

at the end of the month. Now spring was considered to begin on 7th February (Ovid says 9th February), and it is perfectly possible that the master of the *Dioscuri* risked a little in order to gain the glory which always accrued to the first corn-ship of the year to reach Rome. There is nothing, therefore, necessarily inconsistent in Luke's narrative. It may be also Luke is not thinking of 'calendar months,' or, once again, that he is reckoning in Jewish months, on either of

which suppositions it is easy to show that we are led to a date at the end of January.

The point, however, which we wish to emphasize is this, that difficult as it is to fit in the 'three months' in 59 A.D., it is immensely more difficult to fit it in if the year of the voyage be, say, 58, for in that year they must have left Fair Havens some nineteen days earlier, and must therefore have reached Malta nearly three weeks before the date which can be assigned in 59.

On the Question of the Exodus.

BY PROFESSOR J. V. PRÁŠEK, PH.D., PRAGUE.

III.

LET me once more emphasize the fact that the Jahwistic tradition relates simply the fortunes of a single, and that not a numerous, tribe, and of its chieftain Abraham, without bringing these into any connexion with the general history of Palestine. Even the relation of Abraham to the inhabitants of the land had already become obscure at the time when the Jahwistic tradition took its rise. The part played by Abraham in the destruction of the Elamites, and his relation to the city and district of Kiriath-arba [Gn 23⁸⁻¹⁰, following the Priests' Code, but upon the authority of a secondary source, or under the influence of the contemporary geographical situation, incorrectly names the Hittites as inhabitants of Kiriath-arba (Hebron)], justify the inference that Abraham was a powerful tribal chief who, in consequence of his share in delivering the land from the Elamites, and presumably, also, of the Babylonians, gained high repute with the aboriginal population, and was regarded by them both as *'ādōn* ('lord'), like the rulers of certain Canaanite towns (e.g. Adonibezek in Bezek, or Adonizedek in [Uru] Salem), and as *nāsī* ('exalted one'). Abraham's relation to particular kinglets is in some measure illustrated by his treaty with Abimelech of Gerar (Gn 21²²⁻²³, which belongs, indeed, to E). The oath was sworn at Abraham's residence in Beersheba (Gn 21³¹. JE, v.¹⁹ E), to which Abimelech came in person, a circumstance from which one may conclude that Abraham was

regarded as a powerful personage, and the same relation is exhibited in his dealings with Melchizedek of Salem and with the king of Sodom (Gn 14¹⁷⁻¹⁹). We may assume, accordingly, that Abraham in his latter days established a somewhat powerful principality in the southern part of the west Jordan land, somewhere about Hebron and Beersheba, where Amorite kinglets were still named at the time of Chedorlaomer. The way in which this came to pass is, indeed, quite unknown to us.

The details the Jahwist gives us about Abraham's descendants are extremely meagre. Abraham's son and successor was called, according to the Jahwist, *Yizhak* (Isaac), and after his father's decease he is said to have fixed his residence at Beer-laḥai-roi (Gn 25¹¹). Elsewhere the Jahwist mentions, further, that Isaac's wife Rebecca was an Aramæan, of the cognate tribe of Naḥor, in Ḥaran. We have to represent the case in this way, that the principality established by Abraham called in the support of its tribal relations in Ḥaran, which of course is to be understood here in a wider sense as N. Mesopotamia with the adjacent desert. If Isaac obtained a wife not from among the daughters of the land but from distant Ḥaran, it may be concluded that in addition to a dowry he secured also the active aid of his Mesopotamian fellow-tribesmen. Presumably we should see in the retinue of Rebecca a new immigration of Aramæans into S. Palestine.

The present condition of the biblical tradition, however, lets it be clearly seen that the relations between Isaac and the Canaanites, as compared with those of Abraham, have changed for the worse. When S. Palestine was visited by a famine, Isaac betook himself to Gerar, but was driven thence by the native population. The former friendly relations between Abraham and this principality no longer subsisted, and the mutual conflict must have been a very obstinate one, for Isaac, after a series of disagreements, returned to Abraham's original settlement at Beersheba, and only then entered into a new treaty with Abimelech (Gn 26²⁶⁻³³). The circumstance that Isaac had to remove to Beersheba, and thus abandon the territory of Gerar (which, with Trumbull [*Kadesh Barnea*, 63 f., 255], is to be sought in the modern *Wādi Gerūr*, S.W. of *Ḳadeš*), as well as his settlement at Beer-laḥai-roi (beside Hagar's well between *Ḳadeš* and *Bered*), may probably be taken as an indication of his dependency upon Gerar. He is bound by treaty by Abimelech to take up his abode once more at the same spot where his father had resided.

All the above occurrences must, according to the synchronisms obtained from the history of Mesopotamia, have taken place about the year 2200 B.C. Thereafter, according to the Jahwistic tradition, the descendants of Abraham and Isaac continued to live in S. Palestine, until they removed to Egypt. In regard to the question when the posterity of Abraham effected this removal I will not anticipate my further discussion, but the relics of the Jahwistic tradition make it clear that the residence of the Terahites in S. Palestine must have continued for centuries after the death of Isaac. Of the fortunes of Isaac subsequent to the concluding of the treaty with Abimelech we learn nothing. We are told merely in Gn 27, which is certainly a late narrative, for it is ill combined with Elohist elements, that at an advanced age Isaac had two sons, the elder Esau, the younger Jacob, and that between these there broke out a violent contest for their father's blessing, that is, presumably, for the inheritance. Jacob, we are told, succeeded by craft in leading his father to bestow 'the blessing' upon him, the consequence of which was a fierce enmity between the two brothers, which led to the departure of Esau for Mt. Seir and the flight of Jacob to the tribal relatives of his mother in

Ḥaran. It is plain that what are given here in the guise of simple *family* incidents are really important events in *tribal* history. What is in view, it appears to me, is the detaching of a considerable portion of the descendants of Abraham, similar to what, according to the testimony of the Jahwist, had already taken place at an earlier period under the names of Lot and of the descendants of Keturah and of Ishmael. The father's blessing might, indeed, be conceived of as including the whole inheritance in succession to the father, *i.e.* in this particular instance as the hegemony in relation to the whole tribe, but, on the other hand, it had to be noted that such an important event as the rise of a new tribe, that of Edom, of which Esau was regarded by Israel as the eponymous hero, cannot be conceived of as accomplished in the course of a few years. It is surprising, also, that we hear nothing of the fortunes of Isaac and Esau all through the fourteen years that Jacob spent in Ḥaran. This *lacuna* must have already existed when the tradition first took shape in Egypt, and hence the original narrators have recourse to the favourite method of all popular tradition, namely, the uniting of floating elements of historical reminiscences, from family and racial motives.

There are yet other considerations which support the conclusion that in the Jahwistic tradition we have to fill up a great gap between the patriarchs Isaac and Jacob, a gap which is perhaps to be measured by centuries, but which, in the manner characteristic of all genuine popular tradition, was passed over by the tradition in question. Esau, the alleged eponymous hero of the Edomites, was, according to the tradition, the elder son of Isaac, so that we must bring into the sphere of our investigations all the records that have come down to us regarding the earliest condition of the Edomites. The cuneiform inscriptions have as yet furnished no details as to the ancient Edomite period, and it is still, in spite of Trampe (*Syrien vor dem Eindringen der Israeliter*, 6), very questionable whether *al-Udumu* of the Amarna tablets (London collection lxiv., Winckler 237, 24) is to be identified with Edom. Of far more importance is the hieroglyphic information, for we may assume without any scruple that the whole of N.-W. Arabia, along with the peninsula of Sinai, *i.e.*, probably, the land which H. Winckler ingeniously explains as the Muṣri of the Sargoni-

dae, already in the time of the Hyksos period formed a part of the possessions of Egypt outside Africa. The district of Muşri includes also Edom, which under the form *idom* was already known to the contemporaries of the eighteenth dynasty. This is the earliest hieroglyphic mention of Edom, and it is found in Papyr. Anast. vi. From this trustworthy source we learn that the *šasu* ('shepherds') from 'Aduma (whom we may identify with the entire population of the Assyrian Muşri) begged for permission to occupy the Egyptian district about Tuku (cf. Buhl, *Gesch. der Edomiter*, 53). Since the predecessors of the Edomites, namely, the Ḥorites, are represented in an ancient narrative as cave-dwellers, but here the question is about pasturage rights, and thus in all likelihood about conditions arising from the immigration of a new population into Muşri, a land poor in pastures, we may infer that the Aramæan elements comprehended under the name Esau-Edom were already settled in Muşri at the time of the eighteenth dynasty. The fuller details regarding this immigration are not given by the Egyptians, but when we consider that the shepherds beg for permission to pasture their flocks in the district of Tuku, we may regard this request as marking the last stage in their progress, and then the backward inference is justified that the immigration of the shepherd tribes took place in general in the period shortly preceding the eighteenth dynasty.

And now for the first time we see clearly the extent of the gap between the generation of Isaac and that of his alleged sons. Isaac, no doubt, represents the generation following upon Ḥammurabi and Abraham; Esau, on the other hand, and, as we shall see presently, Jacob also, are contemporary with the great change that took place in Egypt in connexion with the struggle to throw off the dominion of the Hyksos. Thus it is quite impossible to look upon Jacob and Esau as sons of Isaac in the ordinary sense, although they may be quite properly treated as his descendants, as chieftains of the Aramæan tribe which migrated with Abraham from Ur to S. Palestine. In this way the uncertainty exhibited by the Jahwistic tradition is explained. This tradition is aware, indeed, that the Aramæans, until their migration to Edom and afterwards also to Goshen, lived in S. Palestine and the adjacent desert regions, but it was already unable to supply correct data as to

chronology and the succession of the patriarchs. In the memory of the descendants of Abraham who pastured their flocks in Goshen, two points alone were firmly fixed—the coming from Ur under the leadership of Abraham and the recollection of his son Isaac on the one hand, and, on the other, the name and the fortunes of the last chieftain of Abraham's tribe in Palestine, namely, Jacob. What lay between had long disappeared from the ancestral story; only a faint recollection of the separating off of a portion which subjugated the Ḥorites of Mt. Seir and under the name of Edom attained to a certain historical importance, survived from this obscure period in the memory of later generations. The historical contents of this great gap in the ancestral story, whose relics still lie before us in the Jahwistic tradition, cannot be recovered with the means at present at our disposal, since we have absolutely no information about the history of Syria from the second Babylonian down to the commencement of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty.

One recollection alone, although a faint one, was preserved in the memory of posterity, the recollection of severe conflicts which gave occasion to the union of the previously somewhat disparate tribal elements into one whole, known henceforward as Israel. This recollection shines forth partly in the story of the fraternal discord between Jacob and Esau, partly in the narrative of the kinsman alliance of Jacob with Laban, the chieftain of the Aramæans of Ḥaran, and it attaches in a special manner to two spots in the east Jordan land, the mountain of Gilead and the ford of Jabbok. It is clear that Jacob, or rather his immediate predecessors, were, in some way unknown to us, compelled to evacuate the west Jordan land, and to retire to the mountain land of Gilead. A feud with the Edomites may have contributed to this result, but we must also take into account the circumstance that the conquerors from Lower Egypt, of the eighteenth dynasty, found in Palestine a number of petty principalities with strong cities as central points, which were unknown to the earlier era, and that definite testimony to a hostility between Jacob and the Amorite population of the land may still be gathered from the present form of the biblical text. We must therefore assume that the principality of Abraham's descendants was, on the one side, weakened by the separation of Edom, nay, that it had even become the

scene of fraternal strife, and that, on the other hand, it was so pressed by the growing power of the Amorites, that its representatives had for a time to seek refuge in the east Jordan land from the overwhelming force of its opponents. It was only after a reinforcement of its strength from Mesopotamia, perhaps in the shape of a fresh immigration of its tribal connexions, and the conclusion of a sworn agreement with Edom, that 'Jacob' could venture to return to the west Jordan land. This time, however, the descendants of Abraham appear as a single tribe under a single name, the tribe of Israel, under which it attained

to its significance in the world's history. The Jahwist (Gn 32²⁹) was aware that the name Israel, which he characteristically attributes to Jacob himself, took its rise for the first time at the crossing of the Jabboḵ by Jacob and his company. Henceforward it became the national name of the tribe which was already becoming a people. Under this name (hieroglyphic *Ysri'z'*) the descendants of Abraham, as the stele of Merenptah expressly witnesses, were known also to the Egyptians. With 'Jacob's' return to the west Jordan land begins thus a new period of Israelitish history.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GALATIANS.

GALATIANS V. 16, 17.

'Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'Walk by the Spirit.'—This is differently explained, (1) by, or according to, the rule of the Spirit; (2) by the guidance of the Spirit; (3) by the help of the Spirit; (4) spiritually. For each view something is to be said grammatically. All together do not exhaust the fulness of the expression. The points to be noted are (a) the antagonism between the *Spirit*—the Holy Ghost in all that He is, and works and produces, and the *flesh* with its appetites and works; (b) the absolute certainty of victory over the flesh to all those who walk in or by the Spirit.—PEROWNE.

THE word 'Spirit' is written indefinitely; but the Galatians knew well what Spirit the apostle meant. It is 'the Spirit' of whom he has spoken so often in this letter, the Holy Spirit of God, who had entered their hearts when they first believed in Christ and taught them to call God Father. He gave them their freedom: He will teach them how to use it. The absence of the definite article in *Pneuma* does not destroy its personal force, but allows it at the same time a broad qualitative import, corresponding to that of the opposed 'desire of the flesh.' The walk governed 'by the Spirit' is a *spiritual* walk. As for the interpretation of the dative case (rendered variously *by*, or *in*, or even *for the Spirit*) that is determined by the meaning of the noun itself. 'The Spirit' is not the path 'in' which one walks; rather He supplies the *motive principle, the directing influence* of the new life. V.¹⁶ is interpreted by vv.¹⁸ and ²⁶. To 'walk in the Spirit' is to be 'led by the Spirit'; it is so to

'live in the Spirit' that one habitually 'moves' (*marches*: v.²⁵) under His direction.—FINDLAY.

'Ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.'—'*Shall in no wise*,' etc. The Holy Spirit and the sinful flesh are so antagonistic and irreconcilable that to follow the one is to resist and defeat the other.—SCHAFF.

'For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.'—In this verse we have brought out most distinctly the antithesis between the flesh and the Spirit, which is one of the root ideas in the psychology of St. Paul. It does not amount to dualism, for the body, as such, is not regarded as evil. There is nothing to show that St. Paul considered matter *in itself* evil. But the body *becomes the seat* of evil; from it arise those carnal impulses which are the origin of sin. And it is the body looked at in this light, which is designated as 'the flesh.' The flesh is the body as animated by an evil principle. It thus becomes opposed to the good principle: whether the good principle in itself—the Spirit of God, or that organ in which the good principle resides—the spirit in man.—ELLICOTT.

THERE is a conflict between reason and appetite, between conscience and depravity, between the higher and the lower aspirations, between heaven and hell, going on in every man who is roused to a sense of duty and responsibility; but this conflict becomes most serious under the awakening influence of the Holy Spirit, and results in the triumph of one principle and the defeat of the other.—SCHAFF.

'For these are contrary the one to the other.'—'For these oppose themselves the one to the other.' The verb always notes opposing action, and not mere contrariety of nature; being used as a participial noun for 'adversaries' or 'opponents' in Lk 13¹⁷ 21¹⁵, 1 Co 16⁹, Ph 1²⁸, 1 Ti 5¹⁴, and as a verb in 2 Th 2⁴ and 1 Ti 1¹⁰ to denote setting one's self in opposition to. This clause, therefore, describes the continual endeavour of the flesh and of the Spirit to thwart