

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

HERR ALOIS MUSIL ON THE LAND OF MOAB.

I. THE NORTHERN LAND OF MOAB.

THE volume ¹ of which I propose to give an account in this article, will long serve as an authority on the land of Moab. With its companion on Edom, which I postpone to another occasion, it forms one of the most considerable additions to the geography of Palestine which have appeared in recent years.

Many writers have described the fascination which the long high edge of the Moabite plateau, lifted above the hollow of the Dead Sea, exercises upon those who view it from western Palestine, with the sense that it is the threshold to Arabia and with some knowledge of its ancient and varied history. This spell is not broken by actual acquaintance with the land. On the contrary, the traveller from the West finds his richest anticipations exceeded when he sets foot on the Moabite plateau and traverses the length and breadth of it, some 60 miles by 30 ; when he breathes its pure, high air, and surveys its far-spreading wheat-fields and pasture-grounds ; when he descends the great cañons which cleave the plateau from the Desert to the Dead Sea ; and experiences a range of climate that extends from the winter snows of the Belka', where, according to the proverb, "the cold is always at home," to the summer heats of the sub-tropical Ghor ; when he breaks upon the marvellous views across the Dead Sea, the most singular basin and lake

¹ *Arabia Petraea*, von Alois Musil. I. Moab, topographischer Reisebericht mit 1 Tafel und 190 Abbildungen im Texte. Vienna, Alfred Hölder, 1907. Pages xxiii. and 443. Vol. ii. is on Edom. Both are published for the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

in the world ; or when he perceives, as he can from almost every knoll upon the plateau, the thickly scattered groups of ruins ; visits the forts and walls of the Roman frontier ; or traces the lines of road which one conqueror after another has laid down in almost all directions. Every one of the vital processes, which constitute the history of Syria, is illustrated here, whether by the remains of vanished races or in the life of the present inhabitants. The constant struggle between the desert and the field ; the steady drift of the hungry swarms of Arabia upon the fertile soil ; the gradual settlement of the nomad to agriculture ; the establishment of long screens of towers against further encroachments from the east ; the decadence of vigorous races among the temptations of the vine, or under the enervating heats of the Ghor ; the growth and fall of various civilizations—Semitic, Greek, Roman, Frankish, and again Semitic ; the early Semitic faiths and their rock altars, the coming of the Greek deities, the rise of Christianity with its innumerable churches, the prevalence of Islam, and in spite of the latter the persistence to the present day of a thin thread of Christian faith. We trace the passage of Israel to the Promised Land ; the life of the people who were most akin to Israel after the flesh and who yet, in contrast to them, have disappeared from history leaving but one legible monument of what they were. We see the last scenes of the life of Moses, of Elijah and of John the Baptist ; the castles built by the Hasmoneans and Herod ; some Nabatean inscriptions ; the milestones of Trajan and his successors to Julian ; Roman camps, prae-toria, inns and changehouses ; Greek temples, Byzantine and Ghassanide basilicas, palaces, mosaics and other ornaments ; Crusading and Saracen castles, Turkish khans and forts. In short, it would be impossible to exaggerate either the geographical or the historical interest of this frontier of civilization against the Arabian desert.

Till a few years ago the topography and antiquities of the land of Moab were very imperfectly known. Seetzen passed through in 1806, Burekhardt in 1810-12, Irby and Mangles in 1818. Lynch visited Kerak from the Dead Sea in 1848, and Roth crossed the country from there southwards to 'Akabah in 1857-58. De Saulcy's and the Duc de Luyne's expeditions followed in 1863 and 1864; Palmer Drake and the two Kiepert about 1870. Most of these contributed in considerable measure to our knowledge of the general features, the main lines of communication and the antiquities of the land. Then came Tristram's expedition in 1871, with its large additions especially to the topography and natural history, published in his *Land of Moab*, 1874; Porter's and Kersten's journeys in 1874; the American expedition to the north end of the country under Merrill in 1876, and Schick's journey in 1877. In 1881 Conder and Mantell made their rapid and courageous survey of the north-western quarter of the land, which was stopped by the Turkish authorities; the results are to be found in the Fund's Memoirs, *The Survey of Eastern Palestine*, volume i., *The 'Adwân Country*.¹ Since then we have had the journeys of Bliss, Gray Hill, Wilson and myself reported in the Palestine Fund *Quarterly Statements* (1895, 1899, 1904, etc.), Germer Durand's account of the road from Petra to Mâdaba in the *Revue Biblique*, vi. (1897), with notes by Sejourné and others on the milestones in different numbers of the same periodical; various papers in the publications of the Deutsche Palästina-Verein, Lucien Gautier's *Autour de la Mer Morte* (1901), the itinerary in Baedeker's *Palästina* (fifth edition), and, above all, Brünnow

¹ The survey, which was partly carried out in the excitement of evading the Turkish officers sent to stop it, extended from the Wâdy el-Hammâm (north of 'Ammân) on the north to the Wâdy Zerka Mâ'in on the south; and from the Jordan and Dead Sea on the west as far east as the Hâjj road in the northern part of the survey, but only to Mâdaba and the Wâdy el-Habis in the southern.

and Domaszewski's two huge volumes, *Die Provincia Arabia*, written, as the title sets forth, "on the basis of two journeys undertaken in the years 1897 and 1898, and of the accounts of earlier travellers" (Strasburg, Trübner). Vol. i. (1904) is on the Roman Road from Mâdaba to el-'Aqaba; vol. ii. (1905) on the outer Limes and the Roman roads from el-Ma'an to Boşra. The authors, connecting their triangulation with that of Conder, surveyed the rest of the land of Moab and the land of Edom. They had no firmân for excavation, but they carefully examined, and have reproduced all monuments and inscriptions above ground. Except in Petra the archaeology was not carried behind the Roman occupation; but within this limit they have done an extraordinary amount of good work. In particular they have laid down for the first time the course of the Roman Limes, defining its origin and gradual extension towards the desert, and they have given numerous descriptions, with illustrations and plans of the rampart itself, as well as of the camps, forts and towers upon and within it. Their trigonometrical survey revolutionized our knowledge of the tributaries of the Arnon (el Môjeb) and of the wadies about Kerak. They give besides a collection of the data and opinions of other travellers.

It is only with a knowledge of all this literature that one is able to appreciate the originality and accuracy of Herr Musil's contributions. His work is not distinguished by the wealth, whether of classical scholarship or architectural and artistic detail, which Brünnow and Domaszewski evince. But like them he gives us the results of an independent trigonometrical survey for which he underwent some training, and in part of which he had the assistance of Herr Lendle, a professional engineer. He is besides, as they are not, an Old Testament scholar, and prepared himself for his journeys by studying exegesis and archaeology in the Ecole Biblique

at Jerusalem, and the St. Joseph University in Beyrout, with additional work at London, Cambridge, Berlin, Vienna and Constantinople. Through the fertile parts of Arabia Petraea he had the company of one or other of the experienced Roman Catholic missionaries who are at work in Mâdaba and Kerak ; while in the Eastern desert he travelled on most friendly terms, under the protection and guidance of chiefs of the Beni Şokhr tribe ; and elsewhere employed local Bedawee or fellah guides ; among whom, I see, was my own guide, Khalil of Mâdaba, a modest, sincere and well-informed man. From all this it will appear how well fitted Herr Musil was to increase our knowledge of the land of Moab, even after Conder's survey and Brünnow and Domaszewski's labours, not to speak of their predecessors, in whose reports the student will still find not a little to reward his reading.¹ To the carefulness of his preparations and his wise methods, Herr Musil added great accuracy and a heroic strenuousness in the achievement of his twenty-one long and short expeditions, during]1896, 1897, 1898, 1901 and 1902. His journeys and surveys covered a wider range than that of any of his predecessors. He traversed more than once the Negeb and the desert east of the 'Arâbah as far south as the gulf of 'Akaba ; the land of Edom and the land of Moab both within and without the region surveyed by Conder ; and in particular he made several expeditions into the Eastern desert beyond the Roman Limes, where he discovered and carefully examined a number of castles surrounded by fair pasture-grounds. The strain from fatigue, from hunger and thirst, illness and many dangers, must frequently have been very severe. But his success is assured. The lucid, careful and lavishly illustrated

¹ I would instance especially Seetzen, Burckhardt, Irby and Mangles, and Tristram.

accounts of his journeys, which were ready for the press in 1903, with the large rich maps,¹ for the completion of which their publication was delayed, place him in the front ranks of the explorers of Syria. He had intended to add the data of other modern travellers, but as these have been given by Brünnow he has limited his references on each site to extracts from the Bible and the Apocrypha, from Josephus, Jerome and other Greek and Latin writers and from the Arab geographers. He has besides published a large work (which I have not seen) on the *Ḳuṣejr 'Amra* (the ruins which he discovered in the *Wâdy el Buṭum*, a tributary of the *W. Sirhân*), with its wonderful wall-paintings.²

One of the few criticisms I have to offer on Herr Musil's work refers to his opening sentence on the name "Moab": "Moab nenne ich dem Sprachgebrauche des Alten Testaments entsprechend das zum Wassergebiete des Arnon-el-Môjeb gehörige Hochland am Ostufer des Toten Meeres." ("According to the linguistic use of the Old Testament I give the name Moab to the highlands belonging to the water-system of the Arnon (el-Môjeb) on the east coast of the Dead Sea.") To this definition there is both a linguistic and a geographical objection.

In the Old Testament "Moab" appears frequently as the name of the people, but it is doubtful whether in any passage it is applied by itself to their land.³ On the con-

¹ (1) Karte von Arabia Petraea nach eigenen Aufnahmen. Scale, 1 : 300,000. Three sheets, 65 : 50 *cm.* Price 15 marks. (2) Umgebungskarte von Wâdi Musa. Scale, 1 : 20,000. One sheet, 36 : 27 *cm.* Price 3 marks 50.

² *Ḳuṣejr 'Amra*. Vol. i., Text; Vol. ii., 41 coloured plates. Price 210 marks. Vienna, Alfred Hölder, with a preface by D. H. Müller, and besides Musil's own descriptions (pp. 3-186) contributions from Kropf, Mielich, Pollak, Wenzel, Wickhoff, and Karabacek.

³ The *Oxford Hebrew Dictionary* cites Num. xxi. 11 as a passage in which the land is meant, but in verse 13 the name is parallel to the gentile Amorite, and in 15 also it designates the people. "Moab" is not necessarily the land even in Jud. iii. 29, nor in Amos ii. 1 f., nor in Zeph. ii. 9

trary when the latter is intended, one or other of several compound terms is used—*land*, or *field* (i.e. *territory*) of *Moab*¹ and the more partial designations *the tableland*; *desert* (or *steppe*) of *Moab*; *shoulder of Moab*; *the 'Arâbôth of Moab*; *the land of Ya'azer*. In harmony with this are the facts that "Moab" has not survived as a geographical term, but disappeared along with the people it designated; and that the Greeks found it necessary to coin the name *Mωαβίτις* when they would designate the land. All uses of Moab for the latter appear to be very late.²

Nor is it a complete definition of the land of Moab to say that it is the "Highlands belonging to the territory watered by the Arnon (el-Môjeb)" and its affluents. It is quite true (as I believe Herr Musil has been the first to establish) that the most considerable of the northern affluents of el-Môjeb, the Seyl Heydân, drains by its affluents the plateau as far north-east as es-Suḵ and er-Razîb near the Hajj road. But there remains the not inconsiderable north-western district of Moab which drains independently to the Dead Sea by the Wâdy Zerḵa-Mâ'in and other streams; and there are besides those parts of the Ghor opposite Jericho which also carried the name of Moab.

Herr Musil gives the well-known native divisions of the land: (1) el-Belḵa from the sources of the Zerḵa near 'Ammân southwards to the Wâdy Zerḵa Mâ'in; (2) el-Jebâl from the Zerḵa Mâ'in to the Wâdy el-Wâleh and its (parallel to Ammonites). Everywhere else the people are obviously meant.

¹ *Land of M.*, both in Deuteronomy and in deuteronomic passages in other books; also in P (Deut. xxxii. 49). *Field of M.*, Num. xxi. 20 (E ?); cf. Gen. xxxvi. 35 (P); Ruth i. 1 f., etc.

² Eusebius and Jerome use *Mωαβ* along with *Mωαβίτις* for a district. A fragment from Bk. ii. of the *Arabica* of Uranius (later than Constantine), quoted by Steph. Byzan. (see *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, iv. 524), has Μώβα μώβα τῆς Ἀραβίας, οἱ ὀκνοῦντες Μωβηνοί. The Arab geographers called Rabbath—Moab Mâba. Compare the Latin inscription at Ḳuṣr el-Bsheir, "mobenium."

continuation the Seyl Heydân ; (3) el-Kûra from the Wâleh to the Môleb or Arnon ; (4) Ard el-Kerak from the Môleb to the Wâdy el-Hsa, the southern frontier of the land. The five summers of Herr Musil's work did not take these in their order ; each expedition crossed more than one of them. But it will be most convenient for us in surveying his topographical results to treat them in their geographical succession from north to south. I may here say that I am to spell the Arabic place-names, in Roman letters, not exactly as Herr Musil does, but according to the system of transliteration which is more familiar to ourselves.¹

I. THE BELĀ. This is the best known part of Moab. It was covered by Conder's survey, and has been most easily visited by other travellers. Mâdaba, one of Herr Musil's two centres for his work, lies in it ; six of his twenty-one expeditions touched some part of it, while four of them (1901, i. v. 1902, iii.) were entirely within it. His survey did not extend nearly so far north as Conder's,² but widely supplements this to the east, where he makes numerous additions to our knowledge of the place-names. Within the region covered by both, when their topography differs, it is well to keep in mind Herr Musil's modest appreciation of the reliability of his maps and his statement that he has laid more importance on the correct nomenclature than on the exact positions of the sites which he has mapped. The nomenclature appears to have been rendered with especial care, and on the whole is to be preferred to that of others ; but Conder's map will still remain the standard for the natural features and relative positions of the sites.

¹ Thus, where he spells with *j* (the German *j*) I have put *y* or *i* ; for his more correct *ǰ* I use the more usual English *j* ; his *ħ* I render *kh* and his *ʿ* by *th*.

² Musil's map does not go farther north than Tell er-Rameh, in the Ghor, 'Ain Hesbân and er-Razib (approximately the northern boundary of Moab), while Conder's extends across Ammonite territory to the W. el-Hammâm.

The Belka divides practically into two parts, and Herr Musil traversed both in several directions. Of its main plateau he knows all the shallow wâdies—fertile beds below stony ridges—rich opportunities both of pasturage and agriculture. He has recognized the remains of the ancient culture of the olive and vine, and how easily this may be restored. As it is, the Belka produces much grain; when I was there in 1904 corn dealers from Jerusalem were buying up the harvests before they were reaped. But there are few or no springs on the plateau. The dams and reservoirs of the Greek period have fallen into ruin; and when the winter rains fail, as they did in 1900-1901, a famine rapidly ensues. The other part of this northerly region of Moab consists of the rugged wâdies which break from the plateau into the Ghor. Here, below the softer strata of limestone, springs appear, and there is even a waterfall at the 'Uyûn Mûsa, in which Herr Musil's photograph of July, 1901, shows more water than I found in July, 1891. Our author's descriptions as well as his maps do justice to the extraordinarily numerous ruins—remains (as throughout the most of Moab) mainly of the Byzantine cities. Naturally Mâdaba and its surroundings receive most attention; the town-walls, old streets, the ten churches (for there were ten), the beautiful mosaic pavements¹ and reservoirs are all carefully described. Here the same rapid destruction of ruins is taking place as we have to deplore in the rest of Moab; the natural result of the re-population of ancient sites under the now more secure government of the Turk. "That the antiquities of Mâdaba vanish from day to day is the more to be deplored, since one finds in every private house beautiful mosaic floors. For it is certain that we have to do here with a native branch of art, which from the

¹ In addition to the famous mosaic map, Father Biever reports having seen a more comprehensive one, which included Rome and Babylon! (116).

point of view of the history of art appears highly important ” (pp. 115 f.). There is not space to recount all the sites described by Herr Musil in this once densely populated district, but I must at least mention his interesting accounts of Nebo, Heshbon, Umm el-Brak, and his appreciation of the importance of the principal sites in the extreme north-east, er-Razîb, es-Suk, Nêfa’a, el-Yadûdeh and at-Toneyb. The older remains of the district, the dolmens and cromlechs, are not so fully treated as by Conder ; but there is a long description of those at el-Kweyjiye, in which he failed to find “any artificial markings which would point to a religious ritual ” (268). “All are so placed that the summit of el-Kwejžije [so spelt by Herr Musil according to the Bedouin pronunciation and his system of transliteration] is visible from them.” This suggests the idea “that a Temple with the image of the deity or something similar once stood above, and that the dolmens were erected round about by pilgrims *ex voto*. Animals were probably sacrificed on the dolmens, and while their blood was poured out on the upper stones, the sacrificer directed his eyes to the deity on the summit, a precedent observed also to-day by the Bedouin when they make pilgrimages to the grave of their ancestors ” (269). Of the identifications noted by Herr Musil in this part of Moab the following may be noted : Bamoth-Baal or Bamoth (Num. xxi. 19, xxii. 41 ; Isa. xv. 2), with the southern slopes of Mount Neba ; the town of Nebo, with Khurbet el-Mkhayyet ; Beth-Pe’or, with esh-Sheikh-Gâzel ; *the valley* (hag-Gai) with the valley of the wells of Moses ; Ashdôth ha-Pisgah with the W. en-Na’am ; Abel hash-shiṭṭim, with W. es-Seyâle ; Beth hay-yeshîmôth with Khurbet es-Sweyîmeh.

One very interesting fact is confirmed by Herr Musil. The Ordnance Survey Map marks a fragment of an ancient road on the direct line from Jericho to the hot springs of

the W. Zerka Mâ'in, but fails to continue it to the latter. Nor could I find an ancient road leading down to those springs when I was there in 1904 (*P.E.F. Quarterly Statement*, 1905, 224), and my guides denied there was any direct road from the springs to Jericho. In 1906, however, Dr. Cropper and Professor Bacon were more fortunate (*idem*, 1906, 297). They found a stretch of basalt pavement on the incline above the hot springs, and proofs of an ancient road "in well arranged gradients and boundary walls" at the top, also more remnants further on. They reached Jericho in thirteen hours. Now Herr Musil tells us that from Bar-râkât below Mount Nebo to the south-west he saw the white line of "the ancient road from Jericho to the hot springs of ez-Zâra or Zerka Mâ'in." It traverses aba-l-Hasan, one of the broad stages by which the mountains of Moab rise from the Dead Sea (271). The hot springs of Hammâm ez-Zerka have been so often visited that except for some names Herr Musil has little new to tell. In this connexion we may note that in the debate whether these springs or the hot springs farther north at ez-Zâra (so Musil spells the name often given as eṣ-Şara) are those to which Herod was carried in his last illness, Musil decides (with Seetzen, Dechent and others) for ez-Zâra. But I still think that Josephus means by Kallirrhoe, "down on" which he says those springs were situated, the main stream of the Zerka Mâ'in (see my article *P.E.F.Q.*, 1905, 223 f.). If the sick and aged king had in any case to be brought by the road which passes them, what was the use of carrying him farther?

II. EL-JEBÂL. On this the narrowest division of Moab I have space to note only the following. The wâdies east of the main road, which flow south into the Seyl Heydân or el-Hammâm, were differently named by Herr Musil's informants from the names given to me by Khalîl of Mâdaba

(*P.E.F.Q.*, 1905, 46); though we agree as to the name ez-Zerdâb in which some of them unite. One regrets that Herr Musil was not able to examine more thoroughly the ruins of el-Ḳreiyât (133), the Kiriathaim of Jeremiah xlvi. 1, 23; but he has fixed its position. This is one of the sites in Moab which would richly repay excavation. When I saw it in 1904 (from a distance) it was as yet free from the re-settlement which is destroying so many of the ancient remains in Moab; but we cannot believe that it will be long left alone.

Herr Musil visited Mkawr¹ or Machaerus more than once (96, 134 f., 237 ff.). The hostility between his guides and the Ḥamâyde Arabs, who inhabit the neighbourhood, prevented him from making more than a rapid survey on two of his visits. He gives us a detailed and lucid account of the topography, which makes us regret all the more that we have not from him a fuller description of the ruins of the town, of the castle now called el-Meshneḳeh, and of the important remains to the south-east of the town. With regard to these I may refer the reader to my own accounts in the *Quarterly Statement* for 1895 (pp. 224-30, 357-60). Like myself, Herr Musil was impressed with the sublime view from el-Meshneḳeh; and he confirms my report that not only the Mount of Olives but a part of Jerusalem is visible from it. He was struck with the similarity between the appearance of Jebel Fardeys (the Frank Mountain) near Bethlehem, and el-Meshneḳeh. He adds: "Fardeys was heightened by Herod by means of banking-walls. On the platform which thus resulted the king erected a palace, and involuntarily the thought arises whether el-Meshneḳa (*sic*) had not the same builder." There can be little doubt of this. Ḳasr el-Meshneḳeh (the name as given to me) is the ruin of Herod's Machaerus, the reputed prison of John

¹ His transliteration of the local pronunciation is Mċawer.

the Baptist. The plan drawn by Dr. Buchanan and my own notes of the place correspond, as I have shown,¹ to the account of the stronghold by Josephus² in every detail of site and feature save one—the position of the “lower city” relative to the castle. For the city ruins, now called *Mkawr*, do not lie so close to the castle as Josephus implies that “the lower city” lay, but are nearly a mile to the east across a deep valley. These ruins, however, are, as far as I could judge, wholly Byzantine; and the town which they represent may not have been built till long after the destruction of Herod’s castle of Machaerus by Lucilius Bassus in 71 or 72 A.D. Neither in the Hasmonean nor Herodian period is Machaerus described as anything but a stronghold: an outlying fortress of the Jews towards the territory of the Nabateans. Any neighbouring settlement of people, worthy of the title “town” or “city,” and possessing the same name, would naturally be found immediately under it (say on the south, in which direction the causeway runs from the castle). There must have lain “the lower city of Josephus.” After the Romans dismantled the fortress we do not find Machaerus (so far as I know) described as a fortress; and it is probable that the inhabitants of “the lower city,” deprived of their protection there, moved to the ridge on the west, where the Byzantine ruins lie which are now called *Mkawr*. There are, as is well known, many precedents for such a drifting of the name. This ridge, to which Herr Musil gives the name *ed-Dejr* (i.e. *ed-Deyr*), but which *Ḳhalil* named to me *et-Ṭeyr*, bears upon it, some distance south of *Mkawr*, a large number of stone circles and curious platforms, which continue all the way to *Khurbet ‘Attârûs*, the *‘Aṭarôth* of the Old Testament. Herr Musil, if I mistake not, reports only remains of terraces for retaining the soil, but there

¹ *P.E.F.Q.*, 1905, 226 f.

² *Wars*, VII. vi. 1 f.

are also the erections I have just mentioned, more frequent than I have seen anywhere else in Moab. They imply a large population, but as I found no domestic ruins among them except at Mkawr and 'Attârûs they appear to indicate that their long and straggling site formed an important religious centre.

The name 'Attârûs attaches to-day to two different spots. About an hour and a quarter north-east of Mkawr¹ is Khurbet 'Attârûs. Herr Musil gives a careful plan (396) of the site and ruins of this once walled city, with the two trenches, north and south, across the ridge on which it lies. The details agree with my description in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1905, 360. We differ as to the names given us by our guides for the surrounding wâdies. North-east from Khurbet 'Attârûs, forty minutes² by an ancient track, I came to a conspicuous elevation crowned by a great mound of ruined stones, to which the name Rujm 'Attârûs was given to me, i.e. Cairn of 'Attârûs. It lies on the brink of the deep W. Zerka Mâ'in, and as you look up to it from the bed of the latter forms the summit of what is known as the Jebel, or Mount, 'Attârûs. This is the name which Herr Musil gives to it. The stones represent what is not actually a cairn, though it appears to be so, but a platform (80 by 110 metres, says Musil) of ruined buildings. I seemed to trace round it the remains of a wall.

It is remarkable that within two miles there should be two sites possessing the same name. But Numbers xxxii. gives both an 'Aṭarôth (verses 3 and 34), a city of Gad, and an 'Atrôth-Shôphân (verse 35). Professor Gray, in his commentary, thinks that Shôphân is probably a tribal name. The reading, however, is uncertain. The Samaritan

¹ Musil gives the direct distance at about 4½ kilometres, but the way between the two winds a great deal in avoidance of the valleys that separate them.

² Musil gives practically the same time, 43 minutes.

Shephîm suggests the meaning heights, and this is suitable to the Rujm or Jebel 'Atţârûs. Both, according to the Hebrew, were fenced cities.

Other points of interest in the district el-Jebâl are these. Musil spells the name of the hot springs below Machaerus as ez-Zara, while all others spell eş-Şara, but he agrees with those who identify the name with the Şereth of Joshua xiii. 19: the text of this passage is, however, uncertain. We have already seen his identification of the springs with Kallirrhoe. The ancient road which I followed across the back of el-Jebâl from Mkawr by 'Atţârûs to Libb is also given by Musil; but he shows besides how it continues eastward to the upper waters of the W. el-Wâleh (there the W. eth-Thamad) and the Desert. In the neighbourhood of its crossings of the two trunk roads north and south stands ed-Dîlet el-Gharbiyyeh—"once a great and strong town on the N.N.W. slope of the range which forms the southern limit of the fruitful plain of Mâdaba. With its loftily situated and powerful castle it commands the three roads [above mentioned] . . . , and was thus of great strategical importance." Musil suggests its identification with the ('Almon) Diblathaim of Numbers xxxiii. 46 (251, 253).¹ Other important sites noted are west of the trunk-road Fizâret en-Nakķûba; on the road itself Libb, first identified by Schlatter with the Lemba or Libba of Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 15, 4; xiv. 1, 4); and to the east Jerwân, Keryeh Mleh, el-'Elaki, the powerful el-Ĥeri, Zeynab (apparently "much older" than el-Ĥeri, and presumably of pre-roman origin), Umm-el-Walîd (which Musil, 107, 122, suggests as the Yahaş of Numbers xxi. 23: *towards the desert*; cf. Jerome and the Moabite Stone), and further north Ziza (marked by Ptolemy), which reminds Musil of the Zûzîm of Genesis xiv. 5.

¹ LXX Γελμων Διβλαθαιμ; Jer. xlviii. 22, בֵּית רַבְלָתַיִם; also mentioned on the Moabite Stone.

consideration of which I was capable, had the same effect upon other thinking men as upon myself. I should, however, prefer a somewhat different comparison. The search for truth, no doubt, involves a struggle against the spirit of error and prejudice in oneself and in others; but I should rather picture the work as the mapping out of a partially unexplored territory, than as the assault on an enemy's position. Each explorer begins with what his predecessors have stored up in the way of facts or inferences or even of hearsay, but progress is made not in learning off these particulars by heart, and refusing to listen to anything which militates against them, but in separating the real from the imaginary, in careful sifting of evidence, in the laborious collection of new facts and the investigation of their mutual relations.

Before proceeding to consider the objections of my critic, whom for convenience sake I shall henceforth designate as X, I am afraid I must recapitulate, as briefly as possible, the main points of the argument which has led me to the conclusion that the Brethren of the Lord were sons of Joseph and Mary. I feel that my thanks are due to X for supplying the stimulus needed to make me reconsider these various points in the light thrown upon them in later publications, such as Zahn's *Forschungen*, pt. vi. pp. 225-363; Gore's *Dissertation on the Virgin-Birth*; Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ* on the "Virgin-Birth," the "Infancy" and the "Brethren of the Lord." But, as it must be plain to every one, who has looked at the chapter on the subject, contained in my *Introduction to the Epistle of St. James*, that the argument there given is not simple, but highly complicated and cumulative, I think I may justly complain when I find X attempting to tie me down to a single point, as in p. 74, where he says that I "lay claim on the strength of this

18 HELVIDIAN *VERSUS* EPIPHANIAN HYPOTHESIS

statement (*viz.* Tertullian's assertion that the Brethren were uterine brothers of our Lord) to have proved that James, the Lord's brother, was the son of Joseph and Mary"; and again in p. 78, where we read that "it is on certain scriptural statements alone that the half-brother theory rests its case." It is true that, in my opinion, the scriptural evidence is conclusive in itself, and, therefore, I shall deal with it first; but there is an amplitude of confirmatory evidence, which we have no right to ignore, and which I propose to treat of under the two heads of Tradition and Sentiment.

First then as to Scripture, the evidence may also be considered under two heads: (1) What we are told as to the Birth, the Infancy, and the Childhood of Jesus; and (2) What we are told as to the household of Nazareth during his manhood.

It may be well to begin with a general view of the situation as given in the early chapters of St. Luke and St. Matthew. A Hebrew maiden of some sixteen years, apparently descended from David, is espoused to a carpenter of the same lineage, and is looking forward to be married to him within a year. She is related to the wife of the priest Zechariah, who, like some of the older heroines of her race, especially Sarah and Hannah, after long endurance of what Jewish women felt to be the bitter reproach of barrenness, had been gladdened by the promise made to her husband, that a child should be granted to them in their old age, who should come in the spirit and power of Elijah, to prepare the way for the Messiah. Shortly afterwards Mary herself receives a yet higher intimation from the angel Gabriel, telling her that she shall bear a child who shall be called the Son of the Most High, shall inherit the throne of his father David, and rule over the house of Jacob for ever. Mary's answer is made up

of two parts—a query, “How shall this be?” and the reason for the query, “Seeing I know not a man.” The query is natural enough. How is it possible that one in such low estate should be so highly honoured? Compare the words put into the mouth of Mary on her visit to Elizabeth in *Protev.* 12), *Μαριὰμ δὲ ἐπελάθετο τῶν μυστηρίων ὧν εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὴν Γαβριήλ, καὶ ἀτενίσασα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶπε, Τίς εἰμι ἐγώ, ὅτι πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαὶ τῆς γῆς μακαριοῦσιν ἐμέ;* And this is the prevailing tone of the hymn which follows, framed, as it is, on Hannah’s psalm of thanksgiving. It is in accordance also with the explanation given by the angel: “The greatness foretold comes not from you, but from the working of the Divine Spirit. Your part is simply to believe that no word of God can fail of its accomplishment.”

But I think every reader must feel that the reason Mary assigns for her query is not at all what we should have expected. The espoused wife would surely have concluded that the child promised must be the offspring of her intended marriage. What should have led her to make what would seem the very inappropriate remark, that the marriage was not yet consummated? The answer given by some of the Fathers, in accordance with the statement found in the apocryphal Gospel *De Nativitate Mariæ* is that we are to regard the words not as a simple statement of an existing fact, but as a resolution or vow of virginity.¹ Cornelius à Lapide compares it with a similar statement which might be made by a Carthusian, *Non vescor carnibus*; and regards it as a special glory of Mary that she sets more store by her own vow than by the promise of the Messiah: *Angelus partum nuntiat*

¹ It is debated among the older commentators whether this vow was made for her by her parents in infancy, or by herself after she was grown up, or in concert with Joseph on their betrothal.

at illa virginitati adhaeret. But (1) according to Jewish law (Num. xxx. 1-16) a woman's vow, whatever its nature, was not binding against the will of her father and husband, and (2) have we any example of a vow of this nature among Jewish women? We know what was Elizabeth's feeling on the subject, how she speaks of her conception as "taking away her shame among men"; and, according to the Protevangelium, which may perhaps be trusted, where it deals, not with facts, but with the feeling of the time, this feeling was doubly strong in the case of Anna, the mother of Mary.

Supposing, however, that we accept the possibility of such a vow, how are we to account for the betrothal? How are the two compatible? After the angel's announcement, we can see a reason for the marriage, but how for betrothal before the announcement, if no marriage were intended? Evidently there was no previous suspicion of her future destiny in the Virgin's mind; or why should she have been so startled at the announcement when it came? To suppose a vow seems to impute to St. Luke or his authority such an ideal of marriage as gained favour with later apocryphal writers¹ (though prohibited by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians vii. 5), and which subsequently blossomed out into the scandals of the *συνείσακτοι ἀδελφαί* (see 1 Cor. ix. 5) condemned in the first Council of Nicaea. Again, the expression *οὐ γινώσκω ἄνδρα* is not what we should have expected. Maldonatus himself shrinks from the literal translation "I know not a man," and prefers "I do not know my husband." Want of refinement, however, is characteristic of Jewish writings, as is evidenced by the changes which are now generally made in reading certain Lessons in Church. It is also to be noted that

¹ Cf. the *Acta Xanthippae*, edited by M. R. James in *Apocrypha Anecdota*, vol. ii. part 3.

οὐκ ἔγνω ἄνδρα is a regular legal phrase for an unmarried woman (see Gen. xix. 8; Num. xxxi. 17, 18, 35; Jud. xxi. 12). But there is nothing to show that *οὐ γινώσκω ἄνδρα* would have been understood in the sense "I am under a vow." Why not *εὐχὴν ἔχω* (or *εὐχῆ δέδεμαι*) *τοῦ μὴ γινῶναι ἄνδρα*? The only explanation known to me, which gives a natural sense to the words, is a suggestion I have seen, I forget where, that the Greek *συλλήμψη* in Luke i. 31 may be an incorrect translation of an Aramaic original, meaning "Behold thou art now conceiving¹ in thy womb," to which *οὐ γινώσκω ἄνδρα* would be a natural rejoinder on the part of one who was seeking to find a reconciliation of two seemingly contradictory facts, not opposing her human volition (the vow) to the Divine Will. I should be glad to know whether this interpretation meets the approval of Aramaic scholars. If not, I confess that I am disposed to look upon the words *ἐπεὶ οὐ γινώσκω ἄνδρα* as a marginal adscript, which has crept into the text in the same way as the insertion of injunctions to fast in Mark ix. 29, Matthew xvii. 21.² I am led to this conclusion not only by the many difficulties we have been considering, but by the want of harmony between the apparent self-assertion of verse 34 and the general tone of the Gospel of the Infancy, especially the beautiful submission [of verse 38, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word."]

The next passage which presents itself for consideration is Matthew i. 18, *μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου*. On learning this fact, Joseph is disposed

¹ Compare *Protev.* xi., *συλλήμψη ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ*.

² I learn from the article on Mary in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* that the same suggestion is made by Kattenbusch in his treatise on the Apostles' Creed, pp. 562-565.

22 HELVIDIAN *VERSUS* EPIPHANIAN HYPOTHESIS²

to put her away secretly, but an angel appears to him in a dream and bids him take her to wife, because τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἁγίου, and to give the name Jesus to the child who shall be born, since it is he who shall save his people from their sins. What we naturally gather from these words is that the betrothal of Joseph and Mary was a betrothal like other betrothals, with a view to a marriage like other marriages. Its character is changed first by the fact of Mary's pregnancy, and then by the angelic intimation made to Joseph with respect to it. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxviii. 20) notices the phrase πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν as a difficulty in the way of his assumption that Joseph, at the time of his betrothal, was an octogenarian, and that Mary was assigned to him by lot, as a ward, not as a wife. He allows that the words naturally suggest a looking forward to the subsequent marriage union on the part of Joseph, but this, he says, was impossible owing to his age; and there he leaves the matter. It is sufficient to say that the supposition of the extreme age of Joseph, which Epiphanius borrows from the Apocryphal Gospels, fails to accomplish what the advocates of the Perpetual Virginity regard as the chief end of Mary's marriage, viz., to screen her from injurious imputations, such as are recorded by Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* i. 28 and 32); and it has been generally abandoned by modern upholders of this theory.¹ Another defence against the inference derived from the word συνελθεῖν has been attempted by the writer of the article on the Brethren of the Lord contained in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ*. It is there asserted that συνελθεῖν means

¹ Many of the Fathers, beginning with Ignatius (*Eph.* xix., where see Lightfoot) supply a more mysterious reason for the marriage, as a means of deceiving Satan, who looked for the Christ to be born of a Virgin according to prophecy, and could not conceive of a Virgin-Wife.

nothing more than "set up house together," but surely the sense is sufficiently proved by the words which follow, *εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα* and *οὐκ ἐγένωσκεν αὐτήν*. As Maldonatus says, it is a euphemism, much like that in 1 Corinthians vii. 5, where the best reading is *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε*, instead of the old *συνέρχθητε*.

In Matthew i. 25 we read *οὐκ ἐγένωσκεν αὐτήν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν*, but Epiphanius (c. 17) gives *οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτήν ἕως ὅτου ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον*. He endeavours to evade the natural force of the words by treating *ἔγνω* as if it were equivalent to *ἦδει*, and asks how Joseph was to know the dignity of Mary until he had seen the miraculous birth? Then with regard to *πρωτότοκον* he says: We must not translate it by her "first-born son," but by "her son, the firstborn of all creation."

Neither of these fancies has commended itself to modern Epiphanians; but Bishop Pearson, following some of the Fathers, and himself followed by Dr. Mill, has endeavoured to show that "the manner of the scripture language produceth no such inference, as that, from a limit assigned to a negative, we may imply a subsequent affirmative," and, strange to say, this has been accepted without examination even by so great a scholar as Lightfoot. As an example of Pearson's illustrations I may quote, "Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child till the day of her death, yet it were a ridiculous stupidity to dream of any midwifery in the grave." Even X owns that the anti-Helvidians went too far in their efforts to explain away the force of *ἕως*, and allows (p. 76, n. 1) that I have been, "with some justice, very severe on the cases of supposed parallelism brought forward by Bishop Pearson"; but he adds, "He should have stopped there, for his own venture at illustration is no happier."

I am sorry that X has failed to see the force of my argu-

ment, and will do my best to make it clearer. Pearson having denied that a limit assigned to a negative can imply a subsequent affirmative, I answered by distinguishing between two kinds of limit, one of which suggests, while the other negatives the future occurrence of the action spoken of. Thus the statement that "the debate was adjourned till the papers should be in the hands of the members," as certainly implies the intention to resume the debate at a subsequent period, as the statement that "the debate was adjourned for six months" implies the contrary. The only question is, which kind of limit do we find in the sentence *οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν*. Evidently it is a very different case to that of Michal. The limit is just that point of time at which the action so long forbidden, not only by the angel's warning, but also by the law of nature, as Clement says, and by the rule of the Church given in the Apostolic Constitutions, becomes both possible and natural.¹ We may compare the well-known parallel in Orig. *c. Cels.* i. 37, where it is said of Ariston, the father of Plato, *καλυθέντος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος αὐτῇ* (his wife Perictione) *συνέλθειν ἕως ἀποκυήσει τὸν ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος σπαρέντα*; after which two sons and a daughter were born to him.² In like manner, if we read "Michal had no child till she left David and became the wife of Phaltiel," it were a ridiculous stupidity (to use Pearson's vigorous phrase) to doubt that the writer intended us to understand that she did have a child afterwards.

It is not quite easy to understand the objection made to this reasoning by X. (p. 76, n. 1). "Obviously the statement that the debate was adjourned till the papers

¹ See the note on p. xxxiv. of my edition of St. James, and add a reference to the Life of Zenobia by Treb. Poll. (*Hist. Aug.* vol. ii. p. 117, Teubner).

² See Diog. L. iii. 5 with the notes of Menage.

should be in the hands of the members, carries the inference suggested, as would any other such general proposition. But we deny that this is a statement of that nature." I do not know whether my readers will find this more intelligible, if I quote from the text to which the note refers. It is said there that, "while it is true the explicit mention of Joseph's attitude towards our Lord's mother, taken as a general statement, implies a changed attitude later . . . yet a careful perusal of the paragraph shows that it is far from having the nature of a general statement. The passage is best regarded as a memorandum in the writing of Joseph, penned expressly for a double purpose" (viz., (1) to testify to the truth of the Virgin's story, (2) to assert that Joseph, equally with Mary, was acting in obedience to the divine command). "This latter point," it is added, "is invariably ignored¹ by those who press the earlier part to further the significance of their general proposition." I do not wish to speak harshly of X, but I confess I cannot see any point in these remarks of his. If Joseph knew that Mary remained a virgin after the birth of Jesus, as before, why did he use, what is at any rate an ambiguous phrase, *ἕως οὖν*, and not say distinctly *καὶ ἐκ τούτου οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτήν ποτε*, or *ἕως τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν*? But what a strange fancy that one who had had such proofs of God's protecting providence should have supposed that a memorandum from himself was required to guard his wife's honour, or could have dreamt that an affidavit signed by him would have the effect of shielding her from the aspersions which were afterwards cast upon her! But *non tali auxilio!*

¹ If this means that Helvidians suppose Joseph and Mary to have acted merely *proprio motu*, it is flatly opposed to what is said in p. xxxvi. of my edition of St. James, "Whichever way the divine guidance might lead them, we may be sure that the response of Mary would be still, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it unto me according to thy word.'"

God is His own interpreter,
And He will make it plain.

In treating of this verse in my edition of St. James, I quoted Laurent's comment on the use of the imperfect *ἐγίνωσκε*, as implying abstention from a habit in contrast to the more usual *ἔγνων*. X (p. 76, n. 3) expresses his dissent, and maintains that the imperfect was necessary to convey the meaning which he supports. "The aorist would have favoured the Helvidian theory. It would have implied a definite abstention on the part of Joseph for a single occasion." It is important here to notice that this is the only instance of the use of the imperfect *ἐγίνωσκε* in this sense, either in the New Testament or the LXX. It is probable, therefore, that there is some special reason for its being chosen. The most usual force of the imperfect is to express continuous action for a limited period in the past, in contradistinction from the present tense which expresses continuous action prolonged up to the present time. A familiar example is 1 Corinthians xiii. 11, *ὅτε ἤμην νήπιος, ἐλάλουν . . . ἐφρόνουν . . . ἐλογιζόμεν ὡς νήπιος· ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ, κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου*, which might be otherwise expressed by saying *ἐλάλουν, ἐφρόνουν, ἐλογιζόμεν ὡς νήπιος, ἕως ἀνὴρ ἐγενόμην*, a sentence agreeing in form with the one before us. On the other hand, the aorist is used to summarize a fact of the past, without necessarily indicating whether it is momentary or continuous. Thus it is used of a continuous fact in such passages as Judges ix. 22, *ἤρξεν Ἀβιμέλεχ τρία ἔτη*; 2 Samuel v. 5, *τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη ἐβασίλευσεν*; Genesis xxiv. 16, *παρθένος ἦν, ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἔγνων αὐτήν*, which covers the whole life of Rebekah up to her marriage with Isaac, similarly Genesis xix. 8. In the horrible story of Judges xix. 25 we find the aorist joined with imperfect, *ἔγνωσαν αὐτήν καὶ ἐπέπαιζον ὄλην τὴν νύκτα*. Sometimes indeed the aorist becomes equivalent to

our present, as in Numbers xvi. 5, *ἐπέσκεπται καὶ ἔγνω Θεός τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ*; Exodus xviii. 11, *νῦν ἔγνω ὅτι μέγας Κύριος*; or where it acquires an iterative or gnomic force, as in James i. 11, *ἀνέτειλε*; i. 24, *κατενόησεν*.

I go on now to Luke ii. 7, *ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον*. There is no question as to the proper meaning of the word *πρωτότοκος*,¹ but Bishop Lightfoot holds that to a Jew it conveyed the idea of special consecration, and that St. Luke himself shows that this typical reference was foremost in his own mind by quoting the law on the subject in verse 33. But is there any reason for supposing such a close connexion between the verses? The story of the Birth is followed by the visit of the shepherds, and that again by the Circumcision. Then at length comes the Presentation in the Temple, which is an independent narrative, introduced to give the prophetic utterances of Simeon and Anna, and explained by the offering required by the law.

I still think Bishop Lightfoot's argument is sufficiently answered by what I have written in p. 25: "No doubt the law as to the firstborn is equally valid, whether there are other children or not; but St. Luke is not here concerned in stating the law, but in giving a narrative of domestic life, viewed retrospectively from the standpoint of accomplished facts. Under these circumstances the use of *πρωτότοκος* is surely misleading, and therefore improbable, if there were no children afterwards." In my note on the same page I have quoted the definition given by Severianus, *πρωτότοκος λέγεται ὁ ἀδελφῶν ἔχων*, and have pointed out that, wherever the word occurs either in the LXX

¹ Dr. Edersheim remarks that, if the Epiphanian theory were true, our Lord would not have been the heir to David's throne, as Joseph's elder sons would have ranked before him.

or the New Testament, even when used metaphorically, it retains this general connotation. Let us see what answer X makes to this. In p. 77 he says: "St. Luke is carefully fashioning his language on the model of the Old Testament, and adhering closely to highly technical phraseology. It is unsafe to base any argument on the use of a word with a precise liturgical value, and to adduce it as evidence of numerical quantity." In *n.* 4 he adds: "Dr. Plummer remarks that the word implies the possibility of subsequent children, and asks whether St. Luke would have used the word after this possibility had been decided, and Mary had had no other child." "Such a question," X thinks, "surprising. It ignores the chief characteristic of the narrative, and assumes that St. Luke would substitute a statistical detail for a picturesque touch."

I think the only answer to be made to this is that X himself must have a highly liturgical mind, by which I mean a mind that holds fast to phrases and formulas (compare his insistence on "general propositions" a few pages back), and cares little to penetrate to the underlying thoughts and facts. One part of our Lord's work was to do away with the "liturgical values" of His time; and it was because he carried on the same work afterwards that St. Paul was so hated by his countrymen.

The return from Egypt suggests to X an argument in favour of the Epiphanian hypothesis, because St. Matthew uses the same words in describing it as he had used in his description of the flight from Bethlehem, "he took the young child and his mother," and yet, according to the received chronology, a space of time had elapsed "in which the Helvidian theory would require, at least, one child to have been born" (p. 78). The simple answer is that the Evangelists exclude irrelevant matter, and that

the presence of another child at this period is not of the slightest importance. It need not even involve the use of an additional ass for their journey.

There is another incident of the Lord's childhood which appears to me, not indeed of itself to prove the existence of younger children, but to fall in with the supposition that there were such children. It is the visit to the Temple in our Lord's twelfth year. Is it likely that Mary and Joseph would have been so little solicitous about an only son, and that son the promised Messiah, as to travel for a whole day without taking the pains to ascertain whether he was in their company or not? If they had several young children to attend to, we can understand that their first thought would have been given to the latter. Otherwise is it conceivable that Mary, however complete her confidence in her eldest son, should have first lost him from her side, and then have allowed so long a time to pass without an effort to find him?

No attempt to answer this is made by X, but he puts forward another consideration which, he thinks, suggests a different conclusion (p. 79). Referring to Luke ii. 41, he says: "We are told that Mary went up to the Passover each year during their residence at Nazareth; could a journey of twice eighty miles be made at a specific date annually by a woman who was fulfilling the functions of motherhood to a large and increasing family?" The original merely says that it was the custom of his parents to go up yearly to the Passover (*ἐπορεύοντο κατ' ἔτος*). Of course such a custom does not imply an iron rule which allows of no exception. We have a parallel in the story of Hannah. We are told thrice over that she and her husband Elkanah and all his house used to go up yearly to sacrifice at Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 3, 7, 21), but in verse 22 we read that Hannah refused to go up during the time (prob-

ably three years) which elapsed between the birth and the weaning of Samuel.

We go on now to the consideration of what we are told about the Holy Family after the commencement of our Lord's public Ministry. From Mark vi. 1-6 (supplemented by Matt. xiii. 54, and Luke iv. 16 f.) we learn what was the general idea which the people of his own town, Nazareth, entertained of Jesus and of His family. He had been preaching in their synagogue on a text from Isaiah, and all were astonished at the wisdom and power with which He spoke. "Whence," said they, "hath this man this wisdom? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James and Joses and Simon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? And they were offended in him. And Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour save in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house."

I think the natural impression produced on any unprejudiced reader of these words is that the four brothers and two or more sisters here spoken of were children of Joseph and Mary,¹ that some of them at any rate were not in entire sympathy with Jesus, that the sisters were probably married in Nazareth, and in some way separate from the mother and the brethren; lastly, that Joseph himself was dead.

Taking our general cue from this passage, I proceed now to consider the earliest mention made of the Brethren.

¹ I do not of course deny (as seems to be assumed in p. 85 n.) that, as Jesus was generally known to his fellow-citizens as son of Joseph, so He might be generally spoken of as brother of Joseph's sons by a former wife, *if the fact of a former marriage were proved*; but this is just the point in question; unless it can be distinctly proved, the probability is greatly in favour of the word "brother" being used in its ordinary sense; and my quotations above are meant to show that the scripture narrative does not favour the supposition.

This is in John ii. 12, *μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ, αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μητὴρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας.* The immediately preceding event was the marriage of Cana, of which we are told¹ that the mother of Jesus was there, presumably as of right, and that Jesus and His disciples were invited to the marriage. It would seem, therefore, that His mother was closely connected with the family who were celebrating the marriage feast. It is not distinctly stated that the brothers were there, but as they are not named as included in the invitation given to the disciples, and yet are mentioned in company with the mother in verse 12, we naturally suppose that they shared the same right as she did to be present at the marriage. The comment of X on this passage is curious. He states in p. 78 n. 1 that "St. John never associates the brethren with the Virgin. At Cana they are present in the house, and Jesus and His disciples are called." But if we are right in inferring, what is not distinctly stated, that the brothers were present in the house, then they were undoubtedly associated with the Virgin, whose presence is asserted by St. John. X continues, "When they leave, St. John, as usual, speaks of the company in pairs, but he transposes them and adds, He and his mother and *the* brethren and His disciples," where, I suppose, X considers that the change of "his" into "the" before "brethren" implies a doubt on the part of St. John as to their right to be called "brethren of the Lord." I content myself here with a small grammatical observation. Every one knows that the article in Greek frequently has the force of a possessive pronoun, and also that *αὐτοῦ* may be supplied from one word to another, as in Luke viii. 19, *ἡ μητὴρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ.* Would X translate this

¹ In verses 1, 2.

“The mother and his brethren”? Compare also John vii. 3, 5, 10, where we read thrice over *οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ*.

We find then that it is incorrect to say that St. John never associates the brethren with the Virgin, because he associates them at the marriage, and adds that they went down afterwards to Capernaum with His mother and His disciples, on which Westcott's comment is, “As yet the family life was not broken.” It is true their sojourn on this particular occasion was not for long, but from that time forth Capernaum is spoken of as the home, instead of Nazareth (Matt. iv. 13). The word “never” itself is misleading, when we remember that the brothers are only mentioned in two passages of St. John, and that the other passage (vii. 3–10) is that of which we shall speak shortly, where they endeavour to dissuade Jesus from going up to Jerusalem, and where the fact that nothing is said of the mother is probably to be understood as showing that she refused to share in their remonstrance.

I go on now to the scene described in Mark iii. 20–22, 31–33. “And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread. And when his friends (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*) heard it, they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself. And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils. . . . And there come his mother and his brethren (*ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ*); and standing without, they sent unto him, calling him. And a multitude was sitting about him; and they say unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek thee. And he answered them, and saith, Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them that sat round about him, he said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of

My review of Herr Musil's work in the rest of Moab and in Edom, with its ethnological and religious results, I must postpone till the next number of the EXPOSITOR.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

*THE HELVIDIAN VERSUS THE EPIPHANIAN
HYPOTHESIS.*

THE April number of the *Church Quarterly* contains an anonymous article on the Brethren of the Lord in support of what is known as the Epiphanian, in contrast to the Hieronymian and Helvidian theories. In p. 76 the recent history of this last theory is compared to [the temporary triumph of "a band of resolute men, under an intrepid leader, carrying a strong position through the sheer force of a splendid irresistible dash. . . . It takes us by surprise, and for the moment carries all before it. But such . . . brilliant assaults melt away under the dry light of criticism."

It would not have occurred to me to suppose that I was included among the heroes of this spirited narrative, were it not that I find two publications of mine specified among the authorities which stand at the head of the article, and also that my name appears in the course of the article more frequently than that of any other supporter of the Helvidian theory. On one point, I must demur to the above comparison, flattering though it may be. It is said that "the first sensation of the victors is that of utter surprise to find themselves in possession, a surprise which deepens into a conviction that this exploit should not have succeeded." As far as I am concerned, it could not be a matter of surprise if the evidence which had compelled me to adopt a certain view, after the fullest