

THE JEWISH ELEMENT IN GALILEE.

IN COMMENT ON PROF. PAUL HAUPT'S ARTICLE "THE ARYAN ANCESTRY OF JESUS."

BY WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

IN the April number of *The Open Court*, pp. 193-204, Prof. Paul Haupt discusses the question of the Aryan, that is, Indo-Iranian, not Indo-European, ancestry of Jesus, pouring upon the subject a most copious flood of mingled historic and linguistic learning. The Jewish descent of the Jesus he would seem to deny positively or at least to hold it to be "extremely improbable that Jesus was a son of David; it is at least as probable (Footnote—I do not say it is probable) that he was a scion of Deioces or even a descendant of Spitam, the ancestor of Zoroaster"—a conclusion that might placate the manes of Nietzsche and almost persuade him to become a Christian.

Professor Haupt is careful to refer to Emile Burnouf, Rudolf von Jhering, and Houston Stewart Chamberlain (elsewhere also to A. Wirth, in the *Neue Revue*) as forerunners in his present theory. With regard to the first he would seem to be almost over-generous. Elsewhere he tells us he had not read Burnouf's article and knew of it only through a subsequent informant.

The great French philologist's idea differs widely enough from Professor Haupt's. He did not indeed expressly ascribe Aryan ancestry to the Jesus, but maintained that from the first there had been an intellectually and spiritually superior minority of Aryan Jews: "observation shows us the Jewish people composed of two distinct races. . . . mutually hostile since the most remote times. The bulk of the people of Israel was Semite and devoted to the adoration of the Elohim personified in Abel. The rest who always formed the minority were so to speak strangers come from Asia and practiced the cult of Jehovah. These were probably Aryans (*Revue des deux mondes*, LXXVI, p. 886). To these Aryans Burnouf, greatly depreciating the Semite, ascribes everything excellent in Hebrew literature and religion. How they kept their blood pure so many centuries, he does not tell.

Professor Haupt rejects the view of Chamberlain, "that the Aryan element in Galilee was due to Greek immigration in the last century B. C.," and dates it much farther back in the days of the enterprising Tiglath-Pileser IV and Sargon II, who permuted the peoples about 738 B. C., sending Galileans to Assyria and Assyrians (afterwards called Itureans) to Galilee, which appears in the wedge-writing as the Land of Hamath (better Hammath or Hammoth, Assyrian Hammâti). Hither, testifies Sargon II, he sent the Median Chief Dejokes with his kin, Indo-Iranians. The majority of those transferred by Tiglath-Pileser IV to Galilee hailed from Ullub and Kirkh in North Assyria, at the foot of the Armenian Taurus, a region not Semitic. These daring and lucky gamblers in men seem to have thought that in order to get good hands one must shuffle the cards well and then cut deep—a theory and practice which the Asia of to-day may thank for a good share of its misery and impotence. By such deportation, and not by much later Greek immigration, would Professor Haupt account for the presence of the Aryan element in Galilee.

However it came about, it must be conceded that the nations, tribes, tongues, and races poured together like many waters into the mountain basin round the Great Harp Chinnoroth (Gennesareth). But not only were the Aryans present; the Jews, thinks Professor Haupt, and this argumentatively is of far greater importance, were absent. "There were no Jews in Galilee after the year 164 B. C.," when "those that were in Galilee, that is, in Arbatta [corruption for Sabrana = Sepphoris, capital of Galilee] with their wives and their children and all that they had, took he [Simon, brother of Judas Maccabæus] away and brought them into Judea with great joy" (1. Macc. v. 14-23). Professor Haupt does not seem to deny that there were Semites in Galilee along with Aryans, but he will not admit the presence of any true-blooded Jews, though the populace was Judaic in religion, having been converted by the forcible persuasion of Aristobulus, first King of the Jews, for whom the Coronation Psalm (ii) was written. Such in brief is the ethnological situation as it lies in the mind of Professor Haupt.

Now Jesus, we are assured, was born in Nazareth, identical with the ancient Hittalon or Hannathon (for Hinnathon), the arrowhead Hinnatuni of the El-Amarna tablets (1400 B. C.), all these words meaning "protection," while Ezekiel's form Hethlon (xlvi. 15) means "swathing," the hamlet being protected or swathed by engirdling hills. This fact, thinks Professor Haupt apparently, had impressed itself on the minds of the "Angels" who told the

shepherds, "Ye will find a babe wrapped in swaddling-clothes, lying in a manger," "just as Nazareth is *swathed* in a basin with a girdle of hills" (Italics are Professor Haupt's). We are assured that the Jesus and his first disciples were Galileans, that the census of Luke ii did not take place till A. D. 7, eleven years after the Nativity, that the Lucan historical framework (so valiantly championed by Ramsay) hangs together like so much sand, that the tradition of Davidic descent and Beth-Lehem birth is not original, since "others said, This is the Christ, but others said Nay! for comes the Christ from Galilee?" and that "Our Saviour Himself referred to the belief that the Messiah was to be a son of David as an unwarranted opinion of the Scribes" (Mk. xii. 35-37); and even Prof. Percy Gardner is quoted as having "well said" that "according to all historic probability, Jesus of Nazareth was born at Nazareth."

The case then stands thus in Professor Haupt's thought: Jesus himself was called the Galilean, the Nazarean; he was most probably born in Nazareth; in Galilee, *ergo* in Nazareth, "were no Jews" (true-bloods), but only Judaized non-Jews; among these latter had been for nearly eight centuries many Aryans imported by Sargon II and Tiglath-Pileser IV; hence the ancestors of Jesus were probably found among these Aryans.

No one will question the ingenuity and seductive charm of these combinations; it remains to test more closely their logical worth, their argumentative conviction-carrying quality.

In the first place, it is vital to the scheme that "there were no Jews in Galilee after 164 B. C." This Professor Haupt would prove from the Maccabean narrative of the deportation of the Jews thence by Simon (1 Macc. v. 23). Can such proof be made out? In the first place, no mention is made of deportation from Galilee in general, but only from the capital Arbatta; such is the explicative force that Professor Haupt gives to the word "and,"¹ rendering it "that is"; there is no reason to suppose that many did not remain behind outside and even inside the capital.

Accepting the Maccabean account at its face value, we still have no warrant to declare that "the Jews who lived in Galilee at the time of Judas Maccabæus were *all* rescued and transferred to Jerusalem in 164 B. C."

This word *all* is not used in the Maccabean text. Antecedently such a complete transfer seems highly improbable.

- Still more, it is notorious that the First Book of the Maccabees

¹καί.

is a glorification of the Maccabean heroes, particularly of Judas, and must be taken with quite as many grains of salt as such glorifications in general. Had Simon Maccabæus rescued and deported only a few dozen Galilean Jews, these would have multiplied themselves, in the imagination of his glorifier, far faster than the Three Black Crows. Least of all men does Professor Haupt need to be warned of the imperious need of heavily discounting the statement of Jewish and Asiatic historiographers and hero-worshippers. We must then dismiss this notion of the deportation of *all* Jews from Galilee in 164 B. C. as quite insufficiently grounded.

But even supposing that Simon had made a clean sweep, what of it? Nothing that we can see. For is it impossible or improbable that they returned, in equal may be or even in greater numbers? Does not the cat sometimes come back? Galilee was a flourishing and inviting region, almost an earthly paradise, if we may credit Josephus. At the beginning of our era the Jew was well-nigh ubiquitous. The papyri show him everywhere in Egypt. In the isles of the sea, in Delian Rheneia, on monumental marble he carved his prayers for revenge and lifted imploring hands to heaven. Why should he avoid his old home, where dwelt his co-religionists in numbers? Evidently Matthew regarded the transmigration of Jews to Galilee as a simple enough matter, for he transfers a Bethlehemite to Nazareth by a stroke of the pen. Look at it as you will, then, the absence of Jews from Galilee at B. C. 4 is unproved, unprovable, and highly improbable. *Non liquet* must be the mildest verdict.

Now if there were any Jews, even a few, in Galilee, then the whole argument against the Jewish extraction of Jesus collapses. We must take heed in applying the calculus of probabilities. If the Jews in Galilee formed only one-tenth of the total population, then if any one were chosen blindly, utterly at random, the chance would be only one in ten that he would be a Jew. But to apply this principle with confidence, one must be sure in the first place that the choice is utterly at random. Now in the case of any particular man, if there be aught to specialize him, as if there be any witness about him, any history or tradition, the choice is not at all at random, and we cannot apply the doctrine of chance. In a given city of X or on a given planet, as the earth, there are (say) only 1 per cent of Jews. In perfectly random choices only once in a hundred times on the average would one get a Jew. But if a *raconteur* should begin to tell a tale about a Jew born in the city of X, would any one interrupt him, saying, "My dear Sir, why do you try to deceive us? There are 99 Gentiles to every Jew in that city. Don't you see that

the chances are 99 to 1 that you are lying, that your hero was not a Jew at all?" Such an interrupter would be suppressed *instanter*. The *raconteur* was not speaking of any purely chance selection. Neither are the Evangelists speaking of a Galilean picked up at random, but of the most specially chosen imaginable. If the supposed testimony is to be accepted at all, there is no reason for rejecting or impeaching this detail on the ground that there were more non-Jews than Jews in Galilee. Now they (at least Matthew and Luke) represent Jesus as of pure Jewish blood. There may be reasons for rejecting this testimony *in toto*, but these reasons cannot be found in the insufficient presence of Jewish blood in Galilee.

At this point it seems proper to institute a more penetrating inquiry into the nature of the evidence, touching the supposed Simonian deportation of Jews from Galilee to Judea, an inquiry that must start the more general question of the trustworthiness of the First Book of Maccabees. It must be frankly stated in the first place that the repute of the book has hitherto stood very high. Professor Torrey in the *Encyclopedia Biblica* can hardly find words too strong to please him. "We thus have here for the first time a Jewish history with a satisfactory chronology." Both in general and "in its narrative of details, it bears the unmistakable stamp of truth." "On the whole, the book must be pronounced a work of the highest value, comparing favorably in point of trustworthiness, with the best Greek and Roman histories." But when we come to look at the details, it seems hard to repress a smile. "Besides being the only detailed account which we have of the events of the greater part of this most important period, the book has proved itself worthy to hold the highest rank as trustworthy history." Strange how it could thus "prove itself" trustworthy, when we have absolutely no check on its statements, no way to tell whether they be trustworthy or not!

Professor Torrey would indeed seem to be using words in a Pickwickian sense, for he proceeds now to limit his general judgment rather narrowly. He speaks of the "author's own inaccuracy" about the inscription in honor of Simon. The letter of Demetrius, x. 25-45, he admits, "cannot be regarded as genuine," though "put in its present place by the careful and conscientious author of 1 Macc." "His statements cannot always be believed, it is true"; "in relation to foreign affairs" he exhibits "naïve ignorance." His "numerical estimates are often exaggerated." His "incorporated documents are not to be taken too seriously." So too the speeches!

In *Hastings's Bible Dictionary*, Fairweather is less enthusiastic

and more succinct, but maintains the same general position. He is at pains to assign the reasons for his faith: "The writer's habit of dating the chief events according to a fixed era (the Seleucid era, B. C. 312), the general agreement of his chronology with that of the Greek and Roman authors and with the data furnished by extant coins of the period, the frankness and self-restraint shown by him in chronicling victory or defeat (!) on the part of the Jews and in speaking of their adversaries, the absence from his pages of tawdry ornamentation and weak supernaturalism,—all combine to give to his work the stamp of authentic history." "The writer is a plain and honest chronicler."

Kautzsch (*Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 1899) is more discreet. He admits that "from the current almost wholly favorable judgment some deductions must be made." His opinion of the letters is in the main adverse, he inclines to accept for some at least the shrewd suggestion of Willrich that they are the insertions of the translator from an Aramaic original.

But enough of expert testimony. To the book itself.

First, we observe that the admitted discrepancies are great wherever we can compare with some profane author. Thus, Livy, (XXXVII, 39) is exact and reduces our author's 120 elephants (viii. 6) to 54. Secondly, from the fact that the writer assigns dates correctly, where all motive to incorrectness is absent, we can infer nothing as to his statements where such motives are plainly present. Indeed, Torrey seems to exercise excess of generosity in saying, "No one will blame him for passing over in silence the shameful conduct of the high priests Jason and Menelaus, or for making only brief mention of the defeats suffered by the Jews." No one? Some think that to suppress the true suggests the false. It seems then that where no motive for inaccuracy is present, and where it is impossible to test the author's statements, we are unable to say that these statements are incorrect! But where motive is present he at least suppresses very important matters, and where we can test his estimates we find them grossly exaggerated, besides finding his "incorporated documents" untrustworthy and himself repeatedly contradicted by profane history when he comes into contact with this latter. So much, by the admission of his admirers. A queer piece of most "trustworthy history"! Now, however, add the fact that the author is admittedly glorifying the Hasmonean dynasty, that he "was a warm adherent of the Hasmonean house, and probably a personal friend of its leaders" (Torrey), and what

right have we to say that "his history is not written in a partisan spirit" (Torrey)? What right have we to put faith in any statement that magnifies his party, patrons, and friends? To credit the Sadducee who admittedly tells all the good and none of the bad about the priesthood? These indeed are only very general considerations, yet sufficient to show how baseless is the universally favorable judgment of critics.

Let us now come to closer quarters. We have not space for a minute study of these sixteen chapters, but a few specimens will show that we are not dealing with pure history but with such a manifest panegyric, particularly of Judas, as reads much rather like a fairy tale.

Let it be noted then that the career of the Maccabees is one uninterrupted series of the most complete and brilliant triumphs over forces incomparably superior in numbers and equipment, of victories such as were never won by Eumenes, nor Sertorius, nor Hannibal, nor Alexander, nor Cæsar, nor Napoleon. Not once is a Maccabean worsted; only once does Judas prudently withdraw after inflicting heavy loss on the enemy. The account of this latter affair is most peculiar and throws a strange light on this highly "trustworthy history." Antiochus Eupator marches through Idumea with 100,000 foot, 20,000 horse, 32 trained elephants, and lays siege to Bethsura, fights a long time, and erects engines of war. But the besieged "sallied out, burnt the engines with fire and warred manfully." Doubtless—but with what result? In this place nothing more is said. The king marches off towards Bethsacharia with a tremendous array, each elephant accompanied by 1000 foot and 500 horse, and mounted by 32 men besides an Indian driver, though elsewhere in history 3 or 4 men suffice for each elephant! Against this formidable host Judas marches out from the citadel of Jerusalem, "and Judas drew nigh and his camp in counter array, and there fell of the camp of the King 600 men." It is neither said nor hinted that any Jew was slain. Then Eleasar Awaran, brother of Judas, fancying he recognized the royal elephant by its trappings, made an heroic rush upon the beast, fought his way single-handed through the 1500 guards, dealing death right and left, cleft a passage to the beast, ran under it, transpierced it from beneath, so that it fell dead upon him and killed him, who thus offered himself up to save his people and win for himself a name everlasting. Then follows the only verse that hints a defeat of Judas. "And beholding the

strength of the King and the onrush of his troops they turned aside² from them," (vi. 47).

Most likely the forces of Judas were routed and dispersed, but the "plain honest chronicler" holds his peace.

The king marched on into Judea, against Mt. Zion. "With those of Bethsura he made peace." "They came out"—such is the euphemism for surrender—because it was the sabbatic year and provisions were scarce, not because the king could fairly take the place. Similarly in the case of the siege of Jerusalem. The Jews defend themselves successfully against the Syrians, but provisions fail because it was the seventh year, and the Jews rescued from the heathen consumed the supplies, so that the garrison was in a measure dispersed. Still no thought of capitulation! Finally Lysias, the king's lieutenant, tells him and the leaders of the host, "we grow daily weaker, we have little provisions, and the place we besiege is strong, and the care of the kingdom is on us. Let us therefore give these men the right hand and make peace with them, and with all their folk, and let them walk in their customs as heretofore, for because of these customs which we abrogated have they become enraged and done all this. This counsel pleased the king and his leaders and he sent to them to make peace and they received them; and the king and the leaders swore to them; and [trusting] these oaths they went out from the citadel; and the king entered the city of Zion and beheld the citadel of the place and set at naught the oath that he swore and bade level down the wall all round."

We note that here even in the direst distress the Jews are not beaten by their enemy; this latter acknowledges defeat by proposing a compromise, which is accepted by the Jews since it yields them everything in dispute, and it is no fault of theirs if the royal word is broken.

Now let the reader consider this account of the victorious march of Antiochus Eupator, how artfully the disasters of the Jews are transformed into splendid onsets, and prudent withdrawal, and heroic self-immolation, and successful defense, and honorable compromise yielding them all their claims, and then say whether he is reading history "fully as trustworthy" as Thucydides. Kautzsch indeed perceives that Judas must have been defeated, and says that Antiochus "*schlägt ihn*," but "the careful and conscientious" historian says nothing of the kind. So everywhere in this model history. Jonathan and Simon are both captured and murdered, (xii. 46-48; xiii. 23; xvi. 16), but only through treachery, which brought

² ἐξέκλιαν.

only shame and no advantage to the traitors. Judas indeed was too wise to be betrayed. He fought victoriously to the last. In the final struggle with only 800 men against the host of Bacchides (20,000 foot, 2000 horse), there is great slaughter on both sides. Judas falls, the rest flee, but his brothers Jonathan and Simon remain apparently in possession of the field, at least they bear away Judas to burial in the paternal sepulchre in Modein.

Josephus modestly amends the account by saying that his brothers received Judas from the enemy "under truce."

If some one still thinks all this might have taken place just as narrated, let him consider the operations of Judas east of the Jordan (164 B. C.) where with 8000 men he campaigns for weeks and seemingly even months, fighting bloody battle after battle against immense odds, storming half a dozen fenced cities exceeding strong (one for a whole day and night, v. 50), slaughtering the enemy by thousands on thousands (8000 in one single instance, v. 34), filling up the streets with corpses so that his men marched through the city over the bodies of the slain (v. 51)—and all of this terrific hand-to-hand warfare without the loss of one single man: "there fell of them not one until their return in peace" (v. 54)! This is far more miraculous than the miracles "and weak supernaturalism" that so discredit the Second Book of Maccabees in the minds of admirers of this excellent historian.

This is not the worst, however. Nicanor, a most trusted commander, takes Jerusalem; not finding Judas there he marches five hours northwest to Bethhoron; there he is joined by another Syrian host. Judas with 3000 men is encamped 90 minutes to the northeast, at Adasa, and prays that Nicanor's host be annihilated like Sennacherib's. Battle is joined, Nicanor falls, his army is routed, the villagers stream out, and *all* the Syrians are massacred or massacre one another, not one escapes, "there was not left of them not even one."³

Notice that the statement is perfectly sharp and definite and made with all deliberation. If this be not incredible, consider the following: Jonathan sends 3000 valiant men to Antioch as body-guard to Demetrius fallen into disfavor with his army. The Antiochians gather against Demetrius to the number of 120,000 and intend to kill him. He flees to his palace, which they proceed to storm. He calls the 3000 Jews to his help; they come; they charge out into the city and slaughter 100,000 in one day; then they set fire to the city, plunder it, and save the king. Whereupon the

³ οὐ κατελείφθη ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἰς.

Antiochians throw down their arms, sue for peace and salvation from the fury of the Jews, who were magnified before the king and all his subjects and returned to Jerusalem laden with booty (xi. 41-51).

By the side of this achievement the exploits of the Swiss guard sink into insignificance, Thorwaldsen's lion droops its tail and forgets to roar, and even Buck Fanshaw is far outdone. He indeed suppressed a riot before it could break out, by leaping in and sending home 14 men on a shutter, but these 3000 Jews slew 33½ men apiece in the suppression of this more formidable uprising.

This is not all by any means. As legate of the young Antiochus, Jonathan marches in triumph all through the region west of the Euphrates, all the Syrian troops rally to his standard, he captures Askalon and Gaza, proceeds to Damascus, and thence against a great army of Demetrius at Kedesh in Naphthali, while his brother Simon invests Bethsura and forces it to capitulation. Jonathan encamps by Lake Gennesar, and on entering the plain of Chazor early in the morning is surprised to meet a heathen army, which had also laid a trap for him by insidiously planting forces in the surrounding hill country. These now burst upon the Jews who, thus attacked, all betook themselves to flight; not one remained with Jonathan but Mattathias Ben-Absalom and Judas Ben Chalpheis, honored names! What does Jonathan, thus abandoned to the foe encompassing him on all sides with fierce and numerous attack? He rends his garments, strews dust upon his head, and prays. Having accomplished so much he turns upon the enemy, defeats the whole army and puts it to rout! When the Jews that had fled perceived his victory, they turned round and joined with him in pursuit of the enemy as far as the latter's camp in Kedesh, slaying 3000.

Here then we find the feat of Horatius at the Bridge writ large, in fact, in six-foot capitals. It sounds strange, however, that after such a marvelous victory, when Demetrius's army thus routed by one man and decimated might easily have been annihilated, to read in the very next verse, "And Jonathan turned back to Jerusalem" (xi. 60-74). One would like to read the Demetrian version of this sanguinary engagement. Queer, too, that the next chapter should open with Jonathan's overtures to the Romans and to the Spartans, "because he saw the season cooperates with him"; what need had such a hero for allies?

Wellhausen perceives the absurdity here and would relieve it by arbitrarily rejecting verse 74 quoted above, along with the incident of the embassy.

There follows the adventurous campaign of Jonathan, in which he goes 200 miles north of Jerusalem to the land of Hamath (on the Orontes) to war against the mightier host of Demetrius, which flees before him across the Eleutheros river. Thereupon he turns against the Arabs, chastises them, breaks camp and marches upon Damascus, and thence to Jerusalem, Simon meanwhile carrying all before him, even to Askalon, and establishing a garrison in Joppa.

Is it possible to see in these rapid campaigns from one end of the land to the other anything more than marauding incursions of flying squadrons, dignified into military expeditions of disciplined armies? Tryphon however determines to end this guerilla strife by capturing Jonathan. He marches to Bethsan (Skythopolis) just south of Gennesareth. Jonathan goes to meet him and with a large army of 40,000 picked men. Tryphon receives him with the most distinguished honor, enriches him with gifts, bids all treat him as they treat Tryphon himself, persuades Jonathan that he has no need of such an army, that he send them all home but a few trusties. Jonathan sends all away but 3000; of these he sends 2000 to Galilee. (Why? Is this another version of Simon's expedition?) The other thousand he retains as body guard. They depart to Ptolemais. Why? Such a voluntary act on Jonathan's part would be one of incredible folly. The arts of Tryphon were perfectly well known; who can believe that Jonathan would of his own accord disband his formidable army of 40,000 and go with an ambitious rival into the rival's country and fortress? Once in Ptolemais, of course his companions are slain and he himself cast into prison. Thereupon his 2000 in Galilee are attacked but make good their escape to Judea. (Is this a variant of Simon's deportation from Galilee?) All the heathen rejoice that the leader of the Jews is taken and hope now to blot out their memory from among men.

It seems plain that the story as told in 1 Macc. xii. 39-53 is quite beyond belief. Tryphon doubtless captured Jonathan, but in no such manner as there detailed. And what more shall we say? For time would fail to discuss the shield of gold of 1000 minae (950 pounds) in weight, of various unhistorical data, as that Antiochus was taken alive by the Romans at Magnesia (B. C. 190)! that he ceded India to them! and others that indicate the writer is thinking of the overthrow of the Achaian League 15 years after the death of Judas! Nor can we more than mention the 12 or 13 letters (86 verses) all important but none authentic, being plainly fictitious in form or matter or both.

We have already noticed the total suppression of the renegade

priests Menelaus and Jason, most important figures during many years covered by this history, but never once mentioned. We have already seen that no defeat is allowed to befall any Maccabean hero; their careers are victorious till they pay the tribute of mortality. It is commonly stated by the admirers of this book (as Fairweather) that it records Jewish disasters. In fact only one such disaster is recorded, and this example is particularly instructive. We are told that while Judas with Jonathan was pursuing his career of triumph in Gilead, and Simon in Galilee, the two leaders Azaria and Joseph hearing of the great exploits of Judas and Simon, said, "We too will win honor for ourselves and go to war against the surrounding nations." And so they did, in spite of the express injunction of Judas to join no battle in his absence; the result was that Gorgias routed them, inflicting a loss of 2000 slain. "And great disaster befell the people of Israel because they heeded not Judas and his brothers, thinking to play the valiant man. But they were not of the seed of those men to whom was given salvation for Israel through their hand. And the man Judas and his brothers were glorified exceedingly before all Israel and all the nations, etc." (v. 61-63). This is the only defeat scored against the Jews during the 40 years (175-135 B. C.) covered by 1 Maccabees; for v. 67, "in that day fell priests in the war, wishing to play the valiant in going out to war unadvisedly" (i. e., against the orders of Judas), is apparently only an expansion or a doublet (v. 61), and in any case enforces the same lesson, that victory was certain with the Maccabean seed of salvation and impossible without them. Herewith then the spirit of the book is clearly and unmistakably characterized. It is an open panegyric of the Asmoneans, it is written to show their divine prerogative as the temporal saviours of Israel. This fact is indeed stamped plainly on every chapter. As such a work of *Tendenz* it can lay no great claim to general credibility and no claim at all to credibility in detail; and in view of the fact that we have already found it literally swarming with inaccuracies and impossibilities, it becomes evident that the book, though historical and exceedingly valuable as indicating the main trend of events at a time and place otherwise almost unlighted by any independent record, is nevertheless not properly a history,—it is adulatory biography and special pleading.

The question now arises, What good reason have we to believe that the expeditions of Judas to Gilead and of Simon to Galilee ever took place at all? The allusion (vi. 53) to "those redeemed into Judea from the nations" seems hardly sufficient, but there are

two other testimonies more decisive. The Second Book of Maccabees stands as low as the First stands high in the esteem of critics. Nevertheless they concede that its attestation is worth something,—even though it be (as Geiger thinks) a Pharisaic counterblast to the Sadducean First Book,—since it seems at various points to reproduce the testimony of an eye-witness.

Now in 2 Macc. xii. 1-31 we find detailed a series of campaigns undertaken by Judas against Timotheus (already slain x. 37!), Apollonius and others, east of the Jordan, which seem to cover about the same ground as 1 Macc. v. 24-54), though the two accounts are widely discrepant at countless points. In both books Judas finally recrosses the Jordan at Bethsan (Skythopolis) *en route* for Jerusalem.

In 2 Macc. this visitation of Skythopolis is meant to be punitive, but the resident Jews bore witness to the great favor shown them by the citizens and so averted destruction from the city. This incident seems to be historic, at least we perceive no motive for its invention. But it appears inconsistent with the expedition of Simon to Galilee, for he would naturally have taken in Skythopolis on his way thither, or at least on return, so that the march of Judas thither would appear unmotivated. Hereby doubt is thrown upon Simon's exploit, which is unmentioned in 2 Macc., a doubt deepened by the silence of another and far more credible witness.

That most mysterious Psalm, the 68th, according to the concurrent judgments of such masters as Wetzstein, Wellhausen, and Haupt (who in the *American Journal of Semitic languages and literature*, XXIII, 220-240, has surpassed all others in thoroughness of treatment), relates specifically to this victorious trans-Jordanic expedition of Judas. In particular, the famous verse 18, "Thou hast led captivity captive, hast received gifts in men," seems to refer vividly to the deliverance of the Jews at the hands of Maccabæus. So too verse 22, "spake the Lord, from Bashan I will bring back, I will bring back from the whirlpools of the sea." At the same time this witness contradicts the "all" of Macc. v. 45 ("And Judas took with him all Israel those in Galaaditis from small to great, and their wives and their children" etc.), for it is repeated (verses 6, 18) "Only the rebellious dwell in a parched land (not with Jah, God)." This implies that some remained behind, even if coercion were applied, as Professor Haupt contends.

But the most important point is that while the Psalmist speaks clearly of the return from Bashan, while indeed his mind is fixed on the envy of Bashan's high hills toward Zion (verses 15, 16),

he says nothing of any return from Galilee, not even in verse 27, which mentions the princes of Zebulon and Naphtali; the rebellious stay behind not in the fertile region around Gennesareth but only in the "parchèd land."

Now Galilee was far more important every way than Gilead, and its relations with Jerusalem were closer. The poet is eager to weave in as many geographical and historical allusions as possible; had he known of any such glorious and saving expedition as Simon's, he would most probably have mentioned it somewhere in his elaborate lyric. That he omits to name it, seems to show that it had no place in his consciousness. Still further, we note that the messengers of distress from Galilee (v. 14, 15) arrive in Jerusalem precisely during the reading of the letters of distress from Gilead,—a most remarkable coincidence that cannot fail to remind one of the horrors on horror's head accumulate of Job i. 16, 17, 18, of which the writer appears to be thinking. Finally, consider the utter vagueness of the account in contrast with the minuteness of the following narrative concerning Judas, and it would seem hard to give any credence at all to the tale about Simon, which appears to have been intended merely to get him away from Jerusalem, that room might be left for the folly of Joseph and Azarias.

Nay more! We find in 2 Macc. x. 14-23 an account that bears internal marks of authenticity (along with certain obvious numerical exaggerations), in which, during a war with Gorgias, Simon is left behind by Judas *along with Joseph and Zacchæus* (apparently = Azarias), to watch two strongholds of the Idumæans. But the avaricious associates of Simon accepted a bribe of 70,000 drachmas to let some of the besieged escape, for which on return of Judas they suffered death. This incident, so discreditable to the Jews, could hardly have been invented. Since it occurs in the war against Gorgias, in the absence of Judas (who in the immediate connection is in a struggle with Timotheus, apparently the same as that described in 1 Macc. v. 30 f.), under the command of Simon along with Joseph and Zacchæus (=Azarias?), and as this arrangement seems every way more credible than the other,—for it would have been most highly injudicious in Judas to leave his base of operations in charge of such incompetents as Joseph and Azarias, while both he and Simon went far away on long expeditions,—and since there is no other place for this incident anywhere in 1 Maccabees, it seems we have no choice but to accept this parallel account as substantially correct. Accordingly it appears from all the indicia that Simon's expedition to Galilee is only a pious imagination intended

to free him from any possible complicity in a rather shady transaction, wherein his good name had suffered from apparent connection with admitted bribery. It would seem then that there is no occasion to worry any further over Simon's alleged deportation of Jews from Galilee. That story served its purpose well for nearly 2000 years, but would now appear to have outlived its usefulness.

Hereby of course it is not meant that Simon never made an incursion into Galilee, never brought back with him any Jews. Most likely he made many such incursions and brought back Jews as camp followers on several occasions, but the evidence is against the actuality of this particular expedition, and common sense is unalterably opposed to any such wholesale deportation as critics and historians—Grimm, Keil, Graetz, Michaelis, Ewald, Renan, Schuerer, Wellhausen, Holtzmann and the rest—unanimously assume. It would in fact have been very ambiguous beneficence to his blood kinsmen for Simon to deport them from blooming Galilee to barren Judea. Many of them must have had permanent homes, houses and lands, in that garden spot of Palestine. To huddle them together suddenly, deprive them of all their fixed possessions, transport them to a rugged region where for a time at least they would be homeless pensioners on the bounty of strangers, would seem to be an act of wanton cruelty as well as incredible folly. It would be treating them as enemies and not as friends.

Josephus seems to have felt the absurdity of the situation, for in his *Antiquities* (XII, 8, 3), while following 1 Macc. closely, he modifies the verse in question (v. 23), saying only that Simon "having pursued" the enemy "to the gates of Ptolemais," "took the Jews that had been made captive by them" "and turned back home." He says nothing about bringing the Jews from Galilee to Judea, but leaves us to infer that the "captives" were restored to their Galilean homes. Josephus is not an independent witness, but the fact that he takes such liberty with his Maccabean source shows clearly that he saw it was unbelievable and must be recalled to reason.

Finally, it must not be supposed that in discrediting the First Book of Maccabees we would in any wise tarnish the luster of the names of the Maccabean heroes. We grant them all honor and glory according to the measure of men. In fact their fame remains no less but even more splendid when we perceive that the record of their deeds cannot be accepted at its face value, and that the prodigious butcheries that ensanguine its pages were in large measure the visions of a perfervid imagination.

[TO BE FOLLOWED BY ANOTHER ARTICLE.]