

An Introduction

TO THE

STUDY OF

The Hebrews, Phoenicians

AND

The Medes and Persians

BY

EUGENE FAIR

---

Kirksville, Missouri  
Journal Printing Company  
1907

## PREFACE.

The writing of this pamphlet has been brought about wholly by the needs of the writer's classes in Oriental History. So far as he knows there is no outline of this subject that is suitable to his purposes. The usual works are either too extensive or out of date. There is no attempt made at originality. The facts have been drawn largely from such works as Cornill's History of the People of Israel; Ottley's Short History of the Hebrews; Day's Social Life of the Hebrews; Duff's Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews; Paton's Early History of Syria and Palestine; Milman's History of the Jews; Maspero's Struggle of the Nations and the Passing of the Empires; Clay's Light on the Old Testament from Babel; The Old Testament; Perrot and Chipiez's History of Art in Sardinia Judæa Syria and Asia Minor; Todd's Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel; Rawlinson's Story of Phoenicia; Jackson's Persia Past and Present; and Bury's History of Greece. In the body of the text Cor. stands for Cornill's History of the People of Israel, J. for Jackson's Persia Past and Present and R. for Rawlinson's Story of Phoenicia.

Special thanks are due to President John R. Kirk, Professor E. M. Violette and Mrs. Fair for consultation, aid and encouragement in many ways. The uniform courtesy and patience of the Journal Printing Company through its manager, Mr. Link, has been much appreciated at all times.

# THE HEBREWS.

## CHAPTER I.

### NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS AND THE PEOPLE.

The land occupied by the Hebrews while they were acting their chief part in history, as a united people, is almost wholly mountainous. Roughly speaking, its northern limit was about thirty-three degrees north latitude, its southern about thirty-one degrees north latitude, its western the Mediterranean, and its eastern the Arabian desert. We are accustomed to call it Palestine a name given it by the Greeks, which means Land of the Philistines (the Greeks had entered the country from the coast and so naturally came in contact with the Philistines first). The inhabitants themselves, during the best period of Hebrew history, called the land west of the Jordan Kenaan. Etymologically this word means "lowland" and so must have originally applied only to the Philisto-Phoenician coast lands. During this same period the land east of the Jordan was called Gilead. But modern historians speak of Palestine as including the land on both sides of the Jordan. Even then Palestine is a very small country, about 180 miles long and 30 to 60 miles broad, with an area of about 8500 square miles.

Two mountain ranges, spurs of the Lebanon and Anti-Libanus, run nearly parallel to the coast on each side of the Jordan valley. "From the foot of Mt. Hermon the valley of the Jordan rapidly sinks below the level of the Mediterranean; in the sixty miles between the lake of Galilee (680 ft. below sea-level) and the Dead Sea (1290 ft. below sea-level) the river falls some 600 feet" (Ottley p. 94). The mountainous country east of the Jordan is divided into three natural parts; the plateau of Bashan north of the river Yarmuk, the hill-country around the river Jabbok and the table-land south of this which extends to the Arnon river. The mountains west of the Jordan are broken into in only one place, the great plain of Esdraelon drained by the river Kishon.

This plain has always afforded an excellent means of outlet from the Jordan to the Mediterranean. South of this plain the range has a westward extension in Mt. Carmel, but the main portion extends on southward. The average height of the mountainous region of Palestine is between 2000 and 3000 feet above the sea, but Mt. Hermon is about 9000 feet.

Palestine as a whole is almost entirely shut out from the outside world. There are deserts on the east and south, on the west the Mediterranean which has no good harbor along this part of its coast, and which was almost unnavigable by the ships of the ancients because of the strong trade-winds. The country on the north is more accessible, though even here are the Lebanon and Anti-Libanus mountains. The various parts of Palestine are also isolated. The mountains have deep gorges which greatly impede intercourse; the Jordan has few fords and can not be navigated to any extent, instead of being a convenient means of transportation it is an almost impassable barrier.

But the isolation was not enough to produce a narrow and boorish provincialism. Palestine is a bridge between the Tigris-Euphrates and Nile valleys; it formed the same commercial link between the Phoenician cities and the Arabian Gulf.

Generally speaking the soil of Palestine is not very fertile in comparison with that of the great valleys we have studied. Its productivity is wholly dependent upon the winter rains and the dews of summer. There are almost all extremes of climate. Mt. Hermon is covered with perpetual snow. In the valley of the Jordan, a temperature as high as 109 F. in the shade, has been noted in May. Since the climate is so varied, there are naturally great variations in plant and animal life. All kinds of grain, figs, olives, grapes and pomegranates thrive, if enough labor is expended. In the sub-tropical regions are the balsam and the palm. Cedar grows on the mountain slopes. Some 2000 species of flowers have been noted. The common domestic animals were used, so far as is known, from the earliest times. "In early times wild beasts such as the lion and bear, the wolf and the panther, the jackal and the hyena, must have lived there in great numbers;

and even to this day, serpents are a great pest, Palestine having more than twenty species, among them five very dangerous and poisonous ones" (Cor. p. 15).

Such were the natural conditions that the Hebrews had to face. It meant a contest at every step. But the Hebrews were not the first, it is thought, to struggle with these adverse environments. Most scholars think the Hebrews migrated into the country from the Tigro-Euphrates valley; at any rate they were Semites and were akin to the Amonites, Arameans and Edomites. Having these facts in mind we may now attempt to trace the history of this people who made such a wonderful contribution to the development of world-civilization.

\* \* \*

## CHAPTER II.

### THE HEBREWS BEFORE THE FOUNDING OF THE KINGDOM (FROM ABOUT 2250 B. C. TO ABOUT 1000 B. C.)

Of the original sources for the study of Hebrew history the Old Testament is of primary importance. There are three parts of it which were ranked as canonical Scriptures "sometimes between the beginning of the fifth and the close of the third century B. C." (Ottley p. 3). The Law (Torah), includes the Pentateuch with its five books. This portion carries the account of the Hebrews back to their remote origins and closes with the end of the wanderings in the wilderness of Paran. Various legislative codes are also found in the Pentateuch. Much of this legal matter is arranged in the form of an historical narrative. But whether these enactments were made in the way the scriptures have it, is open to question.

The most valuable source materials found in the Old Testament are the Prophets. "The name 'former prophets' was in fact applied by the Jews to four historical books: those of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. The title 'latter' prophets' includes the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the twelve minor prophets (these last forming in the Jewish canon a single book).

The prophetic literature contains a considerable amount of actual history, but it is chiefly important in so far as it bears undesigned testimony to the moral and religious condition of the Hebrews during the particular epochs when the various prophets lived, taught and wrote. These writings lay bare those currents of national thought and feeling which issued in the public actions, measures, or lines of policy adopted by Israel's kings or statesmen. They throw a vivid light upon the dangers, external or internal, which threatened Israel's welfare at different periods between the eighth and third centuries B. C. (Ottley p. 3).

The third section of the Old Testament may be called the "Writings." They were likely collected at a comparatively late date in Jewish history. Generally speaking they are concerned with the Hebrews after the period of exile. Few of the Writings are historical in character—Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah may be looked upon as such. The form of Esther and Ruth is historical, but not the content, and none of the books can be used as complete sources.

The Hebrews themselves have supplied us with practically no other sources besides the Bible, but the inscriptions and various records of other people help us here. From the Egyptians, Babylonians and Assyrians we learn much about the Hebrews, in fact this knowledge gained has brought about great changes in the study of the scriptures.

On the 300 years between the death of Nehemiah (about 430 B. C.) and the time of the Maccabees, very little source material remains. Something, however, can be gained from the writings of Josephus, the extra-canonical writers and from classical literature. The first two books of the Maccabees give some valuable information on the period they cover, "and there are various apocryphal and pseude-pigraphic writings which contain information bearing upon the history, and the characteristic beliefs, of postexilic Judaism" (Ottley p. 5).

All sources place upon us certain limitations which must not be overstepped, even though our narrative in places may seem incomplete.

In beginning our study of the Hebrews, it is thought best to emphasize only their political and religious history, and in doing this, to try to show the close inter-dependence of these two phases. It is hoped that the reasons for this procedure will become evident ere our study is done.

The period we now have under consideration (about 2250 to 1000 B. C.) really belongs to the prehistoric age of the Hebrews. This does not mean that the account given in Genesis (I-XII) of the creation of all things is untrue, neither does it mean that the story of Patriarchs given in the same book (XII-L) is wholly unreliable, but it does mean that the events therein narrated apply to the childhood of a people and that, just as with other peoples, it is very hard to find out about the beginnings.

The story of the Patriarchs seems to be made up of a series of obscure tribal movements, under the leadership of Abraham, which had its beginnings in Mesopotamia, its end in Western Palestine. It is probable that under the same leadership were the ancestors of not only the Israelites but the Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites as well. Lot's separation from Abraham may represent a development which finally resulted in the separate nations of Moab and Ammon. Later on, probably during the time that Palestine came under Egyptian domination, another branch of these immigrants pushed to the south of the Moabites and formed a practically independent state called Edom.

It is quite probable that a second expedition of the Hebrews from their original homeland, is represented in Jacob's coming back from Syria with his twelve sons (Gen. XXX-XXXI). If this be true there was an amalgamation of the new branch with what was left of the old Abrahamitic tribes. This would imply that the twelve tribes had begun to form before the migration into Egypt. If such an implication be assumed as true, then it is easy to explain Joseph's going into Egypt and his being followed later by all the Hebrew tribes—easy if it is taken that the so-called sons, of Jacob are the ancestors of the twelve tribes.

Is it unreasonable to suppose then that the struggle between Joseph and his brethren represents a tribal struggle in which the

tribe which Joseph represents tried to exercise a loose control over the other tribes, but failed? While the ideas given above, concerning the story of the Patriarchs may be reasonable, it must not be inferred that such interpretations of the story are final, nor is it natural that they should be, since we are dealing with a tribal people.

But there are certain general matters upon which most scholars are agreed. These are: (1) That Abraham is an historical character; (2) That the Israelites, either as a tribe or tribes, migrated into Egypt during the Hyksos period; (3) That the Israelites were led out of Egypt by Moses (date uncertain, probably about 1200 B. C.).

From the events recorded in the latter part of Genesis, and in Exodus, it is tolerably clear, also, that famine had driven the Israelites to settle in the rich lands of the Delta, and that finally being reduced to serfdom, they rebelled and left Egypt, returning to their former nomadic life. Moses, their leader, exercised supreme control when there was need for combined action. No doubt difficult disputes were also referred to him, his decisions were looked upon as precedents. His people doubtless wandered here and there in the wilderness engaging in the chase, watching their flocks and sowing and reaping as the occasion demanded. It appears that there were also encounters both with the more settled peoples and other nomads. Israel at this time was really more a league of tribes than a simple tribe. "The two main elements comprising it were Rachel (the "ewe") and Leah (the "wild cow"). These in turn were probably sub-divided, but we can go no further with certainty in speaking of the desert organization, since we are unable to say what ancient tribes were wiped out in war, and what new tribes were formed after the conquest by separation from the parent stem, or by incorporating the inhabitants of Canaan" (Todd p. 25).

During the years of wandering in the wilderness a new generation was produced and the men of the Exodus passed away. This new generation had a desire for permanent homes. The best lands were all occupied. The only way for Israel to get any was

to fight for it. Israel had some degree of kinship with all the peoples in Syria-Palestine except the Philistines. In Syria (Aram) there existed probably even this early, Damascus, Kadesh (on the Orontes) and Hamath. The Israelites themselves believed that they had sprung from the Syrians. The great Phoenician cities on the west were already in existence. South of these in the lowlands were the Philistines who had come from the west, probably from Caria or Crete. The Moabites, Edomites and Ammonites still lived east of the Jordan. "Between Philistia on the West, and the Dead Sea and Edom on the East, to the South of the Canaanites (belonged to the same group as the Phoenicians)—dwelt then or later, another collection of tribes, also of the Hebrew stock, as Simeon, Judah, Caleb, Kain, Jerahmeel, The tradition asserts that most of these were with Israel in the desert, and entered Canaan at the same time, but this is very doubtful, as they do not appear effectively in the history until centuries later. In any case, however, their early life was closely parallel to that of Israel" (Todd p. 27).

The Israelites first captured the Canaanite kingdom of Heshbon which was between Moab and Ammon. Gilead was then taken, apparently from the Ammonites. But the territory was still too small, so the Israelites under Joshua crossed the Jordan and attempted to conquer the country westward to the sea. Both the Tell-el-Amarna letters and the books of Joshua and Judges show that this country west of the Jordan was divided among small independent communities each having a walled village and being ruled over by a chief (malek). The inhabitants of each community believed themselves to be related by blood. They carried on agriculture and were much more advanced in most respects than the Israelites.

Israel was a long time in gaining a foothold in this western country. She could not overcome the well trained soldiery and the fortified strongholds. After the first fierce conflicts were over the Canaanites and Israelites lived side by side. They inter-married. This fusion continued for centuries; it was a question of which group should predominate. "The victory lay ultimately

with Israel; the mixed race which sprang up from the fusion of the two was Israel Canaanised, not Canaan Israelised" (Todd, p.30).

There were occasional battles between the two peoples. The turning point in the struggle which finally resulted in Israel's supremacy appears to have been the victory gained by Barak on the Kishon river (see Judges IV and V). This victory is celebrated in a great heroic poem now known as the Song of Deborah and Barak. The Israelitish tribes were now arranged much in the same way as they were during the best part of Hebrew history. "Ephraim, Manasseh and Benjamin formed the group of Rachel. Zebulun and Issachar, together with Gad and Asher, were the sons of Leah. Naphtali and Dan may originally have been connected with Rachel, but in the history we find them incorporated in Leah. Besides these the old and vanishing tribe of Reuben is mentioned in the Song of Deborah. The Judahite tribes of the South were not members of the League" (Todd, p. 33) Israel was now the name of the nation, and the parts of the country were named after her tribes, but the civilization of the Canaanites was generally accepted and developed.

The members of each tribe were bound together by kinship much in the same way as were the members of each Canaanite community. The supremacy of the walled village came to an end; it was made a part of a larger unit—the tribe.

There was no strong bond of unity among the tribes in times of peace, but when outside forces attacked them the tribe most affected appointed a commander who summoned the forces of the whole league of tribes. It was the duty of these several forces to obey the summons, but nothing legally compelled them to do so. "If the campaign was successful the victorious general enjoyed much consideration for the rest of his life, a consideration which even passed on to his sons. He received the title, Shophet, or Judge, which, however, did not signify the holder of an office, but rather simply a leading man to whom it was customary to refer disputes" (Todd, p. 34).

Let us now note something of the religion of the Hebrews before the conquest of Canaan, and then indicate the main effects of that conquest upon their religion.

As with other primitive peoples, their religion was joyful, simple and confident. It was not systematic, neither was it reasoned out. There is nothing to show that there was as yet any thought of a Creator of the World. There were no horrid cults, no emphasis placed on cruel rites. But it was a growing religion and contained the germs of the better things to come. It was the great binding tie among individuals of any group, who supposed themselves to be akin to each other. It makes no difference whether that group is called a family, clan (gens), tribe, league or state.

The god of the group was looked upon from several points of view—he might be considered as akin to every one in the group, or as the abstract idea of the group—but the great thing about him was that he could bring help when the group was in need of help. So if the group gained a victory over an enemy it was due to the combined power of itself and its god. This god also gave advice in other difficulties besides those with enemies—in a word, the very life of the group as such depended upon the continuance of divine aid. Thus it is easy to see how the group and its god must be blood kin.

The group and its god might fall out; this could occur in cases of defeat, famine or plague. This would indicate that the god was offended at something, but that something had nothing to do with the inner life of any individual or group of individuals, in short it was not a moral offense, but had to do with the way the god had been worshiped.

When the group settled down, its land became its god's land. Just as he was the ancestor of all the persons of the group, so was he the progenitor of the cattle, corn and other products of the soil. It will be observed that the Israelites toward the end of their wanderings in the wilderness had a great desire for settled abodes, and that they were bound together in a league. Religion was the great binding element among them. Their god, Yahweh, was revered, but not through slavish fear. He was their defender, protector and guide, but he was not a hostile power. He was, however, the god of Israel alone, a god who gave prac-

tical daily aid to his worshipers; he was not an abstract or unknown essence.

The object of worship was to renew the bond between the group and its god. So worship was a public affair; there was no personal form of religion except that related to magic, which was not at all prominent. The earliest form of worship was the sacrifice, which consisted of the blood-rite and the feast. The victim was slain and its blood applied to the god and his worshipers. The custom of sprinkling blood on the worshipers died out long before our period closes, except in some few cases. Since the god was invisible, something must be used in his stead; this was one of the reasons for the worship of such objects as stones. A stone might be used permanently or temporarily. The feast followed the blood-rite. "The sacred portions were the blood, which flowed into a hole in the ground, and the fat over the kidneys, which was roasted on the sacred stone. The rest of the victim was eaten by the worshipers. It is important to notice that there is only one word for 'sacrifice' and 'feast.' It was only on high days that meat was eaten, and every meat-eating was a sacrifice" (Todd, p. 39). Cakes and wine were also used in the sacrifice, it may be as substitutes for meat, or as an independent rite connected with a settled people. There were other rites besides the sacred meal, such as offerings of hair, clothing and even human sacrifice (see Gen. XX). The person sacrificed might be one of the group or a captive. In either case it was usually done only when the group was in the greatest trouble.

The indications are that the earliest shrine was an enclosed space of ground open to the air. Within the enclosure was a heap of earth or stones—the altar,—and a rude construction used at first perhaps for holding the tools for the sacrifice, but becoming in time the dwelling place of the priests. Everything connected with the shrine was "holy" because all belonged to the god, the priest might be ever so wicked and still a "holy" man.

"From the earliest days we find two classes of sacred ministers, men whose business it is to mediate between god and man. These are the priests and the prophets. The functions of the two

overlap to some extent, and it is conceivable (though hardly likely) that they sprang from one earlier institution. The essential difference between them is suggested by the positions in which we find them, the priest officiates at a shrine, the prophet goes where he pleases. The priest works by visible means, altars, sacrifices, kodesh lots, etc. Every where he has his tools. Even when he leaves the shrine he must take with him his ephod or his Urim. The prophet has no tools, except occasionally a musical instrument. He is the man of god, the spokesman of the divine. He certainly frequents the shrine, but wherever he may be the inspiration comes upon him and he speaks. The priest's function is thus much wider than the prophets, since the latter is confined to the one business of declaring the divine will, yet the prophet has obviously unlimited possibilities in his own direction, and when the 'spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets' he will have power to sway the world" (Todd, p. 44 ff.).

It is assumed that, for most of the time under our consideration, the priests did not form a separate class, neither were they engaged in religious matters alone, but were occupied most of the time with other affairs. Every man might act as priest in his own household, just as the leader of any group. Besides being the sacrificer, the priest gave divine instruction (torah). The torah was handed down from priest to priest until there finally came to be a traditional body of it. The prophets had much to do with the wars that were constantly carried on. They said whether or not the day was favorable; they also chanted patriotic songs and accompanied these by dances which sometimes ended in trances; they gave warning of coming dangers, especially of attacks by enemies.

When the Israelites invaded Canaan their god, Yahweh, always went with them; he was in the forefront of every battle and received his share of the honor and the booty. An altar-stone indicated the presence of the god, but another symbol of the god was an oblong wooden box, the "Ark of God," This box contained two stones, likely for the purpose of finding out the divine will of the god by the priest. "The ark itself, undoubtedly

was Yahweh to the ancient Israelites, in the same sense in which any material object can be said to be God" (Todd, p. 54).

Although Yahweh was the god of the league, the minor divisions (groups of kin) of the league had their own gods which survived for centuries. It seems as if the tribal gods were early identified with Yahweh.

The Israelites looked upon Yahweh as their "kinsman," while the Canaanites considered their god a "husband" and "father." A fusion of the two peoples has been noticed, their religious life had the same tendency. In times of peace Israel worshiped Baal, who stood for luxury usually, the enjoyment of sex relations, the drinking of wine, agriculture with its pleasures, the separation of group from group; but when war broke out they worshiped Yahweh, who stood for the hardships of a wandering life, self-restraint in sex relations and in drink, the enthusiasm of battle, and the unity of the league.

Although this religious conflict ended in a victory for Israel Yahweh now came to be looked upon as a "husband" and "father" just as Baal had been. This was a natural reflection of the changed life, and was not fundamentally degrading. By the time of the founding of the monarchy Yahweh was the one national god, he was worshiped throughout the land, though he had the same shrines as the Canaanitish gods had had. There were also doubtless many local nature gods worshiped. Each village had its high place where both the public and the family sacrifices feasts were held.

The Israelites adopted other customs of the Canaanites. Legends connected with the local shrines were taken over. Three of the great agricultural feasts of the Canaanites were also taken over,—the feasts of Tabernacles, of Weeks, and of Unleavened Bread.

It is probable that when the Israelites entered Canaan, worship of images both among them and the Canaanites was uncommon. The priesthoods were closely connected with the civil authorities, but a class of special priests were springing up. These were the Levites, about whose origin nothing is definitely known. It seems that the office of priest was hereditary.

However interesting all the religious developments spoken of above are, the great important fact to keep in mind is that as the nation developed so did Yahweh.

\* \* \*

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE MONARCHY (FROM ABOUT 1050 TO ABOUT 950 B. C.)

There were, no doubt, a number of reasons for founding the Monarchy. Need of protection from common enemies, such as the Philistines, kept up a spirit of unity. This spirit was powerfully aided by the common belief in and worship of Yahweh. There were surely those, also, who desired that the petty troubles among the tribes themselves should cease; these persons realized that Israel could accomplish more as a united nation than as separate tribes, since older states had been especially successful, when united.

There is considerable difference of opinion about just how the Monarchy originated, but all connect its origin with the name of Samuel. Samuel was an old Benjamite noble of some reputation. He held some sort of a priestly position which made him prominent among the shrines of his tribe. He was also on good terms with the prophets and was known as a seer (a person gifted with "second sight").

One day Samuel went to visit a shrine (place not known), he was stopped by a young man, Sául, who wished information about some asses which his father had lost. Samuel felt that this young man should be the king of Israel. He accordingly invited him to a religious feast and anointed him with oil as a token of his future destiny. The time soon came when he could assert his kingly power. The king of Ammon had attacked Gilead and would not accept the surrender of its city, Jabesh, without the promise that he might put out the right eyes of the leading men (elders). This attempted exaction was a violation of the usual methods of war. Saul became enraged and summoned the fighting men of the various tribes by sending pieces of oxen to them.

The summons proved effective and Saul marched upon and conquered the Ammonites.

The army marched back to Gilgal and after celebrating the religious rites with which a campaign always closed, proclaimed Saul king of the League. It is clear then that "the Monarchy was essentially military in its origin; and the king represented the League in permanent session" (Todd, p. 67).

The two great tasks which Saul had to meet were: (1) To determine how far the office of king should supersede the priest-hoods and the nobles; (2) He must face Israel's enemies from without.

At the very beginning of Saul's reign there was a dispute between him and Samuel. Before the rise of Saul, Samuel had exercised the power of "consecrating the war." But once when the warriors were assembled at Gilgal ready for a campaign Samuel did not arrive at the time he had promised, so Saul "consecrated the war." This made Samuel angry, not because of petty jealousy probably, but because he thought Yahweh might be displeased, and the campaign, therefore, prove a failure. This trouble between Saul and Samuel finally led to their friendly relations being broken.

When Saul wished to assemble his warriors to meet the Philistines, many of the Israelites would not answer his summons. Some of them openly joined the Philistines, others hid in caves or went eastward across the Jordan. No logical account has been left us of the wars of Saul, but, with his small yet loyal band, he was successful against the Philistines, the Hebrews east of the Jordan, some Syrians east of the upper Jordan and the Amalekites.

During his latter years Saul became melancholy and probably partially insane. He was very jealous of David who was very popular at his court. It is recorded, also, that he massacred some priests; this would indicate that he continued to have trouble with them. Samuel was now openly against him.

The old king fought on. He met his death on Mount Gilboa, fighting bravely against the Philistines. The latter were victor-

ious and the Israelites were apparently in the same position that Saul found them. It is a question even, whether the Judahites were a part of Saul's dominions. But his reign had not been without value. There was no attempt to return to the tribal rule of the nobles—the League was thus a unit both in peace and war. This was a great gain when we consider the fact that there was apparently no constitutional restraint on the king (He might however be rebuked by the prophets.).

A great gain was made in the religious development by the establishment of the Monarchy. Before this time the idea that Yahweh was both the war-god of the League and the baal of the local shrine was prominent, but now Yahweh began to be thought of more as the protector of the whole nation. Although Saul had his weak points, we must remember the enormous odds which he faced.

After the battle of Mount Gilboa Israel was apparently at the mercy of the Philistines, but she did not become tributary to Philistia. Ishbaal, the son of Saul, succeeded him as king, but both he and the general of his army were assassinated within a few years.

The nobles then offered the throne to David, a member of the tribe of Judah. Though Saul probably exercised no control over Judah, David had been one of the heroes of his wars, a great personal friend of Jonathan, the king's son, and had married Saul's daughter. On account of Saul's jealousy he had been compelled to flee from the court. He had gathered around him a band of men, most of them broken in fortune and ready for anything, and had cast his lot with the Philistines. The latter rewarded him liberally and finally made him ruler of Judah which was tributary to Philistia. Therefore David's acceptance of the throne of Israel was looked upon, by the Philistines, as a revolt.

Little is known of the early history of Judah. Her people were of the Hebrew stock and had settled in Southern Palestine after a conflict with the Canaanites. The best evidences show that it had not been a member of the League to which the name Israel was applied. Its great hero was Abraham. It is not cer-

tain whether its people worshiped God under the name of Yahweh before the accession of David, but after the political fusion of Israel and Judah Yahweh was worshiped "from Dan to Beersheba."

David's first great act on coming to the throne was the capture of Jerusalem. This was an old Canaanite strong-hold which had remained uncaptured by the Hebrews. The king readily saw the advantageous position of the city,—it was on the border between Judah and Benjamin—and so made it his capital city. The old city "becomes gradually identified with the noblest aspirations of humanity, and even to our own time supplies a name for that ideal which can never be realized under our present conditions. It is of course a grievous error to imagine that the associations which the word Jerusalem conveys to us were in any sense present to the mind of David's contemporaries. No more than in the case of Rome, Athens, Tyre, or any other city, could the end be foreseen from the beginning. \* \* \* The connection of both Judah and Benjamin with Jerusalem is of the utmost importance. The alliance between Judah and Israel was of a transitory nature, but Jerusalem's period of influence was to be unending. As a Benjamite town it inherited the tradition of the North, as a Judahite town it retained its independence long after Israel had disappeared from history. In this way Judah became the heir of Israel, and in fact is Israel for all later ages" (Todd, p. 81 ff.).

David was very successful in meeting the outside foes of the Hebrews. He checked the Philistines so effectively that they were never after this a serious menace to his people, though their old realm remained intact. The Moabites attacked him but were severely beaten, their country was made a tributary province of Israel. Attacks were also made by the Edomites, Ammonites and Syrians around Damascus, but David managed them just as he had the Moabites. Israel thus became one of the dominant nations of the world. This kingdom extended north to the foot-hills of the Lebanon mountains, south to Beersheba, west to Philistia and Phoenicia, and east to the Arabian desert.

During the later years of his life David had time and resources to beautify Jerusalem. Hiram I, king of Tyre, sent him carpenters and masons, and cedar-wood. These he used in building a palace on Mount Zion. Toward the end of his life David had considerable trouble in putting down the rebellions of his sons, and in holding in check outbreaks of the bitter feeling which existed between Judah and Israel. Probably the most serious trouble of all was with the sons of his different wives. "The monogamic principle had not yet been announced. But the murder of Uriah (2 Sa. XI) lies as an indelible stain on his character, and the harem was undoubtedly both in David's reign and afterwards the feature of the Monarchy which produced the largest amount of confusion, instability and bloodshed " (Todd, p. 81). After much intrigue on the part of his mother, Bath-Sheba, and others, Solomon, the youngest son of David was recognized by David as his successor. Soon after this the old king died.

With all his faults David was a great character. "He is the most luminous figure and most gifted personage in Israelitish history, surpassed in ethical greatness and general historical importance only by Moses, the man of God. It is not possible to overestimate what David did for Israel. Israel as a people, as a representative of political life, as a concrete quantity in the development of universal history, as a nation in the fullest sense of the word, is exclusively his work. With this he completed what Moses had begun in quiet and inconspicuous labors on Sinai and Kadesh. And all of this David created as it were out of nothing, under the most difficult conditions conceivable, with no other means than his own all inspiring and all compelling personality.

However far I let my gaze wander among the ranks of the great figures of history, I find no parallel among them for so completely a 'self-made man.' He is one of those phenomenal men such as providence gives but once to a people, in whom a whole nation and its history reaches once for all its climax. David created Israel and at the same time raised it to its highest eminence; what Israel was under and through David it never again

became. And so we can easily understand how the eyes of Israel rested in grateful reverence upon this figure, and how a second David became the dream of Israel's future.

True, the picture of David does not lack the traits of human frailty, which Israelitish tradition, with a truly admirable sincerity has neither suppressed or palliated; but the charm which this personality exercised over all contemporaries without exception has not yet faded for us of later day; whoever devotes himself without prejudice to the contemplation of David's history and character cannot fail to like him. A saint and psalm-singer, as later tradition has represented him he certainly was not; but we find in him a truly noble human figure, which, in spite of all, preserved the tenderest and most fragrant bloom of its nature, ~~and~~ perfect directness and simplicity; nowhere any posing, nothing theatrical, such as is always found in sham greatness; he always acts what he is, but his unspoiled nature, noble at heart, generally comes very near to the right and good. At the same time the whole personality is touched with a breath of genuine piety and child-like trust in God, so that we can wholly comprehend how he appeared in tradition as the ideal ruler, the king after God's own heart.

This king, who did more for the worldly greatness and earthly power of Israel than any one else, was a genuine Israelite in that he appreciated also Israel's religious destiny: he was no soldiering, no conqueror and warrior of common stamp. no ruler like any one of a hundred others, but he is the truest incorporation of the unique character of Israel, a unique personality in the history of the world and we understand how he could become the impersonation of an idea,—how the highest and holiest that Israel hoped for and longed for appears as the Son of David" (Cor. p. 83 ff.).

Solomon's was a great heritage, but his responsibilities were even greater. He was very young for such a position, not more than eighteen, but he was versatile, clever, witty and full of the enthusiasm of youth. He maintained his power for forty years under the most trying circumstances.

In the government of his kingdom, David had not altered, to any extent, the local rule. He was satisfied if the various localities responded to his calls for military aid. The tribute from the conquered peoples was sufficient to support his comparatively simple court. David may have had in mind a system of taxation when he made his great census (2 Sa. XXIV) but a pestilence broke out and caused him to permanently drop this idea. The Israelites under David were united through a voluntary agreement. The people did not forget, neither did David, that the king held his power because of popular choice. There had been no long established monarchical forms of government among the Israelites as among the neighboring peoples in the river valleys to the east and west. David's government was patriarchal, not far in advance of the Bedouins of the desert. Solomon brought about a great change in this regard. He centralized the government and established a very strict rule in the various local communities of his kingdom. This was beneficial in a way.

But Solomon's government was of a personal character. What he did was not so much for the benefit of the people as for his own glorification. He loved splendor and outward display. He therefore built great buildings, kept hundreds of servants and maintained an extravagant court. Since it took great resources to support such a policy, the financial side of his government was most prominent, this was only intensified by most of the tributary people breaking away from his power.

Edom secured its independence early in his reign, but was not able to cut off Israel's commercial highway leading to the Red Sea. It seems that Moab also rebelled but was subdued anew. The Syrians whom David had conquered became independent and founded a new kingdom with Damascus as its center. Damascus later became a great enemy to Israel.

Thus we see that David's conquests were practically gone, and Solomon was forced to rely on the resources of his own people. He divided his kingdom into twelve divisions for fiscal purposes. Each division was to meet the expenses of the court for one month.

Commercial expeditions aided by the Phoenicians, were made to Southern Arabia and Eastern Africa. These brought in rich profits. High tolls were collected from the caravans passing from the Mesopotamian lands to Egypt. Solomon even monopolized the Egyptian horse trade with Asia. As all of these resources were not sufficient for the needs of the court great sums were borrowed of Hiram I, king of Tyre. This loan of the Tyrian king finally came to amount to about 48,000,000 dollars. Since Solomon could not pay it he ceded to the Phoenician a border district which contained twenty cities.

“But Solomon’s chief need was workers. To supply it he robbed of all their rights and liberties the Canaanites who still dwelt among the Israelites, making them state slaves, just as Pharaoh Ramses II had done to the Israelites in Goshen in his day. This was not exactly commendable, but it was an enormous advance in the centralization of the state. Saul had planned something of the sort, but had not been able to carry it out. But this was still insufficient, and accordingly Solomon had levies made of 30,000 Israelite citizens, who were compelled to work in sections of 10,000 every fourth month” (Cor. p. 91 ff.).

Of all the buildings that Solomon constructed none was so important to later generations as his temple, but as a matter of fact this sacred building was only a chapel in the great king’s palace. This temple was an enlarged form of the primitive shrine described above. Within the sacred enclosure was a “house” around which were the chambers for the priests, prophets, temple-servants and other things connected with the temple. In front of this “house” were two brass pillars called Jachin and Boaz. Still in front of these pillars were a brass tank for ablutions, and an altar. Within the innermost chamber of the “house” was the Ark of God which together with Jachin and Boaz represented Yahweh. It is likely there were other sacred objects, such as a brazen serpent, and brazen oxen, lions and cherubim. “The Jerusalem temple had, in its origin, no exclusive significance or position. It was simply one more of the countless high-places. What prestige it enjoyed was entirely owing to

the fact that it was the bamah (sanctuary) of the royal city. It has come to occupy a unique place in the religious thought of the world, but that is the result, not the cause, of its unique history" (Todd, p. 88).

Solomon also constructed separate shrines and places for his various wives. He also tried to fortify all the important points in his dominions. He tried, especially, to make Jerusalem impregnable, in short the king placed himself wholly on the defensive. His policy in that regard was wholly different from his father's. Solomon's methods of defense and centralization must have displeased many of his people, but it is a significant fact that there was only one revolt during his reign, and that was easily put down.

Solomon made many alliances with foreign countries. He married a daughter of the king of Egypt; in fact most of these alliances were through royal marriages. The king "was what one might almost call a cosmopolitan nature; he extended immensely the intellectual horizon of Israel, and opened his country in all directions to intercourse with the world. He placed Israel in the ranks of the great nations. Not only gold and ivory, sandal-wood and peacocks came to Jerusalem, but also the art of the Phoenicians and Egyptians, the wisdom and the fairylore of the East found their way into Israel, giving everywhere the most powerful impulses, and rousing to new life" (Cor. p. 94).

Solomon possessed a great personality. He was witty and wise, and had fine artistic and scientific tastes. Many legends gathered about his name, but even giving these due value, Solomon remains one of the great characters of the world.

The forty years of Solomon's reign were mostly years of peace, but after his death the situation regarding a united state became critical. The economic burdens of the people were too heavy, and although Rehoboam, the oldest son of Solomon, was recognized as king in Jerusalem, Israel had never forgotten that David's house did not belong to Israel's tribes. Hence Israel believed that David's successors should be duly elected just as David had been.

It is little wonder that all Israel gathered at Shechem and made certain demands of Rehoboam, such as "make thou the heavy yoke which thy father put upon us lighter, and we will serve thee" (1 Ki. XII, 4). Rehoboam was not disposed to listen to these demands so Israel openly rebelled and proclaimed Jeroboam, the leader of the revolt in Solomon's time, who had escaped to Egypt and had now returned, king. Thus there were two kingdoms instead of one, and the work of David seemed to be destroyed, but out of this broken condition of an apparently insignificant people will finally come the best ideals of all ages.

"The united Solomonic kingdom had done its work and had left a rich inheritance for posterity, which in the practical sphere was mainly the welding of Judah and Benjamin in the city of Jerusalem; while in the sphere of ideas we have (a) the essential unity of Israel-Judah; (b) the great king reigning in Jerusalem; (c) Yahweh, as the god of kingdoms now hostile; and (d) Yahweh as the keeper of the kings conscience. All these were to prove fruitful in the coming time" (Todd, p. 90).

\* \* \*

## CHAPTER IV

### ISRAEL AND JUDAH (FROM ABOUT 950 TO ABOUT 700 B. C.)

After the downfall of the united kingdom, for some 250 years, Israel and Judah developed along similar lines, but our knowledge of the former is somewhat fuller. Generally speaking, they did not maintain peace with each other; and neither kept peace in its own borders, for any length of time, nor with foreign countries. This state of affairs produced many changes, which it is not profitable to trace in this connection. As a rule these changes brought about such a confusion as finally ended in the extinction of both Israel and Judah.

There were, however, developments taking place, of future world-wide importance, chief of which was the religious development. Before we note this development let us see something of the constitutional and social conditions.

In the beginning of our period Judah had both a capital and an established royal house, while Israel had neither. But Judah was not so closely connected with world influences; the surrounding peoples, with the exception of the Philistines, were less advanced than she. The great trade route between Asia and Africa only touched her borders while it passed through the heart of Israel.

There is no great amount of information on the constitutional and social movements, but we have enough to know that the changes were not isolated but organically connected.

The constitution in both states is still that of an absolute monarchy. The only restraints on the king were traditional customs. When other means failed, as a last resort to get rid of a king, he was assassinated. In Judah, when the king was murdered his son succeeded him; in Israel, the assassin.

The person of greatest consequence next to the king, was his mother. The royal family, called in Hebrew the "sons of the king" had practically no political power, although they sometimes became important factors, in case the king was incapacitated, as his possible successors. They were not the old hereditary nobility, but were chosen by the monarch according to his own judgment. The ministers of the state were called the "king's servants." They were often foreigners, and included the head of the body-guard, the king's priest, the recorder, the scribe and other royal officials.

The great mass of the freemen are distinguished as the inhabitants of Jerusalem (or of Samaria) and the people of the land i. e., country folk, though this latter phrase does not always appear to be used consistently" (Todd, p. 102). The number of slaves increased during the period. They were both of Hebrew and of foreign origin.

Throughout the period, too, can be seen the gradual weakening of the king's power. His servants ceased to be separate heads of departments and formed a bureaucracy which tried to be the power behind the throne (2 Ki. XI). The old landed nobility also became more important. As the cities increased in

size and importance (this city development is especially to be noted in connection with Jerusalem and Samaria, the latter had become the capital of Israel) the nobles gradually drifted into them and became a strong element of control in both political affairs of the city and the kingdom at large. They even sometimes decided a disputed succession to the kingship.

The growth of the towns would seem to indicate an increased prosperity throughout the kingdoms. Such was the case only in a limited degree, since there was an ever increasing distinction between poverty and wealth. The increase in wealth made possible a leisured class, who had time to think deeply and write excellently. We shall notice this class more fully when the prophets are considered. Suffice it to say here that this cultured class worked out ideas which the mass of freemen came to long for, therefore the average intelligence was raised.

Brutality was on the decrease, but the deepest movement of the age was the growth of individualism. The further back we go into primitive life the more we find the individual lost in the group. He is only a part of a greater whole. This principle of the suppression of the individual to a larger whole had been generally followed by the peoples of both the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates valleys. It was thus a great advance in the world's history when the individual was allowed to express himself. This tendency is seen in a torah of Yahweh which runs as follows: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall be put to death for his own sin" (2 Ki. XIV, 6).

These advanced movements of the time are also seen in the religious developments taking place, but before attempting to outline those developments it is well to speak briefly of the Hebrews' connection with outside countries and the consequent destruction of the kingdom of Israel.

The actual conquests of Syria-Palestine, made by Egypt and the Mesopotamian states from time to time, have been noticed in connection with the history of those countries. We need not repeat them here, but it is all important to see what the effects of the

conquests were upon the kingdoms we are considering. These kingdoms were undoubtedly influenced by the valley civilizations, in religion, law, art, commerce, learning and modes of living, but to what extent has never been determined; not enough, we dare say, to cause us to look upon the Bible as a mere scrap of Babylonian learning. For we must remember that Babylonian influence upon the Hebrews was at first indirect—Israel was not destroyed by Assyria until 722 B. C. Then again, along the lines in which the Hebrews have fundamentally affected the history of the world,—the development of Yahweh worship and the city-state organization—they worked out largely their own ideas. Of course it must never be forgotten that the constant hammering process of the outside nations helped to mould into shape the noble and universal religion which had its roots in Yahweh worship. With this in mind it is well to note the religious developments of the time we have under consideration.

Let us first attempt to get a view of the religious life from about 950 to about 800 B. C., and then proceed to discuss the religion of the great prophets of the eighth century.

For these first 150 years of our period the conceptions of Yahweh changed somewhat. Religion is a conservative force but it has to yield in time, to the thought and customs outside itself. The idea of blood-kinship between the group and its god tended to die out. Yahweh did not care so much for bread and meat. He was looked upon more as a Great King who held his court in an heavenly palace. "The common people still thought of Yahweh as having the figure of a young bull but the more cultured evidently regarded his form as human" (Todd, p. 106).

The growing emphasis placed upon the individual relations to Yahweh produced the idea of sin, but for the most part Yahweh concerned himself with the nation as a whole; the king alone had personal relations with him. We are not surprised then when we hear of the prophets rebuking the kings for committing murder.

The growing sense of individuality also tended to do away with human sacrifice. In earlier times the group believed that when one of its number was sacrificed, it was sacrificing a part of

itself, but they now began to see that the individual really paid the penalty.

Sex relationship was also purified. The grosser forms of prostitution were expelled from the shrines. The business of the harlot was no longer respectable. Monogamy was recognized as the ideal form of marriage. This change is seen in the attitude toward Yahweh, Israel is his bride, he is her lover and friend. It was thought that Israel and Yahweh were the high contracting parties of a great alliance, each was necessary to the other. This should have produced a great patriotic enthusiasm for the state. Such was the case, generally, in time of war, but in time of peace the mass of the people very likely took more comfort in worshipping some local "demon" connected with a spring or tree than in giving allegiance to the god of the nation. "Yet in the north, at least, Yahwism was victorious and all cultus appears to have been brought into nominal connection with the national god. Probably the Syrian wars had much to do with this. 'He who sacrifices to a god shall be made cherem, except to Yahweh alone.' So stands the oldest law on this subject, probably promulgated by Joram of Israel (about 850 B. C.). Cherem is the word for destruction in honor of a deity" (Todd, p. 108).

The triumph of Yahweh was not so complete in Judah, with the exception of Jerusalem.

In both kingdoms the shrines were becoming very magnificent. The ritual was elaborated and the sacred buildings adorned with votive offerings. These buildings, in fact, were the public treasure houses. The temple at Jerusalem, being new, did not acquire popularity very rapidly. The older sanctuaries, such as those at Bethel, Gilgal, Dan and Beersheba were the favorite places of worship.

These shrines had a very marked influence upon the Hebrews. To these men went to find out the will of God, either under normal or abnormal circumstances. This gave certainty to men's actions because they then understood the actions of their god. It is not hard to see how the shrines tended to unify the people. Here the poor men found a refuge, and all classes came together in the great festivals.

The most significant religious developments have to do with the prophets. The enthusiastic bands who preached a holy war against the Philistines, were, in some degree, organized and disciplined by Samuel who may be considered the founder of the prophetic schools. But by the time of Ahab's accession to the throne of Israel (about 850 B. C.) a great change had come over these lands. There was now a regular system of devotion and instruction. The prophets were, indeed, a professional order and had a recognized place and function, together with the priests, in the religious life of the Hebrews. It seems that there was a regular system of initiation into the order. There was probably some sign by which the prophets were identified, such as tattooing of faces and means of dress. In his manner of living each prophet had a great deal of individual freedom although each generation inherited the general policy and ideas of the preceding generation. "The prophets might be married or unmarried, live singly or in a community, at a shrine or elsewhere. Indeed, as the whole theory of the order was direct inspiration, we naturally find studied eccentricity modified by the gregarious instincts of a definite order. This eccentricity, however, was never intended to introduce novelties, but to enforce conservative opinions" (Todd, p. 93).

Since to the primitive prophets Yahweh had been a god of war, their successors could not accustom themselves to the comparatively peaceful life after the settlement in Canaan. The cultivation of the fields, the wearing of civilized dress and the building of houses were distasteful to them. They lived in booths or rude huts and wore old fashioned skin mantles for which they claimed a divine origin. "As the sources of civilization developed they opposed all advance—silks, sweet ointments, ivory, costly furniture, elaborate costumes, noble buildings, horses, ships, all fall under the condemnation of the prophets. Nothing taught them the value of civilized life, but the complete loss of it at the destruction of Jerusalem (586 B. C.) after which they labored first in theory and then in practice to rebuild the shattered edifice" (Todd, p. 92).

The prophets were by no means ardent supporters of sacrifice and the priestly laws. No doubt they often lived in the shrines since they were the most convenient religious centers, but the old desert sacrifices were enough for them and they detested the elaboration of the ritual.

The prophets from 950 to 800 B. C. were usually heart and soul for the nation. They were truly patriotic, hopeful and aggressive in their principles in this regard. Just as before this time, sometimes they exercised great political power—it will be recalled that they took a great part in establishing the original monarchy. They actively supported Israel's revolt under Jeroboam.

Though conservative in a high degree, the prophetic order represented the best there was in the life of the time. This order was a direct historical development out of the earlier bands of devotees and its work was the foundation upon which the so-called "writing" prophets of the eighth century built. These connections must be grasped in order to understand the history of Hebrew prophecy.

The prophets of the time we have under consideration (950-800 B. C.) did great things for the Hebrews. "Occasionally there arose among them, and sometimes outside of their communities, an individual of exceptional power (as Jonah, 2 Ki. XIV, 25), qualified to be the public champion of Israel's traditional faith, and claiming the right to control and judge in Yahweh's name the conduct of statesmen and kings. During the earlier period of the monarchy prophets were the most prominent supporters of the throne. On occasion, however, they did not shrink from fearlessly rebuking unrighteousness even in the person of the monarch himself. Thus, for instance, Samuel reproved the willfulness and foretold the impending doom of Saul; Nathan and Gad rebuked David; Ahijah the Shilonite denounced the sins of Jeroboam and predicted the overthrow of his house. A prophet of this exceptional type was the great Elijah, the divinely commissioned scourge of Ahab's dynasty and the sleepless foe of Phoenician Baal worship. It is true that Elijah, in spite of

his own misgivings (1 Ki. XIX, 14), was actually supported to some extent by the better and higher instincts of the people, who were evidently not prepared for any thing like the formal apostacy from Yahweh. But as time went on the religious degeneracy of the northern kingdom became a patent fact, and the prophets found themselves placed in a position of antagonism not merely to the ruler of Israel, but also to the down grade tendencies, beliefs and customs of the nation at large. Indeed the truths which they proclaimed struck at the very root of certain elements in the popular religion of their countrymen. In particular they taught that the nature and requirements of Israel's god were quite other than they were popularly supposed to be. They made it their principal business to root out false conceptions of Yahweh and to awaken the national conscience to the true moral conditions of his original covenant with Israel. It should be added that the first attempts to collect the earliest specimens of Hebrew literature,—the ancient songs and ballads of which fragments still survive in the historical books,—probably originated in the schools of the prophets; and we may reasonably trace to the same source the two connected versions of Israel's past history, which are respectively styled by critics the Yahwistic and the Elohist narratives. These two documents appear to have been compiled independently sometime during the ninth or eighth century B. C. At a later period they were skillfully combined so as to form one continuous narrative, which was repeatedly revised and re-edited under prophetic influence. Thus before the appearance of the earliest of the eighth century prophets a mass of literary materials was already in existence—poems, ballads, prose narratives, maxims and written ordinances—out of which some attempt had already been made to construct an authoritative national history" (Taken mostly from Ottley p. 171 ff.).

The way was thus prepared for the "writing" prophets of the eighth century. The first of these great characters was Amos, a Judahite, who prophesied in Israel about 750 B. C. Israel at this time was a little kingdom about 100 miles long from north to south, and about 75 miles broad from the Mediter-

anean to the eastern border. Her people were comfortable and happy. There was quite an extensive import trade of fruits and cattle into Israel from the sister kingdom of Judah on the south which was about one-fourth the size of Israel. Religion was very prominent; people thronged the altars. The harvest festival, the time of the new moon, and all the great days in the calendar were duly observed. There was eating, drinking and rejoicing before Yahweh. That the intellectual life of the nation had reached a high standard can hardly be doubted.

But with all this prosperity some very hard problems arose. There were monopolies of land and cruelty toward the landless. Everything, it seems, had its price. Wealth must be gained at the expense of everything else. Although religion was prominent, worship was largely for the purpose of self-gratification. The sacred feasts were places of reveling where the strongest got the most and paid the least.

“Drunkenness, gluttony, violence, impurity grew in the midst of religious exercises. The worst feature in our eyes was the unchastity. It had a peculiar religious origin and grew to be fairly devilish. There were modest souls who had ideals and noble longings; but these were pushed to the wall. The meek and the feeble were crushed” (Duff, p. 44).

Not much is known of the life of Amos. He had been a farmer in Judah before being “called” through a vision to be a prophet of Yahweh. After prophesying for a time in his home country, he went to Israel and there did his greatest work.

There is a probability that Amos wrote out his sermons after preaching them; at any rate his style is uniformly accurate. The book of Amos properly begins at II, 6 with the writer's sermons to Israel, the book up to that point is concerned with Judah and forms really an introduction to the whole. In this introduction the surrounding peoples are mentioned with the declaration that each has committed wrong upon wrong and will surely be scourged by Yahweh. The wrongs are the invasions of one people by another, slave hunting, grasping for land, irreverence and sacrilege. The “fire” that is to be sent by Yahweh to right these wrongs is, likely, the Assyrian army.

The first indictment against Israel is found in II, 6-16. The Israelites are charged with silencing the righteous, and robbing the poor of their land. Greed is rampant; gifts brought to the temples are stolen; poor girls are violated; tax payers are mocked. The worst thing about it all was that these things were done at the house of worship after Yahweh's continued kindness to them through the revelations and inspirations of the prophets. For such evil deeds the transgressors would surely be crushed.

In III, 1-8 Amos claims the right to speak to the Israelites in Yahweh's name. Have they not been linked to Yahweh through joy and sorrow? Then why do they not listen to him? "The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

In III, 9-IV, 3 may be observed the sentence of Yahweh upon Israel. The doom of Israel is published to other people. Yahweh is declared to be the "Lord of Hosts." Here is the first plain declaration that Yahweh is overlord. "This is the beginning of the preaching of a monotheistic conception.

It is important to notice that this doctrine arises together with a faith that Yahweh is a righteous god" (Duff, p. 48). Women are instigators of crimes and take part in drunken orgies. Everywhere selfishness is triumphant.

In IV, 4-13 the selfish talk as if Yahweh took part in their gluttonous feasts. Amos holds that God is present everywhere, but not as a sharer in evil actions. It was he who brought the famine and drought, destroyed the bread, dried up the springs, brought on plagues, fevers, sores, and pestilence in the army. After all these punishments, and more, Israel will not listen. Instead of pronouncing a sentence upon them, Amos asks the people to face Yahweh, bow down before him, and become indeed his people.

The climax of all the oracles of Amos is reached in V, 1-5. "The highest and centrally characteristic utterance of the man is almost sublime in conception. We may best catch its significance by regarding it as a sort of dialogue between Amos and his audience. He cries, 'Ye die; scarce a tenth shall remain alive,' They reply, 'Tell us, then, what to do.' He answers, 'seek Yahweh

the creator, the life-giver, seek him and ye shall find life.' 'Yes, come,' say they, 'let us hasten to the sanctuaries.' 'No, no,' cries he. 'Seek not these; not Bethel, not Gilgal. Seek not temples; seek Yahweh and live!' They ask, astonished: 'Is he not there?' Amos answers, 'No! for you pervert the truth, deceive the honest, destroy the righteous, kill the reformer. Yahweh will not be seen among you.' Now they are angry, but Amos cries the more plainly: 'All that is good is assailed by you. You rob and are luxurious; you revel in wrong. You fight against the just and against all justice, and even against the courts of justice. Good flies from you, therefore, good men hide from you, and Yahweh goes with the good!' As they tremble he says, 'you see the only way to Yahweh. Find Good and ye shall find Yahweh and his presence shall bring you life.' This is remarkable. Here is the first writing prophet, and his kernel thought is that Yahweh cares first for goodness and always for goodness. The supreme god and life-giver abides where goodness is" (Duff, p. 49 ff.).

The last twelve verses of V and all of VI have to do with the avenging wrath of Yahweh. We have the germ of a belief in a coming judgment, when all things will be righted. This is the first time such an idea appears among the Hebrews. Only the good will be blessed when Yahweh comes. The false and the hypocrites will be forced out of the country, and thus away from Yahweh. For those who are unconcerned and do not want the day of Yahweh to come, and who think that all is well so long as the national worship is kept up, Amos pictures utter ruin.

Chapter VII and the first three verses of VIII show in the first place, "Yahweh answering prayer, granting forgiveness and averting famine and a great fire, but at last Yahweh's grace becomes exhausted and there is no more forgiveness for Israel" (Duff, p. 51). At this point Amos' denunciation becomes too much for the great priest, Amaziah and so Amos is ordered by the king to leave Israel. Since Amos felt that he himself had a personal fellowship with god, he must continue to speak of the wrongs committed.

The last part of the book recapitulates what has been spoken of. Almost all sorts of troubles shall come upon the people in Yahweh's name. There can be no escape either in heaven, earth or hell (the abode of the dead). All sinners shall die by the sword, an extreme punishment, yet one calculated to bring cleanliness everywhere.

In one sense Amos was the greatest of all the prophets, for he was the first to deny in writing the efficacy of priests and sanctuaries. He faced great odds, yet never wavered in his demands for reforms.

Another great prophet living probably a generation later than Amos, was Hosea, an Israelite. The times were troublous. Both Egypt and Assyria wished to dominate Israel. Sometimes both demanded tribute of her. This together with internal jealousies caused constant shiftings in the governmental policy of Israel. It has been calculated that at one time, each Israelite family paid Assyria a yearly tribute of 31 dollars. The very life-blood of the nation was sapped, and, according to Hosea, the people still committed the horrible sins of which Amos spoke. The history of the time is hard to unravel, so also is the book of Hosea.

Some passages in the book can hardly be translated from the Hebrew; the text has been injured in its transmission; notes have been made by readers and then copied by careless copyists as part of the book itself. With all these hindrances, a fairly good analysis of the book may be made.

The first three chapters give us: (1) The title of the book, and the date, the latter of which is doubtless incorrect; (2) Hosea's personal experiences in his home life with their interpretations as they bear upon his religious life. The wife of the prophet had been unfaithful, but he believed that Yahweh had caused this, and therefore uses the sad experience for teaching purposes. He applies it to his own people; the old union between a people and its land, and its deity was beginning to give way as he saw it. The people did not get due support from the land, hence their old god was not so good a baal as he once was, so they

would try another baal; the people became adulterous. Then Hosea proceeds to go further than any other prophet and inquires after the cause of Israel's unfaithfulness. The main cause he finds to be that the people have forgotten who bestowed upon them so many blessings. Yet Yahweh is still faithful, and Hosea believes that when his countrymen see their wrong doing, which he believes is due to ignorance, or blindness caused by excitement, they will return to Yahweh. This theory may not stand the test of experience but it goes beyond Amos who never stopped to ask whether men could be regenerated; it means sin and suffering, then repentance and regeneration. When the people yield to Yahweh, the land will again become fertile. "Then earth and beasts and birds and all men will live together in mutual faithfulness" (Duff, p. 68). Yahweh then does not carry on the government according to a great eternal plan. Man's actions condition god's actions. Although Hosea's moral atmosphere is not shown to be so pure as modern Christianity, he nevertheless has a tender pathos and beauty that is remarkable. It may be noted in passing that Hosea did not by any means condemn all the instruments of worship.

From the beginning of IV to the end of the book is a long ~~miscellany~~ miscellany which may be divided into several parts.

Beginning with IV and ending with IX, 9, the wrongs in the government are especially condemned, but the first part of this section deals with the priests. In his attack upon the priests he repeats again that sin is due to ignorance. The priests do not teach, hence the people sin. These priests offer sacrifice when the people sin and so get more fees than they would otherwise. Sacrificial feasts are condemned because they do not belong to Yahweh worship, they are observances belonging to other deities. Here is a note, as in Amos, of the older prophets.

Next, the royal house is held equally guilty with the priests. The sanctuaries where the rulers pretend to seek Yahweh are places of feasting and self-indulgence; Yahweh has departed from them; those who seek them are Yahweh's enemies; the sword of the invader will put a stop to this abomination. Again, the

princes are not just in their land laws. Tribal boundaries are altered, the rulers look to foreign countries for help, whereas help comes from Yahweh alone, he has brought on the trouble. But the favors of Yahweh can not be obtained by sacrifices. The oldest sanctuaries are roundly denounced. "Love is the true worship, and the knowledge of himself which Yahweh demands, is that he delights in loving kindness not in smoking sacrifices" (Duff, p. 71). In this section Hosea goes even further and says that, since the rulers pay tribute to foreigners they are paying tribute to foreign gods, all this is wrong. Another advance is shown in that the prophet discovers that images are not really gods. Did not a workman make the image? Still the people deride Hosea for his warnings. But because of their sins the nation shall be destroyed and the people carried away as slaves.

In the second section of the Miscellany (IX, 10-XI, 6) Hosea brings out lessons from the story of the past, but the contents are aimed largely against the sanctuaries. With much despair the prophet wrestles over the impending downfall of Israel. Finally, he reasons that the old tribal union has broken down because of the people's own act. Yahweh is no longer bound to act as a member of the tribe. Out of this a new light breaks; Yahweh is god, not man; in his loving kindness he will follow his own ways, but he will not forsake Israel. True enough his people may be exiled and made slaves but Yahweh "will bring them back to their home."

The third section of the Miscellany includes XII and XIII. Here the merchants are accused of practicing deceit, gain is everything to them. Horrible deeds are committed around the altars. The sacrifices and feasts are in honor of devils rather than of Yahweh. The prophets are laughed at, but they will still preach and cry out doom, yes they will bring that doom to pass.

Chapter XIII gives a picture of the common worship. The symbols of the deities are not utterly condemned, but both symbols and deities must go down before the sword. Amidst all these events Yahweh is the great controller. "It was he who gave evil princes; it is he who takes away. Finally, in wrath and in a

torrent of sublime sentences he summons all power to lay hold and help to ruin this evil nation. He chants this in Yahweh's name:

'Now will I tear thee, ruin thee.  
Come, Death with thy diseases:  
Help me!  
My mercy is exhausted.  
Men shall be sword-hewn;  
Women shall be sliced in twain;  
Children shall be dashed to death.'

Now follows the refrain: Hosea could not let those words be his last. His oracle of loving kindness rises to assert itself again. His voice breaks and he cries:

'O turn ye, O turn Israel.  
Turn to Yahweh your god.  
'Tis not he has slain you,  
But 'tis ye yourselves.  
Come let us cry to him,  
Forgive us our tresspass.'

The prophet sings the answer to his prayer of forgiveness;

'I will heal, heal, heal all things,  
Men's souls, the land, and all its life.  
I am Israel's best symbol.  
I am their sacred tree:  
From me comes all their fruit' " (Duff, p. 77, 78).

A third great prophet, one of the greatest that has ever lived was Isaiah, a Judahite (740-700 B. C.). The Judahites were living under conditions very similar to those which surrounded Amos. Judah was a very small country and possessed a poor land. For the first 20 years of his ministry Isaiah's home country was overshadowed by Israel, which was usually the enemy of Judah; for the last 20 years of his ministry Judah was exposed to the direct invasion of Assyria. The "call" of Isaiah is told in the beautiful words of VI. The prophet felt unworthy of his high calling, yet believed he must preach to the people.

What then is he to preach? In the first place (II) he inveighs against the ill-gotten wealth and the selfishness engendered by it. He believes that Yahweh will send punishment in due time. In III, 1-16 we read of tyranny and confusion in connection with the youthful king Ahaz, but the main charge is that the rulers are grinding the poor. The prophet believes that the comfort of the poor is identified with the interests of the deity. This is the beginning of a rich development.

There then follows an oracle (III, 16-V, 2) against the immodest and vain ladies of Jerusalem. The cry comes that shame shall come upon these. Succeeding this we have the Song of the Vineyard (V, 2-8). In this song we see: (1) The devotion of the owner of the vines, (2) His disappointment at what they produced; (3) That the disappointment and anger cause the man to destroy his vineyard. An application is then made of the story: Yahweh is angry with his people, the cry of the suffering poor rends his heart.

The next oracle is a cry of scorn and woe (V, 8-24). Those who commit wrongs are the land monopolists, lovers of strong drinks, mockers of religion, greedy banqueters, the false and the conceited gluttons. Yahweh is revengeful toward these. Isaiah thinks Sheol, the dark abode of the dead, a fit place for these sinners. While the prophet realizes the love and devotion which Yahweh exercises, he does not, as yet, believe in redemptive love.

"The last of this series of oracles begins with V, 25, which is then followed by IX, 7-X, 4; and V, 26-30. This is the 'Chant of the Outstretched Arm.' It is like an awful funeral dirge, across which strikes ever and anon the refrain:

'For all this anger is not turned away;  
And his arm is stretched out still!'" (Duff, p. 92).

A new spirit is found in all the oracles following these. Israel was in alliance with Syria. Judah refused to join the alliance and rather favored Assyria (734 B. C.). This exposed Judah to the attacks of Israel and Syria. Isaiah preaches faith and courage to Ahaz the king (VII, 1-16). He believes in Yahweh's

goodness and help. The prophet tells Ahaz to ask for a sign from Yahweh, but Ahaz replies "I will not ask neither will I tempt the Lord." Some writers think that the words following those just quoted are a rebuke to Ahaz for the answer he gave, but that is not likely the case since Ahaz's answer was the correct one. But Isaiah proceeds to give the sign he has promised. It was to be a child by the name of Immanuel (a deity is with us). This meant to Ahaz that the child would soon be born and when that event happened, Judah's confidence would be restored.

Chapters VIII, 1-IX, 6 may be divided into five oracles: VIII, 1-4, 5-10, 11-18, 19-22, IX, 1-6. These may differ as to date and authorship but the religious ideas of Isaiah are evident. In the first place an oracle is attached to the life of a child, which is practically the same oracle as the one concerning Immanuel. Coming deliverance is again expressed. Yahweh is with his people. The child will be brave, calm and wise—in short, he will be just the leader that Judah needs. The dominant note in this series of oracles is undoubtedly political but the deep religious nature of the prophet is everywhere manifest.

Linked with this series are the utterances found in XVII, 1-6 and 9-11. Here the utter destruction of both Syria and Israel is predicted. The expectation of this destruction is well founded, but Isaiah's forecasts are not nearly so reliable as his knowledge of Yahweh's moral character. It is interesting to note in this connection that Isaiah speaks of other deities besides Yahweh but they are despised by the prophet.

A number of great discourses have to do with the destruction of Israel (See XVII, 12-14; XVIII, 1-6). These passages are important for us because they show not only the great moral scorn for the sins of the Israelites, but they proclaim that it is Yahweh has brought on the disaster, it is he who moves through all the shifting scenes. In regard to the Assyrians attacking Jerusalem a great picture is given in X, 24-34, but in the foreword is the note that "all will be well" even though Judah is stricken by the Assyrian sword.

Chapter XI, 1-9 presents the idea of the rule of an ideal king

over a saved land. A number of Isaiah's religious ideas are expressed here. The most important one is that man's power over other men depends upon the godlikeness of his spirit. "The spirit causes knowing and almost on Hosea's old theory, it is this knowledge that causes goodness. But the happy life under a king of such spirit consists very largely of material blessings; and more, these material blessings are to be accomplished by the essential alteration of nature. 'The lion shall eat straw like the ox,' etc." (Duff, p. 99).

King Ahaz died in 715 B. C. The Philistines were exultant over this because the Hebrew king had favored the Assyrians. Isaiah (XIV, 28-32) reminds the Philistines to forbear from this glee, for the Assyrian king is coming with an army to harry Philistia; indeed Judah will not escape, but there is the clear utterance that "Yahweh is founding Zion! and in her his people's loved ones are going to trust." This may be the source of the later Zion doctrine. "Isaiah was able to see, as anyone else could see, how inviolable Jerusalem naturally was, perched up 2,000 feet on barren mountains, far aside from the great roads, a very little place, almost a village. But the prophet points out the hand of Yahweh in this and sees in it his definite choice. Here is the essence of the character of Isaiah in a sentence. Yahweh is lord of all things, men, doings and movements" (Duff, p. 100).

Isaiah continued to give utterance to his ideas during the reign of Hezekiah (715-686 B. C.). Oracles were given out in 711, 704, 703, 702, 701 B. C., but none later. It is thought by some that the prophet was the confidential adviser of the king, but no mention is made of why he so suddenly ceased to prophesy. It may be that he was murdered, since he was hated by many of the people, and since his utterances from 711 to 701 show a growing antagonism between the prophet and the court.

In the first oracle from 711 (See XX, 1-6) a pro—Egyptian tendency in Judah is attacked. Dress is used for a symbol of his attack. His opinion is that Egypt's political claims are all vain, yet he attributes his opinions to Yahweh. Yahweh speaks, not Isaiah. The prophet believes that Yahweh not only has an

interest in the politics of Israel, but that he is interested in outside people as well. This is illustrated in an oracle concerning Moab (XVI, 14), and in one concerning a place in Arabia (XXI, 16 ff.). These passages show that the prophet thought that Assyria was to rule all politically.

But grander words than these follow in X, 5-15 and its proper conclusion, XIV, 24-27. Isaiah is startled by the idea that Sargon II may harm Judah. He has heard that the Assyrian king cares little for Judah's king or her god. To Isaiah, a man is a fool to think light of Yahweh, who is God of gods. Yet it is not so much whether the Assyrian king has questioned the identity of Yahweh and God as it is that that ruler has attributed all his successes to his own wisdom (Sargon did not do this but Isaiah thought he did). The prophet's utterance becomes sublime when he says,

“Sworn hath Yahweh of Hosts to-wit:  
Surely it is as I, even I, have planned,  
So it shall be.”

“Now we reach the climax of the oracles, those uttered when Sargon died and was followed by an even sterner prince, Sennacherib, from 705 B. C., on to 701, when Isaiah suddenly disappeared. The oracles are ten in number: (1) XXII, 15-18; (2) XXVIII, 7-22; (3) XXIX, 1-6, 9-10, 13 ff.; (4) XXIX, 15; XXX, 1-5; XXX, 6 ff.; XXXI, 1-3; (5) XXX, 8-17; (6) XXXI, 4 ff.; (7) 1-26; (8) XVIII; (9) I, 5-26; (10) XXII, 1-14. They are less read and less understood than those of the prophet's early life. Possibly the reason is that the traditional theory of Hezekiah's attitude makes it actually impossible to comprehend how Isaiah could say such things concerning Hezekiah's government. So the oracles are made into a riddle by this faulty tradition and they are consequently almost erased from practical use. But a study of the eloquence and wise counsel in the oracles will show how great the preacher has grown. For a grasp of Hebrew ethics and theology they are invaluable authority. Let us point out two features of their whole nature. First, they are all full of

contempt for Egyptian and pro-Egyptian politicians in Judah. In other words Isaiah has risen to a decided faith in world empire and to a clear view concerning it. To him the unity of divine control by Yahweh is being realized through the overlordship of the Assyrian empire. Doubtless the king Ahaz, who has often been lightly esteemed, but who steadily stood as, in some sense, the representative of Assyria in Palestine, had helped to bring Isaiah to this view. Secondly, there stands in the front in all these oracles a growing faith in the safety of Zion, not so much as a sanctuary or a place of forgiveness, but as a fortress. He was more and more attributing its almost inaccessible position, and its undesirability as a prize for invaders, to the all-controlling guidance of Yahweh. These two points go together. If only the king and the people will have nothing to do with the insidious, worthless Egyptian government, and will not vex and irritate Assyria, then Jerusalem shall be the safe, aye, and supreme home of Yahweh" (Duff, p. 104 ff.).

We have noticed that Isaiah's utterances ceased about 700 B. C. Would that we knew more of his personal characteristics! What we do know shows that he was honest, fearless, a lover of justice. In his conception of Yahweh, he gives us a breath of a new life and voices an ideal which has sounded true and clear through the ages. From the standpoint of literature alone his writings belong to the permanent contributions of mankind. No serious person can read his sermons without feeling a glow of enthusiasm for a highly wrought and earnest soul.

Micah, a younger contemporary of Isaiah is of no little interest in the history of prophecy. He was a "man from the country," city life was an abomination to him. He states this dislike very clearly when he says:

"What is the transgression of Jacob?  
Is it not Samarai?  
And what is the sin of Judah?  
Is it not Jerusalem? "

The land question greatly aroused Micah. With the growth

of agriculture, private property in land was introduced, although much of the land was still uncultivated and held in common. But the nobles inclosed this common land for their own uses. Micah appealed to his order to support him in his attack upon the rapacity of the nobles, but he found himself alone. He was the last of the old prophets who was an exponent of pastoral life.

Stirred to the utmost, Micah made his way to Jerusalem and there in the temple court delivered his invectives against both the prophets and the nobles. To him "the nobles are cannibals, the prophets are like wild beasts whose mouths must be stopped with food; the walls of Jerusalem are cemented with blood.

'Therefore for your sake shall Zion be ploughed as a field  
And Jerusalem shall be mere heaps,  
And the mountains of the House a rising ground in a wild wood' "

—(Todd, p. 160).

After all these denunciations it is natural to suppose that Micah would have suffered personal violence, but such was not the case. Jeremiah gives the reason why. "Did Hezekiah, king of Judah, put him at all to death? Did the king, not fear Yahweh and seek the face of Yahweh? And Yahweh repented of the evil which he had pronounced against them."

This reception of the prophet's words is one of the best proofs we have that the people were prepared to appreciate such things. "Great prophets might make themselves unpopular—they almost glory in the fact—but their words went home. Instead of being an age of 'moral decay' and 'spiritual decadence,' the eighth and seventh centuries were the exact reverse. They were the age in which ethical principles were first clearly enunciated, and they were the age in which men set themselves to carry these principles into practice. Nothing can be more fantastically wrong than to regard Israel-Judah as tottering through degradation to an ignoble fall. It was the springtime of humanity just emerging—so rapidly—from the crudeness of the old clan life. The destruction of the nations was not the digging up of an old and withered stump; it was the breaking down of a young

and beautiful plant just bursting into blossom" (Todd, p. 161 ff.).

Micah's style is excellent and his writings deserve careful study even from the standpoint of literature.

Like Amos and Hosea, although invectives are given against private sins, he considers the Hebrews as a whole guilty. All three of the prophets failed to grasp clearly the political and social movements of their time. Not one was a profound thinker, but the great thing about all is that each believes vice to be a negation of religion. "To Amos the great offense is judicial corruption, to Hosea sensuality, to Micah rapacity and they have together so woven religion and morality into one perfect whole that they can never be divided. They lived in an age when individualism was fast coming clearly into play, and neglecting all aspects of it except that which was evil, they inveighed against it with an enthusiasm amounting to ferocity. The great thing is that in the moral sphere they were successful. Practice of course always falls far short of the teaching of the moralists, but Israel recognized in a way as no other ancient nation did that their religion and national existence were bound up with man's duty to his neighbor" (Todd, p. 163 ff.).

Some time in the general period we have under discussion (950-700 B. C.), what may be called the formal doctrinal teachers did their work. These have been hinted at in connection with the Yahwistic and Elohist narratives. The subject of these narratives has been noted also. It was pointed out that the origin of these narratives may reasonably be found among the prophets. Without going into the details of the question, it is also reasonable to suppose that the Yahwistic narrative preceded the four great prophets mentioned above and that the Elohist narrative was written after their time. The prophets are the inventors of certain ideas of which the Elohist make stiff formulations—in a word, they organized and commented upon the thought of the great prophets.

"But all this compels us to a further step. We must hold that the Deuteronomists, the 'D' School, followed the Elohist logically and speedily. The Deuteronomists are Elohist. The

Elohists planned theological views and ecclesiastical order, let us say, that they might realize the moral fruit of the prophets. The Deuteronomists said that the Elohist spirit was right, but that this spirit demanded a more thorough logical application of its own principle. 'Reflect and lay down moral orders,' said the Elohist. 'Organize by centralization, else the morality will never be perfect,' said the Deuteronomist" (Duff, p. 132). This tendency toward centralization was seen in the suggestion of Hosea that there were too many sanctuaries. Isaiah also learned to believe that Zion was especially favored by God, as a political stronghold and, to some extent, as a sanctuary.

Both the Elohists and the Deuteronomists exalted Shechem as the chief sanctuary. Further on we shall notice how king Josiah of Judah applied this idea in a practical way to his little state. So much for the central political view of these schools.

The central thought in their theology is that they are not only conscious of their many past sins but they are not sure but that they may sin again; they are therefore not sure of themselves. The nearest consequent thought to this is that Yahweh is one who lifts them up. God is real now, he is no longer an ordinary clansman but a god. Yahweh is separated from them. Naturally there arises the idea of possible progress through revelation. To these writers their god began to reveal himself at the Exodus. All of them are not, however, carried away by the idea, and further none of them could think of God as a transcendental divine spirit. But they did arrive at the idea that there was not one Yahweh here and another there; there was one Yahweh, in whom were summed up all the powers once thought to be diverse. As has been noticed, Yahweh preferred one place of worship, Shechem.

The Deuteronomists believed that people should be thoughtful, hence the Decalogue, to them, was not a fixed and unalterable thing. The Decalogue was a summary of great things which had to do with morality and duty. "The people had grown morally awake and those needs that pressed first were, to-wit: due reverence for Yahweh, the distant god, not to be meanly represented; due acts and days of orderly worship; clan-

reverence; due regard for life, property, sex and character of neighbors. But there followed the notable demand made by all those writers that the Decalogue must be supplemented" (Duff, p. 145). The men who were to do this supplementing were to be raised up by Yahweh. They were to leave their work in a written form. The main demands of the Deuteronomists were not for the ceremonies of worship but that the everyday life should be filled with love, reason, and respect for the civil organization and the teaching of holy men.

Although these formal teachers were limited in their theological and ethical ideas, these very limitations were fruitful and not incapable of enlargement. What these limitations were is a legitimate question.

In the first place the idea that divine guidance was given through written documents was a limitation. This tended to keep the individual from having direct communication with his god. Yet the document must be added to and commended to the people, so this limitation was not so strict as it might appear.

It appears, also that the concentration of worship in one place was a limitation, yet the document said "worship in one place and in all your homes teach your children to love Yahweh with all their being." Yahweh could then manifest himself in the home as well as in the worship of the far away sanctuary at Shechem. Thus this limitation did not hold.

"Finally, it is remarkable that the whole movement of the time was actually toward a faith in God as something transcendent, one who was 'a god and not a man,' above the material earth and the ways of earthly men, not to be seen with the bodily eye, but in the visions of the soul; and yet the way of the incoming of this doctrine was through the linking of God to certain wonderful, material things, instruments, places, men. Strange surely, advance is claimed, yet men seem to go backward. Yet the movement toward transcendence had started; and if simple souls in the first overwhelmed moments of the incoming consciousness that 'He is far above,' did reel in feeble fashion, they were going forward, and should see better when

the dazzling light grew more wanted, and out of the material they rose to the reality of the spiritual. For to think at all about faults in one's self or people and to dream of a higher ideal than the past, to guess at the unseen who demands righteousness—all this is new birth into spiritual manhood. The Elohist and Deuteronomic schools or school marked a wide awakening, a wonderful advance of many people, and a great step forward in the life of realized religion and goodness. Such were the theology and ethics of this large class (Duff, p. 147 ff.)

\* \* \*

## CHAPTER V

### GENERAL DEVELOPMENTS IN JUDAH (FROM 700-586 B. C.)

The tribe of Judah together with a few families south of her was all that was left of old Israel, since the northern kingdom fell into the hands of Assyria in 722 B. C. Just a century after that event, in 622 B. C., a complete revolution took place in Judah. This revolution was based upon the Deuteronomic ideas and one or other of the documents mentioned above. This revolution produced great changes not only in the political fabric but also in the worship and home life of the people. This great event has not only influenced to a marked degree all subsequent Hebrew religious forms, but it has affected deeply all Christianity.

Such epoch making events do not occur independently. The doings of the master nations round about were all significant. At about this time Assyria, as a state, perished. Egypt, her old rival, tried to grasp the scepter of world-empire, but utterly failed. Nebuchadrezzar II, "King of Babylon," was looked upon as a world ruler, but he had to share his territorial control north of the Tigris with the Medes; neither was he ruler over Egypt. It was with the coming of Cyrus the Great that the world-empire was more fully realized than ever—that event, however, falls beyond the province of this chapter.

The names of the great rulers of Assyria, belonging to our period, will readily be recalled. Just as they had apparently

brought their country to the height of its glory, there was a sudden collapse. The events connected with the downfall show that the Orient was stirred as never before.

But before the passing of the great Tigro-Euphrates state, the idea was worked out that all nations could be ruled as one whole. "Of course the Assyrian believed that he was the fit ruler and centre of all, but the great religious idea in this is the belief in one system in the world, and necessarily one law, one guidance, one supreme God. All men were nearing the same faith. When Assyria fell, Egypt claimed the right to succeed her: therefore Egypt, too, believed in unity in the world. So did Babylon, which fought Egypt. \* \* \* \* \* And so did Medo-Persia. \* \* \* \* \* But little Judah believed the same. When Egypt passed north in 609 B. C. across the plain of Megiddo, in her hope to take the imperial crown, the petty sheik of Judah—we call him commonly King Josiah—marched out to prevent Egypt and her King, Pharaoh-Necho. Josiah fell, no wonder to us; but it was a wonder to him and his little host and people. Why? How did he come to and cherish the dream that he and his god, forsooth, should be the rulers of all men? It was because he had accepted with all his heart the documents and doctrine of the Deuteronomists that Yahweh was the real lord of all men, and the god of the whole earth. The religious movement that we have traced up to its highest moral height in the prophets, to its formal crystallisation in the Elohist, and its vision of unification in one sanctuary according to the Deuteronomists,—this long rise found its rightful climax, on one side at least, in the self-sacrifice of the chief representative Hebrew for the attainment of his Deuteronomic political ideal. Josiah believed God led him. He was not wrong. Soon afterward another representative Hebrew did speak out the watch word by which all the world has really been ruled, but this man, a poor slave in Babylon, saw more clearly than the king Josiah the kind of battle that was to be fought, the kind of realm that was to be won and built and swayed. This later Hebrew was the Suffering Servant of God, whose requiem and rising again are sung in

Isa. LIII" (Duff, p. 152 ff.). So much for a view of the general aspects of the century we have under consideration.

Hezekiah, the king of Judah who had not followed the guidance of Isaiah, died about 697 B. C. He was followed by his son, Manasseh who held the throne from 697 to 642 B. C. From his long reign we should judge that he made a good ruler and was acceptable to his Assyrian overlords. With all the seeming satisfaction with his rule the idea of absolute kingship began to wane. As with most other peoples absolute monarchy became an anomaly in a city-state. During his reign the influences which had produced the Elohist and the Deuteronomist were opposed by the official religious class.

Manasseh was followed by his son Amon. This king reigned only two years; he was assassinated by a palace conspiracy. The old murderous spirit seemed to have returned, but this was only apparent. The whole people were indignant over the murder and so the assassins were immediately brought to justice.

The people as a whole were evidently in very good condition, but they were becoming tired of many of the traditional ways among both the civil and religious officials.

Josiah, a child of eight years, succeeded Amon to the throne. Little is known of Josiah's work before his twenty-sixth year. By that time the temple of Zion had fallen into disorder under the control of the officials mentioned above. There was need of reform, and although, no doubt, many of the people favored reforms, it took the living voice of prophecy to round the advanced ideas into form and to show again that politics and religion were really two sides of the same question.

The man who, more than any other at this time, heralded the coming of a better day was the prophet Zephaniah, who was a true successor of Isaiah. It is evident that the economic condition of Judah was bad just as in the days of Isaiah, in a word, about the same things were condemned by Zephaniah as by Isaiah. Zephaniah, however, appreciated more than did Isaiah, both the city of Jerusalem and the value of her shrine. But the priests were condemned because they had defiled the sacred place.

He proclaims that sinners will be blotted out of existence, destruction will come, yet Yahweh will be in the midst of Jerusalem even though her faults are great. Zephaniah worked with all his might to bring the nobles to his way of thinking. As we shall see later he succeeded.

“Standing on the threshold of the great Revolution, it will be well briefly to recapitulate the history which led up to it.

The hill town of ‘Urusalim’ had remained outside the influence of Judah until it was captured by David, who made it his place of residence. As it was situated on the Northern frontier of Judah it attracted a large Benjamite population, which connected it somewhat closely in thought and temper with the Northern kingdom. The worship of Yahweh was probably, therefore, always a more genuinely popular religion in Zion than in the rest of Judah.

Under Solomon the palace and the temple were built, and the city became definitely and forever the Judahite capital. The nobles gradually tended to leave the country houses and come to live in the city. Of course this movement was slow and never universal. A sense of the dignity and quiet of the country life must have detained many. \* \* \* \*

Under Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Manasseh and Amon, Jerusalem had become more and more the focus of the nation’s life. The distinction between the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem becomes marked in the literature. In Isaiah we see the citizen, and in Micah the man from the country.

The importance and attractiveness of city life had demonstrated itself. The mere joy of the great city—the buildings, the crowds, the sights, the news,—all these threw their glamour over Judah. Nor were higher influences wanting. The clash of intellect and the sense of being alive to thought were at work. In a word, the very courses operating at the present moment to draw the country folk to London were at work in Palestine 2500 years ago. Browning has admirably satirised the weaker side of the movements in his poem. ‘Up at a Villa—Down in the City,’ but the stronger and better aspect is also visible to history.

The city had, however, as yet no definite place in the politics of the nation. The nobles had left their estates in the country to come and live in Jerusalem, but although life there was pleasanter it had its draw-backs. In the country, they were petty kings; in the city they were practically nobody. So long as the king retained his absolute position above law, and with material resources sufficient to enforce his will, Jerusalem and her nobles were powerless. Ahaz and Hezekiah had taken advice, and ruled with some regard to their subjects, but Manasseh had filled Jerusalem with blood from end to end. The long minority of Josiah was coming to a close, and the time was ripe to strike.

From the religious point of view Jerusalem had at first little prestige. Amos and Hosea simply ignore its shrine as being of no account in the popular religion. But as the city became truly the capital, so the Temple—though of mushroom growth compared with Beersheba—gained in importance. The invasion of Sennacherib, who overthrew every Judahite town except Jerusalem, invested the temple at last with the necessary religious glamour as Yahweh's only inviolable sanctuary.

Jerusalem was the home of the party which—for want of a better name—we term the Party of Reform. In the earlier period of its growth the greater prophets had disliked and shunned it, but at length the force of attraction was too strong for them and they joined hands with the cultured Yahweh worshipers within the city walls. Under the leadership of Zephaniah they converted to their views the great nobles by whom the revolution was carried out. The long minority of Josiah had given the nobles time to mature their plans" (Todd, p. 203 ff.).

The Deuteronomic legislation of king Josiah (640-609 B. C.) was so favorable to the nobles that it may be regarded as their work. With all its religious earmarks the main object of the legislation was political in its nature. What the nobles wished to do was to substitute a constitutional for an absolute monarchy.

Their first step toward this end was to centralize all of Judah in Jerusalem. Every Judahite must be made a citizen of Jerusalem, and the other towns and cities must be reduced to minor positions.

Now the focus of the town or city life was the bamah. This bamah was the house of the deity who appeared to many as their own particular guardian. Here the people assembled, the priests gave out the torah, the prophets preached to the people, and private reunions were held.

Although it was a daring thing to do the nobles determined to destroy the shrines and temples out side Jerusalem. The legislation therefore begins with the statement that all "burnt offerings, sacrifices, tithes, heave-offerings, vows, free will offerings, and firstlings" are to be brought to Jerusalem. At another place in the code it is required that, at times of the feast of Unleavened Bread, the feast of Weeks, and feast of Tabernacles, each male is to appear before Yahweh.

These enactments brought up a number of difficulties. Since every feast was a sacrifice the people in the country would have to come to Jerusalem every time they wished to eat meat. This was impossible, so the ordinary eating of meat was declared to be distinct from sacrifice. Even before this time the eating of game was considered non-sacrificial, so the ox and sheep were classed as game.

Sacrifice was allowed outside Jerusalem only in one case. If a man was found murdered in the country and the murderer could not be found, the elders of the nearest town were to sacrifice a heifer where the man was found.

It was no easy task to deal with the priests of the local shrines. They were offered maintenance in the Temple at Jerusalem. In order to take away their power in the locality as property holders they were declared incapable of holding landed property, although they might sell the land and keep the proceeds.

Another thing which might have been dangerous to the central authorities, had it not been wholly abolished, was the custom of having harlots in connection with the shrines.

The shrines had also been the place of Refuge for one who had committed accidental homicide and was sought after by an avenging relative of the dead man. The new law set apart only three towns in different parts of the country where the hunted man might be safe.

The old local courts, composed of the elders in each town, were preserved, but their independence was destroyed by the appointment of a presiding judge. Furthermore, a court of appeal, composed of a judge and priests, was set up in Jerusalem. This court was not a mere advisory body—its decisions were to be enforced under penalty of death.

The central authorities also appointed officials to levy soldiers from each district in time of war. The officials, in turn, appointed the captains for the local regiments.

From what has been said we see that it was natural that the code should place certain limitations on the king. The principle was now asserted that the law was above the king; the monarch must keep a copy of the law beside him. Law-making passed out of the king's hands.

No foreigner was to be king. This may suggest that the murderers of Amon tried to place a foreigner on the throne, but it is probably aimed at the sons of foreign princesses. Even though these princesses were wives of the king, they were not considered members of his family and probably their sons were looked upon in the same light.

The body-guard of the king was to be as small as possible. The army, raised as indicated, was deemed sufficient.

Neither was the king to "multiply wives." It was thought that in the harem the king came under unworthy influences. Here concubines and eunuchs took the place of the nobles, and further no man's life was safe in the hands of a cruel and lustful king.

In the matter of hoarding up wealth the king was to be kept within reasonable limits. He was not "greatly to multiply silver and gold."

The divine guardian of this reorganized state was Yahweh and Yahweh alone. The penalty for worshiping any other god was death by stoning.

How to arrange the ritual or manner of worship was not an easy question for the law-makers, for there were at least two forms of ritual in existence. The simpler one of these which

embodied the old and simple cultus of early Israel, with some emendations was adopted.

The consideration given to the prophets is not of so very much interest. Yahweh still inspires the prophet to predict coming events. Those who do not listen to the prophets will be held responsible. If the prophet is wrong in his forecasts no one need believe him in the future and he may even be put to death. The prophet who invites people to worship any other god besides Yahweh is also to be put to death.

Some of the semi-religious practices were legislated against, for example the propitiation of the dead. The rest of the code "consists of laws on a great variety of subjects—the sexes, slavery, naturalization, etc. Throughout it all run two great principles, the consciousness of the importance and destiny of Jerusalem, and the necessity of kindness, mansuetudo, between man and man" (Todd, p. 217).

Thus the revolution, the results of which we have been discussing, was sweeping in character. No one but the nobles could have done such a thing, for they were not only residents in the city, but lords of the great country estates. It was not then essentially a struggle of the country against the capital.

It can not now be determined who put into writing the Deuteronomic code, but it is far more important, anyway, to note how the code was put in force. "Hebrew antiquity knew four forms of 'Law.' There was the torah given by the priests at the shrine, there was the word of Yahweh given by the prophets, there was the statute or ordinance proceeding from the king or other supreme commander, and there was the judgment or case decision of the judge. None of these was adequate to the promulgation of a constitution" (Todd, p. 219).

So by a political device the whole code was assigned to Moses. Moses belonged to such a distant past that "no one had any idea what he had or had not decreed" (Todd, p. 219), but he was revered by all. It was said that the document had been placed in the temple at Jerusalem and was found there by the chief priest. It is not known how far the device was recognized

as a fiction, but Josiah was probably the only one of the upper classes who did not know the whole story.

Hilkiah, the chief priest, sanctioned the document. The leading prophetess of the day (Zephaniah was dead, apparently), Huldah, was consulted. She expressed her approval. Yet something was still lacking to make the code the constitution of Israel, this was a covenant of the people in the presence of Yahweh. So a great concourse of people of all ranks assembled in the temple court. The code was read out. "The king 'stood on the standing-place and cut the 'berith.' He divided a calf into two pieces. The halves were laid before Yahweh (on Jachin and Boaz?), and the whole procession—nobles, priests, prophets, populace—walked or danced between. It was a great day—the birth day of constitutionalism in Jerusalem; and the form of city law was found neither in priestly instruction nor royal ordinance, but in the solemn agreement of all classes of the free people in the presence of their god" (Todd, p. 221).

No provision was made for law-making in the future, but this did not mean that constitutional freedom was to be checked. We are not surprised then to hear later of the whole governing class going between the halves of the calf. The same power that ratified the constitution therefore amended it.

One of the strongest supporters of Josiah's policy was the prophet Jeremiah. He had taken part in the Revolution, and continued to be a strong force in Judah until about the period of the exile (about 586 B. C.). Sometimes he was favored by the kings, sometimes he was not. The nobles generally defended him against the opposition of the priests and the kings.

The parts of the book of Jeremiah are not arranged chronologically, but this need not surprise us since many of the books of the Bible are in the same condition.

Chapter I shows us that Jeremiah believed that in the struggle between Babylon and Egypt the former would be successful; such proved to be the case. This made the prophet popular. In the same chapter, an idea of prime importance in the history of religion is expressed, i. e., that Yahweh cared for the prophet

individually.. This is the first great advance made by Jeremiah.

In the second set of passages, from II to VI, appeals are made to heed lessons learned in the youthful days of the Israelites; unchastity is condemned; an attempt is made to do away with the idea that Yahweh is one of the baal deities; an argument is delivered against many sanctuaries; there are also echoes of the Scythian invasions. The preacher also pleads for Josiah's plan in other respects.

The next group of discourses are found in XI, XII, XVIII. In these are found the basis of the great hymns of Isaiah LIII. Men thought to kill the prophet, who had doubtless gone about preaching the gospel of the Deuteronomic covenant. In XVIII another of Jeremiah's great advances is made. He begins to study the mind, to ask what will is.

It can be noticed how the prophet's thought advances in VII-X. He gets above and away from the Deuteronomic faith and declares: "We have believed that this temple in Zion was to be the one place where Yahweh would surely meet with us. That is false!" He then proceeds to argue the question, and says, "You believe you may chant: 'Here we are safe, free to do after our own heart's pleasure.' Your pleasure is to steal and murder and be impure. All this and much more you do is utterly unlike Yahweh's way. He is not here. He will avenge your insult." He says something else that is startling. "We believed that we were commanded to sacrifice, that is, to hold joyful feasts of flesh in family circles gathered about this sanctuary. We were not commanded to sacrifice, but to listen to Yahweh's voice. And that voice in all his prophets says, 'Be just and kind, like Yahweh.'" So the third great advance of Jeremiah is made in his criticism of the Deuteronomic reformation. It has not made the Israelites good, so they are open to oppression and invasion.

The fourth great advance made by Jeremiah is seen in XXIV. He holds that Yahweh has ordained that Babylon is to be for the time the supreme state. Judah then is to submit and to become a province of Babylon. Moreover the Hebrews are to be faith-

ful to the Babylonian masters even in slavery. "The slaves are to pray for blessings on their foreign lords. The prophet is startlingly practical; he arranges and invests his possessions and buys land, certain that to do so under this Babylonian lordship is perfectly safe. This is Jeremiah's fourth and final advance in belief." (Duff, p. 173). When Jerusalem was finally taken the prophet had his choice of either going under the protection of the commander-in-chief to a safe retreat in Babylon or of staying in Judah with the "poor who had nothing." He chose the latter course in order to be of assistance to these downcast ones. But they reviled him and carried him away to the delta of the Nile.

His work, however, was not a failure, for the men of the exile carried his ideas with them. We shall see later how they developed them into better things.

Let us now notice some of the most prominent features of the city-state of Jerusalem just before the exile.

The topography of the city is known only in a general way. It was built on three hills, the eastern hill was occupied by the temple, the king's palace, and it may be the palaces of the nobles. The temple was north of the other buildings and on higher ground. In David's time Jerusalem was likely confined to Ophel (See Perrot and Chipiez, p. 142). No doubt the city had expanded in the centuries following David's time, especially toward the west. Of the two hills in the western part of the city the one toward the south was the larger so it became the main part of the town. The deep valleys of Hinnom and Kedron protected the city on the west, east and south. Only the north side was unprotected by natural features. But the whole city was surrounded by walls through which were many gates. Each gate had its own name. It appears that within the city each trade had its own street and bazaar.

The government was largely in the hands of the nobles; their position is well expressed by king Zedekiah (599-588 B. C.): "The king is not he that can do any thing against you."

The temple was the focus of the worship, but sacred rites were performed in several other places within the city. "It is

a common and not unnatural mistake to regard the 'house' or temple-building of Solomon as the place of worship somewhat in the fashion of a church. This is of course quite wrong. The sacrifices took place in the court under the sky, and in early days worship and sacrifice were practically synonymous. The house was designed for keeping the Ark, which in the constitutional period had come to be regarded as the Palladium of Jerusalem; also the processional images, the sacrificial tools, etc. It was, moreover, the dwelling place of some of the priests. The writer in the Kings who describes Solomon's temple is careful to explain that although the house was flanked by chambers three stories high yet they were not structurally connected with it; but the narrator of the 'child Samuel' episodes is familiar with a temple in which sacred ministers slept.

The great point to bear in mind is our almost total ignorance of the courts, buildings, rites and priest-hoods of the First Temple. In four hundred years it must have grown greatly, and probably the courts were in time surrounded with shrines and buildings of all sorts. Priests of various rites, prophets, temples servants, many of them with wives and families, all these, besides the less desirable classes, lived in the sacred enclosure. We have scattered hints which point to a very considerable community, but they are only hints, and do not suffice for a reconstruction either of the place or its inhabitants" (Todd, p. 223 ff.).

When Jerusalem fell there were three religions within its walls, which were fairly well defined. These were the worship of Yahweh Zebaoth, of Yahweh-Baal and of the stars. The second of these perished with the destruction of the city, the last remained but ceased to be of interest, while the first was carried to Babylonia within the hearts of the exiles. It was the enlightened Yahweh worship (Zebaoth means God of Hosts).

The tendency was to look upon Yahweh as the creator and ruler of the universe. It is probable that Jerusalem was to some extent a religious center for the Syrian world.

"Yahweh's relation to Israel was peculiar. It had begun purely as a natural relationship. But Israel had learned that

God is not dependent on his worshipers and that he governs the whole world. Hence his connection with Israel became one of choice on his part. At the Exodus he had selected the nation as one to whom he chose to reveal his will. To the prophets the election of Israel expressed itself as an exaltation of their own Order, which would have been intolerable but for the good use to which they turned it. The whole history was a sending of prophets. 'By a prophet Yahweh brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved,' said Hosea. 'Surely Adonai Yahweh does nothing without revealing his intention to the prophets,' said Amos. 'Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets daily rising up early and sending,' said Jeremiah. As Yahweh assumed more and more a supernatural character (so to speak) the prophets magnified their office, and the one duty of Israel was to listen to Yahweh's word by the hand of his servants. Israel was very far from conceding this somewhat extravagant pretension. The ancestral cultus, the sacrifices of the shrines, were an integral part of religion. No doubt Yahweh was not dependent on them. Once God is recognized as creator the idea of actually feeding him becomes absurd. But still there it was. He undoubtedly desired these sacrifices, and it would be disastrous to withhold them.

Had the religion of Israel been an affair exclusively of priests or prophets it would have perished; it survived because it had become individual. This was the result of political training in the city-state. \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* The permanent value of Israel's religion lay in the fact that men recognized that in the personal sphere the prime demand of God was righteousness.

It required the discipline of the Exile to drive this home. Nothing but the destruction of the shrine and the cessation of sacrifice, the resolution of Israel into atoms, could establish finally and forever the fact that the interior life of man is the real scene of the religious life" (Todd, p. 250 ff.).

Yahweh gave his rewards and punishments in this life only.

The Hebrews still held to the idea of the dark abode of the dead as expressed by the word Sheol.

Considerable writing was done about this time (600 B. C.). Some of the Yahwist's sections of Genesis were revised in order to bring them into conformity with the religious ideas of the time. It seems reasonable to suppose that the reviser intended to do nothing else than give a pious version of the folk lore in Genesis. It was only centuries later that being set in the forefront of the Law, it was taken seriously as the basis of Theology and the starting point of Universal History.

The history of the patriarchs was also in writing at the time of the exile. It is admitted by general "consent to be a masterpiece of pure narrative. Of course there never was nor could be such a state of society as that depicted for us as in the lives of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. These dignified, pious, thoughtful nomads are the products of imagination only. It is the Golden Age of the early prophets translated into narrative—all the gains of civilization and religion transported to the desert without the slightest diminution. Not such, we may be quite sure, were the rude forefathers of Israel in the wilderness. A multitude of sources have gone to the making of the tale—Canaanite shrine myths, scraps of tribal history, political pedigrees. But, save to the student, all these are nothing; the story itself is the world's permanent possession" (Todd, p. 253).

Many narratives found in Judges, Samuel, Kings and the other books of Moses were also in the writing. Some of the Psalms and Proverbs were also in existence. There were two collections of laws, one now in Exodus, the other in Deuteronomy (See Menzies, p. 197 ff.). Add to the above mentioned literature the writings of the pre-exilic prophets, and we have, so far as is known, all of the literature of the Israelites at the time of the exile.

The destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar brought the Israelites face to face with new problems, the solution of which was to be of world wide significance.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE EXILE (586 B. C. ONWARD).

It seems as if thoughtful Hebrews asked the meaning of Nebuchadrezzar's destruction of Jerusalem. Why did Yahweh allow such a thing to take place? In answering this question it must be kept in mind who the men of the exile were. The first deportation consisted of 10,000 men of rank, religious officers, sheiks and skilled workmen. Thousands more went in the second deportation, in fact all except the very poor. Behind they left most of the things that were dear to them; they were to be enslaved and imprisoned in their new home. No wonder then that they despaired and rebelled within themselves as they took their weary way to Babylon. But some knew the Micah song and could sing:

“When I fall, I shall arise:  
Now, even now!  
When I sit in darkness,  
Yahweh is a light about me!”

These songs, the hopes and warnings of the prophets had been the heart and conscience of the people for generations. Although many a child was born in exile, grew old and never saw the sacred soil of Judah, he must often have thought of the dear fatherland, where his ancestors had lived and died.

Was the exile then a punishment for the evil deeds the people had committed? “We are apt to conclude that the Exile was a judgment on these wrong doings. The lashing scourge of Jeremiah's preaching seems to lend confirmation to this opinion. But Jeremiah suffered worse than many another. Was he a worse man than those? The exile came on the righteous, as well as on the unrighteous. Nay more, there was growing up a belief that just those who were bowed down with suffering were the righteous people. Zephaniah had taught, as we saw, that it was best to seek to be bowed down, for the sufferers were the real people of Yahweh. But even those who leaned toward this view must have hesitated to say that slavery was a sign of righte-

ousness. And yet the other horn of the dilemma was as distinct and inevitable; the suffering was settling down upon all, and the best men were suffering most. Was suffering the mark of good men, and should they accept it as a pleasure? Or, was suffering the mark of bad men, and a sign that the sufferer had sinned? Either way was hard to choose. So men were driven more than ever to seek a solution of this problem, the problem of the exile, the problem of suffering, and chiefly the suffering of good men. What revelation was coming to answer this hard problem? What revelation did come in that exile?

Let us not pass this eve of the exile without noting again one practical truth then discovered, and proclaimed by Jeremiah when he counseled submission to Nebuchadrezzar as the will of Yahweh. What an outrage on the old pious belief and respectable organized self esteem! Jeremiah spoke his own doom; but will anyone now question his statesmanship? He and men of like mind were not the only prophets of those days; they tell us themselves how one Hananiah and others prophesied against them and were quite popular because they did so. Yet the generations following have preserved for us the writings of Jeremiah and not those of Hananiah. The world soon saw that Jeremiah was the wiser man. And this is all the more notable because there was evidently a strong reaction against all such prophets as Jeremiah, indeed, against all whom we may call the more spiritual" (Duff, p. 183 ff.).

The great prophet of the period of captivity was Ezekiel. He went with the first deportation of exiles. He was very bitter at first but finally he became more hopeful. One might think that in his rigid application of formal ritualism Ezekiel was only a priest, but he is more than that. He not only uses the ideas of the greater prophets, but contributes valuable ideas of his own.

The central thing with us is to note how he solved the problem of the exile. He says that Josiah's reformation was never fully carried out; that is the reason of his people's slavery and pain. Yahweh demands certain religious forms which the people have ignored. Ezekiel, therefore, arranges for a great increase in the ceremonies, when his people are allowed to return home.

The shrine is to be the center of the worship. The cultus is to be minutely regulated. Ezekiel even gives the exact dimensions of the temple altar and gates. This emphasis of the ritual is in direct conflict with the ideas of the great prophets along the same line. Why does Ezekiel do this? He believes that a well ordered state in religion is the only way to keep up a high standard of private virtue. Can we blame Ezekiel for forming a mental picture of what should be done when his people return to Jerusalem, since he is so anxious to have them please Yahweh?

We hear of no king in Ezekiel's imaginary restoration, in fact he sketches no political constitution at all. From his other ideas we may infer that he wished the political constitution of Josiah to go into operation, with this exception that a distinction should be made between the clergy and the laity. For example the palace and burial-ground of the king is to be separate from the temple, neither is the king to enter the inner court of the temple.

Ezekiel makes a fanciful re-distribution of the land among the tribes, even the northern tribes are provided for.

With all his plans Ezekiel can not see how he and his people may escape from slavery. He fails to believe, as other prophets had, that his god can overcome everything. Yet out of the darkness of this foreboding comes a faith that has been worth much to the world. It is a faith in an unseen being; so Ezekiel cries out "to people the Holy Land there must be a resurrection of the dead who lie there!"

Whatever may be said of Ezekiel's work the one great point to keep in mind is his elaboration and emphasis of the ceremonies of worship. Yet in all his legislation there is no mention of a High Priest.

The High Priest is anticipated in the "Holiness Law" (Lev. XVII-XXVI. The statutes on the "Holiness Law" probably date from Ezekiel's time. We have here a priest who is chief among his brethren. This is not the only marked thing about these statutes.

"If Ezekiel is the prophet of the outward aspect of the restored Jerusalem, the Holiness writer is the prophet of its interior

aspect. He is the founder of the legalism of private life. He takes the word kodesh (holy or holiness) and seeks to make it apply to the whole of life.

All of man's actions are to be regulated by the thought that he is consecrated to Yahweh. 'Be ye ~~k~~odesh for I am kodesh.' Incest, witchcraft, niggardliness, failure to observe festivals—all the sins and errors which a man can commit are alike violations of the kodesh which binds him to Yahweh. This is the foundation of 'legality.' It is easy to sneer at it, to contrast it with the splendid freedom of the old prophets and so forth. That the system had its dangers we all know; the spiritual state of some of its followers was condemned centuries later by supreme authority. But to contrast it with the prophets and represent it as a decadence is somewhat futile. It was an endeavor to put into practice what the prophets had inculcated. The author had a clearer appreciation of the difficulties of human nature than Amos and Hosea. They had regarded 'morality' as a thing in itself. Our writer coming two centuries later realizes the necessity for a principle which shall govern the whole life. He finds this in the theory of 'concentration.' It led in its abuse to the tithing of mint, anise and cummin and neglecting the weightier matters of Law, but none the less it was a great advance in the history of ethics and civilization; it supplied one more upward step on the ladder from whose top society is still so far" (Todd, p. 266 ff.). So much for the answer of the "Holiness-writer" on the problem of the exile.

There were other great ideas and ideals produced by the slaves of Babylon. One writer (name unknown, usually called Isaiah of Babylon) is of the highest consequence. He is the author of Isaiah XL; XLI; XLII, 8-25; XLIII; XLIV, 1-8 and 21-28; XLV; XLVI, 1-5 and 9-13; XLVII; XLVIII, 3, 5-8, 11-16, 20-21. This writer holds that Yahweh is the controller of all things. True enough Jeremiah and Isaiah had little use for other gods, but they recognized their existence. It may be that the exile had taught our author that the images of the Babylonians and other peoples were of little value. In fact Isaiah of Babylon

became a monotheist, the first among the Hebrew writers. According to his view Yahweh not only controls all things but is the Creator of all things. Yahweh is also a helper of the helpless, and what is better is willing to forgive all iniquity. Of course he will exact penalties for sins, but it is he who will say when the penalty is paid.

Little is said about the worship of Yahweh, but what is said (XLIII, 23 ff.) indicates the use of the old festival meal. But a new worship in song is also shown (XLII, 10-13; XLV, 8; XLIX, 13). This song worship is natural as the manifestation of glad and thankful hearts

Our writer is confident that the Hebrews have the honor of being Yahweh's slaves. Although carried off by the soldiers of Babylon the Hebrews were led to believe that Yahweh's power encompassed the whole earth. Another honor which these slaves have is the privilege of making known the character of their god. They are to speak especially of his foreknowledge of all events, for Yahweh alone can foretell. Isaiah of Babylon was never a preacher of the universally saving love of Yahweh among his captors, but the next writer we shall discuss is.

A remarkable feature of this writer's ideas is found in XLIV, 2 ff. where Yahweh is supposed to say:

“Fear not my slave—my chosen,  
I will pour water upon the thirsty.  
I will pour my spirit upon thy posterity and my blessing  
upon thy offspring.”

If Isaiah XI was written by Isaiah of Jerusalem then we have the idea of an endowment with a divine spirit 150 years before the time of the exile. “But then the poured out spirit was to endow the prince; whereas, now it is to come down over and brood upon all people. Micah had described the inspirations of goodness and guidance for men, which came to the preacher. And Ezekiel, of all men the hardest priestly formalist, exalted his pages with records of the works of ‘the spirit’ ” (Duff, p. 202). The great thing about Isaiah of Babylon in this regard is that he

expects Yahweh to not only pour his spirit upon all the Hebrews of his time, but also, upon their posterity. It is the "all" that counts.

Isaiah of Babylon expresses the faith that Yahweh will restore them to their fatherland. Only here can they properly fulfill their destiny. Our writer could not see that the Israelites might fulfill their destiny anywhere. This would seem to be a natural step once he considered Yahweh the creator and controller of all things. This idea of a return is not so inconsistent with the political movements of the time, however, when we consider that Cyrus, the great world-conqueror, as a liberal thinker of the time might capture Babylon and favor the Hebrews. Cyrus finally did capture Babylon, but it was not so soon as the prophet expected. In the meantime "the poor Hebrews were plunged into darker trouble than before, for evidently the Babylonian masters wreaked their vengeance on the slaves who had plotted to be free. Such, then, is the faith, religion and moral height of the singer of 'comfort ye my people.' The expectation and prediction were disappointed; but the faith was far up toward the true height. That height was soon reached" (Duff, p. 206).

The person to reach that height was the so-called Suffering Slave, whose four songs are recorded in Isa. XLII, 1-4; XLIX, 1-6; L 4-9; LII, 13-LIII, 12. True enough the writer we have just discussed spoke of the Hebrews as Yahweh's slaves, but he was angry with their slavish attitudes. He cries out:

"Who is blind, but the servants of Yahweh,  
And deaf as their rulers!  
Much hast thou seen without observing it.  
Thou whose eyes were open yet thou didst not hear!"

But the writer of the four slave songs sings (XLII, 1-6):

"Behold my slave, whom I uphold;  
My chosen in whom my soul delights;  
I have put my spirit upon him;  
He will set forth teaching to the nations.

“He will not cry aloud, nor roar as a lion,  
Nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.  
A cracked reed he will not break,  
And a dimly burning wick he will not quench.”  
“Faithfully will he set forth teaching;  
He will not burn dimly nor be crushed in spirit,  
Till he has set teaching in the earth,  
And for his instruction the far countries wait.”

Thus we see that this man feels that he, as the slave of Yahweh should be the teacher of all people. In his manner he is to be calm and gentle, such a man upon whom the divine spirit has been poured out. The return to Judah is not mentioned at all.

In XLIX, 1-6 there is still the lofty purpose of teaching all peoples, of bringing to them joy and help; but the most wonderful thing about the song is the willingness shown to remain in exile. The disappointment of not returning is spoken of, but after thinking it all over the writer realizes it was a part of Yahweh's plans that his people should not return. Yahweh wished them to remain in the world's social and commercial center so that they might send his love to the ends of the earth. Thus an ideal of foreign missions was heralded to the world by a slave who had been taught to hate foreigners and their gods.

In L, 4-9 a new light shines through the pain and anguish. “The lordly Yahweh has given me the eloquence of his disciples.

That I may know how to revive the weary one with words of comfort;

In the morning he wakens mine ear that

I may hearken as his disciple.

And I have not been rebellious; I have not turned back.

My back I gave to smiters, and my cheeks to those who plucked out the beard;

My face I hid not from insult and spitting

But the lordly Yahweh will help me; therefore am I not confounded.

Therefore, I hardened my face like a flint and was sure that

I should not be ashamed.

Near is he who redresses my wrongs; who will still strive with me? Let us stand together.

Who is my opponent? Let him draw near to me!

Behold the lordly Yahweh will help me; who is he that can worst me?

Behold they shall all fall to pieces like a garment; the moths will eat them."

One can see for himself the lofty evangelic spirit shown in this song.

"The song which runs from LII, 13-LIII, 12 is like the other lyrics in form and in many other respects, but it differs from the former three in that it makes the other Hebrews speak of the slave of Yahweh. The first of the four makes Yahweh speak of the slave, announcing his commission; the second and third make the slave speak himself. In the second he utters his newly received revelation, in the third, his greater danger and his greater devotion. But now, in the fourth, he lives no more to speak. He has died unjustly, ignominiously. But over the grave the strange power of death appears. Death has not ended all; it has caused entirely new experiences, it has created new lives. The suffering servant has died but to live, and to be a giver of life.

The first three stanzas of this new and greater song seems partly uttered by Yahweh, partly by Hebrews. These have changed their minds, they did oppose him, and thought that Yahweh condemned him. But they are coming over to his side; they are becoming one with him now, and they have accepted his ideas about the suffering slave. All chant the paradox, the wonder which this man was in his life, and in his death. The fourth stanza sketches the man, poverty-stricken, ugly.

The fifth tells how all despised him, and according to all human judgment did so justly.

But now begins in the sixth stanza, the note of confession. A revelation we have had in him, say the singers, but a revelation

that is regeneration in us. We thought we understood Yahweh, and we believed that whoever suffered like this man was being beaten of Him for his faults. We find that we were the sinners, we the well-to-do, we the self-satisfied; and this man was altogether one with Yahweh. For Yahweh wished to give us true life and His slave suffered what we deserved that we may go free and live.

The seventh stanza declares that they stand now on his side. His death startled them, his character bowed them in shame; so they were won over to goodness. He has thus taken away their sin; henceforth they hate and abandon it. Their former conduct, ethics, theology, were all folly. He, living and dying, suffered every bitterness with patience. His body had been flung with indignity, virtually, to the dogs; but he has obtained a posterity and prolonged his days in their new life as his followers. The pleasure of Yahweh shall prosper in his dead hands. At this point in the eleventh stanza the text is corrupted so that none can read it.

The end of the stanza clears up again, and in it, with the two that follow, the singers pour out their new yet somewhat anxious faith that the unseen future will be as they sing and hope. And Yahweh's own voice mingles again with theirs:—

‘Yes, it shall be:

With knowledge thereof my servant is to interpose for many,  
Therefore shall he receive a possession among the great.’

A possession it is, indeed, to have such a posterity of souls

to follow him. Observe here, again, how much of the story of Jeremiah's experiences is woven into the song (See Jer. XI, XII, XX). The task is accomplished. We have seen the Hebrews rise to this great height in their view of God and of life's task, which are exactly the same as we see realized in Jesus 550 years later<sup>v</sup> (Duff, p. 211 ff.).

The question arises now whether the Hebrews all rose to the high level as indicated in the four Songs of the Slave. In general this has been answered in the negative. The question may also

be asked whether there ever was a "Return from the Exile." It is not possible to answer this. Mr. Todd, (p. 282 ff.) holds that the return from Babylon has nothing to do with the movement of a whole population. "It means the return of the comparatively few interested in, and capable of, reorganizing the disjecta membra of the political and religious body." It seems that the singers spoken of above deemed it their duty to stay and teach. The story of Ezra bears out the missionary idea mentioned above, so also does the story of Nehemiah.

The books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi are the works of prophets who doubtless lived near Jerusalem about 500 B. C. None of them hint at the return of exiles.

"We may conclude that the ideal of the writer of the Slave Songs was actually attained. The children of the Exile remained in exile. Certainly we cannot suppose that all did the noble work of manifesting Yahweh's character to the ends of the earth. And we need not expect to find records of the work of those who did so serve the world. Such service is seldom recorded in documents. But it is of interest to remember that in all parts of the world known to us, there was at this very time a notable receptivity, to say the least, for spiritual religion. This was the case in China, where Confucius was born about 550 B. C., in India, where Buddha was born about 480 B. C., in Persia, where Zoroastrianism was reborn about 500 B. C., and in Greece where Aeschylus wrote his 'Prometheus Vincetus' about 460 B. C., when about forty years of age, and Socrates was born in 468 B. C., and Plato in 429 B. C.

The influences which radiated from the world's metropolis in Babylon touched the homes of all these seekers after God; and among those influences we cannot leave uncounted the high faith and words of the writer and first readers of the Four Slave-Songs now found in Isaiah. These men did breath divine blessing to the ends of the earth. For their instruction the far countries were indeed waiting. To such a final climax did Hebrew Religious thought, theology, ethics rise" (Duff, p. 217 ff.).

Interesting and valuable as the study of the Hebrews is we

feel constrained to stop with this climax of their religious and ethical thought. They had worked out the loftiest conceptions of religion and morality that the Oriental world knew. Upon these ideas Christianity has built hence all who hold the Bible as a sacred book have to thank that rich past which produced Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah of Babylon, the writer of the "Holiness Law," the author of the Song of the Suffering Slave and those unnamed men who treasured the noble Hebrew ideals in their hearts, and made them living realities through succeeding centuries even to our own.

\* \* \*

## THE PHOENICIANS.

### ~~CHAPTER I~~

Phoenicia (meaning of word unknown) lay at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. It was so named by the Greeks who entered the land from the west. The term was at first applied somewhat vaguely to the entire coast from Egypt to Asia Minor. But when the Greeks found that this region was inhabited by three nations, they confined the name to the more central portion of the coast; northward was the country of the Syrians, southward the country of the Philistines.

Within these limits Phoenicia was a very small country. It extended from a little below the thirty-third to a little below the thirty-sixth parallel. Its average width was about 17 miles, its length about 200 miles. It was less than 4000 square miles in extent. It may be said that it was squeezed in between the mountains and the sea.

Its physical characteristics divided Phoenicia into four regions. There was a sandy belt along the coast, which was well suited to the growth of the date palm. To the east of the sandy belt was a fertile plain, varying from one to twelve miles in width, where grains, fruit trees and vegetables flourished. East of this fertile

tract was a line of low swelling hills which was especially adapted to the vine, olive and mulberry. As the hills rose higher and higher the vineyard region was succeeded by mountains which were in part bare, and in part clothed with chestnuts, sycamores, oaks and above all cedar. This mountain region varied in elevation from about 5000 feet in the north to 9000 feet in the south.

The harbors on the coast were only fairly good, but the Mediterranean, almost tideless in the summer time, incited to navigation. Cyprus was visible from the western coast. It became a stepping stone to Cilicia, Caria, Rhodes and the islands of the Aegean. In the mountains surrounding Phoenicia were great supplies of timber. Phoenicia, then, seemed fitted by nature to be a commercial state, but there were other things to make her such, besides those mentioned. Off her coast was found a shell-fish (the murex) from which was taken a colorless creamy fluid, which after being put on woolen, linen or cotton fabric and exposed to the sun became a bright crimson color. Throughout antiquity the Phoenicians were foremost in the production of this purple dye.

Again Phoenicia had a geographical and political position which favored her rise to importance. Mountains shut her in on the north and east, and it was unusual for the great armies of the Tigo-Euphrates and the Nile to traverse the country from north to south. As has been noted the approach from the coast was not very inviting.

Yet Phoenicia had a very important commercial location as regarded the trade passing from the Tigo-Euphrates valley to the Mediterranean.

It is unnecessary for our purposes to discuss separately the flora, fauna and climate of Phoenicia. These are sufficiently noticed in connection with Palestine to cover Phoenicia.

It is well, however, to note definitely to what race the Phoenicians belonged. They were Semites. They, no doubt, branched off from the general wave of Aramean migrations. It is not known just when these Semites migrated into Phoenicia but probably not later than 2500 B. C.

What little is known of the political history of the Phoenicians may be divided into six periods: (1) From the earliest to the Egyptian supremacy (about 1500 B. C.); (2) The Egyptian supremacy (from about 1500 B. C. to about 1300 B. C.); (3) The advance of the Hittites and Assyrians (from about 1300 B. C. to about 1100 B. C.); (4) A period of independent development (from about 1100 B. C. to about 900 B. C.); (5) The Assyrian and Babylonian supremacy (from 900 B. C. to 539 B. C.); (6) The Persian, Greek and Roman supremacies.

Babylonian influences must have been very great among the Phoenicians during the earliest period. The Babylonian script and language were used as a means of diplomatic correspondence. Each settlement during this time must have formed an independent community. We can reasonably suppose that the members of each community were bound together by a common worship, common blood, a common government and a common land.

During the period of Egyptian control the Babylonian language and script were still maintained, but Egyptian influence was very strong. The foreign commerce of the various communities, instead of going toward the Tigris-Euphrates countries went toward the Nile. Moreover, although the communities were under native rulers, Egypt forced them to pay tribute and discouraged any coalition among them.

Unfortunately Phoenicia lay between Egypt, and her rival, the state of the Hittites. It will be recalled that the Hittites and Egyptians made a treaty by which the latter yielded to the former that part of Syria-Palestine north of Mt. Carmel. During this time Tyre began to forge ahead of Sidon. This was largely due to the fact that Tyre had more and richer colonies. In the thirteenth century Assyria began to check the Hittites and to force the Phoenicians to pay tribute. But with the going down of Assyrian power (about 1100 B. C.), Phoenicia became almost independent.

A coalition of the cities was formed with Sidon at the head, but Tyre (tenth century B. C.) finally gained the leadership. The one of her rulers of whom we know most was Hiram, who extended

his rule over Cyprus and aided Solomon in his building operations.

Assyria, however, again asserted control over the Phoenician cities, (about 900 B. C.). Tribute was exacted as before. It will be recalled with what difficulty these distant places were held by the kingdom of the Tigris. Yet Assyria remained fairly well in control until her downfall, with the exception of Egypt's brief control under Necho II. New Babylonia received Phoenicia as an heritage from Assyria. The most dramatic incident in the rule of the New Babylonian kings was the siege of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar II.

Soon after 539 B. C. Persia asserted her power over the western countries. During the Persian period Sidon forged ahead of Tyre. The Phoenician sailors at this time were of great aid to Persia in her wars against the Greeks. With the appearance of Alexander the Great most of the Phoenician cities submitted but Tyre capitulated only after a siege of seven months. Finally, after varying fortunes, under the successors of Alexander, the Phoenician cities became a part of a Roman province (64 B. C.). The supremacy of Rome greatly benefited the trade of the coast cities, but from that time on their Phoenician character was gradually lost.

With this rough outline of Phoenician political history in mind, let us proceed to speak briefly of the most important work done by the Phoenicians.

That great work was done along the lines of commerce. Before Egypt entered Asia, in the sixteenth century B. C., it appears that the Phoenicians were largely an agricultural people. They were very successful in causing the land to produce to its full capacity—in fact they were scientific farmers. The invasion of Egypt, however caused such a commotion that the tribes to the east migrated into Phoenicia in such numbers as to make the demands for food-supplies greater than the resources of the land. Though many of the Phoenician cities had at this time considerable trade with foreign nations they had not before this time entered extensively, if at all, upon their policy of colonization. It was now realized that places must be found for the surplus popula-

tion, but while founding colonies for this primary purpose they also had in mind the commercial value to be derived from these settlements. Thus cities were soon established in Cyprus and Crete. Farther north they went also into Rhodes, Thera, Melos and Cythera, gradually approaching Greece.

One notable thing about these Phoenician enterprises was that there was practically no competition. The sailors went where the winds and tides carried them. The general policy was to found permanent colonies, whose predominant purpose was, as a rule, for trade with the natives and places of refuge for their ships.

The Phoenicians were skilled in manufacturing; they drew much of their raw material from these distant settlements.

Gold was obtained from the coast of Asia Minor, copper from Cyprus. Dyes, clothing and weapons were traded, in many places, for grain, cattle and timber. This bringing in of raw material to be manufactured furnished employment for all in the homeland. The manufactured articles were by no means all used at home. Finished products were sent to Syria-Palestine.

The Phoenicians had a splendid chance to exercise political supremacy over the less advanced peoples with whom they traded but they were not bent on that object. So they rarely fought the aborigines but attempted to keep them friendly through gifts and promises.

Another great impetus was given to Phoenician colonial enterprise about 1300 B. C. This was largely due to the Hebrews who were then pushing westward across the Jordan. So settlements were made on the more distant shores of the Mediterranean. Sicily was discovered. Malta and Sardinia were occupied. Neither was the mainland of Africa overlooked. Hippo was probably founded about this time (Utica was founded about 1000 B. C. and Carthage sometime in the ninth century B. C.). But the Phoenicians did not stop with the points mentioned above. Before the eleventh century B. C. they had reached the Pillars of Hercules. About 1100 B. C. they founded Gades, the forerunner of Cadiz. At this time gold, silver, iron and lead were

plentiful in Spain. (The Phoenicians gave the country the name of Spain which means "full of rabbits"). Fish and agricultural products were also abundant there.

The discovery of so many natural products in the Iberian Peninsula opened up a new epoch for the Phoenicians. They at first traded to the savages mere trifles for the valuable resources, but the latter, discovering what the former most desired, hoarded their wealth. The Phoenicians then pushed inland, seized the land, located mines, and laid the foundations for many future cities.

Legendary stories have it that, by the tenth century B. C., the Phoenicians had sailed along the Portuguese and French coasts and explored the English channel. There may be some truth in these stories. Herodotus has left us an account of a Phoenician voyage around Africa starting from the Mediterranean westward and returning to the Red Sea. This expedition was made in the seventh century B. C., for the king of Egypt. Although the Greeks were by no means idle in colonization by the seventh century B. C., they lacked much of possessing the geographical knowledge of the Phoenicians.

The sea was not the only place where the Phoenicians were successful. It has been noticed that even before 1300 B. C. they carried on trade with practically all the civilized countries of the Orient. The opening up of Spain greatly augmented the trade with these countries. "On the land the Phoenicians sent caravans in three directions: (1) Towards Arabia, from which they brought gold, agate, and onyx, incense and myrrh, and the perfumes of Arabia—pearls, spices, ivory, ebony, ostrich plumes and apes from India. (2) Towards Assyria, whence came cotton and linen cloths, asphalt, precious stones, perfumery, and silk from China; (3) Towards the Black Sea, where they went to receive horses, slaves, and copper vases made by the mountaineers of the Caucasus" (Seignobos, History of Ancient Civilization, p. 81).

"Notwithstanding their vast traffic in foreign wares, the Phoenicians did not forget to foster their own industries. The

reputed inventors of glass, the undisputed makers of purple, the developers of rare dyes, the unsurpassed weavers of wool and skillful workers in metals; they stood in their day unchallenged, in the foremost ranks of industrial peoples. Their towns became known not less as great centers of manufacture than as excellent harbors and seaports. Of the riches of Tyre and of its magnificence, the prophet Ezekiel, writing about 400 years later, gives in his twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth chapters a brilliant, but well merited description. At the beginning of the tenth century B. C., such was the reputation of the Phoenicians; they had then opened almost every portion of the Mediterranean to their ships, and wherever they had gone had established prosperous and permanent settlements" (Taken mostly from Morris, History of Colonization Vol. I, p. 59 ff.).

As has been noticed, trade was the prime motive of the Phoenicians wherever they went. As a result of this they desired to keep other peoples in ignorance of where they obtained their articles of commerce. Hence "not less crafty than skillful in their actions and conduct, they adopted as a part of their colonial system, an exclusive policy. The mercantile transactions of the colonies were for Phoenicia and not for any other. Crude as the method in those days was, the end was similar to that held in view by many modern states. A monopoly was sought. Captains, pilots and sailors were instructed not to communicate to foreign merchantmen the course followed by their ships. When pursued or tracked by any competitor they did their utmost to throw him off their wake; for this purpose any strategem or trick was permissible. Thus during many centuries, they sought wealth in regions, the direction and extent of which were unknown to their neighbors; and sold these latter's products to the barbarians, whose very existence was to them mythical and whose inhabitants were as remote and even more unfixed in their minds than the abodes of the divinities. By these means the Phoenicians amassed riches and concentrated the carrying trade of that age in their own hands" (Morris Vol. I, p. 61 ff.).

Although the Phoenicians cared only for their own interests

in establishing their settlements, they nevertheless incidentally diffused among the uncivilized peoples of the west, the civilization of the most enlightened nations. "The barbarians of the West received the cloths, the jewels, the utensils of the peoples of the East who were more civilized, and, receiving them learned to imitate them. For a long time the Greeks had only vases, jewels, and idols brought by the Phoenicians, and these served them as models. The Phoenicians brought simultaneously from Egypt and from Assyria industry and commodities.

At the same time they exported their alphabet. The Phoenicians did not invent writing. The Egyptians knew how to write many centuries before them, they even made use of letters, each of which expressed its own sound, as in our alphabet. But their alphabet was still encumbered with ancient signs which represented, some a syllable, others an entire word. Doubtless the Phoenicians had need of a simpler system for their books of commerce. They rejected all syllabic signs and ideographs, preserving only twenty-two letters each of which marks a sound (or rather an articulation of the language). The other peoples imitated this alphabet of twenty-two letters. Some, like the Jews, wrote from right to left just as the Phoenicians themselves did; others, like the Greeks, from left to right. All have slightly changed the form of the letters, but the Phoenician alphabet is found at the basis of all the alphabets—Hebrew, Lycian, Greeks, Italian, Etruscan, Iberian, perhaps even in the runes of the Norse. It is the Phoenicians that taught the world how to write" (Seignobos, p. 84). Doubtless the next most important thing, which the Phoenicians carried to the peoples of the West was a system of weights and measures. This system originated among the Babylonians. We may conclude our discussion of Phoenician commerce by stating that the great result arising from it was the diffusion of civilization. This act of diffusion caused Phoenicia to be one of the great forces in Oriental civilization. Comparatively speaking, she was the greatest of all the oriental nations in that respect.

Although, relatively speaking, the Phoenicians were great

in no other respect, something should be said of other phases of their history.

Little is known of the details of their government. According to the most reliable accounts, at the time of the first invasion of the hill tribes (sixteenth century B. C.), the country was divided into thirty small kingdoms, each with its own royal house and walled capital. It seems that the newcomers in many instances overthrew the old royal houses, but this did not fundamentally change matters. Generally speaking, this idea of independent states remained in force throughout Phoenician history.

The form of government in each independent city was, in every case, a limited monarchy. In Sidon, Tyre, Aradus, Byblos and Berytus the kingship was hereditary. The kings were highly honored and displayed much wealth. Although the king showed great splendor in his rule, there were, nevertheless, limits to his power. It is not known that despotism ever existed. Each city had a council of elders for advisory purposes and magistrates for judicial business. The populace was taken into account. Such a courageous people, with such a large proportion engaged in the trades and seafaring pursuits, would not tolerate the tyranny of a king or an aristocracy. "Throughout Phoenicia it would seem that the people must have had popular leaders, and that these representatives must, speaking in their name, have had considerable influence upon political, commercial and economic policies" (Morris, Vol. I, p. 63 ff.) Though the communities were independent of each other, unions were formed for the purposes of common protection and common enterprise. "Entering upon great enterprises and meditating vast conquests, the Tyrians, the Sidonians, and the Aradians realized the profit to be drawn from co-operation. Just when it is not known, but certainly at an early date, Sidon, Tyre and Aradus joined in sending delegates to a national assembly; as the place of its meeting Tripolis was founded and built. To this congress each of the allies seems to have sent a hundred representatives; their special duty was to develop Phoenician trade and commerce; undoubtedly, in this connection, they had much to say about colonial affairs: Such a system of rule inevit-

ably favored freedom of thought, speech and action; and to this independence Phoenicia owed its glorious career" (Morris, Vol. I, p. 64).

Hardly anything is known of the way Phoenicia governed her dependencies. Apparently there was very little direct control exercised save that which came about because of a common origin, common commercial benefits and common divinities. Politically then each colony was doubtless free. Its local affairs were in the hands of a senate of elders and two leading men, elected for life from the senate. It is thus easy to see how both the Phoenician cities and their colonies could be easily dominated by a military power. We have already noticed that this really occurred.

The Phoenician religion was similar to that of the Babylonians. Each city had a pair of gods, one male, the other female. They were considered able to either destroy or create. "But the same god changed his name according as he was conceived as creator or destroyer; thus Baal as destroyer was worshiped at Carthage under the name of Moloch. These gods, represented by idols, had their temples, altars and priests. As creators they were honored with orgies, with tumultuous feasts; as destroyer, by human victims" (Taken in a modified form from Seignobos, p. 80). However shocking the forms of their religion were, they were imitated by other peoples, such as the Jews and the Greeks.

Phoenician art was largely borrowed from the Babylonians, Egyptians and Assyrians. The rosette and palm leaf came from Babylonia, the sphinx from Egypt, the cherub from Assyria. The gem-cutters of Phoenicia excelled those of Babylonia, her artists in bronze and stone surpassed those of Assyria, while the massive coffins of Egypt were rivalled. With all this excellence, however, there is everywhere present a combination of Egyptian and Mesopotamian elements. This art powerfully influenced the early Greeks. Even the art in Homer's time partook largely of Phoenician characteristics. Phoenician buildings have mostly perished. In art then the Phoenicians made no great contributions to the world.

“In science Phoenicia inherited the discoveries and inventions of its neighbors. Glass, according to Pliny, had been an invention of the Phoenicians, but it was known to the Egyptians long before the Phoenicians had emerged from their primitive barbarism. (Glass was used in Egypt by at least the eleventh dynasty). In the art of navigation, however, the Phoenicians made an independent advance. \* \* \* \* The Phoenician galley seems to have been the model of the Greek one. As for medicine, a Phoenician of Gebal was one of the most famous oculists in the time of the eighteenth dynasty, and even the Egyptian doctors did not disdain to make use of his receipts. The renown of the Phoenicians as builders and carpenters implies their knowledge of mechanics and the use of the lever and pulley” (Sayce, p. 205 ff.). The literature of the Phoenicians has mostly perished, though it is probable that it was of little consequence.

#### THE MEDES AND PERSIANS (FROM EARLIEST TIMES TO ABOUT 323 B. C.).

Between the Tigris and Indus rivers on the east and west, the Caspian Sea and Persian Gulf on the north and south is the land of Iran. Its area is about five times that of modern France (area of France, about 200,000 square miles). “It is composed of deserts of burning sand and of icy plateaux cut by deep and wooded valleys. Mountains surround it preventing the escape of rivers which must lose themselves in the sands or in the salt lakes. The climate is harsh, very uneven, torrid in summer, frigid in winter; in certain quarters one passes from 104 degrees above zero to 40 degrees below, from the cold of Siberia to the heat of Senegal. Violent winds blow which ‘cut like a sword.’ But in the valleys along the rivers the soil is fertile. Here the peach and cherry are indigenous; the country is a land of fruits and pastures” (Seignobos, p. 64).

So much for a general statement of the physical conditions of Iran, of which original Media and Persia were parts. Before

the time of Cyrus the boundaries of Persia were ill-defined, but the center of its power seems to have been in a district which bordered the eastern shores of the Persian Gulf. At the time of the birth of Cyrus the country seems to have been extended. It included not only the central portion of what is now Persia, and probably included on the south a part of Arabia, on the east a part if not all of modern Afghanistan, on the west nearly to the Tigris, on the north to about 33 degrees, or to the land of the Medes. It had an area of probably 125,000 square miles.

The Medes, a kindred people of the Persians, had settled south and west of the Caspian Sea (probably in the ninth or eighth century B. C.). The extent of their power was noticed in connection with the discussion on the Kaldean empire. What ever may be said about the natural environments of the Persians can be applied generally to the original seat of Median power.

Since most of Persia within the limits mentioned above was a part of Iran its general characteristics were the same as those of the latter, but it will be profitable to make more particular statements about the country we have under consideration. Broadly speaking, Persia was a table-land having an altitude of from 3,000 to 5,000 feet. The mountainous portions have a bleak and sterile appearance. Although the winters are intensely cold and the summers intensely hot the air is very dry. Spring and autumn are the most pleasant seasons. The average rainfall in the table-land is not more than ten inches. The soil, however, is very fertile when properly irrigated.

The zones of vegetation succeed each other quite rapidly. Polar species are found in the north, rice and the fruits of southern Europe flourish in the lowlands. Wheat is cultivated at an altitude of 9000 feet. Over most of the table-land the cyprus, dwarf oak, walnut and mulberry grow. The ash, beech, oak, birch and sycamore are common in the valleys, as are also the grains common to the temperate zone.

We would naturally expect to find various kinds of animals. Such is the case. In the forest were (and are) the fox, wolf, hyena, wild boar, leopard and lynx; and on the mountains the

ibex, sheep, wild goat, mountain bear and the maneless lion. Just as now, the common domestic animals, such as the horse, mule, sheep, dog and single-humped camel were common in the very earliest times.

Generally speaking, the natural environments tended to make the ancient Persians a strong vigorous people. They had to toil for what they received from nature. This toil was sufficient to keep them strong, but not enough to deplete their energies.

Persia (at about the time of Cyrus) was not an isolated country. It was open to the influences of both the far East and the Mesopotamian civilization; there were no physical features of sufficient magnitude to hinder its expansion in almost every direction. Later on we shall notice how this expansion takes place.

The Medes and Persians were Aryans. They are thought by many scholars to have come from the region north and east of the Caspian Sea. Many of these same scholars hold that their original homeland was the same as that of the Greeks and the Romans, but that the Greeks and Romans preceded them in their migratory movements. The Hindoos are supposed to have come originally from the same common homeland. The language used by these several peoples is the main proof of these views.

Although the Medes and Persians have a legendary history reaching into the dim past, our earliest trustworthy accounts of them are from the Greek writers of the fifth century B. C. These writers are Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon. They, however, do not agree, hence it is often hard to make out the real facts. There are a number of monumental remains and some literature, but we can not get enough information from either one of the sources to form a continued account of the Persians.

When Cyrus (afterward the Great) became king of Anshan, (about 560 B. C.) a district in western Elam, the world we have been studying was mostly controlled by Babylonia, Media, Lydia and Egypt. But Cyrus was the coming man. Astyages, the king of Media, attempted to conquer Cyrus, but was himself conquered by the ruler of Anshan. The Aryan Medes at once

acknowledged the supremacy of Cyrus. In several of the more distant regions under Median control there was a disposition not to obey Cyrus, but the Persian king soon mastered the situation.

As has been noticed, this rapidly rising power of Cyrus caused the Lydian, Egyptian and Babylonian kings to form an alliance. Cyrus was quick to act. He planned a campaign against Babylonia, but finding the latter's army too strong for him, and believing he could accomplish more in that direction for the time through secret intrigues, he marched westward to meet Croesus, king of Lydia. In one campaign he captured Sardis (capital of Lydia) and its monarch, and thus added Asia Minor to the Persian dominions. In the meantime his intrigues in Babylonia had borne fruit. The causes of the weakness in Babylonia at this time have already been noticed. The Persian army entered Babylonia from the south and soon secured control of that kingdom. The Persian king could then truly boast. "I am Cyrus, king of the legions, great king, mighty king, king of Babylon, king of Shumer and Akkad, king of the four regions, son of Cambyses, great king of Susiana, grand-son of Cyrus, king of Susiana." Cyrus also conquered Ionia, Lycia, Caria and a portion of the Hindu Kush region.

"He chose as the seat for his capital the spot where he had first gained his victory over the Medes. Here he built Pasargadae, the royal city whose ruins still cover several miles, and here he erected his tomb" (J. p. 279). As one comes into Pasargadae to-day from the ridge of hills to the north, the first thing that he sees is a massive platform of stone built on a terrace. "This solid piece of masonry is over two hundred feet long and fifty feet broad, and in many places the beautifully matched stone blocks of the facing are in perfect order and still show the mason's building marks upon them, while in others they have been torn away in great rows, to furnish materials for buildings in after ages. In every instance the great clamp irons that secured the blocks have been gouged out, leaving holes that afford nesting places for hundreds of pigeons and other birds" (J. p. 280). The natives call this platform "Solomon's Throne."

South of this platform several hundred yards are the remains of a solid square building which must have been more than forty feet high. Only one of its shattered walls is standing. It is uncertain whether this was a shrine or tomb. It is called by the natives "Solomon's Prison."

Southward from these remains, several hundred yards, is a shaft nearly twenty feet high, and broken at the top. It is composed of three blocks, and may have been part of a doorway. "Near the summit of this column are carved in cuneiform script in three languages, the simple but dignified words, 'I am Cyrus the King, the Achaemenian.' The same device is repeated on the angle-piers of a ruined edifice or court, several hundred yards farther to the southeast, and it once decorated the top of a high round column within this enclosure, but in the latter case the inscription has disappeared, and the whole structure is in utter ruin. The like is true of a fourth collection of ruins still further to the east—southeast on a raised flooring of white stone sustaining the pedestals of former columns and bases of ruined doorways" (J. p. 281).

Some distance to the east of the court mentioned above is a monolith of great interest. "This impressive monument is a huge slab over twelve feet high, five feet broad, and about two feet in thickness. Upon its weathered front is carved in low relief the figure of a king. On his head there rests a curious crown which shows traces of the influence of Egyptian art; but the most striking feature of the image is a double set of immense van-like wings that rise from the shoulders and droop almost to the feet. The sculptured form is the very idealization of sovereignty. The top of the monolith, which once was inscribed, is broken off, but the missing device, as we know from the drawings of earlier travelers, consisted of the simple words, 'I am Cyrus, the King, the Achaemenian'—in keeping with the dignity of the surroundings" J. p. 282).

More than a mile southwest of this monolith is the tomb of Cyrus. "The structure \* \* \* \* looks like 'a house of stone, roofed over,' as Arrian says, and the terraced steps (though

seven, not ten, in number) answer to the statement of Onesicritus in Strabo's account. The door, which faces west, or rather north west is strikingly small and around the tomb there are the remains of what was once a colonnade that formed a rectangular enclosure around the tomb. With the exception of a few pillars which, though broken, show where the entrances must have been, most of the columns have disappeared or lie tumbled about in confusion upon the ground. A score of Mohammedan graves have been crowded within the area next to the tomb so as to be as close as possible to the shrine of 'Solomon's Mother' (so-called by the natives). In further confirmation of Arrian's statement concerning 'a small house for the Magi who guarded the tomb of Cyrus,' we find about a hundred yards north of the Mausoleum, the foundation of a building which may have been at the same time a sanctuary and residence for the priests; but practically nothing remains of the structure except the base upon which it stood, and this is now partly buried by a mass of wretched hovels.

From a distance the tomb of Cyrus looks dwarfed by the vastness of the surrounding plain, but when viewed nearby, its true size becomes apparent and the nobility of its lines, the symmetry of its proportions and the striking whiteness of the marble-like stone of which it is constructed, come out in full effect. It stands high upon a terraced base seven steps of which are now visible, and the stones which compose both the sub-structure and the tomb are very massive. The lowest stage of seven terraced steps is a plinth over two feet high, nearly fifty feet long, and more than forty feet broad. Each of the other stages above this flooring is proportionately smaller in area, but not in height, and the combined elevation of the pedestal thus formed is more than sixteen feet. The Mausoleum itself is about eighteen feet high, the point of its roof being nearly thirty-five feet from the ground; the length of the building is about twenty feet and its width seventeen feet. \* \* \* \* The mammoth blocks which make up the tomb and base alike are set together with the utmost precision: There is no evidence of the use of mortar, but iron clamps were used in uniting the masonry. \* \* \* \*

Nature has added to her destructive forces an extra one: Several bushes of the evergreen type have taken root in the interstices worn between the great stones of the terraced steps, and a small tree has sprouted out from the roof; both of these agents, as time goes on, will take part in bringing about the general ruin of the monument.

It is natural to suppose that an inscription of some sort adorned the resting place of the mighty dead, and we have the authority of the Greek writers for asserting that there was such an epitaph. Both Arrian and Strabo say that Aristobulus, who was appointed by Alexander to restore the tomb, after it had been desecrated, mentions a Persian inscription to this effect:

O man; I am Cyrus the son of Cambyses, who founded the Persian empire and was king of Asia. Grudge me not therefore this monument.

The entrance to the tomb is low and narrow, as the Greek authorities state. The height of the doorway is only four feet two inches, and its width two feet seven and one-half inches, and it is necessary to crouch in order to pass through as Arrian affirmed. The original door to the vault was probably a heavy stone swinging on pivots. \* \* \* \* \* Crawling through the low entrance, without having the slightest objection raised by the bystanders, who I thought might prevent me, I found myself within the chamber where death had held his court. The room is ten feet five and five eighths inches long and seven feet seven inches wide and seven feet eleven and one-half inches high. Two enormous blocks that look like marble form the floor and the side walls and flat ceilings are composed of stones equally as large. In one part of the eastern wall, facing the doorway, there is a great gaping chink, and the block of the floor at the same end shows a rough sort of depression which suggests the idea that something had been scooped out or forcibly wrenched away perhaps by robber bands. It may have been that the sarcophagus stood here. I could picture its position as I lay down to measure my length near the depression in order to determine whether the space were in proportion to a human form. I found there would

indeed have been room enough, and space besides for the table or couch holding the purple vestments, the sword and other regal insignia which Arrian and Strabo enumerate" (J. p. 287 ff.).

The above description by one who lately saw the tomb suggests the power of the man who found here his last resting place. It is not known how Cyrus came to his end but there are few who question that he was buried in this tomb. "His body, not left in Magian fashion to be torn by dogs and birds, but covered with wax or perhaps embalmed was laid in a gold-adorned casket and carried to the sepulchre, attended by the flower of the Persian army" (J. p. 293).

With all his building operations the main work of Cyrus consisted in forming and ruling the greatest empire the world had as yet known. What little information we have about his personal characteristics goes to show that he was far in advance of his age. Considering his work the title "the Great" is well deserved.

Before his death Cyrus had made his son Cambyses king of Babylon but had reserved for himself the title of "king of the world." Cyrus died in 529 B. C. and was succeeded by Cambyses. The first act of the latter as sole ruler was to murder his brother Smerdis, who was very prominent in the empire. "Then followed the invasion and conquest of Egypt, and the distant expeditions against Ethiopia and the Oasis of Ammon. The long absence of the monarch and army soon produced its inevitable consequences. The loosely-cemented empire began to fall to pieces. The revolt was headed by the Medic tribe of Magians. The Magian Gomates personated the murdered Smerdis, and seized the throne. He represented the non-Aryan portion of the population, which viewed with jealousy the increasing influence of the Aryan element. Cambyses, like Cyrus, it is true, had not been a Zoroastrian and the personator of his brother could thus overthrow the temples and altars of Zoroastrianism without imperilling his imposture; but he had countenanced and probably favored it. During his absence the government had been in the hands of the great Aryan families, who traced their descent from the royal clan of the

Achaemenians, and these families were all Zoroastrian. Hence in the Magian usurpation we see at once a political and religious revolt. It was directed against Aryan supremacy and the worship of Ormazd, the supreme deity of the Zoroastrian creed, and it was at the same time a signal for the different nationalities which composed the empire of Cyrus to recover their independence. Before it could be crushed Cambyses committed suicide after reigning eleven years as king of Babylon and about eight years as sole monarch "(Taken in modified form from Sayce, p. 244 ff).

The succeeding events are recorded on the lofty Behistun rock. This rock located on the western frontier of modern Persia rises about 1700 feet above the plains. Upon it were written the deeds of Darius I. Among other things the inscription says: "After Gomates had drawn away Persia, Media and other countries of Cambyses, he followed out his purpose; he became king. The people feared him on account of his cruelty; he would have killed the people so that no one might learn that he was not Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. Darius the king declares there was not a man in all Persia or in Media who dared to snatch the crown from this Gomates, the magus. Then I presented myself, I prayed Ormazd. Ormazd accorded me his protection. \* \* \* Accompanied by faithful men I killed this Gomates and his principal accomplices. By the will of Ormazd I became King. The empire which had been stolen from our race I restored to it. The altars that Gomates, the magus, had thrown down I rebuilt to the deliverance of the people; I received the chants and sacred ceremonies."

The revolting parts of the empire were subdued. Thrace and a province in India were added. "This empire reunited all the peoples of the Orient: Medes and Persians, Assyrians, Kaldeans, Jews, Phoenicians, Syrians, Lydians, Egyptians; Indians; it covered all the lands from the Danube on the west to the Indus on the east, from the Caspian Sea on the north to the cataracts of the Nile on the south. It was the greatest empire up to this time. One tribe of mountaineers, the last to come thus received the heritage of all the empires of Asia" (Seignobos, p.

71 ff.). The attempt of Persia to expand further westward will be noticed in connection with the history of Greece.

After these conquests Darius began the reorganization of his empire. Centralization became a political fact. It has been noticed that the Assyrians had made some advance in centralization. They had broken down many old kingdoms and ruled their subject peoples through appointive officials who were, theoretically at least, dependent upon the Assyrian monarch. The main trouble with the imperial system of the Assyrians was that the appointed officer in each district, being practically in control of the government there, was inclined to make himself independent.

Just as in Assyria, the king of the Persian empire was the source of all power, but the Persian king Darius introduced certain checks upon the appointed officials such as never existed in Assyria. "In each of the twenty provinces (there are thirty-one mentioned in the inscriptions) power was divided between the satrap himself and the commander of the standing army, who were separately responsible to the capital; moreover, in each province was placed a royal secretary (the 'King's Ear') to communicate constantly with the Great King; and, most important of all, a special royal commissioner (the 'King's Eye') backed with military forces, appeared at intervals in each satrapy (province) to inquire into the government, and, if necessary, to arrest the satrap.

To draw the distant parts of the empire closer, Darius instituted a magnificent system of post roads, with ferries and bridges, with milestones and excellent inns and with relays of horses for the royal couriers. The chief road, from Susa to Sardis, was over fifteen hundred miles long; but it is said that dispatches were sometimes carried its whole length in six days, although ordinary travel required six months. Benjamin Ide Wheeler writes graphically of this great highway (Alexander the Great, 196-197): 'All the diverse life of the countries it traversed was drawn into its paths. Carians and Cilicians, Phrygians and Cappadocians, staid Lydians, sociable Greeks, crafty Armenians, rude traders from the Euxine shores, nabobs of Babylon, Medes and Persians,

galloping couriers mounted on their Bokhara ponies or fine Arab steeds, envoys with train and state, peasants driving their donkeys laden with skins of oil or wine or sacks of grain, stately caravans bearing the wares and fabrics of the south to exchange for metals, slaves and grain of the north, travelers and traders seeking to know and exploit the world,—all were there, and all were safe under the protection of an empire, the roadway of which pierced the strata of many tribes and many cultures, and helped set the world a-mixing' ” (West, *Ancient History*, p. 92).

The main function of the satrapal officials was the collection of revenues. Each satrapy had to pay a fixed annual tribute; this was to be partly in gold and silver, partly in kind. The total annual sum received in gold and silver was equivalent to 120,000 dollars in our money. The king used this to support his government and an extravagant court; he also satisfied his vanity by hoarding up immense treasure. Yet with all his supervision he permitted “each of the peoples of his empire to administer itself according to its own taste, to keep its language, its religion, its laws, often its ancient princes” (Seignobos, p. 72).

Darius ruled for thirty-six years (died 486 B. C.). His son and successor, Xerxes, was not such a man as his great father. He was weak, vain and foolish. His attempts to conquer Greece were utter failures; not only that, he lost the coast of Asia Minor, Thrace, and the command of the Hellespont. The Greeks were thus allowed to manage their own affairs for nearly a century. Xerxes was murdered by two of his courtiers 466 B. C.

During the reign of Xerxes, Persia was on the decline. This decline was largely due to the causes inherent in an Oriental monarchy—rebellions of satraps, palace intrigues, weak monarchs, vice and luxury; all contributed to the general decay. This decay continued for about 140 years, when the empire was overcome by Alexander the Great (about 323 B. C.).

Darius and his successors (to the time of Alexander the Great) had as their capital Persepolis, which was about sixty miles south of Pasargadae. The great platform upon which were the magnificent palaces and other buildings of the kings was

located here. Mr. Jackson describes this so well that we quote from him at length (See J. p. 310 ff.).

“The platform itself lies at the base of a rocky row of hills called ‘Mountain of Mercy,’ and in former times apparently also ‘Royal Mountain,’ which rises to the east and whose spurs have been partly cut away in the building of the terraced elevation. A noble wall, varying from twenty to fifty feet in height and constructed of stone quarried from the hill-side, encloses the area on three exposed sides, for no barrier was needed at the rear because of the natural fortification of the hills, as will be clear to anyone who has visited the scene. \* \* \* \* The configuration of the terrace-height is such that three distinct levels are clearly noticeable, the highest being in the middle which is made still more elevated by a mound in its midst. Over the surface of the platform are spread the remains of the architectural glories of the Achaemenians.

The original plan and the main construction of this noble platform (which more than a thousand years ago was compared with Baalbec and the architectural remains of Palmyra and Egypt, and fabled to be the work of Solomon’s genii) was due to Darius. In one of his inscriptions he definitely states that he ‘built this fortress on a place where no fortress had been built before,’ and that he did so by the grace of ‘Ormazd and the other gods.’ Darius erected at least two of the noblest buildings, but the elaboration of the design was due to Xerxes and its completion to his successors. Though far grander in its magnificence than any ordinary fortress, it must have been easily guarded by armed patrols on the walls and by platoons of soldiers stationed at all points of access, and reasons have been advanced for believing that its strength was re-enforced by walled fortifications or turrets in front of it on the plain. The southerly position of the Palace of Darius and the fact that it faces southward has led, not unreasonably perhaps, to the assumption that there was originally an approach from the south or southeast, whereas the regular means of access, which must have been unchanged since the time of

Xerxes, is by a great double staircase constructed in the wall near the northwest angle of the platform.

This grand staircase consists of a double ramping flight each series numbering more than a hundred steps, with an angle of ascent so gentle and a width so broad, that a troop of horse-men, ten abreast, could ride up it. As we surmount the topmost step and cast the eye over the surface of the platform, we are struck by a succession of stately portals, broken columns, capitals, pedestals, stone steps, sculptured friezes, and doorways, spread about in confusion or gathered into disordered groups. \* \* \*

Directly opposite the grand staircase is the Porch of Xerxes. This imposing propylaeum is guarded at each entrance, back and front, by colossal winged bulls of stone, after the Assyrian manner. Two of these colossi face westward out over the plain; the other two look eastward toward the hills behind the platform. Near the top of each of the massive pylons of this portico there is a trilingual inscription in cuneiform characters, stating that the portal is the work of Xerxes and ascribing praise to Ormazd for all the blessings of his divine favor. Two of the original four fluted columns are still standing between the stately piers of this triumphal arch, the 'Portal of All Nations,' as Xerxes himself called it, through which the envoys from tributary lands marched in solemn procession to bring gifts to the Great King, as portrayed on the sculptured stylobate some fifty yards to the south.

This latter terrace, with its elaborately carved frieze and cuneiform inscriptions on the walls of the four staircases that approach it, served as a stylobate for Xerxes' lofty Audience-Hall, the ruined columns of which gave rise to the native designation Chahal Minar, 'Forty Pillars.' But the original number of columns was seventy-two, and of these only thirteen are standing, to mark with their tall fluted shafts the aisles that led to the spot where Xerxes held levees within its once tapestry-hung walls. The ruin and desolation form a pathetic contrast to the proud vaunt of the king in the cuneiform tablet carved on the stairway of approach, 'I am Xerxes, the Great King, the King

of Kings, King of the Nations with their many peoples, King of this Great Earth even to afar,' and a sadder comment on the pious fervor of the words that follow, 'Thus saith Xerxes, the Great King: Everything that has been made by me elsewhere, I have made by the grace of Ormazd; may Ormazd with the other divinities protect both my kingdom and all that I have made.'

Walking about fifty yards to the south we come to the ruins of the Palace of Darius situated on the highest part of the platform, and directly before a mound. Although smaller and less imposing than either of the main edifices raised by his son Xerxes, the Palace of Darius is better preserved than the others. Here, several times repeated, are inscriptions recording the fact that the building was the 'palace,' 'house,' or the 'abode' of King Darius, whose figure is sculptured in bas-relief, as fighting with some monster, whom he slays, thus triumphing over the power of evil, or as attended by servants who bear the royal umbrella, the fly-flap, and other insignia of sovereignty. To me the most interesting of all the inscriptions was a short device carved around the stone lintels of the windows through which the king looked out upon his people and over the fine panorama, that stretched before his view. The cuneiform letters are deeply chiselled and they form a narrow band of text, originally repeated eighteen times because of the number of windows, of which only thirteen now remain. The brief sentence reads, 'a structure of stone built in the house of King Darius'.

Proceeding again southward, across a space that was once an open court below the palace, we enter the ruins of the Palace of Artaxerxes III, Ochus, which faced directly north toward the latter. An inscription, which is thrice repeated on the double stairway that forms the approach on the north, and is reproduced again on the west, bears the name of Artaxerxes III, or Ochus. In this the king gives his genealogy and, after declaring that he has built this stone structure, close with the words, 'may Ormazd and the god Mithra protect me and my country and all that has been made by me.' These inscribed tablets are separated by handsome panels that are decorated with bas-reliefs of the royal

guards; but excepting these stairway friezes and the bases of a group of columns, there is little to show that the ruins among which we are standing are the remains of a palace. The small size of the ground-plan and the unfinished appearance of the surroundings have led some scholars to question whether the building was actually intended as a royal residence at all and whether it was ever completed.

Directly to the east, on a large rectangular stylobate formed partly of the natural rock, stand the ruins of the sumptuous Palace of Xerxes, the grandest of the buildings in design except his own Audience-Hall and the Hall of a Hundred Columns belonging to his father. The stairways that lead up to it are richly decorated with sculptured panels, slabs, ornamental friezes, inscribed tablets, doorways, and windows remain to mark the courts of the king, who still walks in effigy of stone; but like the grandiloquent titles which he hung upon the now crumbled walls they are merely mute witnesses of a dead past.

Crossing some fifty yards eastward over uneven ground behind the palace, we find the remains of a smaller building, the so-called Southeast Edifice, the identity of which is not positively known. Apparently it was a royal abode of some sort if we may judge from the images of the king carved on the doorways and representing him in combat with conventionalized monsters or as attended by slaves who carry the royal umbrella and fly-flap. We may even go further and presume that it was the abode of Xerxes as crown-prince, if we may judge from the physiognomy of the king as portrayed here and on the walls of his palace.

About forty yards north—northwest from this point and directly behind the mound in the rear of the Palace of Darius, we see a ruined entrance-hall, decorated with the conventional bas-reliefs of the king seated upon his throne. This small structure is known as the Portico of Darius, though sometimes called the Central Edifice.

Adjoining it on the east there stands the last and the largest of all the palatial buildings, the Hall of a Hundred Columns, erected by Darius for holding ceremonial functions. The main

entrance was on the north side through a vestibule whose roof was supported by sixteen columns that led the way into the throne-hall itself. This superb edifice covered an area two hundred and twenty-five feet square, and formed a magnificent structure raised on a hundred columns, ten rows each way, but of these not a single one is now standing. The doorways east and west still represent Darius in the act of slaying animals of monstrous shape, and the entrances north and south depict him crowned with a tiara and mounted upon his throne supported by three or even five tiers of subject nations who carry arms in defence of their ruler, over whom hover the wings of his god. The chamber walls of the royal hall were probably of sun-dried brick plastered over with a glaze or coated with enamelled tiles; but they crumbled into dust ages ago, and only fragments of columns, stone door-jambs, and window-sills remain, together with bits of carbonized cedar buried beneath a mass of debris and ashes, to tell that the pillars once supported a roof with a thousand beams. In this case, as in the case of the Audience-Hall of Xerxes, we are led to wonder whether it was the hand of the drunken Alexander and the torch of his revelling soldiers that brought about the desolation which reigns supreme.

Some sixty or seventy yards north of this famous hall are seen a few blocks and mutilated columns of what was once bull-flanked propylaeum, or Porch, that led to the Audience-Hall itself; but all the rest of its pristine glory is lost forever. In addition to this portal there is near the Porch of Xerxes a rock-hewn Cistern which must have fed a fountain whose jets sprang from the midst of a tank like the hoz in a modern Persian courtyard. Besides the tumulus, or Mound previously referred to, there are beneath the surface of the platform also several underground passages, water channels, and drains which have not yet been fully excavated, together with some minor evidences of unfinished work in the past, but they still await the spade of the archaeologist."

The above description serves to illustrate many points in connection with Persian architecture, but it is desirable to sum

up the main characteristics of this art. The buildings were usually placed on massive platforms; the staircases were also massive. The surrounding walls were thick, the doors were too narrow for their height. Yet there was great harmony and proportion. The doors faced each other exactly, the rows of columns were uniform. Although Persian architecture was copied largely after the Assyrians some improvement was made: (1) Stone was used instead of brick; (2) Painted wooden floors were used in the halls; (3) They erected the slenderest columns known, twelve times as high as thick. Outside of architecture Persia made practically no improvement upon the Babylonian and Assyrian art.

Persian literature has perished with the exception of the older parts of the Zend-Avesta (explained further on). From the references made by the Greek writers there must have been, at one time, a considerable body of Persian literature. This literature, as an art, reminds one very much of the several parts of the Old Testament. During the best days of Persian history the Babylonian cuneiform alphabet was used.

The Persians developed a religion of great value. At first like the ancient Aryans, they worshiped the powers of nature, especially the sun (Mithra).

Sometime between the tenth and eighth centuries B. C. the Persian religion was reformed by a sage, Zoroaster. Nothing is known about this man except his name. No writing from his hand has come down to us, but his doctrines were reduced to writing long after his death and have come down to us in the Zend-Avesta (law and reform). "It was a compilation written in an ancient language (the Zend) which the faithful themselves no longer understood. It was divided into twenty-one books, inscribed on 12,000 cow skins bound by golden cords. The Mohammedans destroyed it when they invaded Persia. But some Persian families, faithful to the teaching of Zoroaster, fled into India. Their posterity, whom we call Parsees, have there maintained the old religion. An entire book of the Zend-Avesta and fragments of two others have been found among them" (Seignobos, p. 65).

According to these writings Ormazd created the world. In prayer this god is addressed as follows: "I invoke and celebrate the creator, Ahura Mazda (Ormazd), luminous, glorious, most intelligent and beautiful, eminent in purity who possesses the good knowledge, source of joy, who hast created us, hast fashioned us, and hast nourished us." Since Ormazd was so good it was not possible for him to create evil, hence everything bad in the world was created by an evil deity, Ahriman.

Each of these gods had his forces, Ormazd his good angels, Ahriman his demons. The home of the angels was in the east, of the demons in the west. These two forces were engaged in incessant warfare. Ormazd and his forces tried to help man. Ahriman and his forces tried to injure him.

This being true it was man's duty to adore the good and fight the bad. Herodotus said: "The Persians are not accustomed to erect statues, temples, or altars to their gods; they esteem those who do this as lacking in sense for they do not believe, as the Greeks do, that the gods have human forms." The only way that Ormazd manifested himself was under the form of fire or the sun, hence he was worshiped in the open air before a fire. The worship consisted of singing hymns and offering up animals in sacrifice.

The moral effects of Zoroastrianism were excellent. "The Persians," said Herodotus, "consider nothing so shameful as lying, and after falsehood nothing so shameful as contracting debts, for he who has debts necessarily lies." It was possible for man to war against death by marrying and having children. "Terrible," says the Zend-Avesta, "are the houses void of posterity."

It was considered that as soon as a man died his body belonged to the evil spirit (Ahriman). The body ought not to be burned however for that would pollute the fire the soil would be polluted if it were buried; the water would be contaminated if it were buried in that way. "The Persians resorted to a different method. The body with face toward the sun was exposed in an elevated place and left uncovered, securely fixed with stones:

the bearers then withdrew to escape the demons, for they assemble in the places of the sepulture, where reside sickness, fever, filth, cold and gray hairs. Dogs and birds, pure animals, then come to purify the body by devouring it" (Seignobos, p. 68).

When a person died his soul separated from the body. "In the third night after death it is conducted over the 'Bridge of Assembling' (Schinvot) which leads to the paradise above the gulf of inferno. There Ormazd questions it on its past life. If it has practiced the good, the pure spirits the spirits of dogs support it and aid it in crossing the bridge and give it entrance into the abode of the blest; the demons flee, for they cannot bear the odor of virtuous spirits. The soul of the wicked, on the other hand, comes to the dread bridge, and reeling, with no one to support it, is dragged by demons to hell, is seized by the evil spirit and chained in the abyss of darkness" (Seignobos, p. 68). Though the religion of the Persians possessed many admirable characteristics which placed it next to the Hebrews in point of importance, its idea of evil demons was productive of much harm in the west.

Persia influenced succeeding peoples in many ways, but her greatest contributions to the world were her religion and the higher and better organization of imperial government.

