

# 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 *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## HISTORICAL AND MYTHICAL ELEMENTS IN THE STORY OF JOSEPH

W. F. ALBRIGHT

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

So perfect a story as the Romance of Joseph, dating moreover from hoary antiquity, can, strictly speaking, be neither history nor fiction. Like most of the ever-enchancing tales of the past, it is likely to be the product of a long evolution. This may be said without eliminating the hand of dramatic genius, which makes itself felt in style and development.

In this article I propose to take up anew the question of sources, from a rather eclectic viewpoint. It were presumptuous to claim originality; one can only sift the evidence, relying on the suggestions of his predecessors, amplified by the comparison of data inaccessible to them. Furthermore, one must be catholic in the choice of methods. No one brush will suffice to reproduce the variegated coloring of Truth.

*A priori* it is impossible to decide whether a given figure is of historical or mythical origin. A categorical generalization is as rash here as elsewhere in the domain of the humanistic sciences. Each figure must be studied by itself. If heroes are set down as historical we must look for mythical analogies from which they have procured their mythic trappings; if they are rated as humanized gods, a heroic model must be presupposed. Moreover, we must allow for the operation of an unlimited number of disguising modifications and accretions. A historical personage may thus be surrounded in time with a borrowed aureole, containing perhaps even rays characteristic of the most out-and-out gods. Heroes may take the place of deities, just as Hassan and Hussein have become the heirs of Tammuz in the Shiite East. We must not be misled, but must examine critically the precipitate left after all suspicious elements have been removed. The analysis must be in a measure quantitative, on the basis of motif-units, in harmony with Bloomfield's folkloristic methods. Almost the only Old Testament scholar who applies this principle seriously is Gressmann, but he is too dashing and tem-

peramental to be a very safe guide, as his treatment of the Gilgamesh-epic rather drastically shows. The motif-principle employed by Winckler and Jeremias is too atomistic, as the many *reductiones ad absurdum* clearly illustrate. A system based on such materials ignores the existence of chance. The likelihood of fortuitous coincidences is much smaller when the unit is itself more complex.

In the following pages we are concerned, as I hope to demonstrate, with a depotentized god, and the analysis must endeavor to identify the motives, shove aside the elements which appear to be secondary or of historical origin, and explain the nature of the god from his name and characteristics, and the cult-motives which may reasonably be detached from his legendary cycle.

When the meaning and purpose of myths are to be considered, we must direct our course with great caution, avoiding the clutches of the philologico-psychological Scylla on the one hand, without falling into the sociologico-anthropological Charybdis on the other. The former has fallen into disrepute as the natural reaction from the over-confidence of the school of Kuhn and Max Müller. The able work of Goldzieher's youth, *Der Mythos bei den Hebräern*, is, however, neglected by Biblical scholars to their loss, since it contains a mass of valuable information, and many happy suggestions, though most of the conclusions were, of course, erroneous. It is a pity that the accurate philology and balanced judgment of a Roscher or an Usener are not better represented among students of the ancient Orient.

The anthropological movement led by Lang and Frazer, which has happily turned the emphasis away from metaphors to the more concrete business of raising grain for bread, and children for the perpetuation of the race, from poetry and astronomy to economics and sociology, is now at high tide. With a dash of archæology added by the classicists, eniautos-daimons and bull-roarers, the sociological invasion is proceeding very successfully, and many hitherto unsolved problems are yielding to its onslaught. At the same time, the invaders are prone to overlook the fact that cult and mythology originate usually with priests and rhapsodists, and that the mysterious and fantastic often plays a stronger part in forming mental associations than the tangible and commonplace. Hence astronomical and zoologi-

cal phenomena exercise a powerful influence in forming myths. Here the work of men like Frobenius, whose anthropological studies have led him to the sun as the perennial fount of mythology (applied to Old Testament problems by Hans Schmidt, in his *Jona*); Siecke and Ehrenreich, lunar champions; Winckler and Jeremias, consistent exponents of the rôle of calendaric and astrological motives in the formation of myths, comes in. Though we may be dazzled by the kaleidoscopic variety of views, there is no place for the swan-song of the pessimist which Frazer has prefixed to the third edition of his *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*. Where even so gifted and indefatigable a worker as Sir James may fail, ten thousand lesser divinities may succeed, by dint of combined efforts.

The historico-critical methods I have employed in fixing the historical substratum of the patriarchal and heroic sagas of the Heptateuch are modeled mainly after Eduard Meyer, the unrivaled chief of the masters of ancient history. Beyond the most assured results of Old Testament science, I have not ventured to employ the difficult weapon of literary analysis. For the rest, we are left to make more or less probable combinations from the still slender stock of evidence, documentary, philological, and archaeological, at our command. The temptation to utilize an ingenious combination, or a pretty idea, without the most rigid criticism, in the well-known manner of Hommel, must be resisted. Here the subjective element enters in: I dare not hope that my combinations will all stand the test. I would not have our science taxed with the *insouciance* which springs from human frailty. With Athene as with Eros, Lucian's epigram holds:

οὐχ ὁ ἔρως ἀδικεῖ μερόπων γένος, ἀλλ' ἀκολάστως  
 ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἔσθ' ὁ ἔρως πρόφασις.

In dealing with the historical records of pre-Davidic Israel, we must always bear in mind that we do not have in them a history based on documentary sources. The theories advanced from time to time since the discovery of the Amarna tablets, that part, at least, of the oldest Hebrew literature is a translation from cuneiform, is preposterous to an Assyriologist, which the latest champion most decidedly is not. While there undoubtedly were archives and monuments extant in the ninth century B. C., from

which an archaeologist might have constructed a very fair history, the scribes did not use them. They were not interested in the history of the land, but in the traditions of their own people, which they accepted as implicitly as the modern Soudanese believes his tribal legends. We cannot blame the Hebrew, when we recall the use made of their opportunities by such men as Manetho and Livy, and the ready faith given Soudanese traditions by a man of Frazer's stamp. The long memory possessed by semi-civilized peoples for historical facts is a pious fiction of over-zealous apologists. The situation with regard to the Arabs and Germans is familiar. Where we have fixed poetic forms, isolated or distorted facts and names may be handed down for several centuries, but they are invariably superseded by a new wave of sagas, unless fixed in the cult, in which case they coalesce with the mythology, itself a very impermanent body. I am tempted to quote from an excellent article by the well-known anthropologist, Lowie, "Oral Tradition and History" (*Journal of American Folk-lore*, vol. 30, pp. 161 ff.). "There are few events that can be regarded as equalling in importance the introduction of the horse into America. . . . Nevertheless we find that the Nez Percé give a perfectly matter of fact but wholly erroneous account of the case, while the Assiniboine connect the creation of the horse with a cosmogonic hero-myth. Similarly the Assiniboine and Shoshones give mythical accounts of their first meeting with the whites a century ago" (p. 164; cf. also especially p. 167).

Nor can rules be laid down for progressive reliability of documents, since they are so diversified in origin and theme, and so subject to the shifting sands of human interest. Who would rate the *Chanson de Roland* higher as a historical source than the history of Gregory of Tours, or consider the legends of Samson more trustworthy than the pericope of Abimelech?

Having given the foregoing survey of my methodic ideals, I will state results in as concise a form as feasible. Too elaborate a discussion often only obfuscates the issue. The available data and the theories advanced hitherto are more or less familiar; I will, therefore, presuppose them, in general, thus saving time and space.

Our Joseph-story is, I believe, the syncretism of two separate

mythic cycles, one grouped around the sanctuary of the god of fertility, Joseph, at Shechem, the other borrowed from similar Egyptian sources, preserved to us only in the Osiris and Bitis myths. This fusion is no more remarkable than the syneresis of the Babylonian Tammuz-cult with the native Phoenician worship of Adonis at Byblos, or the attraction of Phoenician and Syrian elements into the Egyptian myths of Osiris and Bitis. That Joseph is primarily a god of animal fecundity will become perfectly clear, I think. This kinship between Joseph and Tammuz was first observed by the late Hugo Winckler, whose failure to see the full implications of the idea rests chiefly upon the then prevailing tendency of mythologists to reduce all myths to solar bases. We of to-day, enlightened in this respect by the work of Frazer and Baudissin, have no excuse for blindness. Furthermore the materials for the study of Oriental gods of fertility of the Tammuz type have greatly increased in recent years. From a comparison of the myths of such gods of fertility, both animal and vegetable (the precise line of demarcation can very seldom be drawn), as Tammuz, Gilgamesh, Gira (Sumukan, Šakan, or Engidu), Adonis, Attis, Sabazios, Kombabos, Osiris, and Bitis, we know what to expect. I shall frequently refer to a forthcoming paper in *JAOS.*, "Mesopotamian Genii of Fecundity," where much of the material will be critically considered.

We will take up first the Palestinian elements in the cult and mythology of Joseph. That Joseph was worshiped at Shechem, first as a god of fertility, and later as the eponymous ancestor of the **בית יוסף**, including the neighboring districts (later called "tribes") of Ephraim and Manasseh, is tolerably certain, as appears from the tradition that his betrayal and descent into the "pit" took place in the vicinity, and that he was buried there, in the tract purchased or conquered by Jacob from the C̄anaanites or Amorites. The presence of the **ארון יוסף** at Shechem suggests that there was at one time an organized sanctuary and service of Joseph there. Arnold has pointed out recently (*Ephod and Ark*, p. 26 f.) that every organized sanctuary must have had its own special **ארון** in the early days, where the **שכינה** of the deity resided. The connection, if any, between the **בעל ברית** at Shechem and the **מצבה** called (emended text of Gen. 33 :20) **אל אלהי ישראל** (אל is natu-

rally substituted for יוסף, יוסף, or the like), as well as their possible relation to יוסף is an unsolved problem (cf. *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, 148, 542 ff.).

Joseph is a shepherd, like Tammuz and Bitis (see below), as befits the god of a pastoral people. His name, a formation like יהודה יעקב, יעקב, יעקב, etc., means "He who causes to increase (flocks and herds)," a name like Sumukan, "giver of increase" (see my above-cited paper in *JAOS.*). For the meaning cf. Assy. *ruddū*, "add"; Ar. دى, "increase (of cattle)." Like Attis and Kumbabos, presumably also Tammuz, Joseph wears a כתנת פסים, a tunic reaching to the ankles and wrists (פסים connected with פספס, Heb. פס, "palm, sole"), the regular garb of the קדשים attached originally to the cult of Joseph, and therefore ascribed to him, just as Ištar is usually represented in the costume of her קדשות or hierodulae (*kadišāti*, *šamhāti*, *kizrēti*, *ḥarimēti*). All the Asiatic gods of fertility seem to have had attached to their service a guild of eunuch-priests, the Galli of Asia Minor, the כללים of Palestine and Phoenicia (cinaedi), and the (sing.) *kulū*, *kurgaru*, or *assinnu* of Mesopotamia, all of whom wore female dress. The aetiological reason given for Joseph's coat is interesting. He receives it from his father as a mark of special favor, and also, evidently, to keep him at home, pursuing girlish occupations which would not take him from his father's sight, just as Aphrodite attempts to keep her favorite, Adonis, at home, away from the dangers that beset an intrepid youth in more manly pursuits. In the Kumbabos-legend, reported by Lucian (*Dea Syria*, 27), a characteristic reason is given for the female garb of the cinaedi. A woman fell in love with the hero, on account of his extraordinary beauty, and committed suicide after learning that he was a eunuch. In order to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies, Kumbabos assumed female dress. The real reason is probably that the cinaedi dressed in female garb because they functioned as women. The sensuous analogy may have been assisted by magical ideas with regard to the apotropaic value of disguising sex, as Frazer thinks.

The two Joseph tribes and their southern neighbors, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Eduard Meyer, *D. Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, 249 ff.

כְּנִי יְמִינִי or "Yemenites," are said to have sprung from Jacob and the ewe Raḥel. This genealogy belongs properly to Joseph himself, the son of a ewe. Several Asiatic gods or heroes of fecundity were born of animal mothers; Gira-Šakan was the son of Šamaš and a gazelle (for proof of these statements see my article in *JAOS.*); Priapus (Lydian) was the offspring of Hermes and an ass, according to one story. Tammuz and his mother-sister-wife Geštinanna are symbolized by a young ram and a ewe. After the theory that the pastoral tribes of central Israel were sons of Raḥel had established itself, it was only natural to refer the cattle-raising tribes to the wild-cow Leah, the consort of the אַבִּיר יַעֲקֹב, the bull Jacob.<sup>2</sup> The genealogy of Rachel is thus more original than the somewhat haphazard division of the remaining nine tribes between Leah and the two concubines.<sup>3</sup> The tender-eyed Leah corresponds to βωῶπις πότνια "Ἥρη. Joseph was also fancied to be a bull,<sup>4</sup> as we learn from the "Blessing of Moses," Dent. 33: 17;

וְקַרְנֵי רֶאֶם קַרְנָיו	בְּכֹר שׁוּרוֹ הִדְרָלוֹ
יַחֲדָיו אַפְסֵי (ה) אֲרָץ	בְּהֵם עֵמִים יִנְגַח

The couplet is naturally much older than its present setting, with its reminiscence of the thunder-god as donor of fertility and

<sup>2</sup> For the connection of Leah and Rachel with the cattle, *resp.* sheep-raising industries, see Haupt, "Lea und Rahele," *ZATW.*, 29, 281-286.

<sup>3</sup> Bilha and Zilpa do not seem to be eponymous figures, nor are they connected with any clear mythological stories. The incest of Reuben with Bilha may possibly belong to the class of fecundizing incests associated with Tammuz and Adonis. I would suggest that the two "concubines" were originally the two weapons of Jacob as the thunder-god (which he undoubtedly was) named בְּלֵהָה "terror," and יִלְזַפָּה "fury," like the two personified weapons of Ninurta, later independent deities, Šarur, "the rushing weapon," and Šargaz, "the crushing weapon." Bilha then stands for \**Balhát* (see Broekelmann, *Vergl. Gram.* I, § 52, g, αβ), *Ballähát*, and Zilpa for \**Zalpát*, *Zal'ápát* (cf. also *Milka*, Gen. 11: 29, for *Malkat*).

<sup>4</sup> We cannot take the comparisons and identifications with animals too seriously. Sumukan is variously a gazelle, a lion, a wild-goat, an ass, etc. A god could, of course, assume different forms at pleasure. Nor can we delimit functions of a god sharply; Jacob was a god of fertility as well as Joseph; we have an illustration of his fecundating activities in the scheme by which he outwitted Laban, primarily a fertility charm, as is shown by the use of green withes. The מַקַּל לִבְנֵה לַח of Gen. 30: 37 reminds one of the *ildukku* of Gilgamesh.

destroyer of the foes of his people, like the Assyrian Ištar, the *rīmtu munakkīpat zā'irē*, or Rammān the *šūr šamai*, as the thunder-god is called in an old Akkadian epic. The expression כָּכֹר שׁוֹרֵי makes a very archaic appearance, and obviously refers to a legend like that of Bitis, who becomes a bull and thereafter a Persea tree, one of whose splinters enters his former consort's mouth, causing her to bear him in human form. "Firstborn of his bull" (bull born of himself) corresponds to Egyptian *k3 mutf*, "bull of his mother," which Sethe has identified with Κρηφ.

Before considering the death of Joseph, we may dispose of his dreams. Now it is, of course, unscientific to try to make a mythical romance "walk on all fours" when we are ignorant of the relative age of its elements. It is, however, legitimate to take into account all possibilities and to inquire into the association of ideas between the topic of a myth and its details. Thus the dream of the sheaves reminds one of the grain-deity, while the astral dream may be explained as the exaltation of the star with which Joseph is associated. Hitherto the second dream has been variously interpreted. Winckler made Joseph here the sun, which is perhaps logically too objectionable even for the elastic feeling of myth-makers, as Winckler's opponents have gleefully reiterated. Jeremias avoids this snare by making Joseph the embodiment of the whole zodiac, a view which is intrinsically very improbable. While in the "Blessing of Jacob" a series of astrological allusions is unmistakable, as may be seen from the initial sequence Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Leo (probably so, against the world-age hypothesis; Joseph is Sagittarius), nothing of the kind is visible in the dream. The precise number of the stars is without bearing upon the myth. Since in the first dream the other sheaves bow down before Joseph's sheaf, it is only natural to suppose that here the sun, moon, and stars, do obeisance to Joseph's star, representing him as one of the sons. This star can only be the planet Jupiter, since Venus is nearly everywhere feminine. The dream is therefore the reminiscence of an astral myth describing the exaltation of the celestial shepherd to the zenith. Jupiter is said to be so bright in Oriental skies that he often casts a visible shadow. In the creation-epic (King, *Creation*, p. 108, ll. 109 ff.) it is said of

the planet *Nēbiru* (the name of *Umun-pa-e*, or Jupiter, at the zenith: Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 128; Kugler, *Sternkunde*, Vol. 1, p. 11, *Ergänzungen*, 2, 199 f.—*Nēbiru*, however, does not mean properly “Überschreiter” but “crossing, zenith”): *šumšu lū nēbiru aḥīzu kīrbīšu; ša kakkabē šamāmi alkātsunu likīlu; kīma šēni lirtā ilāni gimrašun* = “Let his name be *Nēbiru*, occupying its midst; let him fix (lit. hold) the paths of the stars of heaven; like sheep may he pasture all the gods.” In the third tablet of the Exaltation of *Ištar*, a Sumerian epic entitled *Ninmaḥ ušūni gīra*, we read that when the planet Venus rises to the zenith all the powers of Anu, her consort, and the oversight of the sun, moon, and stars are placed in her hands, while the gods all pay her homage precisely as in Joseph’s dream.<sup>5</sup>

Being Adonis, Joseph had, of course, to die.<sup>6</sup> These gods of fertility are either killed by a boar (*Tammuz*,<sup>7</sup> Adonis, Attis), or are changed into an evergreen tree after emasculating themselves (*Bitis*, Attis). Drowning also occurs (*Tammuz*, Osiris) in alluvial countries, as well as other deaths, less popular. We can hardly doubt that Joseph was originally supposed to have

<sup>5</sup> The exaltation of Esther as queen of Persia may go back to the exaltation of *Ištar*, as Thureau-Dangin suggests (*Revue d’Assyriologie*, 11, 141, n. 1).

<sup>6</sup> The death of an Adonis is always preceded by an amorous episode. The corresponding myth in our story may have been dethroned by the more gaudy arrival from Egypt. At all events, Jacob is now the one who loves and watches over Joseph, and weeps for his death. His appearance in the rôle of *Ištar* is really no more surprising than Kore’s masquerade as *Tammuz*. Even the most obviously masculine function is performed in Egypt by the cow of heaven, whose udders yield fertility, while the earth-deity is male, lying under *Nūt*. This peculiar attitude has, of course, an anthropological basis; the Suahili in East Africa are said to practise the same custom.

<sup>7</sup> For *Tammuz* the principal evidence is astrological; *CT.*, 33, 1 obv. 1, 29 we find a star with the name *kakkab ŠAH il Da-mu*, “the boar of *Damu*.” Originally one can hardly doubt that the pig was sacred to the god of fecundity as the symbol of the prolific earth, wherefore pigs were sacrificed to Kore at the Thesmophoria. Later misunderstanding, assisted by a keen sense of the ravages wrought by wild-boars in the field and orchard, created the fable that the “corn”-god had been killed by a boar. Any American farmer in the corn-belt will sympathize with the votaries of *Tammuz*.

been killed by a wild beast through the treachery of his brothers (or brother, as in the case of Bitis-Anubis and Osiris-Set), just as Ares plots to kill Adonis with the aid of a wild boar. Dying, he descended into the "pit" (כור = שאול), whence he was imagined to rise triumphantly with the spring verdure. Jacob's weeping for Joseph is the reflexion of the wailing of the devotees, like Ištar's lament for Tammuz, or Demeter's mourning for Kore. At one time, no doubt, Ephraimite women wept for Joseph, just as later Israelites, deserting the God of Moses, wept for the young god Hadad-Rimmon at Megiddo and for Tammuz at Jerusalem. Similarly, the Gileadite maidens used to mourn four days each year for the Hebrew Kore, Jephthah's daughter. It would be interesting to know the name of the goddess whom Jephthah's daughter replaced, just as the Syrian queen Stratonike replaced Atargatis in the cult-legend of Bambyke reported by Lucian. The lamentation was really, of course, for the winter virginity of the goddess of fertility, and was thus a ceremonial corresponding to the annual *μηστία* in the Thesmophoria, commemorating the rape of Persephone, goddess of the underworld and its productive functions, like the Sumerian Geštinanna.

The original form of the story has been disturbed by the introduction of the Egyptian pericope, and the subsequent attempts to rationalize the mythical elements and to harmonize the contradictions naturally arising thereby. Before this process set in, Joseph may have died and gone to Egypt in a reincarnation, just as Bitis went to the Valley of Cedars\* in Phoenicia. We have already called attention to the parallel effects of the syncretism. Later, when the mythological elements were suppressed or rationalized, the death was converted into a ruse, and the "pit" became a real cistern, into which the *rabadan*, or chief-herd, Reuben, put his brother for safe-keeping.

The Egyptian pericope, to which we will now turn, is noteworthy for its archaeological accuracy, which makes it very

\*The word 'š was formerly rendered "acacia," later "cedar." The more exact meaning is "juniper," as shown by Ducros (cf. *Jour of Eg. Arch.*, vol. 3, p. 272). However, the Egyptians afterwards extended it to include the cedar, even the stately cedar of Lebanon, which towers above the juniper. In the United States, on the other hand, the juniper is popularly confused with the cedar. Meissner is probably wrong in comparing the Assyrian *ušū* (*Assyriologische Studien*, VI, p. 31).

probable that the original myths have been later revised and cast in an Egyptian mould (see below) for political purposes. Enough, however, of the original setting is left to show the close relationship with the cycle of Bitis, preserved to us in the folkloristic "Romance of the Two Brothers." The story has often been separated into two parts, a "*Bauerngeschichte*" and a fairy story. The two belong, however, together. Owing to a general haziness on this point, I may be pardoned for presenting here a *résumé* of my studies on the subject. The name Bitis means properly "shepherd" (*bt*); the syllabic writing *B3-t3* simply indicates that the etymology of this rather rustic deity's name had been forgotten, and that the name was therefore comfortably assumed by the nineteenth dynasty scribes to be foreign, like Ba'al, 'Astart, Rešep, 'Anāt, etc. Griffith's idea (Petrie, *Egyptian Tales*, Second Series,<sup>1</sup> p. 73 ff.) that Bata is Attis (for *farus*) is quite impossible; Attis stands for Ātta, "Father," the consort of Mā. Moreover, the similarity between Bitis and Attis is not more remarkable than his resemblance to Tammuz, while his relations with Osiris are in some respects still closer. Quite aside from these considerations, the Egyptian origin of Bitis appears from the fact that he was made the last king of the postdiluvian (sic) dynasty of the gods, beginning with Osiris and Horus, and lasting "usque ad Bidin" (Armenian Eusebius, ed. Petermann-Schöne, Col. 135). We owe this suggestion, accepted by Sethe, to Lauth (*Aeg. Chron.*, p. 30). Gardiner (*PSB.A.*, 27, 185 f.) quotes an important hieratic ostracum containing a poem which enumerates the different parts of a chariot, playing upon each. The passage reads: *ir n3 b3-ti<sup>u</sup>n t3ik m-ir3-k3-bw-ti* *B3-t3 nb Š3-k3 iuf m m3-iwq-wi n Bštt(?)* [ ] *h3' r h3št nb* = "The *bt* of thy chariot (the king's) are Bitis, lord of *Sk* [Kynopolis], when he was in the arms of Bast, being cast out into every land" (Gardiner). This rendering is not very convincing; Bitis corresponds to Osiris rather than to Horus, the *bambino*. While the hieratic is inaccessible to me, I am inclined to correct *m3-iwq-wi* into *m3 hq* "oryx antelope" (the writing is almost identical). We may then render: "When he was an antelope (for construction cf. Erman, "*Agypt. Gramm.*,"<sup>3</sup> §445 f.) [ ], being driven out into every land." If the reading *Bštt* is correct, the expression "antelope of Bast" would be like

“gazelle of Isis,” to whom the gazelle was sacred at Koptos, according to Aelian, or “cattle of Šakan” (*būl* “Šakan”). Šakan or Sumukan is a gazelle or a wild-goat, like the Greek Pan and the Hebrew רעש (see my article in *JAOS*). It is interesting to find Bitis in the rôle of a wanderer, like Gilgamesh and Engidu, since this aspect of him does not appear in his romance so clearly.

Concisely told, the Story of the Two Brothers is as follows: Bitis lived with Anubis, his older brother, acting as the latter’s herd and errand boy. Because of his strength and beauty, his brother’s wife became passionately enamored of him, and made illicit proposals, which he indignantly rejected. After Bitis had returned to work, his sister-in-law besmeared herself with dirt and told her husband that his brother had assaulted her, which so enraged Anubis that he lay in wait for the latter behind the stable door. The cattle, however, warned Bitis, and he fled, pursued by his brother. Becoming faint, he implored the sun-god for assistance, whereupon a river appeared between the two. The next morning Bitis told his brother the true story, and emaculated himself to prove his innocence. Having informed Anubis about his further plans, he left him lamenting, and proceeded on his way to the valley of junipers, where he built a house and placed his heart in the topmost blossom of a juniper. At the behest of the gods, Hnūm moulded a beautiful wife for Bitis. One day the river secured possession of a lock of her hair and carried it to the washerwoman of the king of Egypt, who found that it exhaled a most fragrant odor. When this was reported to the king, he sent messengers to look for her and bring her to him. When the woman had come to Egypt, and had been made queen, she had men sent to cut down the juniper and thus kill her former husband, whose vengeance she feared. So it transpired, but Anubis was warned of his brother’s death by the frothing of a jug of beer, and set out to find the juniper-berry in which was his brother’s heart. After a long search he succeeded, and by throwing the heart into a jar of water, Bitis was resuscitated, and transformed into a bull, which Anubis, as previously instructed, presented to the king, receiving a liberal reward. The queen, however, discovering the bull’s identity, ordered it butchered. Two drops of its blood became two fine Persea trees, which the queen had cut down. A splinter entered her mouth, and fecundated her. The infant, of course,

was Bitis, who had his mother condemned as soon as he had mounted the throne. Bitis himself ruled thirty years, making his brother governor of the land.

Both Bitis and Anubis have the determinatives for "god." Bitis, moreover, is addressed by the gods as *kꜣpꜣdt*, "bull of the ennead." The origin of the hostility between Bitis and the jackal-god Anubis may possibly be traced to the hostility between the shepherd and the wolves and jackals which plunder the flocks. In the closely related Set-Osiris myth, however, there is no trace of such a motive, though the euhemeristic explanation proposed by Petrie can hardly have more than a very limited validity. A more probable motive is the antagonism between Anubis, the jackal-guardian of cemeteries, and hence the god of the underworld, especially in the earliest dynasties (cf. Petrie, *Religion of Ancient Egypt*, p. 37 f.), and Bitis, god of resurrection. Similar is the enmity between Nergal-Ares and Tammuz-Adonis.

The origin of fertility was represented by a sexual union in which (typically) the god of fecundity was the male principle, the earth-goddess the female. The motivation, however, varied greatly. In the Langdon-epic, as Jastrow has pointed out, Enki forces Nintud over her protest, it would seem. The rape-motive is especially common in Greek myths. In a general series of myths which probably, with Frazer, we may explain as reflecting the primitive stage of *Mutterrecht*, accompanied more or less with polyandry, the mother seduces the father. When the sociological basis had been removed, however, these myths could hardly have maintained themselves but for their popularity as tales. The psychological reason for this popularity is evident—that the seduction-motive makes an excellent story, and appeals with special power to the imagination of the male sex, the myth-makers. To this category belong, for example, most of the Tammuz myths, those of Adonis, Attis, Engidu and his Indian offshoot *Ṛṣyaśṛṅga* (for whom see my paper in *JAOS.*). This motive has passed into the often closely related stories of the first parents, where Eve seduces Adam, Yamī Yama, Mašyōi Mašya (Būdahišn, Ch. 15). With the development of the ascetic ideal as a reaction against the extravagances of sexual license to which these cults gave rise, and the growth in popularity of the eunuch-priest institution, which required suitable cult-legends to

explain its origin and justify its existence, many of these stories assumed a different complexion. In India and Egypt (?) the ascetic ideal was the force behind the change. So, in the Rig-Vēda, the close of the dramatic scene between Yama and Wamī was omitted, leaving the hearer to infer that Yama resisted his sister's allurements successfully (see Schröder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 275 ff.). Originally, as Von Schröder has pointed out, the episode was a mimetic fertility-charm. Similarly Ṛṣyaśṛiṅga, in the Buddhist Jātakas, falls through no fault of his own, being in a virginal state of ignorance. After learning his misdemeanor, he performs due penance and returns to monastic seclusion. In the older versions (cf. Schröder, *op. cit.*, pp. 292-303), on the other hand, he is successfully decoyed from the hermitage. In the second tablet of the Gilgamesh-epic (recently published by Langdon), the hero is violently separated from his mistress Išhara by Engidu, who himself afterwards curses the *fille de joie* who seduced him and inveigled him into the sophistication and disillusionment of civilized life.\* Later Gilgamesh himself steadfastly repulses Ištar's advances. The progress of sexual morality is also evidently the prime cause in the similar modification of the Syro-Anatolian myths of Attis, Kumbabos, Ešmun, etc. Whether, however, the castration of the heroes is based upon a fertility charm, as Frazer thinks, or has a social origin, as suggested above (in which case the custom was first suggested by the castration of animals for industrial purposes), I cannot undertake to decide. The solution of such sociogenetic problems must be left to the future.

For the sake of completeness I will refer to a third main type of explanations of the origin of fertility, the self-fecundation of males or hermaphrodites, like Agdistis and the Orphic Phanes. However, as these strange aberrations are happily unknown in the Bible, I will refer for a discussion of the onanistic theories to my paper in *JAOS*. The idea of self-fecundation came primarily through the observation of apparently unisexual vegetation, especially in lands where the culture of the date-palm called men's attention to this fact by contrast.

\* The civilizing of Engidu forms a striking parallel to the Fall in Genesis, as was first pointed out by Jastrow (*AJSL.*, 15, 193 ff.; see also Ungnad-Gressmann, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, 98 ff.). This episode cannot,

The adventures of Bitis and Joseph belong to the second type of myths above characterized. The emasculation, however, is solely motivated by the hero's desire to prove his innocence, much as in the legend of Kombabos, where it is also a precaution taken *in advance* (see below). The emasculation of a god is not a permanent disability, so Bitis receives a wife, as perfect a creature as the ram-god of Elephantine could fashion on his potter's wheel. Like Eve, she is created for the eternal reason **לא טוב היות האדם לבדו**. So, again, the Schopenhauerian composer of the Gilgamesh-epic has Aruru model Engidu from clay to serve as a helpmeet to Gilgamesh.

The virtual transformation of Bitis into a juniper, now modified by the well-known life-token motive, belongs primarily with the emasculation, as in the myth of Attis, where the hero is turned into a pine. The association between these gods and evergreen trees is characteristic; Adonis is born from a myrtle, Tammuz from a cedar.<sup>10</sup> Frazer's inability to find a satisfactory explanation (*Adonis, Attis, Osiris*,<sup>3</sup> vol. 1, p. 277 f.) is straining at a gnat; the evergreen tree was the symbol of unchanging verdure and eternal life. The individual choices are, except perhaps in the case of the myrtle, obviously based on the geographical distribution of the trees.

Bitis is brought to life when his heart is put into the water, like the plants. Similarly Tammuz and Ištar are annually revived by being sprinkled with the water of life (*mē balāti*) from the underworld. So also Osiris and Tammuz are cast into the river, to be drowned and resurrected with the subsidence of the inundation. Upon coming to life the god assumes the form of a bull,<sup>11</sup> like the Nile-bull Osiris-Apis,<sup>12</sup> representing the river

however, be dignified with the title "prototype of the Fall." There is a much better parallel, which I hope to discuss soon in this journal.

<sup>10</sup> The clearest proof of this is found in *CT.*, 15, 27, l. 5, where the young god says (as I would render), "My pregnant mother (was) the holy cedar." The translation will be justified elsewhere.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the god's title *kz.* *pšqt*, "bull of the enead." While, strictly speaking, *kz.* here means "hero," like *Sum. gud*, the line between metaphor and mythology is very hard to trace.

<sup>12</sup> Ea is also called the *am-gig abzu-ge*, "black bull of the *apsū*." Lehmann-Haupt's ingenious combination of Sarapis with Šar-apsi, a title of Ea, though supported by very learned arguments (cf. his article in Roscher), is certainly wrong, as Sethe has convincingly shown.

at its inundation; cf. the ram  $\epsilon gb-wr$ , "the great inundation." I expect to show elsewhere that the Euphrates and Tigris were also personified in the same way. A more intimate parallel, perhaps, is furnished by the bull Zeus-Sabazios in the Attis myth.

From the bull's blood two Persea trees grow. The strange mutations of the story are due to the syncretism of different myths and a rather naïve attempt to harmonize them and to adjust their most glaring inconcinnities to the Egyptian taste. How many of the motives are of Egyptian "origin" need not be asked in the present state of our knowledge. Assuming then the readjusting process, one is tempted to consider the two drops of blood a concession to delicacy, substituted for the bull's testicles. From Agdistis' testicles an almond tree (or a pomegranate, according to a variant reported by Arnobius) grows, a tale parodied by Lucian in his account of lunar marvels in the *'Αληθῆς ἰστορία*.

Many of the motives which appear in the Story of the Two Brothers are folkloristic (*märchenhaft*), rather than mythical. Since these motives are nearly all familiar, it is unnecessary to prolong the paper by discussing them. The motive of the scented hair, rather unusual, comes from the Osiris myth, as Sethe has pointed out.

I may add that Bitis' consort, who three times contrives to destroy him, corresponds to Ištar, who destroys her lovers (sixth tablet of the Gilgamesh-epic). This figure is in a sense perhaps the prototype of the "bride who destroys her husband," found in the Bible as Tamar and Sarah (in the Romance of Tobit). Tamar may, indeed, be a depotentized goddess (the name is of no consequence); she seduces Judah, the eponymous ancestor of his tribe, as a **קַדְשָׁה** or hierodule. At all events we are dealing with a folk-tale which was introduced into the tribal history of Judah and given a genealogical import (cf. *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, 200 ff.). The goddess lives forever, but the vegetation which she loves dies annually—a proof of her inconstancy.

Let us return to the story of Joseph. The episode of Joseph and Zuleika is so much like the legends of Bitis and Kombabos that its character is immediately clear. Were it not for the cumulative force of the evidence for Joseph's rôle as hero of fecundity, one might reasonably object to fastening a mytholog-

ical exegesis to so natural and human a story (cf. the examples cited by Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, vol. 2, pp. 303 ff.). In some respects the story of Kombabos (Lucian, *Dea Syria*, 19-26)<sup>13</sup> is even closer to the Joseph-story than the Egyptian tale, which does not militate against an Egyptian origin, since there may have been many variants to the form found in the Story of the Two Brothers. Kombabos is appointed chamberlain of the king and guardian of the beautiful young queen, just as Joseph is his master's steward, and custodian of his house' (and wife). Kombabos also goes to prison (and is later condemned to execution), while Bitis flees. I am furthermore strongly inclined to think that Joseph, in the original story, prudently removed the spring of temptation beforehand, like Kombabos. Later Israelites, not being able to reconcile the idea with Joseph's patriarchal rôle, suppressed it. Taking into consideration the frequency with which motives are transferred (see below),<sup>14</sup> we may see a reflection of Joseph's original state in the eunuch Potiphar. The figure of Potiphar is very secondary; פוטיפר is simply an adaptation or corruption of פוטיפרע, name of the priest of Heliopolis. While a eunuch may have a whole harem, and is often blessed with his share of erotic proclivities (cf. Juvenal's sixth satire, and the Arabian Nights, *passim*), it is at least unusual to find a married סרים<sup>15</sup>. If the סרים was originally Joseph,

<sup>13</sup> Humbaba is probably the prototype of Kombabos. Hierapolis was at one time strongly under Babylonian influence, as appears from the stories of Sisythes (= Zisudu) and Semiramis told by Lucian. Kombabos is the guardian of Stratonike, and before that, we may suppose, of Semiramis (not, of course, Sannurâmat!); Humbaba is the guardian of Irnini. Another indirect reflexion of Humbaba is Haman, who plots to gain possession of Esther's person. The resemblance between the three figures, however, does not go beyond name and attachment to the goddess or queen. Kombabos is a Syro-Anatolian adaptation of Humbaba (cf. Tarku < Tarḫu, etc.); Haman is a corruption originating (as the weakening of the laryngeal indicates) among the Aramaic-speaking population of Babylonia.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. the transference of the death by burning from šamaš-šum-ukin to his brother Sardanapalus, noticed by Lehmann-Haupt.

<sup>15</sup> There is no evidence that סרים ever meant "official," Jensen's derivation from Assyrian \*ša-rēši, which would exhibit a development like Syr. כהיכנא, is to be given up in favor of Haupt's etymology from شرس, whence also sirēšu, "beer," which receives its name from the preparation of malt. Assy. šutrēšu, "eunuch," is a formation like

Zuleika is the pivot of the shift. We might fancy that in an older recension than ours the motive of Potiphar's impotence was employed to fire Zuleika (and excuse her?) and to place the resistance of a virile Joseph in as bright a light as possible, defending his chastity against almost irresistible passion. At this point, however, we lose bottom, and begin to flounder in perilous speculations.

The transference of the motive of emasculation is common elsewhere. In the Sabazios myth (Roscher, vol. 4, 252 f.; see also above), the god falls in love with his mother Demeter, and consorts with her in the form of a bull. In order to pacify the angry goddess when she learns the truth, he cuts off the testicles of a ram, and throws them at her, pretending that they are his own. Since Sabazios is also a ram-god (represented, in the Anatolian fashion, standing on a ram's head), it is clear that originally he emasculated himself, but afterwards, since this was repugnant to Phrygian ideas, Sabazios being a bearded god, the substitution was made. The same motive is modified still differently in the Gilgamesh-epic, where the two heroes slay the celestial bull (*alū*) sent against Gilgamesh by the injured goddess Ištar, and Engidu hurls the *imittu* of the beast at her. Hommel's view that *imittu* is "phallus" (properly "penis" from *emēdu*, "to stand") must be rejected; Jensen and Holma (*Körperteile*, p. 131 f.) have proved that *imittu* means "right leg." However, *imittu* is surely a substitute for *išku* (or euphemism?); Gressmann (Ungnad-Gressmann, *D. Gilgamesch-Epos*, 133 f.) also suggests this idea, but handles it with unusual caution. In the underlying myth, we may suppose, Engidu was approached by the goddess, but maintained his chastity, and (as usual) emasculated himself, throwing the trophy in her face. The fact that he was seduced in another story is no more objection than the *liaison* between Gilgamesh and Išhara is to that hero's triumph over Ištar's temptation. The names and myths of these heroes are not in the least crystallized.

The views of Jeremias regarding the astral-mythological significance of the descent to Egypt, the imprisonment (the dungeon, כּוּר, which is rather inconsistent with the rest of the nar-

*lutmāku*, *hulpālu*, for \**kutrāsu*, which corresponds to the Greek *θλιβόμενος* or *τ.θλασμίνοσ*, and the Hebrew פּצוּיִן רַכָּה

rative, may belong in the category of mythical reminiscences), etc., seem to me quite unfounded. The journey to Egypt, as noted above, is a syncretistic joint, while the imprisonment is the natural consequence of Joseph's supposed crime, and is stressed for dramatic reasons. However, Joseph's rise from his subterranean residence to feed the land during seven years of famine is worthy of an Egyptian demigod. We have two illustrations of the motive of the hero or sage who saves the land in connection with a seven years' famine. According to a story preserved in a Ptolemaic inscription (Sethe, *Untersuchungen*, vol. 2, p. 75 ff.), the land was afflicted by a seven years' famine during the reign of king Doser (head of the third dynasty, *cir.* 2900 B. C.). At last the king directed himself to the half-fabulous sage Imhotep, afterwards deified, asking him for information about the source of the Nile and the reason that the river had so long failed to rise to its wonted level. The sage obtained the knowledge from the sacred books to which he had access, and told the king of the god Hnūm, who controlled the flow of the river from his home in Elephantine. In response to the royal petition, Hnūm appeared to the king in a dream and promised to send the Nile back to the thirsty land. The grateful king thereupon donated to the god a tract of land at the first cataract, into which the Nile was fancied to spring through two subterranean passages leading from the underworld.

The other illustration comes from Babylonia. In the sixth tablet of the Gilgamesh-epic, as already mentioned, Istar goes to heaven after being rejected by the hero and entreats Anu to create a divine bull, a terrible, fire-breathing monster, to destroy the heartless wretch. While the following lines are somewhat broken, the following sketch of their contents, agreeing rather with Jensen than Gressmann (Ungnad-Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 131 f.), can hardly be far wrong. Anu warns her that her request brings with it seven years of "straw," evidently years in which the grain does not fill out ("runs to straw"), and asks her whether she has made provision for feeding men and cattle during the years of famine that would ensue. Having received an affirmative reply, the bull is duly created, and proceeds on its destroying way, slaying two hundred men with one blast from its fiery nostrils. Jensen is probably right in seeing

the cause of the famine in the ravages of the bull. I am tempted to regard the (red) bull as a personification of the reddish rust which attacks grain, often like an epidemic. As is known, the three hundred foxes turned loose in the grain by the solar hero Samson refer primarily to the spread of the rust, called in Italian *volpe*.<sup>16</sup> This explanation does not exhaust the mythical connotations of the bull (cf. above); but the introduction of the taurine element brought with it, we may suppose, the famine. Ištar's glib declaration that the necessary precautions against famine had been taken does not impress one as sincere, since it is so obviously made on the spur of the moment. Presumably she is represented as lying, in order to get her way. The motive of the divine lie is so common in antiquity that it need cause no surprise; cf. Ungnad-Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 204, and Gunkel *Genesis*,<sup>2</sup> p. 170 (to which Gressmann refers). Most interesting to us, however, is the slaying of the bull by Gilgamesh (and Engidu), who thereby saves the land from famine. That Gilgamesh is primarily a vegetation-deity is practically certain (see my article in *JAOS.*); his emblem is the *ıldakku*, or young sprout. While Samson, the pestilential heat of the summer sun (like Rešeph-Apollo), sends the rust into the flourishing grain-fields of the enemy, Gilgamesh, the savior of men, destroys the rust.

Intrinsically, the Babylonian myth resembles the story of Joseph more closely; in both the heroes forestall the threatened famine, while there is at least the suggestion of a proposal to store up grain in advance. Superficially, the Egyptian legend is nearer, because of its Egyptian coloring—the seven low Niles, the wise man (in the more highly cultured Egypt the sage takes the place of the warrior),<sup>17</sup> the dream. However, our story is just what we should expect a tribe of Hebrew shepherds to pick up

<sup>16</sup> For a good discussion of Samson and the foxes see Stahn, *Die Simsonsage* (Diss., Göttingen, 1908), p. 41 f. In the Roman festival of the *Cerealia* foxes with torches attached to their tails were driven through the circus. As protector of the grain against rust the Rhodian Apollo received the appellative *ἑρπιδβίος*. There are a number of parallels.

<sup>17</sup> Joseph's character as an Egyptian sage appears in the age to which he lived, which seems to have been the traditionally correct longevity for a scholar, as several are said to have lived 110 years, among them the famous P'tah-hotep.

from its associations with Egyptians of a similar class—snatches from the cycle of an Egyptian pastoral hero like Bitis, containing elements from various sources adaptable to the story of a god of fertility. The Hebrews, their imagination stimulated by the example of chieftains who had risen to positions of prominence (for historical setting see below),<sup>18</sup> elevated their hero to the highest attainable post, and made him grand vizier to the Pharaoh. The Hebrews brought with them from Egypt, it would seem, the story of their hero-god Joseph, who was a slave in an Egyptian household, encountered and withstood temptation, was thrown into jail, whence he emerged to save the land from a grave famine, and was made vizier of the land. Doubtless there were many mythical additions which later disappeared: *en revanche* the story when committed to writing was thoroughly revised with a view to archaeological accuracy. This revision may come from J's hand, but I prefer to regard it as a century earlier. During the Egyptophile reign of Solomon, which probably, moreover, held a place in Hebrew literature like that of the age of Hammurabi in Akkadian (Semitic Babylonian), the story of Joseph gave an unequalled opportunity to the patriotic scribe. No doubt the government was on the alert for means of impressing its ally and setting forth Hebrew claims in as favorable a light as possible.<sup>19</sup> This explains the archaeological accuracy; the document was prepared for Egyptian consumption, like the composition of Artapanus eight centuries later.

Steindorff's famous explanation of Joseph's Egyptian name. **יְסֻפִּי** as *D(d)-p3-nṯr-iwḫ-'nh*, "God speaks and he lives," pronounced approximately *Cepnūtef'anḫ*, has been made

<sup>18</sup> The view of Marquart and Winckler that the historical prototype of Joseph is to be found in Yanḫamu of Yarimuta must be rejected, as Poebel, *Historical Texts*, pp. 225 ff., has shown that Yarimuta was located in northern Syria, and perhaps is identical with the plain of Antioch. Following Krug's suggestion, most scholars had placed it in the Delta. Eerdmans' suggestion that Joseph represents the "Syrian Arisu" is also impossible (cf. Böhl, *Kanaanäer*, p. 80 f.).

<sup>19</sup> Winckler, in his brochure *Vorderasien im zweiten Jahrtausend* (*MVAG.*, 18, 4), pp. 16 ff., gives a good picture of ancient Oriental diplomatic methods and principles, in many respects strangely modern. Winckler also emphasizes the rôle played by the official historiographer in producing the necessary "documentary" evidence in support of a claim or propaganda.

a basis for the dating of J in the ninth century, since this type of name was not in use before the 22nd dynasty (950-750). This view, at first sight plausible enough, demands so many improbable assumptions that it must be rejected. In the first place, it is very unlikely that the name in question ever existed, as the late Norse authority on Egyptian nomenclature, J. Lieblein, trenchantly observed (*Recherches*, 1, 151). Who will suppose that a Hebrew scholar, acquainted with Egyptian, would search through name-lists until he found a type more or less applicable to Joseph, and then change it, to give the monotheistic coloring requisite? As Lieblein remarks, "Est-ce là de la science?" Lieblein's own suggestion (p. 149 f.), *Dfnti-p3-nh* (*t'fnti-pankh*), "celui qui donne la nourriture pour (le maintien) de la vie," is grammatically anomalous; Lieblein belonged to the pre-grammatical school of Egyptology. His explanation of אֲבִרְךָ as *ib-rk*, "à gauche toi," seems to me, however, preferable to Spiegelberg's *ib rk*, "aufgepasst!" in view of the modern *šimālek*, quoted by him (p. 149). I would propose a different equivalent of Joseph's surname, based on the LXX, which gives *Ψονθομφανήχ*. The superiority of the Septuagint in these details is also evident in *Πετεφρῆ* for פֹּטִיפֶרֶע (Eg. pronunciation approximately *Pteiprē'*). צִפְנַת פִּעְנַח may be on a par with الاسكندر for 'Αλέξανδρος; vocalic *n*, which became *m* before a labial, as in Coptic, is incompatible in Hebrew, so was omitted. We may then reconstruct the Egyptian original as *P3-šnt-n-p3-nh* (pronounced *Ps(š)ntmp'aneh*; we do not know precisely how the participle was vocalized), "the sustainer (establisher, creator; Coptic *sōnt* = 'create') of life," corresponding exactly to the Assyrian expression *mukin balāti* (common in proper names, as appellative of deity).<sup>20</sup> I defy anyone to offer a suggestion more appropriate to the context.

Prof. Haupt has happily suggested that Potiphra, priest of Heliopolis, and his daughter Asenath (אֲסַנַת) belong originally to the story of Moses (*ZDMG.*, 63, 522). In the two centuries or more which intervened between the death of Moses and the accession of Solomon, the Jews, who, as Prof. Haupt has repeatedly

<sup>20</sup> Etymologically *šnt* and כִּן are related, as I shall try to show in my paper on the relation between Egyptian and Semitic, now appearing in *AJSL*.

emphasized, were the real spiritual heirs of Moses (and through the Kenites closely related to him), can hardly have forgotten the basic facts of Moses' life. We may at least expect a more accurate knowledge than can be placed to the credit of the compilers of J and E, several generations later. However, there was ample time for a confusion to rise between the careers of Moses and Joseph, especially since originally each must have been associated with a separate Inodus and Exodus (see below), later identified and fused. The confusion is well illustrated by the later Egyptian story of Moses-Osarsiph; Osarsiph is a curious attempt to reclaim the Hebrew Joseph, whose name was fancied to contain the shortened form of Yahweh (cf. Eliakim and Joiakim; for the combining-form Osar- instead of Osir cf. Sarapis, and Sethe, *Sarapis*, p. 9).

In the preceding discussion I have several times alluded to the historical movements which the Story of Joseph, in its present form, presupposes. I will therefore give a very brief sketch of the patriarchal and Mosaic history down through the Conquest; a more extended treatment would prolong the paper unreasonably.

While Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph are evidently gods, the former by implication (for his name and character cf. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*,<sup>3</sup> p. 401), Abram, however, *pace* Eduard Meyer, is surely not a god; since Ungnad's discovery of the proper name Abamrām<sup>21</sup> in contracts from Dilbat, south of Babylon, belonging to the time of Amuṣadūka (1978-1957), the older view has, very properly, returned to favor. Of course, Abamrām is a West-Semitic name; the stem רום, "be high," does not exist in Babylonian. Abram is said to have come from אור כשדים, unquestionably to be identified with Ur in Lower Babylonia. One cannot, however, help cherishing grave doubts in regard to the antiquity of the tradition, since the Chaldaeans do not appear in Babylonia before the tenth or eleventh cen-

<sup>21</sup> See *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. 6, 5, p. 60. Ungnad's attempt to explain Abamrām from the Babylonian, as "Er hat den Vater liebge- wonnen," is impossible. The name seems to be a formation like Atramhasis, "the greatly wise," and means "Lofty in respect to father," i. e., "Of exalted lineage." Meyer very reasonably took exception to a proper name meaning "The exalted father," and regarded Abram as an appellation of deity. This view is now gratuitous.

tury at the earliest, and Ur did not fall into their hands till considerably later. Moreover Jos. 24:2 refers the ancestors of the Hebrews simply to עֵבֶר הַנְּהָר, which, from the Palestinian standpoint, could hardly mean Chaldaea. The journey from Ur to Harran has given the impetus to ingenious speculations. Winckler thought that Abram was an adherent of the lunar cult, and hence moved to another center of moon-worship, Harran, to escape from the innovations and persecutions of the official Mar-duk religion established by Hammurabi, but his hypothesis is supported neither by direct Biblical evidence nor by illustrative material from the ancient Orient. The long journey up the valley is, besides, very suspicious, especially since the close association of Abraham with the Aramaeans of Syro-Mesopotamia does not take Ur into consideration at all. For light on the traditional prehistory of the Hebrews we are therefor thrown back on the postdiluvian genealogy.

שם (1), ארפכשד (2), and עֵבֶר (4) are evidently eponymous figures; פֶּלֶג (5) is the aetiological representative of the Dispersion, which the Jewish scholars placed half-way between the Flood and Abraham. שֶׁלַח (3) and רַעוּ (6) are apparently mythical heroes belonging to the same class as מתושלח and the many shepherds of Babylonian mythical history, Daonos, Lugal-banda, Tammuz, etc. שְׂרוּג (7) is the Aramaean town Sarūgi (from the Aram. stem סרג) near Harran; its inclusion in our list makes one suspect that Aramaean traditions and records have had a marked influence in the shaping of the Jewish records. Damascus, for example, must have had a literature quite as rich as the Israelite, and many Aramaean scholars may have emigrated to the south after the fall of Damascus in 733. Some Aramaean influence may have been exerted during the Exile, when the eastern Aramaeans had developed a literature (Romance of Aliḫar, etc.). נַחֹר may possibly be an old storm-god, from the stem נחר, "snort" (نخر, "snore"), in which case we have a formation like רִנּוֹן < Dagān < دجن; cf. also רַמּוֹן from Ramman. Finally, תֵּרַח has plausibly been identified by Jensen with the Hittite Terḫu.

The intermediate link between Shem and Eber is Arphaxad, which may safely be identified, as is usually done, with Ἀρφαξάτης, Assyrian Arrapha, the district about the Upper Zab

river, first mentioned c. 2100 (*OLZ.* 18, 170). Arrapha may have been pronounced also Arrapka (for the *k* instead of *h* after a stop-sound cf. *šamkatu*, "courtesan," for *šamhātu*; the new text of the second tablet of the Gilgamesh-epic, published by Langdon, has *šamkatu* throughout); אַרְפַּכְשַׁר is evidently *Arpak* (the Hebrew-Aramaean pronunciation of Arrapka; hence Armenian Albāk < Arbāk) *šadē*, "Arpak of the mountains (or hills)"; cf. Hana and Hanigalbat. We can now perhaps explain the curious similarity between אור אַרְפַּכְשַׁר and אור כְּשָׁרִים which has fascinated and baffled so many investigators—without resorting to Hommel's desperate expedient of considering פ the Egyptian article. The most important city in or near Arrapha was Arbela, which existed, as Urbillu<sup>m</sup>, Urbēl, Arbail(u), from the middle of the third millennium down to modern times, still surviving as Erbil, a town of some importance. So far as recorded continuous existence goes, Arbela may claim the title of being the oldest city in the world. I am inclined to think that in the oldest tradition אַרְבֵּל (*Urbel*)<sup>22</sup> in אַרְפַּכְשַׁר was the home of Abram, later corrupted (in the cursive script!) to אַרְכַּל, which the exilic scholars emended to אור כְּשָׁרִים, having in mind, of course, the Babylonian *Ūr ša māt Kaldī*. That Jewish scholars were at that time not yet bound by exaggerated ideas of the sanctity of holy writ is well-known; a case of haggadic etymology is אַנְרָהָם. Even if incorrect, this explanation of Ur is better, I venture to say, than the combination with Urfa-Edessa, which goes back to Orūa (= Arzaua, as Grimme has very felicitously pointed out, *OLZ.*, 16, 155, n. 1), a city inhabited by a non-Semitic population, or Clay's identification with the ephemeral village of Amūru near Sippar (*Amurru*, pp. 167 ff.).

Can we assume Hebrews in Arrapha during the early centuries of the second millennium? The answer must be affirmative. In *Revue d'Assyr.*, 12 (1915), 114 f., Père Scheil has published a contract from the reign of Rīm-Sin of Larsa (2154-2093) which mentions the *rēdē* (officers) of the Ḫabiru (gen. Ḫabiri), obvi-

<sup>22</sup> While according to tradition Abram may have founded Hebron, I do not feel justified in comparing קריית ארבע with Arba-ilu (written *IF* + *god*), which may be a popular etymology of a very late date. Nor are we justified in seeing traces of moon-worship in קריית ארבע.

ously employed as mercenaries. As the late Joseph Halévy maintained, there is evidence that Kossean elements were found in the Ḥabiru, in particular the proper name Ḥarbi-šipak (*ḥabirā'a*). The Ḥabiru name Kudurra (*Recueil de Travaux*, vol. 16, p. 32) seems to be Elamite. However, the fact that Kosseans are enrolled under the general head of Ḥabiru proves no more than does the circumstance that men with German names are fighting under the French standard, or that tribes of Kurdish origin in eastern Mesopotamia are considered Arab by the European traveler. As Prof. Haupt has repeatedly stated, the Hebrews were the precursors of the Arabs; 'br and 'rb are transposed doublets, both meaning "wanderer, nomad." In an article published recently in *ZA.*, I have tried to show that the Sumerian *ibira*, "merchant," is a loan from Semitic \*'abir, \*'ebir, while its synonym *tibira* stands for \*ta'bar (like *tamkar*), \*tēbir.<sup>23</sup> It is safe to say that the Hebrews were as widely distributed through the countries adjoining Arabia in the second millennium as were the Arabs during the centuries immediately preceding Islam.

So far as I can see, the most trustworthy data in the saga of Abraham are (1) his westward journey from Arrapha to Haran; (2) his association with the Aramaeans (which may also be late; see above); (3) his connection with חברון=קריית ארבע; (4) his association with Egypt. The fourteenth chapter must be regarded, with Asmussen (*ZATW.*, 34, 36 ff.) and Haupt (*OLZ.*, 18, 70 ff.) as a political pamphlet, designed (so Haupt) to strengthen the hands of the patriotic Jews who were supporting the rebellion of Zerubbabel against the Persian monarch. As we now know that Warad-Sin of Larsa, who, under the mask of Eriaku-Arioch, was long the comfort of the traditionalists, died about thirty years before Ḥammurabi-Amraphel acceded to the throne, the historical view has no foundation. We must suppose that a Jewish scholar reckoned back on the basis of the Hebrew figures and "discovered" that Abram was a contemporary of Ḥammurabi. The Babylonian names came from a pseudo-historical composition like that discovered by Pinches; the Hebrew material was either borrowed from extant legends like the saga of the cities of the plain and the legend of Melchizedek, or invented by use of haggadic processes, such as the

<sup>23</sup> Cf. כחר and רכל, the traveling peddler.

erudition of the 318 servants from the name of אֱלִיעֶזֶר, and the friends אֲשַׁכֵּל and מִמְרָא from the נַחַל אֲשַׁכֵּל and the אֱלֹנֵי מִמְרָא. Even if fiction, it ought to have been true. Our modern scholars are often tempted to take the creations of their brains too seriously.

The connection between the entrance of Abram into Egypt under pressure of famine and the Inodus of Jacob under similar circumstances is generally recognized; the repetition of a motive is drastically illustrated by the threefold appearance of the sister-wife ruse in the stories of Abram and Isaac. We cannot doubt that there was an Inodus; Abram was the chief of the tribe (or *a* chief), Jacob and Joseph tribal deities. The time of the entrance can be fixed with a close approach to precision. Hebron was built according to J, Num. 13:22 (by Abram, of course; we need not investigate the validity of the tradition), seven years before Tanis, the Hyksos capital. Now, according to the era of Nubti (Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*,<sup>3</sup> 316), Tanis was founded, or rather rebuilt by the Hyksos about 1680, so Hebron must have been "built" shortly before (the number "seven" belongs to the domain of saga). The presence of Hebrew and Mesopotamian elements in the mixed hordes which conquered Egypt under Anatolian leadership (Ḫajjan is a Hittite name), is attested by the names of the Hyksos dynasts Ia'kub-hr,<sup>24</sup> 'Anāt-hr,<sup>25</sup> Smḫn.<sup>26</sup> The first name, which gave the Egyptians some trouble, proves conclusively the divine character of Jacob.

I shall now offer a hypothetical reconstruction of the history of

<sup>24</sup> Also written Y'bk-hr, Y'kp-hr. Müller concludes (*MIAG.*, 17 [1912], 3, 47) that *hr* cannot be either אֵל. "God," or Eg. *hri*, "be contented." I would suggest that *hr* in these names is simply הַר, "mountain"; Ya'kub-har is a name like אֱלִיעֶזֶר (cf. אֵל שָׂרִי, *Anu šādū*, etc.).

<sup>25</sup> 'Anāt may be derived from אָנָה, the primary meaning of which is "to change" (Eg. 'nt, "turn"; Assyr. *enū*, "suppress"), so that 'Anāt would be a deity of the same type as the Arabic عَوْض and هَبِل (which also meant primarily "change"; cf. my article in *ZA.*, "ablu-abālu"). The combinations of 'Anāt with Antum, a mere theological abstraction, and the Persian Anāhita (Anaitis) are most improbable.

<sup>26</sup> One is tempted to compare *Smḫn* with the Sumero-Babylonian god of animal fecundity, Sumukan, but the resemblance is presumably fortuitous. The last syllable reminds one of the Gutean royal names Arlakan and Tiriḫan.

Abraham (or his tribe).<sup>27</sup> The Kossean irruption which, impelled by Indo-European hordes behind, burst upon Mesopotamia in the first half of the eighteenth century, drove the Hebrew pastoral tribes before it into western Mesopotamia.<sup>28</sup> Here a Hittite state had been set up by the Hittites who had conquered Babylonia a century and a half before, and in its army the Hebrews enlisted as mercenaries. We do not, of course, know the causes or character of the Hyksos invasion of Egypt. That the Hittite associations of Abram made a profound impression upon his followers is clear, above all, because of the fact that he was later regarded as the son of a Hittite god! This is no more surprising than that Alexander was made the son of Zeus-Ammon. We may expect Abram to take a place in Hebrew saga somewhat parallel to that of Dietrich of Bern in Germanic. The Hebrew elements in the Hyksos army which invaded Egypt about 1690-1680 B. C. may even have been under Abram's command, which would account for the extraordinary respect in which later generations held him. The Hebrews, at all events, played such an important rôle that the Egyptians corrupted the imperial title, *ḥk 3- ḥ3 šwt*, "ruler of foreign lands," into *ḥk3-š3 šw*, "ruler of the nomads, shepherd-king."

The circumstances and date of the first Exodus are obscure; I do not know of any passages in the Heptateuch which may have any bearing on the problem. Presumably with the decline of Hyksos power in Egypt the Hebrew tribes withdrew, settling in central Palestine among their kinsfolk. The usual idea now is that the Hebrews invaded Palestine and Syria as a horde, migrating from Arabia about 1500 B. C. This view, however, finds no support in the Amarna correspondence, aside, perhaps, from the letters of Abdi-Heba of Jerusalem. The *SA-GAZ*,<sup>29</sup> whose identity with the Habiru is now established beyond reason-

<sup>27</sup> The Hebrew itinerary Ur-Arphaxad, Harran, Damascus (Eli'ezer), Hebron, Tanis reminds one of the famous itinerary of the Aztec migration, likewise preserved by tradition.

<sup>28</sup> To this period belongs the triumphal stele of an Assyrian king ruling somewhere in northern Mesopotamia, published by De Genouillac (*Revue d'Assyr.*, 7, 151-156), which celebrates a successful campaign against Arraphum and Urbil, in the course of which the king crosses the Upper Zab (Zā'ibum). Evidently Arbela was an important place at this time, apparently the capital of an independent state.

<sup>29</sup> See especially Böhl, *Kanaanäer*, p. 89, n. 2.

able cavil, are found in intimate alliance with the Hittite and Mitannian princes of northern Syria (cf. above on Abraham and the Hittites) against Egypt.<sup>30</sup> They are, in fact, very much in the position of the Turkomans in Persia, a more or less permanent nomadic element in the population, allying itself usually with the ruling power, enlisting as mercenaries in its armies, etc. In this respect the patriarchal legends of Genesis have preserved a truer atmosphere than the reconstruction offered by the modern upholder of the "ethnological" theory of the Conquest. It is interesting to note that Winckler came around to this view of the situation as a result of his Boghaz-köi studies, where he met cases of fluid movement of population like that of Isūa.<sup>31</sup> Of course many Hebrew tribes in Arabia Petraea and the Syro-Mesopotamian desert remained wholly nomadic long after their kinsmen had settled down.

From the indications of the story of Joseph and the Amarna letters,<sup>32</sup> we may reasonably conclude that the Hebrews who returned from Egypt made Shechem their focus. These Hebrews can hardly, however, have played anything but an insignificant part in the whole confederation of tribes which later (before 1225) assumed the name "Israel." To the history of this confederation in pre-Josuanic days belong the sagas of the war between the Hebrew tribes, under the leadership of the town of Deborah,<sup>33</sup> and the Canaanite strongholds of **הענק**, **כנרו**, and perhaps **הצור**, as well as the war of Gideon against the Midianites<sup>34</sup> and Amalekites, etc.

More than three centuries after the first "Exodus" comes the Mosaic period. Instead of dealing with a god<sup>35</sup> we here find our-

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, p. 87 f.

<sup>31</sup> See Winckler, *Mitteil. der Deutschen Orient-Ges.*, vol. 35, p. 32 f.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Böhl, *op. cit.*, p. 93 f.

<sup>33</sup> See Haupt, "Die Schlacht von Ta'anak" in the Wellhausen *Festschrift*.

<sup>34</sup> Midian is here a clear anachronism, like the Philistines in the time of Abram.

<sup>35</sup> Völter's efforts to prove the original deity of Moses, in his brochures *Aegypten und die Bibel* (fourth edition, 1909) and *Mose und die ägyptische Mythologie* (1912), are complete failures. Völter's work is entirely destitute of scientific method, and the perusal of it fills one with much the same sensations produced by the curious book of Gemoll, *Grundsteine zur Geschichte Israels*. The fact that both men are New Testament scholars may give rise to some unjust suspicion.

selves in the presence of a great religious reformer, an enthusiast like Buddha, Zoroaster and Mohammed.<sup>36</sup> Without, however, lingering on his fascinating career, about which so painfully little is really known, I will sketch its salient points rapidly, in keeping with my plan. The view presented is substantially that of Professor Haupt; see *ZDMG.*, 63, 506-530, and *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*, vol. 48, 354-369.

Of fundamental importance is the connection of Moses with Heliopolis, which has been overgrown by the legendary account of his origin (following the well-known Sargon-Cyrus recipe), and finally displaced by religious prejudice (Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 522). The confusion between the stories of Joseph and Moses was also an important factor in the process (see above). Since Petepre' (פּוֹטִיפְרֵעַ) is priest of Heliopolis, we must, on our hypothesis, identify Jethro (יִתְרוֹ), the כֹּהֵן מִרְיָן, "Priester der Kultusgemeinde" (Haupt), with him. The supposed variant Hobab is an appellative meaning "father-in-law" (Haupt, *OLZ.*, 12, 164). For Re'ū'el (Raguel) see below.

I am inclined to consider יִתְרוֹ as equivalent to a Heliopolitan priestly title \**it-R'* (like the priestly class *it-ntr*, "father of god"), pronounced approximately Iātrē' (father = *iāt*, later *iōt*, Coptic ⲉⲟⲩⲧ). For the change of *ē* to *ō* cf. סַרְגֹּון for Sargēn, and Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 522 f. Re'ū'el I consider a name which Petepre' assumed after casting his lot with the Hebrews. "Shepherd of God" (the Greek γ does not prove a Ⲅ) is a monotheistic substitute for the incompatible "father of God," which to a Yahwist was as blasphemous as the titles "Mother" *resp.* "Grandmother of God," bestowed upon St. Mary and St. Anne, are to a Protestant. The name may also have been chosen with reference to the paronomasia (*R'*, "sun-god," and רֵעָה, "shepherd"—which happen to be etymologically connected, as will be shown elsewhere).

Furthermore, Asenath (אַסְנַת. Ἀσενεθ) may possibly be the title of a priestess, like Assyrian *mārat ūli*, standing for *S; t-ntr* (cf. *S; t-nšwt*, "princess," lit. "daughter of the

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Böhl, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-108, and especially Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit*. Arnold's remarks (*Ephod and Ark*, p. 7) are not quite fair to Gressmann's fertility of thought and felicity of diction; cf. Smith, *AJSL.*, 32, 90 ff.

king'), pronounced *Si'nāte* or *Sa'nāte*, *S'nāte*.<sup>37</sup> In case these combinations are correct, Petepre' will be the priest's original name, Jethro and Asnat will be sacerdotal titles, while Re'ū'el and Šippōrat<sup>38</sup> may be regarded as Hebrew names assumed after the Exodus.

Through Heliopolis, as Haupt has pointed out, our path leads to the solar monotheism of Iḥnaton's abortive reform, which took root in the philosophical monism developed in the City of the Sun (cf. Meyer, *Geschichte d. Altertums*<sup>3</sup>, § 272). Most significant is the fact that an uncle of the reformer was high-priest in Heliopolis (Borchardt, *Äg. Zeit.*, vol. 44, p. 98). Perhaps he exerted an influence over the boy-king like that of Jehoiada over Joash. The movement could never have succeeded, however, had it not been for the cosmopolitan liberalism in science and culture which was characteristic of the fourteenth century. Even after the heresy had been suppressed (about 1350), monotheism may have maintained itself in secret among the priests of Heliopolis (Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 523) until the conversion of Moses, about 1250, when it began a new career, destined to revolutionize the history of the world. The great contribution of the Hebrew thinker lay in freeing the conception from the trammels of heliolatry. The ideas of Moses can hardly have fallen far short of those of Mohammed in purity of theology and universality of scope. A cosmopolite like Moses cannot have been a henotheist. In his eschatological doctrines he must have been much more idealistic than the Arab, a position to which reaction from the absurdities of the popular religion and acquaintance with the agnosticism of the intellectual must inevitably have led him.

Moses' name may be a hypocoristicon (or a monotheistic alteration) of Rē'-mōse (a type of name then popular).<sup>39</sup> Since he was surely of Hebrew origin, we may regard him perhaps as a slave manumitted because of his unusual gifts. His master

<sup>37</sup> *Ntr* was pronounced *nāte* in the thirteenth century, as we know from the Babylonian transcription *nāta*.

<sup>38</sup> Šippōra may be a romantic figure; cf. the transformation of Semiramis and the empress Josephine into birds in popular tradition. Moses was once aided by ibises.

<sup>39</sup> The *ʷ* in Mošé is perhaps due to contamination with the name of Yehōšūa', who was as closely associated with him in tradition as Cain and Abel (Arab. Hābil and Kābil).

(? cf. Potiphar above) not only adopted his teachings, like Abubekr, but also gave him his daughter, and finally accompanied him in the Mosaic hegira. Moses found converts among his kinsmen in bondage, who had been imported into Egypt in large numbers, if we may judge from historical analogies; the king "who knew not Joseph" is a late fiction. Many converts came from slaves of all nationalities, with whom Egypt was then full (the "mixed multitude" of tradition), among them Nubians and negroes. In fact, Jethro may have been himself of Nubian stock, to judge from the gentile *Kūšit* applied to his daughter. As is well known, the name Phinehas (*ḥn-ḥšī*, a common type of name among slaves) means "the negro."<sup>40</sup>

Once at *Medina*, the Yahwists gained adherents so successfully that they were enabled to form the religious confederation of Midian, which may be called, with Professor Haupt, the Sinaitic amphictyony. Their God, hitherto called El, after revealing his majesty in volcanic eruption received the name יהוה, "He who causes to be" (the usual Hebrew formation for divine names; see above). Prof. Haupt has emended the cryptic אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה (Ex. 3:14) to אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה. "I cause to be that which comes into existence," a sentence which can be duplicated only in the sphere of Egyptian thought, where we have an exact parallel in the litanic formula *šḥprf ḫw wnwntifi*, "he causes to be that which comes into existence."<sup>41</sup> Morphologically, the Tetragrammaton is Hebrew, semantically it is Egyptian; the numerous efforts to trace it to Babylonia are total failures, nor is there a single valid case of its occurrence in cuneiform inscriptions before the eighth century.

After the death of Moses the Hebrews seem to have separated at Kadesh (*circa* 1200) into two bodies, one of which, under Caleb, attacked Palestine from the south; the other, led by Joshua, crossed the Jordan into central Palestine. Strictly speaking, the two invasions can hardly have been synchronous, as their character seems to have been quite different. The nucleus of the confederation went with Joshua, while the allied tribes of Kenite and Edomite stock followed Caleb. Presumably

<sup>40</sup> Other Egyptian names among the Aaronids are Hophni (*ḥfn*, "tadpole") and perhaps Merari (*mrrw*, "beloved").

<sup>41</sup> Cf., e. g., Erman, *Chrestomathie*, p. 38, l. 6.

the usual quarrel had occurred. The confederates gave themselves the distinguishing name יהוה, "the body of believers" (Haupt, *ZDMG.*, 63, 513, n. 1). In spite of the fact that the sanctuary of Yahweh was in the North, at Shiloh. Judah preserved its faith purer than Shiloh, just as the nomadic tribes of Arabia and not the theologians of Mekka supported Wahhabism. Fortunately, perhaps, for monotheism, Judah was effectually barred from organic union with the North by the chain of Canaanite fortresses extending across Palestine along the line of Jerusalem, Ajalon, and Gezer.

When the romantic exaggerations of the bard, and the artificial constructions of the savant have been cleared away, Joshua's achievement becomes modest enough. After crossing the Jordan and capturing Jericho,<sup>42</sup> he may have attracted a sufficient number of native Hebrews living about Bethel and Shechem to enable him to defeat a Canaanite coalition at the battle of Beth-horon.<sup>43</sup> Beyond the line of Jerusalem to the south and the plain of Jezreel to the north he can hardly have ventured. Since the followers of Joshua had no tribal organizations, they were admitted into the already existing "tribal" divisions. The sanctuary of Yahweh was established at Shiloh, where it soon was endowed with the customary paraphernalia for ritualistic and divinatory purposes. In spite of all corruptions and compromises, however, Yahwism persisted, gaining ground slowly until the reign of David, who may be styled the Yahwist Asoka. The "Aaronid" priesthood retained an Egyptian tinge, as may be seen from the names, down to the time of Samuel, about a century and a half after the conquest.

<sup>42</sup> For the historical basis of the saga of the fall of Jericho see Haupt, *Wiener Zeitschrift*, vol. 23, 355-365. The capture of Ai can hardly be considered historical; cf. Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

<sup>43</sup> The present account of the battle of Beth-horon is based upon a poem like the Song of Deborah; cf. *JAOS.*, 36, 230.