

The inhabitants [of the earth] were afraid :
 The dwellers [therein] were moved :
 The birds dropped their wings, [and died] :
 All the creeping things died in their holes,
 etc., etc.

If we are right in having discovered two Noachic Odes in our collection, neither of which is originally Christian, we may very well ask for time and for a delay of judgment with regard to the rest of the book. We must find the key to the situation in the interpretation of those passages which most resist explanation : if we can make the obscurest Odes intelligible, we shall be more likely to be on the right track than in searching for coincidences of language in out-of-the-way Patristic corners.

RENDEL HARRIS.

*THE JEWS AND THEIR TEMPLE IN
 ELEPHANTINÉ.*

SINCE my article on the Jewish records of Elephantiné was printed in the EXPOSITOR of last August, the long and impatiently expected publication of the Berlin papyri by Professor Sachau has appeared. It is a magnificent work, reflecting all the best traditions of German scholarship. It is too soon as yet to deal with the many questions and problems which the publication raises ; all that I can do at present, therefore, is to write a sort of supplement to my previous article.

The copies of the petition to Bagoas and the answer of the Persian Government still constitute the most important part of the discovery, at all events so far as its bearing upon the Old Testament is concerned. In one or two cases Professor Sachau has been able to improve upon his earlier readings and translations. Thus the revised translation that he offers for lines 27 and 28 of the Petition, due

to Professor Bruston, seems preferable to his older rendering : " And this shall be a merit for thee before Yāhō the God of heaven, greater than the merit of a man who offers Him a holocaust and sacrifices of the value of a thousand talents of silver." At the same time it must be confessed that this translation does not harmonise very well with the words which immediately follow : " As for the gold, we have already written about it and explained."

Equally important with the Petition, though from different points of view, are the fragments of two other papyri which were found in the houses of the Jews. One of these is an Aramaic copy of the great Behistun inscription of Darius in which he gives an account of his victories and reign ; the other is the didactic romance of Aḥiqar. The copy of the inscription, which was at first supposed by Professor Sachau to be a Chronicle, will be of particular interest to the historian of the ancient East. In a text appended to the Elamite version of the inscription Darius states that copies of it were made in other languages and sent to the various nationalities of the empire : one of these copies now lies before us. It differs from the monumental text in giving more details ; thus the number of the slain and captured in the battles won by the king is stated in cases where this is not done in the original text. Similar details are given in a Babylonian copy of the text on a block of dolerite discovered by the German excavators at Babylon, and it is significant that the numbers in the two documents do not always agree. Otherwise the Aramaic version is a faithful translation of the Persian original, or rather, as Professor Sachau points out, of its Babylonian version. I notice one or two Assyrianisms in it, while Semitic scholars will be interested in finding that 𐤀𐤓𐤍 is the equivalent of the Assyrian *mar-banūti* or " freeman."

The discovery of the romance of Aḥiqar will be as much

of a surprise to the ordinary Semitic scholar as that of the Behistun chronicle is to the Assyriologist. Aḥiqar was the wise man of the East, the prototype of the Greek Æsop and the Arab Lokman, and his Babylonian name bears out the assertion of Clement of Alexandria that Democritus translated the story from a Babylonian original. So far as can be judged from the fragments of the papyrus that have survived, the romance was already known to the Jews of Elephantinê in the age of Ezra pretty much in the form in which it is known to us now. The story of the wise man and his adopted son, of the ingratitude of the latter, and the narrow escape of Aḥiqar from death, are all there, as well as the two series of proverbs, parables and fables, for which the story formed a framework. It throws light on the non-religious literature of the compatriots of Ezra and Nehemiah, and shows how much of it must have been lost to us. That the copy of the story was made by one of the Jewish colonists at Elephantinê is indicated by the fact that the papyrus on which it is written is in part a palimpsest and had originally been used for the record of monetary transactions. The Assyrian names—Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Nadin, etc.—round which the story centres, and which have suffered so severely in the later versions of it, are correctly written, as might be expected at a time when Assyrian was still a spoken language. The antiquity to which the story can now be traced back disposes of one of the arguments for the late date of the Book of Tobit, where, it will be remembered, “Achiacharus” is referred to. Personally I have little doubt that it was ultimately of Babylonian origin. Indeed, the fables referred to in it belong to a well-known class of Babylonian texts.¹

¹ As the Assyro-Babylonian *m-w* is represented by *m* and not by *w* (e.g., in the name of Nabu-sum-iskun) it would, however, appear that the copy was made from an Assyrian rather than a Babylonian text.

Besides the literary documents Professor Sachau's work contains a goodly collection of business documents and official and private letters, as well as a few ostraca and *graffiti* on vases. These last, however, are in Phœnician, not Aramaic, and as the names are also Phœnician it would appear that the potters who supplied the Jews with their household crockery came from Phœnicia. That there were Phœnicians as well as Jews in Upper Egypt we already knew: the Semitic *graffiti* at Abu-Simbel are Phœnician, and in the inscriptions I have copied at El-Hoshân north of Gebel Silsila Jewish and Phœnician names are mixed together.

In my article in the EXPOSITOR I have concluded that the establishment of the Jewish military colony at Elephantinê goes back to the age of the first Psammetichus and the closing years of Manasseh's reign. Professor Sachau does not venture to make it earlier than the reign of Psammetichus II., the grandson of the founder of the Twenty-sixth Egyptian Dynasty. Psammetichus II., however, was familiarly known to the Greeks as Psammis; in naming Psammetichus without any other designation the writer of the Letter of Aristæas will have meant Psammetichus I. only. Moreover, as I have pointed out, the foreign garrison at Elephantinê, like those in the Delta, was established by Psammetichus I., and not Psammetichus II., to take the place of the native Egyptian deserters. It is true that Herodotus mentions a campaign of Psammetichus II. against the Ethiopians, and that the cartouches of the latter are found on the rocks of Elephantinê, but the Greek writer also tells us that Psammetichus I. pursued the deserters into Ethiopia where he "overtook" them and vainly endeavoured to persuade them to return to Egypt (Hdt. ii. 30).

The testimony of Zephaniah is equally emphatic. Zepha-

niah was a contemporary of Josiah, and he was well acquainted with Ethiopia and the Ethiopians. Not only are the Ethiopians to be slain like the Assyrians (ii. 12), but Zephaniah knows that there are Jews living among them as far south as the region south of the Sobat (iii. 10), and therefore far beyond the district on the banks of the Blue Nile assigned to the Egyptian deserters. If Jews had already made their way so far south as this, there is no reason for questioning their ability to establish themselves at Assuan.

I have further suggested that there were Greek mercenaries at Assuan as well as Jews. This view is shared by Professor Sachau, who thinks it not improbable that the "other soldiers," who, according to the Jewish Petition to Bagoas, assisted the Egyptians of Assuan in destroying the temple of Yāhō, were Greeks. Indeed, it is difficult to see who else they could have been.

One fact which results very clearly from the papyri is that the Jewish community at Elephantinē was unaware that there was any inconsistency between the existence of their temple of Yāhō with its sacrifices and ritual and the injunctions of Deuteronomy. The scruples felt by modern critics about a prohibition to build a temple elsewhere than at Jerusalem certainly did not trouble them. The Jewish colony at Elephantinē, as Professor Sachau remarks, "worshipped their God Yāhō exactly as did their contemporaries in Jerusalem and Babylonia," and the Petition to Bagoas shows "with what ardour and intensity the whole community, old and young of both sexes, clung to their God and His worship." This, indeed, is proved even by the proper names, which are for the most part identical with the post-exilic names of the Jews in Palestine and are generally compounded with the name of Yahweh. Nevertheless this same community remained utterly uncon-

scious that they were in any way breaking the Deuteronomic law about a central sanctuary. When their temple had been destroyed and its services discontinued they even appealed to the High Priest and his associates in Jerusalem to help them to restore it. It is evident that they regarded the Deuteronomic law as applying only to Palestine.

There is therefore no longer any need to assume that passages like that in the Book of Isaiah, in which the prophet contemplates the erection of an "altar" of Yahweh in the land of Egypt, are later than the discovery of the Book of Deuteronomy, or that Deuteronomy itself was composed at a later date than the age of Isaiah. Before the Maccaean era the Law was not scanned by the Jews with the scrupulosity of a modern European critic: it was in fact treated much in the same way as the Anglican and Scottish formularies are to-day.

This appears still more plainly in a fact which has somewhat troubled Professor Sachau. In spite of their devotion to Yahweh some at least of the Jewish community at Elephantiné admitted both the existence and the authority of other deities. There was a "god" Beth-el who was invoked under more than one form. Malchiah, son of Yoshebiah—names which are witnesses to the orthodoxy of their bearers—brings a charge of theft against another Jew, and then goes on to say: "I have made prayer and appeal to our God, He (?) has come to me with judgment. I, Malchiah, summon thee to Kherem-Beth-el the god." Professor Sachau notes that in one of the papyri mention is made of Kherem-nathan, a name parallel to El-nathan, while elsewhere we find a Bethel-nathan.

Still more striking is the statement made in the last column of a list of persons belonging to the Jewish garrison who had paid their tax of two shekels each to the temple of Yahweh. Here we read: "The money which is to-day

in the hand of Yedoniah son of Gemariah in the month Phamenoth : 31 keresh 8 shekels (i.e. 318 shekels) ; namely, 12 keresh 6 shekels for Yāhō, 7 keresh for Ashem-Bethel, 12 keresh for Anath-Bethel." As the list is introduced by the statement that all the contributions were made "for Yāhō," it follows that both Ashem-Bethel and Anath-Bethel must have been in some way included under the heading of the national God. What is even more curious is that in another document the name Anath-Yāhō, "Anath is Yāhō," is coupled, apparently in an oath, with a word which signifies a "place of prayer." It is difficult to resist the conviction that chapels or altars dedicated to Anath-Bethel and Ashem-Bethel were erected within the precincts of the temple of Yahweh, and that the worship of other deities besides Yahweh was admitted or at all events practised. Anath-Yāhō would be a compound like Ashtar-Chemosh on the Moabite Stone where the female Ashtar has been absorbed into the male Chemosh.

It will be observed, however, that the two divinities associated with Yahweh are not simply Ashem and Anath, but the compound Ashem-Bethel and Anath-Bethel, where Bethel takes the principal place and occupies the same position as Yahweh in Anath-Yāhō. It thus corresponds with El-Bethel in Genesis xxxi. 13, where the Massoretic text has "the God Bethel." El-Bethel (or "the God Bethel") was the name under which "the angel of Elohim" revealed himself to Jacob ; he was not, it will be observed, Elohim, but his angel or messenger, such as was attached in the Babylonian pantheon to each of the chief gods.

That such "messengers" of subordinate deities should have been worshipped by the orthodox community at Elephantinê need not surprise us any more than that they should be referred to in the Book of Genesis. The Jewish garrison in southern Egypt was not likely to be more puri-

tanical in its orthodoxy than its contemporaries at Jerusalem who composed psalms, or used them in the public service, in which they described Yahweh as a "king above all gods" (Ps. xc. 3, xcvi. 9), "the God of gods" (cxxxvi. 2), to whom praise is made "before the gods" (cxxxviii. 1), for "among the gods there is none like" Him (lxxxvi. 8). Even the Chronicler declares that "great is our God above all gods" (2 Chron. ii. 5). Orthodox Mohammedanism adopts the same attitude; my Egyptian sailors invoked the saints rather than Allah when they had a prayer to offer or a particularly solemn oath to make, and the Egyptian peasant carries his offerings to the local saint who is not unfrequently an ancient god in disguise. Christianity has the same tale to tell; the Sicilian or Spaniard, like many an oriental Christian, puts his faith in the Saints rather than in the more distant deity, and the altars of the Saints are usually numerous in a church which is professedly dedicated to the Supreme Being. Even the Anglican cathedral has its "Lady Chapel" and altar.

What the temple at Jerusalem was like before the Exile we learn from Ezekiel (viii.): "Northward at the gate of the altar" was the "image of jealousy"; the walls of the building were covered with representations of divinities, while the women wept for Tammuz at the northern gate. The wives of Jeremiah's companions in Egypt complained that since they had left off burning incense to the queen of heaven nothing but misfortune had happened to them. It is true that the women are generally the most religiously conservative and superstitious part of a community, but on this occasion it is evident that their husbands sympathised with them. The ordinary Jew had just as little sympathy as Solomon with the puritanism of the prophets whose works have survived to us. Yahweh was indeed the God of Israel; He was a jealous God who insisted upon

holding the first place, but that did not mean that the other gods were demons or non-existent. So long as their worship was identified with His, it was permissible. To burn incense to the queen of heaven was a sin, but when once Anath was absorbed into the "God of heaven"—the title given to Yahweh in the papyri—her worship became lawful. As "Anath-Bethel" she was nothing more than an "angel of Elohim," and so had a right to a place in the temple of the supreme God. In setting up her altar the Jew of Elephantinê had no more idea that he was disobeying the First Commandment than has the Christian who prays to the Virgin or St. Joseph.

The distinction between priests and Levites is treated in the same way as the First Commandment or the institution of a central sanctuary. There is no mention of Levites in the papyri. If they existed, they are included among the priests just as they are in the Book of Deuteronomy or as in the Anglican Church the term "clergy" includes both priests and deacons. The ritual of the temple at Jerusalem as prescribed in the Law was observed in Elephantinê, but we never hear of "Levites" in connexion with it. Either they existed and were commonly known as "priests," or else they were an order confined to Palestine, like the Nethinim and "the children of Solomon's servants." In view of the existence of a tribe of Levi, the latter explanation seems to me the more probable. At all events, the Jews of Elephantinê did not share the conscientious scrupulosity of the modern critic in marking off the Levite from the priest.

On the other hand, the so-called "Priestly Legislation" was known to them, and not only known but observed. In my previous article I noticed that the ritual law contained in Leviticus ii. 1-2 was carried out in the temple at Elephantinê; one of the papyri now published by Professor Sachau

shows that this was also the case as regards the law of the Passover. An interesting letter on the subject refers to the "Priestly Legislation" in Exodus ii.; indeed, as Professor Sachau points out, the words of Exodus ii. 18 are actually cited in it. There can therefore be no question that the Elephantinê Jews in the fifth century before our era were acquainted with the Pentateuch in substantially its present form, and that they believed they were faithfully carrying out its injunctions. If, therefore, their interpretation of the latter differed from that of the Jews in Jerusalem it was a matter of interpretation only. And it is clear that they themselves had no conception that there was any difference; when their temple had been destroyed they wrote to the High-priest at Jerusalem, as a matter of course, expecting him to see that it was restored, and they seem to have been much astonished that no attention was paid to their letter. They naturally regarded their own orthodoxy as unimpeachable, and they would probably have maintained that they had more faithfully preserved the religious traditions of the past than the exiles in Babylonia. It must never be forgotten that for nearly a century the temple at Elephantinê was the only Jewish temple in the world, and that if the post-Maccabæan views about a central sanctuary were to prevail, Elephantinê rather than Jerusalem was the place chosen by Yahweh "to cause His name to dwell there."

That the Jews in Southern Egypt should have spoken, written and read in Aramaic while continuing to give themselves Hebrew names may at first sight seem surprising. But the names are for the most part religious, and the language of religion, and presumably, therefore, of the ritual of the temple, remained Hebrew. When the change of language took place, it is impossible to say. The companions of Jeremiah appear to have still spoken Hebrew

when they entered Egypt, from which we may infer that Hebrew was spoken in Judah up to the date of its conquest by Nebuchadrezzar. Under the Pharaohs of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty the foreign language the Jewish mercenaries would have been called upon to understand would have been Egyptian, not Aramaic; Aramaic did not become the official language of Western Asia until the Persian era. The Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription, however, shows that this was at least as early as the reign of Darius I.; it was, perhaps, one of the reforms which he introduced after consolidating his power. Hence the reference to it in the note attached to the inscriptions at Behistun.

The linguistic usage of the Jews of Elephantinê is closely paralleled by that of the Christian Egyptians to-day. While the language of the Copts has become Arabic, their names are largely Coptic—Shenûdi, Markos, Tadros, Claudius, etc.—and the language of the Church is Coptic also. The Liturgy is recited in its ancient Coptic form, and the lessons from the Old and New Testaments are read in the same tongue, though an interpreter stands by to translate them for the benefit of the congregation, verse by verse. The introduction of Western modes of education has led to the rise of two or three native scholars who are able to compose once more in the ancient language of Egyptian Christianity; but such compositions are unintelligible to the great mass of their fellow-countrymen whose literature is necessarily in Arabic. It must have been the same with the Jews of Elephantinê. When Aramaic took the place of Hebrew the secular literature of the people was necessarily written in the Aramaic language. Hebrew was confined to the ritual of the temple and the books employed in its services. That none of these should have been found by the excavators is easily accounted for. The papyri brought to light by the German excavations have

come from the ruins of houses. The Hebrew literature used in the services of the temple would have been kept in the temple, and its very site has disappeared. When the Egyptians eventually succeeded in shaking off the Persian yoke, and the Jewish garrison lost its Persian protectors, the temple and all to do with it would have vanished from the face of the ground. And it is not even certain that the edict enjoining the restoration of the building was ever obeyed. The successful revolt of the Egyptian people followed too quickly afterwards to make this probable, and it is more than likely that such copies of the Pentateuch as the Jewish community may have possessed would have perished even before the Petition of the Jews was sent to the Persian governor Bagoas.

Perhaps it would be as well to add a few words on the bearing of the newly-found papyri upon modern theories as to the age of the Levitical legislation, though the question will doubtless be pretty thoroughly discussed during the next few months, while the materials for settling it are still imperfect as long as the ostraca discovered by the French excavators remain unpublished. There are three documents which bear more or less directly upon the subject,—the Petition to Bagoas with the answer of the Persian Government, and the papyri numbered 5 and 6.

In my previous article I have already alluded to what the first of these documents has to say upon the matter. We learn from it (1) that the Jewish colony and temple at Elephantiné were established before the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar, and (2) that the ritual law contained in Leviticus ii. 1–2 was carried out there. When the temple at Elephantiné was overthrown by the Egyptians the Jews found themselves unable any longer to conform to the Levitical law. Since its destruction, they say, “up to the present day the meal-offering and the in-

cense-offering and the burnt-offering have not been made in this temple." They, therefore, pray that permission may be given for the restoration of the building, so that "the meal-offering and the incense-offering and the burnt-offering may be offered upon the altar of the LORD God (Yāhō Elāhâ)." The Levitical law, which is ascribed by modern criticism to the post-exilic "Priestly Code," runs as follows: "And when any will offer a meal-offering unto the LORD, his offering shall be of fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon; and he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests: and he shall take thereout his handful of the flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof; and the priest shall burn the memorial of it upon the altar, to be a burnt-offering, of a sweet savour unto the LORD." It must be remembered that the papyri, like "the Priestly Code," name only "the priests"; the Levites are not mentioned in them.

The second document, Papyrus 5,¹ is unfortunately fragmentary, but enough remains to render its evidence important. It is a petition from Yedoniyah and four other Jews relative to the destruction of the temple, and belongs to the same period as the Petition to Bagoas. Adopting Professor Sachau's restoration in the 9th line, which is almost certainly right, we should have: "and the temple of the LORD God which [formerly stood] in the fortress of Elephantinê, as [it was] of old, shall be [again re]built, and a pair of turtle-doves (or ?) a goat (roast with fire ?) shall n[ot] be offered there, but frankincense, meal-offering [and burnt-offering]." In other words, the offerings prescribed by the Levitical law shall be restored in their fulness, not the substitutes for them which the law allowed in the case of poverty or necessity. The pair of turtle-doves would have been a

¹ In the text the papyrus ought to be numbered 4, as there is another No. 5. In the plates, however, it is numbered 5.

mark of the poverty or niggardliness of the community : and the goat would point in the same direction, since the nearest place from which a sheep or lamb could have been obtained would have been Edfu, there being no pasturage for sheep in the neighbourhood of Assuan.

The Levitical regulations for offering the two turtle-doves are well known. In Leviticus v. 7 it is laid down that if the offerer " be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass which he hath committed, two turtle-doves " ; and similarly in Leviticus xii. 8 we read that if a woman is " not able to bring a lamb, then she shall bring two turtle-doves " ; see moreover Leviticus i. 14. As for the sacrifice of the goat, that also is in accordance with the prescriptions of the Levitical law. In Leviticus iii. 12-16 provision is made for its being offered in place of the more usual lamb. Thus once more we find the Jewish community at Elephantinê obeying the provisions of what, according to modern criticism, was the post-exilic Priestly Code.

The third document, Papyrus 6, is a letter sent by Haniah, a high Persian official of Jewish origin, to Yedoniyah, the representative of the Jewish priesthood and colony at Elephantinê about the date on which the Passover should be kept. An attempt was being made, it would seem, to harmonise the Persian and Jewish calendars. The beginnings and ends of the lines of the letter are lost : what is left is as follows : " Now shall you thus reckon four[teen days from the commencement of Nisan] . . . be clean, and remember : n[o] work [shall ye do] . . . drink n[ot ?], and everything wherein there is leaven [shall ye] no[t eat from the 14th day of the month] at sunset until the one and twentieth day of Nisan . . . [no leaven ?] shall enter into your chambers . . . "

Here, again, the rules enjoined upon Yedoniyah are derived from the " Priestly Code," to which Exodus xii. 1-20 is assigned by the modern critic. As Professor Sachau has

remarked, almost the very words of Exodus xii. 18 are reproduced: "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even," while the passover lamb was to be killed on "the fourteenth day" of Nisan. So, too, the Israelites were told that the day should be to them "for a memorial" (ver. 14), and that "no manner of work shall be done" during the celebration of the feast (ver. 16). It is true that the instructions given by Hananiah are not said to have been previously observed at Elephantinê, and it is therefore possible to suppose that they were given for the first time. If so, the letter will have no bearing on the date of the Levitical legislation, as it belongs to the end of the fifth century B.C. All it would prove in that case is that the Passover-feast was known to the Jews of Elephantinê and that they regarded the Levitical rules regarding it which they were called upon to obey as of divine obligation. Professor Sachau, indeed, suggests that Hananiah was the brother of Nehemiah who is called Hanani in Nehemiah vii. 2.

However this may be, the first two documents are sufficient to show that the Levitical law was known and obeyed in the Jewish temple at Elephantinê, and that when the temple was destroyed in the fifth century before our era its regulations perforce ceased to be observed. As I have pointed out, the settlement of the Jews in Elephantinê must go back to the reign of Psammetichus I., when the Egyptian king pursued the native deserters into Ethiopia and planted garrisons of foreign troops at the frontiers of his kingdom. The Levitical legislation will, therefore, have been known to the Jewish soldiers and their priests as far back as the middle of the seventh century B.C. Even if we accept Professor Sachau's tentative dating and assign the establishment of the colony to the second Psammetichus it will still have been before the beginning of the Exile.

What becomes, then, of modern theories about the "Priestly Code" and its post-exilic date? Professor Driver, their most cautious and least generalising exponent, thus writes in his edition of the Book of Leviticus (London, 1898): "The priestly historical narrative, which forms, as it were, the groundwork of the entire Pentateuch, describes in Leviticus the inauguration of the full system of the sacrificial worship. . . . Here the priestly history has been expanded by the incorporation of three groups of laws (cc. 1-7; 11-15; 17-26), which seem to have existed originally as independent collections. The most ancient of the three is that contained in cc. 17-26 . . . commonly known as the *Law of Holiness* (H) . . . The compiler of the *Law of Holiness* cannot be separated very widely in time from Ezekiel, whether he wrote before or after that prophet. . . . The account of the promulgation of Ezra's law in 444 B.C. determines the date by which Leviticus had received almost its present form."

As there is no actual reference in the papyri to a Book of the Law, it is possible that the defenders of the theories thus described by Professor Driver may take refuge in his further statement that "the date of the *redaction* of the laws in Leviticus must be carefully distinguished from the date of the laws themselves. The laws embody usages, many of which are doubtless in their origin of great antiquity, though they may have been variously modified and developed as time went on. . . . The various compilers or redactors did little more than reduce to a permanent form the legal and ceremonial tradition which had long been current in priestly circles." It may, therefore, be urged that the references in the papyri to the Levitical law happen to be just these "usages" which belong to a "legal and ceremonial tradition."

This is, of course, to beg the question, but it has the

further drawback of forgetting that the Petition was sent to Bagoas some time after "the promulgation of Ezra's law." We know that the Jewish priests at Elephantiné were in communication with the priesthood at Jerusalem from the fact that the High Priest Jehohanan had been appealed to by them; if their ceremonial usages really rested upon an older tradition and sanction than the newly-introduced Law-book of the priests at Jerusalem they are not likely to have been silent about it.

There is, however, another and a wider aspect of the question upon which the papyri pour a flood of light. From the historical point of view—and when we are discussing dates the historical and archæological point of view is alone of consequence—the main argument for assigning a late date to Deuteronomy, and therewith to the Levitical legislation, is the argument from silence. The history of Judah as unfolded to us in the Books of Kings and in the Prophets shows, it is alleged, a complete disregard and ignorance of the laws of Deuteronomy. Before the reign of Josiah the most orthodox of the Jewish kings allowed worship to be carried on at the "High-places" instead of confining it to the central sanctuary, while the cult of other deities was permitted by the side of that of Yahveh. Hence, it has been argued, it is impossible to suppose that the Deuteronomic law as yet existed.

So it would be if the ancient Jews had been the scholars of modern Europe. But they were not. They were orientals, and they did not live in modern times. Again and again archæology has proved that the argument from silence is valueless, and the Elephantiné papyri offer another illustration of the fact. The Jews of Elephantiné believed themselves to be thoroughly orthodox, and, as Professor Sachau has pointed out, their devotion to Yahveh and His worship was unquestionable. Nevertheless, even in the age

of Ezra and Nehemiah, long after the period when the Book of Deuteronomy is held to have been surreptitiously written, they still saw no inconsistency between its commands and their own practice. They had never discovered that its teaching in regard to a central sanctuary or the service of other gods forbade the existence of their own temple and the acknowledgment of the existence of divine "angels" in the court of Yahveh. And what the priests at Elephantinê failed to see in the sixth and fifth centuries before our era, we may be quite sure their ancestors at Jerusalem would have failed to see in the centuries of an earlier epoch.

A. H. SAYCE.

THE THOUGHT OF PAUL.

IV. THE THEORY THAT PAUL WAS AN EPILEPTIC.

ONE other preliminary question still remains, which demands our consideration. It affects the very foundations on which rests our right to accept as in any degree valuable Paul's belief in the truth and power of his own personal experiences.

The question whether Paul was afflicted with epilepsy is not a matter of mere pathological curiosity. An affirmative reply opens the way to very grave inferences which are drawn by many, who know what an epileptic condition means. "Epileptic insanity" is the explanation of Paul's visions given confidently by numerous physicians and other modern scholars. The same explanation for the visions of Ezekiel was stated to me with full assurance by an experimental pathologist of great distinction whom I knew well.¹ As he declared, he could produce any number of

¹ Another medical friend, also an extremely able pathologist, was equally confident that the visions of Ezekiel were the dreams of an eater of hashish.