Smith, *Jour. of Phil.* xiii. 273 f.

<sup>55</sup> Schwally arrives at the original meaning of זָכַר, viz. "Todtenbeschwörer," by a combination of it with the Targumic זְכָרִי, the translation of the Hebrew אֹב, יָדַעַנִי, and מְעַנְנִים (*ZATW.* xi. 179 ff.), but he never mentions the Hebrew בְּעִלַת אוֹב and the numerous references to woman's activity in this religious sphere.

some women mentioned in Ez. 13<sup>17 ff.</sup> Upon this obscure form of divination the investigations of W. R. Smith (*Jour. of Phil.* xiii. 286 f.) have thrown considerable light. The object of the practice was oracular. According to vs.<sup>22</sup>, it was the means of obtaining responses, which according as they were assurances of divine favor or the opposite made man glad or sorry. The means employed were some kind of appurtenances tied to the arm and put on the head. The word כַּסְתוֹת Ephrem Syrus explains as 'amulets,' and δ'Ἐβραῖος in the Hexapla renders it φυλακτήρια. Now, as the Jewish phylacteries were amulets to make prayer more powerful, "we must take it here," says Smith, "that these women invoked the deity — obviously for an omen." Of the nature of the omen the explanation is found in the words: "Ye profane me with my people for (or with) handfuls of barley and crumbled pieces of bread" (vs.<sup>19</sup>). These were the ἀπαρχαί, the altar gifts, or, perhaps more likely, the pay for divining, of the same elements as in Syriac divination, and pointing as in that case to "a kind of omen which in its first origin was drawn from the gift of firstfruits at a — Canaanite or Hebrew — sanctuary, with the aid of prayer, such as habitually accompanied rites from which an oracle was sought" (Smith, *ibid.*). If we now associate with this official capacity as the dispenser of the oracle that of the בעלת אוב and Rachel's possession of the teraphim, we have found strong indications, to be corroborated later on, that not only did woman share in the cult as worshipper, but that she also occupied an official position in it.

The term המתנבאות used by Ezekiel to describe this activity of the women suggests naturally a probable connection of it with the most important phenomenon in the question of woman's relation to the cult, namely, the order of the prophetesses.

## 6. Women as Officials in the Jahveh Cult.

### I. The Prophetesses.

While the existence and activity of women as prophets in Hebrew religion cannot but be recognized by all, it is of interest to note how variously the fact is treated by moderns. Nowack, in his paragraph on "Seher und Propheten," passes it in silence (*Arch.* ii. 130 f.). Stade (*Gesch.* i. 178) and Montefiore (*Hibb. Lect.* 1892, p. 75) doubt its existence in ancient Israel. The former calls Deborah "eine wirkende weise Frau," and the latter says, "if Deborah was a seer." Professor Moore regards Deborah as a prophetess in the older sense

of the word, an inspired woman, and compares her with the German Veleda and Joan of Arc. Smend (*Alttest. Rel.*, p. 90 f.) more readily acknowledges the religious character of the earlier prophetesses. Of Miriam he significantly says that she was probably more prominent than the tradition represents. The only mention of the prophetess in relation to woman's position in religion is made by Benzinger (*Arch.*, p. 140), and he dismisses it with the curt remark that it is the exception that only proves the rule of woman's exclusion from the cult.

But it is a matter of course that no view of woman's relation to the cult can have any weight that leaves out of due consideration such an important fact. And it is no wonder, on the other hand, in view of the isolation with which the phenomenon of the prophetess has been treated, that it should appear as it does to Professor McCurdy (*Hist. Proph. and the Monuments* ii. § 423) as an anomaly (which he mentions only with a word), yielding itself only a little more readily to an explanation (which explanation, however, he does not attempt to give) than her position as judge and queen. It will, therefore, prove no mean confirmation of the correctness of my view of the relation of woman to the cult if it furnishes an explanation, and the only one offered, of this anomaly. That we must in the consideration of this question draw the important modern distinction between the earlier and the later character of prophetesses is very evident. There is exactly the same difference between a Huldah and a Deborah as there is between a Jeremiah and a Samuel.

Of later prophetesses Huldah is the principal example. Noadiah is simply known to us by name (Neh. 6<sup>14</sup>).

(1) *Huldah* (2 Ki. 22<sup>14ff.</sup>). — This prophetess comes into the foreground as the chief religious authority at the time of a most intense religious excitement, and in connection with an event that stands without a parallel in its effect upon the development of the religious thought and life of Israel. It is a remarkable fact that the person to whom, at the order of the King of Judah, Hilkiah the priest and Shaphan the scribe, and others equally prominent in state and church, should direct themselves to inquire concerning the meaning of the discovery of the Book of the Law, should be a woman. Equally significant is the nature of the oracular response. For, it must be remembered, it is not a political or moral issue that is up; neither does it concern religion in general. Deuteronomy has chiefly to do with the cult; it is therefore a question of the cult that is brought before the prophetess, and her response is altogether concerned therewith. This interest and authority of the prophetess

Huldah in such a question, being also in perfect accord with the legislation of Deuteronomy itself, which, as has been pointed out above, recognizes woman's share in worship, has a momentous bearing on the question at issue. But important as this testimony is, the full force of it will be best perceived when the office of the prophetess is viewed as it existed in its earlier stages.

(2) *Office of the Earlier Prophetesses.*—There seems to me no sufficient ground to call in question the activity of women as seers in the pre-monarchic period in Israel's history, as has been done by Stade, Montefiore, and others. If early Hebrew tradition is of any historical value whatever, it certainly speaks of a prophetess Deborah as distinctly as of a prophet Samuel, whatever meaning that term may have. In like manner do the earliest traditions prominently associate with Moses and Aaron as head of the Israelitish community their sister, the prophetess Miriam (Mi. 6<sup>4</sup> Ex. 15<sup>20f.</sup> [E] Nu. 12 20<sup>1</sup> [JE]). But how are we to interpret the term נביאה as used here? There can be but the one way, it seems to me, which has its basis in the explanation in 1 S. 9<sup>9</sup>, and according to which the earlier Hebrew נביא was a נביא or נבייה. To say this in the case of Samuel, and to call Deborah "eine weise Frau," seems an inconsistent choice of terms in order to convey a different meaning of the word when used in speaking of woman. There is not the slightest reason for such a distinction, and, in fact, none is assigned; so it seems but fair to ask that the word be allowed to mean the same thing in both cases, in that of Deborah as in that of Samuel. And all the more so because the principal function of 'judge,' whether in the earlier sense of 'vindicator' or in the later sense of 'giving judicial decisions,' is ascribed to the one as much as to the other (compare Ju. 4<sup>5</sup> and 1 S. 7<sup>16ff.</sup>; cf. Moore, *Judges*, in loco). If, as may be therefore justly claimed, Deborah was a seer, then all the light which recent investigation has thrown upon the origin and function of the seer is at our service. If the office of seer, as is held by Stade (*Gesch.* i. 468-473), had its origin in the belief that some persons were specially possessed by the divinity; if its function was, by means of visions, to reveal the divine will; if, as is illustrated by the case of Samuel, it was intimately connected with the sanctuary; if, as is indicated by the relation of the Hebrew and Arabic terms, נבין, *kāhin*, the offices of priest and seer were once identical, and the old Israelitish priesthood originated in the settlement of some seers at a permanent sanctuary (cf. Wellh., *Heid.*, p. 130 ff., 167), then the function of the prophetess had an origin in common with the highest cultic function in Israel, the priest-

hood, and this function was, at one time, open to some extent to women. To claim this for Samuel seems perfectly natural, for, of course, we find in his case clear indications of such a fusion of seer and priest. But the inference that such was the case also when woman filled the same office is perfectly reasonable, and by no means lacks more definite confirmation. Woman's relation to the teraphim, the oracle of the dead, and divination, as developed above, is here in point, but additional evidence in the same direction and within the Jahveh cult comes to us in the case of Miriam.

(3) *Miriam*. — In Nu. 12 (referred to also in Dt. 24<sup>9</sup>), belonging to the earliest tradition (JE), we have a detailed account of an incident which purports to involve the question of the relative official rank of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam. The contention was occasioned by the marriage of Moses with a Cushite woman, and partakes of the nature of a family quarrel. "Hath Jahveh indeed spoken only with Moses? hath he not spoken also with us?" (vs.<sup>2</sup>), say Miriam and Aaron; and as Dillmann has pointed out (*in loc.*), the feminine **והיבכר** would show that Miriam was the instigator. The claim that her words imply is prophetic rank and authority for herself and Aaron equal to those of Moses. In the settlement of the dispute by the intervention of Jahveh, it becomes apparent that her claim of prophetic rank is not denied, and she, as well as Aaron, bears the title of 'prophet'; only to Moses is ascribed the official preëminence, while she, as the instigator of the insubordination, has to bear the brunt of the punishment. While the incident thus brings out Moses' preëminence, it at the same time asserts the official equality of Miriam with Aaron. That the whole incident is brought into intimate connection with the **אֱהִל מוֹיֵשֶׁה**, the centre of the religious cult, is certainly significant. If to this be added the facts, that occasion is taken to state that Miriam is the sister of Aaron (Ex. 15<sup>20</sup>), and that in the earlier genealogical list her descent is traced back to Levi (Nu. 26<sup>59</sup> 1 Chr. 6<sup>3</sup>; Ex. 6<sup>20</sup> [P] does not mention her), while throughout she is conspicuously associated with Aaron and Moses as a leader of the religious community, the conclusion can scarcely be avoided that, as Deborah like Samuel, so Miriam like Moses and Aaron, is an example of a seer in whom, in the manner of that time, the functions of prophet and priest are combined. The probability of this inference is heightened, if in this connection again we call to mind the activity of prophetesses in other Semitic religions, and woman's part as diviner in connection with the oracles later proscribed by the religion of Jahveh.

## 2. *Women as Officials in the Tabernacle and the Temple.*

I must now call attention to the direct testimony on woman's official position in the Jahveh cult as contained in the repeated mention of woman's service in the tabernacle.

The passages are **הַצִּבְּאוֹת אֲשֶׁר צִבְּאוּ פֶתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** (Ex. 38<sup>8</sup>) and **הַנְּשִׂיִם הַצִּבְּאוֹת פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** (1 S. 2<sup>22b</sup>). The text in Samuel beginning with **וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר** is almost unanimously regarded as an interpolation. (See Driver, *Text of Sam.*, p. 26; Kittel in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift d. A. T.*; Klostermann's *Samuel*; Budde's *Samuel*.) The evidence that the context speaks of a **הַיֹּכֵל** and not of an **אֹהֶל**, and that the passage in question ascribes to the sons of Eli a sin entirely different from that of vs.<sup>12 ff.</sup> (see Stade, *Gesch.* i. 199, note 2), is far stronger than the absence of the passage from the LXX in Codex Vaticanus, which is, moreover, somewhat counterbalanced by its presence in Codex Alexandrinus and in Lucian's recension. The fact of the insertion of the passage in Samuel seems best explained as originating in a marginal note suggested by Ex. 38<sup>8</sup>.

There is no such question of text connected with the reference in Exodus; it belongs to P, and is definite and clear enough for our purpose.

We must first determine, as far as possible, the meaning of the word **צִבְּאוֹ** as used here. The versions exhibit a marked variation in translating the word. The LXX has for **הַצִּבְּאוֹת אֲשֶׁר צִבְּאוּ** in Ex. 38<sup>8</sup> *τῶν νηστεισασῶν αἱ ἐνήστεισαν*; Cod. Alex. translates **הַנְּשִׂיִם הַצִּבְּאוֹת** in 1 S. 2<sup>22b</sup> by *τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς παρεστῶσας* (Swete, *in loc.*). The Vulgate translates in Ex. *quae excubabant* and in S. *quae observabant*; in Targ. and Pesh. it is paraphrased 'who prayed' and 'who came to pray' (see Driver, *in loc.*). But there can be no question that **צִבְּאוֹ** has in the Priest's Code the very decided technical signification of 'to render service in connection with the tabernacle in a Levitical capacity' (cf. Nu. 4<sup>23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47</sup> 8<sup>24, 25</sup>); by its side is usually found the synonym **עֲבָדָה**, and the LXX translates it by *λειτουργεῖν* and *λειτουργία*. The attempts, therefore, of the ancient versions, as also the A.V.'s 'assemble' (the R.V. correctly renders in Ex. 38<sup>8</sup> "the serving women which served at the door of the tent of meeting," and refers in the margin to Nu. 4<sup>23</sup> and 8<sup>24</sup>), must be regarded as inadmissible, and evidently due to a hesitancy to allow the word to mean the same thing when used in reference to women as when used in reference to men. And such attempts are not any more admissible when the term is limited to express the performance of "menial

duties" by the women (Driver); or when there is simply added to these the duties of performing the sacred dances and choral songs (Dillmann, Strack). The fact is, we do not know in what particular the service of the women consisted, but we do know that, whatever the nature of the service, it is described by the same term used for the Levitical service rendered in connection with the tabernacle.

The remark of Nowack (*Arch.* ii. 69, note) that we do not hear in the older accounts of women who serve in the sanctuary, suggests the inquiry whence the information contained in Ex. 38<sup>8</sup> and perpetuated in 1 S. 2<sup>2b</sup> originated. To regard it as haggadic, late Jewish fiction (Popper; Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs* u.s.w., 1889, p. 147) is out of the question. There is in late Jewish history no indication of a tendency to place women in positions of the cult; both the low estimation in which woman is held and the high estimation with which increasingly the ritual is regarded are against such an idea; the tendency is all the other way. It seems to me that the reference to the service of woman in the passage in Exodus is to something antiquated, something that had long passed even in the time in connection with which it is mentioned. It seems a futile effort to contend, like Dillmann and Keil, over the notion of time the participle **צָבָאָת** conveys: Keil claiming that it does not imply that they had served there before the erection of the sanctuary, but only from that time forward they did perform service there; and Dillmann, that it does not mean that they served later, but that they served until now. It is the **צָבָאָה** that will more readily render service here, yielding itself easily to the tense of the pluperfect; the passage can be rendered: "And he made the laver of bronze, and the base thereof of bronze, of the mirrors of the serving women which *had served* at the door of the tent of meeting." In accordance with this, it is not to be supposed that the **צָבָאָת** contributed their hand-mirrors as a **הָרְוּמָה** (Dillm.), but on the analogy of Nu. 17<sup>2-5</sup> (Eng. Ver. 16<sup>36-40</sup>), where the censers left by the Korahites, because of their sanctity through former use, are beaten out into plates for a covering of the altar, and are so turned into another sacred use, so here, the mirrors left behind by the women are put to another sacred service. It is very probable that in both cases we have to do with reminiscences, embodying Levitical traditions, attached to the sacred utensils of the sanctuary, which were in some cases termed **זָבָוִן** (Nu. 17<sup>5</sup>). And, although this notice is found in P and is probably a later addition even there, that does not preclude its being based upon very ancient tradition. The **אֵהָל מוֹעֵד**

in the Priest's Code is an elaborate affair and not historical, but E knows of an אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, tells us of its erection, and gives its name (Ex. 33<sup>7-11</sup>), and also, as has been shown above, brings Miriam in close connection with it. In view of these facts, it is safe to say that the passages in Exodus and Samuel, though late themselves, are in perfect harmony with, and probably embody, an ancient tradition according to which, in early times, women held some official position in the sanctuary of Jahveh.

A side light upon woman's official position in the Jahveh cult comes to us also from the references in the Old Testament to the women singers. There are four distinct classes of these, one of which, the שָׁרוֹת, mentioned in passages like 2 S. 19<sup>35</sup> Jer. 31<sup>4</sup> Ec. 2<sup>8</sup> and Is. 23<sup>16</sup>, sang evidently only for social amusement, and may here be passed by with the mere mention. The other three classes will find the simplest explanation when considered in their relation to the religious cult.

(1) *The מקוֹנְנוֹת who chant the קִינּוֹת*. — Their official relation to, and prominence in, the cult of the dead have been considered above. See p. 137.

(2) The מְבַשְּׂרֹת, εὐαγγελιζομένη, is mentioned by that name only in Ps. 68<sup>12(11)</sup>, and the term is also applied to Jerusalem in Is. 40<sup>9</sup>; but the function of the מְבַשְּׂרֹת, to announce and celebrate a victory by vocal and instrumental music and dances, finds frequent mention in the Old Testament (Ex. 15<sup>20</sup> Ju. 5<sup>1</sup> 1 S. 18<sup>6</sup> Ps. 68<sup>26(25)</sup>; cf. also 2 S. 1<sup>20</sup>). That these choral dances were at least of a semi-religious character will scarcely admit of doubt. These were the "wars of Jahveh," and He Himself is יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת: the celebration of victory<sup>56</sup> must have partaken of a religious character. This becomes all the more evident from the religious element contained in some of these songs preserved to us (see Ex. 15<sup>21</sup> Ju. 5<sup>3 ff.</sup> Ps. 68 Judith 15<sup>12 ff.</sup> 16<sup>1 f.</sup>). These facts have naturally enough led some to suppose that the particular service that the women according to Ex. 38<sup>8</sup> and 1 S. 2<sup>22</sup> rendered was the sacred choral dances. It is very probable that the term צְבָא may cover, but there is no reason to suppose that it exhausts, this part of woman's service.

(3) *Women Singers in the Temple Choir*. — Neh. 7<sup>67</sup> and the parallel passage in Ezra 2<sup>65</sup> furnish a more direct reference to woman's participation in public religious song. In Neh. 7<sup>67</sup>, a register which has every appearance of having been drawn up under Zerubbabel

<sup>56</sup> "The Hebrew phrase for opening war is 'to consecrate war' (קָדַשׁ מַלְחָמָה), and warriors are consecrated persons." — W. R. Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 383.

and incorporated by Nehemiah in his Memoir (cf. Driver, *Introd.*, p. 513, and Stade, *Gesch.* ii. 98), the statement occurs that among the returning exiles were found "245 singing men and singing women." (In the parallel passage in Ezra, probably derived immediately from Neh., the number given is 200.) There is not the slightest reason to suspect the text, and Oettli's suggestion (*Kurzgef. Komm.*, *Die geschichtlichen Hagiographen*, Ezra, in loco) that the context would lead us to expect 'animals' viz. שׁוּרִים which, by a misunderstanding, was corrupted into מְשֻׁרִים and to which was then added the feminine, is entirely uncalled for and too clumsy. Neither is it a happy suggestion that the function of these singers was secular. Is it likely that this company of religious enthusiasts, returning to a desolate home, had carried with them this number of singers for secular amusement? Rashi supposes that they furnished the music during the glad procession in the return from the exile. If this be not more ideal than real, their service would scarcely have ceased with their arrival at Jerusalem.

This reference to women singers, it seems to me, finds its simplest explanation in the supposition that not only did women in early Hebrew history participate in religious song, but that they furnished such sacred music as was used in sacred worship, and that, even in this later time, women still held positions in the temple choirs. There is some Jewish tradition to this effect. Schechter (*Studies in Judaism*, p. 316) makes the statement that "if we were to trust a certain passage in the 'Chapters of R. Eliezer,' we might perhaps conclude that during the first temple the wives of the Levites formed a part of the choir." (Unfortunately Schechter's reference is too indefinite for verification.) It is therefore altogether probable that when we read of music at the religious festive occasions, e.g. the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. 12<sup>27 ff.</sup>), it will best harmonize with the statement concerning those 'singing women' to suppose that they contributed their share of music as members of the singer's guild, the בְּנֵי הַמְשֻׁרִים of that time. We have here, therefore, an additional indication of women's official position in the Jahveh cult.



---

The Original Form of Leviticus xxi., xxii

Author(s): L. B. Paton

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 149-175

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268789>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## The Original Form of Leviticus xxi., xxii.

PROF. L. B. PATON, PH.D.

HARTFORD, CONN.

IN the last volume of the JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, in an article entitled "The Original Form of Leviticus 17-19," I attempted an analysis of the first half of the Holiness-Code, the **משפטים**, or religious and civil regulations. I there found that this portion of the code contained originally ten groups of ten brief laws each, the pentads of which were indicated by the closing formula "I am Yahweh." This primitive holiness-code was worked over by an early non-priestly editor, who added numerous comments and explanations, and appended the hortatory formulae and the long hortatory passages. At the time of this editing probably a number of transpositions, doublings, and omissions were effected in the text. Subsequently this recension was united with the Priestly Code, and H then received new comments and suffered further transpositions. In an article in *Hebraica*, April-July, 1894, on "the Relation of Lev. 20 to Lev. 17-19," I endeavored to show that Lev. 20 is not a doublet to Lev. 17-19 but a hortatory passage that comes from the same early non-priestly editor who annotated Lev. 17-19. I now proceed in this article to investigate the structure of the second main division of H, the **חקות**, or ceremonial regulations of Lev. 21, 22, leaving Lev. 23-25 and the hortatory conclusion of the entire code in Lev. 26 for a later discussion.

The laws contained in Lev. 21, 22 relate to the priests and the offerings. The legislation is ceremonial in character, but it is addressed to Israel in the same manner as the legislation of Lev. 17-19, and it has so many points of similarity with this legislation in thought and in diction that most critics are of the opinion that it forms an integral part of the same code. This body of laws has been enlarged with priestly comments much more extensively than Lev. 17-20, and this fact makes the analysis proportionately more difficult. The reason for the enlargement is obvious. These ceremonial laws came closer

than anything else in H to the spirit and contents of P and, therefore, lent themselves more readily to amplification in the spirit of P. In the previous chapters the priestly additions are readily recognized, not only by their style but by the fact that they interrupt the thought and are extraneous to the context. Here they are more homogeneous with the tone of the older legislation, and, consequently, are more difficult to detect. Still, the analysis must be made before further investigation is possible, and, accordingly, I proceed to it immediately. Substantial uniformity has already been attained by critics on the main lines of analysis, and it is only in details that I can hope to contribute anything new to the discussion.

**1. Holiness in the Priests** (Lev. 21<sup>1-9</sup>).—The title in v. 1 is peculiar. It is like P in representing the following laws as spoken to Moses, and in calling the priests the sons of Aaron; but P says, "Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons," while this title, which does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch, says, "Speak unto the priests, the sons of Aaron." It is singularly inappropriate as a heading to the group of laws which follow, for they are addressed to the people, not to the priests (cf. v. 8), and the priests are referred to in the third person throughout the entire legislation. This title is, therefore, most naturally regarded as an addition of one of the latest editors.

Supplying **הכהן** as a subject, or perhaps **איש כהן** as in v. 9, the first law reads, "[A priest] shall not defile himself for a (dead) person among his kinsfolk." The point of the law is to prevent defilement in those cases where, on account of kinship, the priest might suppose that he was warranted in incurring ceremonial pollution for the dead. The use of **עמים** in the sense of 'kinsfolk' is an indication of affinity with the legislation of H. The use of **נפש** for a dead person is the same as in Lev. 19<sup>28</sup>, which unquestionably belongs to H. The brevity of this law, and the way in which the general precept is put first, are also suggestive of the method of H.

After this general prohibition of defilement for the dead, v. 2 f. proceeds to give the exceptional cases in which defilement is permitted. For mother, father, son, daughter, brother, and unmarried sister, the priest may incur ceremonial uncleanness. In these two verses there is nothing to indicate the hand of Rp, while the use of **שאר** for near relative is characteristic of H (JBL. xvi. 45). Notice also that the mother is named before the father, as in 19<sup>3</sup>. This law is found in Ez. 44<sup>25</sup>, and, in view of the close affinity between H and

Ezekiel, this is additional proof that it belongs to H and not to P, with whose legislation Ezekiel has no such marked correspondence.

The text of v. 4 is certainly corrupt. It now reads, "A **בעל** shall not defile himself among his people to profane him." This makes no sense, and yet the verse seems to contain the relics of a law of H because of its use of **יטמא** and **להחלו**. Starting from **בעמיו**, which he assumes to be original, Dillmann regards **בעל** as inconsistent with this word, and proposes to change it into **באכל**. This has little probability, since it makes the law a mere repetition of v. 1. It is more likely that **בעל** is original, and that **בעמיו** is a textual corruption which has arisen by the frequent use of this word in other portions of the section. The law which would give theoretical completeness to this group is one in regard to defilement for a *wife*. The present form of the text fails to speak of the case of a wife, but this cannot be original, since it is by no means self-evident that the priest should not undergo ceremonial defilement for his dead wife, nor can it be said that the wife is included in the prohibition of v. 1.

The presence of the word **בעל** suggests that something once stood here in regard to the case of husband and wife, and that the textual emendation to be made is one which will limit **בעל**, and at the same time treat of the case of defilement for a wife. The conjecture of Baentsch (p. 111) is good, namely, to read, **לא יטמא בעל לבנותו**, (cf. Gen. 20<sup>3</sup> Dt. 22<sup>22</sup> Is. 54<sup>1</sup>) only, instead of retaining **בעמיו**, as Baentsch does, I should regard it as a corruption of the original **בעולתו**. To retain it seems to me to spoil the sense. How could one say, "a husband shall not defile himself for his wife among his kinsfolk"? On the other hand, it is easy to see how, by the omission of the initial **ל** after the final **ל**, **בעולתו** might have been read as **בעמיו**. This conjecture restores the law which completes the sense of the group, and has the additional confirmation of corresponding with Ezekiel's refraining from mourning for his wife (Ez. 24<sup>16 f.</sup>).

After the specification of the cases in which the priest may or may not defile himself for the dead, there follows logically legislation in regard to the way in which mourning may be conducted (v. 5). The priest is not to degrade his office by self-mutilation as an outward sign of grief: "They shall not make baldness upon their head and the edge of their beard they shall not shave" (read with **יקררו** instead of **יקררו**). In substance this law is identical with the general prohibition to Israel in 19<sup>27</sup> and the law for the priests in Ez. 44<sup>20</sup>. There can be no doubt, therefore, that it is part of the original legislation.

“And in their flesh they shall not cut a cutting” (v. 5 *b*), agrees with 19<sup>28</sup> in the use of the word שרמט, which is not found elsewhere in the Hexateuch. In that passage the prohibition is expressly said to apply to the case of mourning for the dead. Here the application is left to be inferred from the context.

To this commandment is annexed (v. 6 *a*) the reason, “They shall be holy unto their God and shall not profane the name of their God.” That this is not to be regarded as a new law, is evident, (1) from its general character, which makes it inappropriate as one of a series of laws against defilement for the dead but suitable as an argument for obedience to the foregoing laws, (2) from the analogy of the phrase “they shall be holy” in other contexts (Lev. 11<sup>44</sup> 19<sup>2</sup> 20<sup>7, 26</sup> 21<sup>8</sup>). In all these passages the phrase is an exhortation to obey the law which has just preceded. (3) In Dt. 14<sup>2</sup> the prohibition to make cuttings or baldness is also accompanied by the reason, “for thou art a holy people unto Yahweh thy God” (cf. Ex. 22<sup>30</sup>).

The other phrase, “and they shall not profane the name of their God,” stands also uniformly as an exhortation at the close of a group of laws (18<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>12</sup>; cf. 20<sup>3</sup> 22<sup>2, 32</sup>). Both of these phrases are inserted elsewhere in the original legislation of H at the end of pentads, and, therefore, the five laws which have just been given doubtless belong to the original form of the code. The formula “Thou (they) shalt not profane the name of thy God” is regularly prefixed elsewhere to the closing subscription of a pentad, “I am Yahweh,” and it seems probable, therefore, that this subscription stood originally in this context and has accidentally fallen out of the text. The exhortation in 6 *a* evidently comes from the non-priestly editor, the same hand which has added the exhortations to obedience in Lev. 17-19 and Lev. 20. These are his stock hortatory phrases.

Verse 6 *b* is part of the same hortatory addition. The phrase אשי יהוה, however, is not only superfluous alongside of לחם אלהים (against Driver), but is characteristic of P (cf. Lev. 2<sup>3, 10</sup> 6<sup>11</sup> 7<sup>35</sup> 10<sup>12, 13</sup>, etc.). לחם אלהים stands alone in 21<sup>8, 17, 22</sup> 22<sup>25</sup>. It also stands alone in Ez. 44<sup>7</sup>, and אשי יהוה is never found in Ezekiel. לחם אלהים is peculiar to H. דקריב, as the technical expression for ‘offer,’ occurs constantly in P, but it cannot be said to be characteristic of P, since Ezekiel uses it also (cf. 43<sup>22, 24</sup> 44<sup>7, 15, 27</sup> 46<sup>4</sup>). In 44<sup>7</sup> we meet the phrase בהקריבכם את לחמי, which shows the same striking affinity with H which is noticeable throughout Ezekiel. In view of this fact, and of the frequent occurrence of this word in connection with characteristic words of H in Lev. 21-22, we must, I

think, regard it as a word of the older legislation and not as one which has been added by Rp. The phrase which is characteristic of P is **הקריב קרבן**, which is never used in Ezekiel nor in the primitive portion of H. "They shall be holy," the phrase at the end of the verse, is also alien to P. Omitting, then, **אשר יהיה** as the only priestly addition, we have in v. 6 a comment by the non-priestly hortatory editor whom we have met already in Lev. 17-20. The language is identical, and the heaping up of synonymous phrases in this verse is analogous to what we have met already in the exhortations of the previous chapters.

The second subdivision of this group, vs. 7-9, contains laws in regard to priestly purity in the family relation. The priest shall not defile himself by marrying a harlot or a profaned (dishonored) woman (7*a*), nor shall he take a woman who has been put away from her husband (7*b*). The use of the word **הללה** (cf. 19<sup>29</sup> **תהלה**) and the reason annexed, "for he is holy unto his God," stamp these two laws as part of the original legislation.

The inference which might be drawn from this legislation is that marriages which are not prohibited are permitted, but it is surprising that permitted cases are not enumerated. The peculiarity of this Holiness legislation is its theoretical completeness, and it is not probable that the original legislation left it to be inferred by a process of exclusion what marriages were lawful for a priest. Apparently it is left open to the ordinary priest to marry a virgin or a widow, but it is scarcely probable that marriage with any widow was permitted, since a widow out of a non-priestly family, who had children by her former husband, would have introduced serious complications into the system of priestly separation which is laid down in this code. In 22<sup>10</sup> it is specified that no alien shall eat of the meat of the sacrifices which formed the sustenance of the priests. The only exception is in the case of slaves who have been bought or are born in the house (22<sup>11</sup>). The legislation in regard to the priests in Lev. 21-22 is very complete, but no allusion is made in it to the case of children of a priest's wife by a former marriage; and in 22<sup>13b</sup> the child of a priest's daughter, who stands nearer to the priestly family than children of the widow of a non-priest, is forbidden to eat of the holy thing. This makes it evident that the case of non-priestly step-children of a priest is not contemplated as a possibility. Accordingly, there must originally have been some limitation put upon marriage of priests with widows, and this must have stood in immediate connection with the prohibition of other profane marriages. It is proba-

ble, also, that the explicit command to marry a virgin was given, since in 21<sup>13</sup>, the case of the high priest, it is not left to be inferred from the prohibitions whom he may marry, but it is said positively, "He shall take a wife in her virginity."

The two laws, which must have stood originally before 21<sup>7</sup>, are found in Ezekiel 44<sup>22</sup>. Here the harlot and the profaned woman are omitted as self-evidently unfit to become wives of priests; the divorced woman is named, and in addition it is said, "But (they shall take) a virgin of the seed of the house of Israel, and they shall take a widow who is the widow of a priest." Some such laws as these must have stood in H, unless there was a greater gap here in the legislation than analogy would lead us to expect. The similarity of the diction of this verse in Ezekiel with H is noteworthy (cf. מורע, בית ישראל, יקחו). The reason annexed in v. 7 *b*, "for he is holy unto his God," comes obviously from the same hand as the hortatory comments in v. 6.

Verse 8 calls upon the individual Israelite to guard the holiness of the priest as commanded in the foregoing legislation; "Thou shalt hallow him, for the food of thy God he offereth; holy shall he be unto thee." Nothing more foreign to the spirit of the priestly code could be conceived than this charge to the nation to protect the sanctity of its priests. On the other hand, it is characteristic of the hortatory editor of H to address, not the priests but the nation. The entire verse discloses both the spirit and the language of the hortatory editor in Lev. 17-20.

The following words, "I am Yahweh who hallow you," form the concluding formula which throughout this legislation marks the end of the larger groups of laws (21<sup>15-23</sup> 22<sup>9,16,32</sup>). It is analogous to the formulae "I am Yahweh your God" and "I am Yahweh your God who have brought you out of the land of Egypt," which we find closing the decads in Lev. 17-19. אני יהוה belongs to the fundamental structure of the code, but כי קדוש and מקדשכם are additions of the hortatory editor. The peculiar form of the addition in Lev. 21-22 is due to the peculiar subject which is treated and the desire to emphasize the priestly holiness. The כי, with which the closing formula is here introduced is, of course, not original (cf. 22<sup>9,32</sup>). Throughout Lev. 17-19 אני יהוה is used absolutely.

Although this formula naturally closes the section in which the holiness of the priest is discussed, there follows one law more in v. 9, in which purity is demanded in the daughter of a priest because of the sanctity of her father. That this does not belong to P is evident

both from the thought and from the language (cf. תחל, איש כהן, מחללת, באש תשרף). The problem, therefore, is whether the law belongs to the original legislation, and has been transferred to a place after the closing formula, or whether it is an early gloss on the legislation of H. In favor of the latter view, it may be urged that the penalty of burning with fire occurs elsewhere only in Lev. 20<sup>14</sup>, and there is reason to regard Lev. 20 as a production of the homilete who has added sundry comments in Lev. 17-19. In favor of regarding the law as part of the original legislation, is the fact that the group of laws in regard to the high priest (21<sup>10-15</sup>) is closed with a precept similar in spirit to this, "He shall not profane his seed among his kinsfolk." In view of the special use of חלל in this code, this law can only mean that the high priest is not to allow his children to be seduced or prostituted. If such a special prohibition is given in the case of his family, it is probable that a similar one was given in the case of the ordinary priests' families, particularly as in 19<sup>29</sup> it is said, "Profane not thy daughter to make her a harlot." In all these cases it is probable that the lawgiver has religious prostitution in mind, and the danger of this being introduced at the sanctuaries of Yahweh through imitation of Canaanitish usage was so great (cf. Hos. 4<sup>11-14</sup>) that it is very likely that a law guarding against such profanation was inserted in this connection. The priest's daughter is also referred to in 22<sup>12f</sup>, so that it is not unnatural that she should be mentioned here. These considerations, and the strong correspondence of the diction of this verse with H, make it probable that it is an original law, and that it has been transposed to its present place outside of the colophon by some copyist who regarded it as foreign to the subject of priestly purity. In that case it must have stood originally immediately after v. 7. The penalty, "She shall be burnt with fire," is probably an editorial addition, since it is not strictly relevant to the subject under consideration, which is, holiness in the priest. The words, "she profaneth her father," are appropriate, but "she shall be burnt with fire," abandons the standpoint of the priest and takes up that of the daughter. In view of 20<sup>14</sup>, it probably comes from the hortatory editor.

Gathering up now the results of our investigation, we may exhibit the analysis of the legislation of this group as follows.

GROUP XI. HOLINESS IN THE PRIESTS (Lev. 21<sup>1-9</sup>).a. Prohibitions of Personal Defilement for the Dead (21<sup>1-6</sup>).

*And Yahweh said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron and say unto them,*

1. [A priest] shall not defile himself for a (dead) person among his kinsfolk.
2. Nevertheless for his near kin that is nigh unto him; for his mother, and for his father, and for his son, and for his daughter, and for his brother, and for his sister, a virgin that is nigh to him, who hath not had a husband, for her he may defile himself.
3. A husband shall not defile himself for his wife (?) to profane himself.
4. They shall not make a bald spot upon their head nor shave the edge of their beard: *and*
5. In their flesh they shall not cut a cutting. *They shall be holy unto their God and not profane the name of their God [I AM YAHWEH], for the fire-offerings of Yahweh, the food of their God, they offer, and they shall be holy.*

b. Holiness in the Priest's Family (Lev. 21<sup>7-9</sup>).

6. [They shall take as wives for them virgins of the seed of the house of Israel: and
7. A widow that is the widow of a priest they shall take.] (cf. 21<sup>13</sup> Ez. 44<sup>22</sup>).
8. A woman that is a harlot or profaned they shall not take: *and*
9. A woman divorced from her husband they shall not take, *for he is holy unto his God, and thou shalt hallow him, for the food of thy God he offereth; he shall be holy unto thee, for I AM YAHWEH the holy, who hallow you: and*
10. The daughter of any priest, if she profane herself to be a harlot, she profaneth her father: *she shall be burnt with fire.*

2. Laws in Regard to Holiness in the High Priest (Lev. 21<sup>10-15</sup>).—

This compact and well-arranged little section has come down almost untouched by the later editors, and it is admitted by all critics that it belongs to H. It follows in the main the same lines which were laid down in the section on the ordinary priests but heightens some-

what the requirements of holiness. The phrases **הכהן הגדול מאחיו** (v. 10), **מקדש אלהיו, אני יהוה**, **מקדש, יהלל**, **המקדש** (v. 12) and the numerous verbal similarities with the last group make it certain that it is a part of H. The only places in which the hand of Rp is visible are the phrases **אשר יוצק על ראשו שמן המשחה ומלא את ידו** (v. 10) and **כי נור שמן משחת אלהיו עליו** (v. 12) which, with Kayser, Kuenen, Dillmann, Horst, Baentsch, Driver are to be regarded as priestly glosses (cf. Lev. 8<sup>12</sup> 10<sup>7</sup> Nu. 6<sup>7</sup>). The hand of the older editor is to be seen in the phrase **ולא יחלל** **את מקדש אלהיו** (v. 12) (cf. 18<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>12</sup> 20<sup>3</sup> 21<sup>6</sup> 22<sup>2,32</sup>) and in the addition of **מקדשו** to **אני יהוה** (v. 15).

It deserves notice that in v. 14 a widow and a divorced woman are put apparently in the same category with a dishonored woman and a harlot, while in 21<sup>7</sup> the two latter stand in a separate precept. This was probably the case originally in v. 14 also, and, accordingly, we must supply **לא יקה** after **וגרושה** and make two separate sentences. We must also supply **ו** before **זנה**, since this word is not synonymous with **החללה**, and there is no reason for thinking with Dillmann that **זנה** is a gloss.

Verse 14 *b* is not synonymous with v. 13, which prescribes that the high priest shall marry a virgin, for it commands him to take a wife from his kinsfolk, that is, a woman of priestly family, or perhaps of high priestly family, in order that the sanctity of his lineage may be more strictly preserved. In v. 11 read **נפש** instead of **נפשת** on account of the singular **מת** which follows (cf. Nu. 6<sup>6</sup>). This group is divided into pentads in the same manner as those in Lev. 17-19 by the phrase I AM YAHWEH (vs. 12, 15). The structure of the group, accordingly, is as follows.

## GROUP XII. HOLINESS IN THE HIGH PRIEST (Lev. 21<sup>10-15</sup>).

### a. In Regard to Defilement for the Dead (vs. 10-12).

1. The priest that is greater than his brethren, *upon whose head the anointing oil is poured, and that is consecrated to put on the garments,* shall not let his hair fly loose *and*
2. His garments he shall not rend : *and*
3. Unto any dead person he shall not go in.
4. For his father and for his mother he shall not defile himself : *and*
5. From the sanctuary he shall not go out, *lest he profane the sanctuary of his God : for the consecration of the anointing oil of his God is upon him : I AM YAHWEH : and*

**b. In the High Priest's Family (vs. 13-15).**

6. He shall take a wife in her virginity.
7. A widow or a divorced woman [he shall not take].
8. A profaned woman [or] a harlot these he shall not take: *but*
9. A virgin of his kinsfolk shall he take to wife: *and*
10. He shall not profane his seed among his kinsfolk, *for I AM YAHWEH who hallow him.*

**3. Blemishes which debar a priest Permanently from Ministering** (Lev. 21<sup>16-23</sup>). — The section is now generally admitted to belong to H in all its main features. The formula with which it is closed (v. 23 *b*) is the regular one which stands at the end of all of the groups of this part of the code, and it is reasonable to suppose that if the subscription of H has been retained, something of the original legislation has also been preserved. Moreover, Dillmann has called attention to the fact that the priestly title in v. 16 f. is only a formal attempt to make the legislation an address to Aaron and his sons. Throughout the group the priest is spoken of in the third person, as in the two groups which we have just considered. Accordingly, it is evident that here also older laws have been fitted into the scheme of the priestly editor. This older legislation must have been H, on account of the words **אני יהוה, חלל, מקדש, להם אלהיו**.

The editorial hand of Rp is clearly recognized in the title (vs. 16, 17 *a*) and in the phrase **מזרע אהרן הכהן** (v. 21), which shows itself to be an interpolation by the way in which it breaks the structure of the sentence. If this is an interpolation, **מזרעך** also in v. 17 must be an addition by Rp to carry out the idea of the title. **לדרתם** is characteristic of P and adds nothing to the sense. **לא יגש לדקריב** (v. 21) is redundant alongside of the following clause and shows that it belongs to P by the phrase **את הקריב** (see above on 21<sup>6b</sup>). Furthermore, as Wellhausen has shown (*Comp.*, p. 160 f.), the distinction between **קדשי הקדשים** and **הקדשים** is characteristic of P and is unknown to the older code which, in the discussion of the question who shall eat of the holy things (22<sup>1-16</sup>), gives no hint of the distinction between holy and most holy which is worked out so elaborately by P. Accordingly, **מקדשי הקדשים** (v. 22) is to be assigned to Rp. There is no reason, however, why we should regard the following words **מן הקדשים** as a gloss also, for **הקדשים** is frequently used by H in 22<sup>1-16</sup>. H recognizes two classes of gifts, **להם אלהים** or sacrifices

which are consumed wholly or in part upon the altar, and קדשים or offerings of other sorts, but H never treats קדשים as a variety of להם אלהים, although להם אלהים may be a variety of קדשים. Now it is only natural that the priest with a blemish should be permitted to eat of these offerings as well as of the sacrifices, and some mention of the קדשים must, therefore, have stood in this connection in the original code.

Whether the פרכת (v. 23) is to be set to the account of Rp, as is generally done, seems to me doubtful. It is true that this word does not occur outside of the PC, but then it may fairly be claimed that there is no occasion elsewhere to mention it. Besides, there is nothing to show that this writer uses the word in the sense in which P uses it of the curtain of the inner sanctuary. I am unwilling to venture a positive opinion upon this question.

Verse 24 shows itself to be a priestly interpolation, not only by its language, but also by its lack of relation to the context. וידבר has no object in the immediate context. The priestly legislation which originally followed it is apparently scattered through the next section of H.

Subtracting the additions of Rp from this section, we turn to an examination of the older legislation. Verse 17 (minus Rp) reads, "A man in whom is a blemish shall not approach to offer the food of his God." The first half of this verse is identical with the next sentence, and the last half is in anticipation of v. 21 *b*. The simpler form of the precept, as it stands in v. 18 *a*, is probably original, and the mention of offering the food of God belongs more naturally later (v. 21 *b*) in the enumeration of the particular things which the priest with a blemish may not do. The original first law of the group was the general prohibition, "Any man in whom there is a blemish shall not approach," that is, not only shall not sacrifice, but shall not perform any of the other specifically priestly functions which are enumerated later. This is in harmony with the analogy of the rest of the code, which puts general laws first. Verse 17 *b*, accordingly, must be a summary of the contents of the following group of laws, which has been prefixed by some later editor. The borrowing of H's expressions which it discloses and the use of the phrase איש אשר suggest that it has been added by the homilete who wrote Lev. 20. In any case, this sentence cannot be original. From the same hand come the additions in v. 23 בו מום כי מקדשי, ולא יחלל את מקדשם.

Verses 18-20 enumerate a variety of blemishes which debar a

priest from ministering. These blemishes are of very different kinds and probably once stood in separate laws, but now they are all fused in one long sentence. On closer examination, it appears that they fall into four classes: (1) defects, **עור, פסח, חרם**; (2) superfluities (?) **שרוץ**; (3) injuries, **שביר יד, שביר רגל**, and (4) diseases, **מרוח אשך, ילפת, גרב, תכלל**. The original division into precepts may have followed the lines of the analysis of thought, but a later editor has omitted **לא יקרב**, with which each precept ended, leaving it to be understood from the first general law with which the section opens. This is analogous to the fusing of two independent counts through the omission of the verb in Lev. 21<sup>14</sup>. There is here then, probably, a pentad of laws in regard to those blemishes which exclude from the exercise of priestly functions. Through the syncope of the passage, or perhaps through unwillingness to mention the sacred name of God in connection with loathsome diseases, the usual concluding formula has fallen away.

Then follows in vs. 21-23 a little set of laws which define more closely what the priest with a blemish may do and what he may not do. He may not sacrifice. He may eat of the meat of the sacrifices. He may eat of the other holy things. He may not go in to the **פרכת**. He may not draw near to the altar. Here are five laws before the closing formula of the group, if the mention of the **פרכת** be original. The fact that the law against approach to the **פרכת** completes the group creates a presumption in favor of its antiquity. The group then as a whole reads as follows.

GROUP XIII. BLEMISHES WHICH DEBAR A PRIEST FROM MINISTERING  
(Lev. 21<sup>16-23</sup>).

a. Enumeration of Blemishes (vs. 16-20).

*And Yahweh spake unto Moses saying, Speak unto Aaron, saying, a man of thy seed unto their generations in whom is a blemish shall not approach to offer the food of his God, for*

1. Any man in whom is a blemish shall not approach.
2. A man who is blind or lame or defective [shall not approach] : *or*
3. [A man] who hath anything superfluous (?) [shall not approach] : *or*
4. A man who is brokenfooted, or brokenhanded, or brokenbacked, or crushed (?) [shall not approach] : *or*
5. Bleareyed, or scrofulous (?), or scurvy (?), or swollen (?) in the testicles shall not approach.

**b. Disabilities which they involve (vs. 21-23).**

6. Any man in whom is a blemish *of the seed of Aaron the priest shall not draw near to offer the fire-offerings of Yahweh; a blemish is in him; the food of his God he shall not draw near to offer.*
7. The food of his God [he shall eat]. *Of the most holy things and*
8. Of the holy things he shall eat : *only*
9. Unto the veil shall not go in : (?) *and*
10. Unto the altar he shall not draw near, *for a blemish is in him, lest he profane my sanctuaries: for I AM YAHWEH who hallow them.*

**4. Temporary Disqualification for Eating the Holy Things (Lev. 21<sup>24</sup>-22<sup>9</sup>).** — This group is the logical continuation of the last, and although it contains more matter similar to P than most of the other groups, there can hardly be a doubt that its core belongs to H. The last group treats of blemishes which disqualify a priest *permanently* from ministering; there are other cases, however, where defilement takes place, in which it is of a less serious nature, and H must have had something to say in regard to these. That older laws have been worked over in this section by Rp is evident from the fact that, although Aaron and his sons are formally addressed in the title, here, as before, the legislation speaks of the priests in the third person, except the priestly interpolated words **לדרתיכם** and **מכל זרעכם** in v. 3. Obviously, the legislation was originally addressed to Israel, as in the previous groups. The connection of the main portions of this group with H is further attested by the fact that all the commandments are given from the standpoint of holiness and by the use of the characteristic expressions **יקדשו** (v. 2), **יהללו את שם קדשי** (v. 2), **יקדשו** (v. 2), **אני יהוה** (vs. 3, 8), **איש איש** (v. 4), **לחמו** (v. 7), **לטמאה** (v. 8), “They shall keep my charge and not bear sin when they profane it; I am Yahweh who sanctify them” (v. 9).

The introductory formula in v. 1 f. evidently belongs to Rp. The following sentence is just such a general proposition as we usually find at the beginning of groups of H's laws, and it is couched in the language of H, so that there is no reason to doubt that it is original. “Lest they profane my holy name” is very clumsily interpolated in this sentence and cannot be original. It is doubtless an addition of the homiletic editor. In v. 3 the phrases **אמר אליהם לדרתיכם**, **מכל זרעכם** betray themselves to be interpolations of Rp by their resumption of the direct address of the introductory formula and by

the use of the word **לדרת הנפש ההיא** suggests P, but the addition of **מלפני** is unlike P, and, therefore, the utmost that we can suppose Rp to have done here is to have changed an original **איש איש** (cf. Lev. 17<sup>4</sup> 9) into **נפש טמאתו**. **נפש** is not characteristic of P (cf. Ez. 22<sup>15</sup> 24<sup>11</sup> 13 36<sup>17</sup> 25 39<sup>24</sup>). With these exceptions, this verse belongs to the original legislation, as is proved by its diction and by its organic relation to the rest of the group. The first law bids the priests beware of defiling the offerings; this law pronounces H's customary penalty of cutting off upon the man who eats the holy things when he is ceremonially unclean. The phrase **אני יהוה** in vs. 2, 3 does not correspond with the logical divisions of the legislation, and, therefore, is not primitive. The insertion is to be attributed to the older editor who uses the formula in this loose way.

After these two more general propositions, the special cases of personal defilement through disease follow in v. 4 *a*. Here only **מורע אהרן** is an interpolation of Rp. Three distinct cases are fused in this sentence; that of a leper, of a man with an issue, and of a man who has once been disqualified to eat of the holy thing through disease but has been healed. In substance, doubtless, these laws belong to H, but it is not the literary form of H to unite miscellaneous subjects in the same sentence. Consequently, we must suppose that the combination is not original, but has come in through one of the redactions.

All the cases of defilement enumerated as far as 4 *b* are those which arise through some diseased condition in the priest himself; those which follow are defilements through contact with unclean objects. Verse 4 has an obvious interpolation in **או איש אשר תצא ממנו זרע** which, if it were original, would stand among the personal defilements and not here among the defilements through contact. The language **זרע שכתב זרע** shows that it has been added by Rp (cf. Lev. 15<sup>16</sup> 17<sup>18</sup> 32 19<sup>20</sup> Nu. 5<sup>13</sup>). H says **נתן שכתבך** (1) without the addition of **זרע** (cf. Lev. 18<sup>20</sup> 23 20<sup>15</sup>). Moreover, the case here specified has been covered already in v. 4, and this is another evidence that this sentence is an interpolation.

Verse 5 contains two cases of defilement through contact, both of which belong to H. **שרץ** is no evidence of interpolation by Rp, since this word is used in the Holiness legislation of Lev. 11<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>41</sup> (11<sup>20</sup> = Deut. 14<sup>19</sup>). The last two words of the sentence, however, **לכל טמאתו**, are certainly a gloss of Rp (cf. Lev. 5<sup>3f</sup> 11<sup>26</sup> 16<sup>16</sup>).

Verse 6 belongs to Rp, with the exception of **מזן הקדשים**, which is the conclusion of the sentence in v. 5 (cf. Lev. 11<sup>25</sup> 28<sup>32</sup> 39).

13<sup>6</sup> 34 14<sup>8, 9</sup> 15<sup>5, 11, 13, 27</sup> Nu. 19<sup>7</sup> 10, 19). The next verse belongs entirely to H. The phrase **וּבֹא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ** is never found in P, but occurs in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 22<sup>25</sup>) and in Deut. (11<sup>30</sup> 16<sup>6</sup> 23<sup>12</sup> 24<sup>13, 15</sup>). "For it is his food" is apparently a gloss of the older editor. The use of **לֶחְמוֹ** suggests the same writer who speaks of the sacrifices as **לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים** in Lev. 21<sup>6, 8</sup>.

The legislation in vs. 3-7 is found in another independent priestly recension in Lev. 7<sup>30 f.</sup>. The same legislation of H underlies this passage which underlies Lev. 22<sup>3-7</sup>, but it has been worked up in a different fashion and less of the original legislation has been preserved than is the case here.

Lev. 22<sup>8</sup> contains nothing which suggests P, but it is rather surprising that a case of defilement through eating rather than through touching should be introduced here, although eating is a kind of contact. Besides, a law against eating that which is fallen or torn has been given already to all Israelites in Lev. 17<sup>15 f.</sup>, and, therefore, there is apparently no need of this command being laid particularly upon the priests (but cf. Lev. 19<sup>27</sup> with 21<sup>5</sup>). Baentsch pronounces the verse a gloss, but this is unlikely in view of the facts that it corresponds absolutely with the diction of H (cf. **נִבְלָה וְטֵרֵפָה** Lev. 17<sup>15</sup>, **בֶּה לִטְמֵאָה** 18<sup>20, 23</sup> 19<sup>31</sup>), and that it carries with it the original closing formula of the group **אֲנִי יְהוָה**. It seems more probable that it is part of the original legislation, and that 'eat' is an accidental textual error for 'touch,' which has come in through memory of 17<sup>15</sup> or through influence of **יֹאכַל** in v. 7.

Verse 9 is an exhortation appended to the closing subscription of the group. It comes from the hand of the non-priestly editor (cf. Lev. 18<sup>30</sup> 20<sup>17, 19</sup>). The last clause of this verse, "I am Yahweh who hallow them," is interesting as showing that this longer formula is not primitive. Here the original short formula "I am Yahweh" remains alongside of the expanded formula at the beginning of the verse. In most cases the hortatory editor has simply appended "who hallow them" to the primitive formula. If, now, our investigation has been correct, the analysis of this group must be somewhat as follows.

#### GROUP XIV. TEMPORARY UNFITNESS FOR EATING THE HOLY THINGS (Lev. 21<sup>24-22<sup>9</sup></sup>).

##### a. Defilement through Disease (vs. 1-4 a).

*And Moses spake unto Aaron and unto his sons and unto all the sons of Israel; and Yahweh spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, and*

1. They shall separate themselves from the holy things of the sons of Israel, *lest they profane my holy name*, which they are hallowing unto me: *I am Yahweh. Say unto them unto your generations:*
2. Every man who approacheth *from all your seed* unto the holy things which the sons of Israel hallow unto Yahweh, having his uncleanness upon him, that *soul* [man] shall be cut off from before me: *I am Yahweh.*
3. Any man *of the seed of Aaron* who is a leper [shall not eat of the holy things], *or*
4. A man who has an issue shall not eat of the holy things, *until*
5. When he is cleansed [he shall eat of them].

**b. Defilement through Contact (vs. 4 b-9).**

6. He who toucheth anything that is unclean by a dead person [shall not eat of the holy things], *or a man whose issue of seed goeth from him, or*
7. A man who toucheth any creeping thing whereby he may be defiled [shall not eat of the holy things], *or*
8. [A man who toucheth] a man by whom he may be defiled *according to all his uncleanness, the soul that toucheth any such shall be unclean until the evening and shall not eat of the holy things, unless he bathe his flesh with water, and*
9. When the sun has set, he shall be clean, and after that he shall eat of the holy things, *for it is his food.*
10. That which is fallen or torn he shall not *eat* [touch] for defilement with it: I AM YAHWEH: *and they shall observe my charge and shall not bear sin because of it, lest they die in it, when they profane it: I am Yahweh who hallow them: and—*

**5. Laws determining who besides the Priests may eat of the Offerings** (Lev. 22<sup>10-16</sup>). — After the answering of the question, who among the *priests* is qualified to eat of the holy things, the subject which logically comes next is the relation of those who are not priests to the sacrifices. This subject is thoroughly discussed in the section before us. That it does not belong to P is evident from the absence of any distinction between the holy things and the most holy things, and also from the diction of the closing formula in v. 16. Whether Wellhausen (*Comp.*, p. 160) is right in finding a difference from P in the fact that no sin-offering is demanded of the man who illegally eats of the holy things is uncertain (cf. Dillmann, *Ex.-Lev.*, p. 572).

It is also not quite clear that P forbids slaves of priests to eat of the sacrifices (cf. Baentsch, p. 107). However, even if this writer does not stand upon so radically different ground from P as Wellhausen seeks to prove, still in form and substance this legislation is as independent of P as any of the groups which we have already noted.

The original legislation is preserved here almost intact, and Rp has not done more than add occasional explanatory words. Such words are the appositive phrase קנין כספו (v. 11; cf. Gen. 17<sup>12, 23</sup> 36<sup>6</sup> Ex. 12<sup>44</sup>), בתרומת before הקדשים (v. 12), which is contrary to the usage of H, and is characteristic of P; את אשר ירימו ליהוה (v. 15); אשמה (v. 16). Beyond this, it does not seem to me that the hand of Rp is to be recognized. The exhortation in v. 16 is, doubtless, an addition of the older editor. Compare the use of נשא עון, as in Lev. 20<sup>17, 19</sup>, and compare also the similar hortatory conclusions of the preceding groups.

Other words in this group have been claimed for P, but improperly. זר, for instance, is used frequently by P to denote one who is not of the family of Aaron or who is not a Levite, but it is also used in Dt. 25<sup>5</sup> 1 Ki. 3<sup>18</sup> Job 15<sup>19</sup> 19<sup>27</sup> Prov. 11<sup>15</sup> 14<sup>10</sup> Ho. 8<sup>12</sup> in a broader way to designate a man who belongs to any other tribe or clan than one's own, and this is its sense here. By זר H does not understand a non-priest as P does, for he permits slaves to eat of the holy things (v. 11), but he uses it to denote one who is not a member of the priest's family. P uses תושב as a synonym of גר (Gen. 23<sup>4</sup> Lev. 25<sup>23</sup> Nu. 35<sup>15</sup>), while H, here and in the succeeding legislation, applies it to the Hebrew who through poverty has come into a state of partial and temporary servitude (cf. 25<sup>6, 40</sup>). In the passage before us from H, the תושב occupies an intermediate position between the stranger and the hired servant. That he is an Israelite is certain. גרים do not even come into view in this legislation as eligible to eat of the holy things, for even one of half-priestly blood cannot eat of it (cf. v. 13 *b*). In this use of the word, therefore, there is a marked difference from P. In v. 11 also, יליד בית is not characteristic of P (cf. Jer. 2<sup>14</sup>).

The only other point which needs to be noted is that 13 *b* is not a mere repetition of 10 *a*. Verse 10 *a* is a general law forbidding those who are not members of the family of the priest to eat the holy thing; v. 13 *b* is a particular prohibition, which takes its color from the command which has just gone before. In v. 13 *a* it is said that the priest's daughter, who is a widow, may return to her former privileges in her father's house, "if she have no seed." This law adds,

“but no stranger shall eat of it.” The context demands that this should be interpreted as giving a case which forms the counterpart to the one which has just been stated, namely, where the priest’s daughter *has a child*. In this case the “stranger,” *i.e.* the child of a father who is not a priest, shall not eat of the holy thing. It may be remarked also that v. 15 is not part of the closing exhortation of the group, but a general law commanding the priests to see to it that the unlawful persons enumerated above are not permitted to eat of the holy things. As such it forms an appropriate closing precept. The analysis of the group is accordingly as follows.

GROUP XV. EATING OF THE HOLY THINGS BY OTHERS THAN THE PRIESTS (Lev. 22<sup>10-16</sup>).

**a. By Those who are in the Priest’s Household** (vs. 10, 11).

1. No stranger shall eat a holy thing.
2. A sojourner with a priest [shall not eat a holy thing] : *and*
3. A hired servant shall not eat a holy thing : *and*
4. When a priest buys a person, *the purchase of his money*, he shall eat of it : *and*
5. Those born in his house they shall eat of his food : *and*

**b. By Those who stand in Other Relations** (vs. 12-16).

6. The daughter of a priest, if she have a stranger for husband, she shall not eat *the contribution of* the holy things, *and*
7. The daughter of a priest, when she is a widow or divorced, and has no seed, and is returned to the house of her father as in her youth, shall eat of her father’s food *and*
8. No stranger (*i.e.* child of a non-priest) shall eat of it : *and*
9. When a man shall eat a holy thing by mistake, he shall add a fifth to it and he shall give the holy thing to the priest : *and*
10. They shall not profane the holy things of the sons of Israel *which they contribute unto Yahweh, lest they cause them to bear iniquity that bringeth guilt when they eat their holy things, for I AM YAHWEH.*

**6. Laws in regard to Sacrifices** (Lev. 22<sup>17-33</sup>). — It is natural that legislation in regard to sacrifices should follow legislation in regard to the priests and other persons who are entitled to eat of the sacrifices. It is, therefore, to be expected antecedently that H contained

laws on this subject. Verse 18*b* opens the group with the characteristic formula of H, **אִישׁ אִישׁ מִכִּית יִשְׂרָאֵל**, and the group is closed in v. 30 with the formula **אֲנִי יְהוָה**. Verses 31–33 give an exhortation composed entirely of phrases of H in the style of the hortatory addresses which we have met in Lev. 17–20. This exhortation presupposes that a body of H's laws has gone before.

That laws of H underlie this group is probable, also, from the recurrence of words for blemishes which we have met already in Group XIII (Lev. 21<sup>17-23</sup>). The original form of the code is here very much obscured. The whole section is so interlarded with phrases of P that Kayser and Horst have pronounced it entirely the work of P; but, as just remarked, it is more probable, in view of the introductory and closing formulae, that the resemblance is due to a thoroughgoing editing rather than to composition by P himself. The analysis here has nothing to start from but peculiarities of diction and inconcinnities of style; nevertheless, these indications lead to fairly certain results, if only they are followed out consistently. Under the influence of the theory that H stands close to P in style and substance, the analysts have here assigned much to H which a consistent principle of criticism must lead us to give to P.

The superscription in vs. 17–18*a* belongs, of course, to P. The phrase **וּמִן הַגֵּר בִּישְׂרָאֵל** may belong to P, but more likely belongs to the older editor (cf. 20<sup>2</sup>). In any case, the extension of the legislation to the **גֵּרִים** is no part of the original plan of H (cf. JBL. xvi. 35). Here the extension stands in direct conflict with the prohibition in v. 25 to offer a sacrifice from the hand of a foreigner (cf. the notes on v. 25). Of course, **גֵּר** is not synonymous with **בֶּן נֹכֵר**; nevertheless, it is included in it. The following words, **אֲשֶׁר יִקְרִיב קִרְבָּנוּ לְכָל נִדְרֵיהֶם וְלִכְל נִדְבוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר**, bring the structure of the sentence into confusion, and necessitate the supplying of a predicate in v. 19*a*. Apart from linguistic indications, they seem to be a gloss, and this opinion is confirmed when we observe that the diction of this clause is purely priestly, e.g. **הַקְרִיב קִרְבָּן** (cf. JBL. xvi. 37), **לְכָל** (cf. Gen. 9<sup>10b</sup> 23<sup>10b</sup> Ex. 14<sup>28</sup> 27<sup>3, 19</sup> 28<sup>28</sup> 36<sup>1b</sup> Lev. 5<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>26, 42</sup> 16<sup>16, 21</sup> Nu. 4<sup>27, 31, 32</sup> 5<sup>9</sup> 18<sup>4, 8, 9</sup>), and the combination of **נִדְרִים** and **נִדְבוֹת** in the same phrase (cf. Lev. 7<sup>16</sup> Nu. 15<sup>3</sup> 29<sup>33</sup>). In Dt. 12<sup>6</sup> both are named in a list of kinds of sacrifices, but nowhere except in P are the two words habitually combined. For these reasons, there is no doubt that this clause is to be assigned to Rp, and it is a matter of surprise that Wellhausen and Baentsch should suppose it to have belonged to H. **יִקְרִיבוּ** must then be regarded

as changed from the singular to the plural to correspond with the insertion of the **גַּר**. **לִרְצוֹנְכֶם**, in the second person plural, is singularly inappropriate to the rest of the sentence, which is in the third person, and it interrupts the natural connection between **לְעֵלָה** and **תָּמִים זָכָר**. It is, moreover, a distinctive word of P (cf. Ex. 28<sup>28</sup> Lev. 1<sup>3</sup>). Accordingly, the original form of the sentence seems to have been **אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל יִקְרִיב לִיהוָה לְעֵלָה תָּמִים זָכָר**. Both in form and in substance this law is consistent with the legislation of H (cf. 17<sup>3</sup> 18<sup>6</sup>).

Verse 20*a* is a mere repetition in negative form of the law just given. The reason annexed in 20*b* is foreign to the spirit of H and shows that it belongs to Rp by the use of the word **לִרְצוֹן**.

Verse 21, as a whole, certainly belongs to P. The phrase **זָבַח לִיהוָה שְׁלָמִים** is peculiar to P (cf. JBL. xvi. 37). The combination of **נָדָר** and **נִדְבָה**, which we have already found to be a gloss in v. 18, is also characteristic of P. The phrase **לְפָלֵא נָדָר** is thoroughly priestly (cf. Lev. 27<sup>2</sup> Nu. 15<sup>3,8</sup>). So also is **לִרְצוֹן**, and the rest of the sentence is nothing more than a repetition of v. 19. Besides these linguistic indications, which are decisive in themselves, this sentence interrupts the continuity of thought in the legislation. The author has set out to discuss the burnt offerings, and has not yet finished that subject, for vs. 22, 24 still refer to them. He does not take up the subject of the **זָבָחִים** or **שְׁלָמִים** until v. 27 (cf. 29*a*), and then devotes the rest of the section to this kind of sacrifice. If v. 21 were original, it would stand in connection with v. 27 and not in its present place interrupting the legislation about the burnt offerings. The original legislation of this group, like the legislation of Lev. 17, recognized only two sorts of sacrifices, the **עֹלָה** and the **זָבַח**, and the two main divisions of the group treated of these two subjects respectively.

Verse 22 specifies particular cases of blemishes, and is unquestionably part of the primitive legislation (cf. the diction of the verse with that of Lev. 21<sup>18-20</sup>). In this verse the blemishes are classified, as we found to be the case in the law in regard to blemishes in the priests (Lev. 21<sup>18</sup>). There are two sorts of blemishes: (1) defects, **עוֹרֹת, שְׂבֹר, חֲרוֹץ**; and (2) diseases, **יִבְלַת, גֶּרֶב, יִבְלַת**. Verse 22*b* is a mere repetition of the thought of the preceding clause, and betrays its priestly origin by the words **עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לִיהוָה, אִשָּׁה**.

Verse 23 belongs wholly to Rp, both on account of its artificial distinction between **נִדְבָה** and **נָדָר**, permitting the sacrifice of deformed animals in one case and not in the other, and on account

of the closing phrase **לֹא יִרְצֶה**, which is never found outside of P (cf. Lev. 1<sup>4</sup> 7<sup>18</sup>). It is also an anticipation of the legislation in regard to peace-offerings. It can hardly be doubted, therefore, that this sentence is a later priestly refinement upon the original legislation, which did not permit the sacrifice of such animals in any case.

Verse 24 prohibits the sacrificing of a castrated animal, and enumerates the various forms of castration practised by the ancient Hebrews. It seems to be the natural continuation of v. 22, and the phrase **וּבִאֲרָצְכֶם לֹא תִנְשׂוּ** is quite alien to P. The meaning of the latter expression is obscure. It is hardly probable that it denotes that animals are not to be castrated. Dillmann's idea that it means ye shall not do so in your *land*, in contrast to the present situation in the desert, is also artificial. On the whole, it seems best to take **עִשָּׂה** in the same sense which it bears in Lev. 17<sup>9</sup>, namely, 'sacrifice.' In any case, the clause is superfluous and probably comes from the hand of the older editor.

Verse 25 shows signs of Rp only in the appended clause **לֹא יִרְצֶוּ לָכֶם**. The rest of the sentence is independent of P (cf. **בֶּן נָכַר**, **מִשְׁחַתֶּם**, **לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים**), and is generally recognized as part of the older legislation. The reason annexed to the law in 25 *b* can hardly belong to the primitive code. In its aim to commend the precept to the reason and in its doubling of arguments, "for their corruption is in them," "for a blemish is in them" (cf. 21<sup>23</sup>), it suggests rather the hortatory editor whom we have met so often already.

The interpretations which are put upon the law itself (25 *a*) are numerous. Dillmann (*Ex.-Lev.*, p. 574) understands it as addressed to the priests, and as prescribing that animals with blemishes are not to be received as sacrifices from foreigners any more than from Israelites. Such a law, however, is improbable. If an Israelite cannot offer an animal with a blemish, it is self-evident *a fortiori* that a foreigner cannot do it. When Dillmann says, "Vorausgesetzt ist, dass auch Fremde dem Jahve für sich opfern lassen dürfen," he is surely going beyond any indications of the code. Elsewhere, there is not a suggestion that the writer contemplates sacrifice by foreigners to the God of Israel as a possibility. Moreover, the original legislation in this group, as throughout H, is addressed to the people and not to the priests.

Accordingly, one must agree with Kuenen and Baentsch in holding that the law is intended to prevent Israelites from sacrificing animals obtained from foreigners. These critics are not justified, however, in supporting this position by appealing to the words **לֹא יִרְצֶוּ לָכֶם**,

since these are certainly an addition of Rp. The difficulty in the exegesis of this verse lies in the expression **מכל אלה**. Is this designed to exclude all sacrificial animals, or is it intended to refer only to the animals with blemishes just mentioned? Kuenen (*Volks-godsdienst en Wereldgodsdienst*, p. 277) takes the latter view: "Mijns inziens moet vs. 24 *b* ten nauwste met vs. 25 *a* verbonden worden en drukken ze samen het denkbeeld uit, dat de Israëlieten zulke verminkte dieren evenmin in hun land voor het altaar mogen bestemmen, als zij ze uit de hand eens buitenlanders mogen aannemen of aankopen, om de offerspijze van hunnen god uit een van die alle (d. i. van al die soorten van verminkte dieren) toe te brengen."

The mere grammatical structure is favorable to this interpretation, but it gives a sense which is unrelated to the context. Why, if it is illegal to sacrifice blemished animals in the land, should it be at all doubtful whether such animals might be received from the hand of a foreigner? If such animals cannot be received from the hand of an Israelite, then it is self-evident that they cannot be purchased from aliens to be sacrificed. The notion that this was allowable would never enter the mind of an Israelite, and there is, therefore, no reason to suppose that the original legislator went out of his way to give such a far-fetched enactment (cf. Horst, p. 23; Wellhausen, *Proleg.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 395). Accordingly, it is necessary to hold that the words **מכל אלה** are meant to refer to the various kinds of animals, bees, sheep, or goats, which may legally be offered in sacrifice, and that the prohibition is to offer these from the hand of a foreigner; *i.e.* to receive them by gift or purchase from foreigners to be offered in sacrifice, and *a fortiori* to offer sacrifices for foreigners.

On the other hand, although it gives a sense consistent with the context to suppose that **מכל אלה** refers to the various sorts of animals, bees, sheep, or goats, which may legally be offered, it is very difficult grammatically to suppose that this expression refers all the way back to v. 19 after so many other subjects have come in between.

In view of the fact that **מכל אלה** is incapable of an interpretation which will do justice both to the grammar and the sense, it is most natural to regard the expression as a gloss from the same hand which has appended the argument for obedience in the second half of the verse, particularly as it adds nothing to the scope of the law. A reason for the addition is not difficult to find. The original code read simply, "From the hand of a foreigner ye shall not offer the food of your God." This accords with the general standpoint of

the primitive legislation of H, which is addressed to the Israelite only and ignores foreigners. In the time of the hortatory editor, however, both **בן נכר** and **גרים** had a recognized place in the worship of the nation; consequently, he now and then appends a clause extending the legislation to them as well as to the Israelites (cf. Lev. 17<sup>8, 12, 13</sup> 20<sup>2</sup>; see JBL. xvi. 52). When he came to this verse in his source, he found it impossible to believe that it prohibited absolutely sacrificing an animal which had come from the hand of a foreigner. Accordingly, he took it to mean that defective animals which came from foreigners should not be sacrificed, and inserted the words **מכל אלה**, regardless of the fact that this reduced v. 25 to a feeble repetition of an idea which was included in the legislation already given.

This concludes the legislation in regard to the **עלה**. With v. 27 begin the laws in regard to the **זבח**, which occupy the rest of the group. The priestly editor has indicated that a new section begins by the new superscription in v. 26. That burnt offerings are no longer contemplated is evident from v. 28, where the sacrifice of a female sheep is mentioned (cf. v. 19), and from the explicit statements of v. 29.

Verse 27 *a* shows no signs of the influence of Rp, and is ancient in its contents. The same command is given in regard to firstlings in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 22<sup>29</sup>); and since in many respects H stands upon the same plane of legislation as the Book of the Covenant, this coincidence makes it probable that here we have an original law. Verse 27 *b*, however, is in the pure style of P (cf. **הלאה** Nu. 15<sup>23</sup> 17<sup>2</sup> 32<sup>19</sup>).

Verse 28 contains a provision against sacrificing a mother animal on the same day with her young. In spirit it is analogous to such provisions as we find in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 23<sup>19b</sup> 34<sup>26b</sup>). Neither in conception nor in language has it any affinities with P (cf. **הקריב זבח** instead of **שחט**). After this specification, what animals may be offered as **זבחים** and when they may be offered, there follow, naturally, laws in regard to the eating of these **זבחים** by the offerer; but instead of this legislation being general, as we should expect after the two perfectly general laws which have just been given, we find only one of the less frequent and obscurer varieties of the **זבח** or **שלם** specified, namely, the **תודה** or thank-offering. This, obviously, cannot be original, and since the **תודה** is an offering peculiar to the Priestly Code and apparently not known even to Ezekiel, we must suppose that this restriction of the legislation to the praise-

offerings is the work of Rp. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that the combination **תורה זבח** is used by P in Lev. 7<sup>12.13.15</sup>, and the phrase **זבחי שלמים ליהוה** is suggestive of **ליהוה זבח תורה ליהוה**, which is characteristic of P.

Again, the division of the **שלמים** into **נדרים**, **נדרות**, and **תודות**, which we find in v. 18 and in this verse, is peculiar to P (cf. Lev. 7<sup>11-21</sup>). Baentsch (p. 102 f.) attempts to show that the **תורה** in this passage is not regarded as a variety of **שלם** but as a distinct kind of sacrifice, and that H is here distinguished from P by recognizing only two forms of **שלמים** and treating the **תורה** independently. But, as we have seen, the **נדר** and **נדרה** are not original in this group of laws, and the fact that the **תורה** follows immediately upon the offerings of v. 27 f., which, manifestly, are **שלמים**, shows that it also is regarded as a variety of the **שלם**. There is really no difference between the standpoint of these passages and that of P, and there is, therefore, every reason to think that they come from the hand of Rp.

On the other hand, the way in which the law of v. 29 begins, **כי תזבח זבח** (cf. 17<sup>5.7</sup> 19<sup>5</sup>) instead of **הקריב זבח** (cf. 3<sup>1</sup> 7<sup>11.16.29</sup> etc.), as well as the closing formula **אני יהוה** in v. 30, shows that legislation of H must underlie these verses, and that all that Rp has done is to limit their application to the single case of the **תורה**. Striking out the words **תורה ליהוה לרצונכם תזבח** as a priestly addition, we have the relics of the original legislation of H on this subject.

The restriction of the legislation to the **תורה** has necessitated cutting it down, but fortunately the original full form has been preserved in Lev. 19<sup>5-8</sup>. We have noted already (JBL. xvi. 52) that these verses are out of place in the midst of the moral and social enactments among which they now stand. They are, however, just in their right place at this point in the law of sacrifices, and the identity of their phraseology with that of 22<sup>29</sup> shows that both passages go back to a common original.

That original has been preserved in its purest form in 19<sup>5-8</sup>. In it there is no trace of the threefold division of the **שלמים** which we find in Lev. 7, but the legislation stands upon the same plane as 17<sup>8</sup>, which knows only two kinds of sacrifice **עלה** and **זבח** without distinction within these varieties. This is the position of the Book of the Covenant and of all the early history and legislation, and, as we saw above, it was probably the original form of the code in Lev. 22<sup>18-29</sup>. The only traces of the influence of Rp in Lev. 19<sup>5-8</sup> are the redundant phrases **לרצונכם תזבח** (v. 5), **לא ירצה** (v. 7), and **ונכרתה הנפש ההיא מעמיה** (v. 8 b). All the rest of the passage

displays linguistic affinity with H (cf. the use of **זבח זבח** instead of **הקריב זבח** or **הקריב זבח**, **עונו ישא**, **יהוה הלל**, **את קדש יהוה הלל**, v. 8). There can be no doubt, therefore, that this is a part of H, and if it does not belong where it now is, where else can it belong than with Lev. 22<sup>20</sup>?

This original legislation has been worked over by Rp in Lev. 7<sup>15-18</sup> also, in a manner which is characteristic and instructive. A good deal of the old phraseology is retained, e.g. **פגול**, which is never used in purely priestly passages, and which besides Lev. 19<sup>7</sup> is found only in Ez. 4<sup>14</sup> and Is. 65<sup>4</sup>. The change which Rp has here made in the law is characteristic. He has introduced the threefold division of the **שלמים**. He has substituted **יניח** for **נותר** (v. 15). He has changed **זבח** into **הקריב קרבן** (v. 16). He has introduced the words **מבשר** **הזבח** (v. 17), and **מבשר זבח שלמיו** (v. 18), and **לא ירצה המקריב** **אתו לא יחשב לו** (v. 18). The original legislation of Lev. 19<sup>5-8</sup> is all there, but by means of these amplifications it has taken on the form of the Priestly Code.

In the light of this redaction, we must estimate Lev. 22<sup>18-20</sup>, where the same process has gone on. There the Priestly editor has awkwardly brought in the **נדריים** and the **נדבות** in the section about burnt offerings, and then, in the section on peace-offerings, has reduced the legislation, which must originally have been identical with that which now stands in Lev. 19<sup>5-8</sup>, to its present application to the **תודה** only (cf. Klostermann, *ZLT.*, 1887, p. 410). How the primitive form of the law in Lev. 19<sup>5-8</sup> came into its present position and how it escaped being conformed to the priestly legislation on the subject of the **שלמים**, is impossible to determine. Perhaps it was interpolated from the original H at a time subsequent to the P recension. However that may be, this passage must be taken as furnishing the original draft of the legislation which has been condensed in Lev. 22<sup>20</sup>.

The legislation proper closes with the formula "I am Yahweh" (v. 30). The series of admonitions which follow are all couched in language which is characteristic of H over against P, but their miscellaneous and disconnected character, together with the heaping up of synonymous expressions, points to the hortatory editor who has written the exhortations of Lev. 17-19 and the whole of Lev. 20 (cf. 22<sup>31</sup> with 18<sup>5</sup>. 26. 30 19<sup>37</sup> 20<sup>8</sup>. 22; 22<sup>32a</sup> with 20<sup>3</sup>). The phraseology of 22<sup>32b</sup> stands alone in this legislation, although it occurs frequently in Ezekiel. It is similar, however, to such passages as Lev. 11<sup>44</sup> 20<sup>7</sup>. With 22<sup>33</sup> compare 11<sup>45</sup> 19<sup>36</sup>. Here there is the same mechanical

heaping up of formulae, along with slight deviation from H's language, which we have found to be characteristic of the homiletic redactor who preceded Rp. Gathering up, now, the results of our study of this passage, we may exhibit the analysis as follows.

GROUP XVI. LAWS IN REGARD TO THE SACRIFICES (Lev. 22<sup>17-33</sup>).

a. The Burnt Offering (vs. 17-25).

*And Yahweh spake unto Moses saying, Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons and unto all the sons of Israel, and say unto them,*

1. Any man of the house of Israel *and of the alien in Israel, who offereth his oblation, according to all their vows and according to all their freewill offerings, which they shall offer unto Yahweh as a burnt offering so that ye may be accepted* a perfect male of the herd, of the lambs, and of the goats. *Anything which has a blemish ye shall not offer, for it shall not be acceptable for you. And a man when he offereth a sacrifice of peace offerings unto Yahweh, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, of the herd or of the flock, it shall be perfect to be accepted: there shall be no blemish in it.*
2. Blind or broken or cut [ye shall not offer unto Yahweh] *or*
3. Ulcerated or scrofulous (?), or scurvy (?), these ye shall not offer unto Yahweh, *and a fire-offering ye shall not make of them upon the altar unto Yahweh; and a steer or a sheep that hath anything superfluous or is defective thou shalt make of it a freewill offering, but for a vow it shall not be accepted, and*
4. An animal castrated by pressing or beating, or tearing, or cutting ye shall not offer unto Yahweh *and in your land ye shall not make (a burnt offering); and*
5. From the hand of a foreigner ye shall not offer the food of your God *of any of these, for their corruption is in them, a blemish is in them: they shall not be accepted for you.*

b. The Sacrifice (vs. 26-33)

*And Yahweh spake unto Moses saying,*

6. A steer, or a lamb, or a goat when it is brought forth shall be seven days beneath its dam; *and from the eighth day and upward it shall be accepted for an oblation of a fire-offering unto Yahweh: and*
7. A cow or a ewe ye shall not slay in the same day with its young; *and*

*Lev. 22<sup>29</sup>f.*

8. When ye sacrifice a sacrifice, a praise-offering unto Yahweh, ye shall sacrifice it so that ye may be accepted, on that day it shall be eaten, *there shall none of it be left until the morrow.*

9.

10.

*Lev. 19<sup>5-8</sup>.*

When ye sacrifice a sacrifice, *peace-offerings unto Yahweh, ye shall sacrifice it so that ye may be accepted,* on the day of your sacrificing it shall be eaten and on the morrow : *and*

That which is left until the third day shall be burnt in the fire : *and*

If one eat of it at all on the third day, it is refuse, *it shall not be accepted,* and he that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity, *because he hath profaned the holy thing of Yahweh, and that soul shall be cut off from the midst of its people.*

I AM YAHWEH.

*And ye shall observe my commandments and do them : I am Yahweh : and ye shall not profane my holy name, and I will be hallowed in the midst of the sons of Israel : I am Yahweh, who hallow you, who have brought you out of the land of Egypt to be a God unto you : I am Yahweh.*



---

An Emendation of the Papias Fragment

Author(s): B. W. Bacon

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 176-183

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268790>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## An Emendation of the Papias Fragment.

PROF. B. W. BACON.

NEW HAVEN.

I FIND in *The Expositor* for 1895 (p. 333 sq.) an article by Edwin A. Abbott entitled "The Elders of Papias," in which the distinguished author gives what appears to me to amount to a demonstration of the incorrectness of the clause *εἰ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί*, which in our texts follows upon the names of "Aristion and John the Presbyter." Dr. Abbott has been showing that the extremely early date adopted by Lightfoot (*Supern. Rel.* p. 150) for the birth of Papias, viz., A.D. 60-70 is incredible. He suggests 80-90 A.D. as preferable. Since Dr. Abbott's article appeared, Professor Harnack has called our attention to the fact that De Boor's discovery of a fragment (*Texte u. Unters.* v. 2) attributing to the work of Papias the statement that those brought back to life by Jesus *ἔως Ἀδριανῶν ἔζων*, compels us to bring down our date for the *Ἐξηγήσεις* at least to 140, probably between 145 and 160 A.D. According to Harnack (*Chron.* p. 357) the period of Papias' enquiries, referred to in our fragment of his preface, certainly that of his boyhood (*καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα*), must fall *ca.* 100 A.D. Dr. Abbott's date for his birth (80-90 A.D.) is therefore, if anything, an understatement of the case.

Let us see how he proceeds. "No doubt this late date of Papias is inconsistent with the supposition that he obtained direct<sup>1</sup> information from 'Aristion and John the Elder, *the disciples of the Lord.*'" Of course it is the descriptive clause only with which the late date conflicts, and these words "the disciples of the Lord" Dr. Abbott italicizes, adding, "There is reason for thinking they are spurious and could not have been known to Eusebius." But even if it be insupportable that Papias could have been 'a hearer,' or even a contem-

<sup>1</sup> This is not quite correct. Papias expressly says that the information here spoken of was obtained *indirectly*; and even Eusebius, who takes him for "a hearer of Aristion and the Elder John," immediately qualifies the statement by adding: "At all events he mentions them frequently by name, and besides records their traditions in his writings."

porary of 'disciples of the Lord,' it does not follow that Eusebius would perceive the anachronism. It may be impossible that Papias should have so written, but that is far from proving that Eusebius did not so read.

Another recent discovery, to which Dr. Abbott might have referred as indicating the incredibility of the descriptive clause, is that of F. C. Conybeare (*Expositor*, 1893, pp. 241 sqq.), who found in an Armenian MS. the spurious ending of Mark (vs.<sup>3-20</sup>), prefaced by the formal title in red ink, similar to the titles the MS. prefixed to the gospels: "From the Presbyter Ariston." The identification of this Ariston with the Aristion of the Papias fragment is extremely probable; but even those who are most certain of this will admit, I think, that the verses in question can hardly have been written by a μαθητῆς τοῦ Κυρίου.

But perhaps the proof of the inherent difficulty of the reading, which to us would be most convincing of all, is found in an article of W. Beyschlag (*Th. Stud. u. Krit.* 1898) deprecating Professor Harnack's criticism of the gospels in the work above cited. If Professor Beyschlag is reduced to the desperate expedient of advocating, as here, that the clause οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, which just before has been applied to Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew, when applied to Aristion and the Presbyter John must be rendered as simply equivalent to οἱ μαθηταί, referring us to Acts 21<sup>16</sup>, then the difficulty is great indeed. Imagine Papias citing as his principal informants: α) followers of the apostles; β) certain persons who could tell him what was said by Aristion and John—"the Christians"!

All things considered, the reading must be admitted to present at least very great inherent difficulties. I need hardly say to those who are familiar with the present concentration of the critical discussion on the problem of the Gospels about the argument of Harnack's *Chronologie*, that the question of the identity of these two men, Aristion and the Presbyter John, is of absolutely vital importance, so that if there is anything in Dr. Abbott's argument it is high time it were brought out. Beyschlag, *e.g.*, argues with very great force against the possibility of a confusion in Irenaeus' mind, such as Harnack suggests, between John the Presbyter and John the Apostle. How is such a confusion conceivable, he asks, in the mind of one who had been a hearer of Polycarp in Asia, if John the Presbyter actually survived Polycarp, or was the contemporary of his later years? But, as we have already said, it is a desperate expedient for bringing

down the date of the Presbyter, to interpret the clause *οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου* as meaning no more than *οἱ μαθηταί*.

Let us see then what textual evidence Dr. Abbott has to cite in favor of his contention that the clause is "spurious and unknown to Eusebius." He refers us to Dr. Taylor (*Expositor*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ser., iii. p. 245), who tells us: "Rufinus omits *τοῦ Κυρίου*. The Armenian version omits the whole clause *οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί*. Several Greek MSS. omit *οἱ*."

(1) The intrinsic difficulty of the reading based on the late date of Papias has already been spoken of. Lightfoot himself (*l.c.*) admits that it "would involve a chronological difficulty,"<sup>2</sup> one so great that in Dr. Abbott's opinion Eusebius could not have overlooked it. Moreover Mk. 16<sup>9-20</sup>, if it be Aristion's, is not what we should expect from a "disciple of the Lord." (2) The context is opposed to this reading. Why repeat the phrase "Andrew, etc., disciples of the Lord," and "Aristion, etc., disciples of the Lord?" Why not use the descriptive term once for both if it means the same? (3) Eusebius is arguing that Papias derived his information not from apostles, but from their "followers." Dr. Abbott maintains that he could not speak as he does if Papias cited as his informants actual *μαθηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου*. It is true that this is a misunderstanding on Eusebius' part, for Papias does not pretend to have seen these presbyters; but that does not affect the question of Eusebius' use of language. He cannot well, says Dr. Abbott, have overlooked the anachronism.

Except for the reënforcements, as I deem them, drawn from the discoveries of Conybeare and de Boor, the above are the arguments on which Dr. Abbott bases his opinion that the words *οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί* are either a corruption or an interpolation in the text of Eusebius. As between the two alternatives he naturally prefers the former: for the variant readings, while unfavorable to our text, cannot, of course, have arisen out of nothing. If the Armenian version, with its simple *ἄτε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης λέγουσιν*, represents the original, then the variants are unaccountable. Dr. Abbott therefore supposes Eusebius to have read and written *οἱ [τῶν] τοῦ*

<sup>2</sup> The "chronological difficulty" is greatly enhanced if we accept the reasoning of Beyschlag that the tense of *λέγουσιν* (in contrast with the *εἶπεν* preceding) implies that Aristion and John were alive at the time of writing! But Harnack's reference of the present *λέγουσιν* to the time of Papias' boyhood enquiries is certainly allowable under Greek usage, which commonly presents indirect discourse in the direct form. "I would enquire, What are . . . saying," where we should write, "What . . . were saying." The argument above is based on the less favorable alternative.

Κυρίου [μαθητῶν] μαθηταί. This is doubtless awkward enough to account for almost any degree of transcriptional corruption; but it is quite too awkward for either Papias or Eusebius to have written. Moreover, if it gave rise to change on the part of scribes it could scarcely give rise to misunderstanding, and it is misunderstanding that we have here to account for.

But waiving the question whether Dr. Abbott's conjectural emendation would represent the true form of the original, does not the evidence show that Eusebius must have read and written something equivalent to this, instead of the highly improbable statement of the received text?

Our answer must be, I think, in spite of all the objections to the present reading, which we have found to be not less strong, but decidedly stronger than Dr. Abbott represents, — in spite even of the variant readings, Eusebius can have read and written nothing else than just what we now read in his received text. I have but one objection to Dr. Abbott's reasoning, and this objection is only an *argumentum e silentio*, yet it seems to me absolutely fatal to any such reading as Dr. Abbott proposes, or any substantially equivalent one. If Eusebius had before him such a plain statement that Aristion and John the Presbyter were disciples of the apostles, why did he not say so, instead of beating about the bush with elaborate arguments from the position of the second group of names, reference to the traditional two tombs of John at Ephesus and the like? Obviously it is just because his text of Papias *failed* to make any such clear distinction in the descriptive terms it applied to the two groups of authorities that Eusebius found it necessary thus to explain the great difference between the Apostle John and the Presbyter John. The fact that he ignores the second of the two clauses οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί does not show that he had a text like that of the Armenian version; for that we have seen to be insupportable. It shows rather that the clause *was* there just as we read it in his text: only he did not quite know what to make of it, because he rightly perceived that its apparent sense could not be the true one; for if these two men had been actual disciples of Jesus Papias could scarcely have been content to act as he says he did, and certainly could not have written as he did, actually ranking the report of their living testimony as secondary to that of unknown, unnamed "followers of the apostles."

What then shall we say to all the accumulation of evidence external and internal against the reading? — This: that the corruption, for such I am convinced it is, goes back of Eusebius; but not so far

back as Irenaeus. For I think it can be shown with reasonable probability that Irenaeus employs this passage, and that he read it in the following form: *Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἅτε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦτων [sc. τῶν ἀποστόλων] μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν.*

The work of Papias was not in Eusebius' hands alone, nor in those of Irenaeus alone; it must have been known to many of the transcribers and translators of Eusebius' History. The variant readings of this clause in the texts and versions of Eusebius may of course be accounted for as due to attempts of the scribes and translators to correct a patent error. But I feel tolerably sure that Dr. Abbott is wrong in thinking Eusebius perceived the anachronism — else would he not have called attention to it? — and if Eusebius did not perceive it we are attributing a good deal to the intelligence of mere scribes and translators to impute to their unaided sagacity the detection and elimination of the anachronism. No, there is a reasonable probability that the variants rest ultimately upon the tradition that in some texts at any rate Papias did not speak of Aristion and John the Presbyter as *μαθηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου*. However, they cannot have referred to the original, for none of their readings is the true one.

Irenaeus, on the contrary, must have had before him the work of Papias in a copy presumably far older and more correct than that employed by Eusebius. This was already made extremely probable by Lightfoot in his convincing argument above referred to (*l.c.* pp. 142–216), and is now corroborated by Harnack (*Chron.* p. 336, n.), who points out that the expression of Irenaeus by which in two instances (v. 5, 1 and v. 36, 1) he introduces long series of extracts from the work of Papias, as given on the authority of *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί* is simply a briefer equivalent for Papias' description of his authorities in the passage before us. *Μαθηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου* is here conspicuous by its absence, which is scarcely credible if Papias had indeed referred to such. *Μαθηταὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων* on the other hand is just the expression to cover in a general way both classes of Papias' informants, if the genuine reading was that which we have supposed. It meant primarily Aristion and John, whom Eusebius also wrongly takes to be first-hand informants of Papias; but it included also the other class of Papias' informants, whom he speaks of as *παρηκολουθηκότες τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις*. The inference is

that in Irenaeus' copy of Papias Aristion and John were spoken of as disciples not "of the Lord," but "of the apostles."

But Irenaeus gives additional testimony. In iv. 27, 1, he is not referring to Papias, whom he does not seem to have known otherwise than through his writings; for he takes him to have been not only a personal disciple of Aristion and John, but even, it would seem, an actual hearer of the apostle John. Irenaeus in iv. 27, 1, a passage preserved only in the Latin, refers to another member of the same Asiatic circle, supposedly Pothinus. Harnack (*l.c.* p. 338) collects six other references in Irenaeus to this presbyter, whom in one of them he even calls *senior apostolorum discipulus*, though not apparently in the strict sense; for in the passage which especially interests us it is the distinction of this presbyter to belong to the third, not the second, generation from the apostles. The passage is as follows: *Quemadmodum audiivi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant et ab his qui didicerant.* We are interested, of course, not so much in the presbyter himself as in the description of his informants. The presbyter himself stood in point of authority almost exactly on a par with Papias. The difference is that Pothinus (?) had had "direct information" from Aristion and John the presbyters, which Irenaeus *supposes* Papias to have had also.<sup>3</sup> In any event the circle of informants is the same as that to which Irenaeus understood Papias to refer, and what is here said of the informants of *ille senior discipulus*, Irenaeus might, and very naturally would, express by an adaptation of Papias' description of *his* informants. We may even have a hint of this origin in the order: ἀποστόλους ἑωρακότες — ἀποστόλων μαθηταί, as in Papias, instead of ἀποστόλων μαθηταί — ἀποστόλους ἑωρακότες. If this be its origin, we have a somewhat fuller paraphrase of the Papias passage. The two classes of informants he mentions are no longer fused into one, but kept apart as in the original, and they are again, not ἀποστόλους ἑωρακότες καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, but ἀποστόλους ἑωρακότες καὶ τούτων μαθηταί, *i.e.* μαθηταὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

It seems to me, therefore, that we have reasonably strong evidence from the transcribers and translators of Eusebius, and more particularly from the above cited passages from Irenaeus, for an emendation — not of Eusebius as Dr. Abbott proposes but — of Papias.

<sup>3</sup> There may be some slight confusion in the text, but the sense is unmistakable. Abbott had rendered παρά τῶν τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἑωρακόντων, καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτῶν ἀκουσάντων. Harnack preferably: παρά τῶν τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἑωρακόντων, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν μαθητευθέντων.

Just one word in conclusion as to the transcriptional evidence. Dr. Abbott's proposed emendation seems to me to transcend the bounds of reasonable probability. A scribe could hardly corrupt *οἱ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν μαθηταί* into *οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί*, even though the latter expression did stand just before as the model. But consider how the latter expression looks in uncial script with the usual form of abbreviation, and observe how almost indistinguishable the alternatives might become by a very slight mutilation or obliteration, if for ΟΙΤΟΝΚΥΝ ΜΛΘΗΤΛΙ we substitute ΟΙΤΟΝΤΩΝ ΜΛΘΗΤΛΙ. This latter reading will explain all variants, including the reading of Eusebius himself, and best of all it suits exactly the apparent references of Irenaeus, and the inner requirements of the context itself.

I cannot leave this important subject without a word as to the effect of our proposed emendation upon that vital chain of tradition by which Irenaeus, and we through him, are brought into personal contact with the apostles. Papias' statement as we now understand it is as follows: In my boyhood in Hierapolis I had special opportunity in two ways of informing myself as to what the Lord had taught. For in the first place certain persons came my way who had been actually associated with the apostles. These, among whom I may mention the surviving daughters of Philip the evangelist, who lived to a great age in Hierapolis, and who in their girlhood in Cesarea had of course had frequent opportunity of seeing and hearing many of the apostles, — these followers of the elders, I say, I would ask what Andrew, or Peter, had said, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples. Also in the second place I was wont to enquire of those who came my way from Ephesus, what Aristion and the Presbyter John, disciples of the above named, were saying. For I did not think what I got from books would profit me so much as the living and abiding voice.

Here the great church dignitaries in Ephesus, although, as *μαθηταὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, really superior in authority to mere chance comers who as *ἑωρακότες τοῦ ἀποστόλου* had this and that to relate, are subordinated and put in the second rank because the boy in Hierapolis had not been able to interrogate them personally. Nevertheless as their voice was still "living and abiding" in his time, and not far away, so that he could get abundant information as to what they were saying, he thought it right to add their testimonies freely, almost as if he had heard them himself — so much so in fact that Eusebius, Irenaeus, and apparently even Dr. Abbott seem to think he actually had heard them himself. He says nothing about Polycarp, who in

point of age must have been of the same circle, and who was also a *μαθητῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων*, doubtless because in the period of which he is now speaking, that of his boyhood in Hierapolis, information as to what Polycarp was teaching in the remoter Smyrna was comparatively inaccessible to him. His later association with Polycarp his readers might naturally take for granted.

As to the *ἑωρακότες τοὺς ἀποστόλους* whom Papias mentions, we know that the daughters of Philip were such, and we have no reason to doubt that there were others in Asia *ca.* 100 A.D. As to the *μαθηταὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, the report of Papias in regard to the Presbyter John is corroborated by an independent tradition to the effect that the apostle John installed a namesake of his own in Ephesus. It is certain from the testimony of Irenaeus that Polycarp in Smyrna was such, and we have no reason to doubt the fact in the case of Aristion.

Of all these, however, the only survivor who in the boyhood days of Irenaeus could still claim to have seen the apostles, was Polycarp, lingering till the age of almost a hundred years, so that Irenaeus could regard it as a singular providence of God that he could yet remember the very look of the old man as he sat and taught. Doubtless John the Presbyter had died many years before. Papias *ca.* 150 A.D. would not speak of him as still alive in his boyhood days, if his death had not taken place somewhere in the first quarter of the century. But could Irenaeus confuse this man, the older contemporary of Polycarp, with John the apostle? On the answer to this question depends the whole Harnackian theory of the Johannine writings. And the answer to this question will largely depend on the further one, Did Irenaeus, who, as now seems probable, had before him the work of Papias, read after *ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου* or *οἱ τούτων μαθηταί*?



---

The Authorship of Romans xv. xvi

Author(s): W. H. Ryder

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 184-198

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268791>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## The Authorship of Romans xv. xvi.

PROFESSOR W. H. RYDER.

ANDOVER, MASS.

THESE two chapters are found, without important omissions, in all Greek manuscripts and all manuscripts of versions which are now extant.

The form and order of the Textus Receptus appears in  $\aleph$  BCDE, in a few cursives, in the Latin of the bilingual texts, d, e, f, the manuscripts of the Vulgate, Peshitto, Bohairic, etc.

On the other hand, the long doxology ( $\text{16}^{25-27}$ ) is found between chs. 14 and 15 in L and more than two hundred cursives, in manuscripts of the Harkleian Syriac, in Greek Lectionaries, and in Chrysostom, Theodoret, and John of Damascus.

Cursive 66 inserts the word  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  after  $\text{16}^{24}$ , then adds the long doxology with a note in the margin, saying: "In the ancient copies the end of the epistle is here, but the rest [the long doxology] is found at the end of the fourteenth chapter."

The Vulgate codex Amiatinus has fifty-one titles of sections. The fiftieth reads, "The peril of him who grieves his brother by his meat," etc.; the fifty-first, "On the mystery of the Lord, kept secret before his passion but after his passion revealed," suggesting that the Latin manuscript to which these titles were first added placed the doxology after ch. 14. Similar titles in Codex Fuldensis also omit the contents of  $\text{15-16}^{24}$ .

The uncials AP, the cursives 5, 17, and the Armenian version contain the doxology in both places, while F and G omit it in both places; but Gg have a blank space after 14, and f adds at  $\text{16}^{24}$  the doxology taken from the Vulgate.

The manuscripts, then, which preserve the Greek text in common use place the doxology after ch. 14. This is also the order in Greek service books, in the writings of Greek fathers, and, to some extent, in Syriac and Latin versions. But the more carefully edited Greek manuscripts place it at the close of the epistle. Those authorities

which insert the doxology in both places, and those which exclude it from both, give evidence that their scribes were acquainted with manuscripts which thus differed in locating the passage. This seems to prove that the order of L and the cursives was found in manuscripts before the date of A and P.

We have, further, the direct testimony of Origen that both forms were current in his day. His commentary follows the order of **N** BCDE, but in his remarks upon the section 16<sup>25-27</sup> he says: "Marcion . . . entirely removed this paragraph (*caput hoc*), and not only this, but also from this place (*et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco*), where it is written, 'but everything which is not of faith is sin,' even to the end, he cut away all. In other copies, however, that is in those which have not been corrupted by Marcion, we find this same paragraph differently placed. For in some codices, after the place which we mentioned above, that is, 'but whatever is not of faith is sin,' then follows immediately (*statim cohaerens habetur*), 'but to him who is able to stablish you.' But other codices have it at the end, as it is now placed."

This passage is preserved only in the Latin of Rufinus, but it is perfectly clear and consistent with itself and with the other facts already noted and the inferences which they suggest. We learn thus that, one hundred years before our oldest manuscripts were written, some codices contained the doxology after ch. 14 and others after 16, and that, if one form was a literary revision of the other, that revision was made before Origen's time, and, apparently, without his knowledge. The two forms may have existed therefore in Greek manuscripts before the Syriac and Latin versions were made. The fact, then, that the Peshitto and, in general, the copies of Latin versions which have come down to us place the doxology at the end of 16 simply shows that the translators or copyists preferred that order, as did Origen. That they were led to their decision by critical, historical study is improbable in itself, and is made still more doubtful by the fact that Origen makes no appeal to that kind of evidence in stating his own decision. The question of the original position of the doxology presents itself to us, then, as one of inherent probability simply; and I venture to affirm that it is far more probable that the doxology was transferred from the earlier place, where it seems sadly to break the connection, to the far more appropriate place at the close of the epistle, than that the converse transposition was made and so extensively adopted; that the form, therefore, which places the doxology between 14 and 15 is the earlier, and the other is due to a liter-

ary revision made before 200 A.D., perhaps twenty-five or even fifty years before.<sup>1</sup>

But the paragraph from Origen makes another statement of even greater interest in its bearing upon the subject of our discussion. Origen affirms that Marcion removed entirely this section, viz. the doxology, and not only this but also cut away all that follows the words, "But everything which is not of faith is sin." This, certainly, is the only meaning that can be given to the Latin text. Dr. Hort would change *caput hoc* to *caput hic*, and *ab eo loco* to *in eo loco* (as one manuscript of Origen has it), making Origen say that Marcion removed the *caput*, viz. the doxology *here*, at the end of the epistle, but also *in* the place where it is written, "But everything that is not of faith is sin." But as Sanday remarks, the words, *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*, are meaningless unless they apply to the contents of chs. 15 and 16. Moreover, *caput* needs *hoc* to complete its sense.

Origen was then acquainted with a form of the epistle which ended with the fourteenth chapter. This he attributed to mutilation at the hands of Marcion. He gives no reasons for his opinion and makes no appeal to historical evidence or tradition. Was he correct in his inference, or have we reason to believe that Marcion simply used copies which came into his hands in this briefer form? And if this was the form of Marcion's text, is there reason to believe that it is the earlier and, probably, the original form?

It is interesting to observe that, with the exception of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, there is no evidence that any ante-Nicene father quoted from chs. 15, 16, although other parts of the epistle are frequently cited. I can but think that Hort, Sanday, and Gifford treat this fact too lightly when they attribute this omission to mere accident. It is true, indeed, that 1 Cor. 16 is not quoted in these early writings, unless the "Maranatha" of Didache 10 is such a quotation. But that chapter, like Rom. 16, deals almost entirely with merely personal matters. On the other hand, Rom. 15 deals with subjects of general and permanent interest. In the direct arguments against Marcion in Irenæus and Tertullian, as in Epiphanius also, the omission of quotations from these chapters may be due to the purpose to use only texts whose force Marcion and his followers would admit; though it is surprising that none of these writers suggest that Marcion has removed these chapters. This certainly does not account for the neglect of these chapters elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> Zahn holds that the doxology was originally after 14<sup>23</sup> (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1897, i. 269-272).

But is there reason to suppose that the contents of these chapters would offend Marcion and induce him to remove them? Sanday holds that the quotations from the Old Testament in 15 might lead him to omit the section. But Marcion does not seem to have omitted, with any consistency, those parts of the books of the New Testament accepted by him which contained Old Testament quotations. Tertullian in arguing against him cites at least nine times from sentences in Romans which contain or consist of such quotations, and the reconstructed Gospel of Luke, as used by Marcion, does not, in general, omit such sentences. Sanday holds, further, that Marcion must have excluded 15<sup>4</sup>, "which," he says, "directly contradicts the whole of his special system." He adds that Marcion "most certainly could not have used" the sentence in vs.<sup>8</sup>, "I say that Christ has become a minister of circumcision for the truth of God." But it is hardly less surprising to find Paul using the language of vs.<sup>8</sup>, than it would be to find the same sentiment in Marcion. The commendation of the charitable consideration of weak brethren, the emphasis laid upon a ministry to the Gentiles, and the praise of the Christians at Rome must have been entirely congenial to Marcion, and if a few sentences jarred upon his convictions, he could easily remove them, or interpret them consistently with his system. Moreover, the theory that Marcion removed these chapters does not explain the position of the doxology after ch. 14, nor the absence of quotations in the early fathers; for I cannot think that Marcion's excisions from the text of the New Testament books had much influence over the text preserved in the Church. He was, from the first, looked upon as a heretic, and was freely charged with tampering with the text. The tendency must have been to resist rather than to accept changes made by him or his followers. When he and the early fathers agree in the text, they are two witnesses whose combined testimony is very strong. There is, as we have seen, reason to believe that these two witnesses give testimony in favor of omitting Rom. 15, 16, from the epistle as it first circulated.<sup>2</sup>

These facts which have been noted certainly suggest the hypothesis that the Epistle to the Romans, in its earliest form, ended with ch. 14, or, more probably, with the doxology appended to that chapter.

<sup>2</sup> In supporting the hypothesis that Tertullian used a copy of Romans which did not contain 15, 16, I have not appealed to the fact that he quotes the sentence, "the judgment seat of Christ," Rom. 14<sup>10</sup>, as found *in clausula* (*Contra Marc.* 5, 14), for the term is too indefinite to prove much.

But do the form and contents of 15, 16, give any support to this hypothesis ?

So far as choice of words and of forms of expression is concerned, there is nothing which disproves the Pauline authorship of these chapters. The language is the Hellenistic *patois* of Paul's Epistles, which must, indeed, have been the epistolary style of Paul's associates and correspondents ; for one man could hardly write familiar letters in a style which was unfamiliar to his generation and his circle. There are, however, some minor peculiarities in these chapters which suggest, though they do not prove, another hand.

(1) The quotations in 15<sup>10-12</sup> are each introduced by the phrase *καὶ πάλιν*. Though Paul often groups quotations, this phrase occurs elsewhere, in writings attributed to him, only in 1 Cor. 3<sup>20</sup>. It occurs several times in Hebrews.

(2) The expression, *λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γενεῆσθαι περιτομῆς* (15<sup>8</sup>), is a singular one for Paul to use. He uses *διάκονος* elsewhere of Christ in a question expressing surprise and repudiation ; *ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος* ; (Gal. 2<sup>17</sup>). Paul is not in the habit of applying to Christ terms which denote conventional human relations, such as *διάκονος*, *παῖς*, *ἀπόστολος*, *ιερεὺς*, *ἀρχιερεὺς*. The Apostle is not always careful to guard against a misunderstanding or misuse of his language, but the phrase *διάκονος περιτομῆς*, without explanation or qualification, seems almost like a challenge to a perversion of the underlying doctrine of the epistle.<sup>3</sup>

(3) The well-developed figure from the ritual of the Old Testament which appears in 15<sup>16</sup> is not quite what we should expect in Paul. The word *ἱερουργεῖν* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, though it is found in Philo and Josephus ; nor does Paul use the noun *ιερεὺς*. The offering of Gentiles to God as a sacrifice is not a Pauline conception. Christ is a *προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία τῷ θεῷ* (Eph. 5<sup>2</sup>), and alms are *προσφοραὶ* (Acts 24<sup>17</sup>). The bodies of Christians may be offered to God as a *θυσία* (Rom. 12<sup>1</sup> ; compare Phil. 2<sup>17</sup>), as also their generous gifts (Phil. 4<sup>18</sup>). But in these cases suffering or self-denial is expressed. That a Christian priest should offer other men to God seems remote from Paul's way of thinking.

It is freely admitted that such examples of rare or unparalleled expressions do not go far towards proving diversity of authorship,

<sup>3</sup> The point is not that the thought expressed in 15<sup>8-9</sup> is not Pauline, but that the form in which the thought is expressed is without parallel in Paul's writings, and does not easily harmonize with the use of *περιτομή* in the argument of Rom. 2-4.

though they may furnish some confirmatory evidence of a theory which must find its main support in other facts.

It should be observed that what appears, at first sight, a close connection between the last verses of ch. 14 and the first verses of ch. 15 proves, on more careful inspection, to be more apparent than real. The argument of the epistle closes with 14<sup>23</sup>, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Down to this point the whole thought has centred in the doctrine of salvation by faith. Even the hortatory section, 12-14, rests upon this conception of life and duty (12<sup>3</sup> 14<sup>1-2. 22. 23</sup>). In 15, on the other hand, the appeal is to charity rather than to faith (15<sup>1-7</sup>). In 14 the freedom of faith is emphasized, which may be limited in its application by charity; in 15, the authority of charity is urged without reference to the freedom of faith. The word *πίστις* is not found in 15-16<sup>24</sup>, and *πιστεύω* only in 15<sup>13</sup>.

There are certain biographical and historical notes which do not fit the time and circumstances under which the main body of the Epistle to the Romans was written.

In 15<sup>19</sup> the author says that his missionary labors had covered a field extending from Jerusalem to Illyricum. We have in the Acts a detailed report of Paul's missionary journeys, which gives no evidence that he ever visited Illyricum. At Berea he was within about sixty miles of its boundary, but he went from there directly to the sea and sailed for Athens (Acts 17<sup>14. 15</sup>). That the author means simply that he had come within sight of the Illyrian mountains, or had met certain Illyrians residing in Macedonia, as Sanday suggests, seems to attribute to Paul a rather foolish exaggeration. It is, indeed, possible that in his last journey from Ephesus to Greece (Acts 20<sup>1-2</sup>), Paul crossed the Illyrian border;<sup>4</sup> but there is no evidence of this. The author is not referring to the extent of his travels, but of his successful missionary labor. He had "fulfilled the Gospel of Christ" from Jerusalem to Illyricum. Paul's labors in Macedonia are frequently referred to in his epistles, and are described in the Acts, but nowhere else is there a hint that he labored in Illyricum. Moreover, the singular expression *πεπληρωκένοι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, a phrase without parallel elsewhere in the New Testament, does not seem to describe the first, brief proclamation of the Gospel, or a mere initiation of converts into the Christian life and society. The word *πληρώω* is used elsewhere of the fulfillment of a prophecy or promise, the perfecting of a revelation as in

<sup>4</sup> Compare Zahn, *Einleitung* i. 293, 294.

Matt. 5<sup>17</sup> Col. 1<sup>25</sup>, the complete obedience to a law as in Rom. 13<sup>8</sup>, or the completion of an appointed service, as in Acts 12<sup>25</sup> 13<sup>15</sup> 14<sup>26</sup> Col. 4<sup>17</sup>. It seems to describe here the perfecting of an evangelical work already begun, somewhat as in 1 (3) Kings 1<sup>14</sup>, *πληρώσω τοὺς λόγους σου* means, "I will confirm thy words." While the meaning of the phrase is not quite certain, it seems, as interpreted in vs.<sup>20</sup>, to describe the labors of an evangelist who had traversed a region where the Gospel had already entered and who sought out neglected places and souls and knit together scattered Christian communities.

The author's report of the aim and method of his ministry, contained in 15<sup>20, 21</sup>, seems, at first glance, quite like the Apostle's conception and method of work. But upon closer examination the thoughts expressed do not seem to harmonize with the spirit of the Epistle to the Romans; nor are they fitted to secure the favorable interest of the Christians at Rome in the writer or his message. He does not in these verses lay emphasis upon his call to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, but simply upon his aim to reach the unevangelized from Jerusalem to Illyricum, seeking places where Christ had not been named, avoiding building on another man's foundation. Why should Paul say this to a Christian community at Rome, a community which had received the Gospel from others, and whose members were sufficiently mature in their Christian life and thought to read with interest and profit such a treatise as the Epistle to the Romans? How could he say in such a letter to such a community, "I am zealous to prosecute the work of evangelization, not where Christ is named, that I may not build on another's foundation"? How could he say that this was the controlling purpose in his ministry, when he had already said to these mature Christians, "God is my witness that I am continually praying, if in any way I may be permitted to come to you, that I may impart a spiritual gift to you, that I may have some fruit among you, as also among the rest of the Gentiles" (1<sup>10, 11, 13</sup>)? This whole epistle aims to do, for the Christians at Rome, the very thing which, in these verses, he says he avoids, viz. to build *ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον*. Is there not, also, a lack of taste and tact in thus emphasizing, in a letter to these comparative strangers, the somewhat narrow and personal features of his ministry? The author would be far from saying that this is the only or the most important way of prosecuting evangelical work. He simply says: This is my way. But what is there, in the epistle as a whole, or in Paul's relation with the Romans, to suggest or make

significant such a piece of autobiography? On the other hand, how appropriate and important this is, if it is in the report of some evangelist, some member or presbyter of the Church at Rome, to the church whose missionary he is.

The 23d verse also contains an expression which does not seem to fit Paul's circumstances when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. *Μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις*, the author says. But had Paul no longer a place in Corinth and its vicinity when he wrote to the Romans? It is true, indeed, that when he was prepared to sail from Corinth to Syria, he learned of a Jewish plot which led him to give up the voyage (Acts 20<sup>3</sup>). But this led simply to a leisurely journey by land, during which there was much preaching and Christian labor. Paul at Corinth was far from feeling that he had fulfilled the Gospel of Christ, and nothing appears in his external relations which could have led him to say that there was no longer place for him in those regions. But an evangelist, with a definite and limited mission, which had been conscientiously and successfully prosecuted, might easily thus express himself.

Still more significant, in its bearing upon this question, is the author's announcement of the ulterior aim of his contemplated visit at Rome. "I have had a desire," he says, "for a number of years to come to you, whenever I make a journey to Spain, for I hope when I pass through to see you and to be sent forward thither by you, if first I may in some measure enjoy your society" (15<sup>24</sup>). "I shall go forward through you to Spain" (vs.<sup>28</sup>). The visit to Rome is purely incidental; Spain is the object of his desire. He longs to see his friends at Rome (vs.<sup>23</sup>); he will rest himself with them (vs.<sup>32</sup>); but they must help him forward to the newer regions beyond. There is no thought of a call to labor at Rome. He is not intent on imparting some spiritual grace to the Romans, and on having some fruit among them, as in 1<sup>10-13</sup>. How different the tone of *ἐλπίζω διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς* (vs.<sup>24</sup>) and *δεῖ με Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν* (Acts 19<sup>21</sup>). It seems almost impossible that Paul should have spoken of his long-desired first visit to Rome in this incidental way, or that, after writing such a letter as Rom. 1-14, he should refer to a contemplated visit as only an occasion for enjoying the society of Christian friends, seeing their faces, having a restful time with them, and then hurrying on, with their assistance, to the distant country of Spain. Moreover, the author says that he has had the desire to visit the Romans on his way to Spain, *ἀπὸ ἰκανῶν* (or *πολλῶν*) *ἐτῶν* (vs.<sup>23</sup>). Six or seven years before writing the

Epistle to the Romans, Paul sailed, under the impulse of a vision, from Troas to Macedonia, and began his labors in Europe. Is it likely that for many of these years he had cherished a plan to prosecute this mission to the Pillars of Hercules? It takes time for such great plans to develop even in an Apostle's mind. But a Roman Christian, who had caught the spirit of the Apostle, and to whom Spain would not be the distant land which it must have been to a Palestinian Jew who had been even as far west as Corinth, could easily cherish and express such a plan; and if for a number of years he had been prosecuting this eastern mission, he would say: Through these years the desire has been growing within me to carry this same Gospel to the far West.

The task which makes immediate demand upon the time of the writer of these chapters, viz. to carry to the poor among the saints at Jerusalem a contribution of money collected in Macedonia and Achaia (15<sup>25-27</sup>), reminds us, certainly, of the contribution which was a matter of so much thought and anxiety to Paul (1 Cor. 16<sup>1-4</sup> 2 Cor. 8-9), and which, according to Acts 24<sup>17</sup>, Paul brought with him in his last journey to Jerusalem. The offerings were gathered in the same regions and for the same purpose. But this does not furnish conclusive evidence of their identity. For Jews of the dispersion to send offerings to Jerusalem was a well-established custom. Compare Philo, *Legat. ad Caium*, 40, Josephus, *Antt.*, xviii. 9. 1, and observe the word *προσφοραί* in Acts 24<sup>17</sup>. The Christians at Jerusalem had repeatedly received such contributions (Acts 11<sup>29, 30</sup> Gal. 2<sup>10</sup> 1 Cor. 16<sup>1</sup>). Was it not natural, almost inevitable, that an evangelist, prosecuting his mission from Jerusalem to Illyricum, thus beginning his journey with personal knowledge of the needy condition of Christians at Jerusalem, and passing through regions where, a few years before, Paul had kept this object of charity before the minds of the churches for more than a year (2 Cor. 9<sup>2</sup>), should follow Paul's example and make a successful appeal for the same object?

The sixteenth chapter presents peculiar difficulties to one who contends for the unity of the Epistle. Some of these have been so frequently and fully discussed that it is necessary only to call attention to them.

It is certainly surprising that Paul should show such intimate personal friendship for so many persons in a distant community which he had never visited. He sends his salutations, in most cases with some affectionate or descriptive term or sentence, to twenty-four persons whose names he mentions, to one woman whom he calls the

mother of Rufus and his own mother, to the sister of Nereus, besides the members of the households of Aristobulus and Narcissus, the brethren who are with Asyncritus and his associates, the saints with Olympas and his companions, and the church which is in the house of Prisca and Aquila. Paul had, indeed, known Prisca and Aquila in Corinth and Ephesus. He may have met others in his missionary labors in Asia and in Greece, though probably the majority of the Church were slaves who could not have travelled freely. Some of them he may have known only through common friends. But too many persons are mentioned, the proofs of personal acquaintance and friendship are too numerous, and the knowledge of the present conditions and relations of these brethren and sisters is too intimate to be satisfied with this explanation. We feel this when we try to conceive of a prominent Christian in Boston, a Secretary of the American Board, for example, sending such greetings to Christians in a city which he had never visited, in Constantinople or Yokohama. It should be noted that the first fourteen chapters of the Epistle give no suggestion of such intimate acquaintance with persons at Rome. Paul had a deep Christian love for these brethren which frequently finds expression ; but no other Epistle of Paul gives less evidence of personal knowledge of the individuals or the special conditions of the community addressed. It is in striking contrast in this respect with the letters to the Thessalonians, the Galatians, and the Corinthians, which were written in the same period of the Apostle's life and labor.<sup>5</sup>

There is a consciousness of church organization and life which does not appear in the epistle until we reach this chapter. Indeed, in Rom. 1-14, we have no suggestion of an organized Christian community at Rome ; the word *ἐκκλησία* is not found, there is no mention of church officers, no suggestion of government or discipline, and no reference to Christian assemblies. We need not infer from this that there was no organic life among the Roman Christians, though it seems probable that it was not very fully developed. However that may be, these chapters lay no emphasis upon the responsibilities and duties of an organized church. But in the sixteenth chapter the

<sup>5</sup> Zahn observes that Paul was not in the habit of sending such personal greetings. The epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians close without them. Zahn infers that the long list of salutations here is due to a desire on the part of Paul to gain the good will of a community which he had never visited. A more natural inference is that the chapter of salutations was written by a man whose epistolary habit differed from Paul's.

thought of the significance of the church is a ruling thought. The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs five times in various relations. Phœbe is a *διάκονος* of the church at Cenchreæ; the house of Prisca and Aquila is the meeting-place of a church; all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks; all the churches of Christ send salutations; and Gaius is a host of the whole church. This does not prove, but it does suggest, a later date, when the significance of ecclesiastical connection and organization had come more fully to the consciousness of the Roman Christians.

There are other intimations in the chapter that the church at Rome had been in existence for a considerable time. Mary has already rendered much service to you (vs.<sup>6</sup>), Persis also has labored much in the Lord (vs.<sup>12</sup>), Andronicus and Junias have become distinguished among the Apostles (vs.<sup>7</sup>), Apelles has been tested and proved in Christ (vs.<sup>10</sup>). Moreover, false teachers had appeared and had sown divisions and offences (vs.<sup>17-18</sup>). These are described as men who *δουλεύουσιν τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ*. Whether their fault was self-indulgence or asceticism, the judgment pronounced upon them is very different from the spirit which pervades the instruction contained in 14. How could the Apostle discuss the question of eating and drinking in the calm and impartial tone which pervades that chapter, if he was writing to people who were in danger of being led away by those who served their own belly? In all these earlier chapters, the Apostle's interest centres in a certain conception of the Christian life. He exhorts his readers to accept this principle and to live by it; but he has no reproofs for them, nor does he express anxieties about them. He says to them, in a generous hyperbole, and without qualification, *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ* (1<sup>8</sup>). The author of this chapter is acquainted with that commendation and repeats it, though with a significant change: *ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο* (16<sup>19</sup>).<sup>6</sup>

The biographical notes in this chapter point to a later date than

<sup>6</sup> The word *ὑπακοή* is not a favorite with Paul; indeed, it expresses a conception of the Christian life which suggests the bondage of the law rather than the freedom of faith. He usually qualifies or interprets it by some added term, as *ὑπακοὴ πίστεως* (1<sup>5</sup> 16<sup>26</sup>), *ὑπακοὴ εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (6<sup>16</sup>); or uses it where a figure of speech requires it, as 2 Cor. 10<sup>5, 6</sup>; or of obedience to a human leader (2 Cor. 7<sup>15</sup> Philemon<sup>21</sup>). Only here and 15<sup>18</sup> is the noun used to denote, without further interpretation, the content of Christian character. It defines the obedience of Christ in Rom. 5<sup>19</sup>; compare Phil. 2<sup>8</sup>. The verb is used of obedience to the Gospel in Rom. 10<sup>16</sup> 2 Thess. 1<sup>8</sup> (compare Rom. 6<sup>17</sup>), but more frequently of obedience to parents, masters, etc.

that of the body of the epistle, and to some other author than the Apostle Paul.

First among these are the notes concerning Prisca and Aquila. We are informed in the Acts that Paul made the acquaintance of these people in Corinth, during his first visit in that city (Acts 18<sup>2</sup>). They accompanied him to Ephesus (vs.<sup>19. 26</sup>). They are still in Ephesus, and their house is the meeting-place of a Christian congregation when Paul writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 16<sup>19</sup>). As this epistle was written before Pentecost (1 Cor. 16<sup>8</sup>), and Paul was at Philippi on his return from Corinth to Palestine by the next Passover (Acts 20<sup>6. 16</sup>), it seems probable that something less than a year passed between the date at which Prisca and Aquila formed the centre of an *ἐκκλησία* at Corinth, and the date of the Roman Epistle. That in these few months they should have broken up their home at Ephesus, should have made a new home in Rome, where, apparently, they had not resided before, — for Acts 18<sup>2</sup> does not say that they came from Rome, but simply from Italy, — and should have gathered another *ἐκκλησία* in Rome, and that the knowledge of this should have reached Paul at Corinth, is not impossible, but is surprising. Moreover, had these three or four years of Christian service at Corinth and Ephesus, with, possibly, a few months at Rome, put all the churches of the Gentiles under special obligation to them?

Again, where can we find an occasion, during the period of Paul's acquaintance with Prisca and Aquila at Corinth and Ephesus, when they could have been called upon to lay down their neck for his life (vs.<sup>4</sup>)? Paul was in some danger at Corinth (Acts 18<sup>12-17</sup>), and again in Ephesus (Acts 19<sup>23-41</sup>), in the first case from Jews, and in the second from Gentiles, but in each case he had ample protection from the civil authorities, and it is difficult to see how a Jewish refugee and his wife could have rendered him an essential service.

These are only difficulties, not impossibilities. But it is certainly easier to explain these notes if we suppose that these verses were written a few years later, after Prisca and Aquila had had abundant time to remove to Rome and to gain an influential position among the Christians there, to render a large service to Gentile churches, and in some way, perhaps during the persecution in which Paul had died, to save the life of the author of these chapters.

The description of Andronicus and Junias (vs.<sup>7</sup>) presents some difficulties to an early date and a Pauline authorship. The author says that these two brethren have been his fellow-prisoners. Paul

affirms in 2 Cor. 11<sup>23</sup> that he had been "in prisons more abundantly," and these two Christians may have been his companions in some imprisonment. But it is difficult to find a place and time for the common imprisonment of the man now at Corinth and these two at Rome. It is even more surprising to be told that these two Roman Christians were in Christ before Paul. They may have been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, or they may have been led to Christ by some early evangelist, but such suppositions involve improbabilities. But every difficulty is removed by the supposition that these chapters were written by a convert of a later day, who, with his friends, had passed through a period of persecution at Rome.

One striking feature of this chapter is the number of kinsmen to whom the author refers. Andronicus, Junias, and Herodian are saluted as his kinsmen. His kinsmen, Lucius, Jason, and Sospater, join him in sending salutations. Rufus's mother is his mother, and Quartus is his brother. These terms have often been understood in a figurative sense; *συγγενεῖς* are fellow Jews, as in 9<sup>3</sup> and 2 Mac. 5<sup>6</sup>, Rufus's mother has shown a motherly interest in the writer, and Quartus was simply a Christian. But why should Paul call five or six of these Jewish Christians kinsmen and not apply the term to Aquila, a Jew (Acts 18<sup>2</sup>), or to Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess (Acts 16<sup>1</sup>)? When he sends greetings to Rufus and to his and my mother, why should *αὐτοῦ* be interpreted literally and *ἐμοῦ* figuratively? Why is Quartus alone, of all the twenty-five Christian men whose names are mentioned in the chapter, called *ὁ ἀδελφός*?<sup>7</sup>

But if we take these terms literally, the problem of the authorship of at least 16<sup>1-23</sup> (24) is solved. Who were Rufus and his mother? Was not she the wife of Simon, who bore the cross of Jesus (Mark 15<sup>21</sup>)? Their oldest son was Alexander, the second Rufus, the third Tertius, the fourth Quartus. They were Christians living in Rome, or in its vicinity, when Mark wrote his Gospel, and were well known there. Simon had a Jewish name, but living among

<sup>7</sup> For the omission of the pronoun when an own brother is referred to, compare Jn. 11<sup>13</sup>, and in the Greek Old Testament, Gen. 37<sup>8</sup> 44<sup>26</sup>. <sup>33</sup> 45<sup>3</sup> Job 42<sup>15</sup>. The addition of *μοῦ* would not relieve from ambiguity, for the pronoun is used often of a social or tribal relation. In other cases in the epistles where *ὁ ἀδελφός* is used of a Christian brother the phrase does not distinguish one person from several others mentioned. See 1 Cor. 1<sup>1</sup> 16<sup>12</sup> 2 Cor. 1<sup>1</sup> Eph. 6<sup>21</sup> Phil. 2<sup>25</sup> Col. 1<sup>1</sup> 47.<sup>9</sup> Philemon 1. For a similar omission of the pronoun compare Mt. 15<sup>4</sup>. <sup>5</sup> 19<sup>19</sup> Mk. 7<sup>12</sup> Jn. 19<sup>26</sup> 1 Cor. 5<sup>1</sup>.

Gentiles, he gave his sons Greek and Latin names, first the common names Alexander and Rufus, but as such names had slight significance for him, he called the next two Third and Fourth. Nothing could be more natural than that these sons should have other kinsmen in the Christian community at Rome. Indeed, as Simon, at the time of the crucifixion, resided in Cyrene, one of these kinsmen, Lucius (Rom. 16<sup>21</sup>), may be the Lucius of Cyrene of Acts 13<sup>1</sup>, possibly a brother of Simon, who may be the Symeon Niger of the same group at Antioch.

But, finally, we have the direct statement of Tertius that he wrote the epistle (vs.<sup>22</sup>). This is generally understood to mean that he is Paul's amanuensis, but *γράφω* is not used in this sense in the New Testament,<sup>8</sup> except in the Apocalypse, where the relation of the scribe to Him who dictates is peculiar. It describes elsewhere either the act of a man who records his own thought, or of one who employs another to put it on record. The authors of the epistles of the New Testament frequently inserted the verb, whether they wrote by their own hand or by the hand of another. Paul seems frequently to have employed an amanuensis, but nowhere else do we find this amanuensis adding his own personal notes. In this section, whose authorship we have been discussing, it is used of the responsible author (15<sup>15</sup>). It certainly seems probable that *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν* (15<sup>15</sup>) and *ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν* (16<sup>22</sup>) have the same subject. Moreover, *ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ* is a rather solemn and weighty phrase for a mere amanuensis to use. No other writer in the New Testament seems to make a more definite claim to inspiration.

The conclusion is that Paul closed his Epistle to the Romans when he had finished his argument and fully applied his doctrine, viz. at 14<sup>23</sup>. He appended, however, the long doxology, 16<sup>25-27</sup>, much as he closed the more abstruse part of the epistle in 11<sup>33-36</sup>. The letter at first circulated in this form. Marcion may have removed the doxology; perhaps because he did not like the identification of the only wise God with the God of the Old Testament. At an early day there was circulated with this epistle, or appended to it, a letter, or part of a letter, from a Roman evangelist named Tertius to his friends at Rome. He was an officer, or at least a man of standing and influence in the church at Rome. In an Alexandrian or Egyptian recension the long doxology was transferred to the end of this composite document, apparently taking the place of the brief dox-

<sup>8</sup> It is sometimes so used in the Greek Old Testament, see Jer. 43 (Heb. 36)<sup>4, 18, 27, 32</sup>.

ology, 16<sup>24</sup>.<sup>9</sup> This writer has the style of Paul, and has Paul's conception of Christian love and morality. But there is no evidence that he apprehended Paul's profound idea of the nature of the Christian life. His use of *ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν* (15<sup>13</sup>) is simply imitative. We have, then, at the close of this epistle, as at the close of the Second Gospel, a fragment welded to the original document; and we have, as in the First Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and perhaps other New Testament books, the writing of a Christian of the first age of the church, of whom we know little except what appears in the spirit of his writing.

If Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans as early as 54 A.D. and suffered martyrdom before 60 A.D., as seems very probable, we may suppose that the Epistle of Tertius was written in 64, or a little earlier, after the church at Rome was well developed, but before the beginning of the Neronian persecution or of the Jewish war.

<sup>9</sup> The authorities which place the long doxology after 14<sup>23</sup> have, in general, two short doxologies, 16<sup>20-24</sup>. Those which transfer the long doxology to the end of 16 in general omit vs.<sup>24</sup>. D and its closely related codices EFG omit 20<sup>b</sup>, but D is said to have a mark noting its omission. Apparently Tertius's epistle closed with two doxologies as do several New Testament epistles; compare Phil. 4<sup>20-23</sup> 2 Thess. 3<sup>16-18</sup> 1 Tim. 6<sup>16-21</sup> 2 Tim. 4<sup>18-22</sup> 1 Pet. 5<sup>11-14</sup>.



---

On <RLE>קושידו<PDF> an <RLE>קישׁי<PDF>

Author(s): R. J. H. Gottheil

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 199-202

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268792>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## On קושיהו and קישי.

PROF. R. J. H. GOTTHEIL.

NEW YORK.

IN the last number of the *ZAW.* (xvii. 348) Dr. Peiser has treated of the name קושיהו *י* Chr. 15<sup>17</sup>, which appears again *י* Chr. 6<sup>20</sup> under the form קישי. I can hardly think that he is right in supposing that this second form is an intentional change from the first, due to the feeling that such a name as 'Kōš is Yahu' smacked too much of "other gods." We have undoubtedly the same name in both cases, קישי standing for an abbreviated קושיהו (*i.e.* "קישי").<sup>1</sup> The LXX is interesting, in one of these passages at least. In 15<sup>17</sup> it reads Κεισαίον (B) or Κισαίου (A and Luc.).<sup>2</sup> In 6<sup>20</sup> the ordinary reading is Κισά, B has Κεισαι, A Κεισαν.<sup>3</sup> But Lucian has for this second name Κουσει. We see, then, that the first part of the name varies between קוש and קיש. We have a number of such variants, as *e.g.* צורק and צירי *י* S. 9<sup>5</sup> (LXX Σειφ, A and B) *י* Chr. 6<sup>20</sup>; <sup>4</sup> הירם and חורם *י* Chr. 14<sup>1</sup>; <sup>5</sup> קוליה, Neh. 11<sup>7</sup>, but Ezra 10<sup>23</sup> קליה (LXX Κωλειά, Luc. Κωλίης); <sup>6</sup> עירי *י* Chr. 7<sup>7</sup>, LXX Ούρει, Luc. Ούρίας; <sup>6</sup> עירא *י* Chr. 11<sup>28</sup>, LXX 'Ωραί, Luc. Είρας.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jer. 6<sup>11</sup>, where the correct reading seems to have been וְהִמְתִּי (LXX καὶ τὸν θυμόν μου); the having been read by a later scribe as the abbreviation of יהוה, whence the Masoretic חמת יהוה. Cf. also Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, p. 19; Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 297, "קישי very uncertain."

<sup>2</sup> Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra*, 172, 41.

<sup>3</sup> Lagarde, *ibid.*, 172, 42. Kittel, in his edition of Chronicles (p. 66), in the Polychrome Bible, suggests קיש as the proper reading.

<sup>4</sup> See Kittel, *a. l.*; Marquart, *Fundamente israelitischer und jüdischer Geschichte*, p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Kittel, p. 66. But הירן and חורן are not found on *Phoenician* inscriptions. The citation from Siegfried-Stade treats of *Palmyrene* inscriptions. The name occurs only once on a Phoenician inscription, the famous Baal-Lebanon patera (*CIS.* i. p. 25); cf. Ledrain, *Dict. des Noms Propres Palmyréniens*, p. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *י* Chr. 20<sup>5</sup> ישור and ישר.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. also מיצא *י* Chr. 8<sup>96</sup>, LXX Μαισά; שישק 2 Chr. 12<sup>2</sup>, LXX Σουσακειμ (*י* Ki. 14<sup>25</sup> שושק, K'thibh); אחומי *י* Chr. 4<sup>2</sup>, LXX (B) Αχειμει, (A) Αχιμαί,

Peiser is not satisfied with the usual comparison with *Kaus-malaku* (= Kōs-melekh), *Kaus-gabri* (= Kōs-gebher), names of Edomite kings found upon the Assyrian monuments. He finds upon a contract tablet of the time of Darius a name (*ilu*) *Ḳus-iadu* (= קושִׁי־אָדוּ).<sup>8</sup> Peiser also suggests that the birthplace of the prophet Nahum, אֶלְקוֹשׁ, contains the name of the same god; *i.e.* אֶל + קוֹשׁ.

The question as to the connection of this *Ḳūš* with the Idumaeo-Arabic god *Ḳaus* is regarded by Peiser as not certain. But just for this region the name of the god is well authenticated. We have Greek inscriptions found in Edom with such names as Κόσγῆρος (= קסגֶר), Κοσνάτανος (= קסנתן). Josephus<sup>9</sup> mentions a Κοσρόβαρος, whose ancestors were priests of Κοζε (= Ḳaus, Ḳuzah). Cf. קסנתן on a Nabataean inscription of El-Ḥijr;<sup>10</sup> and קוסנדר on a Sinaitic inscription.<sup>11</sup> We have undoubtedly here the same god in the names found in the Bible, in Nabataean and Sinaitic inscriptions<sup>12</sup> and in Arabic tradition. Whether the brook קישון contains the same name, as Robertson Smith suggests,<sup>13</sup> is yet in doubt.

This *Ḳaus*, however, appears in a different form also in Arabic, *i.e.* as *Ḳais*. The suggestion made by Wellhausen,<sup>14</sup> "näher liegt freilich der Zusammenhang von Qaus und Qais," seems to have remained unnoticed. Even Hartwig Derenbourg, who has written a short memoir on the god *Ḳais*,<sup>15</sup> has not noticed this; though he does suggest that the second part of the name אלקוש is connected with this *Ḳais*. He shows there that in the name of the wandering royal poet we have not the "man of the tribe *Ḳais*-Ailan," but "servant of the god *Ḳais*." Cf. such names as 'Abd-al-*Ḳais* (= נבִיאֵל, אישֶׁבֶשֶׁת, אשבעל).

In looking over this article of Derenbourg's, however, I am surprised to find that he gives this etymology of Imru-l-*Ḳais* as a new

Pesh. אַחֲמִי שִׁפּוֹן 1 Chr. 8<sup>5</sup>, if equal to שִׁפּוֹן (Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 95); וְזוּרָה and וְזוּרָה 2 Ki. 23<sup>36</sup> (Gray, p. 222); יְדוּתָן ψ 39<sup>1</sup>, (Ket. דְּיִתָן) LXX Ἰδούθου, Luc. Ἰδούθου, (once 1 Chr. 9<sup>15</sup> Ἰδούθου. Cf. Kittel, p. 67). For interchange of *i*(ē) and *o*(w), see Haupt, *The Assyrian E Vowel*, pp. 21, 22, apud Kittel, p. 80.

<sup>8</sup> Hommel, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 73, cites a name *K'is-ili*; but he translates it "Gift of God."

<sup>9</sup> *Antiquities*, xv. 7, 9.

<sup>10</sup> Euting, *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, p. 49; cf., also, Κοσαδαρος.

<sup>11</sup> Euting, *Sinaitische Inschriften*, p. 56 (= קסנדר), Κοσβαρος (= קסבנה), Κοσβαραχος (= קסברך); Wellhausen, *Skizzen* iii. 1.

<sup>12</sup> Wellhausen, *Skizzen* iii. 170.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, p. 77, note 2.

<sup>13</sup> *Religion of the Semites*, p. 155.

<sup>15</sup> *Le Poète anti-islamique Imrou-l-Ḳais*.

explanation. It is as old, at least, as the year 1843, when that splendid scholar Osiander propounded it in his *Studien über die vorislamische Religion der Araber*.<sup>16</sup> It has been repeated by De Vogüé (1868),<sup>17</sup> by Halevy<sup>18</sup> (1882), by Schrader,<sup>19</sup> by Baethgen,<sup>20</sup> and is to be found in the tenth edition of Gesenius' *Handwörterbuch*.<sup>21</sup> In the same article, Derenbourg attributes to Wellhausen the comparison of קיש with Arabic *Ḳais*. But that also is to be found in the tenth edition of Gesenius, which appeared one year earlier than did the work of Wellhausen to which Derenbourg refers.

We must not confound this god, *Ḳaus* or *Ḳais*, with another Idu-maeian god mentioned by Josephus,<sup>22</sup> *Κοζε*, as has been done by De Vogüé,<sup>23</sup> Lagarde,<sup>24</sup> Neubauer.<sup>25</sup> We have in *Κοζε* undoubtedly the Arabic *Ḳuzah*, though the name occurs at too late a period for us to determine the connection between this form and *Ḳaus* or *Ḳais*.<sup>26</sup> As both words mean "bow," there may be some connection other than etymological between the two names.

Derenbourg goes still further and identifies this *Ḳais* with the Ζεὺς *Κάσιος* of the Greeks, which we find localized in the names of two mountains, one near Antioch and the other near Pelusium. In this he is also following De Vogüé; while Levy<sup>27</sup> and Scholz<sup>28</sup> connect it with the *Κοζε* of Josephus. But we have here another Idu-maeian (?) god, קציו, found quite often on Nabataean inscriptions. Baudissin has already made this identification,<sup>29</sup> though he confounds קציו with *Κοζε*. This god is found again in Arabic names of an

<sup>16</sup> *ZDMG.* vii. 501.

<sup>17</sup> *Syrie Centrale, Inscriptions Sémitiques*, p. 105.

<sup>18</sup> *Les Inscriptions der Safa*, p. 321; although, at a later time, he withdrew this statement, *Rev. des Études Juives*, 1884, p. 16.

<sup>19</sup> *KAT*<sup>2</sup>, p. 603.

<sup>20</sup> *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, p. 11.

<sup>21</sup> p. 743, s. v. קיש.

<sup>22</sup> *Antiquities*, xv. 7, 9.

<sup>24</sup> *Symmicta* i. 121.

<sup>23</sup> *l. c.*

<sup>25</sup> *Studia Biblica* i. 224, 225.

<sup>26</sup> Tuch, *ZDMG.* iii. 200; Wellhausen, *l. c.*, pp. 77, 171; Baethgen, *l. c.*, p. 12.

<sup>27</sup> *ZDMG.* xviii. 631.

<sup>28</sup> *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den alten Hebräern*, p. 144. Lenormant, *Gazette Archéologique* vi. 143, seems also to hold the same view. I have these two citations from Drexler's article "Kasios," in Roscher, *Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* i. 971. Cf. also Blau, *ZDMG.* xxv. 575.

<sup>29</sup> *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte* ii. 238; Wellhausen, *Skizzen* iii. 62; Baethgen, *l. c.*, 104, 304. Even though this may, in several cases, be the name of a man (Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xlii. 475; *CIS.* ii. Nos. 165, 174; *Rev. Sem.* v. 83), the name was in its origin theophorous.

early period, *e.g.* 'Abd-Ḳuṣai. The name is found at a very much earlier period. Assurbanipal, in his celebrated campaign into Arabia, mentions<sup>30</sup> a place Ḥirata-Ḳazaï (or Kaṣaï). I think that Lenormant<sup>31</sup> was right in seeing here the name of this same god קציו; the first part is, of course, to be connected with the Syriac קרתא, a camp, from which the name of the celebrated Arabian city is derived.<sup>32</sup>

In conclusion, I should like to suggest the connection of this name with that of the mysterious sect mentioned by Hippolytus, Origen, Theodoret, and Epiphanius, — the Elkesaites.<sup>33</sup> Chwolsohn has tried to explain this name as equivalent to the Arabic al-Ḥasiḥ, mentioned by al-Nadīm as the founder of the Mu'tazilite sect.<sup>34</sup> The pronunciation of the Arabic word is, however, entirely uncertain; and the Greek transcription does not at all agree with the letters. This was stated long ago in the notes to the Fihrist.<sup>35</sup> Now Epiphanius says expressly that the founder of this sect lived in Idumaea. Ηλξαι, Ηλξαιος, Ηλξα, and Ηλκεσαι would be almost a transcription of אל קציו. We, certainly, need not lay too much stress upon the report that this was the name of a man. The Elkesaites would take their name from the name of the god they worshipped, or, at least, which their fathers worshipped, — just as the other sect mentioned with them, the Σαμψαῖοι, took their name from the god שמש.

<sup>30</sup> In the cylinder R<sup>m</sup>I, vii. 109.

<sup>31</sup> *l. c.*

<sup>32</sup> Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 25.

<sup>33</sup> See the citations in Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier* i. 116 seq., 806; Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Moḥammad* i. 30, 101.

<sup>34</sup> Flügel, *Kitāb al-Fihrist* i. 340; Chwolsohn, *l. c.* ii. 543.

<sup>35</sup> ii. 177. Renan, *Histoire des Langues Sémitiques*, 4th ed., p. 343, has the same etymology as Chwolsohn; Geiger, *ZDMG*. xviii. 825, thinks of אל ק, and Blau, *ZDMG*. xxv. 569, of el-Choẓâ'i, "dessen Namen . . . auf Verwandtschaft mit dem Sektirer Amr b. Loheij el-Choẓâ'i weist."



---

On Daniel viii: 11, 12

Author(s): J. Dyneley Prince

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 203-204

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268793>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## On Daniel viii. 11, 12.

PROF. J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

NEW YORK.

11 וְעַד שָׂר הַצִּבְאָה הַגְּדִיל וּמִמֶּנּוּ הָרִים הַתְּמִיד וְהַשְּׁלֶדֶת מִכּוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ : 12 וְצָבָא  
תִּנְתַּן עַל הַתְּמִיד בְּפֶשַׁע וְהַשְּׁלֶדֶת אִמַּת אֶרְצָה וְעִשְׂתָּהּ וְהַצְּלִיחָה :

Verses <sup>9, 10</sup> describe the rise and the extent of the sway of the Little Horn, the symbol of Antiochus Epiphanes. In v.<sup>10</sup> it is said that the Horn exalted itself 'even unto the host of heaven (*i.e.* the kingdom of the Israelitish saints), and felled to the earth some of the host and some of the stars and trampled on them.' In these two verses the fem. subject of the verb is unquestionably 'the Horn,' קָרְן אַחֶרֶת צְעִירָה.<sup>1</sup> In the interpretation of vs.<sup>11 12</sup>, however, we meet with three difficulties; viz.: 1. the unexpected transition to the masc. in the form הַגְּדִיל, the subject of which must be either the Horn or Antiochus Epiphanes directly. If it be supposed that Antiochus is referred to here directly, the form of the verb is of course correct; but 2. the sudden recurrence of the fem. forms in v.<sup>12</sup> without any repetition of the Horn as a subject (cf. הַצְּלִיחָה, עִשְׂתָּה, תִּנְתַּן) seems to make this view untenable; 3. the construction of צָבָא as a fem. subject of תִּנְתַּן. Nearly all the modern expositors disregard these changes of gender and make their translations on the unwarranted assumption that the author refers to Antiochus directly in the first instance in the masc., and that then, suddenly thinking of the Horn, he changes the gender of the verbs in the same sentence without any change of subject.<sup>2</sup> Such a confusion of gender, however, taken in connection with the two unexplained suffixes in מִמֶּנּוּ and מִקְדָּשׁוֹ, could only produce the greatest ambiguity and would certainly not have been permitted to stand by any author who had made the most cursory revision of his work. It must be concluded, therefore, that the text is corrupt; and in fact, that if the Masoretic

<sup>1</sup> So Bevan and Kamphausen for M. קָרְן אַחֶת מְצִעִירָה.

<sup>2</sup> V. Lengerke, Hitzig, Behrmann, Kamphausen, etc. Bevan remarks that no plausible emendation has been as yet suggested.

text of this passage be allowed to remain unaltered, a satisfactory translation is impossible.

Little or no help can be obtained from the Versions. The text of both the LXX and © is in even a worse condition than that of M., so that we are practically left to our own devices to explain the difficulty.

I suggest the following emendation of the text and translation :

וְעַר שָׂר הַצִּבְאָה <sup>3</sup> הַגְּדִילָה וּמִמֶּנִּי <sup>4</sup> הָרַם הַתְּמִיד וְהַשְּׂלֵךְ מִכּוֹן מִקְרָשׁוֹ : <sup>5</sup> וַצִּבְאָה נָתַן  
עַל הַתְּמִיד בְּפֶשַׁע וְהַשְּׂלֵךְ אֶמֶת אֶרְצָה וְעָשְׂתָה וְהִצְלִיחָה :

And even unto the Prince of the Host (Jhvh) it (fem., the Horn) exalted itself, and from Him (Jhvh) was taken away the daily offering, and the place of His (Jhvh's) Sanctuary was cast down. And its (the Horn's) host was appointed against the daily sacrifice by reason of iniquity, and it (the Horn) will cast down truth to earth and will undertake and carry out successfully.

We thus have **צבא** used in two senses in vs.<sup>11, 12</sup>. In v.<sup>11</sup> it is the host of Israel, God's host, against which the Horn exalts itself. In v.<sup>12</sup> the author, wishing to emphasize the fact that the Antiochan persecution against Israel was permitted by Jhvh as a necessary chastisement, states that, owing to Israel's wickedness, the Horn's host was imposed upon her as a penalty, to be especially operative against the daily offering. The fem. suffix הַֿ relieves the ambiguity of **צבא** and brings out the contrast between the **צבא** of Israel and the **צבא** of Antiochus.<sup>6</sup>

Hitzig and Ewald also regard **צבא** in v.<sup>12</sup> as an allusion to the Horn's host, but fail to make the reference intelligible by means of a suffix, as they retain the Niph. תַּנְתַּן, unwarrantably construing **צבא** as a feminine.

<sup>3</sup> הגדילה adding ה, accidentally omitted before ו. So also Gall.

<sup>4</sup> הרם following *Qeré*.

<sup>5</sup> וצבאה נתן for וצבא תנתן, changing ת to ה and construing the latter as a suffix referring to קרן. For נתן על in the sense 'impose as a penalty' (also Ewald), cf. 2 Ki. 18<sup>14</sup> Jon. 1<sup>14</sup> Ezek. 7<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> None of Professor Moore's emendations in JBL. xv. seem necessary. The text of these verses can be explained without such radical alterations.



---

Note on Psalm cxxi. I

Author(s): Dean. A. Walker

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 205-206

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268794>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## Note on Psalm cxxi. I.

PROF. DEAN A. WALKER.

AURORA, N. Y.

THE R.V. has here correctly followed the Hebrew text in making the second clause interrogative. This construction gives a more logical sequence in the thought, the direct question, "From whence cometh my help?" being followed by its answer, "My help cometh from the Lord"; whereas in the A.V. we have the psalmist's statement that his help cometh from the hills (R.V. "mountains," Heb. הַרִים) followed by the seemingly contradictory, or at least non-sequent, statement that his help cometh from another source, namely, the Lord. I say seemingly contradictory, for it must be admitted that we have here no necessary contradiction. The usual interpretation which makes this a case of parallelism, in whose first member the psalmist finds his help in the mountains as the symbol, and in the second member finds it in Jehovah as the real source of strength, has abundant warrant in biblical methods of thought. In Old Testament times as well as to-day, devout minds found inspiration in mountain scenery (Ps. 95<sup>4</sup>). The everlasting hills have always suggested God's eternity, strength, and majesty, and His overshadowing presence and protection. It is strengthening to look upon them.

But was this the psalmist's thought in our passage? A very different thought may be found in the verse if we go a step further than the R.V. and render the first clause also as interrogative, a construction which, though rare in Hebrew, is permissible, the use of the affirmative form in an interrogative sense without an interrogative particle (cf. 2 Sam. 16<sup>17</sup>; Zech. 8<sup>6</sup>; and possibly 2 Sam. 23<sup>5</sup>; and Is. 1<sup>18</sup>, where the context seems to favor this interpretation), especially where the idea of surprise or protest is implied. Rendering the main verb אָשִׂא as an interrogative of indignant protest, we may then read the thought, 'Shall I lift up mine eyes unto the mountains [high places, the seats of idolatrous worship]? Nay, verily, from whom cometh my help? My help cometh from Yahweh which made heaven and earth.'

It is consonant with this interpretation that such high places were consecrated to idolatrous rites upon the mountains (הַרְיָרָה), as by Solomon (1 K. 11<sup>7</sup> 2 K. 23<sup>13</sup>), and by Jehoram (2 Chron. 21<sup>11</sup>), upon the same mountains referred to in Ps. 125<sup>2</sup> as "round about Jerusalem." The context also supports this view.

The proper historical setting for the psalm may be found in the great reformation under Josiah (2 K. 23). When this energetic king undertook to "put down the *chemarim* whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah and in the places round about Jerusalem; them also that burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven" (2 K. 23<sup>5</sup>), there must have been many timid souls who dreaded the vengeance of the gods thus summarily cut off from their share in the popular worship and ejected from their high places as things of nought. The psalm may well have been written to comfort and fortify these doubting ones in this trying time.

The psalmist would teach them first the source of his strength: not the gods of the mountain tops whom they had been wont to worship and fear, whose powers were limited to the earth or upper air, to the day or to the night, but Jahweh, the maker of heaven and earth. Fear them not, therefore, for He is all powerful, and neither slumbers in the daytime nor sleeps at night. Fear not, therefore, the vengeance of Shamash, the deposed sun god, in thy going out of the city to labor in the fields through the heat of the day; nor the vengeance of Yareaḥ, the moon god, when in the gathering dusk thou hast occasion to pass by his desecrated altars in thy coming in again to the city. For Yahweh is thy keeper, and He is mightier than they all. He will preserve thee from all evil. Thou art under His protection, who is now, henceforth, and forever thy one and only God.



---

Dr. Torrey on the Edomites

Author(s): T. K. Cheyne

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. 207-208

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268795>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## Dr. Torrey on the Edomites.

PROF. T. K. CHEYNE.

OXFORD, ENGLAND.

DR. TORREY unintentionally exaggerates the difference between the conclusions of his article in Part I. of the present volume, and those expressed in my *Introduction to Isaiah*, pp. 210 f. To say that I there regard Mal. 1<sup>3-5</sup> "as referring to a Nabatæan attack on the Edomites while the latter were in their old home" is not quite correct; it should have been said, "while the main body of the Edomites were," etc. Dr. Torrey has seen the historical truth more clearly than any of his predecessors, but it is too much to assume that "the fact has not been recognized that the invaders (*i.e.* the Edomitish invaders of Judah) *came to stay*." It was recognized by myself; that I underrate the extent of the invasion does not alter the fact. Dr. Torrey also states that according to "the theory now in favour" the Edomites in Judah "were compelled by the Persians to give back their new possessions to the Jews." I do not remember what Wellhausen may have said on the subject; but, lest some reader of Dr. Torrey's article might suppose that I am among those who hold this view, I will state explicitly that never, in any of my references to the subject, have I given any countenance to this baseless theory.

To Dr. Torrey belongs the credit of having first shown that the list of Judæan cities in Nehemiah, supposed by Smend and others (including myself) to be pre-exilic, was really an invention of the Chronicler—a discovery which has important consequences. But even in 1895 it was possible for a critic of Isaiah like myself to avoid this arbitrary supposition, and in *ZATW.* xiv. (1894) p. 142, I have rejected the view of Mal. 1<sup>3-5</sup> adopted by Stade in his *Geschichte*.

I will now add a correction of a view of my own on Ps. 65<sup>2-4</sup>, which, following Bickell, I now arrange thus :

For thee most fit is praise, | O God, in Zion;  
To thee be the vow performed, | O Hearer of prayer.

Unto thee do all men come | because of guilty acts;  
If our transgressions oppress us, | thou purgest them away.

כל-בשר refers to the Jews, as in Joel 3<sup>1</sup>. I could not therefore now use Ps. 65<sup>2-4</sup> in illustration of Mal. 1<sup>11</sup>. On the latter passage I agree of course with Dr. Torrey.

---

ERRATUM.

In Part I. p. 78, line 6 under 'Results,' read (3, 6) instead of (2, 6).



---

Erratum: The Composition of the Book of Daniel

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), p. 208

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268796>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Unto thee do all men come | because of guilty acts;  
If our transgressions oppress us, | thou purgest them away.

כל-בשר refers to the Jews, as in Joel 3<sup>1</sup>. I could not therefore now use Ps. 65<sup>2-4</sup> in illustration of Mal. 1<sup>11</sup>. On the latter passage I agree of course with Dr. Torrey.

---

ERRATUM.

In Part I. p. 78, line 6 under 'Results,' read (3, 6) instead of (2, 6).



---

Proceedings, December, 1897

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. i-iii

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268797>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## PROCEEDINGS.

DECEMBER, 1897.

THE thirty-third meeting of the Society was held in Room 422 of the Library Building of Columbia University, beginning Tuesday, December 28, at 2.45 P.M. In the absence of both President and Vice-President, Prof. Francis Brown was chosen to preside.

The records of the last meeting were read and approved. Dr. Moxom, Professor Gottheil, and Professor Barton were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year. Dr. Peters reported from the Committee of Arrangements in regard to dinner and hotel accommodations.

The Treasurer's report and the financial report of the Recording Secretary were read, and referred to an Auditing Committee consisting of Professors Prince and J. R. Smith.

The reports of the Corresponding Secretary and of the Recording Secretary were presented and accepted. Voted, to follow in general the order of papers as printed on the programme.

At 3.15 Professor Haupt read on Gen. 1<sup>11</sup>. There were remarks on this by Professor Brown. At 3.35 Professor Paton gave "A Restoration of the Primitive Structure of Lev. 19<sup>1-12</sup>." At 3.55 Professor Robinson read on "A New Interpretation of Deut. 1<sup>2</sup>." Remarks were made by Professor Bacon. At 4.25 Professor Gottheil read on "קִישׁוֹר and קִישׁ." At 4.35 Professor Weber read on "Hebrew Words in the Book of Job used in a Sense Peculiar to the Aramaic." There were remarks by Professors Briggs and H. P. Smith. At 5 Professor Haupt called attention to reprints of portions of Ginsburg's Hebrew Bible. At 5.05 Professor Haupt read on "The First Chapters of Isaiah." There were remarks by Professor Brown. At 5.30 Professor Barton read a part of his paper on "The Composition of the Book of Daniel." At 6.10 recess was taken for dinner and a social hour.

**Tuesday evening, Dec. 28.** — The Society reassembled at 8. Professor Barton concluded his paper, upon which Professors Paton,

Haupt, and Briggs commented. At 8.30 Professor Haupt read on "Dan. 3<sup>24-26</sup>." There were remarks by Professor Genung. At 8.55 Professor Bacon read "A Textual Emendation of the Papias Fragment"; on this Professor McGiffert commented.

At 9.25 Professor Thayer presented a report from the Committee on a School of Oriental Study and Research in Palestine, embodying the result of a conference with the Council of the Archæological Institute of America. It was then unanimously

Voted, that the Committee be authorized, in behalf of the Society, to accept the proposition of the Archæological Institute of America, with an expression of the Society's appreciation of the same; and that this Committee be empowered to represent the Society at the meeting of the Council of the Institute in May next.

At 9.50 Dr. Ward read a note on "Nehushtan," after which the meeting adjourned to Wednesday at 9.30 A.M.

**Wednesday morning, Dec. 29.**—The Society was called to order promptly at 9.30 by Professor Brown, the acting President. No quorum being present, adjournment was taken for fifteen minutes.

Met at 9.45. Professor Prince reported for the Auditing Committee that the Treasurer's report and the financial report of the Recording Secretary were correct and properly vouched. The Council reported that they had reëlected Professor Lyon as Corresponding Secretary, and Professor Nash and Dr. Cobb as additional members of the Publishing Committee.

On recommendation of the Council, the following honorary members were elected :

|                   |                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Dr. A. Ceriani,   | Ambrosian Library, Milan, Italy. |
| Dr. S. Schechter, | Cambridge, England.              |

Also the following active members :

|                             |                                      |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Rev. R. H. Beattie,         | Newburg, N. Y.                       |
| Miss Emily Grace Briggs,    | New York City.                       |
| Rev. James E. Frame,        | Union Theol. Sem., New York City.    |
| Prof. A. V. W. Jackson,     | Columbia University, New York City.  |
| Prof. W. D. Kerswill,       | Lincoln University, Chester Co., Pa. |
| Rev. Kaufmann Kohler, D.D., | New York City.                       |
| Prof. H. R. Purinton,       | Lewiston, Maine.                     |

The thanks of the Society were tendered to Columbia University for the accommodations furnished for this meeting. Dr. Moxom

reported for the Committee on Nominations, and the report was accepted and adopted, the following officers being elected :

|                          |                             |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Prof. George F. Moore,   | <i>President.</i>           |                 |
| Dr. John P. Peters,      | <i>Vice-President.</i>      |                 |
| Dr. Wm. H. Cobb,         | <i>Recording Secretary.</i> |                 |
| Prof. Willis J. Beecher, | <i>Treasurer.</i>           |                 |
| Prof. Edward L. Curtis,  | } <i>Associates</i>         |                 |
| Prof. Edward Y. Hincks,  |                             |                 |
| Prof. Benjamin W. Bacon, |                             | <i>in</i>       |
| Prof. Lewis B. Paton,    |                             | <i>Council.</i> |
| Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward,      |                             |                 |

At 9.55 Dr. Cobb read on "Isaiah 21<sup>1-10</sup> reëxamined." There were remarks by Professors Beecher, Haupt, and Brown. At 10.50 Professor Haupt gave a note on "Professor Bertholet's Commentary on Ezekiel." At 11 Professor Prince gave a note on "Dan. 8<sup>11.12</sup>." Upon this Dr. Torrey and Professor Haupt commented. At 11.10 Dr. Torrey read on "The Edomites in Southern Judah." At 11.25 Professor Porter read on "The Original Form of the Story of Judith." At 11.55 Professor Rhees read on "The Confession of Nathanael." At 12.20 Professor Harmon read on "Peter: the Man and the Epistle." There were remarks by Professors Beecher and Barton. At 12.50 Professor Paton read on "The Relation of Isaiah 2<sup>2-4</sup> to Micah 4<sup>1-5</sup>"; Professor Brown remarked on this. Adjourned at 1 P.M.

WILLIAM H. COBB,  
*Recording Secretary.*

**Members in Attendance.** — Messrs. Adler, Arnold, Bacon, Barton, Beecher, Briggs, F. Brown, W. A. Brown, Cobb, Creelman, Dickerman, Ewell, Fagnani, Ferguson, Frame, Genung, G. Gottheil, R. Gottheil, Haas, Harmon, Haupt, Hazard, Homer, Hoskins, McGiffert, E. C. Moore, Moxom, Paton, Peters, Porter, Prince, Reynolds, Rhees, J. Rice, Robinson, Ropes, Schwab, H. P. Smith, J. R. Smith, Thayer, Thurston, Torrey, Ward, Watson, Weber, Wood.



---

Constitution and By-Laws

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. xiii-xv

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268798>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS  
OF THE  
SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

(As amended June 13, 1889.)

---

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 all ex-Presidents of the Society, and 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.

---

**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.



---

Back Matter

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1898), pp. iv-xii

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268799>

Accessed: 28/07/2011 06:31

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY.

1898.

PROF. G. F. MOORE, *President*.  
 DR. JOHN P. PETERS, *Vice-President*.  
 REV. WILLIAM H. COBB, *Recording Secretary*.  
 PROF. D. G. LYON, *Corresponding Secretary*.  
 PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, *Treasurer*.

---

|  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, <i>ex-officio</i> , | } Associates<br>in<br>Council. |
| PROF. J. HENRY THAYER, “                     |                                |
| PROF. FRANCIS BROWN, “                       |                                |
| PROF. E. T. BARTLETT, “                      |                                |
| PROF. EDWARD L. CURTIS,                      |                                |
| PROF. EDWARD Y. HINCKS,                      |                                |
| PROF. LEWIS B. PATON,                        |                                |
| PROF. BENJ. W. BACON,                        |                                |
| DR. WM. HAYES WARD,                          |                                |

---

 PUBLISHING COMMITTEE.

PROF. H. S. NASH,      PROF. D. G. LYON,  
 DR. W. H. COBB.

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY.<sup>1</sup>

## HONORARY MEMBERS

|                                       |                       |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Prof. F. W. A. Baethgen, D.D.,        | Berlin.               |
| M. Samuel Berger,                     | Paris.                |
| Prof. Thomas Kelly Cheyne, D.D.,      | Oxford.               |
| Prof. A. B. Davidson, D.D.,           | Edinburgh.            |
| Prof. S. R. Driver, D.D.,             | Oxford.               |
| Rt. Rev. Charles John Ellicott, D.D., | Bishop of Gloucester. |
| Prof. Frédéric Godet, D.D.,           | Neuchâtel.            |
| Prof. H. J. Holtzmann, D.D.,          | Strassburg.           |
| Rt. Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D.D.,      | Bishop of Worcester.  |
| Provost George Salmon, D.D.,          | Dublin.               |
| Prof. William Sanday, D.D.,           | Oxford.               |
| Dr. S. Schechter, M.A.,               | Cambridge.            |
| Prof. Eberhard Schrader, D.D.,        | Berlin.               |
| Prof. George A. Smith, D.D.,          | Glasgow.              |
| Prof. C. P. Tiele, D.D.,              | Leyden.               |
| Prof. Bernhard Weiss, D.D.,           | Berlin.               |

## ACTIVE MEMBERS.

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Cyrus Adler, Ph.D.,            | 943 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C.               |
| Prof. A. W. Anthony,           | Lewiston, Me.                                   |
| Wm. R. Arnold, Ph.D.,          | Metropolitan Museum, N.Y. City.                 |
| Rev. W. Muss-Arnolt, Ph.D.,    | Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.                 |
| Prof. B. W. Bacon, D.D.,       | New Haven, Conn.                                |
| Rev. Ralph H. Baldwin,         |   |
| Prof. J. H. Barbour, M.A.,     | Middletown, Conn.                               |
| Hon. Samuel J. Barrows,        | 51 Sawyer Ave., Boston, Mass.                   |
| Prof. E. T. Bartlett, D.D.,    | 50th St. and Woodland Ave., Philadelphia, Penn. |
| Prof. George A. Barton, Ph.D., | Bryn Mawr, Penn.                                |
| Prof. L. W. Batten, Ph.D.,     | 4805 Regent St., Philadelphia, Penn.            |
| Mr. J. G. Batterson,           | Hartford, Conn.                                 |

<sup>1</sup> This list has been corrected up to Nov. 22, 1898. Members are requested to notify the Secretary of any change in their address.

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Rev. R. H. Beattie, M.A.,       | Newburg, N.Y.                          |
| Prof. Clark S. Beardslee,       | Hartford, Conn.                        |
| Prof. I. T. Beckwith, Ph.D.,    | Hartford, Conn.                        |
| Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D.,  | Auburn, N.Y.                           |
| Rev. Chas. L. Biggs,            | 225 West 99th St., N.Y. City.          |
| Prof. John Binney, D.D.,        | Middletown, Conn.                      |
| Rev. Erastus Blakeslee,         | 21 Bromfield St., Boston, Mass.        |
| Prof. C. W. E. Body,            | 9 Chelsea Square, N.Y. City.           |
| Prof. John Calvin Bowman,       | 519 West James St., Lancaster, Penn.   |
| Prof. C. F. Bradley, D.D.,      | Evanston, Ill.                         |
| Prof. C. A. Briggs, D.D.,       | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.          |
| Miss Emily Grace Briggs,        | 120 West 93d St., N.Y. City.           |
| Prof. C. R. Brown, D.D.,        | Newton Centre, Mass.                   |
| Prof. Francis Brown, D.D.,      | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.          |
| Prof. Wm. A. Brown,             | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.          |
| Prof. M. D. Buell, D.D.,        | 70 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.     |
| Prof. Sylvester Burnham, D.D.,  | Hamilton, N.Y.                         |
| Prof. E. D. Burton, D.D.,       | Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.        |
| Pres. H. A. Buttz, D.D., LL.D., | Madison, N.J.                          |
| Rev. E. H. Chandler,            | Wellesley, Mass.                       |
| Rev. J. L. Cheney, Ph.D.,       | 17 Irvington St., Cleveland, O.        |
| Prof. Francis A. Christie,      | Theological School, Meadville, Penn.   |
| Prof. W. N. Clarke, D.D.,       | Hamilton, N.Y.                         |
| Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D.,          | Cong'l Library, Boston, Mass.          |
| Rev. J. H. Coit, D.D.,          | Concord, N.H.                          |
| Prof. Rebecca Corwin,           | Mt. Holyoke Coll., So. Hadley, Mass.   |
| Prof. J. A. Craig, Ph.D.,       | Univ. of Mich., Ann Arbor, Mich.       |
| Rev. E. R. Craven, D.D., LL.D., | 1334 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn. |
| Rev. Harlan Creelman, Ph.D.,    | 183 Lawrence St., New Haven, Conn.     |
| Prof. E. L. Curtis, D.D.,       | 61 Trumbull St., New Haven, Conn.      |
| Prof. S. I. Curtiss, D.D.,      | 1530 Lakeside Ave., Chicago, Ill.      |
| Prof. T. G. Darling, D.D.,      | Auburn, N.Y.                           |
| Prof. G. W. Davis,              | Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.    |
| Prof. F. B. Denio, D.D.,        | Bangor, Me.                            |
| Rev. Lysander Dickerman, D.D.,  | 89½ Washington Square, N.Y. City.      |
| Mr. J. H. Dodge,                | City Hall, Boston, Mass.               |
| Rev. G. S. Duncan, Ph.D.,       | 216 S. St., N.E., Washington, D.C.     |
| Harry W. Dunning, B.A.,         | 473 Elm St., New Haven, Conn.          |
| Rev. George W. Elliott, D.D.,   | 2023 Wallace St., Philadelphia, Penn.  |
| Rev. Frederick E. Emrich, D.D., | South Framingham, Mass.                |
| Prof. David F. Estes,           | Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N.Y.          |
| Prof. Milton G. Evans, D.D.,    | Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Penn.     |
| Prof. John L. Ewell,            | 325 College St., Washington, D.C.      |
| Mr. Charles P. Fagnani,         | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.          |
| Prof. Arthur Fairbanks, Ph.D.,  | New Haven, Conn.                       |
| Rev. Robert A. Falconer, M.A.,  | Presbyterian College, Halifax, N.S.    |

|                                    |                                      |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Prof. Henry Ferguson,              | Hartford, Conn.                      |
| Prof. Charles L. Fischer,          | Kenyon College, Gambier, O.          |
| Rev. O. O. Fletcher, D.D.,         | Ithaca, N.Y.                         |
| Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph.D.,      | Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.        |
| Rev. James E. Frame,               | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.        |
| Rev. Frederic Gardiner,            | Pomfret, Conn.                       |
| Prof. F. A. Gast, D.D.,            | 233 N. Mary St., Lancaster, Penn.    |
| Prof. J. F. Genung, Ph D.,         | Amherst, Mass.                       |
| Rev. C. R. Gillett, M.A.,          | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.        |
| Rev. George W. Gilmore, M.A.,      | Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.             |
| Prof. J. H. Gilmore,               | Rochester, N.Y.                      |
| Prof. G. S. Goodspeed,             | Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.      |
| Rev. Gustav Gottheil, D.D.,        | 681 Madison Ave., N.Y. City.         |
| Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil, Ph.D.,    | 169 West 93d St., N.Y. City.         |
| Prof. E. P. Gould, D.D.,           | Philadelphia, Penn.                  |
| Prof. C. R. Gregory, D D., LL.D.,  | Leipzig, Germany.                    |
| Rev. William Elliot Griffis, D.D., | Ithaca, N.Y.                         |
| Rev. John A. W. Haas,              | 57 W. 119th St., N.Y. City.          |
| Rev. A. D. Hall, M.D., D.D.,       | Osaka, Japan.                        |
| Rev. Thomas C. Hall, D.D.,         | 425 North State St., Chicago, Ill.   |
| Prof. G. M. Harmon,                | Tufts College, Mass.                 |
| Pres. W. R. Harper, Ph.D., LL.D.,  | Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.      |
| Prof. J. R. Harris, M.A.,          | Cambridge, Eng.                      |
| Prof. Samuel Hart, D.D.,           | Hartford, Conn.                      |
| Prof. C. D. Hartranft, D.D.,       | Hartford, Conn.                      |
| Rev. E. Harwood, D.D.,             | New Haven, Conn.                     |
| Rev. E. C. Haskell, M.A.,          | Battle Creek, Ia.                    |
| Prof. Paul Haupt, Ph.D.,           | 2315 Linden Ave., Baltimore, Md.     |
| Rev. Willis H. Hazard, D.D.,       | West Chester, Penn.                  |
| Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D.D.,         | Louisville, Ky.                      |
| Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, Ph.D.,      | 1031 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Penn. |
| Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D.,          | Andover, Mass.                       |
| Rev. Chas. W. Homer,               | 73 St. James Place, Brooklyn, N.Y.   |
| Rev. F. D. Hoskins,                | 432 Main St., Hartford, Conn.        |
| Rev. Henry W. Hulbert,             | Cleveland, O.                        |
| Rev. Hiram R. Hulse,               | 130 Stanton St., N.Y. City.          |
| Prof. A. V. W. Jackson,            | 16 Highland Place, Yonkers, N.Y.     |
| Rev. S. M. Jackson, D.D., LL D.,   | 14 East 31st St., N.Y. City.         |
| Prof. Fleming James, D.D.,         | 905 South 47th St., Phila., Penn.    |
| Rev. Marcus Jastrow, Ph.D.,        | 139 W. Upsal St., Germantown, Penn.  |
| Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D.,  | Univ. of Pennsylvania, Phila., Penn. |
| Pres. Robert E. Jones,             | Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y.         |
| Prof. M. L. Kellner, D.D.,         | Cambridge, Mass.                     |
| Prof. Charles F. Kent, Ph.D.,      | 163 Bowen St., Providence, R.I.      |
| Prof. W. D. Kerswill,              | Lincoln Univ., Chester Co., Pa.      |
| Rev. Kaufmann Kohler, D.D.,        | N.Y. City.                           |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Mrs. Wm. C. Ladd,                  | Haverford, Penn.                          |
| Prof. J. P. Landis, D.D.,          | Dayton, O.                                |
| Prof. J. G. Lansing, D.D.,         | New Brunswick, N.J.                       |
| Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D.,           | 15 Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.           |
| Prof. D. B. Macdonald,             | 31 Farmington Ave., Hartford, Conn.       |
| Prof. Arthur C. McGiffert, D.D.,   | Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.             |
| Prof. W. M. McPheeters,            | Columbia, S.C.                            |
| Prof. D. C. Marquis, D.D.,         | Chicago, Ill.                             |
| Prof. W. R. Martin, Ph.D.,         | Hartford, Conn.                           |
| Prof. C. M. Mead, D.D.,            | Hartford, Conn.                           |
| Rev. George E. Merrill, D.D.,      | Newton, Mass.                             |
| Rev. Selah Merrill, D.D., LL.D.,   | Jerusalem.                                |
| Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D.,        | 8 Institute Road, Worcester, Mass.        |
| Rev. Goldsberry B. Merritt, Ph.D., | Somersworth, N.H.                         |
| Prof. R. W. Micou, D.D.,           | 4814 Regent St., Philadelphia, Penn.      |
| Pres. E. C. Mitchell, D.D.,        | Leland Univ., New Orleans, La.            |
| Prof. E. K. Mitchell, D.D.,        | 57 Gillette St., Hartford, Conn.          |
| Prof. H. G. Mitchell, D.D.,        | 29 West Cedar St., Boston, Mass.          |
| Rev. J. A. Montgomery,             | 419 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa.           |
| Rev. E. C. Moore, Ph.D.,           | Providence, R.I.                          |
| Prof. G. F. Moore, D.D.,           | Andover, Mass.                            |
| Rev. P. S. Moxom, D.D.,            | 83 Dartmouth Ter., Springfield, Mass.     |
| Pres. C. S. Murkland,              | Durham, N.H.                              |
| Prof. H. S. Nash, D.D.,            | Cambridge, Mass.                          |
| Rev. F. A. Noble, D.D.,            | Chicago, Ill.                             |
| Rev. P. A. Nordell, D.D.,          | Brookline, Mass.                          |
| Rev. J. W. Nott, M.A.,             | Mount Savage, Md.                         |
| Rev. C. L. Noyes,                  | Somerville, Mass.                         |
| Prof. J. A. Paine, Ph.D.,          | Tarrytown, N.Y.                           |
| Rev. C. R. Palmer, D.D.,           | New Haven, Conn.                          |
| Prof. L. B. Paton, Ph.D.,          | 50 Forest St., Hartford, Conn.            |
| Prof. W. L. Pearson, Ph.D.,        | Oskaloosa, Ia.                            |
| Rev. J. P. Peters, Ph.D.,          | 225 West 99th St., N.Y. City.             |
| Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph.D., D.D.,   | 393 Washington Ave., Albany, N.Y.         |
| Prof. J. W. Platner,               | Avon St., Cambridge, Mass.                |
| Prof. F. C. Porter,                | New Haven, Conn.                          |
| Prof. L. S. Potwin,                | 322 Rosedale Ave., Cleveland, O.          |
| Rev. Llewellyn Pratt, D.D.,        | Norwich, Conn.                            |
| Prof. Ira M. Price, Ph.D.,         | Morgan Park, Ill.                         |
| Prof. J. Dyneley Prince, Ph.D.,    | 31 West 38th St., N.Y. City.              |
| Prof. H. R. Purinton,              | Lewiston, Maine.                          |
| Prof. G. T. Purves, D.D.,          | Princeton, N.J.                           |
| Pres. F. P. Ramsay,                | Fredericksburg Coll., Fredericksburg, Va. |
| Prof. A. W. Reynolds, Ph.D.,       | Chester, Penn.                            |
| Prof. Rush Rhees,                  | Newton Centre, Mass.                      |
| Rev. Edwin W. Rice, D.D.,          | 1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.    |

- John W. Rice, Ph.D.,  
 Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D.,  
 Rev. J. F. Riggs, D.D.,  
 Prof. J. S. Riggs, D.D.,  
 Prof. C. W. Rishell, D.D.,  
 Prof. George L. Robinson, Ph.D.,  
 Prof. R. W. Rogers,  
 Prof. C. J. H. Ropes, D.D.,  
 Prof. James H. Ropes,  
 Prof. W. H. Ryder,  
 T. H. P. Sailer, Ph.D.,  
 Prof. F. K. Sanders, Ph.D.,  
 Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, M.A.,  
 Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph.D.,  
 Rev. L. H. Schwab,  
 Prof. H. P. Smith, D.D.,  
 Rev. J. Ritchie Smith,  
 Prof. W. A. Stevens, D.D., LL.D.,  
 Prof. Jacob Streibert,  
 Prof. M. S. Terry, D.D.,  
 Rev. Roderick Terry, D.D.,  
 Prof. J. H. Thayer, D.D., Litt.D.,  
 Rev. E. E. Thomas,  
 Prof. M. Bross Thomas,  
 Rev. Richard N. Thomas,  
 Rev. H. C. Thomson, D.D.,  
 Rev. John R. Thurston,  
 C. C. Torrey, Ph.D.,  
 Rev. Daniel T. Torrey,  
 Prof. C. H. Toy, D.D., LL.D.,  
 Rev. H. Clay Trumbull, D.D.,  
 Rev. F. D. Tubbs, A.M., S.T.D.,  
 Rev. J. B. Van Meter, D.D.,  
 Prof. Marvin R. Vincent, D.D.,  
 C. W. Votaw, Ph.D.,  
 Prof. Dean A. Walker, Ph.D.,  
 Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., LL.D.,  
 Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D.,  
 Rev. W. Scott Watson,  
 Prof. Henry J. Weber, Ph.D.,  
 Pres. R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D.,  
 Prof. H. G. Weston, D.D.,  
 Rev. Leighton Williams,  
 Rev. M. H. Williams, D.D.,  
 Prof. A. M. Wilson, Ph.D.,  
 Prof. R. D. Wilson, Ph.D.,
- Rockland, Mass.  
 287 Ridge Ave., Allegheny, Penn.  
 430 William St., E. Orange, N.J.  
 Auburn, N.Y.  
 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.  
 M'Cormick Theol. Sem., Chicago, Ill.  
 Drew Theol. Sem., Madison, N.J.  
 Bangor, Me.  
 Shepard St., Cambridge, Mass.  
 Andover, Mass.  
 4046 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Penn.  
 77 Mansfield St., New Haven, Conn.  
 Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.  
 Columbus, O.  
 101 Lawrence St., N.Y. City.  
 Amherst, Mass.  
 Peekskill, N.Y.  
 Rochester, N.Y.  
 Gambier, O.  
 Evanston, Ill.  
 169 Madison Ave., N.Y. City.  
 Cambridge, Mass.  
 Castleton-on-Hudson, N.Y.  
 Lake Forest, Ill.  
 1715 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Penn.  
 Cambria, Cal.  
 Whitinsville, Mass.  
 Andover, Mass.  
 Box 1508, Providence, R. I.  
 7 Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.  
 1031 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.  
 Racine, O.  
 Woman's College, Baltimore.  
 Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.  
 Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
 Wells College, Aurora, N.Y.  
*The Independent*, N.Y. City.  
 Princeton, N.J.  
 Guttenberg, N.J.  
 Bloomfield, N.J.  
 1311 Sheffield Ave., Chicago, Ill.  
 Chester, Penn.  
 305 West 88th St., N.Y. City.  
 1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Penn.  
 645 Washing'n Boul'vd, Chicago, Ill.  
 Allegheny, Penn.

|                                  |                                      |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Prof. E. J. Wolf, D.D.,          | Gettysburg, Penn.                    |
| Rev. Irving F. Wood,             | Smith College, Northampton, Mass.    |
| Rev. A. A. Wright, D.D.,         | Camden Road, Auburndale, Mass.       |
| Prof. G. F. Wright, D.D.,        | Oberlin, O.                          |
| Prof. Theodore F. Wright, Ph.D., | 42 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass.      |
| Rev. Charles S. Wyckoff,         | 1725 Mifflin St., Philadelphia, Pa.  |
| Prof. A. C. Zenos, D.D.,         | M'Cormick Theol. Sem., Chicago, Ill. |

## LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS

WHICH SUBSCRIBE FOR THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY.

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| Amherst College Library,               | Amherst, Mass.       |
| Andover Theological Seminary,          | Andover, Mass.       |
| Berkeley Divinity School,              | Middletown, Conn.    |
| Bowdoin College,                       | Brunswick, Me.       |
| British Museum,                        | London, Eng.         |
| Bryn Mawr College,                     | Bryn Mawr, Penn.     |
| Bucknell Library,                      | Chester, Penn.       |
| City Library,                          | Springfield, Mass.   |
| Colgate University,                    | Hamilton, N.Y.       |
| Congregational Library,                | Boston, Mass.        |
| Cornell University Library,            | Ithaca, N.Y.         |
| Divinity School of Prot. Epis. Church, | Philadelphia, Penn.  |
| Enoch Pratt Free Library,              | Baltimore, Md.       |
| Harvard College,                       | Cambridge, Mass.     |
| Johns Hopkins University,              | Baltimore, Md.       |
| Knox College,                          | Toronto, Canada.     |
| Lane Theological Seminary,             | Cincinnati, O.       |
| Marietta College,                      | Marietta, O.         |
| M Cormick Theological Seminary,        | Chicago, Ill.        |
| Newberry Library,                      | Chicago, Ill.        |
| Newton Theological Institution,        | Newton Centre, Mass. |
| Princeton Theological Seminary,        | Princeton, N.J.      |
| Public Library,                        | Boston, Mass.        |
| Public Library,                        | Buffalo, N.Y.        |
| Public Library,                        | Chicago, Ill.        |
| Public Library,                        | Cleveland, O.        |
| Public Library,                        | Detroit, Mich.       |
| Public Library,                        | Jersey City, N.J.    |
| Public Library,                        | Milwaukee, Wis.      |
| Public Library,                        | Newark, N.J.         |
| Public Library,                        | New York City.       |
| Public Library,                        | Worcester, Mass.     |
| Royal Library,                         | Berlin, Germany.     |
| San Francisco Theol. Seminary,         | San Anselmo, Cal.    |
| Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary,      | Louisville, Ky.      |
| State Library,                         | Albany, N.Y.         |

|                             |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Union Theological Seminary, | New York City.      |
| Union Seminary Library,     | Hampden-Sidney, Va. |
| University of Chicago,      | Chicago, Ill.       |
| University of Pennsylvania, | Philadelphia, Pa.   |
| Victoria College,           | Toronto, Canada.    |
| Wellesley College,          | Wellesley, Mass.    |
| Wesleyan University,        | Middletown, Conn.   |
| Williams College,           | Williamstown, Mass. |
| Yale University,            | New Haven, Conn.    |
| Y. M. C. A. Library,        | New York City.      |