



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE BURNING BUSH AND THE GARDEN
OF EDEN: A STUDY IN COMPARA-
TIVE MYTHOLOGY.

I.

STUDENTS of the Hebrew Scriptures do not now need to have their attention called to the apparent connexion between the personality of Jahveh and the element of fire, nor to that which subsists between the worship of sacred trees and the ancient popular religion of Canaan and of Israel. There is no more striking instance of either than the manifestation of the presence of Jahveh *in a flame of fire out of the midst of a¹ bush* (Ex. iii. 2; cf. Deut. xxxiii. 16).

So far as the mere presence of the deity within a tree is concerned, the subject will be sufficiently illustrated by a reference to the passages quoted from Mr. Frazer in explanation of Isa. lxvi. 17, *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 704, 705. These apply to the cultus of Osiris and to that of Adonis. But it is worth observing that the tamarisk, a tree sacred to the former, was at Beer-sheba, at the southern extremity of Canaan, associated with the worship of יהוה אל עלים, Gen. xxi. 33 (J²), cf. 1 Sam. xxii. 6, xxxi. 13. And if, as seems probable, "the thorn-bush" (so Addis, *in loc.*) of Ex. iii. 2 signifies an acacia², that too was sanctified by the indwelling presence of Osiris. Add to this that the Didu, the

¹ For the use of the article in יהוה compare Robertson Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., p. 126, note: "The definite article is used because in such cases definition cannot be carried beyond the indication of the species."

² For the sanctity of the acacia vid. *Rel. Sem.*, pp. 133, 427; the *only* tree of the Arabian wilderness, p. 103, cited below.

characteristic symbol of this god, must, to say the least, have borne a strong family likeness to the Asherah, which was apparently a symbol of Jahveh (Deut. xvi. 21). "The pillar was interpreted, at least in later Egyptian theology, as the backbone of Osiris. It might very well be a conventional representation of a tree stripped of its leaves; and if Osiris was a tree-spirit, the bare trunk and branches of a tree might naturally be described as his backbone" (Frazer, *Golden Bough*, vol. i. p. 304). So Maspero: "The trunk of a tree, disbranched, and then set up in the ground, seems to me the origin of the Osirian emblem called *tat* or *didû*" (*Dawn of Civilization*, p. 84, note 3). Without pressing this analogy too far¹, it remains probable that the narrative under discussion must be referred to the same order of beliefs which took shape in the cultus of the Asherah, and it will presently be shown that it has close parallels in the religion of ancient Egypt.

It would seem that it was especially the *solitary* tree, growing on the margin of the desert, and nourished neither by rain nor irrigation, but by subterraneous waters, or by springs rising from the ground, to which was attributed a supernatural life, and the indwelling presence of a deity. "The sanctuary of Beersheba," writes Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., p. 181),

properly consisted of the "Seven Wells," which gave the place its name. . . . In the canons of Jacob of Edessa we read of nominally Christian Syrians who bewail their diseases to the stars, or turn for help to a *solitary tree*, or a fountain, or seven springs, or water of the sea, &c. (The italics are my own.) Again, it was not at the great sanctuaries of cities, but in the open field, where the rural population had continued from age to age to practise primitive rites without modification, that the worship of "solitary trees" survived the fall of the great gods of Semitic heathenism (*ibid.*, p. 186). As regards the connexion of holy waters and holy trees, it must be remembered that in most Semitic lands self-sown wood can flourish only where there is underground water, and where therefore springs or wells exist beside the trees (*ibid.*, p. 190).

¹ See further, Note A, at end of this paper.

Turn now to ancient Egypt, where most of us who are not Egyptologists must henceforth seek our knowledge of it, in the noble work of M. Maspero. The references are to the English translation of the first volume.

The sycamores planted on the edge of the desert were supposed to be inhabited by Hâthor, Nûit, Selkit, Nit, or some other goddess. In vignettes representing the deceased as stopping before one of these trees and receiving water and loaves of bread, the bust of the goddess generally appears from amid her sheltering foliage. [Such a representation will be found at p. 185 of the same work.] But occasionally, as on the sarcophagus of Petosiris, the transformation is complete, and the trunk from which the branches spread is the actual body of the god or goddess. Finally, the whole body is often hidden, and only the arm of the goddess to be seen emerging from the midst of the tree, with an overflowing libation vase in her hand (p. 84, note 1).

There were casual divinities in every nome . . . such as an exceptionally high palm-tree in the midst of the desert, a rock of curious outline, a spring trickling drop by drop from the mountain to which hunters came to slake their thirst in the hottest hours of the day, or a great serpent, believed to be immortal, which haunted a field, a grove of trees, a grotto, or a mountain ravine (*ibid.*, p. 120).

The *tree*, the *rock*, the *spring*, the *serpent*, all play their part in the mythology of the Exodus.

Everywhere on the confines of cultivated ground, and even at some distance from the valley, are fine single sycamores, flourishing as though by miracle amid the sand. . . . But on examining the ground in which they grow, we soon find that they drink from water which has infiltrated from the Nile, and whose existence is in nowise betrayed upon the surface of the soil. . . . Egyptians of all ranks counted them divine, and habitually worshipped them. . . . There were several such trees in the Memphite nome, and in the Letopolite nome from Dashûr to Gîzeh, inhabited, as every one knew, by detached doubles of Nûit and Hâthor. These combined districts were known as the "Land of the Sycamore," a name afterwards extended to the city of Memphis; and their sacred trees are worshipped at the present day both by Mussulman and Christian fellahin. The most famous among them all, the Sycamore of the South . . ., was regarded as the living body of Hâthor on earth (*ibid.*, pp. 121, 122).

Finally, to complete the catalogue of Egyptian examples,

myths told how the Phoenix was born "from the midst of flames which arose from out of the summit" of the sacred tree of Heliopolis (Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, Eng. trans., pp. 156, 193). "On its foliage Thoth, or else Safekht, the goddess of learning, inscribed the name of the king, who by this act was endowed with eternal life" (ibid.). It would seem to follow that the tree itself was possessed of immortality, and in a similar conception we may reasonably seek the explanation of the divine name associated with the tamarisk of Beer-sheba (Gen. xxi. 33)¹.

The indwelling presence, and even the visible manifestation of the deity, "out of the midst of the bush,"—the solitary shrub growing where subterranean waters gush forth, at the junction of the divine mountain (הר האלהים) with the desert plain,—have now found their true place in the sphere of ancient religious ideas. It remains to discuss the mysterious fire which burned but did not consume the bush. Students will naturally turn to the page where Robertson Smith adduces analogous examples of supernatural luminosity, and seeks the physical basis of such a conception in electrical phenomena incidental to the clear dry air of the desert or of lofty mountains (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., pp. 193, 194). But this hypothesis will hardly serve to account for the Aryan examples which may be found in the often cited work of Mr. Frazer (ii. p. 365).

Thus in Bohemia it is said that "on St. John's day fern-seed blooms with golden blossoms that gleam like fire." Now it is a property of this mythical fern-seed that whoever has it, or will ascend a mountain holding it in his hand on Midsummer Eve, will discover a vein of gold, or will see the treasures of the earth shining with a bluish flame. And if you place fern-seed among money, the money will never decrease, however much of it you spend. Sometimes the fern-seed is supposed to bloom at Christmas, and whoever catches it will become very rich. Thus, on the principle of like by like, fern-seed is supposed to discover gold because it is

¹ With יהוה אל עולם ; cf. Arab. *el-Khudhr*, Note C.

itself golden; and for a similar reason it enriches its possessor with an unfailling supply of gold. But while the fern-seed is described as golden, it is equally described as glowing and fiery. Hence, when we consider that two great days for gathering the fabulous seed are Midsummer Eve and Christmas—that is, the two solstices (for Christmas is nothing but an old heathen celebration of the winter solstice)—we are led to regard the fiery aspect of the fern-seed as primary, and its golden aspect as secondary and derivative. Fern-seed, in fact, would seem to be an emanation of the sun's fire at the two turning-points of its course, the summer and winter solstices. This view is confirmed by a German story, in which a hunter is said to have procured fern-seed by shooting at the sun on Midsummer Day at noon; three drops of blood fell down, which he caught in a white cloth, and these blood-drops were the fern-seed. Here the blood is clearly the blood of the sun, from which the fern-seed is thus directly derived. Thus it may be taken as certain that fern-seed is golden, because it is believed to be an emanation of the sun's golden fire.

Mr. Frazer supposes that the Golden Bough as described by Virgil (*Aen.* vi. 136 sqq. and 203 sqq.) is nothing but the mistletoe invested with this supernatural golden glory, "seen through the haze of poetry or popular superstition" (ii. 363). "The name was not simply a poet's fancy, nor even peculiarly Italian; for in Welsh also the mistletoe is known as the tree of pure gold" (365). According to Mr. Frazer's theory, as it will be found summed up towards the close of his work, the supreme deity of the ancient Aryans was a spirit of vegetation, especially embodied in the oak. The midsummer bonfire, kindled from the wood of the oak, annually renewed the fires of the sun. But the life of the oak was conceived to reside as an external soul in the parasitic mistletoe;

Therefore the mistletoe must have contained the seed or germ of the fire which was elicited by friction from the wood of the oak. Thus, instead of saying that the mistletoe was an emanation of the sun's fire, it would be more correct to say that the sun's fire was regarded as an emanation of the mistletoe. No wonder, then, that the mistletoe shone with a golden splendour, and was called the Golden Bough (*ibid.*, pp. 367, 368).

Few are competent to pass judgment on a theory set forth with such power, and supported by so vast an array of learning. Perhaps, if its essential parts could be stated with greater simplicity, they would then be felt to possess a higher degree of security. Primitive man, we may suppose, has beliefs rather than a creed, a mode of thought rather than a system of opinions. Possibly, if we had enjoyed the benefits of definite religious teaching from some early theologian, some predecessor of Augustine, some Cedric or Athelstan of the Germanic forest, the lesson might have run much as follows :—

The sun is a big fire up in the sky. It is all alive, just like our fires down here, and it burns and shines just as they do. At Midsummer, when it begins to go down hill, we light big fires to keep it burning. And again at Midwinter, when it gets very low, and the days are very short and cold, we light big fires to make it burn up again. We make them of the wood of the oak, because there is fire in the oak, and when we rub two pieces of wood together, a hard piece and a rotten piece, it comes out and sets all the heap in a blaze. And we use dry bracken to kindle it, for there is fire in that too. That is why the seed under the leaves is yellow, and the whole fern turns yellow when it gets dry and ready for kindling. Sometimes in summer, when the sun is very hot, fire comes down from the sky, and sets the forest and the hillside all alight, and then we have to run for our lives. For the fire is a great god, and devours all that it comes near.

If we may venture to accept Mr. Frazer's theory, in this slightly modified form, it seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that there exists a real and close analogy between the Golden Bough and the Burning Bush. Each is a manifestation or discovery of the principle of fire inherent in the tree, and all fire may be regarded as akin to that of the sun. It seems certain that Jahveh, like the Zeus of Dodona and the Jupiter of the Capitol, was, in one of his aspects, a tree-spirit. In another, he was a god of fire. The living,

therefore divine, tree, nourished by the living waters, which spring from the living rock, nourishes in its turn the living and divine flame.

At this point it may be convenient to bring together a few notes bearing upon the character of Jahveh as the Rock, so strongly insisted on in the "Song of Moses" (Deut. xxxii). The ideas current in early times as real myths, and as such obliterated by the progress of religion, are preserved or revived as metaphors in the poetical compositions of a later age. We have already seen how the ancient Egyptians revered "a rock of curious outline." This is simply, perhaps, an instance of what Sir Alfred Lyall has described as the worship of the Unaccountable Thing. But to the nomads of the desert, the mountain with its grandeur, its wildness, and its dangers, its association with cloud and tempest, with the lightning and the thunder, above all when considered as the source of springs and brooks, upon which they depended for their existence, and at times of irresistible and destroying floods, must needs have appeared the habitation of Divinity. Nay, the very rock of which it was composed, and from which those springs (themselves divine) gushed forth, was instinct with a supernatural presence.

We see this plainly enough in Exod. xvii. 6, "Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out out of it, that the people may drink" (E). The presence of Jahveh, standing there upon the rock, is an antecedent condition to the performance of the miracle. Again in Ex. xxxiii. 21 (J E) the theophany is closely associated with the rock. I would apply these passages to explain the narrative at the end of Ex. xvii (E). Moses, we are told, built an altar and called the name of it *יהוה נסי ויאמר*. *בי יד על כס יה*. The context seems to require *יהוה כסי*. Now in ver. 12 we read, "But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone and put it under him," &c. I would venture

to suggest that this stone was originally either the throne, or the symbol, of Jahveh¹, and that the "hand upon the throne of Jah" was the uplifted hand of the prophet himself (vv. 11, 12).

M. Maspero, in his second volume, which I cite in the French edition (the English version, as is well known, having been emasculated by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in a fit of religious frenzy²), relates how the theologians of Byblos "imaginèrent que le cercueil d'Osiris jeté à la mer par Typhon avait atterri quelque part dans la banlieue, au pied d'un tamarisque: l'arbre, croissant rapidement, l'avait absorbé peu à peu et caché tout entier dans son tronc." And at the same page (570) is a very interesting vignette, showing "L'arbre qui pousse sur le tombeau d'Osiris." According to the narrative as given by Mr. Frazer, it was an *erica* tree, whatever that may be; "a taller and more bushy species than our common heather," say Liddell and Scott, *s. v.* ἐρείκη. The tamarisk, both as an evergreen, and from its property of flourishing by the sea-shore, seems peculiarly appropriate to a tomb so situated. I suppose I may assume that the Egyptian jsr = Heb. לִשְׂרָא (see Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 28, note 3).

Mr. Grant Allen, in his edition of the *Attis* of Catullus³ (*Bibliothèque de Carabas*), has advocated, with great ingenuity, a theory which has for its aim to deduce tree-worship from ancestor-worship, through the intermediate link supplied by the tree (usually an evergreen) planted on the tumulus of some deceased chieftain (cf. 1 Sam. xxxi. 13); and incidentally to reconcile the views of Mr. Frazer with those of Mr. Herbert Spencer. *Non nostrum inter vos*

¹ Cf. Grant Allen, "Sacred Stones," *Fortnightly Review*, Jan. 1890.

² Dea, magna dea, Cybelle, dea domina Dindimi,
Procul a mea tuus sit furor omnis, hera, domo.
Alios age incitatos, alios age rabidos.

³ *The Evolution of the Idea of God* has appeared since this was written.

tantas componere lites, his' readers are likely to exclaim. If we are called upon to derive the whole range of animism, in all its extent and variety, directly and exclusively from the worship of deceased ancestors, I confess that I can see in such a deduction neither necessity nor probability. A species of animistic beliefs is invoked to explain the origin of the genus. But it is the besetting sin of this department of inquiry, that an hypothesis perfectly valid for a certain class of data is continually strained and twisted to serve as a Key to all Mythologies. If Mr. Grant Allen had merely said that a particular class of sacred trees owed their sanctity to being planted on the graves of persons whose spirits they were supposed to embody, such a view would have derived a striking confirmation from the tamarisk of Osiris. But even here it might still be asked, whether is more primitive, the worship of the Divine Tree, or the myth perhaps devised to serve as an explanation?

"When a man has journeyed in the Arabian wilderness," writes Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., p. 103), "traversing day after day stony plateaus, black volcanic fields, or arid sands walled in by hot mountains of bare rock, and relieved by no other vegetation than a few grey and thorny acacias or scanty tufts of parched herbage, till suddenly, at a turn of the road, he emerges on a Wady where the ground-water rises to the surface, and passes, as if by magic, into a new world, where the ground is carpeted with verdure, and a grove of stately palm-trees spreads forth its canopy of shade against the hot and angry heaven, he does not find it difficult to realize that to early man such a spot was verily a garden and habitation of the gods."

"To the same circle of ideas belongs the conception of the Garden of Eden, planted by God, and watered not by rain but by rivers" (*ibid.*, p. 104, foot-note)¹.

Apparently (Gen. ii. 10) the river had its source in Eden, and from it were derived the principal streams of the world known to the ancients.

Of this garden of God (Ezek. xxviii. 13) the central feature (Gen. ii. 9) was the Tree of Life (עץ החיים). We must

¹ With this and the next extract, cf. Note C.

recognize the possibility that the garden should rather be considered as a garden of the gods, the tree as a tree of souls. Now this tree had the property (iii. 22) that the mortal who partook of it became immortal, that is, a god. This implies, I think, that the tree was itself immortal and divine. Yet from iii. 3 it would appear that Man and Woman (ii. 23), the mother of all living (חַי כָּל אִם iii. 20), were threatened with death if they partook of its fruit. Now in ancient Egypt, when the soul on its journey westward entered the desert, it encountered one of those divine sycamores of which we have already spoken. Then, "out of the foliage a goddess—Nûît, Hâthor, or Nît—half emerged and offered him a dish of fruit, loaves of bread, and a jar of water. By accepting these gifts he became the guest of the goddess, and could nevermore retrace his steps without special permission" (*Dawn of Civilization*, p. 184). Just so, when the Sioux "Male Elk" visited the homes of the spirits of his forefathers, "Had I eaten of the food for spirits, I never should have returned to earth" (Tylor, *Prim. Cult.*, 3rd ed., p. 52). But as every reader of *Primitive Culture* knows, there is no ultimate distinction between gods and spirits of the dead. All the gods of Egypt were dead, and their tombs shown at various places (*Dawn of Civilization*, p. 111). Therefore, whether it is the soul of the deceased that partakes of the fruit (or bread and water) offered to him by the tree-goddess, or whether it is Man that eats of the forbidden tree in Eden, in either case the effect is to translate the eater to the world of the gods. The trees make him a god because they are themselves divine¹.

It will not escape the reader that the part played by the tree-goddess in the Egyptian examples is equivalent to that of the serpent in the biblical narrative. I venture to suggest that the serpent is the Genius or Spirit of the Tree of Life. For the serpent as a tree-spirit, see Robertson Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, p. 133.

¹ See Note B.

The same idea appears in the story of Ḥarb b. Omayya and Mirdās b. Abī 'Amir, historical persons who lived a generation before Mohammed. When these two men set fire to an untrodden and tangled thicket, with the design to bring it under cultivation, the demons of the place flew away with doleful cries in the shape of white serpents, and the intruders died soon afterwards. The *jinn*, it was believed, slew them "because they had set fire to their dwelling-place." Here the spirits of the trees take serpent form when they leave their natural seats, and similarly in Moslem superstition the *jinn* of the 'oshr and the ḥamāta are serpents which frequent trees of these species.

If that which tempted Eve were "a literal and ordinary serpent" (Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, vol. I, p. 5), we have certainly some reason to complain that its conduct was unusual and its motives incomprehensible. If, on the other hand, the view here suggested should find favour, it may perhaps throw some light upon the history of the brazen serpent (אֲרִיִּסָה Num. xxi. 8, נחש נחשת ver. 9. Cf. 2 Ki. xviii. 4), its healing power, its elevation on a standard, and its continued worship until the days of Hezekiah¹. It must be remembered that the snake, even apart from the venom of the deadly species, has acquired from its habits of haunting tombs, gliding into houses, and emerging from holes in the ground, last but not least from its annual casting of its skin, an intimate association with the ideas of Death and Immortality.

In the Theban necropolis, Khafitnîbous = *en face de son maître*—"le maître étant ici l'Amon de Karnak" (Maspero, II, 506, note 1).

Une grosse vipère personnifiait la mort, la reine de l'Occident, et on la désignait sous le sobriquet de Maritsakro, l'amie du silence. On lui attribuait trois têtes diverses sur un seul corps ou une seule tête de femme. Elle logeait dans la montagne vis-à-vis de Karnak, ce qui lui avait valu, comme à la nécropole même, les deux épithètes de Khafitnibous, et de Ta-tahnît,—La Cime . . . ses serpents sacrés

¹ The curse pronounced upon the serpent in Gen. iii. 14 is explained by Fergusson as representing a reaction against an earlier cult.—*Tree and Serpent Worship*, 1st ed., p. 6.

rampaient et viraient par la nécropole, accomplissant des miracles *et guérissant les maladies les plus dangereuses*. [The italics are my own.] Les fidèles leur dédiaient souvent, en guise d'ex-voto, des stèles ou des éclats de pierre à peine dégrossis, dont les inscriptions témoignent d'une reconnaissance ardente.

“Écoutez : Moi, du temps que j'étais sur terre, j'étais un *Dometique de La Place Vraie* (member of the Corporation of the Royal Tombs), Nofrâbou, un ignorant insensé *qui ne distinguait pas le bien du mal* [again I italicize], et je péchais contre La Cime. Elle me châtia . . . J'invoquai donc ma maîtresse . . . et elle me délivra de souffrir, car c'est ma vie que La Cime d'Occident, quand elle est apaisée, et on doit l'invoquer” (Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient Classique*, II, 537, 538).

In the text, which I have endeavoured to abridge, the sufferer apparently attributes his recovery to a visit from the Divine Snake. Here the serpent-goddess of the tombs has the power both to kill and make alive (cf. Deut. xxxii. 39), to inflict disease and to heal it.

For want of direct evidence, I will merely indicate the possibility that the Tree of Life, the Brazen Serpent, and the hypothetical tree of Isa. lxvi. 17, may all have been regarded as symbols or embodiments of Jahveh; and similarly the possible relation of the fruit of the Divine Tree, the עץ חיים, to the maternity of the אִמַּ בֵּל הַי. The narrative, as it stands, has been complicated by the introduction of a second tree (Addis, *op. cit.*, p. 3, with a reference to Kuenen) which has the property of rendering the partaker as a god, to know good and evil (iii. 22). The condition of man in the garden, before eating of this tree, is that of a new-born babe, naked, innocent, and ignorant (cf. Isa. vii. 16). Is it possible that man's sojourn in the garden symbolizes a pre-natal existence? That of course is not a biblical idea; but the myth is no doubt of far greater antiquity than the document through which it has been transmitted to us. It may interest some readers to remark that in the mystical system of William Blake, eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge symbolizes the passage of the soul from the Divine world of liberty and

imagination (Blake's *Jerusalem*, Gal. iv. 26) to that of finite individual existence, mundane law, and merely sensible perceptions. I am not able to give a reference for this, as Blake's interpreters do not favour their readers with an index. But the idea is illustrated by what is said of the symbolic garden of Eden, Ellis and Yeats, vol. I, p. 272.

Finally, whence did Spenser derive his splendid myth of the Garden of Adonis? (*Faerie Queene*, Bk. III, canto vi, st. 29-50).

NOTE A.

Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., p. 191, foot-note) writes: "The sacred erica was a mere dead stump, for it was cut down by Isis and presented to the Byblians wrapped in a linen cloth and anointed with myrrh like a corpse. It therefore represented the dead god. But as a mere stump it also resembles the Hebrew *ashera*. Can it be that the rite of draping and anointing a sacred stump supplies the answer to the unsolved question of the nature of the ritual practices connected with the Ashera?" He then refers to 2 Kings xxiii. 7. Now it seems fairly certain that the erica of Byblos was equivalent to the Osirian Didû, and in the *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 130, the reader will find a vignette of the Didû vested in a long flowing dress, "from a figure frequently found in Theban mummy-cases of the twenty-first and twenty-second dynasties." Was this the appearance of the Asherah?

NOTE B.

It has always been felt a difficulty to account for the insignificant and obscure place which the conception of another world or of a future life fills in the Hebrew scriptures. May not the real explanation be that in virtue of the identity of gods with spirits of the dead (1 Sam. xxviii. 19), the underworld was in its very nature a land of gods other than Jahveh?

In Matt. xxii. 31, 32 = Mark xii. 26, 27 = Luke xx. 37, 38, Jesus argues against the Sadducees for the resurrection of the dead from this very episode. "But as touching the dead, that they are raised; have ye not read in the book of Moses, in *the place concerning* the Bush, how God spake unto him, saying, *I am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Jahveh is emphatically the living God.

NOTE C.

In the second volume of Peter's *Nippur*, p. 313, there is an interesting account of "el-Khudhr . . . a grove of the same description as the once famous Daphne. . . . It serves as a place of asylum, where all life, even that of birds and beasts, is inviolable. Some members of the British Survey, in 1838, not knowing the nature of this grove, and seeing game there in abundance, shot some of the sacred animals, in revenge for which desecration the outraged natives attacked the expedition and tried to massacre its members. The name, el-Khudhr, the Evergreen, is also applied by Moslems to Elijah, and accordingly he has come to be regarded as the patron and founder of this old heathen sanctuary."

G. H. SKIPWITH.