

# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VII

JANUARY 1909

NUMBER I

## JOHN HOWIE OF LOCHGOIN: HIS FOREBEARS AND HIS WORKS.

Throughout Scotland and beyond it, John Howie has been a power for good for more than a century. Strictly speaking, he ought to be described as John Howie *in* Lochgoin, not *of* Lochgoin, as he was merely the tenant, not the owner; but the Howie family have occupied that moor-land farm for so many generations that they are constantly and naturally spoken of as the Howies of Lochgoin; and of the many Johns in that family the author of *The Scots Worthies* is preëminently known as John Howie of Lochgoin.

There is no certainty as to the precise year, not even as to the precise century, in which the Howie's first went to Lochgoin; nor is there any certainty as to the district or country from which they came. The origin of the Howies, indeed, like that of many of the oldest landed Scottish families, is lost in the haze of antiquity.

In one passage, the author of *The Scots Worthies* thus refers to the origin of his family:

"Our house had been very ancient in suffering for religion; (some have said that our first progenitors in this land fled from the French persecution in the 9th century)."<sup>1</sup>

It will be noticed that he does not vouch for the truth of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, 1796, p. 153.

## JEWISH PARTIES IN THE FIFTH CENTURY BEFORE CHRIST.<sup>1</sup>

The inhabitants of the little province of Judæa, under the Persian Empire a part of the great satrapy of Syria, were, like the other parts of the empire, divided in interests by those fixed lines of cleavage that in all ages and places have set men off one against another in persistent opposition amounting often to deadly hatred. It appears that the bitterness of party strife is enhanced by the narrowness of the limits within which the factions develop. The proverbial "tempest in a teapot" appears insignificant to the observer, yet it would surpass the wildest storms of ocean, could we but contract our scale of measurements to the standard of microscopic life. For this reason, instead of disregarding the petty and changing factions common to the history of every city-state or little commonwealth, we rather do well to study them with the more care the smaller the community that develops them.

In Judæa in the fifth century before Christ all the elements were present that constitute those fixed lines of cleavage to which we have referred. There were differences, racial, social, political, religious. These we shall take up, one after another, before we attempt to combine them into a general sketch of the parties that arose through the interplay of these conflicting forces.

In the first place, racially, the population consisted of three distinct elements. There were, first, the Persian; second, the Jew; third, the non-Jewish Palestinian. Of the Persian we need say little, for his figure and his position in Asia during this century are well known to us from our

---

<sup>1</sup> An address delivered at the opening of the ninety-seventh session of Princeton Theological Seminary, on Friday, September 18, 1908.

classical authors. There were probably few Persians resident in the Province of Judæa, and these were there undoubtedly in civil and military positions, and subject to constant change. Few in number, they were of an altogether disproportionate importance, but this importance, being political, can best be noted later in connection with the political phase of Jewish life.

The Jew formed the only considerable homogeneous racial element of the population, though the proportion of Jews to strangers in this province, "Judæa" though it was in name, doubtless fluctuated greatly with the ebb and flow of military and commercial tides that swept through Syria during the century. Racially the Jew was indeed a mixture of many elements, but the exclusiveness that tended to conserve the ancient Israelitish strain was by no means a novelty of this century, gotten up by Ezra and Nehemiah for party reasons. The offspring of intermarriages between Jews and non-Jews within the province were at best the exception, not the rule, and the bulk of the population that could be described as "Jewish" was of at least as pure Hebrew stock as were the subjects of King Josiah or King Zedekiah.

The population outside of this compact Jewish mass consisted mostly of Palestinians who had moved in from the surrounding peoples. We read particularly of Ammonites, Arabians, Ashdodites or Philistines, Tyrians or Phoenicians, and Samaritans. In those last named we are of course to recognize a closer racial affinity with the Jew than in the other Palestinian elements.

Representatives of all these nations, and doubtless of many others, such as Egyptians, Greeks and Babylonians, dwelt together, fought side by side in the armies of the Persian kings and satraps, carried on commerce and the peaceful arts, without any difficulty on the score of language. The medium of communication in all the western half of the Persian Empire was Aramaic. Official documents of the Persian courts, letters of merchants, memor-

anda and records of all sorts, in which the parties interested were not of the same mother-tongue, were written in the Aramaic language and the simple, practical Aramaic script. And both in Judæa and among Jews outside of Judæa this dominant language was by the fifth century more and more displacing the Hebrew tongue, even in the daily intercourse of Jew with Jew.

Before leaving this subject, we should observe that there was no particular bond to unite these heterogeneous racial elements, except the negative bond of being all of them non-Jews. Against the Jews they might unite, temporarily, even on the basis of racial considerations; for any other purpose they were a centrifugal, disruptive force, making for the progressive leveling of the province up, or down, to the plane of the general Palestinian type,—in short, for the denationalizing, or internationalizing, of Judæa, and therefore for its disappearance from the field of history.

The second line of cleavage in the community was the divergence of social conditions and interests. Here, as elsewhere, prevailed the distinction between high-born and low-born, the noble and the commoner. But to this in Judæa was added the distinction between slave and freeman; that is, a purely social distinction between slave and freeman, not coinciding with the usual racial distinction between the master and his slave. Repugnant as this enslaving of brother by brother must have been to all wholesome and humane feelings, it was doubly so to a nation with the moral and religious heritage of the Jew. It was utterly foreign to the Hebrew conscience to permit the enslaving of a Jew by his fellow-Jew in any manner corresponding to the usual relation of master and slave. We do not have to go to the Pentateuch to discover this sentiment, for it emerges in the prophets, as in Jeremiah, and again with great vehemence in Nehemiah.

The causes of this intra-Jewish slavery were economic. To trace the development of the social classes of the fifth century out of the cataclysms of the sixth century, its de-

portations and migrations, would be beyond our present purpose. It is enough to note here the three causes which Nehemiah assigns as the immediate occasion of that intolerable social condition which he found in Judæa and attempted to remedy. These three causes, all of them economic, were the following: (1) dearth in production, (2) oppressive taxation, (3) usury in lending. (Neh. v. 2-5.)

The first it was not in the power of the governor to remedy. The second Nehemiah had already largely mitigated by his own voluntary sacrifice of the perquisites of his office: in all the time he was governor, he and his attendants "did not eat the bread of the governor" (Neh. v. 14). That is, he had not levied a special tax for his own private support and the maintenance of his court and table. The third cause he was resolved at once to remove, if it lay within his power. It seems that the wise provisions of ancient law had been habitually disregarded by the wealthy Jews, respecting the lending of money and the terms of service for those who pledged their own persons for debt. Instead of the liberal and fraternal treatment there enjoined, the rich had taken advantage of their needy brethren in every way. They had loaned money (probably that required for the royal taxes) only upon the mortgaging of the fields and vineyards of their inheritance by the poor; and they had precluded the possibility of redeeming the property so mortgaged, by exacting a usurious rate of interest, probably one per cent. a month (Neh. v. 11). For if these lands could scarcely support their owners from year to year without any interest to pay, it would be impossible for them to yield this with a twelve per cent. interest in addition,—to say nothing of any surplus to apply to the reduction of the debt. Once started on this downward course, there was no end for the Jew but serfdom. And even this was not the humane serfdom of the old law, but a real slavery, that might and often did result in his being sold to a foreigner and transported far from his home and nation. (Neh. v. 8.) Nehemiah's remedy was the exaction of a public oath from the wealthy Jews.

that they would restore to their poor brethren their inheritances, and commute the interest heretofore exacted.

Nobles and common people, masters and slaves, rich and poor: all these social distinctions within the bounds of so small a state, where the contrasts in condition were the more galling because constantly in evidence, rendered Judæa in the fifth century peculiarly subject to the passions of party strife.

The third line of cleavage was the divergence of political views. This was in Judæa the divergence natural in a dependent state,—the different answers given to the question, how shall we deport ourselves toward our masters, and toward our neighbors subject like ourselves to the same masters? From the nature of the case two opposite views would emerge: the patriotic policy, and the international policy, if we may so designate them.

No long or elaborate explanations need be entered into, in order to make plain the distinction intended. The situation, considered purely from the political side, is so similar in all subject states, that any instance with which we happen to be familiar will serve to illustrate the situation in Judæa under the Persian sway. No illustration could be better than this same Judæa in the period familiar to us all, the period of Roman domination, the Judæa of Christ and of Paul. The same forces that were at work to produce the parties of the first century of our era, politically considered,—the Herodians, the Zealots, and the rest,—were at work to produce parties in the fifth century B. C.

The internationalist would minimize his Jewish citizenship as a distinctive honor; would "cultivate" the Persian in a manner often suggestive of time-serving and opportunism; would enter into friendly alliances of every sort with the neighboring peoples, especially that element in them that shared his own political views; and finally, would resist every effort to preserve distinctively Jewish laws and customs, national defense, local associations and ambitions. Free play for the individual would emerge as a corollary to



his theory, for it is local government and society, rather than the pressure of imperial authority, that restricts the individual within the bounds of common law or custom.

On the other side, the patriotically inclined Jew, speaking politically, would pride himself most upon being a Jew, maintaining all the inherited national laws and customs, and adapting them to his own age; he would comport himself toward the Persian overlord as a master to be obeyed from the force of circumstances, but to be cultivated and beloved only in proportion to his more or less friendly attitude toward the Jewish people as such; and finally, towards the neighboring peoples he would maintain an attitude of reserve, distrusting the encroachments of friendship and alliance with them, as much as he feared their malice and opposition, dreading most of all absorption with them into the mass of denationalized subjects of "the great king". Here again would follow as a corollary the willing sacrifice of the individual for the sake of the state, the subordination of personal comfort, ambition and tastes to the interests of the community—that ideal which passed for the Jew of that day variously under the designation of "Jerusalem", "Israel", or "Judah".

The fourth and last of these lines of cleavage in the Jewish people was their diversity of religious views. Here we may leave out of account those Jews who completely denationalized themselves by forsaking the God of their fathers and going over to the worship of other gods. After the exile this movement was so comparatively small as to be a negligible quantity. But within the bounds of the worshippers of Jehovah, there were two general tendencies manifest: first, the tendency to make religion an external cultus, splendidly maintained indeed after the traditional forms, but regarded as simply the Jewish analogue to the religious establishments of temple, priesthood and ceremony universally prevalent among the nations. The other tendency was to regard the worship of Jehovah as something wholly unique, from the person of the Deity, down through

His laws, His ministers, His habitation, His peculiar people, His providence, His promises, even to the minutiae of daily life and thought. This latter tendency is too faithfully reflected throughout the Old Testament, in Psalm and Proverb, in Law and Prophecy and History, to need any further exposition or illustration. What God, what Israel, what Jerusalem, what religion as a whole, meant to a man of Judah, say to Isaiah, in the eighth century, just that—no more, and no less—did they mean to a man of Judah in the fifth century who belonged to this stricter tendency, let us say, to Nehemiah. In this age, as in that earlier age, it was possible for the man of laxer tendency to be very much devoted to the ceremonies of the temple, and to set store by the priesthood or, if a priest, pride himself upon his birth and magnify his office. But this interest in religion would not extend to the point of voluntary self-sacrifice for it, nor tolerate the burden of its demands upon the conscience in regulating the hidden life of the soul or even the succession of little acts of which life is made up.

Here again we may best illustrate the two directions of religion in Judæa of the fifth century B. C. by the Judæa of the first century after Christ. Sadducee and Pharisee were by no means distinguished by their attitude toward the sanctuary, the former neglecting, the latter maintaining it. The high-priest and his whole connection in the period most familiar to us from the New Testament belonged to the party of the Sadducees. But the well-known difference between Pharisee and Sadducee in the regulation of all life by religion represents the difference between the stricter and the laxer religious tendency in this earlier age: though we must of course guard against the crude notion that Pharisee and Sadducee may be simply projected back through five centuries, retaining all the accretions of those five centuries of development. If we want an approximate picture of the best type of strict Jew of this fifth century, we may doubtless find it in such characters as Luke's Zachariah and Elizabeth, Mary and Simeon. In fact, Malachi in his third



chapter has painted for us a portrait of his godly contemporaries, less distinct in outline than his companion-portrait of the "proud" man, yet clear enough to exhibit the same features as in Luke's immortal figures.

We are now in a position to sketch the parties that existed in Judæa in the fifth century, by combining these conflicting elements, racial, social, political and religious, in their interplay within the narrow limits of this little province.

There are two such parties, clearly indicated for us on the pages of Ezra and Nehemiah, the histories of the period, and of Malachi, the contemporary prophet.

We take up first the party that for convenience we shall designate, from its political principles, the international party.

Racially, this could count upon the support, first, of resident Persians, under all ordinary circumstances; second, of all the non-Jews of the province—these for obvious reasons; and third, of those Jews who had some particular interest in strengthening the ties that united Jews with foreigners and with residents of non-Jewish birth. What were such particular interests?

There was, first, the commercial bond. In this age, as both earlier and later, Judæa sent corn and wine, raisins, figs and oil to Philistia and Phoenicia, and received, mainly, the products of the useful arts in exchange. Nehemiah mentions specifically the Tyrians of his time as middlemen in the trade in "fish and all manner of ware" (Neh. xiii. 16). It was naturally to the interest of the men of Judæa who were engaged in such commerce, to strengthen the bonds of international friendship.

Again, there was the bond of personal ambition. Those who were anxious to pose before Persian and Palestinian as "men of the world", to shake off the provincial and narrowly Jewish, would attach themselves to this international party.

Finally, there was the bond of intermarriage. We should make a great mistake in estimating the forces at work among the races inhabiting Judæa, were we to suppose that

the marriages contracted between Jew and non-Jew were unions prompted by a preference of Jewish men for non-Jewish women. This probably had nothing to do with the case. It was in fact the same commercial interest and personal ambition that have just been mentioned, which led to these mixed marriages. But the point is this, that they were both result and cause of this internationalism that permeated Jewish circles: result, insofar as commercial and other bonds already contracted or sought led to the consummation of these marriages to seal the extra-Jewish friendship desired; cause, insofar as such marriages committed their contractor to the alien interests with which he was now publicly allied. These considerations are, however, so closely bound up with the social conditions of the province, that we pass at once to the social phase of this international party.

To it were attracted the rich and the noble. From the nature of the case we could affirm this with confidence, had we no facts to prove it. But there is abundance of material scattered through Ezra, Nehemiah and Malachi, to exhibit its truth to fact by concrete illustrations. One such will suffice.

Tobiah, called "the Ammonite" by Nehemiah, of whom he was one of the three leading opponents, was in close touch with the nobles of Judah. They were in a correspondence with Tobiah that Nehemiah justly regarded as treasonable and treacherous, in view of Tobiah's well-known hostility to the Jewish governor. The reason given for this interest of the nobles in Tobiah is that he was son-in-law of one noble, and his son had married the daughter of another noble; hence, "many in Judah were sworn unto him" (Neh. vi. 17-19). But I believe we may with a high degree of probability go one step further. How came this "Ammonite" to be named "Tobiah", a name as Jewish as "Nehemiah"? And how came this "Ammonite" to have a chamber prepared for him, by Eliashib the high-priest, in the courts of the house of God, during Nehemiah's temporary absence from Jerusalem? Is it not the most reasonable

explanation that Tobiah was himself one of those unfortunates, the offspring of the mixed marriages that Ezra broke up a decade or two previous? In these, we are told, the "princes and rulers" were "chief" (Ezra ix. 2), and the priests, indeed the "sons of Jeshua", that is, the high-priestly family, were leading offenders (Ezra x. 18). Offspring of a member of the priestly, or even high-priestly, circle and an Ammonitish woman whose wealth or position or family made her an attractive alliance, Tobiah bore a Jewish name, passed his youth in Jerusalem among the Jewish kinsmen of his father, perhaps had already been initiated into those priestly functions to which his father's rank gave him the right. Suddenly Ezra descends upon the province, armed with the full authority of Artaxerxes' firman. The famous commission on the mixed marriages is appointed. With scores of others, he and his mother are cast out of the Jewish congregation. Henceforth he is neither Jew nor Ammonite. A "man without a country", he is an international, an embittered soul, whose spiteful, tireless, resourceful enmity to Nehemiah and his party is not only explicable, but natural, as recorded on the pages of Nehemiah's memoirs.

After this illuminating story of Tobiah's connections and career, it will hardly be necessary to say more in explication of the social appeal of the international party. The peculiarly close affiliation of the priesthood with this party will be remarked again in connection with its religious phase.

It is from the sphere of politics that we have borrowed the word international, which we are using for a convenient designation of the party. International ideals made a peculiarly powerful appeal to the Jewish provincial of that day, as they do in any little state subject to a mighty empire like the Persian. Unless offset by racial, social or religious considerations—in other words, "other things being equal"—these ideals were those most attractive to the broad-minded, thinking men of the day. The very language of internationalism has a sweep, a poetry, a fascination, that at once puts its opponent at a disadvantage. Having regard to

politics only, you and I feel instinctively that were we Jews of the fifth century B. C., we would adopt the views and the policy of this party. This was the safe course for a little subject-people; it was the practical course; it was the easiest course; it meant peace and material prosperity. Doubtless this is one reason why modern writers on this period so often identify themselves in sympathy with this party and attack the policy of men like Nehemiah. In any case, we find the international party in Judæa attracting to itself men of the province who had largest opportunity for culture, travel, political training: again the rich and noble, of the Jews;—the resident non-Jewish population was of course to a man on the same side.

Lastly, this party attracted to itself all those Jews who, while interested in maintaining established religion, were not disposed to be over-religious. Nor need we be surprised to find in this class the leading members of the Jewish clergy. Analogies are too plentiful in other lands and ages to permit us to regard this as an anomaly. In fact, it is the high-priestly family, the supreme family of the Jewish nation in point of position and influence throughout Jewish history except in the times of Zerubbabel, of Nehemiah, and of the earlier Asmonæans,—it is this high-priestly family that almost invariably heads the “international” party. Personal interest dictated to these leaders of the nation a type of religion that subtracted nothing from the dignity and power of their office, yet that also imposed no restraints upon the cultivation of their masters, upon whose favor the attainment or maintenance of that office depended. Eliashib and his grandsons in this fifth century find their counterparts in many a high-priest of the Egyptian and Syrian period, and of the Roman period.

The important thing to guard against in estimating the religious phase of this international party, is the supposition that it had any hostility to the religion of Jehovah, at least as an external cultus. It was not the successor of the strictly heathen element in the ancient Southern Kingdom. Its

affinity was rather with the men whom the prophets of that kingdom denounced for their purely formalistic conception of the religion of Jehovah, their *opus operatum* notion of ritual and sacrifice, their reliance upon the mere mechanics of expiation.

If such was the international party in Judæa, what now was the patriotic party?

Racially, it was necessarily exclusively Jewish. It had no attraction for the Palestinian whose lineage was not of Israel, unless he gave up all his bonds of kinship, "separated himself from the filthiness of the peoples of the land" (to use the contemporary phrase); in a word, became a proselyte. And only a religious motive could accomplish this remarkable, yet increasingly common, miracle.

Socially, the rich had nothing, the poor had everything, to gain through the dominance of a party that stood for the enforcement of ancient Hebrew law and custom, with its humanity to the slave and the impoverished, and with its leveling equality in position and property, in forensic and civil rights. Under the Persian system, it is plain to see on the pages of both oriental and classical records, the rich grew richer and the poor grew poorer, the noble not the man was the unit, the serf was the abject subject of whim and passion. The Greek felt rightly, from the days of Thermopylae to the days of Alexander, that Persia stood for the opposite of the Greek idea and whatever of individualism it has bequeathed to the world in society and in politics. No; the poor Jew, the everyday citizen of Jerusalem, of the towns and of the country-districts, and of course the enslaved Jew—these all were on the side of the patriotic party. It was from them that Nehemiah obtained his strongest backing, next to the royal authority itself.

Politically speaking, again, the patriotic party represented the toleration of Persia as a necessary, but temporary, overlord, whose domination must soon cease, but, as long as it existed unimpaired, must be loyally obeyed. Every effort should be made to enlist its kings, satraps, governors and



lesser officials, in the service of Jehovah's people. But there should be no compromise of principle, and even the Persian must be made to feel that the God of the Jew was supreme Arbiter even of Persia's destiny.

This brings us to the religious side of the party. Its power of appeal would lie in its devotion to what was peculiarly Hebrew in the national religion: to the voices of its prophets, with their inward, spiritual interpretation of the national law and religion; and with their pictures of a unique mission and future for Israel. The moral and the Messianic, roughly speaking, would be the features of Jehovahism that would be uppermost in the patriotic party's religious characteristics. These Jews would yield to none in their devotion to Jehovah's house, His chosen mountain and city, His ordinances and representatives; but they would not confine their devotion to these things. However unworthy might be individual adherents of this party, the party as such would stand for a strict observance of Jehovah's law in the whole realm of individual and national life.

Such, in brief, was the party known to us chiefly through the ideals and activities of Ezra and Nehemiah, its remarkable leaders.

It is apart from the present purpose to depict the fortunes of these parties. To do so would be precisely to write the history of the Jews in the fifth century. What has been done has been to outline a necessary chapter in the prolegomena to a history of Judaism. The choice of this subject for the present occasion has had for its motive the proper relation of the latest important discovery of archæology to what we already know of the century to which this find belongs. And it has become plain by this time, we believe, that a knowledge of the party-issues is essential to any adequate estimate of Judæa and the Jews in that century. This done, we proceed to the archæological contribution to the subject in hand.

Few of the "finds" that of late years have so enriched the



materials available for reconstruction of the ancient orient can be compared, in value and interest for the Old Testament student, with the three Aramaic papyri discovered recently on the island of Elephantine in Upper Egypt and published last year by Eduard Sachau of Berlin. Proof of this assertion will not be demanded by any who so much as read the text of these three papyri. For on the face of the documents is stamped their near relationship to the history of the Jews as we read it in the closing historical books of the Old Testament. So that Sachau is justified in declaring at the end of his comments on this ancient correspondence, "the excavations in Elephantine have enriched the Old Testament by the addition of a whole chapter, as new as it is rich in contents".

Instead of giving the translation of these documents, it will perhaps better serve the present purpose to mention some of the features referred to above, as of prime interest to the Biblical scholar.

(1) They are dated, and these dates, unlike those in many similar documents, are beyond dispute either in the reading or in the meaning of them. They come to us from "the 17th year of King Darius". This must be the second Persian monarch of that name, who reigned from B. C. 424-406, (the man whose name begins Xenophon's *Anabasis*), for Cambyses (529-522) is referred to in the papyri as having reigned long, long ago, in the days of the "fathers". Darius I, who was practically the successor of that Cambyses, is thus out of the question. And Darius III., whom Alexander conquered in 330, did not reign 17 years. This fixes the date at the year 408-407 before our era, the age of Socrates and Alcibiades and Thucydides, the time when Carthage was overrunning Sicily and Rome was still struggling for existence against the neighboring states.

(2) The authors of the documents are Jews settled in Yeb, the Egyptian name for Elephantine, that ancient border-fortress opposite Syene on the upper Nile, for centuries the chief bulwark of kingdom or empire (as the case might

be) against the Ethiopians. We are hereby confirmed in the knowledge we already possessed from other recent discoveries, that there was a large and flourishing colony of Hebrews in this fortress, who had been there for at least a century and a half.

(3) More particularly, these writers call themselves priests: "Jedoniah and his companions, the priests in the fortress Yeb." And the matter of which they write centers in a certain local temple of the God "Yahu". It was in this temple of their God, whom they term "our Lord the God of Heaven", that these "priests" officiated, and that too with true priestly functions, for we read of an altar, of gold and silver vessels for the sacrificial blood, of incense, and of bloody and unbloody offerings, exactly as in the ritual at the Jerusalem temple then standing. This temple at Yeb had been built, according to our documents, "in the days of the kings of Egypt," that is, previous to the conquest by Cambyses, B. C. 525. At the time when that Zoroastrian overran the country and "destroyed all the temples of the Gods of Egypt," he spared this temple of the Jews at Yeb. But in 411-410, three years before our documents were composed, the "idolatrous priests" (the writer uses the same word *Chemarim* that is used in Zeph. 1. 4 and twice elsewhere in the Old Testament) of the Egyptian God Chnub had brought about the complete destruction of the Jewish temple, through conspiracy with a local official in the absence of the Persian governor of Egypt. The writers proceed to tell of the fasts, prayers and efforts of the Jewish colony during the three years that had since elapsed, looking toward a restoration of their ruined house of God. Their language leaves no room to doubt that not only for these priests, but also for the whole Hebrew population of the place, their temple was the center of their religious life, and its restoration the supreme object of their desire as a community.

(4) Two of the three documents that constitute this "find" are practically duplicates. They are copies of the letter addressed by the priests above described, to "Bagohi,

governor of Judah at Jerusalem". It is to this Persian official, the supreme representative of imperial authority so far as it directly and exclusively touched the Hebrew people, that these men of Upper Egypt, hundreds of miles from Jerusalem, turned for aid and comfort in their project of rebuilding their temple of Yahu. The word for governor is the same (*Pechah*) as that uniformly used in the Old Testament for the same office, held by Nehemiah in the fifth century. We know from Biblical chronology that Nehemiah was *Pechah* of Judah as late as about 430 B. C. Here we have, then, proof (1) that an early, if not the immediate successor of Nehemiah was named Bagohi; (2) that he was a Persian, as Nehemiah's predecessors also had probably been (*cf.* Neh. v. 14); (3) that he was known to be favorable to the nation of which he was governor and, specifically, friendly to its religion; and (4) that he had been governor at least since 411, and was supposed to possess such influence even in Egypt, that a letter from him would secure for the Jews of Elephantine that interest with their superiors requisite for prosecuting their work of rebuilding the temple.

(5) We turn now to others in Palestine involved in this correspondence. The priests of Yeb mention not only a previous letter to this same Bagohi, written in 411-410, but also letters written at that time to "Jehohanan, the chief-priest, and his companions the priests in Jerusalem, and to his brother Ostan, who is Anani, and the nobles of the Jews." Furthermore, at the close of this document, its authors mention the fact to Bagohi that they are sending a letter with similar contents to "Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanaballat, the governor of Samaria." The third of these documents, a brief writing of only eleven short lines, confirms this information, for it commences: "Memorandum of what Bagohi and Delaiah said to me, memorandum, as follows."

Every reader of the book of Nehemiah will recognize at once the familiar name of Sanballat, whom we here for the first time learn positively to have been, or at least ulti-

mately to have become, "governor" (*Pechah*) of Samaria. The name of the chief-priest, Jehohanan, is not so familiar as that of Sanballat, yet it too is known from the book of Nehemiah. Jehohanan was the grandson of that Eliashib who was the high-priest contemporary with the activities of both Ezra (458) and Nehemiah (444—c. 430). This Eliashib, both because of his long incumbency, and in view of his separation by only one intermediate generation from Joshua, the high-priest of Cyrus' reign (537), must have been a very old man by 430. This agrees admirably with the fact recorded by Nehemiah (xiii. 28) that by that date Eliashib had a grandson already married, and with the fact revealed by our documents, that within 20 years or less, the grandson, Jehohanan, and not the son, Joiada, of this Eliashib, was at the head of the priesthood. These same considerations would indicate that even this grandson Jehohanan had in 411 already reached middle life.

This is as far as the Bible takes us in our nearer approach to the acquaintance of these persons. Is there no other source of information to aid us? Happily Josephus in his *Antiquities* xi. 297-301 (*ed.* Niese) comes in to supplement our meagre knowledge of this first age of post-Biblical Judaism.

He tells us of a shocking tragedy in the high-priestly family during the governorship of a certain Bagoses, and the high-priesthood of Joannas. It appears that a brother of this high-priest, named Jesus, relying upon the special friendship entertained for him by Bagoses, assumed so much that he angered the high-priest, who slew him in the temple itself. Hereupon Bagoses, claiming with very good show of reason that his own person was no more defiling to the temple, even though a foreigner, than the presence in it of the fratricide who presided over it, entered the sacred edifice and so defiled it. He also laid a tax upon the people, exacting 50 drachmae for each lamb of the daily sacrifice, contrary to the custom of the Persians and ostensibly as an expiation for the crime committed.

In this brief narrative of Josephus, two of the three persons are easily identified. Bagoses and Joannas are of course merely the Greek forms of the names Bagohi and Jehohanan. Joshua (Jesus), the brother slain by Jehohanan, is otherwise unknown to us, though he bears a name exceedingly likely to reappear in the high-priestly family of that period in any given generation. He cannot reasonably be identified with the "Ostan who is Anani" of our papyri, for this brother already has two names, one of them genuine Hebrew.

Our acquaintance with the high-priestly family is growing. We know now three sons of Joiada, son of Eliashib, namely, Jehohanan, Joshua, Anani. Do we know any more?

Nehemiah in his closing chapter (xiii. 28) tells us that "one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the high-priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite." He adds, "therefore I chased him from me. Remember them, O my God; because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites. Thus cleansed I them from all strangers." Was this leader of the priests, whom Nehemiah expelled from Jerusalem because of his connection with aliens, one of the three brothers we have already learned to know? Here again Josephus can probably give us light. In the paragraph that in his book follows the incident of Johanan and Joshua and Bagohi recounted above, Josephus tells the story of the fortunes of a certain member of the high-priestly family whom he names Manasses. This man he makes the husband of Nikaso, daughter of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. But he also calls him the brother of Joaddous, that is, Jaddua, who was the son and successor of our high-priest Jehohanan. Not only so, but Josephus also mingles the story of Sanballat's plans and Manasseh's adventures with the story of Alexander's relations with Jews and Samaritans; that is, he places all these persons and events in the second half of the fourth century instead of the second half of the fifth century.

There are two alternatives here. One is to suppose that



there were two Sanballats, governors of Samaria, who had each a daughter married to a member of the high-priestly family in Jerusalem. The other is the more natural supposition, adopted all but unanimously by scholars, that Josephus, here as elsewhere in this eleventh book of his work, is astray in his chronology, and has combined names and events that really belonged a century apart. If so, Manasseh is doubtless the correct name for that "son of Joiada, son of Eliaship", whom Nehemiah "chased from him" about 430 B. C.; and we may attribute to this person, in the main, those fortunes and achievements which entitle him to be regarded as the father of the Samaritan sect that figures so conspicuously in the New Testament.

Eliashib, the high-priest contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah; Joiada, his son and successor; Jehohanan, *his* son and successor, in office at least during 411-408; his brothers Manasseh, Joshua and Anani, who was also called Ostan; and Jehohanan's son and successor, Jaddua. Here is a growing acquaintance with an interesting family!

But what was the relation of these persons whom we have thus learned to know, to the parties subsisting in Judæa in their day? Where lay the party sympathies and interests of the Jews of Elephantine, as evidenced in these documents? And what light can be thrown upon their actions by our analysis of those parties?

I. What was the relation of Bagoses, of Sanballat and his family, and of Jehohanan and his brothers, to the parties with which we have made acquaintance in the earlier part of our study? By referring to the results there reached, the answer to this weighty question becomes a simple matter. We cannot be deceived, as we might otherwise be, into the mistaken supposition that because there was strife, now between Bagoses and Johanan, now between Joshua and Johanan, now between Manasseh and his brothers, there was therefore any radical difference between the persons at variance. It becomes evident that they all sided with one and the same



party—the one that we have been terming the international party. It is so obvious that the interests of all these persons lay on this side that it is unnecessary to argue the matter in the case of each individual. Their strifes, then, as recorded by Josephus, sink from the level of strife for principle, the irreconcilable variance that arises out of fundamental differences, and appear in their true light as the struggles of personal ambition, to get or to keep, the shifting coalitions and oppositions of individual interest.

II. With which party in Judæa lay the sympathies and interests of the Jewish colony at Elephantine? Here again our previous inquiry enables us to give a decisive answer. That they should turn themselves to Bagohi, the Persian governor, for interest with their own Persian superiors; that they had been on good terms with the Persians in Egypt; even that they should have written for help in their first days of despair to the high-priest of their nation, Jehohanan, the Jew of highest station of that day; these things do not prove that they felt any more sympathy with the “international” party than with the “patriotic” party in Jerusalem. But when we find that they wrote not only to Jehohanan, but also to his brother, and to the nobles of the Jews, it is clear that they had interest, or at least sought to make interest, with the high-priestly family and coterie, and that in writing to Jehohanan, it was probably not simply as high-priest that they addressed him, but as the most influential leader of the party in Jerusalem that stood for the social, religious and political ideals and aims which we have already described at some length. If any doubt remained on this point, it would be quite removed by noticing that these Jews of Upper Egypt make the sons of Sanballat also their patrons. That name stood in Judæa for the bitterest opposition to “patriotic” Jewish ideals that they had ever encountered. The events of 444, when Nehemiah built the walls of the Jewish capital, in sight and defiance of an army under this Sanballat, were not “done in a corner.” The memory of Nehemiah’s “chasing from him” of Manasseh, son-in-law of this

Sanballat, was not effaced in twenty years. It is impossible, therefore, to suppose that these Jews in Elephantine did not know the conditions prevailing in Syria, and just happened upon the sons of this Horonite as their chosen correspondents. On the contrary, they show very well by the persons they select, that they are well acquainted with the powers-that-be in Jerusalem. This high-priestly family and the family of Sanballat were intermarried; they were hand-in-glove with one another; their sympathies were as identical now as twenty years before when Eliashib made room for Sanballat's confederate Tobiah in the courts of the temple. And the answer came to Yeb as favorable from Samaria as from Jerusalem. Delaiah, son of Sanballat, is linked with Bagothi in the memorandum of the third papyrus, as the patron of this temple of Yahu in Egypt. Why should he not be? And why should not all his father's house, and all the house of his brother-in-law, Manasseh, and all the rest of the broad-gauge Jews, clerical and lay, who could see a Gerizim beside a Zion without scandal? These Jews of Elephantine were wise men, and they used their knowledge of men and conditions with tact and success.

III. What light, then, we ask in conclusion, can be thrown upon the colony in Egypt by our analysis of contemporary parties in Judæa?

For one thing, it is clear that they were not so far away from Palestine as to be in ignorance of what was passing there. This community of Yeb was not the counterpart of that isolated colony of Chinese Jews, which modern travelers have discovered and described.

Again, the zeal that the Egyptian community felt for its local temple cannot in itself determine for us its attitude towards Hebrew religion. That it was the rallying point of the colony is evident; but that this fact, taken by itself, indicates a satisfactory type of religious life, as judged by the standards of the nation's best past, is to be strenuously denied. On this side the way is left clear for us, until more light comes with the publication of other documents, to infer

the character of their religion, collectively considered, from the religious characteristics of the Judæan party with which they were in sympathy. Granted even that it was primarily on the political side that they came into touch with the international party at Jerusalem, still it is incredible that religious considerations would not have outweighed these political interests, had there been any real antagonism at this point.

We conclude, therefore, finally, that this Yahu-temple at Yeb, surprising as it seems on first acquaintance, is actually to be estimated by the same standards as the temples on Mt Gerizim for the Samaritan sect, and at Leontopolis for the dissenters of Lower Egypt. All alike represent a defection from the type of religion known to us from the Old Testament. And although this latest temple to come to our knowledge was earliest of the three in point of origin, yet the conditions that produced it were essentially the same as those that produced its counterparts of Gerizim and Lower Egypt. There is no more light thrown upon the existence and currency of the law of one national altar in the sixth century by this earliest temple, than upon the currency of the same law in the fifth century by the Samaritan temple or in the second century by the temple at Leontopolis.

Any attempt, therefore, to exploit this temple at Yeb built in the sixth century and (presumably) rebuilt in the fifth, as a witness to the alleged late origin of Jerusalem's unique claim to the central sanctuary, must fail when the true situation is understood. What it does flatly disprove is the assertion often made, that in the sixth and fifth centuries,—just when, according to this class of critics, the Priest-Code was being constructed,—a single sanctuary for the whole nation was a matter of course and was therefore presupposed, not enjoined. It is certainly true that the Priest-Code presupposes a central sanctuary. But criticism will now have to look for some earlier age than the sixth and fifth centuries B. C., to find a time when this presupposition was possible. For we now know that at that date a plurality of temples of Jehovah was not only conceivable, but an actual fact. It is

becoming increasingly plain that the period after the exile differs from the period before the exile, with respect to this law of the one sanctuary, rather in degree than in kind. In both periods alike sanctuaries are erected for the worship of Jehovah wherever and whenever political or religious differences create sects and schisms. When men could not, or would not, worship together, a new altar arose to meet the need. The study of parties, and their relation to the growing Diaspora, is the key to the situation. And to allege that the plurality of Jehovah-shrines in the Northern and Southern Kingdoms proves that Leviticus was then unwritten, is to disregard at once the analogy of post-exilic schismatic temples, and the adequate explanation, for all of them alike, in the schisms that arose from racial, political or religious differences.

*Princeton.*

J. OSCAR BOYD.