

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1898.

ART. I.—LONDON DIOCESAN CHURCH HISTORY
LECTURES.

No. IV.—INNOCENT III.¹

I. **T**HE career of Innocent III. represents a great attempt by a great man to realize an impossible ideal—the ideal of a universal spiritual empire on earth, ruling over all the nations of Christendom, and through them exercising a dominating influence over the history of the world. In him, by general acknowledgment, the power of the Papacy rose to its greatest height. For more than five hundred years, since the pontificate of Gregory the Great, that power had been advancing, as circumstance seemed to demand concentration of the forces, both of ecclesiastical order and of social civilization. The growth was in itself natural—due in part to the patriarchal dignity of an acknowledged Apostolic See—due, in even greater measure, to its position as representative of the world-wide empire of Roman law and order, now become (so men believed) not a worldly empire, but a city of God. But unhappily with that natural growth men were not content. They ventured to stimulate it by human artifice, and to give it a false sanction and consolidation by two gross and now acknowledged forgeries of about the ninth century—the donation of Constantine to Sylvester, transferring to it the palace and the city of Rome, and the whole Empire of the West²—the False Decretals carrying the full claim of universal spiritual power through the earliest times up to the

¹ It is right to say that this lecture has no claim to originality. It would be difficult to add anything to the splendid picture of this great pontificate given in Milman's "Latin Christianity," Book IX.

² See Milman's "Latin Christianity," Book I. (vol. i., p. 72, of the fourth edition).

authority of the Apostolic Age itself.¹ These gigantic falsehoods—by whomsoever and in what spirit soever originated—were adopted and grasped at by the popes themselves; probably at first under the pressure of a supposed necessity in troublous times, doing evil (as men will do evil) that good might come; afterwards in all probability inherited by them without suspicion as one of the unquestioned traditions of their office. Naturally in course of time the falsehood wrought its own failure and condemnation. As in the vision of Daniel, the towering fabric of the Papal power rested on feet, part of iron, part of clay, having in it something of the adamantine force of truth, having in it much of the crumbling weakness of unreality. But in the time of which I now speak there was no suspicion of any unsoundness in this foundation. The Pope was unhesitatingly revered as a spiritual head of Christendom; and, since it was impossible to separate absolutely the spiritual and temporal powers—since, moreover, it was clear that the spiritual must be higher than the temporal—men felt, and Innocent himself expressly declared, that the one was like the sun, a supreme light and life in itself, the other at its best only as the moon, shining with an inferior and borrowed splendour. There could be, therefore, ultimately no limit and no rivalry to the dominion claimed for the Papacy. Wherever there was the Christian Faith embodied in the Church of Christ, it was to be supreme in His Name over the bodies and souls of men, and over their whole life, both here and hereafter.

The Ideal was not only a grand Ideal in itself, but one in which there seemed to be the one secret of comfort and hope for an age of crude and ill-compacted civilization; when intestine war, violence and lust, oppression and cruelty, set the nations of Europe, and the classes in each nation, against one another. The supremacy of a spiritual power, representing the unity in Christ, which bound all together, ruling by the purely spiritual forces of truth and righteousness, of love and holiness over the free loyalty of men, needing no attempt at compulsion, supported by no physical force—such a supremacy might well be a real kingdom of Christ, and he who could wield it might well be called a Vicar of Christ on earth.²

¹ The authorship of these "False Decretals"—added to the true Decretals, which dated from the end of the fourth century—is unknown. They appear to have been composed in the ninth century, probably at Mentz, and were first adopted as authoritative by Pope Nicolas I. (858-867). See Milman's "Latin Christianity," Book V., c. iv. (vol. iii., pp. 190-197 of the fourth edition).

² This title seems to have been first assumed by Innocent (see Creighton's "History of the Papacy," vol. i., c. i., p. 21).

But for its realization it is clear that there were three things absolutely necessary. First, that he to whom it was entrusted should be (as Milman remarks) not only infallible, but impeccable—free, as from all folly and error, so also from all sin and selfishness. Next, that its spiritual powers should be used only for spiritual ends, in the cause of righteousness and truth and holiness, not for the sake of any personal interest or any mere worldly aggrandizement. Lastly, that they should rely only on the spiritual weapons of persuasion and love, the prevailing force of truth, the reverence for a fatherly wisdom and authority. Just so far as the so-called spiritual power deserved its name in these respects, it undoubtedly told for good; it introduced into the confusion and discordance of human society, if not a peace, at least a “Truce of God.” Just so far as it failed in these—misguided by error and perverted by sin, prostituted to selfish and worldly purposes by greed of gain in wealth and power, using recklessly the force of compulsion, whether by religious terrorism or by the temporal sword—just so far, I say, it was doomed not only to failure, but to much worse than failure. For the old proverb is true which says that “Worst of all evil is the corruption of the best.” A spiritual power corrupted was, in itself and in its effects, more carnal and degraded than the power which frankly confessed itself to be but a power of this world.

Now, in the claim of the Papal autocracy to be in the true sense a supreme spiritual power, the career of Innocent III. is a splendid object-lesson. For in his pontificate the autocracy itself was certainly at its height of power; the ideal of which I have spoken was most unhesitatingly recognised, both by the Pope and by the world. The character of Innocent himself was not unworthy of the highest calling. He was a man of noble birth and high culture, remarkable for ability and grasp of mind, strong in learning and eloquence, power of administration and influence over men, with a firm undaunted will, and an undoubting belief in his Divine mission, with a character of purity and integrity, of personal holiness and devotion, and (where he allowed it fair play) of a certain graciousness and gentleness of disposition. He came, moreover, to the Papacy at the age of thirty-seven, in the prime of life and strength, ready to devote himself with all his heart and mind and soul to the service of high dignity and responsibility to which he was called, and apparently free from the distraction of such struggle for its authority as had made the life of Gregory VII. a continual battle. In Innocent III. the Papacy was in all respects at its best. What under these auspicious conditions was it able to achieve?

II. It must be remembered that in its claim of universality

of power it had necessarily to face a rival claim from what was called the "Holy Roman Empire."¹ The Empire (be it always remembered) was not a merely national power, like that of France or England, perhaps somewhat greater than the rest. It was the heir of a general European suzerainty in Charlemagne, which itself claimed heirship from the old Roman Empire of the West. The Emperor was held to be in the largest sense the "Lord's Anointed"; the sacredness of his royalty seemed almost to be a modified Christian reproduction of the old Pagan deification. He stood at the head of the great feudal system of European society; he was acknowledged to be the temporal, as the Pope was the spiritual, head of Christendom. In theory the two headships were to be in perfect harmony; in practice they naturally stood in rivalry, which constantly became open antagonism. The relations between them, moreover, were complicated by this—that, while the Emperor could receive his crown only from the Pope, and so far was in a position of dependence and inferiority, the Pope, on the other hand, by the grant from Pepin and Charlemagne of Italian dominion—the "Patrimony of St. Peter"—became a feudatory of the Empire, and had so far to submit to the imperial sovereignty. At the great scene of the coronation of Charlemagne we read that the Pope first gave the crown to the kneeling Emperor, and then did homage to him when crowned. And the confusion was still further aggravated by the fact that, the Empire having by this time practically become German, its sway was always regarded with jealousy, and constantly met by open resistance, by the Italian powers, and by the people of Rome, who still retained some remnant, in theory and occasionally in practice, of the old republican power of election.² Of that local patriotism the Papacy, as a chief temporal power in Italy, became the natural head. It was inevitable not only that there should be conflict between the Papacy and the Emperor, but that the issues of that conflict should be confused; and that the spiritual authority claimed by the Pope should be (so to speak) carnalized—mixed up with worldly struggles and jealousies, using worldly weapons of intrigue or violence, often stained by the vice and the bloodshed of the world in their most revolting forms.

The most critical times of the antagonism to the Empire did not belong to Innocent's Pontificate. The first internecine

¹ It is almost unnecessary to refer to the brilliant and lucid account of the true idea of the Empire and the various phases of its history, given in Bryce's "Holy Roman Empire."

² See the remarkable career of Arnold of Brescia (A.D. 1132-1155), and his assertion of Republican Privilege, crushed by combination of the Imperial and Papal Powers.

struggle had been over the question of investiture of high ecclesiastics under Gregory VII. some thirty years before; and the victory, under some show of compromise, was with the Pope. The humiliation of the Emperor at Canossa could not be misunderstood or forgotten. The last decisive conflict was to be waged about fifty years later under Innocent IV., when the old imperial house fell, and the imperial power practically withdrew within German limits, and gradually became but one—perhaps the greatest—of European monarchies. But still we find Innocent, even more than his predecessors, mixed up with Italian intrigues and quarrels, using alternately the sword of temporal power and the spiritual weapon of excommunication.¹ We find him on the death of the Emperor, Henry VI., plunging into the conflict as to the Imperial succession, seizing the opportunity of setting up a rival in Otho of Brunswick to Philip of Swabia, the brother of the late Emperor, using all his ecclesiastical and spiritual influence in vain, till a chance assassination removed the victorious Philip; then, when he had crowned Otho, finding his own nominee a bitter enemy; and, at last, setting up against him the young Frederic II., son of Henry VI., who had been in his youth under the Pope's own guardianship, but who was to be—by what seemed an irresistible necessity—the determined foe, not only of the Papacy, but of the ideas on which it rested, in the days to come. In all this conflict the Pope was on the whole victorious, but not without much struggle and failure—certainly not without much degradation of the lofty position above the world, which he claimed for his office.

III. We turn from this rivalry to the relation which he assumed towards merely national powers, such as France and England. Here his position was simply that of a spiritual supremacy, and therefore free from the confusion which marked his relation to the empire. Here accordingly he could put forth all his spiritual powers, while yet he sought to assume, strangely enough, the anomalous position of an absolute feudal supremacy. These spiritual powers—so long as their reality was believed in—were tremendous, almost irresistible. The greatest king in Europe could be by excommunication made a spiritual outcast here, and be doomed (so it was believed) to perdition hereafter. His kingdom—although the great mass of his subjects probably had nothing whatever to do with his supposed sin—could be reduced to religious desolation, by the interdict which silenced all religious Services and refused all Sacraments, except the Baptism of Infants and the Absolution of the Dying. Beyond even this the Pope

¹ He was "the first Pope to claim and exercise the rights of an Italian Prince" (see Creighton's "History of the Papacy," vol. i., c. i., p. 21).

claimed the right, in case of obstinate resistance, of pronouncing him deposed, and offering his crown to some other prince—to any one, in fact, who had power to seize it. We can see, of course, that in respect of these spiritual powers the minister of Christ is purely a minister, having no right to exercise them, except as a discipline for sin against God—having certainly no right to make them the means of enforcing a policy, however right that policy may be. But in the eyes of the Pope himself and of the world, resistance to his authority in any matter, spiritual or temporal, was mortal sin—at least as mortal as the most flagrant breaches of the moral law. He claimed the right to wield his spiritual powers, as he would and when he would. The time was to come when the belief in the reality of these powers was to be shaken; and then, of course, the Papal authority collapsed at once. But as yet the world believed absolutely, and trembled before them.

Still, it is interesting to see how the character of the cause in which they were exercised told upon their effectiveness even then.

Thus, in relation to Philip Augustus, of France—one of the ablest and most ambitious kings of the age, who has been always noted in history as one of the founders of the greatness of the French monarchy—Innocent stood forth nobly as the guardian of the sacredness of marriage. He firmly refused to sanction the dissolution of the king's marriage with Ingeburga, a Danish Princess, sought for simply to gratify his passionate affection for Agnes of Meran, and demanded with violent threats from the clergy of France. Here he discharged unflinchingly the high duty of a Vicar of Christ; here, after stern remonstrance, he pronounced the interdict and threatened excommunication. Under the terrible power of the interdict the people rose (so to speak) in a religious insurrection against the king; reluctantly, grudgingly, sullenly, he was forced to bow to the Pope's righteous decree. The spiritual power was here spiritually exercised, and so exercised, it was irresistible.

In relation to England the merits of the case and the course of events were widely different. John was on the throne—weak, profligate, treacherous, cruel. He had snatched the Crown from his nephew Arthur: he was suspected, and more than suspected, of sealing his usurpation by murder. Through these crimes he was to lose for England her wide dominions in France; at home, by his barons and in some degree by his people, he was hated and despised. But for none of these things was he brought under the rebuke or discipline of Papal authority. Innocent here was the champion, not of morality, but simply of his own power. On a vacancy in the Archbishopric of Canterbury, there was a disputed election

between the monks of the cathedral and the Bishops Suffragan of the province, backed by the King. The Pope, appealed to as arbiter, calmly set both nominees aside, and peremptorily ordered the election of Stephen Langton. The choice in itself was a splendid choice; for Langton was to be among the noblest of our Archbishops, and the truest champion against Pope and King of English liberty. But it was clearly an usurpation. John burst out into fury, open resistance, and cruel violence against those who obeyed the Pope. Once more the interdict was pronounced in all its severity; yet, remarkably enough, for four years it was defied by the King and the country. Then followed the excommunication of the King, his deposition, and an offer of the Crown to Philip Augustus, eagerly accepted by his ambition. John himself was brought to abject submission. In his terror he actually consented to acknowledge publicly that the kingdom was but a tributary fief of the holy see. In the ancient cathedral, which stood on this very site, he laid his crown, in token of vassalage, at the feet of the Legate. Innocent eagerly accepted the homage, and at once threw the mantle of his fullest protection over his weak and wicked vassal. But it is notable that here his spiritual power, so misused, was not irresistible. The French King refused to retire at his command; the barons, with the Pope's own nominee, Stephen Langton, at their head, rose against the tyranny of John, extorted from him the great charter of our English liberties, and absolutely disregarded the decree of the Pope annulling that charter. There was a fierce and terrible struggle against the King and the Pope united. It was virtually closed by the death of John and of Innocent himself. England, in the name of the young Henry III., drove out for herself the French invaders, absolutely repudiated vassalage to Rome, and under Edward I. humbled the clerical and Papal power. Soon began the series of parliamentary enactments which limited, resolutely though not quite logically, the Papal autocracy, and prepared for the abjuration of it in the future. The proud triumph of the Legate, trampling on the independence of England, by its very insolence and unrighteousness led to its humiliation, and to the full assertion of that national independence in the sixteenth century.

IV. But there was another aspect still in which the Pope stood out at the head of Christendom—as the authorizer and the organizer of the Crusades. These Crusades—disastrous as they were in the waste of incalculable treasure and countless lives, full of all the mournful contrasts, and outrages against the ideas of Christianity, which attach to all religious wars—yet undoubtedly marked a most important step in the advance of European civilization. They brought the rising

nations of Europe into something like unity, and unity, moreover, in what was in its origination a great unselfish and religious impulse. They had important secondary effects: they stemmed the tide of Mohammedan conquest; they developed maritime enterprise and commerce; they stimulated learning and culture. But in their essential character they were movements of a warlike religious enthusiasm. Naturally they increased the ascendancy and the power of the religious head of Christendom.

It was now nearly a hundred years since the first great Crusade had rescued the Holy City from the grasp of the infidel, and set on the throne the noble Godfrey de Bouillon, the first Christian king. It had all the intense enthusiasm and all the ruthlessness of a really religious war. Since that time the crusading fervour had burst forth from time to time, as the renewed advance of Mohammedan force threatened the existence of the Christian power thus established in the East. But the character of the Crusades had gradually altered: religious enthusiasm had in some degree passed (as with our own Richard I.) into a chivalric delight in heroic daring; and even this had partly given way to the lower ambition of territorial conquest. Now, however, the last remnant of the Christian power was threatened. Innocent, stirred to the very depths of his religious zeal for Christendom, called the nations of Europe once more to arms. The impassioned eloquence of Fulk of Neuilly renewed the magic power of the old preaching of Peter the Hermit; tens and hundreds of thousands assumed the cross. A great victorious movement seemed at hand, blessed by the Vicar of Christ himself. But over it there came a strange spell of degradation and perversion. The Crusaders sought to avoid the long and deadly march by land; the great maritime power of Venice was accordingly invoked, and the promise of transport bought by gold. So the commercial element for the first time came in, with its baser admixture. On a partial failure in the promised payment, the Venetian Merchant Republic drove a hard bargain, and insisted, as a condition of fulfilling its promise, on diverting the army of the Cross to the conquest of the Christian city of Zara from the Christian King of Hungary. In vain Innocent himself and the nobler spirits in the army protested. Venice was inflexible, and her territorial ambition was satisfied by the storming of Zara, and its addition to the realm of the Republic.

It was a miserable perversion of the crusading idea. But it might have been but a temporary perversion; worse was to come. At the entreaty of a deposed Byzantine prince, the whole force of the great Christian army of the West was turned,

not against the infidel, but against the great Christian imperial city of the East. Constantinople was taken by storm, the Greek dynasty driven out, and a Latin Emperor, Baldwin, set upon the throne; the Greek Church forcibly subjected to the Latin obedience, under a usurping Latin Patriarch appointed by Rome; the Greeks themselves treated, both civilly and ecclesiastically, as a subject race. There was a certain fictitious glory about the achievement; there was a rich wealth of spoil; there was necessarily to the Court of Rome a profound satisfaction in thus forcibly terminating the great schism, and putting down the only formidable resistance to the Papal sway. But it was a horrible falsification of the promise and true character of the Crusade. Its very success, such as it was, soon passed away by the restoration of the Greek monarchy and Church; the only effect clearly was to weaken Christendom still more in face of the advance of Islam. Here also Innocent, in the height of his apparent power, uttered protest and condemnation in vain. He had set the fierce warlike force of the Crusade in motion; he could not direct it or stay it from its reckless course.

But there is a sadder story yet to tell. Another so-called Crusade was to follow, not against the infidels of the East, but against the heretics of the rich, smiling, cultured province of Toulouse, in the South of France. The heresy, as men deemed it, there rising up, was of varied character. In part it was simply a resistance to the power and wealth and high pretensions of the clergy, and an appeal from the Church to Holy Scripture; in part it was really a reproduction of the Manichæan heresy of the East. Innocent vainly called upon the independent Count of Toulouse to put it down by force. His commands, although not defied, were evaded; for there was in Count Raymond no strong religious fervour, still less enthusiasm for the power of the clergy, great reluctance to persecute loyal and quiet subjects. The Legate Peter, of Castelnau, a zealous instrument of the vehemence of Papal denunciation, was murdered. The Count was accused, truly or falsely, of connivance in the murder. A Crusade was proclaimed, in a storm of furious indignation, against the unhappy country. The ambition of the Crown of France for domination over what had been an all but independent country, the greed of noble adventurers for spoil and territorial conquest, were called in, to strengthen religious intolerance of heresy and religious devotion to the Church and the Pope. In vain the Count protested his innocence, offered an almost abject submission, submitted (like Henry II., after the murder of Becket) to humiliating public penance.

The wrath was not to be stayed. War, in its most cruel and

ruthless form, sparing neither innocent nor guilty, was let loose upon the whole land. Gallant resistance was made here and there in vain against overwhelming force. The torrent of destruction rolled on, at times stayed for a moment by patriotic reaction against the cruel invaders, but only to gather in the end more terrible force. There was fanatical and cruel intolerance, as in Simon de Montfort; there was in others the eagerness for spoil and conquest, and the very wantonness of warlike excitement. Innocent himself began to feel compunction, some pity for the young Raymond, the innocent heir to the Countship, some shrinking from the horrors of bloodshed and rapine; but, as before, he could not check the terrible force which he had roused. At last the royal power under Louis VIII. intervened, subjugated Toulouse, quenched heresy in blood. Spiritually and temporally men "made a solitude, and called it peace." It was a terrible example of the prostitution of a force claiming to be spiritual, and yet fighting by the arm of the flesh, resolved at all costs and by all means to enforce its sway.

V. Out of it there came but one fruit of good. The spread of heresy among the masses of the people, and the resistance to the proud and often worldly dominion of the clergy roused the Church to the need of laying a stronger hold on the hearts of men, by popular preaching of the truth of Christ in the Church itself. The fruit of that conviction was the foundation—not originated, only accepted, after hesitation, by Innocent himself—of the two great Orders of Friars, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the preaching and ministering friars, the sterner apostles of truth and the gentler apostles of love. They were like the old monastic Orders in their vows of poverty, obedience, chastity, self-devotion, putting to shame the luxury and pomp of the Church of their days; they were like those Orders, again, in their detachment from the regular hierarchy of the Church, and their absolute obedience to the heads of their Orders, and through them to the Pope. But they were utterly unlike them in this—that they exchanged monastic seclusion and contemplation for public ministration everywhere to the masses of the people, professing to supplement, tending to supersede, the evangelistic and pastoral functions of the parish priests.

It was a great movement; it met the needs, it harmonized with the enthusiasm, of the time. Its founders, the ascetic Dominic, the loving Francis, men of heroic and saintly character, had the unusual experience of seeing what they had begun, almost singlehanded, with at most but a handful of followers, grow even in their own lives to cover nearly the whole Church. Through hundreds of branches of the Orders, through

many thousands of members, there spread everywhere this great wave of popular influence; and that, speaking generally, in face of much natural jealousy from the Bishops and parochial clergy, and from the older monastic Orders. How corruption made its way in—how the vows of absolute poverty and hardship were evaded or forgotten—how the Orders, once the delight of the people, earned afterwards so much of hatred and contempt—it happily lies beyond the province of this lecture to trace. In Innocent's time they were at their best, a strong enthusiastic support of the Papal supremacy, a powerful religious influence over the whole body of the Church, uniting the most resolute orthodoxy of creed with the most glowing fervour of devotion—so far a true spiritual power, wielding the sword, not of the flesh, but of the Spirit. It is a refreshment to close our sketch of Innocent's great Pontificate with this picture, after the survey of all its struggling with imperial and national power, after the bloody annals of its religious wars.

VI. But I must come back at the end to that with which I began. The ideal of the Papacy, then most clearly grasped in thought and set forth in practice, is seen, both in its theory and by its fruits, to be an impossible ideal. The power claimed was far too great to be concentrated in any mere man, and it led by necessary inference to further claims of attributes virtually superhuman, trenching even on the Divine. But history showed only too plainly—what even without its witness we could not but anticipate—that no man could be wise enough or good enough to be trusted with an absolute power over humanity, practically overbearing the freedom, which is its birthright before God. Nor could it be kept to be really a pure spiritual power. It was impossible to separate spiritual pretension from grasp at temporal dominion. I mean, not the miserable temporal power over a fragment of Italy, to which so blindly the Papacy has always clung, and in our own days clings still, not seeing that it would be, now at any rate, a source, not of strength, but of weakness; but the universal Empire, necessarily resulting from a universal Pontificate, which afterwards Boniface VIII., on the eve of the great humiliation of the Papacy, so overtly and arrogantly claimed. And, perhaps naturally, the advance of that claim coincided with the use of worldly intrigue, reckless coercion, reckless bloodshed, in the endeavour to sustain it. So even its apparent success was real failure; and the reality of that failure, traceable at the time by those who looked below the surface, was in after days to be manifested by obvious disgrace and disaster. The lesson is therefore plainly to be read, and certainly should not be ignored or forgotten. If ever, in the painful sense of divisions and

perplexities, of irregularities and rebellions in doctrine and life, men are tempted to sigh for a spiritual despotism, and to lay at its feet the freedom which seems to them to be a perilous gift, in the vain hope that its sway will be perfectly wise, perfectly beneficent—it may be well in this matter, as in others, to turn from theory to history, and to read the story of the Papacy, not in its worst corruption, but in its palmy days of dignity and nobility of idea—as impersonated not in an Alexander VI., but in an Innocent III.

ALFRED BARRY.



ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. XVI.

IN chap. xxv., verses 7-11*a*, 12-17, 19, 20, and 26*b*, are assigned to P. It may assist the inquirer to have these verses before him in connection with the passage immediately preceding. In xxiii. 20 we find the words, "And the field and the cave that is therein were made sure unto Abraham as a possession of a burying-place by the children of Heth." The narrative of P, as separated by the critics, then immediately proceeds: "And these are the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived, an hundred threescore and fifteen years. (We may here interpolate a remark that the omission of any sentence by way of transition from xxiii. 20 is unusually 'juristic,' even for P.) And Abraham gave up the ghost and died in a good old age, an old man and full (of years), and was gathered unto his people. And Isaac and Ishmael his son buried him in the cave of Machpelah, in the field of Ephron the son of Zohar the Hittite, which is before Mamre; the field which Abraham purchased of the children of Heth; there was Abraham buried, and Sarah his wife. And it came to pass after the death of Abraham that God blessed Isaac his son. Now these are the generations of Ishmael, Abraham's son, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's handmaid, bare unto Abraham; and these are the names of the sons of Ishmael, by their names, according to their generations; the first born of Ishmael, Nebaioth and Kedar and Adbeel and Mibsam, and Mishma and Dumah and Massa, Hadad and Tema, Jetur, Naphish and Kedemah. These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names by their villages, and by their encampments; twelve princes according to their nations. And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, an hundred and thirty and seven years, and he gave up the ghost and died,