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

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

direct bribes to the practice of righteousness addressed to those who lack the love of it in their hearts.

These are grave charges. We shall endeavour to meet them in our further discussion of the subject.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.

NOTES ON THE OLD CANAANITE RELIGION.[1]

THE Old Testament, the excavations in Palestine, and the evidence of monuments and inscriptions show that the old Canaanite religion during the latter half of the second millennium before Christ did not differ essentially from that of agricultural and pastoral peoples who depend upon the fertility of the soil. Such communities tend to develop similar conceptions of the relation between animate nature and themselves. The customary rites, the thank-offerings, the regular festivals, the promotion of growth and fertility —these were essential to Canaanite popular cultus both in our period and in the age when its licentiousness brought the condemnation of the prophets of Israel. But it was not accompanied, in our period at least, by any rudimentary mental or material culture. By the side of amulets, talismans and idols we must observe resource in fortification, building and even in tunnelling. The sacred places, which presuppose organized ritual, the crude plaques of the mother-goddess of nature, and the grim sacrifices of human victims give only one side of the picture. On the other side are the diplomatic letters (discovered at El-Amarna) written by the Canaanite chieftains to the king of Egypt, and the less official communications more recently found at Taanach. These reveal a by no means inferior mental ability and a not

[1] Based upon a paper read before the Third Congress of the History of Religions, Oxford, September 1908. See further the *Transactions*, i. 259–262, and the writer's *Religion of Ancient Palestine*.

inconsiderable power of expression, and they furnish important evidence for the complex thought of the age.

Now, Robertson Smith has shown that religious and political institutions formed part of the same social structure. They were for the preservation and welfare of society, so that we have to deal, not so much with formulated laws and rules, as with *practical systems* wherein the reciprocal relations between deities and men were well understood. Religion was the affair of the community, and of such communities the deities themselves formed part. Thus, our classification of acts into religious and secular, or civic, ceremonial, moral and spiritual was unknown ; and one may look in vain for such subdivisions among the prophets of Israel. (Cp. W. H. Bennett, *The Post-exilic Prophets*, pp. 263-266.) Consequently, practical religion being simply a branch of social duty, there was no distinction between offences against the community or its deity, and we can hardly conceive a nature-religion devoid of ethical ideas, however rudimentary or narrow. The essence of the system lay in the recognition of common interests and mutual social obligations. Even in the most primitive races there are certain rules of conduct and tribal morality, and the whole teaching of anthropology warns us not to look only upon the dark side of Canaanite religion. Nor must we form too low an estimate of the nature-deities. If men looked to them for the increase of the soil, they were no mere gods of clouds or flocks ; their loyal adherents appealed to them in all human crises and troubles, in all matters where their joint welfare was concerned. An Egyptian nobleman of about 2500 B.C. records : " I gave bread to the hungry, and clothing to the naked ; never did I judge two brothers so that a son was deprived of his paternal possession." After these noble sentiments he proceeds to relate how he was sent to " hack up " the Nubians, and slew many of the children—

and so forth.[1] A simple illustration, but typical of the fact that, though the system essentially made for unselfishness within the group, there were different standards for those outside it. Thus, while we must recognize the possibility of a certain moral development, it was obviously limited; and its fundamental weakness, as Robertson Smith has said, was its "inability to separate the ethical motives of religion from their source in a merely naturalistic conception of the godhead and its relation to man" (*Rel. Sem.*, p. 58).

In the next place, Assyriological and Egyptological research have proved the underlying identity of thought throughout Western Asia and Egypt. Questions of borrowing or of comprehensive influences are secondary; the primary fact is the common soil—the recognition of common fundamental ideas; and however intelligible this may be in the case of the various Semitic peoples, we cannot exclude Egypt, as any perusal of Egyptian texts will show. It is clear also that this identity in the mental environment manifests itself unintermittently over the Oriental world from our earliest sources to the present day. There is a body of tradition which has been unconsciously propagated generation after generation, and every positive religion has come into contact all along the line with the old ideas and practices which held the field. In the elaborate cults of Babylonia and Egypt, in the priestly and the prophetical writings of the Old Testament, in the Talmudic and Syriac sources, and in modern Palestine itself, the common fundamental ideas appear in a great variety of shapes. Perhaps in no other area is there such opportunity for the *historical* treatment of comparative religion. Sometimes we may trace the progression or retrogression in a single district: the lengthy history of the famous old city of Ḥarran, the points of connexion and divergence between the Baby-

[1] J. H. Breasted, *Anc. Records of Egypt: Hist. Documents*, i. 357 seq.

lonians and the Mandaeans; or we may see in Ḥauran the influence of Hellenism upon the district, or the Arabs of the Ṣafa inscriptions in the act of adjusting their pantheon. More interesting is the evolution of Mohammedanism and its numerous sects—each founded upon older ideas. We can perceive the Nosairis with their pantheon disguised under Mohammedan names, the Sun and the Moon being the respective heads of minor subdivisions. Indeed, in Jezidis, Druses, orthodox Mohammedans, and in the antique popular religion of modern Palestine, we have living examples of the various forms which the underlying conceptions have taken at one and the same age. Consequently, unless it can be proved otherwise, some variety of standpoint, such as can also be illustrated from the Old Testament, Egypt and Babylonia, was by no means precluded in early Canaan.

Thus, leaving the purely *comparative* method for the *historical*, we have to allow for constant modification; we must distinguish between the persistent and the more temporary features, between the conceptions inevitably inherited and the more accidental growths due to political or individual causes. Hence, we may not take the crudest rudimentary conceptions and reconstruct a Canaanite or pre-Israelite religion. Nor may we evolve from the more noble and desirable elements an abstract faith above the social conditions of the age. Least of all may we adopt the chronological method and assume that the religion *must* have shared any specific characteristics which can be found in those lands which had politically influenced Canaan. The lines of influence were many. Intercourse with Egypt dates back at least to 2000 B.C. and shows itself in the presence of Egyptians at Gezer, Megiddo and the North at that age, and in the introduction of the Astarte of Gebal or Byblos into Egypt. The Hyksos invaders were probably Semitic, and when they were expelled, the Egyptian kings

of the XVIIIth dynasty embarked upon their great campaigns in Western Asia, with the result that in our period the fortunes of Canaan were controlled either by Egypt or by the powers of the North : North Syria, Mesopotamia and the Hittites of Asia Minor.

The question of *Babylonian* influence is very complex. In our period, about 1400 B.C., the cuneiform script and language were used for diplomatic correspondence between Western Asia and Egypt and for more private matters among the Canaanite chiefs. We also find in Canaan such deities as Addu or Adad, Shamash, Sin, Nebo, Nergal, Ninib, and perhaps Marduk—names familiar in the religions of Babylonia and Assyria. Further, although these lands recede somewhat from Canaanite history in this period, there is reason to suppose that some centuries earlier, in the age of Hammurabi, Babylonian supremacy had extended over the Mediterranean coastlands. But although it seems natural to infer that Babylonia exercised a predominating and lasting influence upon Canaanite religion, it is necessary to remember that there are many difficult questions in regard to the relation between Arabia, Babylonia, and Assyria. Arabia, with its old seats of culture, is a little known factor which we cannot afford to ignore. On the other hand, the region of Assyria, Mesopotamia and N. Syria is intimately connected with Canaan by geography, political history and by certain archaeological features. Some of the personal names in Canaan about 1400 B.C., suggest a direct influence from the North, and since we now know that the cuneiform script and language were used even by the Hittites of Asia Minor, Babylonian culture could continue to reach Canaan second-hand. Our available evidence is unequally distributed, and it is inadequate as regards other quarters whose influence claims equal consideration. It seems safer, therefore, to work up from the common prevailing religious conceptions

to the point where we can recognize specific influences than to assume that any specific Babylonian features *must* have left their mark when Babylonia was supreme, and—what is far more important—*must* have persisted, or to infer that whatsoever recurs also in the prolific literature of Babylonia (or of Egypt) was once foreign to Canaan.[1]

We are fortunately able to gain a fair idea of the effect of Egyptian supremacy over the Mediterranean coastlands. The Egyptian conquerors would carry away the sons of the Canaanite chieftains to serve in the royal court; some of them would be subsequently anointed to their father's positions. Egyptian garrisons and patrolling officials supervised the land. The recognition of the great national god Amon-Re was enforced. About 1500 B.C. Thotmes III. dedicated three cities in the Lebanon district to this god. About 1400 we find Egyptian gods residing at Tunip in the North, where, a century later, Ramses II. erected a statue of his divine self. Notwithstanding the disturbances illustrated in the Amarna letters, or the later movements of the Philistines and their allies, Canaan, in the first half of the twelfth century, was still under Egypt. The Papyrus Harris refers to the sea trade in the Levant, and to the Asiatic tribute; Ramses III. built a sun-temple in Canaan to Amon-Re, and this "lord of gods, lord of heaven," had three Asiatic cities dedicated to him. But the power of Egypt decayed, and the rule passed into the hands of the priests of Thebes. Nevertheless, as we learn from the interesting story of the envoy Wenamon, about 1100, the supremacy of Amon-Re was acknowledged by the independent Delta state, and, after some argument, by the king of Byblos, who, though unwilling to allow the *political* suzerainty of Egypt, admitted the claim of Amon-Re to be lord and possessor of the sea and of Lebanon.

[1] See further Swete's *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, (1909), p. 74 sqq.

From the Amarna letters we see how slightly earlier conditions in Canaan were transformed by Egypt. Egypt was tolerant to faithful vassals. It accepted the use of the cuneiform script and language. It even adopted the powerful warrior-deities of other lands. The Astarte of Byblos, the Sutekh or Sēt of the Hyksos, the gods Resheph and Baal and the goddesses Anath and Kadesh entered and became popular, and Ramses II., when in Ḥauran beyond the Jordan, paid homage to some non-Egyptian deity of the district. It appears from this that religious conditions in the Mediterranean coast-lands were solidly established, and that the deities were not pre-eminently Babylonian. We may infer, then, that Egyptian supremacy did not affect the religion of Canaan, except in so far as it involved the recognition of the supremacy of Amon-Re, the "great god," and of the king of Egypt the "good god." For the king was the member of a complicated divine family, the son and champion of the supreme Sun-god, whom he incarnated. He embodied the kingdom, and was the source of its wealth and prosperity. He was the visible god of his people and received their adoration as the Sun-god. He was the great mediator between the worshipping body as a whole and the leading gods. He was the guardian of the cult; the gods were his gods; the temples were his memorial; and when he died he mingled with the gods, still retaining his inferiority to the supreme deity.

The belief that the king was the son and viceroy of the deities was all-pervading. It leaves its mark in many shapes, in many ages; in the prayers and the praises, in myth and history. It appears in the prologue to Ḥammurabi's code of laws; in the priest-kings and "lieutenants" (*šaknu*) of Assyria; it underlies some of the Old Testament ideas of the real and the ideal king; the belief is active in the Greek age; and the Syrian father Aphraates employs it to support his argu-

ment that Christ was the Son of God (xvii. § 8). It leaves its traces in the insignia, the costume and the toilet; in the court etiquette and the royal prerogatives; in the tithe and tribute; and in the relation between temple and palace. In fact, the divine king is part of the "system" which united the deities, the land and the people. The deity was king; other nations were the kingdoms of other gods; the king was the deity incarnate, and both stood in the closest relationship to the people. Ramses II. could be called the "husband of Egypt" (Breasted, iii. 490), and a text of Meneptah declares that from of old Egypt had been the only daughter of Re whose son sits upon the throne (*ib.* 612). Parallels to this conception could be easily found elsewhere. On turning to the letters sent to Egypt by the Canaanite chiefs about 1400 B.C. we find that the land as a whole belongs to the king, whom they love, and to his gods, and the chieftains look for the assistance of both. They acknowledge that the king of Egypt is the god, the Sun, the child of the Sun, the Sun in heaven, the everlasting Sun, whom the Sun loves. These titles recur from Syria to Lachish in the south, but are not used, of course, by the *independent* kings of Cyprus, Babylonia, Assyria, etc.

The king investigated complaints, he was the court of final appeal. The petty chieftains themselves were divided by jealousy and intrigue; and the supremacy of the external power was practically their sole bond. Indeed, when once they joined in appeal to Babylonia for aid against Egypt, they were promptly warned that their duty lay in allegiance to the Pharaoh; and when the servants of the king of Babylonia were robbed and slain by Canaanites, this monarch wrote direct to the king of Egypt, "Canaan is thy land—kill the people who slew my servants and avenge (*lit.* bring back) their blood." The position of the Pharaoh as supreme authority finds a parallel in the recognition of the authority

of Mohammed by the Arabian clans who were willing to refer to him questions of right and precedence in which they would not yield to one another.[1]

The Amarna letters are not religious literature, but they illustrate some of the religious beliefs. When, in an Egyptian text, the defeated Amorite and Libyan chiefs cry to Ramses III., "Thou art like the Sun when he rises, men live at thy appearance" (Breasted, iv. 127), a Canaanite chief writes that the king is like the Sun which rises over the lands every day. When, in the same Egyptian text, the captives pray for the king's breath or spirit, the Canaanites affirm in their letters that his breath gives them life, it soothes their heart, they rejoice when it reaches them, for without it they cannot live. The king's breath is life-giving. We read in Egypt that the god Horus gives his breath to the one that follows him; in Assyria, Marduk is "lord of the good breath" which comforts those in distress, and a man prays to his god, "Make thy good breath blow, and make me to be released."[2]

It follows from the structure of the "system" that loyalty to the king and to the gods was identical, and it is interesting to notice that the Canaanites use the same familiar word for "sin" (*ḫiṭu*) to denote a political or religious offence. Thus the prince of Byblos ascribes his illness to the wrath of his gods, and confesses his sins to them; while another writer, accused of intrigue complains that he has been slandered (the phrase in Dan. iii. 8), and declares, "I have not sinned, I do not refuse my tribute or the wish of the officer set over me."[3] "Sin" lay in intrigue and disloyalty, and

[1] W. R. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 70. Cp. also the independent Greek city-states, and the deification of the Macedonian kings (E. R. Bevan, *English Historical Review*, 1901, p. 632).

[2] See Breasted, ii. 73; Jensen, *Keilinschr.-Bibl.* vi. 39; and *Proc. of Society of Bibl. Arch.*, xvii. p. 138 seq. Cp. also Ezek. xxxvii. 14, Isa. xi. 4, etc.

[3] Knudtzon, *die El-Amarna Tafeln*, 137, l. 33, and 254.

when the chief of Jerusalem repudiates an accusation of this character, he protests that he is "loyal," using a Canaanite word (*ṣaduḳ*) which is practically the Old Testament *ṣaddīḳ*, "righteous" (Knudtzon, 287). For, the "righteous" man did not conform merely to public opinion or law, he conformed to the well-understood mutual obligations which bound together the "system" whether tribal or monarchical. He adhered to the "manner" (comp. Hebrew *mishpāṭ*), the customary law or usage of the group, and since in old religion there were mutual obligations between deities and man, we can understand how the conception arose of the righteousness of the Godhead or *his* "loyalty." This, the common legal explanation of the idea leaves untouched.[1]

Ideas of righteousness and sin thus depend primarily upon the character of the social order, and it is interesting further to find in the Canaanite letters that cursing and expulsion are expressed by the word which in the Old Testment means to curse (ארר). It is used of driving a hostile chief out of a city, while it is also said that the king will expel or curse the man who does not serve him (Knudtzon, 179 and 193). The meaning is essentially the same. Robertson Smith has already observed that the man who defies the tribal obligations has to fear the god as well as his fellow-men; and typical curses, from the epilogue of Ḥammurabi's laws, or in Egyptian texts (Breasted, ii. 925 seq.), involve severance from the protection of the gods, the state and fellow-men.[2]

If cursing is excommunication, blessing, to judge from the use of the Canaanite word in Egyptian (*b-r-k*), meant recognition, homage or the like. Just as Abimelech of Tyre writes that his lord is the Sun that rises daily according to the decision of *his father* Shamash," in Egypt, Semitic captives cry to Ramses III., "*Thy father* Amon hath put us beneath

[1] See further, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, p. 632, n. 1.
[2] Comp. the curse of Cain, Gen. iv. 11–14.

thy feet for ever, that we may see and breathe the breath of life, that we may *bless* his temple" (Breasted, iv. 122). Similarly, they pray for the king's breath, that they may *bless* his royal insignia (the double serpent-diadem) and may speak of his might to their children's children. Ramses III. refers to captives offered as "*blessings*," i.e. gifts to Amon (*ib.* 207). This idea of recognition or homage seems to recur in 2 Kings xviii. 31, Isaiah xxxvi. 16.

It may be observed at this point that the fundamental idea of "abomination" involves all that is contrary both to the social group and to its gods. The violation of tombs was an "abomination" to Astarte; Israelite sacrifices were an "abomination" to Egypt. When queen Hatshepshut repaired the ravages of the Hyksos, she removed "the abominations of the great god." Ramses III. cleansed the temples of S. Egypt from all abomination, and records his command "to bring in truth and to banish falsehood, and to cause lying to be an abomination." In the time of Sety I. it is more forcibly stated: "an abomination of the god is the transgression against his people." A practical illustration of the idea is afforded by the great harem conspiracy in the time of Ramses III., when magical practices are called "the abomination of every god and goddess." [1] And this is the anthropological view of irreligion: all that was contrary to the religion of the group—contrary to the clan-god or to clan-custom; all that was private and harmful rather than communal and beneficial; in a word, irreligion was, to use Robertson Smith's term, "anti-social"; [2] and in any "system" closely bound together, as that of Canaan was, there were probably standards of religion and irreligion or of orthodoxy and unorthodoxy.

The "system" is also bound up by the Name. The

[1] The references are to Breasted, ii. 303, iv. p. 85, iii. 192, and iv. 454 sqq.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 264.

name is the Essence, Nature, Personality; perhaps, as Robertson Smith has conjectured, it was originally the emblem (*Kinship and Marriage*, 2nd ed., p. 248). In Egypt, as in W. Asia, it was considered indispensable that the Name should be kept fresh; "the king dies not who is mentioned because of his achievements," says Sesostris (i. 503). A dead man would pray for his name to be mentioned, or for libations to be poured out upon the ground in his name.[1] Monuments were erected that the name might live, and memorial tablets were solemnly anointed to benefit dead ancestors. The king of Egypt even sacrificed captives to perpetuate his name.[2] In Egyptian texts we find the familiar thought that the name of an enemy "shall not be among the living"; and Ramses III. boasts of destroying the name of the Asiatic lands, and of obliterating for ever the name of a vanquished chief.[3] In like manner, the prince of Tyre writes that the name of the loyal man is unto eternity, while, as for the disloyal, "his name will not be in the land for ever." All vassals took the oath by the royal name, and the name, as an emblem of the king, meant possession. Ramses II. tells the god Ptah, "I have branded . . . the whole land with thy name, they belong to thy Ka for ever, for thou art the creator of them." The chieftain of Jerusalem, in turn, acknowledges the supremacy of Amenhotep IV. who had put his name upon the East and upon the West. Possession involved protection, and the same chief writes that the king has put his name upon Jerusalem for ever, therefore the king cannot abandon his territory.

Now the king of Egypt, who stands at the head of this vast system, was not only the incarnation of the Sun-god, the chief of all the prominent deities, he is also likened to the bull. Ramses II. is described as "the king who shines

[1] Breasted, i. 503, iii. 626.
[2] Breasted, ii. 798*a*, iii. 410.
[3] Breasted, i. 765, iv. 103, 109.

over Egypt, and his roaring is as far as the circuit of the sun." Egyptian scenes depict the symbolical bull destroying the foe, and the Sun-god Amon himself is called the "bull of the gods." Ḥammurabi, too, calls himself the sun-god of Babylonia, who caused light to go forth, "the mighty bull" who gores the enemy. Moreover, the god Amon and the Egyptian king have the attributes of a storm or weather-god, and allusion is made in Egyptian texts to their thunder. Similarly, two Canaanite chiefs compare the king to Shamash the Sun-god, and to Adad or Addu the storm-god. The king, writes Abimelek of Tyre, gives his thunder in the heavens like Addu; and while many Canaanite writers call him their Shamash, one addresses him as his Addu.

This merging of attributes in the supreme deity and king is as complicated as the inquiry into the *nature* of the gods. Perhaps it becomes less obscure when we recall that a Pharaoh could be styled "an abundant Nile," or "the great harvest-goddess of Egypt."[1] The gifts of the soil depended upon the sun and the weather; and the weather-god supplied rain and springs, while in his destructive aspect he brought storm, thunder and lightning, and was an appropriate patron of conflicts. Thus the head of the state practically incorporates those powers upon which his land and people depended in peace and in war, and there was a real belief in his ability to control nature, whether directly or through his intimate relationship with the departmental gods. This was by no means confined to Egypt; even the peculiar combination of the sun and weather-god probably was not specifically Egyptian. The Hittite kings apparently called themselves "the Sun," and although the weather-god stands at the head of the Hittite pantheon in the treaty with Ramses II., both the Sun and weather-god could be styled the "lord of Heaven." A personal name in the Boghaz-keui

[1] Breasted, iv. 92 and p. 7*d*.

tablets designates Addu "king of gods." In Assyria, the kings were identified with the Sun, and the old name Shamshi-Adad shows that the two deities could be closely united. Addu (prominent in the Kassite period) appears to be Assyrian rather than Babylonian; and the combination of Shamash and Addu is perhaps foreign to Babylonia. One Shamash-Adad of Assyria was the son of Ishme-Dagan, "Dagan heard." Dagan was certainly one of the old Canaanite gods, more conspicuous in Assyria than in Babylonia, and it may be doubtful whether the Canaanite Nebo, Sin and Shamash and the goddess Ashirat really prove Babylonian influence alone.[1]

It is perhaps a well-founded impression that powerful warrior-deities were not developed to such an extent in Babylonia as in other parts of Western Asia. I have already referred to their introduction into Egypt. In the XIXth dynasty the Canaanite Baal finds a place there; he is a destructive storm-god, and warlike kings are frequently likened to him. Although the term Baal is properly a title ("lord, owner, inhabitant") applicable to any god, *the* Baal represents that prominent deity Addu, corresponding to the Sutekh or Sēt of the Hittites. It is interesting to find in three tablets from Taanach that one writer invokes "the gods," the second appeals to Addu, while the third calls upon "the lord of the gods." It may be conjectured that the last is *the* Baal or Addu. Whether this Baal included solar elements and was assimilated to the Sun-god is again a matter for conjecture. At all events, specialized deities were not limited in their influence, and among the personal names of our period we find such ideas as Baal hastens, remembers, is high, or is a protection; name of Baal, name of Addu; Addu hears and Addu opens.

Nor does the supreme deity, or *the* Baal, exclude the lesser

[1] On the *goddess* Shamash, see *Religion of Anc. Pal.*, p. 88.

powers or the local Baalim, even as a system with a supreme king did not necessarily supersede the smaller systems with their heads. The divine Pharaoh would anoint the Canaanite chieftains and acknowledge their gods, even as Ramses III., for example, would look after the local gods of Egypt. In Babylonia, we learn from the inscription of Gudea that the lesser gods were supposed to wait upon the more elevated deities, and there, as in Egypt, the subordinate beings were always venerated among the less exalted ranks of men.[1]

The relation between the members of the smaller group finds analogies in the monarchical system. Nin-lil of Nippur was the mother of the inhabitants of the city, and the Egyptian local chief Kheti regarded his city-god as his father. The members of a group could be called the children of their deity, and the Sinaitic Arabs who dressed their hair in imitation of their god find a parallel in the privileges of the royalty in more advanced societies. In modern Palestine families will sometimes claim descent from a patron saint or weli, often a former sheikh, and the living sheikh may be the guardian of the cult.

But the evidence does not allow us to trace the stages in the social-religious development throughout. At one end of the scale, perhaps, is the totem-system of the Arunta of Australia. The members of each group are of the same essence, recognize no ancestors, but incarnate a spirit which clings around special localities. It is a perpetual reincarnation. At the other end is the monarchical system as I have endeavoured to describe it for Canaan. The king of Egypt *ipso facto* was the incarnation of the national god, a combination of the Sun and Weather-god. His supremacy over Canaan continued until towards the middle of the twelfth century B.C., in the person of Ramses III. And even at the close of that century Zakarbaal rendered homage to the

[1] See further, *Rel. of Anc. Pal.*, p. 96 seq.

great Sun-god Amon who thunders in the heaven. But the day of Egyptian political supremacy was over, and there is a gap between the decay of the Egyptian domination in the XXth dynasty and the *rise* of the Israelite monarchy.

When the Israelite monarchy *fell* the power of the priesthood increased, and the post-exilic high-priest, in princely state, embodied (to quote Robertson Smith) "all the glory of the nation as the kings had done of old." [1] But at the same time the prophets were insisting more emphatically upon the supreme sovereignty of the national god, and in place of the earlier religious *nationalism*, characteristic of the unity of the state, greater prominence was given to the doctrine of *individualism* and *universalism*.[2]

In Egypt, in the XXth dynasty, the priests gained kingly power and in due course claimed to be the divine seed of Re, lord of gods; but the god himself appears to be more prominent in the religion of the individual, and seems to be brought more closely into human affairs. Fuller information upon this is much to be desired.

How Canaan was affected by the changes in the twelfth and following centuries is a problem which lies outside the scope of these notes, and I would only point out that there was no sudden break in the history of Canaanite religion. Moreover, one must claim for Canaan a higher stamp of religion than is usually granted.[3] In common with the popular beliefs in Palestine to-day and the elabor-

[1] *Encyc. Biblica*, art. "Priest."

[2] On this great development, associated with the profound changes in Western Asia during the age of the Assyrian conquests, see The Expositor, August, 1909, pp. 104 sqq.; *Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, July, 1909, p. 387.

[3] The gradual development is attested from the archaeological side by Father Hugues Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'Exploration Récente*, pp. 147–151, 201–4, 294–6, 463 seq. We may not find what Father Vincent calls "le fétichisme répugnant" (p. 148), but we must avoid using this term in its popular and incorrect sense (W. R. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 209; comp. A. C. Haddon, *Magic and Fetishism*, pp. 66 seq.).

ate cults of Egypt and Babylonia, it went back to similar fundamental institutions. Finally, modern knowledge has so interwoven departments of research that progress can be ensured only by checking the results reached in one path of inquiry by those in another. Unfortunately, there is an occasional inclination to overlook the value of anthropology, or to suppose that the study of the fundamental institutions is no longer of the first importance. But we cannot sever religious cult from social custom; and though we may not be prepared to accept every interpretation or every hypothesis of the gifted author of the *Religion of the Semites*, I would venture the conviction that the subject of these scattered notes can only be advanced by following upon the lines laid down twenty years ago by Robertson Smith.

STANLEY A. COOK.