

only case in which recent excavations in early Christian cemeteries have yielded important results. Not only in Rome, but in Sicily (at Syracuse) and in Africa (at Hadrumetum) this branch of investigation has been pursued with success. An account of these discoveries must, however, be deferred to a future occasion.

H. STUART JONES.

### THE ORIGIN OF THE AARONITE PRIESTHOOD: A REPLY.

MR McNEILE'S temperate and courteous criticism of my article on the 'Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood', which appeared in the *JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* for October 1905, deserved an earlier reply. Since my theory, however, presupposes the view that Deuteronomy is an exilic work, it seemed better that a reply to criticism upon the theory should appear simultaneously with an article upon the date of Deuteronomy.

Certainly if any 'bones' can be found 'which will not fit into the conjectural skeleton', it must be frankly admitted that a new skeleton must be reconstructed; but before attempting to do this it will be well to subject the alleged bones to a careful scrutiny.

In the first place I would point out that Mr McNeile has inadvertently misrepresented a sentence of mine, the last half of which he quotes *verbatim* on p. 1. I did not place the original story of Aaron's calf at Horeb at all. Following Wellhausen, I regard the whole Horeb section as belonging to a later *stratum*. Hence the tradition that Aaron made a golden calf, even if (as I admit to be probable) he is identical with the Aaron who is mentioned as the associate of Hur, does not locate the calf worship at Horeb. Indeed on p. 166 I distinctly stated that the obvious place in which to look for the origin of the legend of Aaron's calf is one of the sanctuaries which possessed golden calves. And since, in my opinion, the beginning of the iconoclastic movement (which is clearly implied in Exodus xxxii *in its present form*) cannot be dated earlier than the end of the eighth century B. C., when Hezekiah broke up the brazen serpent, it is obvious that Exodus xxxii must have taken shape since that date. The essential elements in that chapter are that a calf was made, and that Aaron made it. Details were probably still in a state of flux<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The earliest tradition was probably altogether silent on the subject of Aaron's death, and moreover did not represent Caleb and Joshua as the only persons of the host that came out of Egypt who entered Canaan. Only fragments of the earliest tradition have come down to us. Hur evidently occupied a position of some importance in the oldest story, but for some reason unknown to us the compiler of *JE* has excluded from his book the later history of him.

Mr McNeile goes on to ask, 'Why did the writer of 1 Kings xii 26+33 select Jeroboam I as the founder of the cult?'

But surely if (as I believe) that writer, when he wrote, 'had before him the full story of Exodus xxxii, and the reference to Moses' anger in Deut. ix 12-21', he could not have assigned the Bethel calf to Aaron; for his sources stated that the calf which Aaron had made had been destroyed by Moses, and that Aaron himself had died before the conquest of Canaan. But since he knew that Bethel was the royal sanctuary of North Israel (Amos vii 13), he naturally would infer—and his inference may be perfectly correct—that the temple which was standing at Bethel in the days of Amos had been built by Jeroboam. It was notorious that the idol at Bethel was a calf. There is surely no difficulty, therefore, in supposing that the writer of 1 Kings xii 26-33 believed that the cult of the calf had been suppressed from the time of Aaron, and refounded by Jeroboam.

Mr McNeile finds it difficult to believe that a calf would have been assigned to Dan, unless that sanctuary had actually possessed such an idol. But the post-Deuteronomic author of 1 Kings xii 26-33 (who, if he is not the same as the compiler of the Book of Kings, writes from the same standpoint, and may, therefore, for practical purposes be identified with him) certainly knew very little of the ancient sanctuaries of North Israel. When he wrote, all the high places of that country had probably been desecrated. But the old phrase, 'Dan to Beersheba', would of itself have been sufficient to convince him of the importance of Dan, and he would naturally conclude that what Jeroboam had done at the one sanctuary he would have done at the other also. It must be remembered that Dan was situated in a part of the land which for some two centuries had been in the hands of the heathen.

Mr McNeile writes: 'There is not necessarily a difficulty in the fact that Aaron was unpunished for his sin, while 300 men were slain by Levites. There are many critics who hold that Exodus xxxii 25-29 is from another source than that of 1-6, 15-24.' I certainly did not intend to imply that these passages are from the same hand; but the fact that the compiler placed them together is surely remarkable. If he had possessed any account of Aaron's being punished for making the calf, he would surely not have excluded it from his book. It might have been supposed that the making of a calf would suggest a probable reason for the death of Aaron<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The statement in Deut. ix 20 may rest on some narrative originally contained in *J*, but it may be a mere inference of the Deuteronomist to account for the fact that, whereas (according to the ideas of his time) Jehovah must have been angry with Aaron, no punishment fell upon him.

Mr McNeile does not attempt to show by what right a king of Judah could carry on an iconoclastic campaign in a neighbouring province. He apparently admits that the phrase 'from Geba to Beersheba' gives the *limits of the kingdom of Judah*. In his view 'the expression "Geba to Beersheba" is used to shew how thoroughly the purging of Judah was carried out'. But surely it would be difficult to imagine a more thorough 'purging' than that to which, according to 2 Kings xxiii 19, 20, not only Bethel but also all the sanctuaries of the cities of Samaria were subjected! Moreover if the province of Samaria formed part of Josiah's kingdom, why does Jeremiah regularly appeal to Jerusalem and Judah?

In his remarks on p. 4, Mr McNeile has misunderstood my contention. He says, 'If the acute antagonism between the Zadokites and Aaronites had existed for years before, would not the Levites have been called "the sons of Aaron"? If Deuteronomy in its original form did not mention Aaron, it must have been because it was written before the quarrel began.' In Mr McNeile's phraseology the term 'Levites' seems to be equivalent to 'sons of Aaron'. I never dreamed of suggesting that Aaronites and Zadokites quarrelled before the days of Deuteronomy. Why should the Aaronites at Bethel have quarrelled with the Zadokites at Jerusalem? or why should the Aaronites at Jerusalem have quarrelled with the Zadokites in Babylon?

On the same page, by bringing together two quotations from different parts of my article, Mr McNeile understands me to 'imply that the law of the single sanctuary was the intention of the compiler, or compilers, of *J*'. He has apparently overlooked the fact that on p. 169 I wrote, 'It must be remembered that the reformation under Josiah was not the outcome of a tendency that had suddenly arisen. Reforming ideas had been "in the air", and gradually gaining force for more than a century.' When, on p. 184, I used the phrase 'the reforming party' with reference to the legislation of *J*, the context shews clearly that I refer to the reforming party in the days of Manasseh, when, as far as we know, no one had dreamed of limiting worship to one sanctuary; whereas the words, 'the intention of the original reformers', on p. 161, were used when no mention had been made of any reformation other than Josiah's, and therefore could only refer to the original leaders in the reformation which aimed at the limiting of worship to a single sanctuary.

On p. 5, Mr McNeile writes, 'Though the genealogy of Joshua in 1 Chron. vi 13-15 may very possibly be an 'unhistorical artificiality'—as the genealogies of the Chronicler often are—yet Seraiah and Jehozadak were both historical persons, and there is no direct evidence to shew that the former was not the father of the latter'. But to assert

that a genealogy is an unhistorical artificiality is not to deny that it contains any historical names. It certainly does not follow that because a genealogist has got historical names he must necessarily arrange them in their right order, or know their proper relation one to another. I do not doubt the historical reality of either Seraiah or Jehozadak. But the absence of 'direct evidence' against the statement that the former was the father of the latter is of little importance, when it is considered that this statement itself, as I shewed in my article, was an inevitable inference to one who, like the Chronicler, believed in the continuity of the priesthood, and knew that Seraiah had been priest at the Captivity, and that Jehozadak was the father of a priest who was supposed to have returned in the first year of Cyrus. Moreover if nothing but 'direct evidence' is to be admitted in historical criticism, all such criticism becomes impossible.

I would point out that Wellhausen's restoration of Zech. vi 9-15 is not as arbitrary as Mr McNeile seems to imply. Having regard to the assertion, utterly unintelligible in the Masoretic Text, that 'the counsel of peace shall be between them both', and the LXX reading  $\text{ἰσχυροὶ καὶ ἰσχυροὶ}$  for  $\text{ἰσχυροὶ καὶ ἰσχυροὶ}$ , as well as to the strong evidence of verse 14 that only *one* crown was originally mentioned, it is difficult to see any other possible way of amending the admittedly corrupt text.

A few words as to Mr McNeile's reconstruction. Whether Deuteronomy xxxiii is an early northern poem or not may here be left an open question, but surely it is an altogether unwarrantable assumption to identify the subject of verse 8 with Moses. Obviously the Levites generally are here referred to. Because a 'Levite or clergyman' according to Judges xviii 30 was a descendant of Moses, it certainly cannot be inferred that all clergymen claimed a like descent.

I am not sure that I quite understand to what Mr McNeile refers, when he says on p. 6, 'And signs perhaps survive till a late date in the similarity of the names in different branches of the family'. If he means signs of a tendency to trace all priestly families back to Moses, it would seem to follow that he regards Eleazar as having arisen from Eliezer, and Gershon from Gershom, or in other words that the genealogy of Aaron is an 'unhistorical artificiality', the names in it being to some extent suggested by names in the genealogy of Moses.

That this is the case is indeed probable, but if it is admitted, it shews that *nothing was really known* as to the genealogy of the family of Aaron, and it is therefore impossible to say whether Eli was an Aaronite or a Mosaite. There is, therefore, no trustworthy evidence that the priests at Shiloh, Nob and Anathoth were Aaronites. Indeed if it were safe to infer from 1 Sam. ii 27 ff. that the family of Eli had been priests at the Exodus, having regard to the fact that in

the oldest *stratum* of the Pentateuch Moses is the sole priest, we should naturally conclude that Eli was descended from Moses.

But it is probably a mistake to suppose that in the early days of the Hebrew Monarchy the actual descent of a priest went for anything. The chief sanctuaries probably had their own traditions as to the origin of their ritual. Thus, for example, Ophrah seems to have ascribed its ritual to the priest-king Gideon; and had not tradition related the destruction of Gideon's family, it is not improbable that the priests at Ophrah would have been known as 'sons of Gideon'. In like manner we may suppose that the Bethel 'use' was associated with Aaron. In a new sanctuary, such as Micah's, unless the ritual had been prescribed by some theophany, it was desirable, though not necessary, to have some one with a priestly training.

Mr McNeile's argument on p. 8 depends on the assumption that Josiah intended to admit priests from North Israel to the temple at Jerusalem. That there were images at most, if not all, the important sanctuaries of both Israel and Judah down to the end of the eighth century B. C. is extremely likely, and in North Israel, probably still later. But the priests whom Ezekiel has primarily in view are those of *Judæan* sanctuaries such as Beersheba (unless we adopt the improbable supposition that his polemic is directed against the amalgamation of worship of Judæa and Samaria, of which tidings had reached him in Babylon), and Mr McNeile brings forward no evidence to shew that these were Aaronites. Anathoth was not a 'high place', but a suburb of Jerusalem, and the priests who resided there were definitely connected with the Zadokite priests at Jerusalem.

It may be pointed out that, if, as Mr McNeile contends, 2 Kings xxiii is historical, there were *no priests left in North Israel*, for Josiah put them all to death (2 Kings xxiii 19, 20). And even if the 'all' be not understood *au pied de la lettre*, is it likely that the survivors of the barbarous massacre, which Josiah is said to have ordered, would have been authorized by the same king to officiate in his temple at Jerusalem?

R. H. KENNETT.

### THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Two valuable books, already familiar to readers of the JOURNAL, have lately come into my hands at Naples, and this circumstance leads me to put together a few observations which may be fitly registered under the above heading.

In his commentary on Numbers at p. 155, Dr Buchanan Gray refers to a suggestion contained in an article of mine (*Jewish Quarterly*